

TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON
MAYS LANDING, NJ 08330
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MARCH 16, 2017

A meeting of the Township of Hamilton Planning Board was held on the above date with Chairman Richard Cheek presiding. Other members present were David Adams, Harry Bilicki, Wayne Choyce, John Kurtz, Allan Womelsdorf and Alternate Member I John Percy, Alternate Member II Marla Caldwell. Absent members were Charles Cain, Harry Rogers, and Art Schenker.

The following Board Professionals were in attendance: Charles Gemmel, Solicitor; Steve Filippone, Engineer; Vincent Polistina, Planner; Christopher Carey, Landscape Consultant, Kevin Dixon, Traffic consultant and Philip Sartorio, Community Development Director/Second Alternate Planner.

Compliance with the Open Public Meetings Law was acknowledged.

Approval of Minutes - Motion was made to accept the minutes of February 16, 2017 by Mr. Kurtz and seconded by Mr. Bilicki. SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL ELIGIBLE MEMBERS VOTING "AYE", No "NAY."

Adoption of Decision and Resolutions as prepared by Solicitor:

PB2016-12 – Laundry & Sweets, LLC – Block 1134, Lot 17.02. Interpretation of Permitted Use within the applicable district Mr. Percy moved, seconded by Mr. Bilicki to adopt the said resolution as prepared by the solicitor

SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL ELIGIBLE MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING "AYE"; NO "NAY"; AND NO ABSTAIN"

PB2016-10 – 5034 Atlantic Avenue, LLC – Block 994 Lot 58.05 – Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval for expansion. Mr. Percy moved, seconded by Mr. Choyce to adopt the said resolution as prepared by the solicitor.

SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL ELIGIBLE MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING"AYE"; NO "NAY", AND NO ABSTAIN"

PB2017-01 – 20 Bogden Boulevard, LLC – Block 732, Lots 59,62,63,65 & 75 - 45 Mill Street - Preliminary and Final Site Plan amendment for fit-out of existing property for new tenant. The site consists of 12.52 acres, with two existing buildings and parking and loading areas. It is in the IBP Zone.

Applicant is being represented by Warren Stillwell, Attorney with Cooper Levenson. Mr. Stillwell stated that the applicant is here for preliminary and final site plan approval with variances and waivers to utilize an existing property and 2 buildings on said property for a company called Intex and further stated that the owner/contract purchaser of the business was present.

Chairman Cheek recused himself as he has a present conflict with the representing law firm and left the dais. Vice-chairman Bilicki then took the seat to chair the meeting.

Vice-chair Bilicki asked that witnesses be sworn in and Mr. Gemmel proceeded to do so. They were Mr. Joe Umosella, owner and the applicant's engineer, Jason Sciuillo, PE of Marathon Engineering. Board professionals were sworn in at this time.

Completeness Review:

Vice Chairman Bilicki remarked that Mr. Stillwell had already outlined the plans and asked if there was anything else he wanted to add. Mr. Stillwell stated that Mr. Sciuillo, the applicant's engineer, will do so and it was further recognized that Mr. Sciuillo's qualifications were acceptable and that he has testified before this Board previously.

Mr. Sciuillo gave an overview to generalize the application and reviewed the checklist for completeness. The property is identified as 45 Mill Street. Mr. Sciuillo referred to a rendering of an aerial photo A-3 as submitted to the Board and pointed out the areas of the project property. It fronts on Old Harding Highway and Mill Street, both of which are County roads.

Mr. Sciuillo continued that the site work proposed is minimal, the property is occupied with 1 large building which will be used for manufacturing and warehousing and 1 smaller building that will to be used for be warehousing. He proceeded to point out a yellow area of pavement as shown on exhibit that will be repaired, and where they plan to put three overhead doors for loading and unloading materials to

move within the site. He commented that nothing is stored outside except PVC which is of minimal value except to the owners.

Mr. Sciullo proceeded to review the checklist items and waivers as addressed in respective review reports from Board Professionals: Engineering Design, February 22, 2017; Polistina Associates – February 10, 2017; Dixon Associates – March 9, 2017.

