

10.

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
February 23, 2016

The regular meeting of the Florence Township Planning Board was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood then read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

Mildred Hamilton-Wood	Tim Lutz
James Molimock	Council Representative Ted Lovenduski
Mayor Craig Wilkie	Ray Montgomery
Thomas McCue	

ALSO PRESENT: Solicitor David Frank
Engineer Hugh Dougherty
Planner Barbara Fegley

ABSENT: Wayne Morris, William Federico

RESOLUTIONS

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood explained that Resolution B is no longer to be considered.

- A. Resolution PB-2016-07 continuing the application of Wawa, Inc. for Minor Site Plan approval to allow the sale of diesel fuel at existing pumps and addition of an underground fuel storage tank at 2060 Rt. 130
- B. Resolution PB-2016-08 deeming complete the applications of 500 Cedar Lane, LLC for Minor Subdivision, Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for 500 Cedar Lane.

It was the Motion of Lutz, seconded by Lovenduski to approve Resolution No. PB-2016-07.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue
NOES: None
ABSENT: Morris, Federico

MINUTES

11.

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Letter from T&M Associates dated January 20, 2016 regarding NJDEP Upland Waterfront Development Permit Application for River Bridge Business Park, West Front Street, Block 170, Lots 1.02, 1.03, 1.04 and 1.05.
- B. Letter from Florence Township Clerk Joy Weiler dated January 29, 2016 regarding adoption of Township Ordinance Nos. 2016-01 and 2016-02.
- C. Letter from Burlington County Planning Board dated January 25, 2016 regarding Cedar Lane South Industrial Park, Liberty Venture I, LP.
- D. Letter from NJ Department of Environmental Protection dated February 4, 2016 regarding Final Solid Waste Facility Permit Renewal and Major Modification for Burlington County Resource Recovery Complex Sanitary Landfill.

It was the Motion of Lutz, seconded by Montgomery to receive and file Correspondence A through D.

APPLICATIONS

- A. Application PB 2015-06 for Wawa, Inc. Applicant is requesting Minor Site Plan approval to allow for the sale of diesel fuel at the existing fuel pumps and the addition of an underground tank for storage of the diesel fuel on property located at 2060 US Route 130 North, Florence Township. Block 163.02, Lot 13.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said the board received a letter from Duncan Prime, the applicant's attorney, dated February 22, 2016 asking that the application be withdrawn.

It was the Motion of Montgomery, seconded by Lutz to dismiss the application without prejudice.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue
NOES: None
ABSENT: Morris, Federico

- B. Application PB#2016-01 for 500 Cedar Lane, LLC. Applicant is requesting Minor Subdivision of property located at 500 Cedar Lane, Florence. Block 148.06, Lot 6.01.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood explained that the board would be hearing three applications from this applicant this evening. This was the first; it deals with the subdivision of the property, not with the building site plans.

12.

John Gillespie of Parker McCay was representing the applicant. This was the evolution of a redevelopment plan. The applicant approached the governing body and presented what they wanted to do on Cedar Lane and Railroad Avenue and a redevelopment plan was developed. It was reviewed and approved and adopted by ordinance. Last month the applicant appeared before this board for its completeness hearing. They also appeared before Council not just for the redevelopment plan but for the soil fill permit as well. This evening was the next step, to get approvals from the board for the minor subdivision of what is now Block 148.06, Lot 6.01. If the subdivision was approved this evening he will move on to the Preliminary and Final Site Plan applications. Lot 1 would be the existing building on Railroad Avenue.

Mr. Gillespie said with him this evening were John Hanlon and James Knopka of First Industrial Realty Trust, Bob Hunter of Bohler Engineering, Dave Horner of Horner and Canter Associates and Mr. Norman Dotti of Russell Acoustics.

Mr. Gillespie said he would like to proceed with the minor subdivision. His only witness for this application was Mr. Hunter. Solicitor Frank swore in all the witnesses at this time. Solicitor Frank requested they all be accepted as experts in their fields because each of them has testified before this board in the past. The board was in agreement.

Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Hunter to explain the nature of the subdivision to the board. Mr. Horner referred to an aerial photograph of the site and entered it as Exhibit A-1. It showed the proposed lot lines. For representational purposes they were a little wider. Mr. Gillespie indicated where Lot 1 and Lot 2 were located. Mr. Hunter noted it was correct. Mr. Gillespie asked how large Lot 1 would be. Mr. Hunter said it 12.13 acres. Mr. Gillespie asked the same regarding Lot 2. Mr. Hunter said it would 33.363 acres. Mr. Gillespie asked if Lot 1 would have the existing building on Railroad Avenue. Mr. Hunter said that was correct. Mr. Gillespie asked the size of the existing building. Mr. Hunter said it was 203,877 sq. ft. Mr. Gillespie asked if the subdivision as proposed complied with the Township's standards. Mr. Hunter said it does. Mr. Gillespie asked if it reflected the redevelopment plan that had been approved for this property. Mr. Hunter said it does. Mr. Gillespie asked if Mr. Hunter reviewed the letters written by the Board Professionals. Mr. Hunter said he had. Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Hunter if he agreed on behalf of the applicant the conditions recommended in the letters. Mr. Hunter said everything in the letters can and will be met. Mr. Gillespie asked if the applicant was still working on getting the PSE&G easement vacated. Mr. Hunter concurred. Mr. Gillespie asked if there were any conditions in the professional's letters that he was concerned with or would like to discuss. Mr. Hunter said the application fully complies with the redevelopment plan and there are no variances.

