OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

The Delran Township Planning Board regular meeting of Thursday, April 4, 2019, was called to order by Mr. Macey at 7:00PM in the Delran Township Municipal Building.

The Open Public Meeting Act announcement was read by Mr. Macey and the Pledge of Allegiance was performed.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Macey, Mr. Chinnici, Mr. Reimel, Mr. Catrambone, Mr. Anagnostos, Mr.

Morrow, Mr. Parento, Mr. Khinkis & Mrs. Pomeranz

Absent: Mr. Paris & Mr. Hejnas

Professionals: Mr. Gleaner, Attorney, Mr. Raday, Engineer & Mr. Banff, Planner from

Pennoni to fill in for Joe Luste.

DISCUSSION OF APPLICATION

Delran Township School District
Delran High School New Security Vestibule Addition

Louis Profera, Professional Architect with Garrison Architects representing the Board of Education was sworn in. They were contracted by the school district to provide a security vestibule for both the Middle School & the High School. Middle School work was all interior so there are no issues with the site plan approval. The HS addition is a small 170 sq. ft. addition outside the office. Logistically they couldn't provide the security level they were looking for unless they added the addition. All visitors must pass thru to the main office on the way configured now, it would not work.

They proposed this 170 sq. ft. addition with a small canopy component to it. In addition to that, the area where they are putting the addition, there is no real visitor parking. Currently they have a small space. The proposed plan is to have 5 regular spaces & 1 handicap space. They will be providing a sidewalk from those parking areas to the vestibule. They are removing some existing concrete sidewalk there. The increase in impervious in the parking area, the sidewalk & the addition is about 1,100 sq. ft. They are removing about 700 sq. ft. so the net total impervious on the entire site will be about 400sq. ft.

Mr. Gleaner stated that this is not here for an official approval. It's submitted under a statute that allows for comment from the board. We can't accept or reject it but if there are comments from the board, adjustments they need to consider or any planning considerations that they

would have considered should it had been an official application. It's more like a courtesy than anything else. But it is required by statute.

Mr. Raday stated that from their standpoint, from the Engineering review, they just wanted to make sure that the plans address the handicap accessibility. Mr. Profera stated that there was no handicap access parking at this area where visitors would come in. That's one of the reasons they implemented increasing that parking lot.

Mr. Raday stated that they had adequate signage. Guzzi Engineering did their site plan.

Mr. Catrambone asked what happened to the old entrance. Mr. Profera stated that the students enter there. A security guard sits and lets the children in. With the security vestibule, anybody that visits the school needs to be buzzed into this vestibule itself. Once in they are contained and can't go into the school. Their credentials are verified in there & once they are accepted, they get buzzed into the school. It is basically creating a mouse trap. All doors are egress.

OPEN/CLOSE TO THE PUBLIC

There was no one from the public.

NEW APPLICATION

Victory Real Estate Development Hartford & Bridgeboro Road Block 120, Lot 43 & 44 PN2018-02 Final Site Plan

Mr. Mark Rinaldi, Attorney representing Victory Real Estate Development. When they were last here in February, after several & many witnesses the Board granted preliminary approval for the site plan. It is a permitted use. The proposal is for two pad sites, one being a 7-11 tenant & the other for future expansion of retail. At the conclusion of that meeting, it was agreed by all that there were various changes that needed to be made to the site plan and that it would be best to have Mr. Stout address them with the Board engineer. Mr. Stout will confirm that upon review of the Board Engineer's most recent letter, the applicant is in agreement with every aspect of the Board Engineer's recommendation.

Mr. Stout was sworn in by Mr. Gleaner. Mr. Stout shown exhibit A1, colorized site plan & landscaping plan. There previous approval was the 2 pad sites and the access they have.

What he is going to show them is just the changes that were made as a result of the last meeting, the Engineer & Planner review. Everything seen is pretty much exactly the same. The main change is with some site triangles with the house that sits right next to it. So they relocated the driveway by moving it down about 40' and moved the other 3 parking spaces to the other side.

They still meet the parking requirement and all of the impervious coverage plus all of the things that have been previously approved. The last thing from last meeting was the width of the driveway. They had a 30' wide driveway. The Fire Official asked for them to widen out to 35' to make sure they had true fire safety in there, so they have widened it to 35'.

