

HILLSBOROUGH TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES
November 09, 2017

Chairman Shawn Lipani called the Planning Board Public Meeting of November 09, 2017 to order at 7:34 pm. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting took place in the Courtroom of the Hillsborough Township Municipal complex.

Chairman Lipani announced the meeting had been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 ("Sunshine Law").

ROLL CALL

Mayor Carl Suraci - Present
Robert Wagner, Jr. - Absent
Committeeman Frank DelCore - Arrived 7:35pm
Robert Peason - Present
Stephanie Forrest - Absent
Neil Julian, Vice Chairman - Present

Sally Becorena - Absent
Shawn Lipani, Chairman - Present
Kenneth Hesthag, Secretary - Absent
Ron Skobo (Seat Alt. #1) - Present
Sam Weinstein (Seat Alt. #2) - Present

Also present: David K. Maski, PP, AICP, Planning Director; Eric Bernstein, Esq., Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein & Associates); William H.R. White, III, PE, CME, Board Engineer (Maser Consulting P.A.); Lucille Grozinski, Board Court Reporter; and Caz Bielen, Board Videographer (Premier Media, LLC).

DISPOSITION OF MINUTES

- September 14, 2017

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Peason, seconded by Mayor Suraci.

Roll Call: Mr. Peason - yes; Mr. Skobo - yes; Mr. Weinstein - yes; Vice Chairman Julian - yes; Mayor Suraci - yes; Chairman Lipani - yes. Motion carries.

DISPOSITION OF RESOLUTIONS

None

PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS

None

SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

None

BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR

None

CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES

None

PUBLIC HEARING - SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN APPLICATIONS

- **814 CRE, LLC / 814 Development (Parking - L 32.02 / Trailer - L 33.01)** - File 17-PB-12-MSPV (TOD: 02-23-18) - Block 142, Lot 32.02 (198 Route 206) and Lot 33.01 (210 Route 206). Applicant seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval; 'c' bulk variances; and design waivers; and submission waivers, for approval to retain an existing temporary trailer on Lot 33.01, and construct 36 parking spaces on Lot 32.02, as a temporary parking lot to service the existing veterinary hospital on Lot 33.01, while the new veterinary hospital is constructed on Lot 33, on property in the I-1 Light Industrial Zoning District (Highway approaches must adhere to I-2 Zoning Ordinance standards) (*EC Review: 10-23-17*).

Jay Bohn, Esq. of Schiller & Pittenger P.C., said the Applicant is seeking approval to continue the use of a temporary trailer for the existing veterinary hospital while the new veterinary hospital is being constructed. Mr. Bohn said he had several professionals available for testimony.

Michael K. Ford, PE of Van Cleef Engineering Associates was sworn in and gave the following testimony:

Exhibits:

- A-1** - Colorized Sheet 2 - Existing Features Plan
- A-2** - Colorized Sheet 3 - Temporary Trailer and Parking Site Plan
- A-3** - Colorized Site Exhibit - Hillsborough Veterinary Hospital

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

Mr. Ford showed Exhibit A-1 which he said showed the existing condition of Lot 33.01 and Lot 32.02. Lot 33.01 has the existing Red Bank Veterinary Hospital building and temporary trailer. The trailer is already at the site, having been granted approval previously, which had since expired. Part of this application is to regain approval for the temporary trailer. The existing conditions of the property to the North, for which the Applicant has secured a lease with the property owner, to provide for temporary parking for the existing veterinary facility. It came out in the last hearing that the parking for the existing facility would need to be relocated during construction of the new facility.

Mr. Ford said there is an existing concrete pad (Lot 32.02) where there was an existing building that was destroyed by fire in the mid-80's. Part of the existing concrete pad would be utilized for parking. The pad would be expanded slightly with gravel to facilitate parking spaces. A gravel driveway and paved pathway would connect the two properties. The request is to maintain the trailer and create a temporary parking area. Once the new hospital is constructed (A-3) and a certificate of occupancy has been issued for the new building and the existing building is no longer needed for the veterinary hospital; the temporary trailer on Lot 33.01, driveway between Lot 33.01 and Lot 32.02, and the gravel expansion on Lot 32.02 will no longer be necessary. Lots 33.01 and 32.02 would revert back to the existing conditions, and the temporary trailer would be gone.

