

WESTAMPTON TOWNSHIP LAND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

REGULAR MEETING

May 4, 2022

MINUTES

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Westampton Township Land Development Board was held via the Zoom platform virtually on May 4, 2022 at 7:00 P.M. The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairman David Guerrero and the opening statement required by Sunshine Law was read. This meeting was advertised in the Burlington County Times on January 10, 2022 and on the Township website. All guests were welcomed.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Mr. Carr, Mr. Fagan, Mr. Grace, Mr. Guerrero, Mr. Odenheimer, Mr. Thorpe  
Absent: Mr. Borger, Mr. Henley, Ms. Karp, Mr. Ottey  
Professional Staff: Attorney Louis Cappelli, Engineer Michael Roberts, Planner Chris Dochney, Secretary Jodie Termi

---

**SWEAR IN PROFESSIONALS:**

Mr. Cappelli swore in Planner Chris Dochney and Engineer Michael Roberts

**MINUTES:**

April 4, 2022 - Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion to approve Mr. Grace, Mr. Carr second. None opposed. None abstained.

**RESOLUTION(S):**

10-2022 – Kristina Dera, Block 1207, Lot 2, 1844 Route 541 – Minor Subdivision, Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for Rita's Water Ice. Continued to May 4, 2022, meeting. Motion to approve Mr. Odenheimer, Mr. Carr second. None opposed. None abstained

11-2022 – MRP Industrial NE, LLC, Block 894, Lot 12 – Denied Application for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval. Motion to approve Mr. Odenheimer, Mr. Grace second. None opposed. Mr. Carr abstained.

12-2022 – Rancocas Holdings, LLC, Block 201, Lots 10 & 11 – Denied application for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval and Use Variance Relief. Motion to approve Mr. Odenheimer, Mr. Grace second. None opposed. None abstained.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

Kristina Dera, Block 1207, Lot 2, 1844 Route 541 - Minor Subdivision, Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for Rita's Water Ice.

Patrick McAndrew (Mr. McAndrew), Attorney for Kristina Dera stated – He has three witnesses. Kristina Dera the applicant, ReganYoung, Architect, and Bill Nicholson, our engineering planner.

Mr. Cappelli – Swore in Professionals and applicant.

Mr. Gerrero told Mr. McAndrew to continue.

Mr. McAndrew stated – This has been in the past law offices that was operated by George Kotch. It looks to me like it was at one time a home it was converted into offices. Christina is proposing to buy it and put a walk-up window basically in the back for Rita's water ice. She would like to maintain offices upstairs and part of the first floor and they are small offices that are not intentionally used. Her operation is seasonal. We did benefit actually from the one-month adjournment because we did get county approval and with minimum adjustments in the plan, they approved our proposal. One of the key facts is that the traffic on the road operates northbound and there is a barrier, so we're only dealing with what really one way traffic and we can operate with basically a right in and a right out so it's not two-way traffic and going across the median.

Mr. McAndrew asked Kristina Dera to state her background and experience.

Kristina Dera (Ms. Dera) stated - She had the Rita's literally six doors down until I decided to move into my own place, and I thought I could just do it so much better for myself not renting from someone else. I was there for six, almost seven years, this would have been the seventh season. And, you know, I just thought it was just better for me to strike out on my own. And I was able to find this place. It's very similar to where I am now. With a dual occupancy. It was a home turned into it and turned into a multi-use property. Which is the same thing I was hoping for tonight. If we can get the approvals. Again, it's six, seven doors down at most. And you know I've been in the community I've done a lot of work with people, and it's been very successful. So, I'm looking to you know, hopefully get the approval to get opened up for the season again and continue on with my business.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera – Is Rita's going to occupy about a third of the building?

Ms. Dera stated yes about a third. Originally, I was hoping to have the second as like just an office space like a perfect example was Koch's are there already. I would take literally two thirds of the first floor and he would keep the same from the same structure and you know, framing with it within the house nothing added additionally outside for spaces or exits or entrances, just building a spot within us to have it work where we both had two entrances, two exits, they had access to use the full basement the other third of the home which would give them access to the steps and upstairs. It's a much bigger house than what I need, so I thought it would be very complementing because we're kind of opposite businesses. They don't have many clientele that come in and out and we're seasonal. We're busier during the nighttime when they're there during the day. We're not there for seven months out of the year. So, it's only five to six months that we're operating from March 1<sup>st</sup> to September 30<sup>th</sup>. So, you know it was having office space there will compliment me because we are different.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera – Will your peak hours be evening and weekends.

Ms. Dera stated - Yes, there are some hot days that we might be busy. But primarily it's a weekend and evening after six o'clock business where we tend to be busiest and weekends.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera - What would be your general hours of operation in season?

Ms. Dera stated – In season hours fluctuate a little bit. We always open at 12:00pm and we go till 9:00pm from March 1<sup>st</sup> until Memorial Day and then we go from 12:00pm until 10:00pm until Labor Day and then we roll it back to 8:00pm. We close for the season September 30<sup>th</sup>.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera – Can you explain with more detail why you think your business would be compatible and say with the office use?

Ms. Dera stated – She feels they are compatible because they operate on opposite schedules for the most part. We're busier at night they operate during the day. Weekends they're typically not there. Our busiest days are Friday nights, Saturday, and Sunday. It's very small office space and it's perfect for someone who's starting a business or a small business that looking for a space. It kind of helps me because, the property is bigger than what I would need access for so it's it would just be a great second income to rent it out. I mean, and like I said I'm already coming from that situation already, with the past Rita's location at down the Street and it was a multi-use property.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera - How many employees would you have during the day and for your peak hours.

Ms. Dera stated – During the day there's usually one or two like it's about prepping and just waiting on the customer. During nighttime hours there's usually three people. There's going to be 2 serving windows and that's the same as the previous location. We are going to take out the bay window that's in the front and serve out of the two bay windows. We are going to create to walk up windows there for them to come up and then the third window that's on the front on the garage if you're looking at the building that was converted into office space, that would just be like a door dash pickup. So, there would only be a max of three windows if we were busy but primarily sticking to two. So, two employees during the day, three employees at night.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera – What type of vehicles do you expect to make deliveries of your supplies?

Ms. Dera stated - I have already been in contact with them. They're going to use like 18-Wheeler. They're going to use a small van so that can turn around within the parking lot. Typically, the 18-Wheeler would pull in at the old place and just go in through the Verizon and even have a big turn, but they have already been there looked at the area and they agree that they're not going to be able to deliver with an 18-Wheeler because there's no way to enter or exit safely.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera – You expect a van or small truck delivery. How often during the week and what time?

Ms. Dera stated - They come super early in the morning. I get the custard deliveries at like three or four o'clock in the morning. They start their day at three and they're typically done by 12 for the Rita's. So, they come in anytime from 3:00am – 12:00pm. They have the route and the route that I'm on currently in Mount Holly for the customer delivery is a three to four o'clock in the morning. Bunzl is usually there before we open between 9:00am – 11:00am.

Mr. McAndrew asked Ms. Dera - How would you handle trash, and you know waste?

Ms. Dera stated - Waste management typically come in off hours of Rita's. I've never seen so them they must come in early. We start prepping about 10:30am for the day and I haven't seen. They typically come once a week in the morning, and they pick up recycling and trash.

Mr. McAndrew asked the Board if they have any questions about the proposed use?

Mr. Guerrero stated – Asked if the current Attorney is going to remain using that building or the office space.

Ms. Dera stated - We have plans for them to leave, but if I get the Multi-Use Zone, they may stay but if I have an issue then they will leave. I think at some point he is planning on retiring over the next couple of years. That's kind of up in the air. Where we left it is he's currently leaving he did put the building up for sale. So, I think he's looking to do something, but I don't really have an answer for his business. But right now, he's going to be leaving.

Mr. Guerrero stated to Mr. McAndrew - I believe you also saw the professionals report I guess were some comments in regarding the multi-use of this building and possibility of a Use Variance multi-use.

Mr. McAndrew stated - Yeah, I noticed that to be safe. You know, personally, I did not think there was a use issue because it is a unified design. It looks like a house, and you just have two tenants in it that are what I think very good is that they're both compatible. As Christine described, they have different peaks. So, it's not like having two restaurants in one building. What we have really is a passive low key office operation, coupled with a seasonal takeout operation from two windows. I don't think it's a full-fledged restaurant. It's certainly not a very busy office. So, I think they're compatible. I think it is a unified design. So, I didn't perceive it as a use issue I didn't notice for this.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I think there's still an agreement that there is a mix of uses here. Just a question on whether a Use Variance is required.

Mr. Dochney stated - Frankly, the issue is whether the two uses are compatible. It's just that the township code permits multiple uses within a single building, and both would be permitted uses in the district. There's no question about that. Multiple uses are permitted in a single if they are designed as a united and comprehensive plan in accordance with the applicable zoning district standards. That's more than one building on a lot more than one use within a building and when it specifically references shopping centers or industrial complexes receiving site plan approval. As the Board went over this extensively last month with the MRP application and the warehouses and the cell phone tower. I think it probably be appropriate for the board to decide whether they feel this is a unified and comprehensive design in the same sense that a shopping center typically is, or these are two totally separate, unrelated uses but not a comprehensive design when presented together. In my opinion this is pretty similar to a shopping center the only difference being that it's not a shopping center. Typically, the users are side by side on the ground level versus there are they're stacked on top of each other. But they have an architectural plan clearly showing both together and how they would function together. But that's certainly the Board's determination to make whether or not they feel this would fit the definition that would qualify them to allow you to use multiple uses within this on the same site.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Cappelli if he had an opinion regarding this.