As part of this application, they have a submission to the County, they have conditional approval that has been resubmitted back to them. They have soil erosion conditional approval that also has been submitted back to them. They have answered all the Engineer & Planner's comments from the first letter. They have a few comments left in here & they are in 100% agreement with everything.

Mr. Andrew Banff, PP from Pennoni went through the review letter dated March 26 2019. They had 5 remaining comments from the review letter that Mr. Stout stated they will take care of.

Mr. Raday referenced his letter dated March 28, 2019. On page 3, the applicant must provide ADA compliant handicap ramps. On page 4 he asked applicant to consider a larger orifice opening with a valve to drain for maintenance. On page 5 the spacing of the pipes in accordance with the specifications. Mr. Stout stated minor adjustments but can do on the site. Page 6 for the trash enclosure is situated on top of the storm water basin. There is a brief pause for a Board Member who needed to excuse himself. Resume the meeting. Mr. Raday stated that in regards to the second retail building, it will be graded & seeded. Mr. Stout stated they spoke about extensively in last meeting. He agreed to all of the issues Mr. Raday expressed.

Mrs. Pomeranz questioned the sign that is to be posted on Bridgeboro stating the time when you can turn. It is a County road so they are waiting on them. Everything else that was agreed to at the last meeting is shown on the plan. There were no additional comments on the original conditional approval but they made some changes so they have another bite at that apple.

Mr. Gleaner stated that in the Resolution under 6B it stated that there will be a sign on the Hartford Road exit which will prohibit left turns and a sign on Bridgeboro Road prohibits a left hand entry into the premises for traffic traveling north on Bridgeboro Road which is on the plans. It's not time restricted anymore. So it was eliminated to no left hand entry anytime from Bridgeboro. They didn't want the crossing traffic.

Mr. Catrambone reiterated the sign movements with Mr. Stout. People traveling on Hartford towards Moorestown, how do they get in? Mr. Stout stated you can make a left into the premises, just no left out there. Mr. Catrambone also wanted to make sure that there would be handicap ramps. Mr. Stout stated that there would be a series of them. The one in question would be the one at the intersection at Bridgeboro & Hartford. Right now there is a traffic signal at corner, light standard. This isn't a standard ADA ramp, so what happens is that it gets split between 2 different sections. The engineer's comments are that he wants to see additional spot grade just to verify that and they have agreed to do that. This was originally put in as an ADA compliant intersection so they will give the additional information as needed.

Mr. Catrambone asked about the underground storm water basin, the remark was, oh yeah I agreed, can you tell us what they agreed on. Mr. Stout stated that a part of the review of the underground system, obviously they meet all of the DEP criteria and everything that you need to make sure that this is compliant with all the state, township and local approvals.

There are 3 sections that they will correct. The corner of the trash enclosure of the second building, the side of the pipe is right on the edge of that so they wanted to make sure that there was no conflict with that. What they are going to do is remove that one pipe and extend it out into the field into the center. The other two comments are roof drains which go under the sides of each of the enclosures so all they will do is relocate that so if it has to be repaired, they don't have to disturb the trash enclosures.

Mr. Catrambone asked about the underground storm water basin in perpetuity. He wanted to know if we have that agreement. Mr. Stout stated that it has to be done after everything is done. There also is a deed filing that has to be done that has to go along to this property. Based on the new storm water management regulations, there is a maintenance report that goes along with this that they put together that the Board Engineers' have reviewed and it outlines all of the steps required to maintain this system properly. That gets filed against the deed plus this is an agreement that the applicant and Township will have some sort of agreement. That's something legal that will have to be in place against the deed.

Mr. Catrambone asked about the waiver for the height of the light fixture mounting height to be 15'. Mr. Stout stated that there is no waiver required any longer because they have agreed to drop it to 14'. No waiver required.

Mr. Catrambone asked about the age of the structures and whether there is any potential for asbestos or lead. Mr. Stout stated that one of the comments was when the building was being demoed, they need to inform the contractor that when they start it, it has to be cleared for asbestos & lead paints.