Mr. Polistina commented that Mr. Sciullo went through all items in the report and because it is a developed site and very little improvements proposed, there is no objection to granting most of these waivers. They are requesting parking variance, which the Board is going to hear about and further stated that the Board may want to hear testimony at a minimum, regarding traffic study as it relates to parking and trip generation. Mr. Polistina further remarked that the Board may not need anything requesting utilities as the MUA will require a report and the Board can waive that request.

Mr. Polistina commented with regards to security analysis that the Board will be hearing just what use is proposed, we heard some cameras proposed and some security at the sight, but he feels that some sort of security plan should be part of the submission so that it does get done and knowing what it is so as a Board you may want to get that as part of the submission.

Mr. Polistina further commented that he has no problems with other ones, it is a commercially developed site and they are not proposing much in the way of improvement, and he has no problem with the Board in granting waivers for the other ones.

Mr. Filippone commented that the applicant did come to a work session and spent time in telling us about their project and their expectations and the professionals gave them comments. .

Mr. Filippone commented that from completeness he has no objection to the Board recommending approval for waivers requested. They went through Pinelands approval very quickly, because of very little site improvements proposed, Pinelands does not require any storm water structures or features with this project. He has no concern with completeness waivers this Board will grant.

Vice Chair Bilicki expressed concern about the storm water management plan as that intersection tends to flood during storms. Mr. Filippone remarked that he will be addressing that.

Mr. Dixon reviewed his report and stated that the applicant indicated that Checklist items 1E and 37 for submission of traffic impact study as being requesting for waiver and he has no problem conditioned on testimony being provided to traffic by the applicant. He would like to hear testimony about trip generation on this project site as to the proposed use as it compares to either and/or previous use and/or other permitted uses on this site. We also want to hear about the traffic impact as it relates to the fact that the facility has been underutilized or closed for a period of time and when this traffic is infused, which is part of the by right use of the building, there is going to be an adjustment at the intersections and traffic pattern and we want to hear testimony where the anticipated impact is going to be. He sees no problem with not submitting but reserve the right to request possible additional study on top of that.

Mr. Carey commented that the only checklist items he has concerns with is the vegetation plan, and remarked that as his colleagues stated it is an existing site, no issue granting waivers at this point.

Mr. Bilicki asked if Board members had any questions on completeness:

Mr. Choyce expressed the need to hear some testimony regarding traffic proposal and any additional data they can provide before he would agree to waive the traffic report.

Mr. Gemmel remarked that if we don't waive them, we cannot deem complete and really can't hear it. He further stated that all the Board is doing in granting the waivers is acknowledging that there is enough information to hear the application, we are not giving up the right to listen to storm water and if we are not happy, we don't approve the project; not happy with traffic, we don't approve. This action is getting the applicant in the door and says that there is enough information that our professionals can guide us in the application.

Mr. Choyce asked if the Board is in the position to hear testimony around traffic and get comment,

Mr. Gemmel remarked that if the Board wants to before deeming complete, you can do that; Mr. Stillwell stated that it is his understanding that these are waivers for completeness; the Board does not give up the right to make it a subject of further inquiries.

Mr. Choyce asked if we grant completeness during testimony for site plan and we feel a report is necessary, can we can make that a condition.

Mr. Gemmel responded, yes, we could basically say that we don't have enough information and unless you can provide us with traffic report we are not going to be in the position to grant you site plan approval.

Motion was made to grant the waivers that have been requested and discussed and DEEM THE APPLICATION COMPLETE, with Mr. Percy moving the motion and Mayor Kurtz seconding because of the explanation that was received through Mr. Choyce's discussion.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE: Adams, Bilicki, Choyce, Kurtz, Womelsdorf, Percy and Caldwell
NAY: None
ABSTAIN: None

SAID MOTION CARRIED GRANTING COMPLETENESS WITH REQUESTED WAIVERS TO PB2017-01 WITH ALL MEMBERS PRESENT (7) VOTING "AYE"; NO "NAY"; AND NO ABSTAIN"

PRELIMINARY and FINAL

Mr. Stillwell asked Mr. Umosella that he has stated that he is the owner of primary tenant and that there will also be some sublease utilizing the warehouse. To which he responded yes. It was also stated that there will be two tenants and 20 Bogden Boulevard LLC is the company that will be holding the real-estate and that they are going to acquire the property and do fit out work.

