OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

I would like to call the Delran Township Zoning Board meeting to order. All meetings of this Board are held in compliance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act in a resolutions adopted by the Board's annual reorganization. Pursuant to the Board's resolution, public notice of this meeting has been made in the following manner:

Written notice filed with the Secretary of the Board, the Clerk of Delran Township and on the official bulletin board of the Township. Written notice has also been mailed to the official newspapers 10 days before the scheduled hearing. Written notice has also been mailed to all persons requesting a hearing before this Board.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Jeney, Mr. Smith, Mrs. Parento, Mr. Mr. Hewko, Mr. Anderson, Mr.

Chascsa

Absent: Mr. Singer, Mr. Khinkis

Professionals: Mr. D'Armento, Engineer, Ms. Apte, Planner & Jen Johnson, Attorney

NEW APPLICATION

Bridgeboro Square, LLC Hartford & Bridgeboro Road Block 116, Lot 28.01 & 29.01 ZN2019-03

Minor Subdivision

Pat McAndrew, Attorney representing the applicant and the two witnesses Samuel Previtera (Land Surveyor) and Jim Miller (Professional Planner) were sworn in before the board.

Mr. McAndrew: Basically this is a lot line adjustment. We have an existing shopping center and house. The shopping center is known as Bridgeboro Square the board approved it about 13...14 years ago and it was approved as two lots. What was unusual was the residential lot which is 29.01 included the house, included the driveway isle into the parking for the shopping center and also two basins.

May I interrupt I don't want to cut you off but before you get started I'd just...what we like to do here is go through the application for completeness first and have a vote on if your application is complete then go through the substantive. Secondly, if I'm going to ramble on I don't want...we have a disagreement Mr. McAndrew and I, on what this application is. I understand in theory it's a simple line lot adjustment but what the planner have discussed it's actually it's a D1 variance because it's a use variance. It's an expansion of a use variance for the lower lot which Mr. McAndrew will get into. Nothing is changing but, technically the use that's happening on the lower lot is expanding. So, it is a D1 variance but, everything is staying the same I don't want to take over your application.

Mr. McAndrew: No its okay.

Okay, buts lets go through your application please.

Mr. McAndrew: Sure.

Ms. Apte: This is referring to...on page 3 item 2 completeness. I'm just going to state the item then if you could just provide what is being decided. The items #16 Meets & Bounds Description ...in a minor subdivision application.

Mr. McAndrew: Well we were going to supply that when we supply the proposed deed of subdivision so I think the meets and bounds are on the plan but we'd provided the description with the deed of subdivision.

Ms. Apte: So we have no meeting of extension. The second item is minimum setback lines.

Mr. McAndrew: Yea we'll provide that plan when we submit an applying plan and a compliance plan.

Ms. Apte: Okay any existing or proposed access of easement that you would provide.

Mr. McAndrew: Yea we were going to put that into the deed of subdivision because well what will happen is there's an existing driveways to the house that go to the shopping center. We're just going to give from the shopping center, a blanket easement for cross access to the house to maintain the current situation. So it won't be a particularized easement it will just be a blanket.

Ms. Apte: And that would be a blanket. Then item number 27 which is property owners & lot lines within 200 feet.

Mr. McAndrew: We have that information on a separate 200 foot list but we'll put it in the plan when we revise the plan.

Ms. Apte: The next is item number 30 proposed clearing limits along with existing and proposed contours based on USGS datum.

Mr. McAndrew: And that we were going to ask for a waiver because it's about a 12 or 13 year old center with no changes proposed.

Ms. Apte: Given the type of application we take an exception to the board planner as a waiver. Again item number 31 which is boundary limits, nature and extent of wooden areas, trees 6 inches in diameter or greater.

Mr. McAndrew: Yea same response as the prior one. Actually this will be the same for each, its existing center with no changes so there won't be any trees removed or anything like that or new utilities.

Ms. Apte: So after seeking a waiver for item 31 and 34.

Mr. McAndrew: 30.

Ms. Apte: 30, 31, and 34. Given the title of the application we think we can make an exception for those items. Item number 52 which is the public notice...

Mr. McAndrew: We did submit this.

Ms. Apte: And just defer to the board solicitor to look at that.

Ms. Johnson: Okay, I haven't seen the public notice but you submitted it.

Ms. Phillips: Yes to me. Yes everything is good.

Given the type of application the applicant has provided sufficient items for a planning review.

Mr. McAndrew: Thank you.

Mrs. Parento made a motion to deem the application complete, seconded by Mr. Smith. Results are as follows:

AYE: Mr. Jeney, Mr. Smith, Mrs. Parento, Mr. Hewko, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Chascsa

NAY: None

Mr. McAndrew: Okay, in a nutshell what we're trying to do is match the lot lines to the uses so were moving the lot line for the house to basically where the house is, expanding the lot line of the shopping center so the shopping center is all one lot and basically the house is all one lot. Right now the house lot includes the house, the driveway to the shopping center, and also most of two drainage basins. We'd like to get everything on the shopping center lot and everything on the house on the house lot. I view this as modifying the use variance and so you may discard the semantics but we have a planner so we can address it and say it's pretty straight forward. Sam could you step up please and just quickly give us your qualifications.

Mr. Previtera: I'm a professional land surveyor for 24 years. I've got over 30 years in the business. I run the survey department at Taylor, Weisman, and Taylor. He's appeared in front of numerous boards.

Mr. McAndrew: You've prepared the survey for here. Can you tell us, if you can, simply what's there now versus what's purposed?

Mr. Previtera: What I think Pat said is basically the boundaries really didn't change from the original site plan, the exterior boundaries. The only thing were changing is the interior boundary as Pat said on a separate part of the shopping center. So, it's basically a line adjustment if you recall the surveying. So were basically what Pat said whatever the residential house is, were keeping that the way it is and keeping that lot for that. We're not creating any new lots were just kind of tweaking it.

Mr. McAndrew: Sam was there any...now that pink lot is basically the entrance to the shopping center, some basins, and the house.

Mr. Previtera: That's correct.

Mr. McAndrew: The green is the shopping center main build.

Mr. Previtera: That is correct.

Ms. Johnson: If I could interject for one second just for you clarification. The pink lot is in A1 agricultural district. A house is allowed the accessory use for the retail are not allowed. The green section is NC1, correct? Retail is not allowed there either. They got a variance years ago to put the bank there as well as the accessory uses, the basins, the driveway, the drive through. So, everything that's bank related had a use variance. It's not a preexisting nonconforming but it did get a use variance. So in terms of special reasons, the site is particularly suited for that. It's been

that but, I just want to give you what's going on there that now they're just making that part of the A1 the lower part of the pink they want to make it green.

Mr. McAndrew: You should have reduced copies of these as well. Well long story short this is what's existing now and this is what we propose.

Ms. Apte: If I may, could we just propose that exhibit A1 and A2 are...

