

**TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, March 28, 2016**

The Regular Meeting of the Mansfield Township, Planning Board was held on the above shown date with the following in attendance: Chairman Scott Preidel, Vice-Chair Douglas Borgstrom, Arthur Puglia, Robert Semptimphelter, John Kampo, and Randy Allen. Attorney Tom Coleman, Planner Barbara Fegley, Traffic Engineer Al Litwornia, and Secretary Ashley Jolly. Gary Lippincott, Barry Winn and Alan Abramowitz were absent.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Preidel 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 25, 2016. Said Resolution was published in the Burlington County Times, e-mailed to the Burlington County Times, and Trenton Times, 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, 2016.

DISCUSSION TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS PROGRAM:

Edward Fox, Burlington County Bridge Commission. He stated that they are proposing the TDR program which will accomplish several things. It would preserve more than 1,500 acres of land. Also, to get a bypass from route 206 and Mt. Pleasant Road. It would also decrease the amount of affordable housing units that you have to provide. To implement TDR you need a series of plans. We talked about the Land Use Plan update, Farmland preservation update, and a Master Plan re-examination report. The first map that was given out has gray area showing the wetlands, the second map is what the receiving area could look like. It is one planners thought on what the development capacity is on the different tracts in receiving areas. Once we resolve whether the lands are sending or receiving and how they laid out, we can tweak the Land Use Plan update, Master Plan Re-Examination report, and Farmland Preservation Element. This will help push the TDR program forward.

Chairman Preidel, said that the water company total property is 126 acres the one part on the map is receiving 14 acres (in red) how much frontage is commercial? Would you say its 20 acres roughly? **Mr. Fox** said yes and there would be 16 credits for sending for 64 acres. **Chairman Preidel** said on 30/8.01 there is a ditch which effects 30/8.01 all the wetlands go through there with a 50ft buffer from it. Is there some way for checks and balance with this? What can we do to inspect before these credits are given? **Mr. Fox** said the ordinance would publish a list of credits that properties are available for. The second way it could be done is to have people lay out conceptual subdivision plans that the board would review before getting their credits.

Chairman Preidel asked what the difference is in easements. You can't put build anything, you can't put trees on them. He also questioned the underground pipeline. **Mr. Fox** said that underground pipes the properties could extend in the three acres and include land that is underground. You rarely see development that has high tension lines in its backyard. **Mr. Fox** said the pipeline is very difficult to map where it is. We estimate where it is and might include land that is not taken by the pipeline easement.

Attorney Coleman asked if someone could contact the turnpike, as they might have a map showing the location of the pipeline. **Mr. Fox** said they contacted the turnpike authority and they do not have the map. **Attorney Coleman** said the turnpike is saying that it is within their turnpike right of way they just can't tell you where it is within that right of way. **Mr. Fox** said it is outside their right of way because they expanded the width of the turnpike. **Planner Fegley** said maybe call before you dig? She said someone must have a map. **Attorney Coleman** said that he is shocked the turnpike would allow someone just too arbitrarily go ahead and put it wherever you want to put it. **Mr. Fox** said they have maps of them, but they are in file cases and binders. You would have to go parcel by parcel, map by map. **Chairman Preidel** said he could give Mr. Fox a rough idea because they went through his farm with it. **Mr. Fox** said that would be helpful. He said they would contact NJ American Water directly to talk to them about possible interest in the program.

Mr. Puglia asked if it would be a problem to make the water company a commercial property. They wouldn't be entitled to any TDR correct. **Mr. Fox** said it is a commercial property and that he is not sure if they have any interest in developing it. **Mr. Puglia** asked how the rest of the board felt about making the water company commercial. **Chairman Preidel** said yes he has no problem with it. **Mr. Fox** said he would contact NJ American Water.

Mr. Fox said you can estimate how many credits someone gets, or you can have them prove how many credits they receive. **Mr. Puglia** asked if you made the water company commercial, would it have any major impact on the TDR program. **Mr. Fox** said the more land that's taken out the better it will be to get it done. **Chairman Preidel** said the pipeline easements need to be looked at. **Mr. Fox** said they would have to go parcel by parcel, the pipelines and easements are written out in narrative descriptions, by deed, they are not mapped. **Mr. Fox** said that he understands the concern and if the program doesn't work, it doesn't work. There were no further questions from the board.

EXTENSION OF PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION APPROVAL:

Bright View Group – Block 13, Lots 3.03 and 3.04. Requesting an extension of the protection period time frame for preliminary approval be extended by two one-year extensions; for a total of two years beyond June 30, 2016. **Attorney Tom Coleman** said he spoke to Bright View's attorney Mr. McAndrew and since they just received preliminary approval, they are entitled to two separate one year extensions. **Attorney Coleman** recommends two one year extensions.

A motion was offered by **Mr. Puglia** and was seconded by **Mr. Semptimphelter**. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Puglia, Semptimphelter, Kampo, Allen

NAY: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Lippincott, Winn, Abramowitz

Sta-Seal (Trap Rock Industries) – Block 66, Lot 8, requesting a one year extension of approval from November of 2013. **Attorney Coleman** said he spoke with their attorneys. Sta-Seal had received final approval from the board, so their situation is different from Bright View. Their approval technically expired 95 days after the board granted them approval because they never filed their subdivision plat. They will come back and ask for subdivision approval again because right now they do not have any approval. The board does not have the right to grant an extension for an approval that was never properly filed. They had asked me to verbalize to the board a continuance to the April board meeting. They were supposed to send a letter, but none has yet

been received. There is no action to be taken by the board this evening. **Attorney Coleman** asked that the board withdraw this application from the agenda. A motion was offered by **Mr. Puglia** and was seconded by **Mr. Borgstrom**. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Puglia, Semptimphelter, Kampo, Allen

NAY: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Lippincott, Winn, Abramowitz

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was offered by **Mr. Puglia** and was seconded by **Mr. Semptimphelter** to approve the minutes from January 25, 2016. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Puglia, Semptimphelter, Kampo, Allen

NAY: None ABSTAIN: None ABSENT: Lippincott, Winn, Abramowitz

A motion was offered by **Mr. Borgstrom** and was seconded by **Mr. Kampo** to approve the minutes from February 1, 2016. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Kampo, Allen

NAY: None Not Voting: Puglia, Semptimphelter ABSENT: Lippincott, Winn, Abramowitz

A motion was offered by **Mr. Kampo** and was seconded by **Chairman Preidel** to approve the minutes from March 1, 2016. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Kampo, Allen

NAY: None Not Voting: Puglia, Semptimphelter ABSENT: Lippincott, Winn, Abramowitz

PUBLIC COMMENT:

There was none.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:

A motion was offered by **Mr. Puglia** and was seconded by **Mr. Allen** to adjourn the meeting. All ayes. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted:

Date Approved:



Ashley Jolly, Land Use Coordinator

6-27-16