Mr. Stillwell asked Mr. Umosella to explain the work they will be doing. Mr. Umosella explained that they do custom millwork fabricating, which includes custom railing systems, do a lot of historic reproductions too, naming some of their projects they have worked on and gave a simple explanation of the procedures.

Mr. Umosella described his workforce and staffing. He gave a brief summary of the history of the business which started in 2006 and its growth and further stated that they are looking for this sight to be their last stop as the building is larger than what they need now. They will be leasing a portion of the building now with hopes that they grow into the space. He further explained it is a family owned business, started with nothing, built it up to where it is today, employing 75 full time employees, and "in season" work with temporary help which brings the amount up to 100 people, which may flex from time to time.

Mr. Umosella gave brochures to Board members showing what they do. He continued to explain the company's distribution and procedures and they primarily go from Maine to Florida at present time.

Mr. Stillwell asked Mr. Umosella to review their traffic to which he responded that the inbound is pretty minimal, outbound pretty minimal, truck traffic not very heavy with this type of operation. Mr. Umosella further stated that the truck traffic for the most part is 5 to 6 trucks a day. There are generally 75 employees year round, other times they may flex to approximately 100. There are people who don't really work at operations, sales people living in different states there is no retail, no walk in trade. The sales reps are part of the 100 employee count. He continued to go describe the operation in the seasonal peak times of year.

Mr. Choyce asked if the work force works multiple shifts or just one. Mr. Umosella remarked that they work pretty much one shift. A typical work week, hours for hourly people is 7:00 AM to 3:30 PM ; office 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM but that they do go to ten hour shifts during their busy time, 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM; half of the work forces exits as 3:30 PM and others dispersing at 5-6 PM, at different times; typically Monday thru Friday. He further stated that in the spring season they will do some Saturdays, 1/2 day, which is pretty much just the shop.

Mr. Kurtz asked about overnight operations, and it was stated that there is no overnight operations.

Mrs. Caldwell questioned the planned traffic flow for trucks and employees. Mr. Umosella and Mr. Sciallo gave their responses as to what is proposed. Mr. Sciallo reviewed the traffic pattern that is being proposed for use by the applicant and their business with regards to passenger cars and truck movements. Their plan is to have their trucks utilize Route 559 to go out to the Black Horse Pike and keep them out of town because it is too congestive and hard to maneuver.

Mayor Kurtz asked if they are going to occupy the office space or is Hope All Day staying there and the applicant responded that Hope All day will be moving and that they will be occupying the office space.

Mr. Stillwell asked Mr. Sciallo to describe their meeting with the County and what they plan to do with regards to Harding Highway improvements proposed. Mr. Sciallo went over the meeting and further stated that they have had a letter saying that they will be starting to repave Old Harding Highway,

sometime in the spring and that the County and the applicant will work together. The applicant will be giving them copies of their project so that they can tie it in and neither of them has to tear up any of each other's project.

Mr. Bilicki remarked about the intersection of Weymouth Road/Rte. 559, being difficult and if in discussion with the County does the applicant know if they are planning on fixing that as it is pretty tough for tractor trailers to maneuver. Mr. Sciullo responded that the "pork chop island" is being renovated as part of the County project and that the County has standards they have to follow to make it traversable by larger vehicles and that the applicant has been assured there won't be an issue for movement for trucks through that intersection.

Mr. Adams asked about noise, odors, and hazardous chemicals that might be involved. Mr. Umosella said the noise level is not too loud, that he can get information if necessary. He further remarked that they use pvc materials with a foaming agent, a bit of wood milling and for the most part all plastics. It was further stated that the applicant is not manufacturing they are milling.

Mr. Percy raised questions as to the weight factor for flooring, which Mr. Umosella responded that they are being checked out and appear to be adequate. He also inquired about the noise level of machinery and asked if they have done calculations of noise level of machinery where you are operating now, and the applicant said he has to follow to OSHA requirements. He further asked about the noise outside the building, there have been no studies done. Mr. Percy asked if that is something our professionals may want to take a look at, from the standpoint of noise to outside environment. Mr. Stillwell made comment that it could be made a condition of approval that they satisfy the DEP and the Township ordinance with regards to noise requirements and Mr. Sciullo said they would.