Yes.

Mr. Previtera: So A1 is existing and A2 will be proposed.

Mr. Jeney: To your point though an agricultural zone would not require a use variance?

Ms. Apte: No the zone line is not here. The zone line is...

Well the pink is currently agricultural...

Correct.

And that's going to change and become green?

Well the use is staying what it is.

Well right now it's a house.

No.

Its approved with the basins and all okay.

Exactly, were just confusing....

The variance according to that.

Exactly it covers that.

Mr. Previtera: See this is existing. There's a driveway here in the center, a basin, and a few parking spaces. What we want to do is move it up so everything is one lot in the center, one lot for the house. That's why we didn't know what to call it.

Mr. Previtera: You could call it a lot of things it's confusing.

Mr. McAndrew: Mr. Miller please...Jim I think you've testified here before.

Mr. Miller: As recently as October of last year.

Mr. McAndrew: And quickly put your credentials on the record.

Mr. Miller: Yes just very quickly, I'm a licensed professional planner in the State of New Jersey. I'm certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners as a certified planner and I've been qualified as an expert witness in excess of 250 municipalities in Pennsylvania and New Jersey.

Excuse me Jim do you have business card so I know what business?

Mr. Miller: I do and I'll...after...

Thank you I submit that he's qualified.

Mr. Miller: Okay, before I begin I just have one question. Is this a D2 or a D1 in your opinion?

A D1.

Mr. Miller: Okay. Well the planners report said D2 I believe?

No

Mr. Miller: D1 okay.

Yea we have been correctly arguing D1 and I was fighting her for a while saying it's a D2 but...

Mr. Miller: Well the reason I thought it was a D2 and I think there's some presence for this because the uses are existing so in that were not changing the uses. I think they're preexisting

Non-conforming they become preexisting nonconforming once they're created but...I'll argue it however you want it because I think the proofs are the same.

We found proof.

The proof is that I argued it because I got the declaration of a nonconforming use it's a very loosely...preexisting nonconforming use is technically nonconforming zoning showing amendment.

The change in zoning.

Mr. Miller: There was a change in zoning subsequent to the...

No change in zoning ordinance I'm sorry.

Change in the zoning ordinance right. There has been no amendment to the zoning of A1 and NC1. The property did receive a use variance so it can be turned as an expansion of a nonconforming use. It is a use variance that has been modified so it cannot be technically be certified as a preexisting nonconforming use. A use variance that has been modified use variance.

Mr. Miller: I just want to get the ground use that the board wants to apply and then we can go from there. With the D1 use variance you need to show that the site is particularly suited and that the relief we're seeking with a vast purposes in municipal land uses law. I would say two purposes. Purpose A to encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use to develop of all lands in this state in a matter that will promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare. Purpose B to provide sufficient space and appropriate locations for variety of agricultural, residential, recreational, commercial, industrial uses and open space both public and private according to their respect of the environmental requirements in order to meet the need of all New Jersey citizens.

Those are the two purposes that deal with the appropriate use of land uses and I believe at least two reasons that make this site particularly suited. First, the variance is triggered by the minor subdivision but what the minor subdivision does is it aligns the lot lines with land uses with the pattern of the land uses that's been established prior to the development of this property. To leave the lot lines where they currently are creates issues with maintenance and with the management of the properties and those issues go away and they're remedied when the lot lines are contiguous with the boundaries of the respective uses. Secondly, this is an application that doesn't involve and improvements or any changes in the field. There's nothing going on here other than the creation of the lot line. So, basically what it does is it just enhances the conditions in field by making the lot lines align with the land use patterns and otherwise there's no other impact other than the positive impact of the lot line alignment. So, basically that's what makes it particularly suited and also the fact that the uses are already there and they've been authorized by the board of the adjustment to prior variance the board of adjustment is

already declared that these uses are particularly suited for the location. So, this is just a continuation of this approval.

In terms of the negative criteria, there's no impairment or intended purpose of the zone plan. Primarily because there's no additional development occurring here, so there's no potential for any further impairment for the intended purpose of the zone plan. Otherwise the board had already found that this use advance the public welfare as well did not impair the entire purpose of the zone plan.

There's nothing changing here physically, there's no real potential to alter the conditions in the field that would result in either a substantial detriment to the public welfare or any impairment, intended purpose of the zone plans. So, with that I believe the application satisfies both of the applicable criteria for your approval.

There is also some C variances that your planner identified and in a light manner, a C variance simply mirror the conditions that are in the field and absent the C variances, you'd have to basically rearrange everything and relocate driveways...tear down houses. There's just no practical way of going forward without the C variances and they basically reinforce the existing land use patterns. So, the benefit of maintaining the land use patterns that already present on the ground, far exceeds any potential adverse impact because there's really no impact whatsoever. So there isn't any physical changes occurring, so you have the benefit of rationalizing the land use patterns and the setbacks making them match the field conditions without any potential detriment whatsoever because nothing is occurring here.

There's no physical changes so the benefits relief out way the detriments that satisfies the balances tests as a better zoning alternatives. It advances the purposes I cited under the use variances as an appropriate use of land therefore it meets the applicaiable crieteria for the C2 variance. There's no apparent terra purposes of the zone plan. As a result of the C variances, because basically they support the D variance which has already been found to impair the entire purpose of the zone plan. Basically all these things are sort of sequential one variance supports the other and all the relief will merited the board's approval.

Mr. McAndrew: I have a few questions. As a planning principal I've been hearing for over 40 years that planners like to have one use per lot and basically have the lot match the use so you don't have overlap or this kind of situation. Why is it that good to have one use per lot in each use have their own lot?

Mr. Miller: Well it basically goes back to what I said about management maintaining their respected uses. It means that you don't have situations where their might be separate owners of the same development and that creates a need for easements. It creates issues with

maintenance. It creates issues with access. So it creates a lot of impediments that practical day to day operation of the respected uses and by having the lot lines contiguous with the use lines, you eliminate all these potential problems.

Mr. McAndrew: Any questions about the planning testimony?

Ms. Johnson: Could you just speak on the single family house and on what's happening there?

Mr. Miller: Again, this is basically just creating a typical single family rectangular lot around the perimeter of the house and the lots have been located so that they exclude the improvements that are associated with the shopping center. But, include the improvements that are associated with the house.

Mr. McAndrew: Currently it's a tenant house and has been for over 13 years and by drawing its own lot with processes then we do have an option of keeping it rented or selling it. Because, it's impossible to sell now because if you sell the lot now they're getting a driveway and two basins that they don't really need and you can't finance that for a house.

Ms. Apte: I do have a question. The driveway, is there any future proposal to separate the driveway from the residential and the commercial lot?

Mr. Miller: No were maintaining exactly as is and it was a suggestion in one of the letters in putting a residential driveway straight out to Bridgeboro and the county would not allow that. That overview letter said no on that. That was a condition of their approval.

