

**TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, July 24, 2017**

The Regular Meeting of the Mansfield Township, Planning Board was held on the above shown date with the following in attendance: Chairman Scott Preidel, Douglas Borgstrom, Arthur Puglia, Robert Semptimphelter, John Kampo, Randy Allen, Gary Lippincott ,and Delpat Patel. Attorney Thomas Coleman, Engineer Robert Stout, Planner Barbara Fegley, Traffic Engineer Alexander Litwornia and Secretary Ashley Jolly. Barry Winn was 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 23, 2017. 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, 2017.

NORTHERN BURLINGTON REGIONAL SCHOOL DISTRICT:

Rich Kaz, Northern Burlington Business Administrator joined by **Ted Hopkins, FVHD Architects**. They had presented a similar plan in 2015. He explained that they heard the voters at that time and have now scaled back on the plan significantly. The gymnasium and auditorium have been eliminated from the plan and they are now focusing on connecting the two buildings and renovating the infrastructure; the HVAC and electric as well as creating a clear front entrance. The main idea is to provide more security.

Mr. Hopkins said they want to consolidate and make it more practical and provide a safer environment. The library will be brought to the middle of the building and the cafeteria will be expanded. Additional parking in the back will be provided.

Mr. Semptimphelter asked what is being eliminated. **Mr. Hopkins** explained that the auditorium and the gym were eliminated from the original plan to this one. **Mr. Semptimphelter** asked about changing traffic patterns. **Mr. Hopkins** clarified that there would be a change in that they will try to separate teacher parking, student traffic, and visitor and bus traffic the best that they can.

Mr. Kampo asked how many children they are projecting. **Mr. Hopkins** answered that they are projecting 1,487 and presently they are at 1,250. **Mr. Kampo** asked about the cost of the project. **Mr. Hopkins** stated that it is about 40 million dollars but the original plan was around 65 million. **Chairman Preidel** asked what the number is they would ask of the public. **Mr. Hopkins** said 40 million is the number but there is some aid that will go back to the district. **Mr. Kaz** commented that is .26 cents on the dollar for the whole project.

Attorney Coleman stated that the board's job is to determine if the plan is consistent with the Township's Master Plan and that is all. **Chairman Preidel** asked for any further questions. **Vice Chairman Borgstrom** asked if there were any plans for fire sprinklers. **Mr. Hopkins** pointed out the the new area will have sprinklers. **Mr. Semptimphelter** asked about the connecting of the two buildings and the reasoning behind it. **Mr. Kaz** said it is for organizational reasons to create a front entrance as well as the safety concerns.

Attorney Coleman explained that the board needs to make a motion to determine if the plan is consistent with the Master Plan. A motion was offered by **Mr. Semptimphelter** and was seconded by **Mr. Allen**. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: SEMPTIMPHELTER, ALLEN, KAMPO, LIPPINCOTT, PATEL, BORGSTROM, PREIDEL
NAY: None ABSTAIN: PUGLIA ABSENT: WINN

APPLICATION PB2017-3MSD: Spain - Petticoat Bridge Road

Attorney Coleman stated that this application cannot be heard because as per engineer review a variance would be required. This variance was not noticed, therefore this application would be heard during the August meeting.

APPLICATION PB2017-1PSP+FSP: Mansfield Realty North, LLC.

Chairman Preidel stepped down as he has property abutting the area included in this application. **Vice Chairman Borgstrom** took over the meeting.

Attorney Ronald Shimanowitz, attorney for the applicant introduced himself stating that they are applying for preliminary and final major site plan approval with a variance for the parking as well as some design waivers. These properties are on the east and west side of Route 206. The west tract is known as Block 4, Lots 6.01 & 7 and the east tract is known as Block 3, Lots 5.01 & 10.01. The properties are located in the C-2 highway commercial zone and are located within a redevelopment area. The site plan is for a total of 900,000sqft of warehouse space and 45,600sqft of office space. He stated they have witnesses as well as the various review letters they are prepared to respond too.

Gregory Oman, Site Engineer with Menlo Engineering 261 Cleveland Ave, Highland Park, NJ was sworn in and provided his qualifications. **Exhibit A-1** Aerial Exhibit was displayed. This was the site boundaries and the surrounding areas. The area consists of 82.5 acres located within the C-2 zone. The eastern site makes up about 62.34 acres with a 1,000 linear feet of frontage along Route 206 and a little over 2,000 linear feet along Aaronson Road. The western parcel is approximately 20.17 acres and has approximately 850 linear feet of frontage along Route 206. Runoff from the site will go through two culverts under Route 206. He discussed elevations.