Engineer Dougherty said subsequent to the completeness hearing he met with the applicant on February 9, 2016. The applicant submitted a revised plan. Engineer Dougherty said his current letter was dated February 18, 2016. The completeness issues were addressed and the applicant has submitted the requirements for the minor subdivisions with the two site plan applications. The applicant addressed all the comments mentioned in his January letter. He wanted to just confirm that the applicant

13.

would vacate the PSE&G gas easement that is on the property. At the time of the meeting that was the only outstanding issue. It must be vacated for any development to occur on the proposed lot.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked the status of the issue. Mr. Hunter said the applicant is working with PSE&G. There is a very particular process. The gas improvements in the easements have already been removed. A representative of PSE&G has to come to the site to confirm the gas improvements were removed. Once that's been done the paperwork will be processed and they will refile with the county. Engineer Dougherty said the applicant is filing by deed rather than plat so those easements will not be recorded with the deed. Engineer Dougherty noted that would be a condition of approval.

Planner Fegley noted her letter of February 5, 2016. There was also a subsequent February 18, 2016 letter. She said the Zoning Information Table should have another column reflecting that the standards are met. Another comment in her letter was that the plans submitted should show the approximate location of the county right-of-way. It was agreed that a note would be added to the minor subdivision plat showing the county right-of-way.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said there was a letter submitted from the Environmental Commission regarding impervious coverage. She didn't see any reference in the letter as to where the coverage is. She speculated it was for Lot 1. Planner Fegley said there really aren't impervious requirements for the redevelopment area or for this zone. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said she believes the comments only pertain to the lot that has the existing building on it. The other lot looked like it would have more pervious coverage on it. Mr. Hunter said he could address the issue for both lots. There was a comprehensive stormwater analysis done for both proposed lots and the concern in impervious coverage but the impact has been mitigated with additional landscaping on Cedar Lane and Railroad Avenue. Also the stormwater report showed that the plan was designed to reduce the runoff from the overall site. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood noted that the condition is existing. Mr. Hunter agreed. He said for Lot 1 it is an existing condition. For Lot 2 the applicant is proposing a system. Overall the applicant is reducing stormwater. They looked for potential of using gravel but there is nowhere on site that it was appropriate. The tractor trailers and the parking would create operational issues for the overall use of the site. They looked at putting it on the passenger car parking area on the site but it is really a safety hazard. It was considered but operationally there was no benefit.

Engineer Dougherty said the site plan for the lot does show that the stormwater is reduced. That would be a mitigating factor for the impervious. Also, one of the problems with gravel is that over time it compacts to become almost impervious. He thinks the way it was addressed with stormwater management was the proper avenue.

It was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by Lutz to open to the public regarding Application PB#2016-01. All ayes.

14.

Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by McCue to close the public hearing. All ayes.

It was the Motion of Lutz, seconded by Molimock to approve Application PB#2016-01.

Upon roll call the board voted as follows:

YEAS: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue
NOES: None
ABSENT: Morris, Federico

C. Application PB#2016-02 for 500 Cedar Lane, LLC. Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for property located at 500 Cedar Lane, Florence. Block 148.06, Proposed Lot 1.

Mr. Gillespie said he had two witnesses for this application, Mr. Hunter and David Horner. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood noted both were previously sworn in and were accepted as experts in their fields. Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Hunter if he was familiar with the site plan. He concurred. Mr. Gillespie noted exhibit A-1 was being used. Mr. Gillespie asked for him to explain how the traffic would circulate and what improvements were being made to the site. Mr. Hunter referred to A-1. He noted that it is the lot at the corner of Cedar Lane and Railroad Avenue. It is an existing approximately 203,000 sq. ft. warehouse facility. It currently has one access from Cedar Lane. All vehicles would enter the site off Cedar Lane and would be in the easterly area to turn around and exit the site. He presented Exhibit A-2. It showed an aerial and a color of the portion of the site he was referencing, proposed Lot 1. For the most part the site will stay the same. To make it viable parking was added along the northern property line. There is also an added entrance to Railroad Avenue. This entrance is key for two reasons. The county plans on improving the intersection at Railroad Avenue and Cedar Lane with a roundabout. That should enhance the safety of the area. This entrance will permit access when there is construction. There will be a period time where the intersection will be closed. Passenger vehicles will be detoured but the truck traffic will go through the lot temporarily. Additionally for the operation of the site, the access on Railroad Avenue will provide truck movement through the site and will allow circulation in such a manner that when backing up to the loading docks the drivers can look over their left shoulders. This is the preferred method for trucks when they enter a loading dock. The traffic will be able to circulate and exit to Cedar Lane. There won't be any turning around on the site, it is a much safer circulation. There would be some improvements. In the front where the passenger vehicles are parked the access to Railroad Avenue would be abandoned. Some parking area will be abandoned to provide green space along where the roundabout will be and the ADA features will be improved. The applicant is also providing a 6' wide path on Railroad Avenue. It will allow it to be constructed right on the inside of the right-of-way so there would not be any easements necessary. There would also be landscaping along Railroad Avenue to buffer the building and give it a better aesthetic view. There were some large pylon signs at the site that have been removed. There will be a monument sign identifying the property.