Ms. Apte: Based on that the only thing I would...if you would agree that this proposed subdivision can be interpreted as only the use that is being granted to only the proposed lot 29.01. So the purpose that the commercial use and the access ways and the driveways would only be awarded in this proposal 28.01. Because the proposal 29.01 would be a house only use.

Mr. Miller: Yes.

Mr. McAndrew: I do have the county letter from May 2019. There's a county plan board it basically prohibits the house to use access onto Bridgeboro Road.

Any board members have any questions?

Mr. Anderson: Once the subdivision are made and the property lines are staked out for the residence, will that be in compliance to these zoning setback requirements?

Mr. McAndrew: There's a side yard variance we're seeking and that's what I put in the proofs on under the C2 criteria and the lot is somewhat undersized. But again, that's an existing condition you can't remedy the undersized slot because of the improvements associated with the shopping center. You can't extend the rear lot line back I guess that's to the east...north.

East I think.

Mr. McAndrew: Yea I think east but whatever...that direction and the reason being you'd get into the detention basin and create the problem were trying to remedy, which is to separate the improvements associated with the shopping center from the improvements associated with the house.

Mr. Anderson: When this is approved...should it be approved, then this will be a nonconforming lot. If they were to do some improvements with it later down the road that would sign a setback that maintain the condition but I believe its 12 feet or 30...

15 feet sign.

They're required 20 on the side and they are at 19 and if they propose the move it would be 8.

Is the same owner own that entire parcel right now?

Mr. McAndrew: Today he does, yes.

What initiated this interest?

Mr. McAndrew: We're looking to sell the shopping center and the buyer the shopping center didn't want a house and we were looking to sell the house and then the buyer house, they didn't want a shopping center, so we thought we'd match them up it's the same thing but it works for financing and everything else.

I guess that's not surprising. Any other questions?

Yes what potential would this create for the residential lot that they will have no access or egress on their property?

Mr. McAndrew: They do have access and egress by virtue of the driveway.

That's not going to be part of the other part.

Mr. McAndrew: Well the easement of that and the deed that creates the new lot will say that they have a cross easement for access which is current. That's what they are using now & they can't use Bridgeboro Road for direct because of the county. That's how it is now too. So, which nothing's going to change? They're just going to access the same way they do and it will be in the deed.

The fire department with our report indicated the property...existing property with access to the fire department to the commercial property will access through the residential. Therefore the fire department has no comment on the subdivision. Anything else to cover?

Questions were opened to the public. No one from public made any comment.

I just have a comment. It looks like they're looking to possibly be sold at some point. Could you make sure the tax records and that no...?

Yea that process should be done and that should be reflected at some time...

Jen can you just clarify one thing on the discussion whether were just moving that line or we're doing something else so it is still just fine to move...

No they are asking for approval for a D1 variance which is they're expanding a use on 28.01 on lot 28.01 were altering...I mean modifying

Mr. McAndrew: We're modifying a prior approval.

Alright anything else?

Mrs. Parento made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Anderson. Results are as follows:

AYE: Mr. Smith, Mrs. Parento, Mr. Hewko, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Chascsa, Mr. Jeney

NAY: None

AdvoCare, LLC 3104 Bridgeboro Road Block 118, Lot 2 ZN2019-02 Preliminary & Final Site Plan w/ Use Variance

Michael Floyd, Attorney for Archer & Greiner and witnesses Joe Delgiorno, Advocare, Jim Miller, PP For JA Miller Planning Consultants, LLC, Mike Citerone, PE from Taylor, Wiseman & Taylor, and Glenn Sarsale, Architect from Nelson Architecture, LLC.

Jim Miller just testified in the previous application with his credentials. Accepted as a credible witness.

Mr. Mike Citerone, Licensed professional Engineer state of NJ been before many boards thru out the state for site plan subdivision & has been before this board before. Accepted as credible witness.

Glenn Sarsale, Bachelor of Architecture form City College of NY, studied abroad in Paris, France. Licensed in NY & PA. Working under the guidance of a licensed architect in the state of NJ. Has over 23 years' experience in the building industries. Accepted as credible witness.

Mr. Floyd advised the board of exhibits that would be used in the case and reviewed with the board any outstanding documentation. Exhibit A-1 Ariel View, Exhibit A-2, Survey, Exhibit A-3 Photographs & existing conditions, Exhibit A-4 Render Site Plan, Exhibit A-5 Rendered Elevations, Exhibit A-6 Conceptual floor plan.

Ms. Apte reviewed her latter dated April 29, 2019, page 2 Completeness items:

- #16 Meets & Bounds Description Agreed as a condition we take no exception to that.
- #33 Drainage Calculations In receipt and agreed to work with Board Engineer to satisfy any storm water comments we take no exception to that.
- #47 Preliminary Architectural Plan & Elevation completed
- #48 Environmental Impact Report Applicant has submitted an application 2 ½ months ago to the NJDEP for letter of interpretation for any wetlands on property, agreed to provide to Board and should the letter show that there is anything that impacts environmentally sensitive areas, they will take care of it we take no exception to that.
- #51 All applicable outside agency approvals Sent letter to NJDEP, Burlington County Planning Board. In process in providing revised site plans to Co. & waiting on conditional approval we take no exception to that.

#290-4L – Survey prepared by license land surveyor – Completed Aug 3, 2018 #290-4V – Colored Photograph – Provided

The applicant has provided sufficient information - the 4 items mentioned will be provided – the board takes no exception to that.

Mrs. Parento made a motion for completeness, seconded by Mr. Hewko. Results are as follows:

AYE: Mr. Jeney, Mr. Smith, Mrs. Parento, Mr. Hewko, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Chascsa
NAY: None

Mr. Floyd: Thank you, so our plan this evening if there's no objections would be to have Joe provide some fact based testimony about AdvoCare. Their current location. Why they plan to relocate to the property in question and talk about the hours of operation...days of the week. How medical waste is handled and try to answer some of those questions and request a testimony that were raised in the boards review letters. After that we'll have Mike Citerone speak to the site plan and the proposed improvements and then Jim Miller provide his planning testimony in support of the requested use variance. We recognize that the board has to make a decision of the use variance first before acting upon the site plan application, but I think much of Jim's testimony will be based not only on the AdvoCare facts, but on the actual site plan. So, that's why I would like to have Joe and Mike testify first before Jim.

You guys get that? You want to do it like that? Okay great.

Mr. Floyd: Sir, can you state your relationship with AdvoCare and your position in the company.

Mr. Delgiorno: I myself am a practicing pediatrician I've been with AdvoCare since its existence. My dad helped start AdvoCare and I currently have a pediatric office and I am in charge on behalf of the company to manage Delran Pediatrics which has been in existence in Delran for 20 or more years.