Mr. Bilicki asked if there were any more questions on operations before going to parking. There were none.

Mr. Sciullo described the site as being 2 existing buildings, the larger is 118,000 square feet – smaller 16,600 total on site under 135,000 square feet stating that he feels the site is underutilized area and described what the old site may have been utilized. He also made comment that the cross bridge will be coming down very soon.

The project is serviced by Public utilities, 2 existing driveways onto Old Harding Highway and neither are really used much today. Mill Street entrance is utilized today for the counseling group and the Mahogany employees use this as well. He reviewed what the Board heard from Mr. Umosella regarding the fit out of existing building for the new operation, the office space, 12,000 sq. ft.; 74,000 sq. ft. fabricating; 33,000 sq. ft. warehouse space, smaller building is 16,000 sq. ft. and is considered warehousing. The site improvements limited to change in overhead doors, installation of modular loading ramps, repair of concrete aprons, reconfiguration of island on west side for trucks and widening of driveway.

Mr. Sciullo stated that the professionals had made comment about the condition of the parking lot as well as did Mr. Percy and that they recognize it is in need of some repair but that they do not want to go in and redo the lot at this time and reviewed what they plan to do. We are trying to minimize cost to get into the building while obviously keeping it safe for the employees. He further stated that if approval is granted they would like to work with the professionals as to what repairs need to be done.

Mr. Sciullo reviewed the fencing along Wheaton Avenue and other points, the change in signs and the lighting aspects of the project. He will check lighting to see if upgrades need to be made. Further review took place regarding the County reconstruction of Harding Highway, the delivery aspects and operational techniques. The work results in no increase in impervious surface and is well below levels to warrant investigation of storm water management as was stated in Pinelands letter and Mr. Filippone's report.

Mr. Sciullo reviewed the landscaping and existing conditions and stated that it will be taken care of when the applicant moves in. He reviewed what is proposed to be done. He received a letter from Fire Official requesting 2 new hydrants and as a result met with Mr. Primavera and Fire Chief to review and result of that discussion it was agreed to put in the hydrants as he feels it should be resolved.

Mr. Sciullo reviewed the matter of sidewalk and curb along the Wheaton Avenue and why they requested a waiver.

Mr. Sciullo addressed parking. They are seeking 122 as opposed to 182 required. He presented exhibits and continued to review the building sight to provide information as to what the parking and conditions of the property was: exhibits were aerial photos A-3-1930; A-4-1958; A-5-1977; - A-6 1983; A-7 1995; and A-8 - 2000. The areas that were used previously are the same, but they will have more today, and had similar number of employees, not more.

Mr. Sciullo reviewed and discussed request for variance from sidewalk and building length as outlined in the Township ordinance. He feels that they have no negative impact to general public, the general planning and the zoning ordinance.

He reviewed the variance with regards to parking and would like it as a "C2" variance, or as a flexible "C" per the MLUL. He further stated that he feels they have no negative impact to the zoning ordinance. I feel testimony was heard with regards to number of employees for the complex and that they are at the number they need to work with.

With regards to parking, Mr. Sciullo referenced Mr. Dixons report regarding amount mentioned in the township standard and referenced Institute of Transportation and with the . He further stated that they know what they need, and that the lawn area in front could be used for additional parking if needed, and if they get to that point they will come back if they need to but feels it would be a hardship enabling them to get started. Mr. Stillwell inquired that if the use changes and they have someone other than Mahogany Company in there with more employees if they would come back to the Board. Mr. Sciullo stated yes, they would.

Mr. Sciullo reviewed the variances as Criteria C; Criteria G; and Criteria H and how they relate to the request. He continued it is felt that that there is not a negative impact to the public, it is a repurpose of an existing building, it will bring employees back to town; they will spend money and perhaps move here. The impact is positive. The relief is specific to this use only. The granting of this variance will not impact the neighborhood, the public, the master plan or zoning and ordinances negatively.

Mr. Percy discussed Wheaton Avenue, the overgrowth along that roadway and fencing and improvements need to be made. Mr. Choyce also questioned fencing along Old Harding Highway as well. Discussion ensued as to what is there, what will be there, and being cleaned up and landscaped.