15.

Mr. Hunter introduced into evidence A-3. He said it better illustrates the worst case scenario. Truck traffic is restricted from Railroad Avenue, this showed a truck is able to navigate into the site. Preferred truck traffic will come from Railroad Avenue from the west and turn into the site and circulate around. The driveway will accommodate truck traffic from the west and the east.

Mr. Gillespie introduced Exhibit A-4. He asked if it was the rendering of the site would look like along Railroad Avenue. Mr. Hunter concurred. He said it showed the applicant is working with the existing building. It is representational, it was not exactly what would be there. It showed the bike path that is just behind the utility poles and the plantings along the existing building.

Mr. Gillespie noted there were questions presented in some of the review letters. Mr. Gillespie asked if Mr. Hunter knew what the occupancy of the building would be. Mr. Hunter said right now half of the building is occupied with Pinnacle Trucking. The intent is once the improvements are made and the additional parking stalls are put in along the north property line, the applicant would seek a second tenant. There is about half of the building available. Mr. Gillespie asked if the tenant would be a warehouse or distribution type use. Mr. Hunter said yes, similar to what is currently operating there. Mr. Gillespie asked what the business hours would be. Mr. Hunter said he does not, but they would comply with township ordinance.

Mr. Gillespie said the board professionals had some comments regarding trash and recycling. Mr. Hunter said he did review those reports. The trash and recycling would be handled inside the building and it would all be private hauling. Mr. Gillespie asked about the design type and location of irrigation. Mr. Hunter said the applicant does not intend to irrigate the site. It is not currently irrigated and any landscape improvements would be handled by the landscape contractor for the first year to establish growth.

Mr. Gillespie asked if there were any other concerns raised in the professional's letters that needed to be addressed. Mr. Hunter brought a letter dated February 23, 2016 to have it be part of the record of this hearing. It was entered as Exhibit A-5. The applicant in the letter stated that not knowing what the intended hours would be it will meet the township ordinance. The parking provided is based on the industry standard. It is consistent with other sites and would meet any future tenant's needs. Regarding the ADA requirements, there is a ramp at the front and it currently exists and there are additional ADA parking spots being provided in that area. There is no objection to repairing any pavement identified by the Township Engineer as being in need of repair. The 6' walkway on Railroad Avenue is sufficient to meet ADA standards and handle the free flow of pedestrian traffic back and forth. As far as landscaping and lighting, he agreed to meet with Planner Fegley and her office to make sure it is to her satisfaction. Solicitor Frank clarified that the issue of landscaping and appearance and maintenance of landscaping will be addressed in the developer's agreement. Mr. Hunter said any comments regarding the path on Walkers Road to the rear of the site will be addressed as part of the design. Mr. Gillespie said there were discussions with the township about this.

16.

The idea of doing something there is a continuing discussion and all look forward to a private public partnership in that regard. The applicant will do some of the clearing while the workers are there. As to what happens after that in terms of how it's developed, it would be in accordance with what the township wanted the developer to do. There would be ongoing discussions.

Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Hunter if the site plan was consistent with the township's applicable bulk standards in the redevelopment plan. Mr. Hunter said it was. Mr. Gillespie asked if there were any variances required. Mr. Hunter said there were not. Mr. Gillespie asked if it complied with applicable stormwater standards. Mr. Hunter said it did.

Engineer Dougherty said the letter submitted as an exhibit this evening addressed the February 18, 2016 letter that he had prepared. On January 19, 2016 he reviewed the plans and submitted a letter. The board declared the application complete on January 26. On February 9 he met with the applicant's professionals specifically about this site plan and reviewed the details that were in the January 19 letter. That resulted in his February 18 letter. By way of the testimony this evening and the February 23 letter, Mr. Hunter had addressed of Engineer Dougherty's outstanding issues. Engineer Dougherty said there were some environmental issues mentioned earlier. He said on page three of his letter a stormwater report was submitted for the entire site including 400 Cedar Lane. There would actually be a stormwater runoff reduction of 19%, 31% and 43% for the various storms, the 2, 10 and 100 year storms. This speaks to the impervious coverage issue the Environmental Commission mentioned.

Engineer Dougherty said there were some grading issues around the driveway entrance and at the rear of the loading dock. He was concerned there could be ponding water. The applicant has agreed to provide a better detail of that area. The applicant already addressed the truck turning template on the plan. Mr. Hunter said they chose that direction to show that if a truck were to come from the east that would be the most impactful movement on the site. It demonstrated that it would be a minor impact, and it would be the absolute worst case scenario on the site. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if there was a turn lane proposed. Mr. Hunter said there is not a turn lane on Railroad Avenue.

Mr. Gillespie said the applicant is moving forward with a four way agreement for the roundabout with Liberty Property Trust, Burlington County and the township. He said he, the Township Administrator and the Township Attorney have a conference call scheduled with Liberty Property Trust. The county just provided their comments on the agreement that was submitted. He didn't think they included anything that would be a problem. Hopefully it will move forward quickly.