Mr. Floyd: Can you describe your current location in Delran and why the site in question seems perfectly well suited for a new location for AdvoCare.

Mr. Delgiorno: Sure, and this might have been stated in the last meeting. Our current location actually isn't actually too far from here around the corner on Route 130. When I took over management at Delran, I didn't find a particular site that wouldn't be honestly befitting the quality of the medical practice. Anything with any consumer demand for bigger, brighter, and nicer spaces I think our patients deserve that. So, we enlisted the help of a real estate agent and it was super important for us to stay within Delran. It's called Delran Pediatrics. So, when we found this particular site within a mile or two within our current location, we thought it was ideal. Mainly due to the access and just the ability to create something new and exciting for our patients.

Mr. Floyd: What would the hours of operation be? How many days per week?

Mr. Delgiorno: Our hours of operation are 8:30 AM to 7:00 PM Monday through Thursday and 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM on Fridays. On Saturdays, we sort of have a sick only walk-in only period of time between the hours of 9:00 and noon and were not open on Sundays.

Mr. Floyd: In terms of employees, how many total employees participate within the facility? The secondary question would be how many employees would be there at any one time?

Mr. Delgiorno: I anticipate anywhere from 10-15 employees. Probably about 15 employees hired and about 10-12 there at any one time. In its current state with the opportunity to grow to perhaps double that.

Mr. Floyd: In terms of your patients, how many...what's the expansion if approved, it's totally fitted out, and how many patients would you expect on the property at any one time?

Mr. Delgiorno: So we schedule 4 patients per hour that's the physician's maximum on site currently and if we expand to this location I expect there to be 12 and a maximum to double 24 patients at one given time. That's sort of my thought process in the middle of flu season. Not every day is every slot booked up by any means. There's quite a bit of holes about the schedule.

Right now you have 4 patients an hour for 3 physicians?

Mr. Delgiorno: 3 physicians during the afternoon for example and with our expanded site our hopes would be to double that. So I would have perhaps 5 physicians on at any given time and we'll again...4 patients per hour at the maximum.

Mr. Floyd: You've had an opportunity to review the site plan that was submitted?

Mr. Delgiorno: Yes.

Mr. Floyd: 43 parking spaces are required under the ordinance. We're proposing 69 parking spaces. Can you just briefly speak to the sufficiency to the parking spaces? We think those are more than enough for you know those high volume days when you'll have potentially more patients on site.

Mr. Delgiorno: So probably of upmost importance besides for the facility to fit our needs was parking. That number of parking spaces was driven by me. There is nothing more important to physician then having a patient be able to park, particularly in this location where's there's no bleed over spots in any way shape or form. So again, in thinking of growth and thinking of the

worst case scenario I think 69 given more of our wildest dream forecast to be more than sufficient even at peak hours of operation.

Mr. Floyd: Shifting gears to truck traffic, what type of delivery do you normally get? Would you expect in your facility tractor trailers, box trucks, UPS, FedEx type of deliveries?

Mr. Delgiorno: So we never receive tractor trailer trucks or anything of that sort. It's simply UPS trucks for the most part dropping office supplies and things of that nature.

Mr. Floyd: and what would be the frequency of this?

Mr. Delgiorno: Perhaps 2-3 a day at most. So perhaps 5-6 a day at most.

Mr. Floyd: In terms of waste, of medical waste and non-medical waste, can you explain how to the board especially medical waste is handled.

Mr. Delgiorno: Medical waste and most of you probably know is in certified containers that are required by OSHA to have and get inspected yearly and so the waste is stored in those containers and then there's a regular pick up depending on how quickly they get filled up. So medical waste...containers are picked up by a separate company.

Mr. Floyd: Do any of you guys have questions for Mr. Delgiorno.

That medical waste, is that stored indoors?

Mr. Delgiorno: Yes or medical waste is stored indoors. We don't put anything outside.

Ms. Apte: When you talked about the number of employees did that include the number of physicians or is that only staff?

Mr. Delgiorno: No that includes the number of physicians. Again that's current state and our hope is we can grow to double that amount.

So the proposal is about 6,000 square foot of this medical facility and the other 4,000 square feet is kept as a future planning area. When you talk about the same as currently are 10 to 12 employees, you talking about the 6,000 square feet or the current practice?

Mr. Delgiorno: So our current practice if I have to go back and look it's a very odd site it's around 3,500 square feet or so which is why this location seemed ideal out of the gate. Once we purchased it and I engaged Nelson's Architect, so we started to go through the fit out it became

pretty clear that it was going to be tight and not really allow for growth that we anticipated. Anytime you build you're going to need growth and we thought okay this would be an ideal opportunity then to maybe expand our medical service offering. Not only within Delran Pediatrics but perhaps to the future to any of my other AdvoCare colleagues from the medicine inter medicine along those lines. It's yet to be determined.

So that's your intention to allow 10 to 12 employees at a maximum time is in reference to the 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Delgiorno: Correct and let me just state any anticipated other offices that might go in there, Pediatrics is considered to be the most intensive use. So we have the most amount of hours of operations and the most amount of patients per hour so all of my colleagues that might be interested down the road would have a less intensive use. So by sort of forecasting the worst case scenario for pediatrics would sort of cover my base any other practice that might go in there.

Ms. Apte: So in the future tenant space that would identify the use would be probably be a medical office or regular office?

Mr. Delgiorno: Most defiantly. This practice was purchased by AdvoCare. AdvoCare is independently physician owned physician run facility and we have no intention to have an accountant there. In fact what happened when I had to go to the board to get approval of this facility the phone started ringing oh I would love to go there it looks like an ideal spot that kind of thing and that's what led into these kind of conversations.

Ms. Apte: You talked about medical waste, would there be any medical as in any kind of paper or is there any equipment or any truck that would come in and take care of that?

Mr. Delgiorno: No it arrives through a service truck for example serves vaccines in which looks like a box to anyone else but when you unpack it there's vaccines in there with some freeze dried stuff but that would be sort of the only medical equipment that would be delivered but it's again just a box.

Ms. Apte: So that would be just a regular box.

Mr. Delgiorno: Yes.

Ms. Apte: In terms of any kind of emergency vehicle would there be anyone far from site or any...emergency vehicle at hand or inside that could be parked outside.

Mr. Delgiorno: No, so thankfully it doesn't happen that often but we call 911 if there's an emergency on site.

Thank you.

Anything from the engineers?

Mr. Floyd: Mike Citerone please come up. Mike if you could just...look at exhibit A1 in the area photograph of the property just help to orient the board with the property and where it's located on the road network.

Mr. Citerone: So the site is located on Bridgeboro Road, County Road 613. It's adjacent to the Ott's Tavern and right near the intersection of Hartford Road.

Mr. Floyd: Switch me to exhibit A the photographs of the property. We did have existing photographs of the property. It is an existing bank property building. It's currently vacant. I think the photographs are self-explanatory but either Mike or Joe can come up and describe the existing conditions.

