

JACKSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, APRIL 26, 2021

The April 26, 2021 meeting of the Jackson Township Board was called to order at 7:38 p.m. by Planning Board Secretary, Denise Buono with a salute to the flag by all present. Attorney Sean Gertner read the Open Public Meetings Act Statement noting that adequate notice has been provided and advertised in the manner prescribed by law.

ROLL CALL: Tim Dolan- *virtual* Terence Wall, Township Representative- *virtual*
Andrew Jozwicki- *virtual* Martin Flemming, Councilman
Manuela Brito- Alt #2 Joseph Riccardi, Mayor's Designee
Len Haring, Board Vice Chairman
Robert Hudak, Board Chairman

Absent: Dr. Michele Campbell, Jeffrey Riker, Anthony Luisi- Alt #1

Also Present: Planning Board Attorney Sean Gertner, Mr. Peters, Board Planner, Doug Klee, Board Engineer, Denise Buono, Planning Board Secretary, Anthony Jacob, Township I.T. representative, and Danielle Sinowitz, Planning Board Recording Secretary.

Payment of Recording Secretary, Danielle Sinowitz, for 4/26/21 motioned by HARING/ Flemming. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Payment of Planning Board Secretary, Danielle Sinowitz, for 4/26/21 motioned by HARING/ Flemming. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Applications: 1. Dubin Contracting, LLC, Block 3601, Lots 2, 3, 5 & 6- Mr. Klee stated this is an application for preliminary and final site plan for a 6,000SF office building on West County Line Road, and on March 1, 2021 there was initial testimony, and the application was variance free and there was concern with the actual layout and there is some new variance relief required and there should be testimony in support of that to support the relief being requested and there should be confirmation on the trash enclosure because it's not on the drawing and it needs to be a minimum of 10' from the property line. Mr. Peters advised there are 3 letters, the 3rd letter being date April 22, 2021, and this is still in the HC Zone and in addition to the 3 existing bulk variances there will be an additional variance for side yard setback and minimum parking setback from the travel way, and that is because the request has been reconciled from the March 1, 2021 meeting.

Sal Alfieri- attorney for the applicant- stated as the professionals indicated there was a revised plan to reorient the building closer the road and there the engineer and the planner presented and there was buy/sell letters submitted to show this is an isolated under sized lot and the letters were provided to show that there is no land that can be obtained and there is an adjacent property owner and in addition to the 2 repots there has been a new letter obtained and the engineer will be called. Mr. Gertner announced it was just noted that Mr. Riccardi is not eligible, and so the record is clear there is still a quorum.

