

**TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
PLANNING BOARD
Tuesday, May 28, 2013
Work Session**

The regular work session meeting of the Mansfield Township Planning Board held on the above shown date was called to order at 7:10 p.m. with the following in attendance: Douglas Borgstrom, LaVerne Cholewa (arrived 7:13 p.m.), Robert Higgins (arrived 7:13 p.m.), John Kampo, Gary Lippincott, Scott Preidel, Arthur Puglia, Robert Semptimphelter (arrived 7:18 p.m.), Douglas Walker (arrived 7:18 p.m.) and Michelle L. Gable, Secretary. Also present were Charles Petrone, Louis Glass, Harry McVey, Robert Stout and Michael Angelastro.

The following agenda items were discussed:

Application Number PB13-01PSP,GDP, V: NAK Realty c/o American Properties Realty, Inc., Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01 and Block 4 Lots 6.01 & 7:

Harry McVey said he has no concerns at this time and noted that Robert Stouts' report goes into the waivers that are being requested. They are only requesting Preliminary and General Development Plan approval and will most likely have to amend the Preliminary down the road, which may trigger additional variances. He then reviewed the standards of what is permitted on each side of Route 206.

Robert Stout said he has no issues with completeness.

Mr. McVey noted there were enough open issues that they do not want the public hearing in June. They are looking at July or August.

A question was raised about the DEP regarding fencing around the basins. It was noted that this can be addressed during the public hearing and not during completeness.

Mr. McVey advised that Mr. Litwornia has a conflict. Therefore, Michael Angelastro will act as the Traffic Consultant for this application.

Application Number 2013-02CU,PFSP: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T), Block 45.01, Lot 2.02:

Louis Glass said they are proposing three (3) new antennas at 130' and two (2) equipment cabinets to the existing facility noting that he has no problems or issues.

There being no further discussion, the work session was closed and the regular meeting was called to order.

Regular Meeting

The regular meeting of the Mansfield Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Preidel at 7:28 P.M. on the above shown date followed by the Flag Salute and the following opening statement:

The notice requirements provided for in the 'Open Public Meetings Act' have been satisfied. Notice of this meeting was properly given in the annual notice, which was adopted by the Mansfield Township Planning Board on January 28, 2013. Said resolution was published in the Burlington County Times on February 1, 2013, e-mailed to the Burlington County Times, Trenton Times, and Register News, filed with the Clerk of the Township of Mansfield, posted on the official bulletin board at the Municipal Complex, filed with the members of this body, and mailed to each person who has requested copies of the regular meeting schedule and who has prepaid any charge fixed for such service. All the mailing, posting and filing having been accomplished on January 29, 2013.

Also notice was published in the Burlington County Times on Sunday, May 26, 2013 changing the location of the meeting as well as notification via e-mail to the Burlington County Times, Trenton Times, the Register News, the Clerk of the Township of Mansfield, the members of this body, each person who has requested copies of regular meeting schedules, posted on the official bulletin board at the Municipal Complex and to anyone who has prepaid any charge fixed for such service with all the e-mailing and posting being accomplished on May 24, 2013.

ROLL CALL:

Board Members: Douglas Borgstrom, LaVerne Cholewa, Robert Higgins, John Kampo, Gary

Lippincott, Scott Preidel, Arthur Puglia, Robert Semptimphelter and Douglas Walker.

Professional Staff: Charles Petrone, Solicitor; Louis Glass and Harry McVey, Planners; Michael Angelastro, Traffic Engineer and Robert Stout, Engineer.

Public Comments:

Chairman Preidel opened the public comments portion of the meeting on non-agenda items.

Hearing no public comments **Chairman Preidel** closed the public comments portion of the meeting.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDER BY THE BOARD:

Application Number PB13-01PSP,GDP, V: NAK Realty c/o American Properties Realty, Inc., Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01 and Block 4 Lots 6.01 & 7:

Chairman Preidel introduced this Application for Preliminary Site Plan, General Development Plan and Variance to develop on both sides of Route 206, to contain a total of 398,930 square feet (SF) of retail space within several buildings. Development to the east of Route 206 will consist of approximately 362,335 SF of retail space, with the remaining 31,826 SF of retail space and 4,769 SF convenience store with gas station located west of Route 206 located at Route 206/Aaronson Road in the C-2 Highway Commercial Zoning District.