Mr. Ford said there are a number of bulk variances that exist on the property today. Technically, there is a "new" variance for the existing trailer. The trailer is 46 feet from the right-of-way on Route 206 vs. the required front yard setback of 125 feet. Design waivers are requested for the gravel temporary parking area; minimal lighting is shown, although it will be increased as per the Maser comments; parking space sizes; and parking buffer. There is an existing stockade fence along Route 206 for Lot 32.02, which will be utilized as part of the parking buffer for the area that has more than ten parking spaces.

Mr. Ford said there is a driveway and ten parking spaces in front of the existing veterinary hospital on Lot 33.01. There is also a separate driveway on Lot 32.02. Five spaces would remain on the existing facility (Lot 33.01). A pedestrian paved pathway will connect the two. Mr. Ford said by providing the connective driveway, it will allow for the vehicle to continue north to the temporary parking area, rather than to have to turn around, exit that site (Lot 33.01) onto Route 206 and enter the adjacent parking area (Lot 32.02). There will be 20 parking spaces in the area closest to the fence (Lot 32.02) and eight additional spaces beyond the concrete pad for parking. More parking is provided than required for the 6 exam rooms.

Mr. Ford said they will comply with the Tree Ordinance with respect to mitigation for the 1 - 2 trees that will need to be removed. The existing brush and vegetation immediately adjacent to and behind the stockade fence, and any trees that are of a size that need to be mitigated, will be. Mapping and site survey work has been done since the last hearing. There were no trees identified in that area in excess of a six-inch diameter that would warrant mitigation, but that would be further verified as part of compliance for approval.

Mr. Ford said the existing hospital and temporary trailer are to remain "as is" unchanged; there is no loading zone. As a result, a technical waiver would be required.

Mr. Ford addressed the comments from the professionals. He said the Fire Marshal provided a "no comments" memo. The application was heard by the Environmental Commission. The Commission suggested providing additional on-site lighting for the temporary off-site parking, which was also reiterated in Mr. White's memorandum. The Applicant will comply to their satisfaction. Also addressed with the Environmental Commission was the pre-existing building (Lot 32.02) that burned down in the mid-80's, that revealed an underwater contamination issue that has been the subject of remediation since that time. The environmental clean-up has been headed up by Mr. Llewellyn as the LSRP. Mr. Ford said the proposal would not have any adverse impact to the ongoing environmental clean-up, nor would it expose the public to any environmental hazards, as stated in the LSRP's report. That report was also reviewed by the Township Health Officer, Dr. Belnay, who concurred. There is a small existing trailer that is part of the environmental clean-up, located at the end of where the eight parking spaces are proposed. The area in the middle of the lot (Lot 32.02) is where there are a few monitoring wells and connections to the trailer groundwater treatment facility that returns the water pipes back into the ground. There will not be any disruption to that area.

Mr. Julian stated the Environmental Commission recommended that concrete barriers be placed around the monitoring wells and trailer so that vehicles cannot hit or disrupt those areas.

Mr. Ford said the application has approval from the SUSCD. Application has been made to the SCPB and DRCC. He said the Applicant would be looking to proceed with providing the temporary parking and

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

maintain the temporary trailer as soon as possible. He said the only other approval needed would be from the Board.

Mr. Ford discussed the Maser memorandum, dated 11-06-17. He said they will agree to all of the suggestions and recommendations. The plan would not change any of the existing operation of the veterinary hospital. The current 24- 7 hours would continue since it is an emergency clinic. Mr. Maski's review memo pointed out that the lease agreement stated the temporary parking would be for "employees only". That has already been rectified by the Applicant.

Mr. Ford said there is a provision in the lease agreement that states that the property to the north can elect to get out of the lease agreement with 90-days' notice. He said it is an unlikely occurrence that they do not envision, but if that were the case, Red Bank Veterinary Hospital is prepared to secure a contract with an off-site valet parking provider. Anyone coming onto the site would give their car to a valet service for parking at another location. This service is currently done at the facility in Red Bank. Mr. Maski asked if Mr. Ford had an idea of where the off-site parking would be located, if the contract was terminated.