Mr. Oman discussed **Exhibit A-2** Overall Site Plan Exhibit, which is a total of 925,600sqft of buildings broken up into two buildings. Building A located on the eastern parcel and Building B located on the western parcel. The building on the eastern parcel is 765,000sqft of warehouse with 30,600sqft of office space. The western parcel is 150,000sqft building with 15,000sqft of that being office. Both buildings have a height of 46 feet. 154 truck docks and 176 trailer storage is being proposed. For the west building 30 truck docks are being proposed. The

east is would have 306 parking stalls also 12 ADA handicapped accessible parking stalls for building A. For building B 102 parking stalls are being proposed with 4 ADA parking stalls. There will be some improvements along Route 206 which would be under the NJDOT. A traffic signal is being proposed. Some retaining walls will be onsite. There will be some guiderails along Route 206 as well that will conform to the NJDOT guidelines.

In terms of grading, there are three major components: 1. The rate of runoff, 2. The water quality, 3. The ground water recharge. The east side will have curve cuts, swales, inlets, and underground piping. All runoff is being conveyed underground to a retention pond along Route 206 and meets the water quality standards. The western side similarly conveys all runoff to underground piping network which is made up of 5ft diameter or 60inch PCP plastic piping which discharges into a manufactured treatment device prior to discharging out into the tributaries. They are currently working with Burlington County Soil Conservation on same.

Mr. Oman stated that NJ American Water is in the process of extending their 12inch main up to provide services to these two buildings. Both sites will have a 10 inch system around to provide fire sprinklers to the buildings along with hydrants. In regards to sanitary sewer, the office buildings will be serviced by a gravity sewer system to pump stations located on the eastern side of the southwest corner of building A, and on the west side on the northeast corner of building B. The sewer flow will be pumped out to the southeast corner of building A and continue down Aaronson Road, White Pine Road, and to Mansfield Road where they are connected to the Four Seasons at Mansfield's pump.

Mr. Oman briefly discussed lighting and explained that they are getting all required prior approvals. **Applicant Attorney Shimanowitz** asked other than the parking does the development proposal comply with the redevelopment plan for US Route 206 Northern Area. **Mr. Oman** stated that it does. **Applicant Attorney Shimanowitz** asked Mr. Oman to speak about the parking and what a typical parking requirement would be. **Mr. Oman** stated that the standard ratio for warehouse parking is 1 per 5,000sqft of warehouse and the office component generally has 1 per 200sqft. After running the numbers for this project there would be a requirement of 306 parking stall for the larger building and 102 for the smaller building. The township ordinance does not have parking standards for warehousing. The ordinance states the greater of 1 per 1,000sqft of building or 1 per 1,000sqft of lot area. This would be an excessive amount of parking spaces for this size of a lot.

Mr. Puglia asked about the parking space for tractor trailers on the large lot. **Mr. Oman** said they are proposing 154 docks, and then another 176 trailer storage spaces. There will also be dedicated left turn lanes into the site. **Vice Chairman Borgstrom** asked who would be utilizing these parking spaces. **Mr. Oman** clarified that it would be for both truck drivers and employees. **Vice Chairman Borgstrom** asked about maintenance of the man-made storm water filter. **Mr. Oman** explained that it gets monitored after a rainstorm event and at least 4 times per year for cleaning etc.

Traffic Engineer, Andrew Freanda was sworn in and provided his qualifications. He stated that a traffic study was conducted for the site. All traffic from the site will be directed towards Route 206. An application has been submitted to the NJDOT as is currently under review. There will be some road widening to allow for five lanes. Typically trucks are going there before the morning peak and leave before the afternoon peak or after the afternoon peak.

Because of the traffic signal, acceleration and deceleration lanes are not needed. Parking is very typical for a warehouse of this size. The smaller warehouse has about 10% office space. He stated that they have submitted to the DOT and have been deemed complete. They are required to meet all the DOT requirements. **Mr. Kampo** talked about exit 8A on the turnpike and how backed up it is with trucks from the warehouses over there. **Mr. Freanda** explained that there are many large warehouses in that area, since this is currently the only warehouse in this area, he doesn't see a problem with traffic especially since the turnpike is so close.

Mr. Puglia asked if a study was done for the Route 295 entrances to the property. He wanted to know if the tractor trailers would go through the town of Columbus to get to 295, 52A or would they go to the next one. **Mr. Freanda** explained that most of the trucks would be going north, however some could go south and onto county roads through Columbus, but he doesn't anticipate a majority going through that area. **Mr. Puglia** is concerned if they go Columbus Road through the Town of Columbus that this could be a problem. The town is older and there is not a large turning radius. **Mr. Freanda** stated that he understands that concern, but it is his opinion that the traffic would be heading north towards the turnpike.

