



Founded 1688

Township of Mansfield

- County of Burlington -

PLANNING BOARD
3135 Route 206, Suite 1
Columbus, New Jersey 08022

Sheri L Hannah, Secretary
(609)298-3629
Phone: (609)298-0542, Ext. 1025

Fax:

E-mail: landuse@mansfieldtwp-nj.com

MANSFIELD TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD

MINUTES

Monday, September 23, 2013

WORK SESSION

WORK SESSION MEETING: 7:00 P.M.

REGULAR MEETING

The regular meeting was called to order at 7:34PM.

FLAG SALUTE:

OPENING STATEMENT:

Read by the Secretary

ROLL CALL:

Planning Board Members:

Present: Douglas Borgstrom, LaVerne Cholewa, Robert Higgins, John Kampo, Scott Preidel, Arthur Puglia, Robert Semptimphelter,

Absent: Gary Lippincott and Douglas Walker

Professionals:

Charles Petrone, ESQ, Louis Glass, Harry McVey – Planners; Robert R. Stout – Engineer;

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

No comment from the public

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE BOARD:

NEW BUSINESS:

COMPLETENESS & PUBLIC HEARING:

Application Number PB13-05PMJ: Sta-Seal, Inc – Block 66, Lot 8:

Application for Preliminary Major Subdivision to subdivide to separate the existing office and garage onto a new lot.

Location: 5205 Route 130
Zoning District: High Industrial
Application Filed: June 17, 2013
Deemed Complete: August 26, 2012
PUBLIC HEARING

(Formal Official Action Maybe Taken)

Mr. Gross, Attorney for the applicant, Stay Seal, advised his clients his clients would take too long to be heard so requested to be adjourned until October, 28.

Mr. Semptimphelter made a motion to adjourn Application PB13-05PMJ until the October 28, 2013 meeting and Mr. Puglia Seconded.

Voted in the Affirmative: Douglas Borgstrom, LaVerne Cholewa, Robert Higgins, John Kampo, Scott Preidel, Arthur Puglia, Robert Semptimphelter,

Application Number PB13-06APFSP, V: Homestead Plaza II Corp. – Block 42.30, Lot 151:

Application to Amend Preliminary & Final Site Plan with Variances to erect two pylon signs.

Location: 23200 Columbus Road

Zoning District: C-1

Application Filed: July 22, 2013

Deemed Complete: August 26, 2013

PUBLIC HEARING

(Formal Official Action Maybe Taken)

Mike Maubaer, Attorney for the applicant. Mr. Maubaer stated that the applicant wishes to construct two signs at entrance of Homestead Plaza. He also states that this will require variances for size and number of signs.

Mike Maubaer testified about the size of the signs. He stated that the signs will be 14 feet in height and 4 foot at the base of the signs.

Bob Higgins excused himself, has client in shopping center.

Because of split rail fence and shrubbery there the signs would need to be that large the signs are not in right-of-way but on the property. They have existing sign which says name and address of development. Mr. Laino also stated that major corporations are hesitant to come without sign on street. With there being 18 stores that is the need for 2 signs because 1 sign only holds 8 ads.

Lou Glass, Mr. Glass reviewed his letter dated August 13, 2013. He spoke of the stipulation of settlement resulting in resolution that this comes under uses in C-1 zone. The two sections where they are requesting signs would require two variances. Mr. Glass also requested testimony on tenant change and how that would be handled. Mr. Laino stated that the landlord responsible for who gets name on sign. Mr. Glass testified that this is typical signs found in Burlington County, 8 signs are standard. Mr. Glass recommended all his items become condition of approval. Applicant should explain why two signs are needed. One is 100 feet from entrance. Other is 140 feet from Fieldcrest Drive.

Bob Stout reviewed his letter dated August 7, 2013. Mr. Stout Stated that he got a response letter dated August 16, 2013 stated that most of Engineering has been addressed. The only comment is that if one sign is placed in the basin that a letter from their engineer stating the sign does not affect the basin be submitted.

Opened Public.