Mr. Ford said they do not have a site. He said the other option is to cease operations at the existing site.

A question was asked as to whether or not there will be lighting on the pathway.

Mr. Ford said there is a light pole proposed. Since there were requests for additional lighting, the idea is to have building mounted lighting on the temporary trailer alongside the pathway, so when the trailer goes away, so will the lighting.

Mr. Maski asked Mr. Ford if he would agree to provide a lighting plan, to the satisfaction of Mr. White.

Mr. Ford agreed.

Chairman Lipani asked who is responsible to maintain the parking lots in the lease agreement, in terms of snow and ice.

Mr. Ford stated the Applicant is responsible.

Mr. Maski asked in the event the Applicant received a 90-day termination notice, the Township would be immediately notified.

Mr. Ford agreed.

Mr. Bernstein stated that if the parking agreement was terminated, the facility would not longer have parking. The Applicant would be required to come back to the Board with a new option on how they plan on handling the temporary parking.

Mr. Ford agreed.

Mr. Ford said one of the comments was to provide for a cross-access easement. The entrance (Lot 33.01) would be a one-way with temporary parking area on the adjacent lot (Lot 32.02) to be used only for the veterinary hospital.

Mr. Maski said the lease agreement gives permission to use the property but does not allow anyone to cross over the property line to access the property. He said as it is written, one would think you would need to access the property by the driveway on that lot.

Mr. Ford said the lease can be amended to clarify that. He said the Lessee has reviewed the plan and consented to the application but the matter will be addressed.

Mr. Maski reminded the Board that at the last hearing (new facility) there was an issue raised that the neighbor's property was being used for parking for the existing facility. The purpose of this application is to clean up that issue. With this new setup, people would be aware not to park on the Leopardo's property. It needs to be clearly marked with signage or striping of some sort, or perhaps a split-rail fence.

Mr. Ford agreed.

Committeeman DelCore asked if there will be something to indicate where the overflow parking is located.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

Mr. Ford said that would be part of the directional signage.

Mr. Ford continued review of Mr. Maski's memorandum. He said the existing driveway for the existing facility is now two-way. The suggestion is to have that access be one-way. He said the Applicant prefers to maintain the two-way access so that anyone parking on the existing lot would not have to exit by way of the adjacent property. He said that would help to not add any more traffic to that driveway (Lot 32.02) than necessary. Using the existing driveway as an exit would only be used by the five spaces in front of the existing facility. Vehicles parking on the adjacent lot would be directed to exit the property by way of the driveway on that lot (Lot 32.02) by way of "one way" traffic signage. Mr. Ford said from a traffic and engineering standpoint, he did not see a substantial adverse impact either way.

Chairman Lipani asked if there will be a designated drop-off area for emergency patients. He suggested the owner of a large animal may not be able to carry that animal from the adjacent parking area. The owner may also be inclined to drive against the one-way driveway in order to access the entrance.

Mr. White said by Law, only one handicap space is required. He suggested one of the two spaces in front be converted to a temporary parking space for emergency unloading / loading.

Mr. Ford agreed. He said it could be accomplished through striping and signage.

Mr. Maski expressed concern with retaining two-way traffic at the driveway. He said the area is difficult to maneuver. He asked Mr. White to weigh in.

Mr. White said in reality, there will only be three spaces for parking, plus a handicap space. He said it is such a low turnover that it will not be an issue.

Mr. Ford continued his response to Mr. Maski's memo. He said the eight parking spaces (Lot 32.02) in the back are not required but the Applicant would like them to remain so as to not have a parking shortage. He said that area would be designated for employees and operational standard parking. The operation of the facility is to essentially remain unchanged; there is no expansion of use or additional facility at the existing site as part of this application. The neighbors to the north are a low-traffic generator.

Mr. Ford said the temporary trailer would be removed as soon as the new facility is open and the existing facility has been moved over. The trailer is being leased monthly so there is an incentive to decommission the use as soon as possible.

Mr. Maski said that was too open-ended. The original approval was for two years, which extended beyond that.