Chairman Preidel then turned the meeting over to Vice Chairman Semptimphelter as he has a conflict of interest as he has a piece of property that abuts this property.

TESTIMONY:

Michael J. Gross from the Law Firm of Giordano, Halleran & Ciesla was present representing the applicant. He advised Fred Coco from Menlo Engineering will testify on completeness this evening.

Solicitor Petrone swore in Mr. Coco to give testimony on this application.

Mr. Coco gave his qualifications stating he is the President of Menlo Engineering Associates. They are a Civil Engineering Firm located in the Central New Jersey area. He is a Professional Engineer, Land Surveyor and Planner for 30 years. He has presented applications before Boards such as the Planning Board for residential, commercial developments through out the State and his office takes care of permitting through the County and State agencies to gain land approval permits.

Mr. Gross asked Mr. Coco if he is a familiar with the report received from Stout & Caldwell Engineers dated May 16, 2013. **Mr. Coco** responded yes. **Mr. Gross** asked are there some items that Mr. Stout has requested testimony on. **Mr. Coco** said yes and these are items they were seeking either variances or waivers from and for completeness purposes he described to the Board in general what they are seeking. Page 3. Item 12 under completeness indicates they must provide a statement in writing regarding the variances and waivers they are seeking. They are going to be seeking waivers or variances from the design standards on parking. One of the issues is they are proposing to use 9' x 18' parking stalls where the ordinance requires 9 ½' x 18'. They are going to provide 9 ½' wide parking spaces in the immediate frontage of the two large boxes but the remainder of the site they would like to propose 9' x 18'. They are going to provide testimony about other standards that being throughout the Country for the 9' stalls but that is one of the waivers they will be seeking and they will provide information for the Board to consider at the hearing. The second is the number of parking spaces that they are seeking for the large portion of the development on the East side of Route 206. Based on some investigative work in the ordinance done by the Planners it has been deemed that the site on the East side of Route 206 is going to be deemed a shopping center and under the shopping center category under the C-1 Zone is requires 5 ½ parking spaces for every 1,000 square feet of space. They applied

for the 5 parking spaces for 1,000 square feet that is outlined elsewhere in the ordinance for retail and again they are going to provide the Board with information and testimony regarding that request to get some relief from that section of the ordinance. Finally, on the shopping center portion, the East, the larger parcel of property being developed there is a requirement that parking aisles be no closer than 50 feet to a side yard. They have one property line they are going to ask for relief from that standard in one area only where they abut another property that will be developed commercially. Those are the three (3) waivers and variances they will be discussing in further detail when they get through the Planning Board. **Mr. Gross** asked if that also covers Item 22 on page 4 of 6. **Mr. Coco** responded yes. **Mr. Gross** said the next item is 29 where Mr. Stout requests testimony with respect to any protective covenants and deed restrictions. **Mr. Coco** said yes, item 14 on page 3. They are not aware of any prior approvals or development proposals for this property. Again they will put that on the record at the public hearing. **Mr. Gross** said the next item is 34 on page 4. **Mr. Coco** said the delineation of the floodplain and per the FEMA Insurance rate map. It indicates that this could be a condition but they just wanted to indicate to the Board that on the East side of the development there is a flood hazard area. The permit has been received and they are utilizing that to establish the flood plain on that side and they are similarly applying to the DEP for the flood plain on the west side of the property on both sides of the road. The FEMA has one set of criteria they use. The DEP in this case is actually a little more stringent and they will show both at the time they come back for Public Hearing. **Mr. Gross** said on Page 5 Item 48 Mr. Stout requests testimony with respect to the slow groups. **Mr. Coco** said Items #48, 49 and 50 all sort of tie together. There are requirements for doing a drainage analysis in accordance with the DEP standards that they measure the percolation-graded velocity of the soils. Once they are below a certain level the introduction or re-infiltration of water back into the subsurface is no longer required. In this specific case, the soils are poor from that standpoint. They do not have a very good perc rate, they had provided soil information and they will go into that in further detail with some additional testimony at the time of the hearing but the permeability rates on the site are very, very low, so they will not be providing the recharge because there is none today essentially. **Mr. Gross** said Item #57 requests testimony on the tractor-trailer circulation. **Mr. Coco** said they will have a traffic engineer provide testimony about how they anticipate deliveries will be made to the different buildings within the site. They will also provide a plan that indicates the wheel track of the larger vehicles that will be using the site to prove they can negotiate and maneuver around the site properly. **Mr. Gross** said with respect to the other requests from Mr. Stout that he does not request testimony, does Mr. Coco agree to provide all those items. **Mr. Coco** said yes as a number of the items are/is a request to provide or a direction to provide additional information, which they will provide or make applications to other agencies, which they will be doing as well and other changes or what not that he is requesting that they have agreed to make and they will provide him with revised plans. **Mr. Gross** said there is also a completeness letter from Mr. Glass' office and noted he has not asked for testimony on any of the items. **Mr. Coco** said Mr. Glass' office went into the description of the regarding the designation of the retail versus the shopping center designation and noting they will go through that in further detail at the time they provide their testimony to the Board.