Mr. Citerone: Yea those pictures were taken in the fall and they represent the different elevation views of the building. Also the views of the entrance and other businesses on the site.

Mr. Floyd: So Mike if you could turn to the red site plan. If you could just walk the board through the proposed improvements in terms of storm water management, parking lot circulation, entrance and egress.

Mr. Citerone: So the existing bank building and existing driveway located here, existing bank was in this section here. The bank being expanded to approximately 10,150 square feet. The entrance off of Bridgeboro Road to remain and the existing parking lot expanded from the existing 21 spaces that are present to the proposed 69 spaces included 4 ADA accessible spaces. Existed storm water management basin that is located at the intersection of Bridgeboro Road and Castleton Road that is also going to be expanded to accommodate the increase impervious surface proposed improvements. The main entrance to the pediatric office will be essentially bank entrance was and expanded building will have a secondary entrance in the rear to accommodate the two future tenants.

Mr. Floyd: Have you had a chance to review the technical review letter issued by the board engineer?

Mr. Citerone: Yes.

Mr. Floyd: Are there any specific items in exception to that you would like to discuss at this time?

Mr. Citerone: I had a conversation with the engineer today on the phone. We went through some of the technical comments and we agree that we would work those a lot of those drains type details and construction details out in the future iterations of the plan. There was one item I just wanted to highlight we have a lighting plan proposed. The ordinance allows for a maximum height of the pole lighting of 14 feet and were proposing 16 feet to get a better coverage and spread of the light over the parking area. The lower the light you get more hot spots and less coverage so we would like to be able to have that additional 2 feet of height to the light.

Mr. Floyd: Did you have a chance to review the board planners review letter?

Mr. Citerone: Yes.

Mr. Floyd: Was the comment in the letter regarding the existing driveway having a width of approximately 25 feet, 30 feet is required. To the best of your knowledge is that a lofting preexisting nonconforming condition?

Mr. Citerone: That is correct that's an existing a 25 foot wide drive to the county road.

Mr. Floyd: Did the county planning board engineer raise any issues with the use of the existing driveway for this span of facility.

Mr. Citerone: No and our review correspondence and conditional approval they had no comment on the existing driveway.

Mr. Floyd: Any questions for Mike?

MS. Apte: Two questions, one could you expand a bit about the landscaping? I believe we've had some problems with landscaping and parking what was planned.

Mr. Citerone: I talked to the engineer. We had a landscape architect who prepared the plan. I spoke to her and she said one of things she tried to do in this plan is there is some existing vegetation and trees that she thought were valuable on site that would have been demolished as part of the expansion so she tried to save some of those and transplant them. She also prepared an additional buffer plan. In our discussion, if we need to supplement that with additional plans she's willing to work that and we can work that with a site visit and come up with...if some spots need a bit more buffering we can do that.

Ms. Apte: In terms of the type of trees I think one of the recommendation is, I saw it was ash trees...and what they will have...are you okay with that recommendation?

Mr. Citerone: Yes

Ms. Apte: In terms of the requirement of having each facility shall have a minimum of 200 sq ft of landscape area for 20 spaces. I just wanted a clarification on are they meeting that requirement?

Mr. Citerone: So obviously the exterior perimeter is more heavily buffered to the outside. Interior, we do have a small area between the parking that is proposed some landscaping. This given the configuration of the existing lot in our expansion. It didn't lead to a lot of islands.

Ms. Apte: Just so we're clear on the record, you would be complying with that requirement or, or is that still...?

Mr. Citerone: We will try to comply with that as best as we can. Again if it requires a meeting on the site of the field to work some of those details out, we're open to that.

Ms. Johnson: I have a quick question who are you neighbors? Who are the adjoining properties?

Mr. Citerone: So this is the Ott's Tavern here. So we have Ott's, we have the Castleton Rd. Development to the rear and to the side.

Mr. Jeney: Regarding the lighting you told to enhance the lighting to acquire light. How is that going to affect the roadways as well as the residents that's in back?

Mr. Citerone: I wanted to continue that the buffering that were proposing with the trees and the existing trees and well as the building itself. The building is 24' proposed height that would all tend to help buffer that lighting to the outside.

Mr. Jeney: That lighting would be centered on the property so it doesn't bleed over onto the outside.

Mr. Citerone: Yes the lighting right now is proposed so that it doesn't bleed off the property and it's really most intense in the parking area.

Mr. D'Armento: In terms of the lighting, we spoke to the applicants engineer, we don't have any objections on raising the lights to 16 '. We'll make sure there's no spillage over to the adjacent properties.

Mr. Citerone: Yes.

Mr. Floyd: If there's any questions for Mike then please....

Mr. D'Armento: In term of width of the fire lanes. Did you have a discussion with the Fire Marshal? I see his letter in here that there's not a fire lane that needs to be established at this time.

Mr. Citerone: Right, in his letter the only comment he had regarding access was he's requesting that we widen the drive isle in this one area right here to accommodate his truck...it's not depicted on here but we can agree to providing that and adjusting the radius here.

Mr. D'Armento: I just wanted to bring the attention to the board. We've had a discussion with the applicants engineer that soil testing will be provided to back up the calculation to provide for the soil for their draining plan.

Mr. Jeney: I found regarding the fire official's comment on the both types of area will need two means of egress travel distance for the main entrance is 175' on the north side shows a second means of egress.

Mr. Citerone: We're showing...you talking about in the building?

Mr. Jeney: You know what...it doesn't...yea I'm not sure it could be that?

Mr. Floyd: I think he's speaking of the two future...The future building.

Mr. Citerone: Yes, I've incorporated another means of egress for the tenants north and south.

Mr. Floyd: Well have Glenn speak to the fire official code comment momentarily.

Mr. Jeney: He wasn't clear if we were talking about driveways or access.

Mr. Floyd: Since the immediate question is regarding emergency egress from the building. Can you point out where those locations are on the floor plan?

Mr. Sarsale: So main entrance for AdvoCare would be here in, main entrance for the tenants here. Their second means of egress are here, here, and here.

Mr. Floyd: And that complies with the comment raised by the fire official?

Mr. Citerone: Correct.

Mr. Floyd: Maybe show the rendered elevations of the building. Can you just walk the board through the design and building materials and color scheme?

Mr. Sarsale: Essentially what we're doing is, we are keeping in tune with the existing massing of the building not going any taller. So, currently the existing building has a gable grove here which were extending to the north and also tying into the additions which is the sub tenant space keeping that peak at the same height of the building. Essentially were recladding the entire building with a fresher look of materials. The roof would be a standing seem aluminum roof and the color of the new roof would be a similar tone to the existing roof which is grey. So, it would be almost like a blueish grey or slate grey. Just below that where the AdvoCare sign would be you would have a vertical board and baton which would be white to sort allow the roof to have a nice contrast. Below along the base would be a cementitious board that would be clad along the entire perimeter along the building that would be a light grey color to tie in with the rest.