Mayor Wilkie said the goal is to have it done over the summer when school is not in session. Liberty is doing the construction. Mr. Gillespie said yes, and the applicant would be reimbursing Liberty.

Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if the building was a refrigerated building. Mr. Hunter said it was not. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood asked if it would become one. Mr. Gillespie said he has heard no discussion of that.

Planner Fegley asked for clarification of the ADA and asked to be shown where they were on the plan. Mr. Hunter showed it. He explained the ramp was to the right of the stairs. He said even if something had to be changed he would make sure it meets the requirements. Planner Fegley asked about the plantings along the front on Cedar Lane. She asked if the applicant would try to get permission to plant in the right-of-way. Mr. Hunter said he has had brief conversations with the county. He has not had the opportunity to address that but he will request it. Planner Fegley said in many cases the county will allow developers to put landscaping in the right-of-way.

Planner Fegley asked for more detail regarding the sign. Mr. Hunter said he could provide answers for the next application, the sign will match the façade of that building. There would be a monument sign that would meet the ordinance. He agreed to work with the planner to be sure the signs are acceptable.

Member Lutz asked Planner Fegley why there were so many evergreens and arborvitae along Railroad Avenue. He said he didn't think it was aesthetically pleasing. Planner Fegley was in agreement. She noted the building is attractive. Member Lutz agreed. Mr. Hunter said he will work with the planner to be sure the plantings are to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. Gillespie called Mr. Horner at this time. Mr. Gillespie asked Mr. Horner if he was able to look at the access point on Railroad Avenue. Mr. Horner said he did. Mr. Gillespie asked if he formulated an opinion on the impact that would have on traffic. Mr. Horner said he did. The most notable aspect of this plan with regard to traffic is that there will be an access added in that location. It facilitates the natural circulation desired for this building. Most of the truck traffic would come in from the west, turn into the site and then circulate and exit. The access will reduce some of the tension that existed prior on Cedar Lane.

It was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by Lovenduski to open the meeting to the public regarding PB#2016-02. All ayes.

Don Nemeth, 729 Morris Court, asked about signage for different addresses on the site. He was concerned about truck drivers being confused if the addresses weren't well marked. There are four warehouses within 100' of each other and it could be confusing. Mr. Hunter said the sign that is proposed is a 40 sq. ft. monument sign. It will be internally illuminated. There will be no light projecting out or flood lights projecting onto it. He thinks it will be more than adequate for drivers to identify. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said she believed the question was more about directing trucks to the Railroad Avenue entrance near where the whirlybird is at the intersection of Cedar Lane and Railroad Avenue. Mr. Hunter said the more important part of that is the frequency of the drivers to the site. They will be used to the route and they are all professional drivers

18.

so they will know what direction they would want to circle in, which is counter clockwise, so it would be easier to back in. In the beginning there might be one or two errant trips and they will be able to turn around at 400 Cedar Lane. The frequency of the site would dictate how the traffic pattern operates. Additionally, truck traffic is restricted further down Cedar Lane.

Mr. Nemeth noted the different developed and proposed sites in the vicinity. He is afraid there will be more than a couple errant trips. Mr. Hanlon said what is proposed is the best design for the drivers. The sign will be easy for the drivers. If they go onto Cedar Lane they are limited from coming in that way. It's not preferred and they certainly wouldn't do it a second time. It will be very clearly identified as 500 Cedar Lane.

Mr. Nemeth asked if the building façade on Railroad Avenue would have exterior lighting. Mr. Hunter said there is existing overhead lighting and it will be supplemented with additional lighting on the building. It is primarily for the safety of the walkway. It will be LED downward cast lighting. It should provide more than adequate safety for the walkway.

Mr. Nemeth asked if there were any proposals for solar panels. Mayor Wilkie said he doesn't believe solar panels were presented at all, but asked for the applicant to speak to it. Mr. Nemeth said it is a big clean roof. Mayor Wilkie said after the fire at the meat plant he doesn't think panels are recommended right now. Mr. Gillespie said solar panels are not shown but it is a permitted use under the redevelopment plan.

Seeing no one else wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Montgomery, seconded by McCue to close the public portion of the hearing. All ayes.

It was the Motion of Lovenduski, seconded by Molimock to approve Application PB#2016-02.

Solicitor Frank said the first condition would be the submission of site plans addressing the comments and corrections. A detail of the irrigation would be provided. Maintenance would be provided through the Maintenance Guarantee and secondarily through whatever Developer's Agreement is formed. The developer will work with the planner regarding selecting appropriate plantings. The applicant will be asking the county for permission to place plantings in the right of way along Cedar Lane in order to better buffer the building. The applicant will also work with the planner to create compatible signage. These are in addition to the regular conditions. Walker's Road is shown on the plan. That will be part of the Developer's Agreement.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue
NOES: None
ABSENT: Morris, Federico

19.

- D. Application PB#2016-03 for 500 Cedar Lane, LLC. Applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for property located at 400 Cedar Lane, Florence. Block 148.06, Proposed Lot 2.