The Architect **Rick Pratt , OGP Architects** was sworn in. He briefly discussed exhibit A-3 plans and elevations. A question was asked about the lighting. The engineer **Mr. Oman** explained that exhibit A-2 shows the overall site plan. The facility would have all LED light fixtures 150kw.

Landscape Architect Dennis Griswold was sworn in. He gave his qualifications then discussed exhibit A-4. Shade trees, flowering trees, and shrubs for the west side were discussed. Exhibit A-5 shows the east side with a variety of shade trees, evergreens, flowering trees, and shrubs. **Mr. Griswold** stated that they had visited the site to look at the current landscape buffering for the residential lots and noted that the current buffer is growing and maturing.

Mr. Griswold discussed exhibit A-6 titled Landscape Buffer Exhibit. He explained that the exhibit shows the buffering at the time of planting and then 10 years later when plants are mature. The topographic techniques were discussed. **Mr. Griswold** explained that the east side slopes from a height of 98 about the midpoint of the Aaronson Road property line. Therefore there is a high knoll along Aaronson Road. The buildings floor elevation is set below Aaronson Road at 79. There is a retaining wall that wraps around the truck maneuvering area and trailer storage area. The retaining wall is at an elevation of 98. In addition, burming was added along Aaronson Road about 7ft above the retaining wall.

The berm height from the Aaronson Road side, ranges from 12ft above the road in the southern corner to 9ft above the road at the midpoint, and 13ft above the road at the intersection between Aaronson and Sherwood. On top of the berm, nearly at the highest point, is a 6ft high solid fence. As per the Planners letter, the 6ft high fence requires relief from the board. The applicant asks that the relief be granted as the fence adds an additional visual barrier for the

residential properties along Aaronson Road frontage. The fence is set back approximately 46ft from the existing right of way line.

Exhibit A-7 titled Landscape Buffer Plan View 2. This plan is showing the landscape buffering at installation and again after 10 years of maturing. There is a slight swale and then a dip and the berm rises up to the 6ft high solid fence.

Exhibit A-8 titled Landscape Buffer Plan View 3. This viewpoint is going further to the east. Nearly at the back of the existing residential homes. Showing existing vegetation along Aaronson Road. About 1/3 of the building is visible above the fence line. However after 10 years of growth the landscape buffer practically screens out the entire building. Exhibits A-9 and A-10 were also briefly discussed.

Mr. Semtimphelter asked if they had met with the residents since the previous application. **Mr. Griswold** stated that they have not. The reasoning being they have used the same principles and enhanced it, for example they are increasing the berm heights. The visual impact will be less with the new scheme. **Mr. Puglia** commented that maybe the buffering should get started at the beginning of the project that way at completion there will be some maturing of the vegetation. **Mr. Griswold** said the only problem with that is they have to generate the material to build the berm. So grading may need to be done first. **Attorney Shimanowitz** stated that they would take **Mr. Puglia's** comment into consideration.

Mr. Allen asked if there was a proposed material for the solid fence. **Mr. Shimanowitz** explained that he believes that detail needs to be added, however he believes it to be vinyl. **Mr. Allen** asked for the height of the sound wall that is on the southern portion. **Mr. Crestwood** said he would let the sound expert describe that.

Sound Expert **Norman Dotti** with Russell Acoustics was sworn in and provided his qualifications. **Mr. Dotti** pulled exhibit A-5 and explained that he would be discussing mostly night time sound since that is the most critical. The most critical area is the southern side of the property; the truck roadway and driveway along the eastern side of the property because this is where the residents are. Sound data was taken on heavy tractor trailers in a computer model and driven around the site. The nighttime standard is 50dba. The 6ft fence was not included in his evaluations. When making no modifications to the site it registered at 50dba, so nothing further would be needed.

On the southern side, he incorporated a sound barrier coming from the southwest corner of the roadway wrapping around to the southeast corner. The barrier comes up to 18ft then drops down to 8ft. This will get it to 50dba around the homes there. Different types of materials were discussed. **Vice-Chairman Borgstrom** wanted to know what the maximum sound level of the truck was. **Mr. Dotti** answered 77dba at 50ft. **Vice-Chairman Borgstrom** asked about the sound of the backup alarms on the trucks. **Mr. Dotti** stated that most of those alarms are adaptable to the environment depending on if there was a lot of noise or if it was quiet. The

backup alarms are still under what they need to be. **Vice-Chairman Borgstrom** asked how they can address noise during the construction process. **Mr. Dotti** explained that construction noise under NJSA 7:29 is exempt, however having the bur and wall will reduce any noise during construction. He stated that the warehouse building should reduce traffic noise from Route 206.

