OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

The Delran Township Planning Board regular meeting of Thursday, September 6, 2018, was called to order by Mrs. Rovinsky at 7:00 PM in the Delran Township Municipal Building.

The Open Public Meetings Act Announcement was read by Mrs. Rovinsky, and the Pledge of Allegiance was performed.

NEW MEMBER

Joseph Parento was sworn in as a Class 4 board member.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mrs. Rovinsky, Mr. Russell, Mr. Catrambone, Ms. Kolodi, Mr. Singer,

Mr. Morrow, Mr. Hejnas, Mr. Parento & Mr. Khinkis

Absent: Mr. Cathel

Professionals: Mr. Ed Farrell, Engineer from Pennoni for Mr. Raday, Ms. Mika

Apte, PP & Jenn Johnson, Attorney

APPLICATION CHANGE

Sun Delran Lightbridge Academy Route 130 South BLK 46, Lot 9.01 PN2018-03 Amended Site Plan

Mr. Duncan Prime, from Prime Law, represents the applicant, Sun Delran LLC. Ms. Johnson swore in the applicant's witnesses.

Mr. Justin Mihalik, Architect for the project.

Mr. David Falzarano, Vice President of Development for Lightbridge Franchise Company.

Mr. Ahmad Tamous, Professional Engineer, Bohler Engineering.

Mr. Charles Mannino, Vice President of Construction for Sun Equity Partners, Owner Representative.

Mr. Prime does a brief introduction. He stated that they've been here twice in 2016 and 2017. His client purchased a property three or four years ago that was in need of being

spruced up, the former Greenleaf Center, block 46, lot 9.01 at 5011 Route 130 in Delran. They came to a previous meeting in 2016 with an overview. They wanted to do a fitness center on the end, various entertainment & retail type uses in the middle. They had an idea for a childcare center on this end. They came in piece by piece, first for approval of the fitness center, later for a subdivision, created a pad site in the front which is being marketed. They indicated at that time they were going to do site improvements. They have repaved approximately 85% of the property – most of the front and just a little of the back needs to be done, as was called out in one of the letters.

But the center has been improved – money has been put into it, new tenants, and he's back tonight for an amendment to the prior Site Plan from 2016, which was the conceptual plan for this daycare. They have a tenant, Lightbridge, and they have a play area outside and some other site plan issues that need to be discussed with the Board.

He had several completeness waivers. They were submitted with the original approval. They were reviewed and granted approval. They have just a small change on the end where the childcare facility is proposed.

Mr. Prime stated to Mrs. Rovinsky that he was ready for completeness. Mrs. Rovinsky asked Ms. Mika Apte to speak.

Ms. Apte refers to the CME letter of August 28 from Page 2. Mr. Prime stated he will respond to questions. Ms. Apte stated that the first four items are the waivers that were requested. Ms. Apte stated she has no objection, but she diverts some of them — the drainage systems, the drainage calculation, and the traffic impact report — to the Board Engineer. Mr. Prime stated he has some testimony for these and that they are asking for a waiver from the official submission of the new Traffic Impact Report, new Environmental Impact Report. They have some testimony regarding traffic.

Mr. Farrell stated he had a conversation with the design engineer who was sworn in.

- Item 48: Environmental Impact Report no issue with waiving.
- Item 32: Narrative & minor calculations will be provided.
- Item 33: Narrative & minor calculations will be provided.
- Item 49: Traffic Impact no issue with waiver based on the testimony they'll present tonight in accordance with review letter.

Ms. Apte stated there were some incomplete items and that it was suggested that Mr. Prime officially request a waiver from the Board or provide these items. Most are as the

attorneys testified. It is just an amendment to an already approved application, so they do not have any exception to granting most of these waivers.

We did recommend there were certain items that should be provided in case the Board looks at it favorably, such as Item 12, which was the signature blocks. The revised plan should provide that. As far as the landscaping and lighting plans, depending on the type of application, you don't need to provide; but it was suggested to have the engineer or architect to present testimony regarding the lighting and the landscaping.

290-4V: Color Photographs, Page 3 – should be provided during testimony or you should seek a waiver.

Mr. Prime stated that they had some exhibits that they hoped would substitute for the official requirement of color photographs, including a rendering of the childcare center.

Ms. Apte stated that other than the four items, they have no exception to granting waivers to the other missing items, as long as the applicant officially asks for those waivers. Mr. Prime stated that he does ask.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated that we're granting everything but what four items.

Ms. Apte stated that they are granting everything except Item 12, the Signature Blocks. If the Board looks at this application favorably, they would be asked to revise their plans and submit with Signature Blocks. Then Item 40, the Lighting Plan, and Item 41, the Landscape Plan. She recommends that the applicant's experts testify regarding these plans, although they're not officially submitted, just kind of provided testimony.

Ms. Apte stated that she forgot to mention one item.

Item 42: Solid Waste and Recycling. She requests the applicant's experts to testify regarding that.

Mr. Prime stated that they're going to provide testimony for that and also will provide an enclosure. It'll be shown in the revised plans.

Mrs. Rovinsky clarifies that testimony will be provided for Items 32, 33, and 49. And also the 290.4.

Ms. Apte stated that 290.4, the colored photographs, the applicant's expert is going to provide some exhibits.

Mr. Morrow made a motion to grant this application complete. Ms. Kolodi seconded it. The results are as follows:

Ayes: Mrs. Rovinsky, Mr. Russell, Mr. Catrambone, Ms. Kolodi, Mr.

Singer, Mr. Morrow, Mr. Hejnas, Mr. Parento, & Mr. Khinkis.