Mr. Bilicki questioned parking and if they vision tractor trailers blocking or using the parking spots, Mr. Sciullo explained the movement that will be in place and they do not anticipate any being blocked.

Mr. Percy questioned entrance at Mill Street and would like to see a sidewalk and curbing to connect sidewalks for safe entry into the sight with a favorable reply from other Board members.

Discussion continued regarding parking that is available, location and if there is room for expansion. Mr. Umosella discussed what he plans to do to bring the building and sight up to date and make it a good sight and are doing what they can to make it better to get it operating, and will do what needs to be done later, he will put in for them.

Chris Carey remarked about the section along Wheaton Avenue and that it is white pine and evergreen species and feels that there would be no problem planting shrubs under those pines so it is minimal expense for owner but impact for the neighborhood.

PROFESSIONAL REPORTS:

Mr. Polistina addressed his report of February 10, 2017. The project is in the Industrial Business Park Zone, it is a permitted use, manufacturing as well as warehousing, variance required preexisting non-conforming conditions, most time was parking, it is understood if they don't need right now, but based on full utilization of the building something has to be put into place for some type of review in the event that they have more demand for parking.

He further stated that the applicant addressed his comments, sight lighting, signage, and they comply and are fine and put in any directional signage that would be required to get people around and they will need to seek and obtain all other governmental approvals as required.

Mr. Filippone reviewed his report of February 22, 2017, and for safety reasons questioned the layout of the loading docks and the movement of materials between two buildings. Mr. Sciullo expressed that it is because of fire protection that a connection would not be good. He further explained that the trucks are of the Conestoga design and can't use regular dock doors. He further commented that the building is not ideal but it is a good buy and something that is big enough for the client to grow into and will make it work. Items #6, 8, 9, 10 12, 13, 15 and 17 were addressed as well.

Mr. Sciullo stated that they have submitted their road plans to the County.

Mr. Filippone commented that they need to meet state standards for noise and asked applicant to provide something for that and to make sure they meet noise level impact noise levels for a safe and quiet neighborhood. Mr. Sciullo said that they intend to meet the standards.

Mr. Filippone asked about outside storage and that they may need a state storm water permit depending what materials they are going to store. Mr. Sciullo felt they should be fine to which Mr. Filippone asked that they please pay attention to what is being stored outside and to let him know.

Mr. Carey reviewed his report of February 22, 2017 and remarked on vegetation and what is there and what he would like to see there with regards to fencing and landscaping. There is to be replacement of 2 shade trees that have not made it that were planted from previous owner. Would like to see some vegetation along where it is somewhat bare on Wheaton Avenue side in lieu of fencing as previously discussed. Currently there is a 6' fence which doesn't obstruct the view. He would like to see planting something along that edge taking it back to where the truck operations are. Mr. Sciullo said that they will agree to under plant along the parking as was suggested.

Mr. Carey addressed the sign along Mill Street and landscaping it appropriately as well as adding landscaping along facade along Old Harding Highway.

Mr. Dixon reviewed his report of March 8, 2017, and commented that in essence discussion was taken place with regards to parking and the concern about shortage of. He has checked ordinance standards related to Institute Of Traffic Engineers (ITE) as a cross reference, and feels like the ordinance is on target with regards to amount needed based upon the criteria, which was heard from applicant with a very direct assessment of what their operations are and which may not exactly correspond with ITE. He thinks the applicant has provided adequate testimony based upon that and feels they have adequate parking on their facility. The primary concern that remains was brought up by the Mayor and if the applicant is going to have problem of what do with new employees he has to hire and where are they going to park. If Board approves to move it can put in place some situation where future parking would be preserved, set aside or guaranteed. The applicant's engineer Mr. Sciullo, mentioned an area adjacent to parking area that could be prepared and stabilized and could be reserved, dedicated, or restricted as matter of condition for overflow if needed, It can be reflected in the decision and resolution that if parking was observed in this area, the applicant could be called back before the Board. There needs to be an area set aside if they grow into the space that it would be able to handle possibly 40 spots.