Mr. Floyd: Any questions for Glenn?

I do have one per our letter is there going to be an emergency generator on the facility?

Mr. Delgiorno: So yea typically it's advisable to have an emergency generator because of the immense cost of vaccines. So there sort of requiring that we do that now. We monitor the temperature remotely and in the case of outages and we would back that up with a generator.

Just to follow it up at this point I don't see it anywhere on this plan is that considered to be added?

Mr. Delgiorno: That's still on conversation as far as the location.

Mr. Citerone: I mean it would be on a pad and adjacent to the building we had not added it to the plan at this point.

Mr. Floyd: What were are currently showing though is the proposed location for the condenser units out to the north of the build. The current condenser are to the east here so we would relocate them to the north and have some sort of shrub coverage over them.

Ms. Apte: I would recommend that be discussed should the board accept this application. It should be discussed with the professional's offices just to make sure in terms of buffering it...its right on the side of the entrance to the property. So we just want to make sure that the buffering and anything that requires some kind of permeant fencing.

Mr. Floyd: The applicant would agree as a condition of any approval to work with the board's professionals on any additional landscaping or buffering on the site.

Ms. Apte: I do have some question regarding the signage. I believed I raised the planning memo that any kind of signage would have to be proposed any usual problems and would comply with the required ordinance.

Mr. Citerone: We have a free standing sign which is existing which were just going to reuse and then the sod signage which we provided I believe 64 square feet based on the overall square footage of that side. We can provide the calculation base that justify that 64 square feet.

Ms. Apte: Um no my question was about future wall sign that are being shown in this exhibit now. Whether they comply with...because that wasn't part of the initial application.

Mr. Floyd: I think the answer is that any signage shown is intended to comply with applicable signage ordinance requirements. If we don't not comply with those ordinance requirement we would have to come back for a variance.

Ms. Apte: The only issue with that I would raise is that the way this ordinance reads is one sign per commercial establishment. If you're increasing the number of signs that would become non-compliant issue.

Mr. Floyd: That's understood.

Mr. Jeney: I noticed on the site plan it looks like there's a trash container in the one corner of the parking lot.

Mr. Citerone: Yes we're proposing a trash enclosure.

That would be per town ordinance fenced in.

Mr. Citerone: Yes. I believe were showing it 6'. I believe your comment it needs to be 8'.

I mean you're informative of a maximum wall height of 8'.

Mr. Citerone: Yes, so if 6' is fine I think that's where we would keep it.

Just add to the trash enclosure the following should be considered.

Mr. Citerone: Yes.

Ms. Apte: I mean given the rear location of the garbage disposal and the conflict that existed around it I mean 6' could work as a fence height around it.

Mr. Jeney: Should the traffic impact is obviously, it's a busy area it's getting busier and it looks like it's pretty minimal anyway.

Mr. D'Armento: I spoke with the traffic engineer he's actually out of town. They'll be submitting that is required from our letter we don't anticipate any issues. Just to point out there is a center turning lane on Bridgeboro. On that the leveled surface will operate and we'll see based off of our provided submissions we'll see that it will be impact the center. One other question. What is the trash hours or what was the plan on the pickup of the dumpsters?

Mr. Delgiorno: I don't actually...know.

Mr. Floyd: Do you have any idea when the trash trucks come to the dumpster?

Mr. Delgiorno: No actually I don't. Actually it can be...actually I would be speculating. Typically the trash is handled by the janitorial service and they come after hours is how it's handled in my own office id have to check about that location.

Mr. Jeney: But the truck that comes to pick up the dumpster to dump it. What time do they usually come?

Just not when your there I guess.

Well I think the concern would be just we don't want it to be a certain hour in the morning and certainly after a certain hour at night. You do have residence back there and it does get a little noisy.

Mr. Delgiorno: If you want to propose an ideal time I can certainly look into it.

You have any guidance on that?

Mr. Delgiorno: We understand the concern and we certainly want to be reasonable.

I think the township ordinance says 7:30 in the morning for landscapers.

Mr. Floyd: We would agree to follow the ordinance requirements for landscapers or other type of service providers that come to commercial properties.

Is that as early as your trash is picked up as well?

I think they come around that time sometimes obviously they come later but some days they come earlier.

The recycling comes around 7 o'clock. Okay.

Ms. Apte: I would suggest the trash pickup would be in accordance to the ordinance.

Mr. Floyd: Agreed and that's how it is now.

But that might, you don't want that to bother the neighbors that what Lynn's point was being. I see your point but...

Mr. Floyd: To make it easier I would propose no pickup before 7:00 AM.

Sure.

Mr. Floyd: The evening the trash pickup...

Is 7:00 PM fine?

Mr. Floyd: 7:00 PM that's fine.

It will between 7:00 AM and 7:00 PM.

Mr. Floyd: That's fine.

I'm sure the early part is the concern. So we agree on that. Anything else there?

Ms. Apte: I just have a question to the engineer. I think one of the comments in my letter was about the clearing limit. I think the maximum permitted is 70 percent and this expansion is at somehow is expanded or are we meeting that requirement. Because the site the chart on the site plan just it's not quite sure.

Mr. Citerone: I think we were looking at the clearing in terms of there weren't any additions trees being taken down. This expansion was already in an area that was already sort of made for it. It was cleared and grass area so as you can see it's sort of depicting a tree line. That tree line is what's existing and this expansion sort of fit within that. So, we weren't really clearing per say there was a disturbance. Obviously, but not clearing the disturbance is well within the limits of the ordinance.

Thank you.

Do you own all of the green, the ebony shown in color there or just the grey more or less? Is it, that whole site?

Mr. Citerone: This property is everything that is colored. This area here is all wet lands. The wet lands lines and buffer is pretty much skirting the improvement except down there. This area here is upland but our improvements stop short of it.

Mr. Floyd: AdvoCare LLC the applicant is also the feasible owner of the property.

Mr. D'Armento: I do have a follow up question from what Mika pointed out. It terms of clearing, you have on your site plan, those edges you put over in the south corner right where your finger was. There is an actual clearing going to taking place there? Or is that just a...?

Mr. Citerone: The wetlands buffer line is right here we are proposed disturbances outside the buffer.

Do you have a call out on your plan that should pose as it was? That's just to lineate a new edge or is that just a lineate that's existing?

Mr. Citerone: That's an existing edge.

Any other questions?

Mr. Hewko: I noticed in the parking and circulation that I didn't even mention this, the sidewalk should connect & provide to the following sidewalk along the building access.

Mr. Citerone: Presently there is sidewalk along the frontage of Bridgeboro Road.

Mr. Hewko: There's no sidewalk connected to the building?

Mr. Citerone: Correct, that's presently shown that there is no sidewalk that goes from the sidewalk along Bridgeboro to the building.