Absent: Mr. Cathel

Mr. Prime gives more details for the actual Amended Site Plan application for the daycare. This proposes an outdoor playground, roughly 3,400 square feet. This facility is permitted by code. We're requiring no variance relief whatsoever, just minor site plan issues. He stated there are some comments in the engineer's letter regarding the use and operations of the academy. An engineer will present first to talk about modifications to the site, and then second an academy representative will answer any questions and hear about operational stuff – drop-offs, number of kids, number of classrooms, all that stuff. Let's mark the exhibits as we go.

Mr. Tamous stated that A1 is the aerial photograph of the existing site. That is dated June 7, 2018. It shows the existing shopping center, the site is bound to the east by the Holy Cross Academy, and that is zoned Office and also zoned General Commercial. To the west is South Chester Avenue, and to the south is Route 130. The property is properly located in the northeast corner of the existing building. The site has two access points over Route 130, one of whom is right hand. The other one is right hand, right out of South Chester Avenue. There are two access points. One of them is right hand, right out. The other one is a "movement access." No proposed changes to any of the access points due to limited activity of the site. No major storm water management improvement.

Exhibit A2 is the current condition of the site plan. The existing site plan is not visible on the plan, but that is an exact representation of what was submitted to the township, dated June 7, 2018.

This currently shows the existing building and proposed improvements of the existing building. The area in question is approximately 5,700 sq. ft. The site is paved, so we're proposing a play area on top of a paved surface. There is no change in impervious coverage, and they are not seeking any relief from that. As a result of this improvement, having reviewed that with an engineer, there are some type of cosmetic changes to the site like paving and some repair to the existing pavement in the vicinity of the proposed improvement that services the daycare center is also something they discussed with the engineer and they are agreeable to.

There are no more major storm water management improvements for the site. There will be some modification to the existing inlets with some underdrain, collecting the runoff from that area just to help manage the runoff concentration of the proposed improvements.

The site in front of the daycare, we have in excess of 49 parking spaces, which is more than adequate to service the existing facility. Also, what we have in Exhibit A3, and that date is also the same day, June 7.

That shows the past circulation throughout the site, which was one of the concerns brought up by the engineer and the planner. There the plans showed two different parts. One is esoteric. It's almost like a UPS truck that's a smaller type truck that maneuver the site. It shows that there's no obstructions and easily able to maneuver the site. The other truck is the larger semi- trailers that would be 67. It also shows the greater ease in maneuvering the site to get to the rear of the site to service the larger buildings, all the way in the back.

Mr. Prime asked if the playground is fully enclosed or is it susceptible to a kid getting out and running into a truck. He wanted to explain the void. A fence or bollards, what will be protecting the children from the trucks?

Mr. Tamous stated that this plan shows the distance between the existing parking area and the actual finished wall of the building. This actually is a raised platform, so there's a retaining wall that's as high as 2 feet around the entire play area. They're also proposing fencing on top of the retaining wall, and there are bollards to prevent the parked car against the wall from impacting the wall, causing any damage.

Mr. Prime said there's a retaining wall, fence, and bollards? Mr. Tamous stated, "Correct." Mrs. Rovinsky asked if the bollards were all the way around. Mr. Tamous said the bollards are only on two sides. The third side, we have an existing loading dock on that side.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked who would the loading dock service? Mr. Tamous said that the loading dock serves the remaining existing building and believes these are currently vacant buildings. Mr. Prime said that they are and hope to fill them soon. Mr. Tamous stated that this is a loading dock here, and there's another loading dock here. And that's where the majority of the deliveries will occur, to this side of the property.

Mr. Catrambone asked if the loading docks will be connected to the area that you will occupy or beyond. Mr. Tamous stated they are not. This dark-shaded area, that's the limit of the daycare facility. These are the remainder of the complex, and then the loading docks begins. Mr. Tamous stated that it's here, and the playground is here. So there's some separation if you're looking at it larger scale. This is the playground area. The loading dock starts here. So you have this safety zone in here.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked how long does the safety zone go? I'm just saying if kids are playing, and somebody's trying to back up, can they hit the fence, instead of the loading dock is my big-

Mr. Tamous stated that it's not right immediately abutting the area. It's slightly higher. Mrs. Rovinsky stated that so another driver that's backing up, he would hit something before he hit that. Mr. Tamous stated that correct, that is a retaining wall holding this difference in elevation. And on top of the wall is a fence for privacy, security but also bollards. Mrs. Rovinsky said she thought the bollards weren't going to be in the back. Mr. Tamous said the bollards are here and here. There is nothing here, but there shouldn't be any major activity in this area.

Mr. Prime stated that we can extend a few bollards on that side. That's not a problem. There's no question. I got it when you first asked it.

Mr. Khinkis asked will there be exit traffic going past it or is it in through the back and out through the back as well? Mr. Tamous stated that is the overall site plan which represents the layout of the site. I have 11x17s. Just to clarify, one is the circulation of the property. It provides the access route for the truck. It's not going to be able to maneuver everywhere on site. Once they enter into this area, this will continue through the site, and then through the rear where they access the fork controlled exit, they'll have access to 130. If they wanted to make a left on 130, they have to come off of Chester.

Pretty much that covers the majority of the testimony. The other thing I would like to point out, that there was some comments by the engineer about the existing lighting. Obviously, safety is a major concern for the owner. They opted to replace all the existing lighting in the center with LED lighting, so that has been completed for the site. In our discussion with the engineer, we will provide a lighting study for the proposed lighting, just for the daycare center. There are some concerns, especially in winter, 5:00 it's dark. So we will provide the lighting level, and we are agreeable to providing a safety plan for the pedestrians and township ordinances, and we'll work with their engineer to resolve that.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated especially the playground area too, with no kid left behind because it's dark, so no new walk paths on that side of the building.