Mr. Cappelli stated - I share Mr. Dochney's thoughts. I do not believe that this requires Use Variance just a couple of permitted uses within the same building on no different shopping mall.

Mr. Guerrero stated – I'm in agreement considering it's all in the same building and it's going to be renovated all continually at one time for the for this particular use. Does the Board have any comments on this?

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Cappelli - Do you think it was wise to hold the board on this issue?

Mr. Cappelli asked the Board if anyone objects to this interpretation? There were no objections.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I think that's a fair there Mr. McAndrew that we believe a Use Variance is not required.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. McAndrew to proceed with his presentation.

Mr. McAndrew stated - My next witness is Raegan Young (Mr. Young) and can you give us your background and credentials please?

Mr. Young stated – I'm a licensed architect have been in practice in Burlington County since 1989. In Hainesport and now we're in the County seat in Mount Holly and have done various civic and private sector projects throughout the county and appeared with numerous Boards.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Young if he was a Licensed architect in New Jersey.

Mr. Young stated – Yes in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Texas, etc.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Young if he has testified before, land use boards previously many times?

Mr. Young stated - Yes

Mr. McAndrew asked the Board – Are there any questions about Mr. Young's experience? There were none.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Young - Can you describe the renovations that are proposed for this building including floorplan and elevations?

Mr. Young shared his screen – Architectural Plan – Exhibit A-1 - This is the drawing that was submitted to the Township, and it will turn into a construction document should approval be given. The building largely been kept as is on the exterior with very few exceptions. I've got a color rendering that I believe that the sign people did essentially there's some modifications to these windows but essentially the only major modification to the building is putting on the Rita's sign which is a standardized sign for the company. The other changes would be hardly noticeable but changing these windows to be operable windows for the serving function. Other than that, on the interior, we would have the Rita's function here which would be the serving and service areas from the back of the house. The remainder of the first floor, you'd come in the same existing front stair, you can go over to the Rita's, or you could go into the tenant which would have not only this part of the first floor but would have that part of the second floor and use of the basement.

Mr. Dera stated - On the left side the employees are going enter and exit through the back and we're going to serve through the front. The employees and whoever stays if it's Koch or any other tenant that comes in, they'll enter through the back and they'll go off to the left and from there if they walk straight, they will have access underneath the steps or they can or they can go through those two rooms and go up to the third stair. So, we each have a front and back you entrance and exit, and they have access to basically three quarters of the house. I would only be occupying the far-right side or left side I guess if you're looking on the plan, those two double windows on the front. We will serve our customers from those two windows and the third window will be used for Door Dash and pickups, but we could use that as third window.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Young – There are two signs one freestanding and one facade. Are they're both proposed to be complying signs.?

Mr. Young stated – Yes and no variances are required.

Ms. Dera stated – If a separate tenant came in, they would have space on the sign for their name.

Mr. McAndrew stated - So the existing George Koch sign would come down and be replaced by this, which would cover both the Rita's and the tenant.

Mr. Young stated – Yes.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Young - That sign is a little bit different than what's on the site plan that you're showing here on the screen is that those dimensions still conform to the dimensions that you have on here?

Mr. Young stated - This was the original sign we got from Rita's, but they modified it after it was submitted. It is the same width just a little taller. It's 4x6, which is 24 square feet instead of 116. But it's well within compliance which is allows 50 square feet.

Mr. McAndrew asked the Board if there were any other questions for Mr. Young? There were none.

Mr. McAndrew asked Bill Nicholson (Mr. Nicholson) to state his background, experience, and credentials.

Mr. Nicholson stated - I'm a Professional Engineer, Professional Planner in New Jersey. I have a Bachelor of Science degree in Civil Engineering. I've been practicing in the land development field primarily in Northern Burlington County for over 40 years. Over 30 years of my own practice, have testified before many boards including this board before and specialize in Land Development.

Mr. McAndrew asked the Board - Are there any questions about Mr. Nicholson's qualifications and credentials? There were none.

Mr. Nicholson shared his screen – Site Plan – Exhibit A-2.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Nicholson – Can you tell us what's there now and what modifications on this site are proposed to accommodate this proposal?

Mr. Nicholson stated – They are proposing to demolish the front sidewalk from the front of the building to the street and demolish the shed in the back. We are going to construct the new sidewalk along the county road, 5' wide to match the existing sidewalk to the south. A sidewalk around the south side of the building to get the patrons from the back of the building to the front and around the south side of the building. These will all be accessible routes under the ADA guides. The front porch now is a step or two up from the front yard and will be filled in a little bit and raised up. We will build the sidewalks are shown here and reconfigure the rear parking lot and create a total of 11 parking spaces back there. We are going to construct a trash enclosure and demolish the shed. In conjunction with the county approval, we agreed to widen the driveway and a little bit there would be a full 24 feet wide out on the county road. It is wide enough for two cars but it's a little tight so we will widen that a little bit and add a radius and it will be easier to get into and then taper back to the existing driveway as it goes to the side of the house. Those are the proposed improvements.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Nicholson to go through some of the variances that are necessary for this. Some are existing conditions but there were also some new ones.

Mr. Nicholson stated – There's a variance for lot area. The lot area requires 1.5 acres, and this lot is .36 acres. The lot width requires 150 and 80' is provided on the existing lot. The side yard requires 20' whereas the existing conditions is 11.9' on the right side of the plan on the south side of the building. They buffer width requires 30 feet. We don't have that, and you can't provide that and maintain the proper parking, so we seek the waiver on that. Impervious cover requires 60% and 65% is proposed and that's an existing condition. A variance for loading space as testified by Christina, there will be a small van making deliveries to the sites we don't really need a loading space they can use one of the existing parking spaces. There is a variance required for the parking lot to be curved on the perimeter.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Nicholson – Can you show or describe the landscape buffer and point out where that's an issue?

Mr. Nicholson stated – Across the back of the lot or along the rear line. There's a comment in the planners review that we add some landscaping back there. We can plant a single row of plants across the back their to supplement the existing fence.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Nicholson - Some of the variances are existing conditions, but the new issues, like this buffer, can they be granted without negative impacts.

Mr. Nicholson stated - Absolutely, yes, they can.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Nicholson - Okay, and what's the justification for the new variances?

Mr. Nicholson stated - I believe it's a couple of things. It advances the purpose under the Land Use Act that allows for more efficient use of the land, which is one of the purposes the Land Use Act and has special reasons is very well-suited property for us, I believe.

Mr. McAndrew stated - Okay. In this case, what we're doing really is adaptive reuse of a house that was there for many years. First became an office and there will be this dual use.

Mr. Nicholson stated - Correct. That's the more efficient use of the land and recycled materials etc.

Mr. McAndrew asked the Board if they had any questions Mr. Nicholson?

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Nicholson - Would you agree that with this use and in the amount of traffic coming to the back woods actually be more of an intensive use than what's currently in place today?

Mr. Nicholson stated - I'm not a traffic engineer, but I would think so.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I'm always one is really concerned when it comes to industrial commercial properties against residential zones. I understand this is a non-conforming use from prior as this being a new application. I am kind of concerned with the rear yard buffer. I believe it's less than the 30' and you are at 25'. I would be looking to see if we get the full 30' back there as well as the buffering that was also asked for by our Professionals. Second comment and question. Typically, the Board only looks for parking spaces as -9x18 when it comes for employee parking, and this is meant for patrons here to use this facility. I would think that the normal 10x20 parking spots would be more in line with what we normally see from commercial space.

Mr. Nicholson stated - We can certainly provide a 20' depth in the parking spaces because there is an overly wide island down the middle. So, to the extent that we want to try to maximize the parking I don't know about the width. We can provide the 20' depth on the space, we may have to eliminate spaces if we have to go with the 10' width. It seems more important to keep the parking count up in this situation.

Mr. Guerrero asked - Also I was looking at the plan what is the current distance that I'm looking at here for the driveway between the house and I guess the finished portion of the driveway where the tree is?

Mr. Nicholson stated - The house is 18' from the property line so, it's a little less than 18 maybe 15' or 16'.

Mr. Guerrero stated - It doesn't sound like it's possible to have two-way traffic going through this. This is like a one-way traffic going through this driveway one at a time with this width.

Ms. Dera stated - I was honestly planning on removing that tree just to just make the driveway straighter and a little wider.

Mr. Guerrero stated - So you're saying that the maximum width is 18' from the house to the property line?

Mr. Nicholson stated - Yes

Mr. Guerrero stated - He would have to refer to our professionals on whether 18' is considered a wide enough for two-way traffic to me sounds pretty tight.

Mr. Dochney stated - I think it is a little bit of a tight end. I think removing the tree and providing the width up to the property line would probably be a better option and then getting as close as you can to a proper width, but 18' would be

pretty tight people would probably have to wait before they can go. In our report we asked for some additional striping or some other markings that would kind of help guide drivers in and out. Just to kind of give everybody a heads up that is a bit narrow for the drivers coming through. One way traffic is probably going to be what you're looking at.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I just trying to consider how if this is so narrow and we are looking at one way traffic, how would it work when we have a car trying to egress while another cars trying to ingress onto the property.