PROFESSIONAL STAFF:

Harry McVey, Planner, referred to their report dated May 1, 2013 and as Mr. Stout will get into in more detail, they had no concerns or issues with deeming this application complete for Preliminary only. He wanted the Board to be aware that there are no architectures, there are no floor plans, and there are no tenants associated with this application, which is not unusually in this day and age for Preliminary approval. It becomes a great deal easier for the Developer to then market to specific tenants at that time. However, for the Boards perspective, the aesthetics

of the Center are certainly going to be very critical and we are going to want to see a coordinated effort in the aesthetics, the facades of the building and the signage, which will all come later. It also relates to the operations of the site. Each of the tenants especially in the big boxes have different ways of setting up their business, truck traffic, outdoor sales, patio sales, etc., they are trying to corroborate as much as they can at this point with the understanding that when an individual tenant comes in an amended preliminary approval could be required and amended variances could also be required. It is not the case here and it is just a caveat that what may happen. The last item had to do with the Zoning that was already discussed. It is a completeness issue because retail sales in general allow gas stations and planned shopping centers do not. This project needs to be looked as two separate distinct projects. The West side is the much smaller center. It has the characteristics of a neighborhood type of center. It is not the type of impact that the ordinance was geared to. The ordinance is geared so the larger scale projects that have the impacts beyond the borders of Mansfield Township. The East side is clearly the larger of the two. You have the big boxes, you have a number of restaurants, you have some additional retail, this is going to have the type of impacts that the Ordinance really had in mind. It is going to be drawing from up and down 206 from a much larger market area and as such he is comfortable basically looking at the proposal, looking at our ordinance, looking at some of the standard definitions used in the State of New Jersey and making a recommendation that the West side be deemed to be retail use and be reviewed and analyzed according to the retail standards and that the East side (big box area) be reviewed and analyzed according to the standards for a planned community shopping center. That puts the uses before this Board and he is comfortable making that recommendation.

Michael Angelastro, Traffic Engineer has not comments at this time as he has not had the chance to review the plans.

Robert Stout, Engineer referred to his report dated May 6, 2013. They did coordinator with Mr. Glass' office and Mr. Coco did outline the testimony that they needed for deeming it complete. Most of the other information is technical in nature and it can be done as part of the preliminary and is not necessary for completeness review. Therefore, in his opinion this can be deemed complete.

BOARD COMMENTS:

Arthur Puglia is concerned with the width of the parking spots because we are looking at stores that have shopping carts. He is going to take his tape measure and measure parking spaces in businesses that he visits and see which would meet the be criteria.

Douglas Walker questioned the entrance and egress to the site as the shopping center in Princeton is a nightmare to getting in and out of. **Mr. Coco** said they have an application filed with the DOT as they are proposing to signalize the intersection. They think they have adequate number of lanes and storage to address peak traffic and they have planned for an alternate emergency access proposal and they will address this at the public hearing.

Vice Chairman Semptimphelter asked if they are complying with the parking standards. **Mr. McVey** said there will be variances at this point unless they can convince them to make some changes.

LaVerne Cholewa asked when it comes to parking that the applicant consider the number of seniors that live in Mansfield.