Ms. Dolan was sworn in. Ms. Dolan was qualified at last meeting & continues with them. Mr. Catrambone asked about the traffic report & what the findings were. He was concerned that it was at an E level which is more on the failing side of the conditions with the traffic & traffic signals. Ms. Dolan explained that they did an addition study from the first one taking into effect the new builds that are coming to that intersection. With that new study the county found that with the signal change it could change the level back to a D to where it was before & it would now benefit that intersection. All turn lanes are included in the analysis.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Angelo R. Cinti who lives at 27 Ashley Drive was sworn in. He has lived there for 20 years. One of the things was the location of the 55 plus community for him to purchase there. He thinks that what they are doing at that intersection is not in their best interest. He is concerned about the 2 new residential communities coming to that area. The traffic was nowhere were it is now when he purchased. Safety & pollution are both a quality of life. The trucks that run threw that area is horrible. The enjoyment of being in Delran is going downhill. He feels that it is the Boards responsibility not to be concerned about what kind of income the town is going to receive. It has to do with what happens to the people in Delran & what's going to happen to their community.

The other thing is, would there be a need for another 7-11. The answer is no. We don't need any more traffic on Bridgeboro Road. It can't handle what it has now. On Mondays at 7am he goes to Ott's to pick up bread for Catholic Charity. It takes him at least 5 minutes just to get out of his street. It is not in their best interest to have things that will compound their lives.

Sharon Coryell who lives at 7 Ashley Drive was sworn. She is the president of the Ashley Crossing Homeowner Association. She is presenting a statement on behalf of the 103 homes in the community. The accelerated growth plans of a business cluster initiative in this specific area is appalling. The Township Master Plan is to provide for the benefit of the public good. Despite the right of free enterprise, approval for use is a direct disservice to the entity's that currently exist in this zone including those currently approved & ending applications for several business in the very immediate zone. These businesses will suffer in sustained economic vitality and potential displacement caused by proposed particular project.

It is also a multifaceted disservice to the quality of life & the safety concerns of the community with pedestrian, bicycle & vehicular traffic increasing congestion, impeding ingress & egress from the ongoing Conrow/Hartford intersection issue as well as the residential communities and the High School populist.

The Hartford road goes from Route 38 to Route 130 both in car, truck & service vehicles. The traffic study indicates no significant impact with the inclusion of approximately 800 units comprised of Timber Ridge, Stellwag as well as the Dunkin Donuts & retail suites in the immediate zone. The study does not include the former bank site purchased by Advocare for the erection of a therapy medical facility on Bridgeboro. The study attributes approximately a 1% impact in traffic flow. She questions the validity of that percentage given the fact it is unknown of the occupants in both the 5500 sq. ft. Dunkin Donuts as well as the 3200 sq. ft. retail suites adjoining the 7-11. There is no inclusion of the proposed Advocare medical site in the same vicinity utilizing the same road ways. The area is already served with a convenience store & coffee shop, Hartford Deli. Lottery sales Ott's & Hartford Deli. A bank with an ATM. These are all services that the 7-11 would be offering and would serve as duplication.

Multiple other businesses are on the corner & the passerby needs are met by those businesses as well as with in a half mile Starbucks, Shoprite & the strip mall up at Hartford Corners. Additionally, the site plan though revised in its ingress & egress placement further south on Bridgeboro due to the structure of the red house almost on Bridgeboro Road and on the property line is another impediment to the traffic & safety concerns. The driveway revision only serves to provide stacking up of vehicles into the intersection. The resident adjoining the 7-11 property will further be impacted in their quality of life as well as a potential issues of getting in & out of their property, noise, rodent control, lighting & litter.

The current structures on the property have been occupied by the same families since 1958 & hasn't been operational and a scope of a commercial entity for many years. Although it is situated in an NC1 zone, it provides no impact to the community due to the initial limited and subsequent nonuse. By mere nonuse & technical abandonment with vacancy the legal protection of a grandfathered use should be reviewed. The detriment of deviation from its current use far outweighs the benefit resulting from granting this variance.

The harmony, character & quality of life of their community will be disruptive and impeded by the projected density of both this use variance as well as the pending cluster development and should be decided as integral to the global affect and not just one solitary application.

The traffic study didn't include the peak time of Delran High School dismissal times. At that time in the afternoon, prior to commuter time, there is continual stacking of vehicles for approximately one half hour with parents picking up walkers. There is also student & bicycles falling in those times which is not being taking into consideration in the study.

One crossing guard has told her that her personal safety has been compromised with vehicle mirrors sideswiping upon her person. For the concern of her safety, her husband waits in her car nearby & observes her during the shift for her own safety. The traffic study reported the

start time is at 7am. There is always a stack up of cars at this time for student drop off, & the ingress & egress to their community is severely impacted.