Mr. Dochney stated – I'm looking at the street view, now and even though it does measure to around 15' to 15.5' feet if you scale it on the PDF. I feel like the street view makes it look wider than that. With removing the tree, it probably get to two cars being able to pass each other at very slow speeds. So, I leave it up to you to decide whether that's something that we're comfortable with. I think it will be a little tight, but it should still function, and if nothing else there'll be able to have a car on the opposite ends of waiting their turn to come by if that driver is uncomfortable by the driver coming from the other end.

Mr. Guerrero stated – I was also looking at the tree in the back. I know there's some comments here about making an island around that tree or whether they're actually looking to eliminate that tree to try to save a parking space because I was already making comments about 30' off the rear property line and as well as the 10' width for a parking spot versus 9'.

Mr. Dochney sated - If you want to go with a 10' the tree is not going to be able to stay just from the dimension that's provided. You are going to lose three spaces next to the handicap space and that's almost encumbered into that tree, but it's substantial size tree so I don't know if that outweighs the other that's I'll leave that up to you.

Ms. Dera stated - I was planning to remove that tree because it is an obstruction in the middle of the parking area, and it is quite sizable. I agree with you and those two trees I'm looking into having them removed.

Mr. Guerrero stated - There's also the consideration we don't know what your other potentially use is you did make comments that your hours are during your season which runs from Memorial Day through Labor Day, noon onward into the evening. That whatever use you may have during the day, there's potential that you have coexistence usage during noon until four or five in the afternoon. Will there be enough parking spaces based on the other usage you may have, and that's an unknown that we currently have since you don't have a tenant outside of your current attorney so maybe I'll leave it up to the professionals to chime in on whether what they think about the parking spots, considering that I'm not sure how many employees you are going to have there at a time and how many parking spots they are going to be using and how many other spaces may be used by one of your tenants.

Ms. Dera stated – There would be two at the most but usually only one person. They just come in early prep everything and then they kind of run the Windows, but at the most there would be two. That's what we typically do they are efficient girls. Two is really needed when it's super-hot. Probably 70% of time it's only one person. Currently they have 3 employees there and they do a lot of off-site things. Mr. Koch doesn't even come into the office he sees everyone via computer right now. So, it's just his receptionist and the attorneys just popping in.

Mr. Dochney asked Ms. Dera - Since you did previously operate you said maybe what a quarter mile up the road. The building that you were in you were sharing that with a hair salon. That might have relatively similar hours except being open on the weekends to an office which is usually busy during the day, and they are not staying open late at night. How was the parking over there? It looks like that site had more parking. I think it's 6-8 parking spaces in the front end about 20 unstriped spaces in the back.

Ms. Dera stated – No it's not that big. They had 7-8 parking spaces in the front. They only added that back maybe two years ago. Because it was just rotted and runny back there and it was a new owner and that is what he did. He paved



back there for us. People really didn't even use that spot not that it's the same situation. But I think there were maybe 10 spots back there. They never striped them so I honestly don't know how many spots would have been back there.

Mr. Dochney stated - I guess in terms for the Board to determine how much parking would be necessary here. There are really three considerations. One how many employees would there be for Rita's and their testimony has been up to three not even at their peak hours. Then for the office use. If you go with what the floor plan shows it could be five offices in a reception room and if you assume that one professional per office and one administrative staff member, I would assume they could have maybe six employees. There would be the max capacity six to seven maybe for the most part, there's probably not too much overlap between the office use the Rita's Water Ice and Custard. Another consideration is how many customers during a peak hour would be coming for Rita's and to what extent, even though there is no seats there I assume that a lot of your customers come get their water ice and their custard and then they hang out at their car for a while they all just don't go home. Since you don't have a traffic engineer it's hard to tell what the turnaround time of a customer is when they come or how long are they there?

Ms. Dera stated – Most of the time they take their stuff and leave. We had 3 benches out there and not too many people sit honestly it kind of surprises me that but not too many they usually take it and go unless they have little kids and the parents don't want to mess up their cars.

Mr. Dochney asked Ms. Dera – Regarding the amount of parking at your current location, has that been a problem?

Ms. Dera stated - No

Mr. Dochney stated – Let's assume that some of these Board members are your previous customers and they have some experience on whether or not parking is a problem there.

Mr. Guerrero stated – I did have a thought here as well. Based on some of the comments earlier, I don't know how many parking stalls that are left will if we hold to the 30' in the rear yard between the Commercial and Residential as well as something greater than a 9' width. Even with the elimination of the tree how many parking spots will be left, and it looks like it would be less than 11.

Mr. Roberts stated – I measured out the front grass area and it's about 27.5' so 30' buffer would have to go out another 3 feet from there. If you remove the tree, you could shift those last 2 spaces down even with the width it will fit that six spaces on that side and five spaces on the left. It will be questionable about that last space is going to encumber people coming in and out so you may end up losing that space so you're going to be between 10 and 11.

Mr. Guerrero stated – That is assuming something greater than 9' or are you using 10' for that?

Mr. Roberts stated - I think that would be assuming 10'. If you keep it a 9' you keep it at 11 spaces at a minimum or possibly even go to 12 spaces depending on how the dimensions shake out on the right. I don't know if there's any room for the 5' hatched space for the van accessible portion of the handicapped accessible and it would be shifted closer to the building it looks like you may need to do construct more pavement to do that but that might provide better access to space.

Mr. Guerrero asked - Anybody else on the board have comments?

Mr. Carr asked - Do you have any plans for lighting on the driveway during your nighttime hours?

Mr. Ncholson stated – We can provide some lighting on the building. I was a little worried about lighting because of the residential neighbors behind Rita's but what we can do is provide some lighting on the back of the building to light up the parking lot from the building only. It may be a little sparse all the way back in those spaces, but it will provide some

lighting at the building. It will be more advantageous than putting up poles and having higher lighting that may impose on the neighbors.

Ms. Dera stated – I used 5 battery packs at the old Rita's that were placed around the building, and I would like to use them again. They shined down and they were bright LED. It lit the parking lot on the front sides and back of the building. I don't know the size of them, but Jim Nicodemus installed them. I was planning on putting them back up around the house because they were bright. I think it's small enough facing downwards and it wouldn't be in the back area, but I would have to default to professionals for that because that's not my area of expertise. This is what was installed at the previous store is very adequate and bright and I was very happy with them.

Mr. Roberts asked Ms. Dera – Do they turn off at night?

Ms. Dera stated – Yes, they were set on auto, and they were probably 1' wide and eight inches tall. But there's a super pack the liquor store has them if you are driving around you can look at them and they have several around their building. I didn't have to use the parking lot lights from PSE&G or the electric company. They were kind of obsolete and they drowned them out anyway. I only had 1 light in that parking lot and after years of asking the landlord if he could add additional lighting I went upon and added them myself and it was more than adequate. Again, it was professionally installed by Nicodemus they took care of everything so I was planning on going back there again because you know I think that was the easiest and less intrusive without poles and they could easily be attached around the house.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Dochney – I think you will agree when we are talking about lighting and it's near residential property, we're looking to have these light fixtures shielded so we can't see light element from any of the residential properties we don't have any carryover of the light going over to the property so, does she need zero-foot candles on the residential property? I'm not sure if what she is describing would be adequate for that purpose.

Mr. Dochney stated - I honestly have no idea without seeing any details on the plan to review it. I think conceptually what we're looking for here because this is a commercial operation that will have nighttime hours there needs to be some lighting in the parking lot and in the front of the building while you're waiting for safety and security, but also minimizing and completely removing light spillage into residence behind you. So, on the one hand it makes a lot of sense putting smaller building lights that shine right into the parking lot. I also in my head at least I'm having trouble thinking how you would do that and adequately light your parking without having lights shine into the people's houses behind you. In my head I'm thinking the best way to light your parking lot without having any lighting going into residence behind you. Some sort of pole mounted fixture in the back that faces toward the building perhaps in addition to small building mounted lights. It's not the tallest building so I'm thinking it may be hard to light that parking lot from a building mounted light and have it shielded enough so that it's not glaring directly into the residence because of the distance it would be traveling. I'm not certain how you would be able to do that. I'm not really a lighting expert maybe Mr. Roberts might want to say something or Mr. Thorpe.

Ms. Dera stated – We can mount them to the second floor, that's the uniqueness about this building is you do have that second floor. Obviously the higher you go the more you can cast the light downward and can shine out a little bit further. I was just hoping to mount them higher and shielding them from casting on the back area without them going into the neighbors. I was hoping not for pole because there isn't a lot of space with parking that you guys are asking about.

Mr. Dochney stated - I certainly understand certainly more expensive and more construction, but safety and security in the parking lot if you are going to have people there at night, trying to make it as much as possible without light shining directly onto adjacent properties. So, I'm certain that something worked out and we just need to see some details. I'm sure your Engineer can work with us to figure something out that would be appropriate under these circumstances. Whether that's the combination of wall packs and something in the back, my primary concern is that safety.

Mr. Guerrero stated - Additionally, do you have lighting for your sidewalk on the East side that goes around the building?

Ms. Dera stated – I was going to use packs again on right side, left side and front because they are business and not residential. I don't think they will disturb anyone, but the Board would have the final decision on that.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I think normally even though that might be acceptable would probably be easier if you could a light fixture there and keep it shielded that would keep the light on your property.

Mr. Guerrero asked Ms. Dera - You also made some comments about possible benches or tables. Can you tell us where you anticipate putting those?

Ms. Dera stated – If I put something it would probably be where the sidewalk is on that side of the house away from the entrance and exit along the trees.

Mr. Guerrero asked Ms. Dera - On the sidewalk or near the sidewalk?