MOTION FOR COMPLETENESS:

A motion was offered by **Douglas Borgstrom** and duly second by **LaVerne Cholewa** to deem Application Number PB13-01PSP, GDP, V: NAK Realty c/o American Properties Realty, Inc., Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01 and Block 4 Lots 6.01 & 7 complete. The motion carried on a roll call vote taken as follows:

AYE: Borgstrom, Cholewa, Higgins, Lippincott, Puglia, Semptimphelter, Walker
NAYE: None
NOT VOTING: Kampo

Mr. Gross said they anticipate receiving technical comments from the Board Professionals hopefully by the end of next week. Therefore, they would like some time to digest those comments, possibly make some changes on the plans as they do not plan to be back in June and hopefully be on the July agenda noting they will coordinate with the Board Secretary.

Solicitor Petrone requested a letter extending through the public hearing date. **Mr. Gross** said sure.

Vice Chairman Semptimphelter left the meeting at 7:50 p.m. and **Chairman Preidel** returned to the meeting.

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING:

Application Number 2013-02CU, PFSP: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T), Block 45.01, Lot 2.02:

Chairman Preidel introduced this application for Conditional Use, Preliminary and Final Site Plan to add three antennas and related equipment to the existing six antennas at 130' on an existing tower with an addition of two equipment cabinets to the existing compound located at 22295 Columbus Road in the ODL Zoning District.

TESTIMONY:

Judy Fairweather from Day Pitney was present on behalf of AT&T. The applicant currently six antennas on a 220-foot lattice tower at a height of 132 feet. They are requesting to add three antennas and two equipment cabinets on an existing concrete pad, which is located at the base of the tower with no expansion to the compound.

Solicitor Petrone said as they are dealing with a co-location everything has to be demonstrated by the applicant and then asked Ms. Fairweather to have the witnesses put their credentials on the record, give their conclusion and reserve for the applicant additional testimony if there are members of the public or the Board who have questions.

Solicitor Petrone swore in Brock Riffel, Radio Frequency Engineer for the application to give testimony on this application.

Mr. Riffel has a Bachelors of Science in Electrical Engineering from Drexel University, he has roughly sixteen years design experience and Radio Frequency for Verizon, AT&T, Clearwire and has testified roughly in 300 municipal hearings across New Jersey and Pennsylvania.

Ms. Fairweather then offered Mr. Riffel as their expert in the field of Radio Frequency Engineering and then asked Mr. Riffel if they upgrade the site from 3G to 4G and they are allowed to add the three antennas will they be able to handle the sophistication of the site, the data and the amount of traffic that the site gets. **Mr. Riffel** said that is correct.

Solicitor Petrone swore Antonio Gualtieri, Engineer for the applicant to give testimony on this application.

Mr. Gualtieri is a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of New Jersey. He has been with Tectonic Engineering as a Senior Vice President and has been with the Firm for 21 years. **Ms. Fairweather** asked if Tectonic was response for the plans that are before the Board this evening. **Mr. Gualtieri** said correct. She then asked Mr. Gualtieri that they are adding three antennas to the existing tower at the same centerline as the existing antennas and two equipment

cabinets on the existing cement pad. **Mr. Gualtieri** said correct. **Ms. Fairweather** then asked if Mr. Gualtieri was able to review the structure and the tower can handle the addition of the three antennas. **Mr. Gualtieri** said correct. **Ms. Fairweather** referred to a review letter that was received from one of the Board professionals, asking Mr. Gualtieri if there is no proposed outdoor storage, no additional lighting, no proposed additional signage, do the number of visits to the site change and will there be any additional noise generated from the site pursuant to the two new cabinets. **Mr. Gualtieri** said no to all of the above asked by Ms. Fairweather.

Solicitor Petrone swore in Peter Tolischus, Planner for the applicant to give testimony on this application.

Mr. Tolischus is a Professional Planner Licensed in the State of New Jersey for over 40 years and in the last 15 years he has handled some 300 cellular applications in the Tri-State area primarily New Jersey. **Ms. Fairweather** asked Mr. Tolischus if they were here for a conditional use, which means they meet the conditions in ordinance and therefore the Board just needs to grant the conditional use. **Mr. Tolischus** answered correct. **Ms. Fairweather** asked Mr. Tolischus aesthetically adding the three small antennas to the 220-foot tower does it matter. **Mr. Tolischus** said he had to put arrows on the picture to indicate where the new antennas are added otherwise you would not even notice it.