Mr. Gillespie called for Mr. Hanlon. Mr. Hanlon said he is the Senior Investment & Development Officer for First Industrial Realty Trust. Mr. Gillespie asked what First Industrial was. Mr. Hanlon explained it is a publicly traded realty investment trust. They only do industrial product, they develop across the United States for major companies. Mr. Gillespie asked him to describe for the board what it was he would like to do and why he wanted to do it. Mr. Hanlon referred to the aerial view. He noted where on the property there had been existing buildings that had since been demolished. The exhibit was a colored rendering of submitted site plan sheet. It was previously submitted as exhibit A-3. The intent was to design a facility relative to what the tenants are looking for which is warehouse and distribution. Within that design they looked at where the old building was and how was it was in relation to the neighbors. The building was pushed up away from the back corner. It is closer to Cedar Lane. He showed where the sound wall will be located on the plan. It will lessen the existing noise of the turnpike. In addition there is a significant setback that is heavily landscaped. There is also an appealing look to the front as far as landscaping. The buffering in the back has the sound wall. There is a proposed walking path and a buffer to the residents. There is also a significant piece of land that is in the buffer zone between Morris Court and the property that the applicant does not own that is heavily vegetated. There is also a basin there before the sound wall before there are any improvements the applicant will make. There is about 400' before the building.

He referred to exhibit A-5. It was a rendering of the property from Cedar Lane. The rendering showed the type of building. He said his company only builds "Class A" properties. They also don't build the properties and then flip them. The lights at the top of the building allow for natural light in the warehouse area. The corner would be the office area. It would be heavily landscaped. There would be additional landscaping along Cedar Lane. He referred to Exhibit A-6, a rendering of the proposed landscaping from across Cedar Lane. The two front corners of the building would be office entrances. The maximum would be two tenants in the building. The renderings were very specific to the landscaping plan and very specific as to level and what the view. He referred to exhibit A-7. It was a rendering of the view of the building from the Legacy at Meadowcroft development. It showed the sound wall that is going to be built and the landscaping proposed. The concept was to build a very good looking sound wall. It is over-engineered for what was necessary to actually meet the standards for eliminating sound. It is 5' thick precast concrete panels with color inlay. He doesn't ever intend to have to touch the wall again. It is being built to last forever. It's not painted, the color is dyed into the concrete. A-8 was the same perspective but with the vegetation at anticipated maturity. The thickness of the vegetation runs all the way down to the back side. Exhibit A-3 shows the landscaping that buffers the basin. The wall will be from 20' high to 22' high. It varies relative to the requirements.

Mr. Gillespie asked if there was a tenant for the building. Mr. Hanlon said there was not at this time. Mr. Gillespie asked if it was an expectation of a 24/7 operation and what would it be. Mr. Hanlon said it would be warehouse/distribution facility. The hours of operation would be whatever is allowed in the area.

Mr. Gillespie called Mr. Hunter. He asked Mr. Hunter if he was responsible for the site plan for this part of the application. Mr. Hunter said he was. Mr. Gillespie said there were a number of discussions with the township professionals. Mr. Hunter said there were. Mr. Gillespie asked if he was able to review the reports regarding this application. Mr. Hunter said he had. Mr. Gillespie said he saw Mr. Hunter provide his response this evening to the professionals. Mr. Hunter's report was entered in as Exhibit A-11. He referred to A-3 to show the proximity of the old warehouse and the property line with regard to Legacy as opposed to what was proposed now. The old building was about 10' off the property line. The proposed building is 132'. It will be 400' from the property line near Morris Court, the northern property line. There is an additional 50' property that he believed is owned by Cream-O-Land. The building would be about 450' from that property line. He referred to Exhibit A-2, the rendering of the site plan. It showed a little better the landscaping that is proposed.

Mr. Hunter said the building is about 578,000 sq. ft. It was situated as close as possible to Railroad Avenue and Cedar Lane. This was to provide as minimal an impact as possible on existing residents. There is an external circulation route for the trucks that would be accessing the site. Internally there are areas for the employee and passenger vehicles to park. There would be ADA parking and features at each entrance. There will be loading docks along Cedar Lane and the rear. They were kept as far away from Legacy as possible. Mr. Hanlon referred to the sound wall that surrounds the back portion of the property. It fully complies with the redevelopment plan. There were discussion with the board planner and some buffering was adjusted. The shade trees were pushed out toward Legacy. The evergreens were moved closer to the sound wall. There are two entrances off Cedar Lane. The intent is to have counter clockwise circulation. The vehicles would enter the first access of Cedar Lane and circulate counter clockwise around the building. Truck traffic is not allowed past a certain point on Cedar Lane. There would be proper signage. Anything exiting would know they are unable to turn right. Passenger vehicles would be able to turn right but large trucks would have to go toward Railroad Avenue. If someone errantly came out of the site at the first entrance and turned right there would be signage directing them to turn back.

There is a guard house identified if it is deemed necessary. There were discussions with the police department. Their concern was stacking on Cedar Lane. There would not be any need for stacking once a truck pulls on site. If there was security or fencing it would not be any closer than 250' to provide for close to five tractor trailers on site waiting for the guard to let them on site.