Mr. Ford said the Applicant would agree to file for a demolition permit as soon as they get close to the CO for the new facility. He said it would take some time to get the demolition permit. He suggested that as soon as the building is not being used, the Board can set a time as to when the Applicant has to file for the demolition permit. He said the actual removal would be subject to the issuance of a demolition permit. Once the permit is issued, they would agree to remove the trailer within 30-days of issuance.

Committeeman DelCore asked how long the Applicant expects to remain in a "temporary" state.

Mr. Ford said the goal is to break ground in the Spring. The Contractor would break ground now if not for the prior approval expiring. He said they expect the new facility to be CO'd by the end of next year. The new facility has been a long time coming but everything seems to be in place now to make it all happen.

Mr. Ford agreed to distribute flyers to the clients as to the new temporary parking arrangement.

Mr. Bohn said they would want to be able to submit for a building permit and have those plans reviewed while the process of getting the temporary parking in place, so that they are able to start construction as soon as possible, after that happens. He clarified that the comments of Mr. Maski suggests the new parking lot should be in place prior to the issuance of any permits. Mr. Bohn said they are requesting to be able to submit a permit application and be able to have it reviewed by the Construction Official for comments, so as to be able to secure a permit as soon as possible.

Mr. Maski said the Building Permit will not be issued until a Zoning permit is issued. A Zoning permit will not be issued until all conditions have been fulfilled. He said you should not get rid of the existing temporary parking until the new temporary parking is in place.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

Mr. Ford said the goal is to start construction of the temporary parking immediately. He said they would be prepared to start construction tomorrow at their own risk, if allowed to do so. He said they already have the SUSCD approval; the property is not on a County road; and the DRCC exemption is pending. He said they would like to proceed with the laying down of stone and pavement for the pathway as soon as possible. He said if the Board was to make a favorable decision on the application, and the Resolution drafted so that it is able to be memorialized at the next Board meeting, they would endeavor to satisfy all of the conditions being requested, and immediately proceed with the temporary parking. He said they would be looking to focus on fulfilling the conditions for the new facility thereafter so as not to delay the project further.

Chairman Lipani and Mr. Maski both suggested that likely is not possible since permits would not be issued prior to the resolution.

Mr. Maski asked the Board if there is a more specific time in which the approval for the temporary provisions would run.

Mr. Ford commented that the demolition permit is for the trailer. It is required to decommission the trailer.

Mr. Bernstein asked how long it would take to decommission the trailer once the permit was issued.

Mr. Ford responded it would take 30-days.

Mr. Bernstein asked if the Board would be willing to have as a condition of approval, that the trailer be decommissioned within 30-calendar-days of the issuance of the demolition permit. He said the trailer is a rental so it is not going to be demolished but returned.

Members discussed the number of days that should be allowed.

Mr. Ford said the trailer is in two pieces and not on wheels. It is secured to the ground with hurricane straps, per the Construction Department.

Vice Chairman Julian asked if 90-days would be enough for the removal of the temporary parking area.

Mr. Ford said the demolition for the trailer permit would be done at the same time as the temporary parking removal.

Mr. Bernstein explained the 90-days timeframe is associated with the clause in the lease.

Mr. Maski asked for a confirmation that a new lease agreement would be submitted which addresses the cross-access and that anyone can park in the spaces, not just the employees.

Mr. Ford said that is correct.

Open to the public

Mr. Bohn said he has other professionals present for testimony, should the Board desire.

Vice Chairman Julian asked for the LSRP to comment on his report.

W. James Llewellyn, LSRP, was sworn in and reviewed his credentials.

Vice Chairman Julian read a comment from the Environmental Commission review letter regarding the hoses that were found to be on the ground at the time of the site-walk.

Mr. Llewellyn said he had contacted the operator of the system the day after the site-walk. He said he had been told by Mr. Bollens that the initial extraction wells in between the two parking areas were installed with sub-surface lines. Those lines still exist today and are utilized. He said there were three additional wells put in the same area at a later date, that had above-ground lines leading to the treatment trailer. Mr. Llewellyn said he asked Mr. Bollens about potential freezing, to which Mr. Bollens responded that the lines have been operating since 2000 without that problem. He said as long as there is enough water flowing through the lines, there is no issue.