Mr. Tamous stated that there are existing walk paths along the east side of the building, and there are two side areas, one here and one there. And these side areas actually need double hall lights on them. We will evaluate those, if need be to provide some additional lighting for better visibility during the evening hours.

Mr. Prime questions the paving, the rear and the side that needed to be fixed or overlaid. Can that be agreed to as part of this application?

Mrs. Rovinsky stated that we actually have a little bit more than that. Weeds are coming up where the overlay was in the whole parking lot, not just the area that wasn't done. No crack filling done or something. Mr. Prime stated that luckily we have the owner of the center right here. So I'll bring up Mr. Mannino to address that.

Mr. Mannino stated that the entire center was not repaved. We did 130 entrances and the Chester entrance, and then we did the frontage across the entire building. The rest was crack filled and seal coated last year. We recognize that we've got to come back and fix a few of those other areas. Mrs. Rovinsky asked that you're fine with crack filling those areas. Mr. Mannino stated yes.

Mr. Prime asked if any questions for Mr. Tamous.

Ms. Apte asked if the Board looks at this favorably, you're willing to provide a lighting plan for your portion of the site? Mr. Tamous stated that is correct. Mainly for the daycare. It's not going to cover the entire site, just for adequate light and level for that facility. Ms. Apte stated that that will be a planned conformance condition? Mr. Prime stated yes.

Ms. Apte, the second, I guess you're not creating any change in impervious coverage. Mr. Prime stated that is correct. Ms. Apte stated that basically its paved area, and you're just putting AstroTurf grass?

Mr. Tamous stated that is correct. And, technically, we're being more conservative in saying there's no change in impervious coverage, but the intent is to fill on top of the existing paved service with BGA clean stone, provide some under laying with further blacktop which should address some of the work quality concerns brought up by the engineer and that would be it.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked is there going to be any sort of padding or anything before the synthetic grass goes in. If a little kid falls, Mr. Prime said we'll get there.

Ms. Apte asked would you provide brief testimony on how much parking is required for just the Lightbridge Academy, and where are the spaces? Are there defined spaces just for Lightbridge Academy parking? Mr. Tamous stated that they're not defined.

Exhibit A-5 Overall Site Plan.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated that you're still going to have a lot of side parking as well. Mr. Prime stated, "Correct." Mrs. Rovinsky asked if there's any defined crosswalk from that

parking. Mr. Tamous stated that the shaded area on the plan provides the ADA access from this side of the parking lot to that facility. Here you're parking against the building, so that's easily accessible. There's additional parking along the east side, on this side against the wall and the bollards. That's one of the concerns brought up by the engineer. There's additional parking in this area.

Keep in mind that the majority of the parking is quick, there's the peak hour first thing in the morning, and you drop the kids off. And then the afternoon, for pickup. So while the need for the 49 parking spaces is there, rarely are you going to see 49 cars parked there. However, in this vicinity here, that would be south of the proposed improvements. There's in excess of 49 spaces. We could revise the plans to show that this is being utilized by the facility. We're not going to require that this area only be utilized by the facility because that deprives the rest of the center from those spaces.

Mr. Prime stated it's the same principle used with the fitness center. The parking's there for them. It's not marked for Edge though. It's all shared part of a center. There are ten marked spaces, correct, Ahmad, so we're clear? Along the building that are marked for pickup and drop-off? Mr. Tamous stated yes.

Ms. Apte mentions that in the review they found that there would be waiver requirement for the parking spaces that are to be right next to the proposed playground area because of the size of the parking space. Mr. Tamous stated that they're talking about this parking to the east of the play area. If you're looking at the plan, after modification and everything else, you'll end up with 17.6 parking spaces, which is slightly less what's required. Mr. Prime asked if you're talking about parking depth where they're 9x18, and so it's previously approved here.

Mr. Tamous said correct. This is slightly wider than what it needs to be. It's approximately 26 feet. Reduce this to 24 foot. In this small area, resize all these spaces to make them 18-foot long spaces and that will comply with the ordinance and maintain the parking spaces.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked if you could do more of a compact car scenario thing back there.

Mr. Tamous stated that we could. Unfortunately, not a lot of people use compact cars. After making that modification, that's going to be reflected and provided to the board and to the township. That area would function after doing the modification as well. Mrs. Rovinsky asked if the Fire Marshal see this new plan. Mr. Tamous stated that we did not get a chance to provide it to anyone.

Mr. Morrow stated that when Sam's Club was there, all truck deliveries were coming off Chester Avenue. I think to avoid any tractor trailer movement, not the daycare, but any

new tenants if they do need tractor trailers, they're going to be coming in off of Chester Avenue. That entrance is pretty wide, designed for the tractors to make their turns in there. If we put a sign there, "All deliveries on Chester Avenue," that way they'd use the back of the facility.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated that's kind of how Cinnaminson is. They have one turn where you can't do tractor trailers. Mr. Morrow stated that I just don't see the logic in crossing Route 130, making a turn there, and then trying to come around the playground. From tractor trailer driving, I don't think the drivers would do that.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated that's a nice point because then you don't have them in front of the driveway either. Mr. Morrow stated they're away from the school. Like I said, there was always a sign there saying, "All truck deliveries-"

Mr. Prime said that we can resign it. We can put a sign up for sure. Yes, that's not a problem. I can't promise that'll always work, but it'll be a deterrent. It was stated that there's two entrances there. There's one right by the 130 Diner that comes into that parking lot. Mrs. Rovinsky said the next one down? So it's just got one entrance that you're going to put this on.