Mr. Gillespie asked if there were any variances needed for this application. Mr. Hunter said there were not. Mr. Gillespie asked if the site plan was consistent with the redevelopment plan. Mr. Hunter said it was. Mr. Hunter said regarding stormwater

21.

management, a majority of the water would be retained in a basin. Engineer Dougherty indicated in his report that it fully complies with standards. Mr. Hunter said he reviewed Engineer Dougherty's letter there were no objections to complying with any of the items in his letter. Any traffic comments should be directed to Mr. Horner.

Mr. Gillespie asked about trash and recycling. Mr. Hunter said trash and recycling would be retained inside the building. When necessary a private hauler will come and remove it from the site. Mr. Hunter said in regard to Planner Fegley's letter, there were some issues that were outstanding and he would meet with her office regarding the landscaping design specifically along Cedar Lane. With regard to the monument sign, the materials and colors will be consistent with the building and will compliment them. The detail just didn't refer to color.

He wanted to touch briefly on Engineer Dougherty's letter. There is an area at the rear of the site that is lower than typical lighting. The only way to make the lighting like it is shown on the rest of the site would be to put a hole in the middle of the circulation area. Due to safety and operational reasons this wasn't an option. The applicant relayed to his office that the proposed lighting is more than adequate. You won't necessarily see a penny on the ground there, but as far as trucks moving in and out and people walking through that area, the other lights would provide lighting so they would be seen. It is a condition he is more than comfortable with. Once there is a tenant, the directional sign details would be provided.

Planner Fegley asked about the size. She thinks they seem large. Mr. Hunter said they are large, they need to be visible for the trucks pulling on site and so the text is big enough for the drivers be able to see them. They are the directional signs. He indicated their location. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said they are on site and really only meant for on-site directions. Mr. Hunter concurred. They won't be seen from the road. Planner Fegley asked about building signs, they weren't indicated in the plans. Mr. Hunter said it was provided for in the redevelopment plan. It can't go above the front façade. The style is dependent upon the tenant. It would fall within the guidelines that were established in the redevelopment plan. They will be provided for review and approval prior to installation.

Engineer Dougherty said he did have a previous letter dated January 19, 2016. He met with the applicant on February 9, 2016 to review the plans. On February 18, 2016 he generated a letter. The letter he received this evening from Mr. Hunter does address the concerns he still had in the February 18, 2016 letter. He referred to the area with low lighting. He understood the rationale for not installing a pole. Additional lighting there would be closer to the residents anyway so it's not a bad thing to not have that lighting. He asked if there was parking in that area for passenger vehicles. Mr. Hunter said it is not an area for passenger vehicles and the adequate lighting at the site is directed in toward the site. It is a small triangular area. Vehicles moving in the area at night would have their headlights on and there is lighting that would cast across the area. Figures going through that area could be identified. There is no other reason to provide lighting

in that area. Engineer Dougherty said the applicant testified that it was adequate for their security purposes. He doesn't have an issue with it.

Engineer Dougherty said the other items deal with stormwater management. There were some items the applicant agreed to address with a revised submittal. He also had some traffic comments. Subsequent to his letter he received a letter dated February 18, 2016 that must have crossed his in the mail. The items were addressed in the letter. He would like to hear testimony from the traffic engineer about how the proposed round-a-bout improves the circulation at Railroad Avenue and Cedar Lane.

Mr. Gillespie called Mr. Horner to testify on this. Mr. Horner said the improvement addresses two things, the level of service and safety. The intersection has an odd configuration. He pointed it out on Exhibit A-2. It is an unusual "Y" intersection around the curve. In terms of safety, the county has been wanting to do something with it for a long time. With this application as well as Liberty, the county decided to install a round-a-bout.

In terms of the level of service the change would provide, it was analyzed in his report. The February 18 Traffic Engineering response had an updated analysis to address Engineer Dougherty's comments. He found that with both lots in place the intersection would be a little worse than it is now. It would still be a Level D which is acceptable. With the round-a-bout it improves to levels A, B and C. The flow is much better. The round-a-bout is very different than a traffic circle. In a situation like this when there is this level of volume involved and the truck traffic, the round-a-bout will make it safer. All vehicles coming in have to yield and it accommodates trucks safely.

Mr. Gillespie said in the report there was mention of ITE and trip generation. Mr. Gillespie said the state standards are always twice what reality is. He asked Mr. Horner to explain ITE numbers and reality and how he came to his conclusions. Mr. Horner said there is a publication that traffic engineers have to refer to called the Institution of Transportation Engineers Publication Trip Generation. That is what is used to project traffic for all kinds of uses including warehouses. The ITE is not perfect. He was involved extensively with the Haines Industrial Park. In the course of the many years of that building out there was concern if the trip variation projects that had to be used were an accurate reflection of what was going to happen. What he found was that the ITE overstates the impact by about twice, at least in terms of the warehousing in this area. Unfortunately he still had to use the ITE and for this report he used the ITE. He wanted to make sure that was clear. The information was in the report. The report showed that the driveways operate acceptably, the round-a-bout would be a big improvement for the area but the report is extremely conservative and it does overstate. The end user isn't entirely identified but he found with these kind of warehouse this is the trend.

Engineer Dougherty said the witness fully addressed his letter of February 18, 2016. Planner Fegley said she had no comments regarding transportation.