Vice Chairman Julian asked Mr. Llewellyn if he was okay with that.

Mr. Llewellyn stated he was.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

Mr. Bohn asked Mr. Llewellyn if the above-ground lines are protected from potential interference from the vehicles using the temporary parking lot.

Mr. Llewellyn said they are protected. He said the lines run from the extraction wells, over land or subsurface, to the eastern side of the treatment trailer. Mr. Llewellyn testified he had been to the site and verified that is what those lines are for.

No questions from the public.

Chairman Lipani asked for confirmation that the demolition permit will be submitted 30-days from the issuance of the CO, and the demolition will occur within 45-days of the issuance of the demolition permit.

Mr. Bohn said that is his understanding as well.

Mr. Maski asked to hear testimony on the variances requested.

Mr. Ford said the property fronts Route 206 so the I-2 standards apply. The minimum lot size is 2-acres. Each of the lots is approximately 1-acre, so both are undersized. There is a minimum lot width of 300 feet. Both lots do not comply. The temporary trailer is situated 46 feet from the front property line, where a 125 foot setback is required. The required side yard setback is 50 feet. The existing side yard setback for the existing building on Lot 33.01 is 17.54 feet. There is also a requirement for lot depth of 300 feet. Lot 33.01 has an existing lot depth of 266.46 feet and does not comply. Mr. Ford said these are all existing nonconformities. They are not being exacerbated or worsened by this application, but for the existing setback of the main structure of the veterinary hospital is setback farther back from the existing trailer. Mr. Ford said they are asking to maintain the 46 foot setback, albeit because the prior approval expired. He said in order to eliminate the variances, you would have to remove the structures, or add land.

Mr. Ford stated the existing conditions would not have any substantial impairment to the Township Zoning Code or Master Plan; nor would they have any adverse effect on the public.

Close public

Chairman Lipani asked for a motion. He said any approval would be based on the professionals reports and comments; the demolition permit would need to be applied for within 30-days of CO; removal of the temporary trailer within 45-days of the issuance of the demolition permit; a drop-off area in place of one of the front parking space; signage, to include directing visitors to park in the adjacent temporary parking area; and increased lighting to the satisfaction of Mr. White and Mr. Maski.

Mr. Maski added the requirement of a new lease agreement; wayfinding signage and to keep visitors off of the neighbor's property; concrete barriers around the wells and/or the above-ground hoses; and that the Applicants will distribute flyers to their clients regarding the temporary parking area.

A motion to approve, as discussed, was made by Mr. Skobo, seconded by Mr. Peason.

Roll Call: Ms. Peason - yes; Mr. Skobo - yes; Mr. Weinstein - yes; Vice Chairman Julian - yes; Committeeman DelCore - yes; Mayor Suraci - yes; Chairman Lipani - yes. Motion carries.

Break 8:40 - 8:49pm

- ***814 CRE, LLC / 814 Development (Veterinary Hospital)*** - File 17-PB-04-MSPV - (TOD: 11-14-17) - Block 142, Lot 33 - 212 Route 206. Applicant seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval; 'c' bulk variance for side yard setback; submission waivers from providing a CIS; and parking design waivers, to construct a new Veterinary Hospital with parking and stormwater improvements, on property in the I-1 Light Industrial Zoning District (Highway approaches must adhere to I-2 Zoning Ordinance standards) (*EC Review: 07-24-17*). ***Adjourned from October 12, 2017 without further notice.***

Jay Bohn, Esq. of Schiller & Pittenger P.C., representing the Applicants, said the application is continued from September 14, then carried to October 12, and adjourned to this meeting. He said at the time of the initial hearing, substantially all of the testimony was presented. There became an issue of legality with the temporary trailer for the existing site since the approval had since expired. There was also an issue on how the parking for the customers would be accommodated while the new facility was being

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

constructed on this site. Both of the outstanding issues were addressed and completed with the application just approved.

Mr. Bohn said he had a number of witnesses available for any further questions. Mr. Bohn said if the professionals wished to have any further discussion on their reports.