Art Bernard, Planner was sworn in and gave his qualifications. **Mr. Bernard** stated that a parking variance would be needed, partly because the current ordinance does not have a parking standard for this type of use. The current standard is 1 parking space per 1,000sqft of floor area. It also requires 1 space per 250ft of floor area for office space in addition to 1 space per two employees. The standard for warehouses is usually 1 space per 5,000sqft. The standard for office space is normally 1 space for 200sqft or 1 space for 250sqft.

Mr. Bernard explained that the townships ordinance would require for the East Tract, 2,959 stalls and they are proposing 306, which goes with the typical warehouse standard of 1 pr 5,000sqft. On the West Tract the township ordinance would require 959 stalls, and they are proposing 102 stalls, which also goes with the standard 1 per 5,000sqft and 1 per 200sqft of office space. He believes the variance should be granted based on the C-2 criteria.

Mr. Bernard further explained that in addition to the parking standard, they require relief or the solid 6ft fence, due to its location. It is located 50ft from the front yard setback. He stated that he doesn't think they need the variance as it is not in an easement. The applicant will maintain the buffer. The buffer is needed because it does lye in the front yard setback. The benefits of the proposed variances outweigh any deterrent. He stated that the Master Plan and recent Redevelopment Plan promotes the industrial use for this site.

Mr. Bernard stated that he finds no negative criteria for the parking relief. There will be adequate parking with less impervious coverage. In regards to the fence, he again doesn't see any negative impact on the public good. In fact, it enhances the screening for the neighbors in an area that has been a target for industrial development. It also has a safety benefit for keeping young children off of the site.

Mr. Bernard also finds no negative impact for the zone plan. The applicants proposal helps implement the master plan and the redevelopment plan. The parking relief and the relief for the fence amounts to some minor fine tuning of the master plan and the redevelopment plan. **Mr. Semptimphelter** commented that the landscaping and cutting of the grass will be maintained by the applicant. **Mr. Bernard** said yes. **Vice-Chairman Borgstrom** then called a five minute recess.

Vice-Chairman Borgstrom called the meeting back to order around 9:30pm. He explained that they would hear from the Planning Board professionals, followed by public comment. The meeting will end at 10:30pm and at that point the application would get carried to the September 25th meeting.

Engineer Robert Stout referenced his July 24th review letter. Page 4 number 1, Grading Plans was discussed. He explained that the proposed spot elevations should be provided throughout the areas of the proposed improvements to ensure the site drains properly. Once they receive the information they will perform a review of the grading.

Engineer Stout referenced page 5 of his review letter and storm water was discussed. He stated that the length, slope, and capacity of the 36" storm pipe from manholes B1 and B10 to the underground storm water control system should be provided. He further stated that details on the control of the pond drain pipe from the Basin to Manhole A61 should be provided. He briefly discussed the fire hydrant to Aaronson Road and the storm water management from Four Seasons.

Engineer Stout stated that the applicant may need to make changes to the plan on the west side as some environmental issues may arise. They will need to adjust according to the DEP need. Additional information may be required before final approval. **Mr. Semptimphelter** questioned the hours of operation. **Attorney Shimanowitz** mentioned that they currently do not have a tenant, so the hours of operation are unknown. **Engineer Stout** commented that this would need to be fine tuned. He also stated that the board can waive the sidewalk contribution requirements.

Traffic Engineer Alexander Litwornia referenced his July 18th review letter. He stated that the applicant did a good job addressing his comments from his original letter dated May 12, 2017. He explained that there were still some things that need to be addressed. He had requested a turning template for the trucks for people coming in and out of the site. This, as well as most of these things, can be a condition of approval.

Mr. Litwornia explained that he wanted an analysis of the proposed traffic signal, an improvement plan along Route 206, the traffic distribution for the proposed trips in and out of Columbus, and a signing and striking plan. He stated that in the traffic study some of the traffic generation needs to be addressed because the numbers used did not match what was in the report. He would like to go over the trip distributions with the applicant to make sure nobody goes through the town of Columbus.

Mr. Litwornia discussed the parking analysis. He stated that sidewalk sales should be eliminated and the hours of operation need to be discussed. The applicant needs to address if they will be using the area above the office for warehouse storage or if it will be sealed off. He stated that he does not have too many issues with the noise report, however if the HVAC system is roof mounted it could make a lot of noise as well at night. So, it would need to be shielded and put on special mounting that helps with the vibrations.