These are the same passersby that you are documenting in your study that will stopping for various things at this proposed site. More traffic, stacking, queuing, ingress & egress issues.

Ms. Katherine Newman who lives at 4101 Bridgeboro Road was sworn in. She wanted to make a few points about that intersection and the amount of traffic that is there. Her son graduated from the High School in 2004 and the traffic has grown tremendously since then. It will change the traffic pattern. She was concerned about the 2 new retail sites being built there. The Dunkin Donuts driveway off Hartford & the 7-11 also. She was hoping that Ms. Dolan had taken a look at that. Ms. Phillips stated during Ms. Newman's testimony that the Dunkin Donuts driveway will be an ingress only approved by the Zoning Board. The turning into both the driveways is a concern. Her main concern is that there are so many kids coming & going to school and their safety is the issue.

Chairman called for a 5 minute recess.

Mr. Larry Zack who resides at 29 Marsha Drive was sworn in. He is concerned about the traffic study who was hired by the developer of the site. He feels that it would be a conflict of interest. The Township should have asked for a neutral company to provide the study but have the developer pay for it. His other concern is the left hand turn off of Hartford Road. He wants the Board to take this into consideration.

Mr. Tom Fisher who lives at 3 Tara Lane was sworn in. He was a career tractor trailer driver for 44 years. His concern is that they are going to direct the traffic in front of the two stores and have the trailer back in between the two buildings from the right hand side. In the business it is known as a blind back. You have very limited vision. He feels the traffic should go in thru the back of the store. There is no staging for multiple trucks. What happens when 2 trucks are there at the same time? Cars and pedestrians are what should be in the front of the building not delivery trucks.

Mr. Michael Bigaj who resides at 3105 Bridgeboro Road was sworn in. He lives in the house next to the property with the red house which is practically on the street. He sees light, litter, noise pollution that he will be dealing with. Will the landscaping that was shown be enough to help with all the pollutants? He started that he has even caught kids loitering behind there. He just wants to make sure that there is some kind of Border there in order to prevent kids from walking thru there. He wants to make sure that there will be sidewalks provided so foot traffic can use it.

Mr. Stephen Feerrar who lives at 11 Tara Lane was sworn in. He has a child that is in a wheelchair who travels down to Ott's for happy hour to visit her friends. He wants to make sure that there will be the handicap ramps provided that she will have the ability to be out there crossing the intersection to the businesses on the other side. Mr. Stout stated that it is ADA compliant from the beginning of the property where there are depressed curbs at the crosswalk. He is an Engineer and stated that he is aware that there will be signs but his concern is that signage works when there is enforcement. He has witnessed at that intersection people blowing thru the lights at the wrong time, turning into the cross walk etc. He would like to state to the board that the real problem occurs around 2:30 when you have walkers & bikers from the High School crossing the street where there are a ton of teenage drivers also coming from the High School & Holy Cross. That is the issue they need to define, not how many seconds it's going to take for somebody to get across the intersection. He doesn't feel that the kids will be safe. Mr. Catrambone responded as council liaison, that he will forward your concern to Council & the Police, should this move forward. The handicap ramps were obtained not by him but by the Township Engineer. He stated that he had no influence for them being put there.

Mr. John Nark who resides at 33 Notre Dame Drive was sworn in. He wanted to mention that the 7-11 on Haines Mill Road at 9am & again at lunch time always has landscape trucks with the attached trailer pull up on side of road to run in & grab stuff. He feels that the new 7-11 will experience the same problem which is a big issue.

CLOSE TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Gleaner spoke to the board members stating that this isn't a Use Variance. It has nothing to do with Use Variance or the standards and the board is prohibited from looking at those standards in connection with this consideration by law. It's also because preliminary approval was already obtained, this is for final approval & addressing the issues that came up at the February meeting. Our engineers have put together a 12 page report with all the changes that were requested from February to now. The planning issues have been essentially resolved so they are not looking for any new variances. The law states that as long as they meet all the criteria, we are required to give them approval. The job of the board is to decide whether or not it meets the Zoning Ordinances of Delran and whether it meets those criteria and also meets the applicable requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law.