Ms. Dera stated – Along the property line where there's just trees. So, it's a way from everything. The street and the side where they would be entering and exiting. I only plan on having a couple benches like at the other store.

Mr. Guerrero asked if the Board had any more questions.

Mr. Thorpe asked - It's Mr. Thorpe. How much space is there between the sidewalk and the fence along the property like?

Ms. Dera stated – I believe it's 11.85'.

Mr. Nicholson stated – That is the dimensions from building to the property line. From the sidewalk to the property line is approximately 2'-3'.

Mr. Thorpe stated – It doesn't seem like benches would fit there.

Ms. Dera stated – It's a little further down where the curve and the patio in that area 10' for so in front if you are headed toward the street in that little corner there where they can have their treats in the shaded area.

Mr. Thorpe stated - Okay, so I have a couple of comments. The buffer zone which our ordinance calls for 30' right now I believe Mike said it's approximately 27' which is relatively close. I believe there needs to be a 6' solid fence installed between the commercial property and the residential property. There should be a solid fence there, anything like a 6' vinyl woodgrain fence and I personally don't like white vinyl. It could be a wood fence if it's solid and it should be landscaped and buffered with a lot of foliage back there. That is something that should be addressed and talked about. No one has ever heard me say remove trees in my entire life but of these trees to go otherwise it just doesn't work and never come out of my mouth in history. This is a strange one because people hang out at their cars the 10' wide parking spaces make a lot of sense. The problem that I think Mr. Roberts or Mr. Dochney was talking about that first lot as you are driving in and if it breaches down too far that's not a good thing. So, I'm a little bit tentative on that and would see if this can be done with 10' slots this is going to be a very strange suggestion is that the first lot be waived in as a 9' wide if that works, I'm going to have to see what Mike says about that. As for lighting, there needs to be a pole mounted fixtures in the buffer zone facing the parking lot. We must get the parking lot lit for safety. I'm not sure what the wall packs are so I wouldn't approve anything a lighting layout and design. It sure would be nice if there were fixtures mounted to the building, some sort of architectural fixture that matched the architecture of the building. I would say we need to see a lighting layout to do it properly. My number one concern is in fact the width of that driveway. If you have

cars coming in and out at the same time, are they playing chicken? That's my number one concern on that side of the parking lot. People know, I'm not happy when drawings are submitted and are not. Not a big fan that and I would like to see what this curve is on the ingress that someone mentioned was going to be changed. So, we really shouldn't be seeing that. That are all my comments for now and would like to hear what the professionals and some of the applicant's professionals think about some of those things.

Mr. Nicholson stated – The County issued a review letter and we negotiated with the County through some emails that we agreed to widen the driveway and that happened after submitting the plans to the Township. If we agree to widen the driveway for the County to a 24' driveway it's not on these plans because we already submitted to the Township, and they haven't been changed yet for the County approval. We propose to do that change on the entrance of the driveway and taper back to the house. We agreed to remove the tree on the North side of the house and widen the driveway there. Then those 5 spaces when you come in and try to maintain a proper isle before that we can make a combination of 9' or 10' spaces whichever may work. Make sure we have proper isle width so you can get around there and if we eliminate the other tree off to the right when you convert those to 10' spaces we can also provide a 30' buffer in the back and various kinds of plantings. As to the lighting comments, I will propose lighting on the building I didn't want to go with pole mounted lighting because I'm afraid it's going unto the neighbors. There were talks about wall packs. The old wall packs were glaring in that they shine not just down but out and down. They do make new one that shine down only. I'm not sure if we can get enough lighting on the building alone and cover the whole back of the lot. It's up to the Board whether the back needs to be supplemented and we can work that out with your Engineer.

Mr. Thorpe stated – There is nothing that you are going to put a fixture on the building that is going to light that parking lot without going into neighbors' areas. There must be something in the rear and again I would like to see what it is. Again, I firmly believe there needs to be a 6' fence back there.

Mr. Guerrero stated to Mr. Dochney– The site plan we are looking at now is incomplete because it doesn't have the trash enclosures. We had some comments as to where the trash enclosure will be based on the report.

Mr. Dochney stated – It could be 1 pole mounted light adjacent to the trash enclosure. I assume the garbage enclosure would be 6'-7' in height and a pole mounted light would be 10'-12' in height so I don't think that would be an issue. The site plan that we have shown a dumpster enclose to the shed that is shown on the screen now and facing into the parking lot. Why is the dumpster skewed to the South side of the property where the gate will swing into an actual parking space rather than be centered onto the drive isle.?

Mr. Nicholson stated – The trash pickup will be at off hours and he's trying to not make it so prominent, but it can be shifted.

Mr. Dochney stated – It will be back there regardless and shifting it over 3' will reduce its prominence. I do understand you point as testified earlier that Waste Management does come in off peak hours. It would not be an issue but something I noted as a concern. In response to Mr. Guerrero's question. I don't think that wherever they eventually locate the dumpster as the submitted plans show or they shifted it somewhere else would not significantly interfere with placing a pole mounted light in the back. It may also work out that they put two poles, not necessarily in the back but on the side with shields on them. There are several options here it's a matter of reviewing and what works best for them.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Dochney if he had any comments regarding the fence or landscape buffer in the rear yard.

Mr. Dochney stated – He agrees with Mr. Thorpe that there must be a fence. Google maps is showing something in the back.

Ms. Dera stated – There is a chain link fence back there.

Mr. Dochney stated – It should be some type of solid fence. I would like some more of a buffer maybe a wood or vinyl fence. I'm not fond of white vinyl but that's more personal preference of mine and not a planning opinion. I think in addition to the 6' fence, as much vegetation as you get back there would be great. Combination of a staggered row of arborvitae or Cypress or evergreen trees that's relatively fast growing. Perhaps 2-3 shade trees in there as well so it's not just a green wall. Maybe a tree or an ornamental tree break up the monotony of just a green buffer. Even if you shifted the parking, you have a full 30' where you can do the buffer without having the dumpster enclosure there and won't encroach into the buffer and would still require a variance. I have one last comment, on the assumption that people will be hanging out in the parking lot or at least a little while, do you plan on having any garbage or recycling bins for people to put their garbage.

Ms. Dera stated – We have the normal 55-gallon trash cans with the dome lids for them to dispose of their trash. Just like we had at the other store.

Mr. Guerero asked Ms. Dera – Where do you plan on locating those?

Mr. Dera stated – Somewhere along the walkway so if they sit on the benches along the grass line and as they are walking to their cars. One in the back and one along the curve. In the back if they were to sit in their car, I would trash receptacle there. I'm not limited to the number of trash receptacles, I would rather them throw it in the trash than on the ground.

Mr. Dochney stated – I would like to see 1 or 2 in the back.

Ms. Dera stated – Maybe 1 or 1 In the back parking lot, one by the handicapped parking space and one along the curved walkway. Would 3 be acceptable?

Mr. Dochney stated – I think 2 would be enough but if you wanted to do 3, I won't stop you.

Mr. Guerrero asked if the Board had anymore comments or questions?

Mr. Carr stated – I support your concerns and Mr. Thorpe's.

Mr. Guerrero stated to the Professionals – You were saying without that tree you were saying the distance is 18' for the driveway? I'm still looking at this drawing of the driveway and that's one of my biggest concerns is that making sure you know cars can get in and off this property on a two-way traffic. It's probably the most imperative thing going on with this site plan.

Mr. Dochney stated - I can say if that is a full 18' that's essentially 2 9' wide parking spots next to each other so it's certainly wide enough for any regulation street legal vehicle. They can pass as long as they are careful and go slowly. I agree with Mike's comment before to the extent any sort of centerline stripe with arrows on the right side pointing in and out to direct people will minimize the people driving through the middle of that driveway. It will be tight, and people will have to drive slower than they would like to but it's wide enough so vehicle can physically pass on another.

Mr. Guerrero stated – I'm a little bit familiar with this property and I don't know if there are any considerations since you already putting up a rail there on the covered porch limiting those steps so vehicles will have a tendency to try to shift over to avoid those steps and especially this point, they will not be required.

Ms. Dera stated – They are going to be eliminated.

Mr. Guerrero stated - Ok. Thank you.

Ms. Dera stated – They are going to be eliminated and I'm going to put a fence to keep anyone from stepping off in that area.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I did see the fence I just didn't know if they planned on being eliminated.

Mr. Nicholson asked Ms. Dera – Is the downspout going away?

Ms. Dera stated - I didn't think about the downspout but I can make a modification to place that somewhere else.

Mr. Roberts stated – It would be fine pointing forward just not directed into the roadway.

Mr. Guerrero stated – One of my concerns is scratching the building. You see with drive thru windows the scratching from the sideview mirrors because people try to get to close to the window. Just a hinderance that there might be an occasion that you might have vehicles passing each other that might actually come in contact with your building. That is a consideration for you to aware of as well with this tight space.

Mr. Guerrero asked if the Board have any questions or comments?

Mr. Thorpe stated – While it's not a requirement in Westampton but it is a lovely thing, and I will throw out the suggestion and a lot of people have done it. You don't have to say yes or no but one of the things we do appreciate is that when people put signs up and underneath the wording of the signs it says "Welcome to Westampton Township" or "Welcome to Westampton" something along those lines. I just wanted to throw that out there. If that is something, you would like to do and work with our professionals with. It's something you see around town a quite of bit. It's a nicety to set yourself in Westampton and make people know that you are in Westampton.