Planner Barbara Fegley referenced her review letter from July 19th. She started on page 4 and mentioned that there was testimony on the fence variance, but there were a couple of other items in the Ordinance. For example whether or not a gate is provided and also shadow box style

stained or painted white, so there may be additional variances associated with that one. On page 5 she recommended that because there is a large amount of landscaping there should be some kind of drip irrigation system. **Planner Fegley** mentioned that they showed great graphics from Aaronson Road, however they did not provide the view from Route 206. She stated that she would like to see that view as well.

Planner Fegley mentioned additional landscaping and asked for the Wetlands location plan. Detail on the noise wall should be provided, as well as, detail for the sign. There is the potential easement that is required and the environmental assessment report is older and showed potential arsenic. So she would like to see what the most recent one shows. There were some other concerns with the Environmental Assessment report and the Environmental Commission had some concerns as well. The applicant had responded to the Environmental Commission but there is still some information that needs to be provided.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Scott Preidel, 702 Mansfield Road West – Brought up the exhibit from the west side showing the overall landscaping plan. He pointed out the area that he owns and stated that he is third generation to own this property and it is farmland preserved. There is a 10ft wall and the last applicant was willing to put two rows of white pine and buffer there, maybe 7 or 8 footers to shield from the farmland preservation. He asked if this applicant would be willing to do so. **Mr. Shimanowitz** stated that it seemed like a reasonable request. **Mr. Preidel** further commented about Route 206 and the retention pond. There is a washout where the culvert pipe dumps out from the DOT. It takes sediment from the stream and pushes it down and clogs up his stream, if the applicant is adding to it would there be a way fix. **Mr. Oman** stated if the DOT allows it they could help stabilize the culvert. **Engineer Stout** will take a look at it with **Mr. Oman**. **Mr. Preidel** asked about the repairing buffers. **Mr. Oman** stated that the only disturbance within the repairing buffers are the out wall for the basin. **Mr. Preidel** asked about the maintenance of the basin. **Mr. Oman** stated that would be mowing. **Mr. Preidel** asked about the surrounding area. **Mr. Oman** explained that those would be left untouched. **Mr. Preidel** asked if they were putting plantings in. **Mr. Griswold** explained that it would be a native repairing mix, which allows succession to take control of those areas, and make it a more natural environment.

Bob Tallon, Axe Factory Road – **Mr. Tallon** brought up the square footage. **Mr. Oman** stated that the 945,600sqft is the total square footage for both buildings. He discussed wet basins and explained that they cut down into the seasonal water table when constructed and they flow all year long. He believes there is supposed to be a 2ft buffer between the ground water level and the bottom of the basin. He asked if the basins did not work correctly is there a way to fix it after it is installed. **Mr. Oman** stated that it could possibly be changed. The water surface elevation could be raised slightly as long as there would be ample volume. **Mr. Oman** further explained that wet ponds can be installed at ground water, because if you have less than 20 acres of drainage two are wet pond, the ground water actually supplements and keeps the permanent

water surface elevation where it is supposed to be and it should not drain constantly. **Mr. Tallon** said they test the stream at Old York Road, they are finding higher levels of conductivity which is probably a function of sodium. Because of that, he wanted to know if the board could request that the asphalt around the project be the pervious kind that allows water to drain through it. He quoted Ordinance 2012-3 section b, and f, saying that it would help with base flows. Section g would help control down water flooding. **Mr. Oman** explained that pores pavement cannot be utilized on this site. The DEP requires that a permeability rate be at minimum .5inches an hour. They have done numerous tests and the permeably rates are generally in the .001inches per hour.

Lou Passano, 18 Sherwood Lane – He had questions on air quality. With hundreds of trucks idling and polluting. **Mr. Litwornia** stated that they are required to have no idle signs. **Mr. Passano** asked who would enforce that. **Attorney Coleman** explained that there is a number you are supposed to call to report it. **Planner Fegley** said the Environmental Commission did have a concern about air quality, but the response was the facility is a manufacturing or industrial operation with direct discharge, therefore air quality testing is unwarranted, however she was not sure she agrees with that. **Planner Fegley** asked if the applicant had any further response. **Attorney Shimanowitz** said nothing further than what was just quoted. **Planner Fegley** stated she would look into the air quality for **Mr. Passano**. Mr. Passano brought up the improvements to Aaronson Road, if the project goes through he believes the board should ask the applicant to level the road, taking the hump out to make it safer. Mr. Passano stated that he hopes the board takes the time to hear from its residents and does not grant final approval that evening.

Vice Chairman Borgstrom closed the public comment section.