Discussion continued with regards to the parking as to what is there, what needs to be done and a way to follow up on. Other aspect discussed was condition of paved areas, originally said something needs to be done to improve surface, It was discussed that Mr. Sciullo and Mr. Filippone walk the sight and identify areas in need of repair and making sure cracks, potholes and broken areas are addressed and to establish a hard parking surface to establish a secure area to get the applicant open. The parking lot has exceeded its life and the Board needs to have a mechanism in place to follow up on, perhaps mandatory appearance in 2 years to discuss condition of parking lot. It should be a commitment on part of applicant, and if in 2 years still not stable and in need of repair, the applicant is responsible under its site plan approval to make repairs. Mr. Stillwell, stated they have no problem with that. Mr. Dixon's office is satisfied with that decision. He wants to be satisfied that a stable, secure, hard flat parking surface is established. He did make recommendations as to parking lot markings, and if applicant has no problem with items as requested they can be made to do the repair.

Mr. Dixon remarked on his concerns with Old Harding Highway and further stated that the applicant has discussed that and what the County plans to do. He has reviewed the plans and the improvements don't match improvements on applicant's plans. He questioned if the contractor is holding price the applicant may be renegotiating, and wondered if they will be able to make necessary changes in plans going forward that will involve driveway configuration that has been designed. He suggested that it be either replaced as is, no modification; the smaller entry will have sidewalk, curb and apron and it is going to be widened.

Mr. Gemmel asked for clarification as to what is being said as far as condition; number of parking spaces; is a motion granting of the variances conditioned upon them stabilizing this grassy area, or are they going to do that now, keep it from development and if at a point in time in the future, and if the Township believes that area needs to be used for parking, it will be used in that condition or improved. Mr. Dixon remarked that it would be improved.

It was further stated that the improvement of the pavement would be designed and reviewed in the future, not at this time, but in a future site plan approval. It is not their decision, 122 spaces are adequate on the site plan revision at this time. The Board reserves the right to require them to come back in two years.

Vice Chair Bilicki asked if any further questions and there were none.

It was asked of the applicant if they are amiable to professional comments and Mr. Sciullo remarked that they were.

No further questions.

Mr. Bilicki opened to Public Comment:

Terri Elliot - 6133 Old Harding Highway – Concerned that big trucks coming in and out, and if it will be wide enough for them to make the turn. Also inquired about when the roadwork will take place and it is her understanding that the sidewalk will be on both sides of the street.

Mayor Kurtz remarked that work was already set to start on Old Harding Highway but was shut down by the governor due to funding, which was good as it gave these folks time to work things out with the County.

William Kruse, 6118 Longwood Avenue - asked as the applicant would like to skip the environmental study and questioned if a study has been done, and that's why or is the Board looking into it.

Mr. Sciuillo, asked for EIS waiver as checklist item as it was not needed because if was done before purchase. Mr. Polistina explained the process that takes place regarding this study.

Motion made by Mr. Percy, seconded by Mr. Choyce to close public portion with all Board members voting in favor.

Mr. Gemmel was asked by Board members to form motion to which he replied, the motion is to grant preliminary and final site plan approval to 20 Bogden Boulevard, LLC, purchasers of properties for improvements discussed tonight. Included in that approval are the variances listed in Mr. Polistina report, including building length, setbacks, parking, impact statement also included in the approval would be the two design waivers for the curb and sidewalk on Wheaton Avenue; the variance granted for number of parking spaces would include the two conditions of having grass area stabilized and available for future parking if Township determines it is needed sometime in the future. The other condition is that at this current time and two years from now, the applicant's professionals and Township professionals will examine the condition of the existing parking lots and determine if any rehabilitation or replacement is necessary. The applicant will comply with the requirements imposed by the Fire Department and obviously the applicants will comply with all the other conditions contained in the professional reports other than to the extent during the conditions that we waved some of those, which we did. The applicant will agree with any state/federal noise standards that would be applicable to this property.

Mr. Bilicki questioned site lighting with a response from Mr. Gemmel that it is in the report. The applicant's engineer said he will check the lighting for compliance.

Mr. Percy questioned security cameras, and if it is something that could be placed in the motion as he feels it is something that should be addressed for the applicant's own protection.