PROFESSIONAL COMMENTS:

Louis Glass, Planner referred to his report dated May 8, 2013. This is an existing tower in the Office Distribution Laboratory District. He indicates on page 1 they are going to add three antennas and two cabinets at ground level on the existing cell tower, which is next to the Vanco facility. They are requesting three waivers from checklist "A". To not submit that all prior approvals have been satisfied, not to submit easement documents for drainage and not to make a submission to the Environmental Commission. They are also asking on checklist "B" waivers on eighteen (18) different items most of which are engineering in nature because the checklist was developed to gather information when an applicant wants to convert a vacant site into a developed site but this site is already developed so most of these checklist items are not applicable. Therefore, he has no problem with all of the eighteen (18) items that they are requesting. Item E on page 3 we do have in a zoning ordinance a set of standards for cell towers and it basically falls into two categories, which are existing cell towers and applications for new cell towers. He references the section of the ordinance that is applicable to existing cell towers. The first is subsection C1 it indicates that cell towers are permitted as a conditional use in all non-residential zoning districts. Since this is in an ODL district it automatically is a conditional use so the Planning Board has to consider granting approval for a conditional use for them to put the three antennas on the tower. Subsection C3a1 for existing towers the first priority location shall be collocation on existing towers. The ordinance promotes putting new antennas on existing towers rather than building new towers. Therefore, the application fits the objective that is set forth in the tower ordinance. Site Plan Design: The three antennas right now there are existing antennas on the tower at a height of 132 feet. When they install the new antennas, they are going one foot higher. He indicated in his report they should submit the existing height of the entire tower because the antennas are going midway on the tower. He wants the Board to be aware that there is 87 feet of existing tower that is not being used. The antennas themselves one is 72 inches high and the other two are 96 inches high. The cabinets they have an LTE cabinet, there is at the base of the tower several supporting poles and what they are going to do is clamp one of the new cabinets onto the pole that exists at the ground level noting they are small cabinets measuring 27 x 25 x 30. The second cabinet an Argus cabinet is going to sit on the ground measuring 30 x 25 x 72 with plenty of ground area remaining within the fenced compound to accommodate the cabinets. Item G he noted the applicant submitted a five-page

addendum addressing the positive and negative criteria because under a conditional use they are required to submit negative and positive criteria to justify the application. They submitted a number of photos inserting the new antennas into the photos from various locations and he indicated that was appropriate and they should submit the height of the whole tower, which they did at 220 feet. He did inspect the site and found it was quite wooded and there was no need for any further landscaping on the site. He took no exception to the list of requested waivers because they are not applicable to existing developed sites and he reviewed the photos, structural and electromagnetic reports and had not comments on them. His concluding comment was he takes no exception for the positive and negative criteria statements presented by the applicant to support this application.

Robert Stout, Engineer referred to his report dated May 10, 2013 stating as Mr. Glass outlined there are a significant number of waivers for completeness, which are engineering in nature for a new tower and he has no problem with waiving any of these and he is okay with deeming it complete. As far as his comments it is an existing tower, there are no changes from the site plan portion and they did provide testimony on his items that were required.

BOARD COMMENTS:

Chairman Preidel asked when they do the engineering do they account for the weight of the cables. **Mr. Gualtieri** said the structural analysis addresses all the loading on the structure.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Chairman Preidel opened the public hearing on this application. Hearing no comments the public hearing was closed.

SOLICITOR'S COMMENTS:

Solicitor Petrone said this is a motion for conditional approval as well as preliminary and final site plan for the collocation of three additional antennas to supplement the six existing that the applicant has on the tower at a height of 133 feet subject to the comments contained in the review letters of the Board Engineer and the Board Planner and the applicant applying for and receiving the necessary permits before the antennas go up and the cabinets get installed.