No comment from the public

Mr. Semptimfelter questioned the need for 2 signs? Mr. Laino stated so that all stores can be advertized.

Mr. Semptimphelter made a motion to approve, variance to permit 2 free standing signs, sign area 8 x 10, 4 foot stone base, subject to comply with original site plan and memo from Lou Glass and a letter from their engineer that functionality of basin will not affected, Ms.

Borgstrom Seconded.

John Kampo asked about the light of the sign. Mr. Laino stated that the signs do not light up but there be a light shining on it at ground level.

Voted in the Affirmative: Douglas Borgstrom, LaVerne Cholewa, John Kampo, Scott Preidel, Arthur Puglia, Robert Semptimphelter,

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:

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.

Location: Route 206/Aaronson Road
Zoning District: C-2 Highway Commercial
Application Filed: March 20, 2013
(Formal Official Action Maybe Taken)

Continuation of hearing from last meeting. Mr. Preidel excused himself from board because his property is adjacent to this property, Vice Chairman, Mr. Semptimphelter took over.

Michael Gross, Attorney for the applicant stated that the applicant is proposing to construct several retail buildings on both sides of Route 206. The Block is 3, Lots 5.01 and 10.01 and also Block 4, Lots 6.01 and 7.

These areas are located in the C2, Highway Commercial Zone.

Norman Dotti, Acoustics Expert.

Mr. Dotti studied the proposed use and assessed the potential for making sound according to State of NJ. The State sets limits on sound according to time of day.

Exhibit A2, Put devices out for two days measuring the sound levels. (Devices set out around the property).

Part 1 is to find out what are the existing sounds. Part II use data that he has for sounds. Data available on what type of roof top equipment such as air conditioning. Spoke of terrain, frequency, objects in the way.

Exhibit: A6. The overall sound - computer generated map where he super imposed different sound levels on top of the buildings. out or below 50db (decibels). The applicant is planning a solid fence in addition to the berm which will also keep sound down.

Exhibit, A-7. Sound level diagram.

Mr. Dottie stated that unloading is quiet operation. The trailer is backed in and the opening is sealed up. In his opinion and experience, it will comply as it has to comply. The noise regulation is a performance standard and has to be met. John Kampo stated that diesel trucks can't be shut off and they have to continuously run. Mr. Dottie testified that they do shut them down because of EP regulations. There are no idling signs which can be enforced. Shutting down truck for half hour will not prevent them from starting.

Mr. Semptimphelter asked if there were 50 decibels and adds another 50 decibels, that makes 53 decibels and would that fall within the state requirements? Mr. Dottie said yes.

Mr. Bernard, he had testified as to the fiscal impact. Mr. Bernard said this will create \$1 and 1/2 million dollars in taxes. This will mean 1.25 million for the Township and School. This will be about a 30% increase from what is expected to be collected this year.

Mr. Bernard spoke of a GDP plan. This allows for the board to approve a concept plan with understanding the applicant must provide more detail. This plan will require many years to build out. Each step needs approval. Board will always get the detail it needs to protect the public.

Exhibit A-8 "Findings for Planned Development" and read it in its entirety.

Bob Higgins, spoke of assessed values as being 35 million but now it is 50. Mr. Higgins questioned the amount the municipality would get. He was told about 200,000 and the school would get a million.

Kenneth R. Grisewood, Landscape architect.

Mr. Grisewood stated that the applicant met with residents 3 times and was present for two of them. His responsibilities for this project are the overall landscape design. Primary focus was dealing with screening and buffering from adjacent property owners. When they met they discussed alternatives to enhance the area. The goal was to identify the residents concerns and address alternatives and techniques. They initiated significant enhancements and met again with residents to see if enhancements addressed their concerns.

Mr. Grisewood referred back to exhibits that were introduced previously. Started with the west side. He referred to exhibit A-4. He spoke of the number and type of trees. Spoke of A-3, east side of project. Spoke of number and type of trees; these were on the original plan. He also spoke of existing trees along side of road...

Exhibit A-9 Aaronson Road, plus development to the East and their plans to the West.