Mr. Gillespie called Mr. Dotti. Mr. Gillespie asked him to explain why he was retained by the applicant. Mr. Dotti said he was asked to look at the proposed use, truck traffic and its effects on the surrounding residential uses and if there were issues what could be done to abate them. Mr. Gillespie asked if he submitted a report in January. Mr. Dotti said he did. Mr. Gillespie said, just generally speaking, explain to the board what the methodology when he performs a sound study. Mr. Dotti submitted Exhibits A-9 and A-10. He said he did two things as part of his study. First he looked at the existing noise. Last year he went out in the vicinity of the site. Exhibit A-10 is an aerial view of the area and three graphs of existing sound levels there. He measured the sound for three days at three different locations. One was set back from Cedar Lane using the residential area as the distance. This is because putting them near the road would provide a falsely high reading. Another was at the end of the residential area in the northwest. The third one was behind the site between two long condominium buildings. He explained the graph. The readings were done day and night. He measured the DBA, or overall sound level. It is the measure the state uses in its noise regulations. Existing sound levels there were on the average in the mid 50's, day and night. The applicant has to meet a sound level limit of 50. A great majority of the time the sound levels were already over that. The reality is that the neighbors probably aren't going to hear it. Exhibit A-9 was a sound level contour map. It takes into account everything that was discussed. He pushed the applicant to move the building away from the residents as much as they could. He showed a line on the map that depicted tractor trailers moving through the whole site. He said the graphic was included in his report. He noted the location of the proposed sound barrier running about half the site. It separated the truck operations from the residential areas. The barrier starts at 20', goes up to 22' then at the very end back down to 20'. When there is a sound barrier between a noise source and a receiver, the height becomes significant. The barrier has to be tall enough to block line of site between the source and the receiver. As the receiver gets higher there is less shielding. The calculations need to be realistic. He used a sound level for someone in a second floor bedroom in the condominiums. It was not what someone standing on the ground would hear. The analysis was projected for night time noise. He didn't know if was going to be a 24 hour operation. He projected for a worst case scenario. There are many variables that are taken into consideration such as sound bouncing off buildings and such. The sound levels projected for Morris Court are around 40-45 DBA. It was the same for the condominiums. The applicant has to meet 50 and much of the time the sound levels are more than that. In reality, unless something goes wrong, such as a maintenance problem, the neighbors probably won't hear the operation and it will comply as well. He doesn't tell people what products to use, he gives the acoustical criteria. He said the barrier being proposed is very good. It will do much more than it needs to do acoustically.

Mr. Gillespie said at this time he didn't have any more witness on behalf of the application. Engineer Dougherty said he had nothing further, all of his concerns were addressed. Planner Fegley said the applicant will be meeting with her office regarding the landscaping. The concern with the design is that it is too uniform and if something dies its very obvious.

Member Lutz said he didn't have any questions about the design. He knows there was concern from the public regarding the amount of dust and debris from the site. He would like the properties to be evaluated and washed if needed. The applicant agreed. Mr. Hanlon said the construction would be completely different than what had been happening with the demolition. The intention is to put the sound wall up as early on in the project as possible. The project should take about 7 months to complete, it is not a long process.

It was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by Montgomery to open the meeting to the public. All ayes.

Don Nemeth, 729 Morris Court, was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mr. Nemeth said he had concerns regarding the sound study. He asked when the sound study was done. Mr. Dotti said he collected the data in March of last year. Mr. Nemeth asked if the demolition had anything to do with the study. Mr. Dotti said it did not.

Mr. Nemeth asked if there were limits on how late work could go on. Mayor Wilkie explained that local ordinance requires sites to stop at 8pm. He knows there were some issues with the demolition, most of it out of the applicant's control, but the applicant is working with the township. Mr. Nemeth said the demolition was being done late on the evenings and on Sundays. He said his neighbors called the police to complain. There is constant rumbling and vibration from the work being done.

Mr. Nemeth said the Legacy lake affected some of the properties on Morris Court. It caused the table to change. Some residents had to put sump pumps in. He is concerned the new drainage system being installed will cause problems. He said there is already a ponding problem on the common property behind Morris Court. Mr. Hanlon said the drainage system meets all requirements and drains within 72 hours. Mayor Wilkie asked if some of the site water may be going onto that property and now it won't be because it will be retained on the applicant's property. Mr. Hanlon said the basin should have a positive effect.

Mr. Nemeth asked about where the loading docks would be located on the building. Mr. Hunter indicated on the rendering. He said behind Morris Court would be vehicle and truck parking. Then there is a 10' buffer and then the sound wall. Then there is the basin. He indicated a swath of land that will be purposely left the way it is. There are no loading docks on the Morris Court side of the building.

Mr. Nemeth said the landscaping for the Cedar Lane frontage is beautiful, but he didn't see a walkway along Cedar Lane. Mr. Hunter said there were many conversations regarding this. It would be a sidewalk to nowhere. There is already a worn path along the railroad tracks. They proposed putting in a paved path on the Walker's Road right-of-way from Railroad Avenue to Olive Street. Mr. Nemeth noted the word proposed. Mayor Wilkie said the township still had to finalize things with Conrail. He said another reason there weren't going to be sidewalks on the Cedar Lane frontage is because there are going to be sidewalks on the other side of Cedar Lane at the Liberty site. There will

25.

be sidewalks from Tollgate on Firehouse Lane, on the fire department side, all the way to Cream-O-Land. Mr. Nemeth said there is a big opening in the Liberty site across from the end of his street. He asked if it was going to be a driveway. Mayor Wilkie said it was going to be. It is a second entrance. Liberty cannot have any trucks on Firehouse Lane. They have to use Independence Way, which is their main entrance, or the second one that was cut in. He wasn't sure if that was a real entrance or just an access. Mr. Nemeth said the driveway affected his snow removal. That is where the snow from his used to be place so this year no one removed the snow because there was nowhere to put it. Mayor Wilkie said the township does the snow removal so the township will figure it out.