Attorney Coleman suggested that the applicant could go back and clean up what they need to address and come back in September. **Vice-Chairman Borgstrom** agreed and asked the applicant for their input. **Attorney Shimanowitz** stated that they agree and there are some issues that need to be tidied up. **Attorney Coleman** stated that he'd like the professionals to come back with less questions and a better recommendation for this plan. **Attorney Coleman**, stated that the August meeting is pretty full at this point so if the board is comfortable with having this application return on September 25' 2017, there should be a motion to carry the application to that date. The applicant will not need to notice any further and any public should return on September 25th should they feel inclined.

Mr. Semptimpfelter made the motion to carry this application to September 25, 2017. This motion was seconded by **Mr. Puglia**. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

**AYE: SEMPTIMPFELTER, PUGLIA, KAMPO, LIPPINCOTT, ALLEN, PATEL
BORGSTROM**

NAY: NONE

NOT SITTING: PREIDEL

ABSENT: WINN

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-06-05

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING BOARD
OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
RECOMMENDING THE TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE
ADOPT A REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PARCELS WITHIN THE
COLUMBUS VILLAGE REDEVELOPMENT AREA
PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING LAW, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A -7**

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq. (the “Act”), the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield adopted Resolution No. 2015-04-01 and Resolution No. 2015-10-04, that Block 28, Lots 5, 6 and 38, located in Columbus Village, satisfied the criteria set forth in the Act, including N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5, to be designated as an area in need of redevelopment and recommended that the Township Committee include these parcels as Areas in Need of Redevelopment and Areas in Need of Rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, on December 29, 2015, the Township Committee of the Township of Mansfield adopted Resolution No. 2017-12-17 declaring Block 28, Lots 5, 6 and 38 as an Area in Need of Redevelopment (the “Columbus Redevelopment Plan”) pursuant to the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Township of Mansfield received notice from the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (“DCA”) on January 12, 2016, that the designation of Block 28, Lots 5, 6 and 38 as An Area in Need of Development became effective upon the Township’s filing of the designation with DCA; and

WHEREAS, at its June 14, 2017 meeting, the Township Committee introduced Ordinance No. 2017-9 “An Ordinance of the Township of Mansfield Adopting a Redevelopment Plan for Parcels Within Columbus Village Redevelopment Area Consisting of the Former Municipal Complex, the Fire Station and the Municipal Police Station” in accordance with the requirements set forth in N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq. and has referred Ordinance 2017-9 to the Planning Board for the Board’s report and recommendation as required by N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-7(e); and

WHEREAS, on June 26, 2017, the Planning Board held a hearing and reviewed the “Redevelopment Plan for the Columbus Village Redevelopment Area Consisting of the Former Municipal Complex and Fire Station and the Municipal Police Station, Block 28, Lots 5, 6 and 38” and prepared for The Township of Mansfield by Mark A. Remsa, AICP, PP, ASLA, LLA, Director, Burlington County Bridge Commission, Department of Economic Development and Regional Planning, dated June, 2017 (the “Redevelopment Plan”); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield as follows:

1. **HEARING ON THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.** The Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield at its regular meeting on June 26, 2017, reviewed the Redevelopment Plan, heard a presentation by Mark A. Remsa, and afforded the public with an opportunity to make comments and ask questions concerning the Redevelopment Plan, in accordance with N.J.S.A.40A:12A-7(e).

2. **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONG OF THE PLANNING BOARD.** The Planning Board, following the presentation by Mark A. Remsa and an opportunity for public comments, finds that the Redevelopment Plan satisfies the requirements of N.J.S.A. 40A:12-7(a) and that the Redevelopment Plan is substantially consistent with the Master Plan of the Township of Mansfield.

3. **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.** The Planning Board resolves that the Redevelopment Plan, as considered by the Planning Board at its June 26, 2017 hearing, and after the presentation by Mark A. Remsa and the opportunity for public comments, be ADOPTED by the Township Committee. This Resolution shall constitute the Planning Board's Report and Recommendation required in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-7(e).

4. **SEVERABILITY.** If any part of this Resolution shall be deemed invalid, such parts shall be severed and the invalidity thereby shall not affect the remaining parts of this Resolution.

5. **AVAILABILITY OF THIS RESOLUTION.** A copy of this Resolution shall be available for public inspection at the Office of the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield.