Mr. Mr Roberts stated – I feel that's a great idea since you are so close to the Mt. Holly border.

Mr. Thorpe stated - And that's why we like to do it.

Mr. McAndrew stated – We did have to notice Mt. Holly because we are that close and, I think we have enough square footage that for that to fit so we can probably accommodate that request. That sounds like it's very doable.

Ms. Dera stated – She didn't have an issue with adding that to the sign.

Mr. Grace stated – I share the same concerns regarding the driveway, and I would certainly like to see what the result of the negotiation with the Burlington County Planning board is as it relates to that. The lighting plan as well and if we can get as much vegetation on the back to shield the residential homeowners in the back would be important.

Mr. Guerrero asked if anyone on the Board had anymore comments or questions.

Mr. Roberts stated – I just want to poll the Board regarding having 10' wide spaces or 30' buffer because both are not possible at the same time. They are already asking for a waiver to the buffer because of the location of the trash enclosure. So, if that must continue at 27' would still be acceptable to the Board? Just so the applicant has an idea which would be the preference.

Mr. Guerrero stated – Since the enclosure isn't used during business hours it's only a once or twice a week kind of pick up and the parking spots will be used quite consistently, I'm personally hoping for a 30' set back for the parking spots as well at the 10' on the parking spaces. That's why I asked how many spaces would be left because what I'm seeing is it is less than eleven but might actually be only nine with both of those considerations in place.

Mr. Roberts stated – I'm thinking probably 10 because once you move the tree on the right side you will have more space to continue to have 6 on the right but you would lose 1 space on the left.

Mr. Thorpe stated - I agree with Mike. If it went to 30' and the tree goes away I'm counting with 10' spaces. I think you end up with 10 parking spaces and that's the way I'm scaling right now and that would be my ultimate preference because the bigger the buffer the better. Obviously, I voiced that I'm expecting a fence and what Chris said regarding foliage a row of arborvitae is a wonderful landscaping buffer and in addition to the fence and ornamentals. I think a 30' buffer and 10' spaces is my preference.

Mr. Roberts stated – I agree with you both and the plantings will provide shading from any type of potential lighting fixtures that would be put up as well.

Mr. Guerrero asked the Board if anyone had anymore comments or questions?

Mr. Dochney asked – Are either of the signs going to be illuminated?

Ms. Dera stated - The Rita's sign on the building is going to be eliminated and the other sign I'm struggling with that. I'm thinking of just having just a plain wood sign and just have lights shining up onto it. That's kind of where I was leaning on that not doing illuminated.

Mr. Guerrero stated – Internally illuminated on the façade sign of the building.

Ms. Dera stated – Yes that would be illuminated with LED lights, and you should have the dimensions and the LED light sizes and then to just have a wood sign with lights shining up to it.

Mr. Dochney stated – I must double check the code because I don't know if the code allows externally illuminated signs and the lights to be directed upwards. Generally, what we have always directed to be dark sky compliant which would be all lights be directed downwards. Is it possible, if you want to light the sign to do it from the top of the sign? I think it would trigger any variances almost like a little gooseneck fixture on top of the sign pointing down.

Ms. Dera stated - I'm sure they can create the sign anyway they want to and I'm sure that they can do that. I was thinking about using a solar power light or something like that.

Mr. Dochney stated – My preference would be that the lights be directed down but there are a lot of signs I have seen including my old office that we had lights directed up at nighttime and if they are pointing to the sign and not in the air then it shouldn't be a problem, I will leave that up to the Board whether they have a preference. Your code doesn't specifically address the illumination of signs in determination of direction, but I will double check that really quick.

Mr. Thorpe stated - I personally am a fan of both of those styles. The big problem with ground mounted signs is that you need to light both sides of the sign. One of them would be facing traffic so it's hard to shield a ground mounted but it's not impossible with the proper fixture. The options could be there, but you have to make sure you're not lighting into a driver's eyes if someone pulls into the building. The gooseneck type signs with an architectural fixture are much more elegant. Most of the stuff we do in parking lots and things we keep people to a 4000-degree kelvin temperature and this kind of sign a 3000-degree kelvin makes a lot more sense. It's much more pleasant. And I think that will ultimately again we need to see a lighting plot.

Mr. Thorpe stated - full disclosure. I am a lighting expert, and this is what I do for a living. So that's why I end up harping a lot on the lighting and trying to make sure that it is appropriate beautiful and architectural safe all those things. So, this is why for this we don't have a lot of information on lighting and that is something we need because there is always

that need to be lit, there's a parking lot, and signs etc. The ultimate is safety and security and then making sure your building looks as gorgeous as it can.

Mr. Dochney stated – For clarification even though we both said we prefer the lighting from top down like a gooseneck style fixture the Township code does require that externally illuminated signs be lit from bottom up.

Mr. Thorpe stated – That's fine it's a gorgeous look it's a matter of finding the right fixture that from the distance from the sign has the correct angle and it's a shielded fixture. There's more out there than we know what to do with.

Mr. Guerrero asked - Going back to parking and assuming we are doing 10' parking spots What is the minimum distance on the corner of the back of the building to that first parking spot on the West side?

Mr. Dochney stated – Just eyeballing it if those spaces are 9' wide then it must be somewhere in the range of 25' – 30' from the stripe to the curb.

Mr. Nichols stated – From there to the back of the building is 25' right now.

Mr. Guerrero stated – We will maintain the minimum of 25' for a parking spot.

Mr. Nicholson stated – If you go to 10' you are going to have to eliminate a space, or it will encroach on the 25'.

Mr. Roberts stated – You are going to want to keep it 25' there is a sharp turn right there. If you go with anything narrower than that you're going to start running into conflicts.

Mr. Guerrero stated - Okay, I just wanted to make sure where the line would be.

Mr. Nicholson stated – Can I propose a highbred situation where those spaces would be 9' on the left and 10' on the right and the ones on the right will be the most used anyway.

Mr. Thorpe stated - That's kind of what I was suggesting, and I only suggested that the one parking area be 9' but having all of them be 9' on the left side and that is acceptable and it keeps things safe and gives them the minimum 25' then a hybrid situation does not terrible to me.

Mr. Guerrero stated – The consideration would be to have 2 spots reserved for employees at 9' to help you out on the West side?

Mr. Nichols stated – All of them on the left side not necessarily reserved for employees but labeled for employee parking on the left or at least 3 of them over there and keep them all 9' on the West side to maintain the 25' aisle between the spaces and the building.

Mr. Roberts stated – I think that is appropriate but it's up to the Board, but I have no problems with that.

Mr. Oddenheimer stated – I think that is a better solution. The one piece of that would be to maintain a 30' buffer on that side you would have to push those spaces closer to the building and lose a space anyway. I'd be in favor of keeping the 5 spaces and keeping the back line where it is so we can have the extra parking space.

Mr. Roberts stated – That is what I was trying to reference earlier when I was asking whether there was preference over 10' spaces or losing the 30' buffer. You can get it at 27' but aren't able to keep that space and I think that would be my preference. The number of spaces versus 30' or 27' is more of a significance but that's up to the Board.



Mr. Oddenheimer stated – I agree with that if we have 27' and adding the vegetation that we are discussing, and it provides us with an extra parking space. That would be my preference at the proposed plan.

Mr. Roberts stated – Ensuring that the landscaping and different types of vegetation that is a smarter move in this case. It provides the exact same level of coverage between 27' and 20' I don't think you would even be able to notice it or tell a difference.

Mr. Grace stated – I'm in agreement and I think given the lack of overall parking, if we can maintain that 1 parking spot, I think that the back buffer with all of that foliage and vegetation that we're talking about difference between 27' and 30' is not that significant.

Mr. Roberts stated - What I ask regarding striping for that first spot is that you come down from that spot with a little triangle there like it's hatched out just to help guide people toward the center of the drive aisle and then people don't park there if there isn't an extra space or hinder the circulation.

Mr. McAndrews stated – That is a good idea, and we will take care of that.

Mr. Guerrero asked - if anyone had any comments or questions?

Mr. Roberts stated – I have one last question regarding the utilities. I assume that you are going to use the same connections that you have now. The usage for your water demand and sewage is going to increase, have you gone ahead and start contacting any of the utility companies yet to find out that they will serve? Also, in your other Rita's do you have a grease interceptor and is that a requirement for Rita's?

Ms. Dera stated – I don't have a grease trap in there because it's basically just sugar and water. We don't have anything fried, cooked or greased.

Mr. Roberts stated - I wasn't sure, but I think so, but it was a little bit unclear. If it's just the Water Ice and custard I can't see how that would be necessary.

Ms. Dera stated – It's basically water and sugar and solvents for cleaning. The machines are water fed and water cooled.

Mr. Guerrero asked if the Board had anymore comments or questions.

Mr. Guerrero opened the meeting for public comments regarding this application.

Brian O'Neill – 15 Mayfaire – Mr. Cappelli swore in Mr. O'Neill - I'm looking at the plans and I'm a little concerned about the driveway with people walking down that driveway to go to the front even though they are supposed to go to the other side that's not going to stop people from walking down that driveway when cars are coming in and out. The first two parking spots on the left-hand side is going to be trouble for cars to turn into them. There will be cars doing K turns in the parking lot. I don't think 10 parking spots are enough, especially if you use those 2 parking spots for employees and I think it's going to be a bottleneck back there for parking. Especially how the driveway and parking lot is designed.