Mr. Rinaldi stated that he was going to state the same things. What he thinks is so important for this community to understand is that Ms. Dolan is an expert in traffic study. Some of you might be concerned that she is being paid by the applicant to say what they want her to say and hopes that this board accepts it. Nothing could be further from the truth. Not only is her report & her conclusions tested by their Engineer, they also have been tested by the Board, the Board's Engineer, the County Professionals & the County Engineer. He can assure you that her

report has been questioned time and again, she made changes & has been tested again. Nothing is being swept under the floor in an attempt to push anything through. Regardless of who she is being paid by, she has a professional & moral obligation to make sure her study is accurate. If everyone is convinced that her report is accurate, then they make the final determination. We have already received preliminary approval from the County. They have asked several things be changed, so they have been changed & resubmitted. This board has thoroughly questioned their professionals with regards to the traffic, the safety & the children. Also that there is a School & a Tavern nearby. Mr. Fisher, if he had been at the preliminary meeting he would have heard that they addressed the tractor trailer deliveries be done at off hours. That is part of their approval so they couldn't just ignore it & do what they want to do. They would be in violation of their approval. All of these safety factors have been considered by the Board and by the County Board as well. They are here for the approval of the site plan only.

Ms. Dolan stated that based on her notes, there were a lot of concerns about the School dismissal period on why they hadn't study or analyzed it. The School activity is comparable to School activity all thru NJ. There is a surge of activity with drop off in the morning and pick up in the afternoon. The times of any of the Schools in Delran will not change because it is State regulated. No matter what business comes to town. Whether they develop or not develop in that area, that condition is not going to change. That goes along with the speed limit reduction too.

Ms. Dolan wanted to clarify that the driveway on Hartford is closer to the intersection than the proposed Dunkin driveway. Left turn egress from their site onto Hartford will be prohibited. For the data collection, it is a standard collection of one day as long as School is in session when there is no snow or detours. In this case, they did have other studies to compare their data with. The numbers were really close so that was a check that they did to ensure that their data collection was appropriate. The independent Traffic Engineer was also explained by Mr. Rinaldi where they prepare the study but then the revisions where requested at both the County & the local level. In fact, they met with the County to go through the anticipated turning restrictions at the onset of the project.

Mr. Chinnici made a motion for final site plan approval conditions upon all the changes and modification in the March 28, 2019 Engineer's letter and the March 26, 2019 Planner's letter, seconded by Mr. Macey. The results are as follows:

Aye: Mr. Macey, Mr. Chinnici, Mr. Reimel, Mr. Anagnostos, Mr. Parento & Mr.

Khinkis

Nay: Mr. Catrambone, Mr. Morrow & Mrs. Pomeranz

Absent: Mr. Paris & Mr. Hejnas

MINUTES

Regular meeting minutes from September 6, 2018.
Regular meeting minutes from October 4, 2018.
Regular meeting minutes from November 1, 2018.
Regular meeting minutes from December 6, 2018.
Reorganization meeting minutes from January 3, 2019
Special Re-Org meeting minutes from January 23, 2019
Regular meeting minutes from February 7, 2019.
Regular meeting minutes from March 7, 2019.

Minute approval will be carried over to next month.

RESOLUTION

Resolution # PP2019-04

Jose Pereira 816 Chester Avenue Block 9, Lot 39 PN 2018-06 Minor Subdivision

Mr. Morrow made a motion to adopt Resolution # PP2019-04, seconded by Mr. Khinkis. The results are as follow:

Aye: Mr. Macey, Mr. Chinnici, Mr. Reimel, Mr. Morrow, Mr. Parento & Mr.

Khinkis

Abstain: Mr. Catrambone, Mr. Anagnostos & Mrs. Pomeranz

Resolution # PP 2019-05

Braga Construction Co., Inc. 1 Moreland Drive Block 63, Lot 3 PN 2018-07 Minor Subdivision

Mr. Morrow made a motion to adopt Resolution # PP2019-05, seconded by Mr. Khinkis. The results are as follow:

Aye: Mr. Macey, Mr. Chinnici, Mr. Reimel, Mr. Morrow, Mr. Parento & Mr.

Khinkis

Abstain: Mr. Catrambone, Mr. Anagnostos & Mrs. Pomeranz

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Morrow made a motion to adjourn at 9:00 pm, seconded by Mr. Khinkis.

Motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Phillips, Secretary, Planning & Zoning