6. **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

A motion to memorialize the above resolution was offered by **Mr. Semptimphelter** and was seconded by **Mr. Allen**. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

**AYE: SEMPTIMPHELTER, PUGLIA, KAMPO, LIPPINCOTT, ALLEN, PATEL
BORGSTROM
NAY: NONE NOT SITTING: PREIDEL ABSENT: WINN**

**RESOLUTION NO. 2017-07-06
RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
ENDORING ORDINANCE NO. 2017-10
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE 2017-5
OF THE TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
AMENDING CHAPTER 65 OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
ENTITLED "ZONING"**

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 51 of the Municipal Land Use Law of the State of New Jersey (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-64), the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield is obligated to review any and all proposed land use control ordinances prior to adoption by the Committee of the Township of Mansfield;

WHEREAS, the Township Committee introduced Ordinance 2017-10 at its July 12, 2017 meeting and has submitted to the Planning Board Ordinance 2017-10, proposing to amend Ordinance 2017-5, amending **Chapter 65 (Zoning), Article II, Section 65-2 (Districts); Article III, Section 65-4 (Application and Interpretation); Article VI, Sections 65-14 and 65-15 (C-3 Office/Residential District); Article VII (R-1 FLP Farmland Preservation Zone); Article VIII, Sections 65-24 and 65-26B (R-4 Village Residential District); Article IX, Sections 65-29 and 65-32A (C-1 Neighborhood Commercial NCD); Article X, Section 65-33 (C-2 Highway Commercial District); Article XI, Section 65-41 (ODL Office Distribution Laboratory District); Article XIA (O-1 Planned Office Development); Article XII, Sections 65-46 and 65-49 (LI Light Industrial District); Article XIV, Sections 65-56 and 65-57 (HI Highway Industrial District); Article XV (INS Institutional District); Article XVI (Flood Plain District); Article XVII, Sections 65-79 and 65-80 (Open Space Regulations); Article XIX, Sections 65-89, 65-93, 65-94, 65-95 and 65-95.2 (General Regulations); Article XX (Off Street Parking and Loading); Article XXI, Section 65-100.B (Landscape Buffers); Article XXIII (Farm Regulations); and Article XXV, Sections 65-113.2 and 65-113.2.1 (Signs) of the Township Code to include in the Township Code the updates and revisions recommended in the Master Plan Reexamination Report, prepared for the Township of Mansfield and the Mansfield Township Planning Board by the Department of Economic Development and Regional Planning of the Burlington County Bridge Commission; and**

WHEREAS, through this resolution, the Planning Board wishes to memorialize its findings concerning the review and analysis of the proposed amendments to the Township's existing Zoning Ordinance in the Township of Mansfield;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD, IN THE COUNTY OF BURLINGTON, STATE OF NEW JERSEY THAT:

1. The amendments to Chapter 65 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Township of Mansfield as set forth in an ordinance identified by the Township Committee as Ordinance No. 2017-10, having been previously reviewed by the consulting engineer, planner and solicitor to the Planning Board and no objection having been identified, is hereby endorsed by this Board for adoption by the Township Committee.

2. Ordinance No. 2017-10 is not inconsistent with the Master Plan of the Township of Mansfield.
3. The Planning Board's solicitor, consulting engineer, planner and board secretary are hereby further authorized to undertake any and all action to forward the necessary endorsement to the Township Committee concerning the Planning Board's endorsement.
4. This Resolution shall constitute the report of the Planning Board required pursuant to Section 17 of the Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-26) for the Planning Board's review of proposed Township Ordinance No. 2017-10.
5. This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

A motion to approve the above resolution was offered by **Mr. Semptimpfelter** and was seconded by **Mr. Allen**. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: SEMPTIMPFELTER, PUGLIA, KAMPO, LIPPINCOTT, ALLEN, PATEL BORGSTROM

NAY: NONE

NOT SITTING: PREIDEL

ABSENT: WINN

RESOLUTION NO. 2017-07-07

**RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING BOARD
OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
RECOMMENDING THE TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE
ADOPT A REDEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR PARCELS WITHIN THE
INTERSTATE 295 AND FLORENCE-COLUMBUS ROAD
REDEVELOPMENT AREA
PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING LAW, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A -7**

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq. (the "Act"), the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield adopted Resolution No. 2016-6-8 affirming its March 16, 2005 recommendation to the Township Committee that Block 44, Lots 1, 2, 4 and 5.01; Block 45.01, Lots 2.01, 2.02, 3.01, 3.02, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Block 45.03, Lot 1; and Block 47.01, Lots 3.02, 9.01, 9.02, 9.03, 10.01, 10.02, 11 and 12 satisfied the criteria set forth in the Act, including N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5, to be designated as an area in need of redevelopment and recommended that the Township Committee include these parcels in the Interstate 295 and Florence-Columbus Road Redevelopment Area as Areas in Need of Redevelopment and Areas in Need of Rehabilitation; and

WHEREAS, on March 1, 2016, by its Resolution No. 2016-3-6, the Planning Board endorsed Township Ordinance 2016-4 and recommended that the Township Committee adopt the Redevelopment Plan for the Interstate 295 and Florence-Columbus Road Area, prepared by Mark A. Remsa, AICP, PP, ASLA, LLA, Director of Economic Development and Regional Planning, Burlington County Bridge Commission, Department of Economic Development and Regional Planning, Revised November, 2015, as the Redevelopment Plan was consistent with the Board's 2005 recommendation; and