Mr. Guerrero stated – Anyone else from the public wish to make any comments or questions regarding this application.  
None

Mr. Guerrero closed this application for public comment.

Mr. Guerrero asked the Board if they had any more questions or comments? None

Mr. Cappelli stated – Both of the trees must be taken down. Along the back or the rear of the property will be a 6' solid fence. There will be additional foliage plan submitted to our Engineer. A lighting plan needs to be submitted and approved by our Engineer. Plans need to be updated to show the driveway curve. There will be at least two trash cans for customers on the property. The parking spots on the left hand or West side of the lot would be 9' wide and 3 spots will be labeled for Employees only. The parking spots on the right hand or East side of the lot would be 10' wide. The buffer 27' which is a condition that is set forth in our engineer review letter.

Mr. Thorpe stated – I have a question and want to make sure Mike and Chris are fine with this. As for a lighting plan I think by now we all know each other, and we know a lot of our preferences and I want to make sure that you two are comfortable with working with the applicant on a proper lighting plan that will meet the specifications that we talked about here in the meeting. Obviously, safety, well lighted and proper color and temperature and not blinding people. I want to make sure you are comfortable with that and it's ok with you.

Mr. Roberts stated – I'm very comfortable with it I have designed lighting plans myself many times and I'm comfortable to work with their Engineer to make it work.

Mr. Nicholson stated – Did the Board agree on the rear setback for the dumpster can impede on that 27'?

Mr. Guerrero stated – Yes, it's just that the parking cannot impeded on the 27'.

Mr. Oddenheimer stated - I'm not sure that we should designate them but have a policy encouraging the employees to park on the West side with the 9' spaces. If 2 employees carpool and 1 might walk or ride a bike and they are designated 2-3 employee spaces now we are taking up spaces that people wouldn't park in when we have limited parking anyway.

Mr. Guerrero stated – He agrees with Mr. Oddenheimer.

Mr. Thorpe stated – What hasn't been decided tonight and I will leave it up to Chris or Mike to work with the applicant to come up with the best prettiest or best fencing that would be appropriate for Westampton.

Mr. Guerrero asked if the Board had anymore comments or questions.

Mr. Carr asked Mr. Guerrero – Is this a conditional approval based on the conditions that Mr. Cappelli stated.

Mr. Guerrero stated – Yes all of the conditions that Mr. Cappelli stated and there are a lot of them and some are preexisting and non-conforming.

Motion to approve this application for Preliminary and Final Site plan approval together with the requested variances. Mr. Carr, Mr. Odenheimer second. None opposed. None abstain.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. McAndrew – As Kristina's attorney, she is aware of the ramifications with proceeding at risk?

Mr. McAndrew stated – Yes, she's willing to accept that if everyone else will allow it.

#### **NEW BUISNESS:**

Westampton Realty Urban Renewal, LLC, Block 805, Lot 1 – site plan review, major subdivision. Redevelop/Construct hotels, Restaurant with drive thru.

Mr. Hulse attorney for Westampton Realty Urban Renewal requested a continuance to the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. They need to get an extension on a redevelopment resolution from the Township.

Mr. Cappelli stated – He also agreed that this should be continued and that Westampton Realty Urban Renewal, LLC would not have to re-notice to the Public and this will be held at the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting. None opposed. None abstained. Continuance approved.

National Society of Colonial Dames, Block 906, Lot 12 – Requesting a 3-year continuation of Resolution 17-2020 for the reconstruction of a barn on a historic farm.

Mr. McAndrew, Attorney for Colonial Dames requested a 3-year extension due to Covid and contractors they haven't been able to move forward. Motion to approve Mr. Thorpe, Mr. Odenheimer second. None opposed. None abstained.

#### **IFORMAL APPLICATIONS:**

Burlington County Institute of Technology & Burlington County Special Services School District, Block 804 Lot 8 & 10, 695 Woodland Road – Informal Review Application – Sign Replacement and Addition.

Mr. Guerrero turned the meeting over to Sara Werner (Ms. Werner) Attorney with Prime & Tuvel appearing on behalf of the applicants. Tonight's informal application relates to the property as your chairman just stated designated as block 804 Lots eight and 10 which property currently operates as the applicants Westampton campuses of its respective institutions. We're before the board this evening seeking an informal review on two items. The first is the replacement of various signs throughout the campuses. Which signs are proposed for the purposes of simply updating the site, and the second is a proposed building addition? I have with me tonight, our Architect Larry Uher who is going to go through the details of what's being proposed. I also have a representative of the applicant Andrew Wilmont and he's available to answer any questions the Board may have, but I don't have anything directly that I'm going to ask him to offer this evening. So, without further ado, I will go right ahead and kick it over to Mr. Uher. I have plans that I can share and put the sign plan onto the screen.

Mr. Uher stated – The proposed project of the district is for sign replacement at both schools, BCIT and the Special Services School next door. All these signs are replacement signs except for one sign which I will mention a second. The main sign is the BCIT sign which is right on woodland road which I'm sure you're aware of. It's a larger sign. It is not a lit sign although it does have some ground mounted up lights on the sign. And we are proposing to replace that sign with a new double sided LED sign. The new sign will be smaller than the existing sign. It will have a brick face and a double-sided LED sign. If you want to go to the next page or page D 100. You can see a photograph at the top photo is the existing sign that is on woodland road. That's the BCIT sign and the other sign you see below is the Special Services sign which is on the campus on Pioneer Boulevard. We're also replacing that sign with an identical double sided LED sign with a brick base. So basically, both sides will look pretty similar to the photograph on the bottom, pretty much the same size as well. The LED sign itself is approximately 10' x 5.5' tall on top of the brick base. The other replacement signs as part of this project, we are replacing just the text on some other signage around the Special Services School. Again, these are existing signs and we're literally just replacing the text on the sign.

Ms. Werner asked Larry - These are existing signs and we're literally just replacing the text.

Mr. Uher stated – Correct, that's existing signage and that's what it says now for instance, the Elementary School sign they're going to change that text to read South entrance. The High School side will now say North entrance. Middle School sign will say east entrance and central administration sign will be changed to read main entrance these are existing signs and we're just replacing the text. There was one new sign that's being proposed with this project. It's on the corner of Academy Drive in Pioneer Boulevard and it's to provide direction to the public on how to get the Board of Ed offices. That you heard that you have the aerial view site plan there a second ago. Sir, there you go. You want to zoom in on that on the left. It's a little hard to see but right at the corner of Academy Drive and Pioneer Boulevard. Again, this was on the campus itself. They want to provide a small sign approximately 6' x 4' that will direct visitors to get to the administrative offices of the district. That's the entire sign project itself. I can go over the specifics of what the

signs look like if you want but pretty much it's a break base with an LED sign. The new sign is an unlit sign that is just a static aluminum sign on a masonry base that will not be lit.

Ms. Werner stated - This is the detail for that new sign Correct?

Mr. Uher stated - If you scan up a little bit you can see the elevation of it. That's the sign and its single sided sign aluminum masonry sign just to direct visitors to the Board of Ed offices and that is that's within the campus footprint.

Mr. Guerrero stated – I have a couple questions here. It seems pretty basic with replacing the text on the signs and even the addition to this Board of Ed sign as well. I guess the biggest issues that's probably going to come up that we've had some precedent with all the signs in the Township come to your electronic sign. Will the signs have changeable copy and if it is how often do you anticipate having that copy change. Whether it's per hour or something different.

Mr. Uher asked Mr. Guerrero – Are you referring to the two LED signs?

Mr. Guerrero stated - Yes.

Mr. Uher stated - You I may have to ask Mr. Willmont that question because I'm not quite sure what their plans are for the changing of text.

Mr. Willmont stated - So we could work with the township if you would rather not change too often. We could certainly do that if you guys have a precedent for that. It would be you know the language would update the school community on events and any other things going on at the school. Do you guys as a Board have a preference on that?

Mr. Guerrero stated - I just want to let you know when it's come to the changeable copies and signs, we've been rather restrictive with it and where typical signs like this have been approved in the past. The restriction has been to change the copy once a day.

Mr. Willmont stated - Okay, yeah, we could work with that. That'd be fine.

Mr. Thorpe stated – There's no scrolling copy, no video, and no motion. Keep in mind that, you know, our vision plan for Westhampton is the term that comes up all the time it's rural. We're not interested in being Route 70 or Route 73. So those are some of the stipulations and then making sure that the signs are either set on timers or censored. So that usually, in my experience, it's around 10 o'clock at night they dimmed down to about half intensity, particularly the main sign which has residences across the street. So those are important things when you decide on the manufacturer which I'm assuming you've already found a manufacturer for these signs. So typically, what would be requested is I'd like to see what model and manufacturer this is, cut sheets, things like that. So that would be very helpful. As for the static signs

Mr. Uher stated – The static signs do not get illuminated.

Ms. Werner asked if there were any other questions regarding the signs, we're happy to answer that or we can move on to the proposed building addition.

Mr. Guerrero stated - Just had a question for our Professionals. Are you aware of any additional types of variances that might be associated with these signs? Well, these are I know the one I believe both are actually preexisting science but they're not electronic signs.

Mr. Dochney stated - The code does not like to see changeable copy other than you set up a lot of for if it changes once a day. However, this this being BCIT they're technically not subject to informal reviews. This is really a courtesy presentation. So, to the extent that they would need any variances, I don't believe the board has the jurisdiction to

really approve or deny what they're proposing tonight is merely a curtesy review is my understanding. Is that correct Mr. Cappelli?