Mr. Morrow stated that when that was Two Guys was here & Staples was there, I'm sure that they came around that back, made the delivery, and came back out. It would just make more sense if I was driving a tractor trailer.

Ms. Rovinsky stated that the fitness center is really not going to get deliveries. The daycare's really not going to get many deliveries. So it's just dependent on the other, the middle one that I don't know you're all aware that that is the Launch Trampoline club, so that's not going to get a lot of delivery.

Ms. Apte wanted to make sure the parking spaces are going to remain 17.5 or you're going to change it? Just so you're aware, the minimum required depth is 20 feet, not 18.

Mr. Prime stated that they are 18 on site, but in the existing condition. Mr. Tamous stated that we're matching what's existing. Mr. Prime stated I think the position is we're going to make them 18, and then whatever's left for the drive aisle, I think we thought it would be 25, not 24, Ahmad. We have enough to get 25 I believe was what we discussed today. But the remainder will be the drive aisle, which if our testimony meets your ordinance requirements. We will be wider than that.

Ms. Apte stated the other question I have is regarding the setback line. Would the fence meet the current conditions? I think with the fence being proposed, how much is the

setback from the property line? Would you happen to know that? Mr. Tamous stated in excess of approximately 80 feet. Ms. Apte stated that meets the requirement. From the property line. Mr. Prime stated we looked at that, if it would require a setback variance, but we do not require a setback variance, but we do not. Ms. Apte stated, okay, just wanted to put that on record. I think I have nothing further for this witness.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked what kind of landscape? Ms. Apte stated, no, we haven't. Are you going to do that?

Mr. Tamous stated that due to the limited activity we're proposing for the property, we are not proposing any modifications or additions to the existing landscaping in the center. The majority of the work is going to be comprised of a 5,700 sq. ft. area to the right of the center further away from anyone or any activity. Also, just by visiting the site today there is missing vegetation along the side property line and we're not proposing any modification to this vegetation either.

Mr. Prime stated that we had discussed that at our original approval as well. This is just for this amendment for the childcare center. We discussed landscaping in 2016. It is marked A5. A4 was that rendering that you passed around. A5 is the overall site plan.

Okay, I've got one last witness, our representative from Lightbridge, Mr. Falzarano.

David, you are Vice President of Franchise Development for Lightbridge. Is that correct? Mr. Falzarano stated that he is. Mr. Prime asked him to tell the Board a little bit of background about Lightbridge, who they are, and specifically your role at the company.

Mr. Falzarano stated that Lightbridge Academy, a franchise company started in 2011. My family actually started this company, formerly as Rainbow Academy back in 1997. My father still is the founder and CEO of the company and manages a corporate office which is a franchise system. And our product is Lightbridge Academy Childcare Centers. And so we work with our franchisees, in this case Viba Wymer, who is sitting here in the audience today, will be our Operations Manager and owner of the facility. She's going to be working with our expertise in training and getting over 100 hours of training for herself as well as some of her key staff members, and making sure that they follow the procedures and protocols, not just of the Lightbridge Academy standard for childcare, which we consider to be a very high level educational facility, but also to the standards and exceeding the standards of the State of New Jersey and the Division of Children & Families which regulates childcare.

The child care industry has changed a little bit over the last 20 years or so since we've been doing this and started this at that time. And so technology is a big part of what we

do, and I'll touch on this a little bit in our testimony, but just to give you a sense, a parent will now walk into our facility-

So we're going to be operating all year round. We are Monday through Friday, 6:30 AM through 7 PM. We serve the needs of working families. Dual income working families is our customer base primarily, and so we're going to serve the Delran community and some of the surrounding communities that are going to be potential customers that are going to commute up and down Route 130 primarily.

We've done extensive research on competitors in the area and similar competitors that we've competed against in 35 of our operational centers throughout the states of New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, soon to be North Carolina. And so, technology is a big part of what we do. When a parent comes to us, and parks in hopefully one of those ten designated parking spots, if not, they will spill over into those additional day parking. But we've done our research, and we know that ten parking spots for this size of a facility is going to cycle over every five to seven minutes typically. A parent is going to pull into a parking spot, exit their vehicle, take their one or multiple children out of their vehicle with all of the bags that go with them, and they're going to enter into the facility into a vestibule. They will then finger scan, and any of their designated pickups will be allowed to register with the office with photo ID. Nobody is allowed to just enter our facility. In order to have access and open the electronic door lock in our internal door is through a finger scan access point or to be buzzed in.

A parent then enters the facility with their children, delivers them to one of the classrooms, makes sure that the staff is acknowledging that they've been delivered and have arrived, usually have their to-do list of things to communicate in the morning; and the same happens in the inverse. That parent then enters the building, scans their finger in. That is also our ability to check our child in and out of the facility. So a staff member in their classroom is holding a tablet, usually an iPad, in which that child is also going to now be checked in and out based on that finger scan. So our staff knows when a parent has now entered the facility and to start helping that parent get in and out of the building.

We try to avoid having people lingering and hanging out in our facilities. Even though they are our customers and they're more than welcome to be there, we try not to have a group of parents necessarily congregating in the mornings and in the evenings when they're supposed to be picking up and dropping off.

Most of our families, like I mentioned, are dual income working families and are mostly rushing in in the morning to drop off to get to work on time. And so we understand that as well, and so we're helping take their bags and get them situated and sitting down for breakfast in the mornings typically. And the inverse in the evening, helping their family

get on their way so they can get home and spend a little quality time with their children as we get to most of the day for them.