Mr. Umosella stated that there is a security camera system in there now, and that he will examine it. Mr. Percy stated that he is talking about external, who or what is coming and going off property. Mr. Sciuillo asked if there is a specific standard in the ordinance, or is it if we (the applicant)) are doing it, we write a report.

Mr. Polistina responded generally the professionals and the Board just want to see how the property is secure. Discussion continued as to security guard, alarm systems and gates to secure the site. Mr. Umosella said that they will probably have gates to the work area so public would not have access to that area, the public will just have access to office parking lot.

It was felt that it is not a stipulation that we can impose cameras on the applicant unless it is connected to one of our variances granted.

Motion was moved by Mr. Kurtz, seconded by Mr. Percy to grant preliminary and final site plan approval for PB2017-01 to include the conditions that were generated by Board professionals, including everything as was stated.

ADAMS – YES - thanked the applicant and all professionals. He feels there were problems going into this old building, it's been an eyesore, the parking lot was tough but we reached a reasonable solution to get through this. It is a good opportunity for the town, hope it soars and works well.

CHOYCE – YES - thanked the applicant and professionals for working through the issues, the parking, has been a key issue for this board as well as the township and the testimony from the applicant justifies the 122 spaces that we agreed to and warrants the waiver requested. He likes the suggestion that was added into the resolution of having the capability and providing a space on the site for additional parking if needed and that it doesn't get developed. Also on the issue of the conditions of the parking lot, the applicants willing to meet with professionals to do an assessment and making repairs that may be required and to revisit in two years. It gives the applicant the opportunity to get on his feet and to get established. Hopefully the applicant will still be there in two years...20 years... and he feels that all

requested waivers and variances have all met the necessary proofs and no way impairs the master plan or zoning for this particular area.

KURTZ – YES - echoes same sentiments. Thanked the applicant for beautifying a corner that has been an eyesore for a long period of time. The plans you have will make a big difference and we will see quite an improvement when the bridge and the roadwork is done. Mr. Kurtz also thanked the professionals for a great job to get the necessary items into the resolution.

WOMELSDORF – YES - Thanked everybody involved. He feels that the workshop was beneficial to everybody although it may not seem like it helped as much, but he feels that it did. Aside from the parking issue there weren't very many other issues. As for the parking I appreciate Mr. Dixon leading us down this right path to come to a resolution where we can help the applicant get started and for the Board still being able to retain some kind of oversight for you, because you need more.

PERCY– YES - agrees with all his colleagues. He further remarked that is enjoyable when someone who comes before the Board wants to take something that was there years ago and allowed to deteriorate and bring it back to life. Hopefully the applicant is successful, hope they have to come back again, and hope they will be treated the same way they were tonight with our Board and professionals and then welcomed the applicant to the Township.

MRS. CALDWELL - YES - thanked everybody for their hard work. Welcomed the applicant to the neighborhood and further stated that it will be nice to have that area maintained.

BILICKI — YES - Mr. Bilicki addressed Mr. Umosella and stated that he hopes that he has some appreciation of what we went through tonight. He further explained that he wants the applicant to know every applicant is treated like this; the Board tries to do it a thorough job and we try to do that because we want this Township to have a good standard, and everybody here, professionals, and the people on Board, try to do due diligence to keep that standard. He further stated that he feels that the applicant is coming into a neighborhood that has a lot of good planning behind it, they are now part of that team and that it is awesome that the applicant is taking this eyesore and trying to make it into something that will be productive for our town and applauds them for that. It is not an easy application, not a perfect fit, but you are going to make it work. That is great for us.

SAID MOTION CARRIED GRANTING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITH WAIVERS TO PB2017-01. WITH ALL ELIGIBLE MEMBERS PRESENT (7) VOTING"AYE"; NO "NAY", AND NO ABSTAIN."

Chairman Cheek left the meeting and did not return to the dais.

Green Acres Request – Regarding Block 809 Lot 6 - Discussion and formal action may be taken

Phil Sartorio, Community Development Director/Alternate II Planner - the Township filed application for purchase of the Bohren property, Block 809, Lot 6, located at the end of Second Street and is about eight tenths (8/10) of an acre and does have variance approvals. The Great Egg Harbor Watershed Association is the applicant who is leading this effort to come up with the funds and they in turn will sell it to the Township for us to manage.