Mr. Capelli stated - Yes, that's correct.

Mr. Guerrero stated – Anytime they come back for a formal we won't have any say, they would go to the county Board for this?

Mr. Dochney stated – I'm not sure what it was like, for utilities that the Board of Public Utilities gets to make some of those decisions I'm not sure for if the Board of Education has its own Board.

Ms. Werner stated – It's our understanding that, we don't have to make a formal application to this to this Board. At the very least. It's just again, it's a courtesy to show you what's going on get some feedback, try to be good residents, and incorporate any comments that you might have.

Ms. Werner stated - To clarify with regard to the replacement of those signs with the LED with the size, I believe, Larry that you had stated that these are actually smaller in size.

Mr. Uher stated - The BCIT sign, yes, the new sign is smaller than the existing BCIT sign on Woodlane. The other sign on Special Services is about the same size as that one.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I guess as best as we can do is make comments as if we had jurisdiction on these applications if they were to be applications at a later date.

Mr. Cappelli stated - That's the idea on these types of reviews. I guess this Board has not seen an application or informal application from a School but generally we're here just to give comments and hope the school is a good neighbor and friend and follows as closely as possible the comments and requests that you make tonight.

Mr. Dochney stated - Just for clarification or for your reference. The township code does provide standards for signs for schools specifically, it is a max of 32 square feet and a max height of six feet for ground mounted signs that would be I suppose if a private school were coming before you that would be what they would be subject to.

Ms. Werner stated - if there's no other questions or comments then I'll go ahead and switch over to our addition plan set.

Mr. Uher stated – This is an aerial view of BCIT. The area in Orange is the location of the proposed addition and it's in the rear of the building and this part that faces the turnpike and the fire academy building to the Northwest of this addition. There's an existing auto and diesel program in the rear of the building and the existing bays are not large enough or tall enough for the district's program, so we're doing a partial building demolition of the existing bays and replacing it with a larger addition. The location of the addition is an existing paved parking lot so there's no additional impervious area as part of the project. This is blowup of the floor plan and the area in yellow is the area of the addition. You can see a part of that yellow addition is crosshatched where the classrooms are, that's the area of the building has been demolished and replaced with the addition. The reason we can't keep that part of the building is the truck bays are not tall enough for the existing lifts to lift the diesel vehicles. So that's why that part of the building has been demolished and replaced with a taller one-story auto and truck bays you can see there's classroom spaces. There's some warehouse space in addition to the auto and diesel program. The right side of that addition on your screen is a warehouse distribution program that the district is incorporating into their curriculum and is basically a demonstration warehouse for students to learn how to drive forklifts etc. There will be an outdoor roof covered portion of the building which is on the top right of that addition you see there? That is where students will learn how to operate tractors etc. As part of the program. The area in blue is just interior renovations to the existing school as we reprogram and renovate interior spaces. The

facade of the building basically will be matching the facade of the existing school, which is a brick facade, flat roofs, etc. Everything will pretty much tie into the aesthetics of the existing building. We're demolishing approximately 5800 square feet and we're replacing it with approximately 20,400 square feet so it's a net add of about 14,600 square feet to the building footprint.

Ms. Dera asked - Does the board have any input, any comments, any questions, we're happy to hear it and answer what we can at this time.

Mr. Guerrero stated – I'll make a comment. It looks like a very nice addition to and an increase into your program there for auto maintenance or whatever it might be called. I guess just one a question for future reference. What else is in that side of the building facing that direction? Looks like it's facing West I believe.

Mr. Wilmott stated – They are Career Technical shops for vocational program. Another thing I wanted to add is we're going out for a grant for this project. So, if we aren't approved for the grant addition, we will not be doing this project it's subject to the state approval. They'd be funding 75% of the grant. So, it's basically 75% free money the county would fund the other 25%, we had to jump on this opportunity.

Ms. Werner asks the Board if they have any other comments or questions?

Mr. Guerrero stated – It sounds like a really good deal and nice added capacity to your school there if it should get approved.

Mr. Thorpe stated – It look really nice both my brother and sister-in-law are graduates of BCIT. So good luck.

Ms. Werner stated - Thank you very much. If there's nothing further, we appreciate the board's time this evening and your input we will obviously take it into consideration. You know, even though you don't have to grant us a formal approval. Again. We want to do this as a courtesy. We want to be friendly neighbors and do something that the township can be proud of. So, again, we appreciate your time.

Mr. Guerrero stated - Going back to those comments on the sign Woodland Road, the one that's closest there is probably most probably in the Township that's going to be seen by most of our residents. So that's the one that's you know, we're probably most concerned with.

Ms. Werner stated – Understood.

#### **Fly High Express, LLC, Block 401, Lot 3 – Concept plan application to construct a truck repair shop.**

Mr. Guerrero turned the meeting over to Sara Werner (Ms. Werner) Attorney with Prime & Tuvel appearing on behalf of the applicants.

Ms. Werner stated - This property is currently vacant. We're before the Board this evening for an informal review of applicants proposed construction of an approximately 6000 square foot auto repair shop, I have with me tonight applicants engineer Bob Stout as well as applicant's planner Mark Remsa. This is a I believe Commercial Zone however a Use Variance would be required. I know you know you may not be commenting on the use aspects of it this evening, but Mr. Remsa is here to answer any questions regarding the use that you may have. Before I turn it over to our professionals, I just want to note having sat through this evening's application of the Rita's you know we are very cognizant of their concerns regarding landscaping, lighting, and things to the aesthetic side of things. You will obviously not see the items on the concept plan since it is conceptual at this stage, but I can assure you on behalf of the applicant those are items that we would definitely pay great detail should a Formal application come to fruition. So with that said I will turn the meeting over to Mr. Stout.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I believe this property some years ago had an approval for a two-story commercial building.

Ms. Werner stated - That sounds correct.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I think the first floor is meant to be a daycare and a second-floor office space and I don't remember how many years ago that was approved but obviously at this point that's long been expired.

Mr. Stout stated - Okay, everybody sees my screen I've got an aerial photo. Yes. Okay, good. So, outlined in the center is the yellow box this is the area we're proposing for the site, it's about a 4.5-acre tract. To the West is Springside Road and the Walgreens is directly to our West. There's a nursery directly to the East. Right across Woodland Road, obviously is the Wawa newer expanded Wawa and Freedom Village at the bottom of the site. The area you see in the center is the brown that is a 6000 square foot three bay repair garage. The area that is in the corner is the pink color that is going to be the office of the area directly behind would be the mechanicals and equipment storage area. What we're proposing to do is obviously repair vehicles in these bays are 70' deep. 20' wide. We have 16 tractor trailer parking spaces on the East side of the property and 12 spaces on the back. These are for more like box trucks similar stuff like that. We are proposing a trash enclosure, what we've done is looked at the site and as you can see there's a large tract of wooded areas to the West, that is staying. Some wetlands pockets in the back corner as well and that will all stay as part of the buffer that we would have towards the Walgreen section. Obviously, the other end is open and what we propose to do, and Ms. Werner touched on is we've shown some preliminary buffering again, we have not gotten into the design of that, but we understand the need to make sure that this is buffered and cleaned up. We're thinking that we're going to put a berm buffer along the front there of some sort and along the East property line. Obviously, the zoning data is to commercial zoning. So, looking at the zone, we meet all the criteria for the zone based on your current ordinance. Your repair or truck repair ordinance for parking allows for square footage 24 is required based on the current code. Obviously, that's not something we need because we don't anticipate having more than five or six spaces necessary. So, what we've done is we've allocated 10 spaces across the front, and we do have room to meet the 24 spaces. So, what we're proposing to do is show these 10 spaces at the bottom as landscape spaces, not thinking to build them to keep the impervious area down. We would still design any kind of storm water management areas for that if we needed to. If you think that we need the 14 spaces, we do have room a little bit farther to the East to add an additional 4 spaces. Obviously, we've looked at some preliminary information and obviously the stormwater management regulations which are the current ones as of March of last year must be addressed. So, what we've done is put several different areas of potential stormwater management that we would anticipate for the site itself. We've also looked at the site for full access. This has full circulation around the building, and we've got the area up at the top to allow for parking and backing into these spaces. We have left a large tract of this in green space so we're concentrating the pervious surface right into the center. The access drive is located directly across the street directly across from the detention facility of the Villages across the street. This far corner on the East side would be the area that would need to be cleared so that's what we're proposing as far as what we want to move forward with the use variance. If we get past the use variance portion of this, obviously we'll go into a full site plan level designing for stormwater landscaping and other items along those lines. So really, we're looking for some input in any kind of thoughts you may have.

Ms. Werner stated – As I stated Mr. Remsa is here to answer on any planning questions you may have. I don't believe it's pertinent for him to provide anything directly at this time since this is an informal application, but I just want to keep that in mind in case you do have any specific questions.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I guess I just make some comments and I'm not sure if there's necessarily a question but going other truck facilities similar to this, one of the things that kind of stands out of my mind is noise. What kind of consideration there is for noise and what kind of consideration there is for hours of operation on this because some of the truck places that I've been to anytime you see like an impact gun they are considerably loud and that noise will travel quite a distance?

Ms. Werner stated – Understood. Mr. Remsa are you able to address that?