MOTION FOR APPROVAL:

A motion was offered by **Douglas Walker** and duly second by **Douglas Borgstrom** to grant approval to **Application Number 2013-02CU,PFSP: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T), Block 45.01, Lot 2.02** for Conditional Use, Preliminary and Final Site Plan to collocate three additional antennas to supplement the six existing that the applicant has on the tower at a height of 133 feet and two equipment cabinets subject to the comments contained in the review letters of the Board Engineer and Board Planner located at 22295 Columbus Road in the ODL Zoning District. The motion carried on a roll call vote taken as follows:

Aye: Borgstrom, Cholewa, Higgins, Lippincott, Preidel, Puglia, Walker
Naye: None
Absent: Semptimphelter
Not Voting: Kampo

Resolution Number 2013-05-08

(A copy of the foregoing Resolution is spread on the following pages.)

Ms. Fairweather asked if it was possible if before they adopt the Resolution that they can submit their building permit application knowing they will proceed at their own risk. **Solicitor Petrone** said the applicant is aware and has stated for the record that if they do submit in proceed prior to the expiration of the appeals period they do so at their own risk.

**RESOLUTION NUMBER 2013-05-07
MANSFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
AMENDMENT TO ANNUAL MEETING NOTICE**

WHEREAS, the Mansfield Township Planning Board adopted Resolution Number 2013-01-01 "Annual Meeting Notice", and

WHEREAS, the Mansfield Township Municipal Offices have relocated to 3135 Route 206, Columbus, New Jersey, and

WHEREAS, the Annual Meeting Notice must be amended in accordance with the "Open Public Meetings Act".

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Mansfield Township Planning Board, assembled in a public session on Tuesday, May 28, 2013, amend the "Annual Meeting Notices" as follows:

The Planning Board hereby designates the following dates as the dates of its regular meetings until the next reorganization meeting of the Mansfield Township Planning Board on Monday, January 27, 2014, and unless otherwise modified by Resolution of the Planning Board, there will be a work session meeting beginning at 7:00 P.M. immediately followed by the regular meeting. All meetings shall be held in the **Mansfield Township Municipal Complex, 3135 Route 206, Suite 2, Columbus, New Jersey.**

WORK SESSION AND REGULAR MEETINGS

June 24, 2013	October 28, 2013
July 22, 2013	November 25, 2013
August 26, 2013	December 16, 2013
September 23, 2013	January 27, 2014 -- Reorganization

A motion was offered by **Douglas Borgstrom** and duly second by **LaVerne Cholewa** to adopt Resolution Number 2013-05-07. The motion carried on a roll call vote taken as follows:

Aye: Borgstrom, Cholewa, Higgins, Kamp, Lippincott, Preidel, Puglia, Walker
Naye: None
Absent: Semtimphelter

REQUEST FOR APPROVAL OF ATTENDING CLASS TO KEEP CERTIFICATION:

Michelle Gable, Secretary to the Board is requesting the Planning Boards permission to attend the 13th Annual Current Issues in Planning & Zoning Conference to earn credits to maintain her current Certification as Planning Board/Zoning Board Secretary.

Chairman Preidel said we do not do bills and we are sending this to the Township Committee for approval. **Secretary Gable** noted the fee is \$199.00 to attend. **Chairman Preidel** said we do not do bills here as far as paying them for the Board Secretary. All we can do is make a recommendation. **Mr. Higgins** said a Committeeperson questioned and wanted the Planning and Zoning Board to approve it. There is some differentiation between what the Township Committee is suppose to do and what the Planning Board does. They can appoint professionals and things like that so one Committeeperson questioned it and we would just like to know that you are all on favor of it before they spend the funds. **Chairman Preidel** said he is looking for a motion for a recommendation to send it to the Township Committee. **Mr. Walker** asked if it includes meals. **Secretary Gable** said they do have food. **Ms. Cholewa** asked if the Secretary if she takes a Township car. **Secretary Gable** said in the past she has used her own vehicle. **Ms. Cholewa** asked if she gets reimbursed. **Secretary Gable** said no. **Ms. Cholewa** said I think you should. **Mr. Walker** said it should not cost her any money to use her own car. **Chairman Preidel** said they would put that in the recommendation.

A motion was offered by **Douglas Borgstrom** and duly second by **Douglas Walker** to approve the class and any reimbursable expenses to attend the class. Motion carried.