Mr. Hewko: Ought there not to be?

Mr. Citerone: We can certainly provide a link of sidewalk if that's required.

MS. Apte: Any plans for the sidewalk along Bridgeboro Road as intention as pedestrian traffic is expected?

Mr. Citerone: Well I think it would be mostly cars.

Ms. Apte: Is the connection established be recommended?

Mr. Citerone: Yea I think we can accommodate that.

Mr. Floyd: Actually Joe can you just come up for a moment were discussing sidewalk for pedestrian traffic based on your existing facility granted it's on Route 130 but taking your experience with similar facilities would you expect any pedestrian traffic going to the new facility?

Mr. Delgiorno: No. Yea I suppose it's possible if someone wanted a good walk.

It's not doable.

Mr. Jeney: Well if they drop someone off or the person took a bus of taxi they could. I think for safety sake....

Mr. Delgiorno: Sure I suppose anything is possible. I's sure someone could run a marathon there. Well whatever the board desires to do in that as far as pedestrian access I'm willing to...

Mr. Floyd: We would agree then should the board grant the request of relief that we would work with the board engineer to provide the appropriate sidewalk.

Mr. Hewko: It's also mentioned the fault line existing driveway should be reconstructed I didn't see that.

Mr. Floyd: Well there's some of the details that we were going to work out. What we presently did we preserved the existing pave way in the drive way and then there's a salt cut line somewhere in this area. Then the rest of this is all going to be new. That would leave just that

small piece of existing pavement as the old pavement is not a problem to continue the milling that's going to occur here all the way to the entrance and just replace all that. It's not a large amount of pavement so we can do that.

Any other questions? Comments?

Mr. Floyd: We are here for a use variance approval so again Jim Miller is going basing his testimony on the testimony you've already hear so Jim you've heard all the testimony. You've provided all the justification for the request of use variance.

Mr. Miller: Good evening again James Miller for the record licensed professional planner. I just want to go over a couple things quickly about the context of this site. The area to the north and to the east are both zone A-1 and the Grande Town house complex and the area to the south is where Ott's Tavern is and the shopping center that was the subject to the earlier variance we discussed in the beginning of the hearing. To the west there's a series of single family homes in front on Bridgeboro Road and a trucking terminal that's situated behind those. That strip is also zoned in NC-1 so that's the zoning in the land use patterns in the area.

The existing use is actually the vacant bank that's been there for many years. I appeared last October in support of a prior variance for this site in which the board granted approval to utilize the existing building as a medical center in this variance is basically a follow up to that earlier procedure. It still remains a D1 variance and we still have to meet the same approvals that we addressed at the prior hearing. Basically it advances the purposes municipal land use law and that there's special reasons and the site is particularly suited for the proposed use.

So it terms of the positive criteria the two criteria I site are the same ones I sited on the earlier matter. Purpose A to encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use of the development of all land in the state in a matter that will promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare. Purpose G to provide sufficient space and appropriate locations for variety of agricultural, residential, recreational, commercial, and industrial uses and open space both public and private according to their respect of the environmental requirements in order to meet the need of all New Jersey citizens. Again these are the purposes that were sited at the prior hearing and I think they still remain appropriate to this application. The site continues to remain particularly suitable for the use despite the enlargement of the building and the modification the use that you just heard described. The building is going to be 10,000 square feet as supposed to the prior 3,000 square feet.

There's a series of reasons I believe the site is particularly suited they're going to pretty much mirror the reasons I cited in the prior application. First of all the site again has a long history as a bank. It has sufficient capacity to support the proposed use. I think you've heard extensive

testimony about the parking, the open space, the landscaping, but there's ample room for all those facilities to support the use. The parking is well in excess of what the ordinance requires.

Ordinance requires one space for 250 square feet of floor area. That translates to 4 spaces per 1000. This use is proposed 69 parking spaces for little over 10,000 square feet. That's a ratio of 6.9 parking spaces per 1000 so it's well in excess of the requirements of the code. We believe and were very confident that there's more than enough parking to support to use even when it's at its busiest during the flu season or any time whether it be maximization of the visitation. We believe that there's more than enough parking both in accordance of the ordinance and our own projection to what the parking requirements would be.

The engineering plan shown that there's sufficient space for the required for the storm water management basins. The site will be more than adequately landscaped and facility is going to provide a very important service for the surrounding community. You've got a lot of residential households in that vicinity and having this medical use approximate to those uses where they currently isn't a medical facility will give that community an important service. I believe all those factors from a capacity standpoint for a functionality the site make this particularly suited for the use. The specific location I believe is also particularly suited for the use. Again these are factors I said previous but your NC1 zoning district is primarily a zone that permits commercial and service uses service the immediate neighborhood its neighborhood commercial district.

A lot of these uses tend to be more impactful then the use is proposed. For example the zone permits liquor stores. It permits banks. Uses that have higher rates of visitation are more impactful in terms of their signage. Their impact on circulation. This use from its impact standpoint fits in well with the area as generally constant with the impacts that are anticipated by the zoning district. It's a good fit from an impact stand point and again it also provided a service and services is what that district is all about. Providing services that are going to serve the immediate neighborhood. This is a use that is going to achieve that objective so it's a good fit from that standpoint.

It also responds to the limits of the township's land use plans. This is another purpose I cited in the previous hearing. The way the townships zoning districts are laid out, there isn't a lot of commercial zoning in this area so this becomes one of the few location in the vicinity with all this residential development where you can put a medical facility that will service the residences of the area. It's also an appropriate location because of the character of the road itself. As we testified earlier in the hearing it's a much better location for example than Route 130 where you got a median. You can only access the site from one direction. It's heavily trafficked. Those of us that have been parents know when you have a sick child the last thing you want to contend with is a lot of parking and turning movement. This kind of, it's a significant county road but it's not a

highway. It's not a local street. It's basically the perfect place to put this type of use as an access standpoint. That's another reason we believe this site is particularly suited.

Finally, this allows for the adaptive reuse of another wise vacant unit. The bank building has been vacant for many years. It's never desirable to have a vacant building on a long term basis in any community. There's all kinds of potential the building can become blighted over time, become dilapidated. What this use is going to do is replace a vacant building with limited utility with a new building that's going to be perfectly suited to the use its going to occupy that build. That's going to contribute to the stability and vitality of the NC1 zoning district. For all those reasons I believe this site is particularly suited for the use. The application would advance the sited purposes of municipal land use law and would satisfy the positive criteria.