Mr. Prime stated that in the Pennoni letter there are some comments, and comment 2A1, A-F. You answered A, B and-C regarding the hours of operation, the pickup and drop-off times. D was a question whether children and/or staff would be bussed on and off site.

Mr. Falzarano stated that we require parents personally deliver their children to the actual classroom. That can be a guardian – grandmother, grandfather, or a designated pickup or drop-off person. No buses. We may partner up with some local elementary schools in Delran to potentially do before/aftercare program. In that case, we would ask the town to add us as a designated drop-off spot with a staff member at the front door to bring them into the facility.

Mr. Prime mentions that there was a question regarding whether the daycare facility would provide any services to special needs children.

Mr. Falzarano stated that we're not designed or equipped to handle certain or most developmental challenges that some children may go through. We're going to be serving six-week-olds through five-year-olds, so we're infants through kindergarten typically. Ultimately, if a child is later found to be on the spectrum and needs additional care, then we would give them references to find what the best need of their family is.

Mr. Prime asked if there will be any field trips, outings, or special events involving the children where they'd be away from the daycare facility? Mr. Falzarano stated there will be. A summer program is run primarily for graduating children and/or siblings of graduating children. Again, some of those before and after care children might stay over in the summers. Depending on what the owner/team decide, there could be local trips to the Local Park or aquariums or educational type places, pumpkin patch, etc.

Mr. Prime said that there's a comment in Item 6 regarding outside rules. We'll be seeking a waiver from the Burlington County Planning Board as well as Fire Marshal review. Also, walk through what we have to have from the township for the New Jersey Department of Children & Families.

Mr. Falzarano stated that childcare in the State of New Jersey is regulated by DCF, the Division of Children & Families. To get our license, we submit an application. We then get a checklist of 10-12 items. We need a Certificate of Occupancy (CO) or temporary CO in order to clear our checklist to get licensing to approve us, come out and do a measurement, and give us our actual licensing. It's a Catch 22 to have DCF's approval

prior to township approval because we can't get our license until after construction and completion and review.

Mr. Prime stated that they're hoping the resolution reflects the fact that we'll need to pursue a CO from the township in order to get that NJ DCF's license.

Mr. Prime stated that those are all the questions.

Mr. Falzarano discusses the playground, any padding underneath the turf. The existing parking lot will stay. We're going to put an air grate. It's a plastic, probably 2" thick, like a harder plastic egg carton on top of the playground. It'll be filled with a little base stone, and then certain areas will have a pad for fall zones. Play units will have clearances, licensed by NJ.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked if there are certain cleaning requirements for that AstroTurf.

Mr. Falzarano stated that it's very easy to be cleaned with a hose. It really is impervious, and it dries very quickly. There's not much maintenance to it. Over years, it will get matted down. It can be raked back up, and it looks like real grass with even a yellow thread thatch in it, which gives authenticity. There's no infill like older AstroTurf. Any separated seams would be stabled back down by the installers.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked about signage for no parking, no idling? Mr. Falzarano stated in front of the front door should be a fire lane, so parents shouldn't park there anyway. We have no additional signage; but we would point out parent drop-off spots on the side. We would be more than happy to come up with something, idling, safety purposes, etc. if necessary.

Mr. Morrow asked if there will be an onsite nurse. Mr. Falzarano stated no. No medication or have the ability to. 24-hour clear of any illnesses, we won't give medication on site. Parents have to come to do it.

Ms. Kolodi asked how many children you anticipate. Mr. Falzarano stated this facility will be just over 10,000sq. ft. and expect a license occupancy of about 170 children. Total of 10 classrooms; the architect will discuss the layout.

Each age group is regulated separately, based on the number of teachers per age group with different ratios. The younger a child, the more teachers in a classroom. The max in any classroom is 20. In a preschool classroom of four- and five-year-olds, that would require two teachers typically if 100% occupied.

Mr. Morrow asked about the finger scan. How many members of a family can have this? Mr. Falzarano stated they have no limitation on it. Must be registered and cleared

with office. Typically mother, father, maybe grandparent, emergency contact like a neighbor maybe.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked if anybody else has any questions.

Mr. Parento asked if there is emergency access to the playground. Mr. Falzarano stated there will be an exit gate on the playground as well, which will have a panic bar on it for immediate notification if opened. That would be the egress from the playground. It's in the rear of this building, so not much traffic if someone was to exit one of those doors.

Mr. Morrow asked about janitorial service. Mr. Falzarano stated there will be a five-day-a-week cleaning service after hours. Typically they wet mop the floors, clean the many bathrooms, and remove the garbage to the dumpster area. The dumpster area is not set. We just ask that it doesn't sit up against the playground but close enough.

Mr. Prime asked that if no further questions, he'd like to turn it over to the professionals to go through the letter. He does have an architect with him for questions about inside looks, classroom layout, or the façade. Mrs. Rovinsky stated that the only question she has, the big gap between the door and the metal frame, her daughter put her hand in there, and the door was shut by a teacher. So there's a thing called an accordion that can go on those type of doors. Mr. Mihalik stated they are finger guards. Each of the doors near children have those accordions on them so children's fingers can be protected.

Mr. Mihalik stated that if you look at the Pennoni letter dated August 29, 2018, Page 2 and B, the truck turning template exhibit needs to be provided to the Fire Marshal for review, just because he hasn't seen it.

Moving to Page 3 and the top of Page 4, Item 3 of the Engineering Review has to do with the previously granted variances which are covered to the Board satisfaction. Good, okay.

Midway down Page 4, Item C, Streets and Parking Lot. There's actually seven items here, and as the engineer who gave testimony spoke of our conversation earlier today, there's only a couple of things outside of what they said they were going to directly comply with that I want to bring to the attention of the Board.