Chairman Preidel clarified this is a recommendation as the Planning Board does not approve expenditures.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was offered by **Douglas Borgstrom** and duly second by **Douglas Walker** to

approve the minutes of **February 24, 2013 Regular & Joint Special Meeting with the Township Committee**. **Chairman Preidel** abstained, as he was not present at the meeting. Motion carried.

ACCEPT, RECORD & FILE CORRESPONDENCE:

A motion was offered by **Douglas Borgstrom** and duly second by **Douglas Walker** to accept, record and file the correspondence as submitted. Motion carried.

Louis Glass Associates

- 1 Date: May 1, 2013
Re: NAK Realty – Promenade at Mansfield
Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01; Block 4, Lots 6.01 & 7
Route 206 – Completeness Review
- 2 Date: May 8, 2013
Re: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T)
Block 45.01, Lot 2.02 - 22295 Columbus Road – Zoning District ODL
Proposed Conditional Use, Preliminary & Final Site Plan

Litwornia Associates

- 3 Date: May 22, 2013
Re: NAK Realty – Promenade at Mansfield
Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01; Block 4, Lots 6.01 & 7
Conflict of Interest
- 4 Date: May 13, 2013
Re: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T)
Site: Sharp NJL03350
Block 45.01, Lot 2.02 – 22295 Columbus Road
No Traffic Impact – No traffic review required
- 5 Date: May 13, 2013
Re: Manheim Remarketing, Inc.
Block 3, Lot 2 – Demolition Project
No Traffic Impact – No traffic review required

Stout & Caldwell Engineers

- 6 Date: May 6, 2013
Re: NAK Realty – The Promenade at Mansfield
Preliminary Site Plan – Completeness Review
Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01; Block 4, Lots 6.01 & 7
- 7 Date: May 10, 2013
Re: New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC
Block 45.01, Lot 2.02 – 22295 Columbus Road

Burlington County Planning Board, John A. Engle, PE, PP, Planning Board Engineer

- 8 Date: April 29, 2013
Re: New Cingular Wireless – Sharp Site Plan
Mansfield Twp. – Block 45.01, Lot 2.02
Application found to be deficient
- 9 Date: April 3, 2013
Re: NAK Realty – Promenade at Mansfield Site Plan
Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01; Block 4, Lots 6.01 & 7
Route 206 & Aaronson Road

Burlington County Soil Conservation District

- 10 Date: March 20, 2013
Re: Community Swimming Pool Deck Redevelopment
Block 42.02, Lot 37 (Homestead Clubhouse)
Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan Certified
- 11 Date: May 9, 2013
Re: Great Northeastern Enterprises
Block 28, Lot 49.07
Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan Certified

NAK Realty

- Date: March 12, 2013
- 12 Re: Freshwater Wetlands Permit Application Notification Letter

13 Re: Flood Hazard Area Permit Application Notification Letter

Stout & Caldwell Engineers

14 Date: May 13, 2013

Re: The Promenade at Mansfield
Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01; Block 4, Lots 6.01 & 7
Environmental Review

NJPO

15 Date: January/February 2013

16 Date: March/April 2013

Re: The New Jersey Planner

BILL LIST:

Litwornia Associates

Great Northeastern Inv.#9048 \$ 11.50

Raymond Coleman Heinold & Norman, LLP

Blue Sky (Tindall) Inv.#14432 \$ 28.00

NAK Realty Inv.#14561 \$ 119.00

New Cingular Inv.#14070 \$ 133.00

Stout & Caldwell Engineers

Bright View Inv.#MPB-12-001-0003 \$ 93.75

NAK Realty Inv.#MPB-11-003-0001 \$3,012.50

A motion was offered by **Douglas Walker** and duly second by **LaVerne Cholewa** to approve the bill list as submitted. The motion carried on a roll call vote taken as follows:

AYE: Borgstrom, Cholewa, Higgins, Kambo, Lippincott, Preidel, Puglia, Walker

NAYE: None

ABSENT: Semptimphelter

NEXT MEETING DATE:

It was noted that the next regular meeting will be held on Monday, June 24, 2013.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:

There being no further business a motion was offered by **Douglas Walker** and duly second by **LaVerne Cholewa** to adjourn the meeting at 8:12 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Michelle L. Gable, Secretary

Approval