We also have a bulk variance that has to do with the driveway. The driveway is 25' and I believe the ordinance requires 30'. Here the C2 variance we have to show the leaf would advance the purpose of municipal land use law. Also it would be a better zoning alternative where the benefits would out way the detriments. In terms of the purposes I believe this advances those purposes to deal the appropriate use of land purposes A and G. The design is a better zoning alternative because of the fact that the site has to meet the requirements of the County and the County basically wants to see the driveway remain the way it is. Part of the reason I believe the county wants that and I would also say this another reason why this is a better zoning alternative. If you look at the planning you'll see that there's draining inlets in place in the bottom of the driveway. There would be an obvious disruption and a need to realign those drainage systems and it's better to leave those in place and maintain that situation. The 25' driveway is more than ample to provide ingress and egress from the type of uses proposed as a typical driveway for this use. I believe again it's a better zoning alternative. There's some detriment from making it wider and there's no detriment on leaving the existing condition there. It's workable in a better zoning alternative. I believe that relief also satisfies the applicable positive criteria.

In terms of the negative criteria we have to show there's no substantial detriment to public welfare. We've hear this so many times already but that there's no impairments in purposes in the zone plan. For the medical use there's an obvious benefit in providing that service and given the impacts of the use are comparable and constant with what the zone otherwise would have if it was replaced by another uses otherwise permitted by the district. I don't see any potential negative impacts on the neighborhood and overall the impact of this use is going to be positive on neighborhood. I also factored in there also were going to have an adaptive reuse of a structure on site.

So in terms of impairment in total purpose of the zone plan, the zone basically requires for low intensity regional service uses. I think pediatric practice is consistence that that purpose for a

use which has those same attributes. It's basically an office use where all the activity is contained within the walls of that use. That's another in effect its less intensive then some of the commercial uses you think of Ott's for example which I've participated in over the years. That's a good place to have a soccer party or something. Basically, those uses are a little noisy, a little more active in those uses by comparison its quieter it meets that criteria as well.

The bank itself never really had an adverse impact on the surrounding area this is a little less impactful use of the bank. By extension of that it's another indication it's not going to have an inverse impact. You've got again the rehabilitation of the vacant site. I think that's a positive impact on the zone plan and zone ordinance. Basically overall, I think this project has a positive impact on the zone plan and zone ordinance therefore no negative impact. As a consequence the site would meet the negative criteria as well as the positive criteria with the board's approval.

Mr. Jeney: Just to point I noticed the fire marshal's letter indicates that the 25' drive way is acceptable to him.

Mr. Miller: Yes. That doesn't surprise me that's typical drive way.

Ms. Johnson: I do have a question. Are you proposing the uses in the rental expanded site is that a condition that they will be medical uses as well?

Mr. Miller: Yes.

So all your testimony applies to the expanded rentals.

Mr. Miller: The only thing I wanted to add to my testimony is that those factors that I just sited also enable us to reconcile the fact that this use is not included in the district with the fact that we believe remains appropriate thus enhances criteria under the deed sheet.

I do have one question. Can you show me where the proposed signage would be as for the tenants that would be...?

Mr. Miller: What is he asking for?

Could you show me where that signage would be...there will be no additional signage at street...other than the signs that are existing?

Mr. Floyd: Correct, were going to utilize the existing signage rather than change location.

Future tenants though?

Mr. Floyd: Correct.

Ms. Apte: I'm not...the entrance is on this side of the future plans right on the northern side?

Mr. Floyd: No it's on the eastern side.

Correct.

Thank you.

Any questions? Professionals?

Mr. D'Armento: We feel confident that the applicant's engineers will work with us on the revisions that have been accounted for. This won't affect the plan in any way that is substantial based on the plans that have been provided.

OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

There were no comments from the public.

CLOSE TO THE PUBLIC

Ms. Apte: I just have one quick question just so we're clear the future tenant space is going to be medical related to similar type of medical use with doctor's office and we other emergency services.

Correct.

Good point. Alright anyone else?

I just want to ask Jen. So, with this application am I correct to say there's on one variance that we have to...and that's the driveway.

Right and anything else is basically going to be items that the professionals are going to work with.

As far as the pad site for the generator, the buffing area, the AC, the lighting the additional 2 feet, the trash pickup, the sidewalk.

Right what you have to decide is the engineers to work upon...it's the use and the bulk variance. The use variance and bulk variance.

You do the use first.

And at this point they're not applying for any wall signs.

Mr. Floyd: Correct and if it wasn't there before the signage that's proposed and the plans will be revised all the signage will comply with applicable signage requirement. If we need a variance we will be back before this board.

I know your hesitation because you can't have a sign without a variance, but he said he'll comply.

Mrs. Parento made a motion to approve the Use Variance, seconded by Mr. Hewko. Results are as follows:

AYE: Mr. Smith, Mrs. Parento, Mr. Hewko, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Chascsa, Mr. Jeney NAY: None

Mrs. Parento made a motion to approve the Bulk Variance, seconded by Mr. Hewko. Results are as follows:

AYE: Mr. Smith, Mrs. Parento, Mr. Hewko, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Chascsa, Mr. Jeney NAY: None

Mrs. Parento made a motion to approve the Preliminary & Final Site Plan, seconded by Mr. Smith. Results are as follows:

AYE: Mr. Smith, Mrs. Parento, Mr. Hewko, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Chascsa, Mr. Jeney NAY: None

DISCUSSION

Bee Dee- Discussion on possibly revoking conditional approval from the meeting of December 16, 2014.

The board made a statement to the record that this matter would be discussed in June do to time allotted to the applicant.

MINUTE APPROVAL

Approve minutes from regular meeting dated September 20, 2018.

Approve minutes from regular meeting dated October 18, 2018.

Approve minutes from regular meeting dated December 20, 2018.

Approve minutes from the Re-Organization meeting dated January 17, 2019.

Approve minutes from regular meeting dated March 21, 2019.

Approve minutes from regular meeting dated April 18, 2019.

Minutes to be carried over.

RESOLUTION

Resolution # ZZ2019-01 (Completeness)
Palavra Viva Church Corp.
4000 Route 130. Unit 31 Second Floor
Block 107, Lot 2
ZZ2019-01
Use Variance

Mrs. Parento made a motion to approve Resolution #ZZ2019-01, seconded by Mr. Hewko. Results were as follows:

Vote carried with a unanimous voice vote.

Resolution # ZZ2019-02 (Approval)
Palavra Viva Church Corp.
4000 Route 130. Unit 31 Second Floor
Block 107, Lot 2
ZZ2019-02
Use Variance

Mrs. Parento made a motion to approve Resolution #ZZ2019-02, seconded by Mr. Hewko. Results were as follows:

Vote carried with a unanimous voice vote.

OPEN/CLOSE TO PUBLIC

No members of the public were present. Session was closed to the public.

DELRAN TOWNSHIP
ZONING BOARD
MUNICIPAL BUILDING
REGULAR MEETING
MAY 16, 2019 - 7:00 PM

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. Parento made a motion to adjournment at 9:00 pm, seconded by Mr. Hewko. Results were as follows:

Vote carried with a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Phillips, Secretary Planning & Zoning