Michael K. Ford, PE of Van Cleef Engineering Associates was reminded by Mr. Bernstein he was still under oath from the previous application, and still qualified for testimony.

Mr. Ford was directed to start testimony on item (f) of Mr. Maski's Planning memorandum, dated August 10, 2017.

Mr. Ford stated they will comply with the request for signage. He said the site plan associated with this application was previously approved by the Board of Adjustment. All of the conditions of that prior approval were satisfied, including a NJDOT permit. He confirmed an application for re-approval was submitted to NJDOT for the driveway permit. Mr. Ford said they had already received comments from NJDOT which they have responded to. The prior plan shows a sidewalk along Route 206 which has since been eliminated at the suggestion of NJDOT. This section is in the section between the Bypass and the completed improvements of Route 206 by Duke Farms. He said his understanding is that the State is in the design phase of widening the highway to two lanes north and south, with a concrete medium down the middle. Mr. Ford said a portion of this property has been acquired by the State to facilitate that widening. He said the NJDOT parcel maps indicated this future driveway for the Red Bank Veterinary Clinic. He said Exhibit A-2 shows the preexisting conditions for the site which include structures that have since been removed. The State's plan shows a driveway on the south section of the site, as well as on the north section. It will be consolidated to one new driveway as now showing on the NJDOT parcel maps for this section. Any approval would be conditioned on the re-approval of the NJDOT.

Exhibits:

A-1 - Color Rendering of "Compassion First Preliminary Elevation View, Sheet A2.1, Dated September 5, 2017"

A-2 - Colorized version of the Site Plan

A-3 - Colorized version of Existing Features Plan

A-4 - Colorized Architectural Plan by Architects Plus, Sheet A2.1

Mr. Maski said one of the comments from the previous hearing was that the DOT is actively designing the remainder of the Route 206 project. He said they do not want to run into the same situation Mr. Ford experienced with the Senior Housing application, where the DOT Access Staff did not communicate with the DOT Design Staff, which led to some issues with placement of utilities, that later had to be moved. Mr. Maski said Mr. Ford would need to reach out to both groups for comments.

Mr. Ford said he had, and would provide the Township with a copy of the DOT parcel map showing the previously approved driveway, which is on the DOT plans.

Chairman Lipani asked about a cross-access easement.

Mr. Ford said as part of the prior approval, a cross-access easement is already in place for Lot 33.

Mr. Ford said the architectural plan was submitted with the application.

Mr. Maski asked Mr. Ford to go through the design waivers being requested.

Mr. Ford said some of the comments were addressed at the prior hearing by another witness. He stated the way the building is oriented, the front access is actually at the back of the building, adjacent to the parking lot. He said there seemed to be no objection. He said what is the back of the building, which in this case faces Route 206, has been treated with an architectural theme similar to the front of the building but there are no sidewalks to invite pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Ford said the building is designed to be a single-story so a design waiver is requested. The front of the building facing Route 206 is not over 100 ft. There is also a portion of the building facing the side, that is not 100 ft., but it would not face the public; it would face the driveway. Although only a single-story building, it will not have a flat roof. The roof will have dimensional asphalt shingles. Although in the Industrial Zone, the building is not designed to look industrial.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

Mr. Ford said Exhibit A-4 shows all sides of the building. The asphalt shingled roof has a slope to it so it has dimension. There are windows and a gable end that faces the back of the building so it does not have a straight line look from Route 206. The west elevation faces an existing detention basin. The same architectural theme is carried throughout the building design.

Mr. Ford handed out small versions of the colorized architectural plans to the Board. He said the "South Elevation" would face Route 206; the "North Elevation" would face the parking lot as the main entrance. The "East Elevation" would face the driveway; the "West Elevation" would face the existing detention basin and neighboring industrial facility. The exterior doors on the west elevation lead to a walking area for the animals and will be used as an emergency exit. That exit is far away from Route 206, the access driveway, and the parking areas.

Chairman Lipani asked if there will be any lighting mounted on the exterior of the building.

Mr. Ford said the area lighting is all pole mounted lights. Building mounted lighting would only be what is required by Code for doorways and entrances.