Mr. Remsa stated - Yeah, I can address that. So obviously, one of the things that we're required to do is we're required to meet the state statutes for the noise along the property line. So that's one of the things we will have to do. The plus with the building is we're trying to keep everything indoors so they're all the repairs are anticipated to be indoors so that would mitigate any kind of noise that would be in there. That's really where we'll focus on that. Those are things we can address with the owner to make sure that all the noise issues would be abated as much as possible. One of the pluses with this site is it is a wooded site, and we are leaving you can see to the West of this a large tract of wooded area. Directly behind us is a large tract of wooded areas as well and the garage doors are not facing the front. They're to the right which is the large open tract, and the nursery is to the right of us. So, we believe we can keep the noise a tolerable level within the state's statutes.

Mr. Guerrero asked - Is there any ideas of hours of operation?

Ms. Werner stated - I don't believe we have the exact hours of operation. Now if I'm wrong, someone from my team get correct me however, that is something we can provide. I wouldn't anticipate crazy working into the night hours that would disrupt neighbors. That's something at the time of a formal application we would be fully prepared to address with specific details.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I have seen some shops that start as early as 6:00am. Which might be a concern.

Mr. Werner stated - Understood. At the time of a formal application, I'm sure someone will make a comment, a traffic analysis that we could submit as well to show you how this would impact the roadways and local traffic.

Mr. Guerrero stated - I'm sure the County is going to want to see that for their approval as well.

Ms. Werner stated - Of course.

Mr. Guerrero stated - If you came for an application it would always help to see elevations on this as well.

Ms. Werner stated - Yes, absolutely. We will be able to provide that.

Mr. Guerrero asked if anybody else on the board had any comments for questions?

Mr. Roberts asked - Are you aware of wetlands on the left side? It looks like there's a culvert North near the bottom corner of the property.

Mr. Stout stated - There are wetlands, it's mainly the area that we have outlined. We do not have a LUI at this at this point in time. There are wetlands that we've been out to the site on the left-hand side, West side. So obviously we're going to have some sort of DEP permit for this.

Mr. Dochney stated - I have a couple of questions. I'm looking at the concept plan what you're showing for parking spaces on the East side, and when you say more or less a box truck on the North side in terms of the overall operation this is a repair facility. Would that be something where there would be tractor trailers potentially, they're broken down tractor trailers are sitting there for extended periods of time or is it anticipated that they would be there just until you can get to pulling them into the garage and work on them. They're there for maybe a day or two at most. It's not really an engineering operations statement, if you can answer that.

Mr. Stout stated - My understanding is that they would be in and out for repairs for a day or two whatever they needed to, but we will get some clarification on that before applying for the use.



Mr. Dochney stated - Besides being slightly concerned about there is a township code does limit the amount of time you can leave a trailer parked in any one location. I think it might be 48 hours I'd have to double check. The other comment I have is because it's not showing up on the on the plan that you have on the screen but on the content plan, I have in front of me it looks like you have a larger almost a landscaped area behind the building. I don't see that on the screen though.

Mr. Stout stated – We have been through several reiterations, and we weren't proposing anything behind the building. We'll clarify that before we get to the use portion as well.

Mr. Dochney stated – Obviously you need a wide drive aisle for the tractor trailer parking regular 24' drive aisle might not be sufficient be able to maneuver the trucks in there and certainly not an 18' driveway as we discussed at the Rita's will not work for tractor trailers trying to maneuver spaces. What that looks like, you have maybe 60' or so in between the parking spaces for the box trucks and the building, is there going to be any sort of additional storage of things out there or is that that amount of space just needed to maneuver trucks in and out?

Mr. Stout stated - This large area is the need for maneuvering the trucks in and out so that's why the section up at the top here on the North side truck would be able to come straight in wrap around and then back into these spaces

Mr. Dochney stated – Did you give any consideration to perhaps locating all the truck parking to the rear of the building and maybe fencing that off from the front. So, it will be less visible from the street even though you do have some landscape screening there.

Mr. Stout stated - We might be able to do a little bit of that what we're trying to do is concentrate this into a smaller area so if we do have the ability to push this back a little bit towards the North. We might be able to do that across and work with the applicant see what we can come up with.

Mr. Dochney stated - That might help not only from a visual perspective within might even be able to potentially buffer some noise coming out of that garage. It could even be gated, and you would still get the 360-degree circulation.

Mr. Guerrero stated - Looking at their site map there are some properties there on the Northwest corner of the property as well as directly across the street which was Project Freedom. There's some proximity to those properties when it comes to noise. Especially across the street.

Mr. Roberts stated - I would also take note, based off looking at the adjacent property, Walgreens, you're looking at a much wider roadway as you get close to the intersection. I would anticipate with it whatever plans you submit to the County they are going to want a widening there and you will probably have to push back a lot of the site plan back into the site a little bit to accommodate that widening.

Mr. Stout stated – We are on a County Road and whatever they County requires us to do we be glad to adhere to.

Mr. Roberts stated – The culvert over that I mentioned before might end up being a concern with that widening so they may ask you to widen that as well or replace it or extend it. I also want to note that the Walgreens property has sidewalks along their frontage as well so the County may ask for sidewalks along the frontage of the property.

Mr. Dochney stated - One other issue to note I think technically you would require a variance. I don't think the Township's parking code does not list an Auto Repair Garage as a particular use for the Zoned parking standards so the general and more general commercial parking standard type has to be applied to it, but I believe technically you will be required to having 24 parking spaces. I'm honestly not sure that would be necessary. I can't imagine you have 24 people waiting there for three trucks that are being worked on or that you would have 24 employees there. But I do think technically that would be a variance as proposed now.

Mr. Stout stated - I would agree with you 100% and that's why we were showing just 10 spaces that we feel is more than adequate. The rest we did in landscaping so that way we can design for allocated for the Storm Water Management Facility. If it becomes an issue for any reason, obviously we would put them back in.

Mr. Guerrero asked - Anybody else? On the board have any questions or comments?

Mr. Thorpe stated - I think Ms. Werner hit it. She obviously has figured out a lot of the fact that I don't particularly like to see things, especially a line of trucks. I mean, this is a commercial zone, not an Industrial zone. There are residences across the street. So those were all huge concerns for me. It feels like 16 slots for tractor trailers for something that has 3 bays. There seems to be a lot of space that could be utilized for some other things and hiding trucks and things like that. I don't have an opinion on the thing if I was going to have one, I mean, I love the fact obviously that you know, there's lots of trees and lots of places to utilize those trees to buffer any sort of business that comes in. So you got to think about it but that's my feelings are buffering rural landscape. Like I said in that last application, and it's the first time in history I ever said pull out a tree that is not normally something that comes out of my mouth.

Mr. Roberts stated - Where you have the storm water management facilities located, because it's a completely wooded property and just to keep everything to a minimum and to save as many trees as you can between the parking and storm water management facility.

Ms. Werner stated – Absolutely and we'll do what we can and that our goal.

Mr. Guerrero asked if anybody else have questions or comments?

Mr. Oddenheimer stated – I need clarification on the use. So, a repair facility is not permitted in this Zone?

Ms. Werner stated – Yes that is correct.

Mr. Dochney stated - To clarify as per the Townships of code and definitions in Auto Service Station is permitted but the definition of auto service station is more akin to a gas station that has a couple of bays for you to do oil changes and maybe get your wiper fluid topped off etc. This would be considered heavy equipment repairs and is not permitted in this zone.

Mr. Guerrero asked if anybody else had any questions or concerns. None

Ms. Werner thanked the Board for their time.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**OPEN MEETING FOR PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

**COMMENTS FROM BOARD MEMBERS, SOLICITOR, ENGINEER, PLANNER AND SECRETARY:**

Mr. Dochney stated – As it has been discussed by this Board the past several months the Township Committee has authorized us, and we are starting to study now. It's not exactly as to the level that you had requested in terms of a full Master Plan review. We have been authorized to do a study that potentially would be adopted as a Technical Appendix to the Master Plan to review Industrial uses in town and how they relate to your current zoning and in terms of looking at updating the Industrial standards. Recognizing that what a Warehouse currently is as most of the applications you've seen does not quite match what a Warehouse was 30 years ago when you when your zoning was written. With things like last mile facilities and Amazon distribution centers it's time to really look at these types of uses and their impacts

and where appropriate and inappropriate locations for them are. We have started that study and part of our contract is that we will have several meetings with the Town. One will be with the Planning Board because if it's a Technical Appendix of the Master Plan this Board would have to adopt that. I think it would be a good idea to have a sub-committee of this body in perhaps 2-3 members of the Board. If there are any volunteers that would be interested could have a couple of Zoom meetings once, we have our preliminary data gathered to talk about where this is going and what you would like to see with it.

Mr. Guerrero stated – I would be interested in being part of a sub-committee. I also wanted to add that we have had some issues with the wording of our Office Research Zones, primarily the fact that within those Zones it talks about some of the requirements of what the building should be but then it also includes that the remainder of the buildings could be warehousing, and I believe that is kind of hurt us in the past. Basically, having a OR Zone being looked at as an Industrial Zone.

Mr. Thorpe stated – He would be interested in being part of the sub-committee. This is really good news, and the Township Committee should be thanked for this, and we will try to do the best for our residents.

Mr. Guerrero asked Mr. Dochney – Was there a dollar value that was approved for this?

Mr. Dochney stated – Yes. The contract is for \$11,000.00.

Mr. Guerrero asked if there were any public comments? None

Mr. Guerrero asked if the Board had anything? None.

#### **ADJOURN**

Motion to adjourn Mr. Odenheimer, Mr. Guerrero second. None opposed.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Jodie Termi, Board Secretary