Mr. Tamous stated #3, the railing.

Mr. Mihalik stated yes because we already talked about parking striping. So #3, the indication of a retaining wall outside an existing door, the SE corner of the building, an existing access and a small retaining wall there that could provide a tripping hazard. So I

spoke to the engineer about providing some type of protective railing there, especially if an active access. The wall is 18 inches, 2 ft. off of the sidewalk surface. Just for added protection, putting a railing there, similar to around the playground area, would make sense. Mr. Tamous stated that they are agreeable and will work with the office to coordinate the esthetics of the railing, but they have no objections.

Mr. Mihalik stated #5, they had talked about the pavement repair. Because this is an amended portion of a larger site, what I discussed with the engineer is doing repairs more in the areas with the playground and with access to the building in regards to where there's going to be children being picked up or dropped off to the facility, not just blanket statements saying that you need to repair the whole parking lot.

Mr. Tamous stated that is correct. That area is comprised of south and to the east of the proposed daycare facility, which is roughly the access of 49 spaces. This area will be treated, filled, and restriped. Mrs. Rovinsky asked if you're doing an overlay.

Mr. Mannino stated if there's an area in need of repair, it'll be cut out, repaired, and taken care of in that manner. Otherwise, it'll be seal coated and restriped, just like the main lot. Mrs. Rovinsky stated sectional asphalting. Mr. Prime stated yes.

Mr. Mihalik stated that with the restriping, you just described Rules #6 under Streets and Parking. So you're talking about restriping, just because some of the condition of the hairpin striping is in poor condition. And because of the parking shifting because of the proposed bollards near the playground area, so you're amenable to the restriping the spaces with this particular site.

Expert stated that he was agreeable.

Mr. Mihalik stated that moving on to Page 5, the grating comments under D, Items 1 and 2, speaking with the engineer, he said they will be working with our office to fix any flat areas with draining issues.

In conversation with the design engineer stating that the retaining wall isn't that tall, even near the playground, as long as we're supplied the manufacturer's specifications and the bearing stress of the fill material, we don't have any issue with that as opposed to them making a huge report for a 5,000 sq. ft. area. So if you're amenable to providing those specifications, that'll be great.

Letter E, the storm water collection conveyance system, Page 5. Talking with the engineer, they were talking about providing specific calculations for groundwater recharge, runoff quality/quantity, and total suspended solids. They are in agreeance that this is a developed site. It was fully impervious. The professional asked for things

that would satisfy any of the storm water changes out in site. There is going to be an underdrain system. He asked the engineer for a bit of a capacity analysis. With a 4 ft. pipe around this thing; what can it hold. There's also a stone or DJA base that basically acts like an infiltration envelope. He asked for some calculations on that and how it works hydraulically and then the tie-in to the existing inlet system.

It's not necessary to provide things like groundwater recharge because it's already in an existing, totally impervious area. They're going to be improving upon that a bit because of the infiltration features and the percolation features of a perforated synthetic grass system and the fact that it's going to be layered underneath with stone. Details later.

It covers water quality, removing total suspended solids and asking the engineer to provide in his narrative. Just give direction to the Board – what we're putting together and why we believe it'll serve this new facility. So if everybody's in agreeance to that and combining that. Excellent.

In Items 2 and 3 under Letter E have to do with the existing piping that is under the ground. These plans don't show the roof drain system pipes tie into the existing inlets. It looks like there are pipes coming out. In lieu of digging, provide some type of approximate location because they are putting in an underdrain system. They are putting in a sprinkler feature for the kids. Just need some approximate locations of piping in the parking lot area between the existing inlets north of this playground area and the roof drains that are coming down the side of the building? The pictures show downspouts go underneath the pavement and pipes coming out of the inlets in the direction of the building. So just some approximate locations. After construction, they can look for conflicts underground.

Mr. Prime stated that that's fine. Mr. Mihalik stated if you're amenable to that. Mr. Mannino stated that, yes, we are. Mr. Mihalik stated excellent.

Next, so looking at Page 6, #4 is pretty easy. A couple of the inlets need bicycle safe grates. Simple and you guys said you'd take care of that. This ties into our prior talk, #5 regarding those roof drains and where they tie into any underdrain piping that is leading to the existing inlets. We covered that pretty well, unless the Board has any questions.

Landscaping was already discussed. Lighting, as discussed with the engineer and discussed here in testimony, is that an updated lighting analysis be provided for the playground and then also ingress/egress, kids being dropped off and things like that. Mr. Prime stated that they'd agreed to that in testimony.

Mr. Mihalik stated that utilities, from talking with the engineer, for water, they'd already been in contact with the township about upgrading from a 2" to a 4" service. Is that correct? Everyone agrees. Paperwork needs to be provided for records.

The engineer stated that the architect will provide sanitary sewer flow calculations to show sufficiency and requests that be added to the record. That would be a compliance item.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated to state what it is. Sanitary Sewer Flow Calculation?

Mr. Mihalik stated correct. That's the utilities unless any questions from the Board.

Mr. Catrambone asked if there's a bigger service coming in for water, and we have Joe here, does that impact the amount of water that's going out through the sewer. Does it have the capacity to handle that? You're going from a 2" to a 4" water or supply? It doesn't impact what's going to the sewer?

Mr. Tamous stated that it should not. The way they calculate the sewer flow, it's per sq. ft. per individual and they assign gallon age per individual. It's about 10 gallons per person per day. For sewer it's .1, for water its .125 gallons per sq. ft. So the 4" pipe has a normal capacity. I do not know what the exact number is, but it is a few thousand gallons. And we've done subdivisions with an 8" sewer line that's servicing like 400 homes. So for this environment, it's more than adequate and we will provide the calculations to support that position.