Mr. Ford said the Overlay Architectural Design Standards suggest pedestrian access, including bike racks. The Applicant is requesting a waiver. The sidewalks and pedestrian areas are solely to provide for access from the parking lot to the facility.

Committeeman DelCore said given the 24-7 nature, if additional lighting would be required.

Mr. Ford said other than the lighting in the parking lot and immediately adjacent to the entrance, no other lighting would be proposed, except perhaps for additional lighting at the walking access area.

Mr. Savo asked if there will be lighting on the signage.

Mr. Ford said the application was not submitted with any freestanding sign but with a building mounted sign. As discussed, a sign design package with no deviation from the ordinance will be submitted.

Mr. Maski said the lighting would need to be addressed to the satisfaction of Mr. White. He asked Mr. Ford to discuss the screening from neighboring properties.

Mr. Ford said they are endeavoring to maintain the vegetation to the neighboring property to the west, and have utilized most, if not all, of the tree mitigation plantings along the driveway and the most immediate residential neighbor. There will also be some landscaping in the parking lot itself.

Mr. Maski said the overall landscaping plan is subject to Maser's satisfaction.

Mr. Ford agreed. He said they had already submitted on the record a compliance statement recognizing the economic hardship limitation.

Mr. Maski asked Mr. Ford to discuss the recycling and trash storage areas and how each will be handled.

Mr. Ford said they are proposing a standard trash enclosure with a concrete pad and wood fence. The trash area would be immediately adjacent to the parking lot along the common area with the existing industrial park to the west.

Mr. Maski confirmed a wood fence is permitted.

Mr. White said his concerns were addressed at the prior hearing date for this application.

Open to the public

Janet Leopardo - Route 206

- Mrs. Leopardo said she recalled there being a wall of some sort near her property. She said she was concerned that the noise would be an issue.

Mr. Ford said there is no difference in the application. He said they are proposing the bulk of the plantings along the driveway to buffer the Leopardo's property. No plantings are proposed to buffer the industrial park to the west. Mr. Ford said there was no fence proposed with the 2004 application either.

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES
October 12, 2017

Mr. Bernstein asked Mr. Ford to explain what will be done along the Leopardo's property for the current veterinary clinic relative to the parking.

Mr. Ford said that area will be striped to delineate it as a "no parking" zone. He said they will also be adding signage, as per Mr. Maski's suggestion.

- Mrs. Leopardo acknowledged she understood.

Vice Chairman Julian said the recommendations of the Environmental Commission would need to be met, as noted in the review memorandum dated September 6. The project would need to be reviewed by the Township Engineer and meet the current Stormwater Management Rules; DRCC approval; provide an updated LOI with wetlands delineation; and update the project regarding threatened and endangered species.

Mr. Ford agreed. He said the NJDEP wetlands application has already been submitted. An application to the DRCC has been submitted and review comments have already been satisfied. Like most outside agencies, approval is not granted until after receipt of a board's Resolution of Approval.

Mr. Ford said one of the subtle changes between this application and the prior approval is that there are some porous pavement sections within the parking area to provide for total suspended solids (TSS) removal, in accordance with the new Stormwater Best Management Practices. He said they have also requested a T&E update from the State, which would be renewed as part of the LOI renewal as well.

A motion to approve, with all requirements stated, was made by Committeeman DelCore, seconded by Mr. Peason.

Roll Call: Ms. Peason - yes; Mr. Skobo - yes; Mr. Weinstein - yes; Vice Chairman Julian - yes; Committeeman DelCore - yes; Mayor Suraci - yes; Chairman Lipani - yes. Motion carries.

CORRESPONDENCE

None

Chairman Lipani reminded by Board the next meeting is scheduled for December 7.

Mr. Bernstein said there are two ordinances scheduled for review on the December 7 meeting. He said the ordinances need to be reviewed by the Board and referred to the Township Committee so that the Committee can take action before the end of the year. He asked the Board to authorize the Chairman to call a special meeting, if need be, in the event a quorum is not available for the December 7 meeting.

A motion was made and seconded. All were in favor; motion carries.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. All were in favor, none opposed; motion carries.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:23 p.m.

Submitted by:
Debora Padgett, Administrative Assistant / Planning Board Clerk