WHEREAS, on March 3, 2016, the Township Committee of the Township of Mansfield adopted Ordinance 2016-4 declaring Block 44, Lots 1, 2, 4 and 5.01; Block 45.01, Lots 2.01, 2.02, 3.01, 3.02, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Block 45.03, Lot 1; and Block 47.01, Lots 3.02, 9.01, 9.02, 9.03, 10.01, 10.02, 11 and 12 as an Area in Need of Redevelopment (the "Interstate 295 and Florence-Columbus Road Redevelopment Area") pursuant to the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Township of Mansfield received notice from the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs ("DCA") that the designation of Block 44, Lots 1, 2, 4 and 5.01; Block 45.01, Lots 2.01, 2.02, 3.01, 3.02, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Block 45.03, Lot 1; and Block 47.01, Lots 3.02, 9.01, 9.02, 9.03, 10.01, 10.02, 11 and 12 as An Area in Need of Development became effective upon the Township's filing of the designation with DCA; and

WHEREAS, at its July 12, 2017 meeting, the Township Committee introduced Ordinance No. 2017-11 "An Ordinance of the Township of Mansfield Adopting a Redevelopment Plan for Parcels Within The Interstate 295 and Florence Columbus Road Redevelopment Area" in accordance with the requirements set forth in N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq. and has referred Ordinance 2017-11 to the Planning Board for the Board's report and recommendation as required by N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-7(e), and to reaffirm the Board's March, 2016 recommendation; and

WHEREAS, on July 24, 2017, the Planning Board held a hearing and reviewed the "Redevelopment Plan for the Interstate 295 and Florence-Columbus Road Area, Block 44, Lots 1, 2, 4 and 5.01; Block 45.01, Lots 2.01, 2.02, 3.01, 3.02, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8; Block 45.03, Lot 1; and Block 47.01, Lots 3.02, 9.01, 9.02, 9.03, 10.01, 10.02, 11 and 12" and prepared for The Township of Mansfield by Mark A. Remsa, AICP, PP, ASLA, LLA, Director of Economic Development and Regional Planning of the Burlington County Bridge Commission, Department of Economic Development and Regional Planning, revised November, 2015 (the "Redevelopment Plan"); and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield as follows:

1. **HEARING ON THE REDEVELOPMENT PLAN.** The Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield at its regular meeting on July 24, 2017, reviewed the Redevelopment Plan, heard a presentation by Mark A. Remsa, and afforded

the public with an opportunity to make comments and ask questions concerning the Redevelopment Plan, in accordance with N.J.S.A.40A:12A-7(e).

2. **FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONG OF THE PLANNING BOARD.** The Planning Board, following the presentation by Mark A. Remsa and an opportunity for public comments, finds that the Redevelopment Plan satisfies the requirements of N.J.S.A. 40A:12-7(a) and that the Redevelopment Plan is substantially consistent with the Master Plan of the Township of Mansfield.

3. **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.** The Planning Board resolves that the Redevelopment Plan, as considered by the Planning Board at its July 24, 2017 hearing, and after the presentation by Mark A. Remsa and the opportunity for public comments, be ADOPTED by the Township Committee. This Resolution shall constitute the Planning Board's Report and Recommendation required in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-7(e) and reaffirms the Board's March 1, 2016 recommendation, as adopted by Board Resolution No. 2016-3-6.

4. **SEVERABILITY.** If any part of this Resolution shall be deemed invalid, such parts shall be severed and the invalidity thereby shall not affect the remaining parts of this Resolution.

5. **AVAILABILITY OF THIS RESOLUTION.** A copy of this Resolution shall be available for public inspection at the Office of the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield.

6. **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

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

**AYE: SEMPTIMPHELTER, PUGLIA, KAMPO, LIPPINCOTT, ALLEN, PATEL
BORGSTROM
NAY: NONE NOT SITTING: PREIDEL ABSENT: WINN**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion to approve the minutes from June 26, 2017 was offered by **Mr. Puglia** and was seconded by **Mr. Semptimphelter**. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

**AYE: PUGLIA, SEMPTIMPHELTER, KAMPO, ALLEN, PATEL, BORGSTROM
NAY: NONE NOT SITTING: PREIDEL ABSENT: WINN**

PUBLIC COMMENTS: There was no public comment

MOTION FOR AJDOURNMENT:

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

Respectfully Submitted:

Date Approved:

Ashley Jolly, Land Use Coordinator