Mr. Mannino states they're not changing the service size. They're just changing the meter size to get more volume.

Mr. Mihalik asks if there are any other question before moving on. Moving to Section H and Item I on Page 7, asking for some testimony in location of the trash enclosure but the recycling and the refuse will be handled onsite, whether private or township. Mr. Prime stated that he would bring the rep back up.

Mr. Falzarano stated that a cleaning company will come in at the end of the day, take the garbage to that refuse. Typically they'll have regular garbage in a 4 cu. yd. dumpster, and that'll get picked up twice a week, prior to opening hours, so prior to 6:30 AM to avoid mingling with customers. A recycling dumpster of about 2 cu. yds. with removal once a week.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked for the location. Mr. Prime stated that he'll turn it over to Ahmad, but that has to be finalized and part of the conformance plans and subject to review by the township engineer. It was not shown on their plans.

Mr. Tamous stated that is not shown on the plan, and because of the site layout and the existing parking, they have limited options on the location of the dumpster. One location considered on the site plan, further from the play area. Needs to be able to accommodate trucks trying to service that area without impact the additional parking. Will work with township engineer to finalize the location. The intent is to provide the dumpster's location that's compliant with the township ordinance. I'm not triggering any additional relief.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked how close the parking ratio to the size on the site is. Not put it against the building, can you move it out.

Mr. Tamous stated one option is eliminating parking spaces here and place the dumpster on an angle. This will allow for easy access. However, that takes away from the existing parking for the site. Mrs. Rovinsky asked if there was a lot of excess parking ratio or not? Ms. Apte stated that she believed not from the approved plans provided. They need 725, and 725 have been provided.

Mr. Tamous stated that is correct and limited options. Need to work with engineer to find an amenable location that works for the tenant, for the owner, and also for the township.

Mr. Prime stated that he was just discussing with his client, in a worst case scenario, if it doesn't work, if we have to take a parking spot or two away, we could probably relocate it elsewhere on site to keep the parking count the same. If needed, that is an option. I'm going to try to avoid it, but it's something that if we need to we can do. So it'll work. You might have to tweak it a little bit.

Mr. Farrelle said the next is fence detail, which the engineer said he could take care of. Pavement detail per the DOT standards, that's fine. The only other thing with the playground, speaking to the engineer about this, is there wasn't a whole lot of detail. You have a synthetic grass layer, 1-1/8" pad, and then crushed stone. Crushed stone could be 6". Crushed stone could be 3/4" or it could be DGA or fines. In his experience from paving, you don't have a good compacted base, you get rutting, shifting. Don't want to see a kids' play surface shifting or low area tripping hazard. Need some testimony on the stability of the infill that's below this development and have details updated.

Mr. Prime stated that they could provide a detail sheet as part of the conformance plan that shows that for your review. Could have testimony too.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated that she's seen those egg crate things, and they're sturdy in itself, and they form a whole platform, and then the grass sits on top of it.

Mr. Farrelle says the detail just says pad, and so any more information we can get to determine the safety and the stability of it and what it's made of and how what's going under that is being compacted, that would be helpful to settle.

Mr. Tamous stated that they'll revise the plan to show as much detail for that area and the way it functions. That's no problem.

Mr. Farrelle says okay. Now Page 7, #4 is the Environmental Review, and we didn't have any issue with the Board granting a waiver for the environmental impact statement in that it is an already fully developed site. Then the approval process, and we touched on some of the outside agency approvals. Unless there's any other questions that I didn't cover.

Mr. Prime stated that he believed, unless the planner tells him otherwise, they attempted to at least address every comment she had in her planning comments #5 and was there anything not addressed in your letter?

Ms. Apte stated that she just had one testimony regarding is there any signage that's being proposed or was it already approved as part of the previous application?

Mr. Prime stated that they are going to propose signage that is permitted by code, so it'll be on the free-standing pylon. They'll have a slot there, two sod signs which they're allowed being a corner with the frontage, and they'll be under the allowable square footage by both. So we're not seeking any higher relief, just whatever's permitted.

Ms. Apte stated that was okay, as long as that was on the record. Thank you. No more outstanding issues.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked if anybody else has any questions at this time.

OPEN TO PUBLIC

Mr. Khinkis made a motion to open to the public. Mr. Catrambone second it.

Motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

We're now in public session. There was no one from the public at this time.

Mr. Khinkis made a motion to close to the public. Mr. Morrow second it.

Motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

CLOSE TO PUBLIC

Mrs. Rovinsky stated these conditions, before us is an application for an Amended Site Plan Approval. The conditions that I have from our conversation is that the Signature Block be added; that we make the North entrance no tractor trailers; that modified parking in the rear that we confirm with the Fire Marshall regarding the turning ratio; additional bollards in the rear; a lighting study evaluation will be done and modified to the Planning Board's Engineer's recommendations; drainage will be reviewed by the Planning Board Engineer; sectional asphalt repairs and perform crack filling and overlay on the area not done; crack filling existing cracks where grass is showing currently; No Idling Zone signage placed on the side of the building; protective railing along the retaining wall; grading and drainage will be looked at & provide information regarding specifications; storm water underdrain system capacity analysis, hydraulics, and tie-in information will be provided to the engineer; provide approximate location of roof drain routing and any context; bicycle safety grates on the inlets; Sanitary Sewer Flow Calculations; dumpster location will be discussed with the engineer approved; and a detail sheet on the grass infill.