The Township received a completeness letter, with items they needed to provide. They asked for a letter from the Planning Board describing how it is consistent with our master plan. The letter and cover information was presented to the Board with their agenda packet for their review.

Mr. Kurtz commented that it was on the agenda of the last TC meeting, no action was taken. Mr. Akers did thank the Board for the work that has been done to let the grant process move forward.

Vice chairman Bilicki asked if the Board had any questions, there were none.

Mr. Choyce commented that he sits on the Zoning Board and that the owner came before them to get variance to build a single family home on property and explained that the sensitive environmental area surrounding the property was of great concern to the Zoning Board that it went into lengthy discussion and multiple meetings. He further commented that the Zoning Board supports the request of the Green Acres for the property and location because there is a large area as preserved land and it is also identified as environmentally sensitive.

Mr. Choyce moved, seconded by Mr. Adams to approve letter for submission as prepared by Mr. Sartorio. SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL ELIGIBLE MEMBERS PRESENT VOTING"AYE"; NO "NAY", AND NO ABSTAIN"

Legislation S22788 proposed to amend land use law - Mr. Sartorio presented Board members with correspondence outlining the purpose of the above referenced proposal and gave a brief overview of his view of this proposal. It would involve the requirements of what this board would review, what the professionals would review and changes the landscape of things; he further remarked that it limits the amount of things the Board would review, i.e. site plans, roads, setback, any variances, landscaping, storm water or off-tract and site improvements. It reduces time of approval from 90 days to 75 days for major site plan, and would allow an increase of a density of 10% between preliminary and final without having to come back to a board for approval.

Discussion ensued regarding the sponsor of the legislation and that there is no companion bill in the Senate and there is no indication of action for the coming Monday, so it is uncertain when it will be scheduled again. Mr. Polistina added that his consensus is that he senses a lot of opposition from most municipalities.

Discussion

Mayor Kurtz discussed an application coming to Egg Harbor Township next week for a shooting range planned for construction near Hidden Mill Golf Course which borders Santore Gravel Pit by Thelma Avenue. Township residents have been calling and asking if there is anything we can do to look into the matter as for activity, scope of project, and noise on our Township's side.

Mr. Polistina commented that it is a sporting clay shooting ground at the end of Asbury Avenue, proposed by Hansen who owns the golf course. There is not only opposition in Hamilton but also in Egg Harbor Township.

Mr. Percy commented about his concerns over the safety and welfare of the general public and the installation of security devices, i.e. cameras on developmental projects and posed the question if any of our professionals are familiar with anything that we can require.

Discussion ensued with comments from professionals and Board members as to what is possibly out there, a different method, whose responsibility, etc. as to security cameras. It was suggested that perhaps Mr. Polistina could look into this and it was advised by Mr. Sartorio, that if the Board is going to have Mr. Polistina do an analysis, he should present a proposal. Mr. Bilicki remarked that this has been handled on a case by case basis. There was no decision to move forward with an analysis.

Mr. Adams remarked that he thinks the proliferation of cameras that we see that technology is getting cheaper, and that businesses are installing them. If the business needs them, they are putting them in as it benefits them. He does not think it is impervious of the Board to say that they have to have a camera or to spend money on our professionals to evaluate that question.

Mr. Percy remarked that he will be suggesting it on applications from a standpoint of security. Mr. Filippone remarked that item #49 is Security Analysis Plan and that is used for review. Mr. Polistina commented that if it doesn't meet what the Board thinks it should, the Board does not have to grant the waiver for it.

NO EXECUTIVE SESSION

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Committeeman Guishard – remarked that he felt this was a great session and, really appreciate the professionalism and sensitivity of the requirements of the applicant coming in. He further stated that it will be great to have someone there and hope we can get more people to come in.

Motion was made to close Public Comment with motion by Mr. Percy seconded by Mr. Choyce. Said Motion carried with all members voting in favor. .

Adjournment: 10:05 PM - Mr. Percy seconded by Mr. Choyce to adjourn the meeting. SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH ALL MEMBERS VOTING "AYE", (NO) "NAY", (NO) "ABSTAIN".

Respectfully submitted,

Mary A. Lisitski
Planning Board

Adopted 5/4/2017