Mr. Grisewood spoke of the topography, including the elevation, they depressed the building elevations. Between the buildings and Aaronson Road is a retaining wall. After meeting with residents the second time, they were concerned that the retaining wall was leveling off. The setbacks of their buildings are over two times the Township requirements. After meeting with residents the second time, they went back and enhanced the plan.

Exhibit A-10. Enhanced plan. They addressed the retaining wall which originally was tapered, now it won't be tapered, they did this by raising the berm on the North and South side. Because new landscaping will be spaced apart to allow growth, they have added a fence. They have planned a cluster approach of trees to give a natural look. It will be a solid row of evergreens. He said they have made a substantial buffer. Their approach is a multi-tiered buffer.

Exhibit- A-11 - blow up of the landscape plan, Entitled Landscape Buffer Plan.

Referred back to A-10 to address the homes to the south of the property. The approach was different as they introduced paddock fencing, and heavy planting of trees.

Exhibit-A-12 and A-12A

Mr. Grisewood showed a three dimensional model. This showed 4 views and how the plan will change 10 years down the road. This exhibit showed the enhanced buffer plan showing installed version and the installed version in 10 years.

Exhibit-A-13: Plan of install taken across Aaronson Road to where original driveway was....shows installed plan and then 10 years later.

Exhibit-A-13A: Enhanced Landscaping Buffer - same location.

Exhibit -A-14: Photo taken from middle of back yard from property on East of Aaronson Road. A-14 shows installed plan and then 10years later.

A-14A: Same view. Enhanced plan installed and 10 years later.

Exhibit -A-15: taken from different angle.

A-15A - Showed enhanced landscape buffer.

Exhibit -A-16: View from adjoining res. property to the south. Showed installed plan and 10 year afterwards.

Exhibit -A-16 a: Enhanced buffer planting from same point shows paddock fencing.

Doug asked: asked how that will affect storm water runoff off Aaronson Rd. Kenneth explained there is a swale. Doug asked if buffering will be done before buildings go up and would hope this is done before

buildings.

Bob Stout. Asked height of building used in renderings. Kenneth said 35 feet.

Mr. Coco, Engineer for the applicant.

Mr. Coco submitted a letter to the Planning Board about comments that dealt with issues regarding details of tenants and sidewalks. These are things we don't know right now and want them deferred until later. These issues will be addressed during preliminary approval. Also they will notice neighbors during final approval as well as newspaper notice.

Mr. Coco spoke of parking space size. They have revised plans to have 9 1/2 foot spaces. He spoke of the number of parking spaces by stating that they are deficient in number of spaces, but will be flexibility

Drainage patterns will remain same with landscaping.

Mr. Puglia asked who will be the architect for this project. Mr. Coco testified that the tenants have own architect. Mr. Puglia stated that we want the country look. Mr. Gross stated that they will try to carry this out.

Mr. Schropshire, Traffic Engineer for the applicant.

Mr. Schropshire stated that he feels that there are more than a sufficient amount of spaces for this type of development. He feels that 5 spaces for 1000 are plenty. Mr. Schropshire stated that some use less to accommodate there needs.

Mr. Schropshire spoke of sidewalks. Usually it is up to the DOT, and they are not interested in sidewalks along highway based on speeding and character of highway. The DOT allows but don't encourage. Mr. Gross asked for the board not to require sidewalks on both sides of 206.

Mr. Schick spoke of the timing of landscape; he said the retaining wall is first thing to go in. Landscape plan would be done the same time as construction of buildings.

**Mr. Semptimphelter made a motion to continue Application PB13-01 PSP, GDP, V, until the October 28, 2013 meeting and Mr. Puglia Seconded.
Motion carried with a unanimous voice vote.**

CORRESPONDENCE:

Correspondence gone over.

ADJOURNMENT:

**Mr. Puglia made a motion to adjourn at 9:55PM and Ms. Cholewa Seconded.
Motion passes with a unanimous voice vote.**

Submitted by: Sheri L Hannah, Secretary

Approved: January 27, 2014