Mr. Nemeth asked if there would be fencing and lighting on the proposed walking path, he asked if it would be the big 36' lights. Mayor Wilkie said he didn't know what kind of lighting it would be if it is decided that there would be lighting. Mr. Nemeth asked if there would be a security booth on the site. Mr. Hunter said if there was one it would be 250' back. Security for the property would be tenant dictated. If they require fencing it would be installed.

Planner Fegley noted it was shown in the detail. Mr. Hunter said it was, but if the tenant didn't need it the fence would not be installed. There would be an upgraded fence in the front, dark bronze wrought iron style. It would be between the tree line and the building. Further into the site the fencing would be vinyl coated chain link.

Mr. Nemeth asked if since his complaint, had anyone gone to the site to verify what he said. Chairperson Hamilton-Wood said his complaints were related to demolition and that is not this something this board would address. He needed to contact the township administrator. Mayor Wilkie added that his complaints were addressed, but not by this board. The Construction Code Official went to the site and the attorney for tonight's applications also contacted the owner of the property.

It was the Motion of Lutz seconded by Montgomery to close the public hearing. All ayes.

Solicitor Frank said approval would be with the conditions that revised plans reflecting the professionals comments be submitted, the applicant will work with the board planner regarding plantings, add signage if necessary, create a developer's agreement for Walker Road, the signs will match the building colors and the applicant would power wash residences in the area if necessary. The applicant is also subject to the usual conditions.

It was the Motion of Lutz, seconded by Lovenduski to approve Application PB#2016-03.

Upon roll call the board voted as follows:

AYES: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue

NOES: None

ABSENT: Morris, Federico

Solicitor Frank said prior to the hearing Mr. Gillespie's office provided him with much of the information that was presented this evening. He took the liberty of preparing some draft resolutions of approval for the projects. With the Chair's permission he would circulate them to the board, starting with the minor subdivision. There are going to be some small changes in all of them. This would start the applicant's appeal period much sooner rather than later.

OTHER BUSINESS

Mayor Wilkie said last year the township reached out to Mark Remsa at the county and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission. He presented a draft of sites with the potential for development between Florence Township, Burlington Township and areas where the DVRPC is looking at traffic patterns. Improvements would need to be made at the intersections of Cedar Lane and Route 130, Delaware Avenue and Route 130 and Hornberger Avenue at Route 130. The study will determine where these intersections are at today and what would be necessary to get them to a better standard. Some changes that have been made recently include longer light times to let more vehicles through. There needs to be some engineering work and changes at these intersections. One comment that was made was that Roy's Garage should not be there and it should be a right turn. The study will be completed by this summer. Then it will get into the funding level. He wanted to make the board aware. It will be a topic at a later date as it gets more refined.

Next month there will be a subdivision application that is adjacent to the Ready Pac property. The township is working with the owner of the Ready Pac property to build apartments. He wanted to make the applicant aware.

Solicitor Frank said the board should have in front of them a draft of Resolution 2016-08, concerning the minor subdivision that was approved this evening. He reviewed the contents of the resolution that are standard for most of his resolutions. He reviewed the conditions of the approval for the subdivision. He added the condition that an existing PSE&G easement be vacated.

It was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by Lovenduski to approve Resolution PB-2016-08.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue
NOES: None
ABSENT: Federico, Morris

Solicitor Frank referred to Resolution PB# 2016-09. He reviewed the conditions of approval. He added the applicant will request of the county to add landscaping to the Cedar Lane right-of-way and will work with the board planner regarding signage.

27.

It was the Motion of Montgomery, seconded by Molimock to approve Resolution PB#2016-09.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue

NOES: None

ABSENT: Federico, Morris

Solicitor Frank now referred to Resolution PB#2016-10. The applicant will provide signage if needed on Cedar Lane, they will have a developer's agreement regarding Walker's Lane and will work with the planner.

It was the Motion of Lutz, seconded by Molimock to approve Resolution PB#2016-10.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Hamilton-Wood, Lutz, Molimock, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,
McCue

NOES: None

ABSENT: Federico, Morris

Mr. Gillespie said on behalf of the applicant he thanked the board for expediting the process and being so helpful. The work that went into it before it came to the board was enormous. The cooperation from the township was wonderful. Things don't happen this well in other towns. It is a testament to the township that it takes the time and goes the extra mile. Mr. Hanlon seconded that.

It was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by Lutz to open to the public. All ayes. Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Montgomery, seconded by McCue to close. All ayes.

It was the Motion of Molimock, seconded by Lutz to adjourn at 9:54 p.m. All ayes.

Tim Lutz, Acting Secretary

TL/ak