Ms. Apte stated that we're to comply with signage.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated to comply with signage.

Ms. Apte stated that the parking located along the southern portion of the playground is to increase to 18 feet.

Mr. Prime stated yes, which brings it back to existing condition. Ms. Apte asked if revised plans for that will be provided. Mr. Prime stated that it'll be showing a revised plan.

Ms. Apte stated there was the license from the State of New Jersey. Mrs. Rovinsky stated New Jersey Children & Family, right. Mr. Prime stated that provided we get a CO first from the township.

Ms. Apte stated that's all she has. Mr. Prime stated thank you.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated that with all of those items listed, did anybody else have any questions, comments? If nothing, asks for motion.

Mr. Morrow made a motion to approve the application with the conditions listed above. Randy seconded it. The results are as follows:

Ayes: Mrs. Rovinsky, Mr. Russell, Mr. Catrambone, Ms. Kolodi,

Mr. Singer, Mr. Morrow, Mr. Hejnas, Mr. Parento, Mr. Khinkis.

Absent: Mr. Cathel

OLD BUSINESS

Mr. Catrambone brought up the township lawsuit from Fair Share Housing regarding their COAH obligation which was constitutionally obligated and with many hours spent in negotiation with both Fair Share Housing who brought the suit and the developers that were involved, one of which being Stellwag and the two interveners.

Counsel did introduce an ordinance as part of the plan to settle this suit with Fair Share Housing based on input from the Special Master deciding the court. The Stellwag property was discussed. An ordinance had been introduced and allows for additional units. It'll include additional COAH units, low to mod units that will be purchased, not rentals. And they will be age restricted, which was a key component; and, fortunately, the township had the ability within our available units to include age restrictive there so that entire development will continue to be age restricted.

Ms. Apte stated there were 111 total, out of which 20 will be affordable set aside.

Mr. Catrambone stated that the number went up about 19 unit's total, something like that, to accommodate the COAH units. So, ultimately, this is part of the plan. Mika who was in the negotiations with myself and the bevy of lawyers that were there, and we found the number he thinks, originally to the public. They had originally requested 1,300 COAH units, and we got it down to 365. It was, in my opinion-

Ms. Johnson stated that she didn't know if that's 1,300?

Mr. Catrambone stated that was their original request was 1,300, Fair Share Housing. There was no number in the suit, I don't believe.

Ms. Johnson stated that she didn't recall that number. Before my time I guess.

Ms. Apte stated that maybe we don't discuss that because the settlement is still not-

Mr. Catrambone stated that because it's not yet, and this is where it gets goofy because in order to get this plan in place, we have to do what we have to do. So the reason we're here tonight is to look at this particular ordinance. It has been reviewed by the engineer and our planner, and I'll ask her for her input on if it complies with the Master Plan and that the Planning Board should take a look at it. Mika & Jen will answer questions, Jen will answer questions legally, and I'll do my best if Jen keeps me in the safe zone.

Jen Johnson, Board Attorney states that she will back this up a little bit. This is for informational purposes only. The PB doesn't get to vote on this. This is done by town counsel, and there was a first reading already. As the PB attorney, this is in line with the

Master Plan as written. We're presenting it for your information and input as much as you'd like, but we don't have a standing to vote on it, just to be clear.

Mr. Catrambone stated that, ultimately, the end result is we just have to allow, based on your legal opinion, allow this board secretary to send a letter to counsel saying our attorney has reviewed the plan and it does comply with the Master Plan.

Mr. Catrambone stated that that was always an age restricted community. From their perspective, they also wanted it age restricted. We had the available credits. It doesn't change anything, but the COAH thing is just a maze that we can walk this through. They didn't want to have age restricted community and basketball hoops on the same street, so they were happy to hear that. We were happy to hear that. It has no impact on the school, and it will continue to have no impact on the school.

Mrs. Rovinsky asked if anyone had any questions. Anything else to bring before the Board tonight?

Mr. Morrow asked if this board has any power to bring a shopping center landlord back in, make requests for some safety things to be put in place? I'm referring to Hartford Corners, in front of Shop Rite. I had brought counsel's attention to a safety issue. There's nothing protecting pedestrians from somebody driving a car up on the sidewalk there. They had some changes to the site without approving years ago, speed bumps in the parking lot. That's not on the original site plan. What options do we have to get something done there?

Mrs. Rovinsky stated you can make them take the speed bumps out.

Ms. Johnson said that the procedure for doing that would be as a resident, you could make a complaint to the Zoning office or the Construction office. Community Affairs and that they would have to investigate that. Then that would trigger and perhaps have to come back. But as a PB, we don't have authority to call people in. But anyone could make that complaint as just someone who happens to go to Shop Rite and see that.

Mrs. Rovinsky stated remember the bank and the LED lighting. That was a separate parcel than the rest of the shopping center because she had issues with the shopping center. So if there's anything unusual in that shopping center if there is anything that goes on in the shopping center, & they have to come before this board, we again have the right under site plan approval to make any recommendations at that time. She had issues with the landscape buffer that's up by H&R Block. When you come out of that Chick-fil-A and you make a left there, you can't see.

Mrs. Rovinsky says it depends how the lease is written. They might be responsible for that area as their own. If that's the case, I can call Mike Dixon, the Operations Manager at that Shop Rite and find out and let you know. He might be able to make a request to the owner.

MINUTES

Minutes from the regular meeting July 12, 2018. Ms. Rovinsky stated we will carry over till next meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Catrambone made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:45, and Ms. Kolodi second it. The results are as follows:

Motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Phillips, Secretary Planning & Zoning