Jason Burneyko- licensed professional Engineer in New Jersey, employed with D.W Smith, and has been previously sworn- Mr. Hudak noted Mr. Burneyko's credentials have been accepted previously as well. Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. Burneyko to describe the changes to the plan and if there are exhibits Mr. Jacob should be told. Mr. Burneyko advised there are previous exhibits and there are new exhibits that have been provided to compare the original plan to the plan before the Board this evening, and first is the last revised exhibit of April 5, 2021; **Exhibit A-5**, and after the first meeting there were comments raised and the building was set to the rear of the site with a single drive isle with parking on both sides and the site went to a dead end and it was advised that if the building was moved closer to County Line Road it would be more in line with Mavis Tire, and there is a previously approved plan in between this site and the Mavis and all 3 will be aligned for better unity. Mr. Burneyko stated the building is still the same size with the same use and there is still the requirement for 30 spaces and as previously discussed in order to move the building towards West County Line Road and fit a drive isle there were variances and waivers created, and one variance is a setback to the side yard which is now 12' where 20' is required, there is a side yard parking setback and there is 4-6' where 20' is required, the front yard setback is 15' where 20' is required and the front is matching with Mavis and the variances and waivers will be gone through and with the new layout there is access to the rear of the property and that allows for better access for garbage and fire trucks and there is no dead end as previously designed and the trash enclosure was able to be moved to the rear corner of the site and the intent of the drainage will remain the same. Mr. Burneyko mentioned the impervious percentage has increased however it is still within the requirement and there will be 2 underground drainage systems which will be keep the levels low to keep with existing conditions and there is landscaping all throughout the site and there will be 52 trees planted where 30 are required and the plantings will be in the visible islands and there is buffering provided in the front to avoid glare to County Line road and the trash enclosure has plantings on 3 sides and there is a rear buffer provided on the northern property line and the adjacent condo complex asked for a 6' fence board on board which has been agreed too, and there have been outside agencies reached out too and the fire official is all who has responded, and the fire official did agree that the site was acceptable and the site layout was noted to be working better than the original site layout. Mr. Alfieri noted there were 2 comments in Mr. Peters and Mr. Klee's report, and one is as it relates to lighting, and the dumpster, there is a setback requirement for the dumpster. Mr. Burneyko stated the enclosure has a 10' requirement and this shows the side yard at 6 ½' and it can be moved to the west to comply with the 10' requirement and there was comment about the front parking spaces and the driveway area that were noted they were under the requirement, and there can be revised plans to add or shift a necessary light. Mr. Peters asked if the dumpster went from the front to the back. Mr. Burneyko advised the dumpster was in the front of the building and that was when the building was to the rear and the comments were made about the nice building with the dumpster in front of it and the layout now allows to the dumpster to be to the rear which allows for required access. Mr. Alfieri asked for testimony regarding the glass element on the building. Mr. Burneyko stated the building has a glass feature and it's not included in the footprint and the glass facade has been moved. Mr. Alfieri asked if the plan handed out shows how that has been moved. Mr. Burneyko said yes. Mr. Alfieri asked that if the Bard approves the plan, the facade be able to be moved so it makes for a nicer appearance. Mr. Burneyko presented **Exhibit A-6**, an updated architectural rendering. Mr. Gertner stated this Exhibit is showing the moving of the facade. Mr. Burneyko stated the rendering has been done to reflect the new layout. Mr. Alfieri stated as the Board professionals indicated, there was a report of April 21, 2021 from Mr. Klee, and Mr. Peters letter was received shortly after, and asked if there are comments that cannot be addressed. Mr. Burneyko stated there was a comment about the light fixture that the lights should be in the 6" concrete footing and because there is the 2 light fixtures where there is head on parking towards county line road, there is a 3' concrete footing to keep vehicles safe in the event there is an accident, and the 6" concrete base would be installed not along head on parking, and its asked that the 2 light futures have the larger fitting. Mr. Hudak noted the

building really does look nice from the rendering.

Jason Schooling, civil engineer and planner. Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. Schooling if he will be testifying as a planner, and if the planning credentials could be placed on the record. **Jason Schooling- licensed in the state of NJ, and has testified before other Board's in the state-credentials accepted- sworn-** Mr. Alfieri advised the bulk variances have been discussed, and asked if the proof could be placed on the record. Mr. Schooling stated this is an office building, and there are variances being sought for minimum lot area, minimum lot frontage from County Line Road, minimum lot width, minimum side yard setback from the principal building, and for providing front yard parking setback and a side yard parking setback. Mr. Alfieri asked if the first 3 which relate to the size and width of the lot are C-variances. Mr. Schooling advised that was correct, and these are requested through the narrowness and size of the lot and the strict bulk standards for the highway commercial zone which result in a hardship that relates to a specific lot in the zone and there were buy/ sell letters sent, and there was no interest from anyone to buy and sell, and moving to the C-2 variances; when this was originally submitted the building was in the rear of the property with all the parking in the front and that eliminated the variances and with the comments from the Board it was suggested the building and parking be moved so the building can line up with Mavis and by shifting the building the parking split up and there was a drive isle added and shifting the building made for a variance and there is a parking variance required and as the Board is aware the c-2 variances would be advanced by deviation from the local zoning required, and the outcome benefits more than detriments, it will be secure safety, because there is emergency access on 3 sides of the building in the event of an emergency, and the circulation has also been improved, and it helps improve the location and will promote the free flow of traffic. Mr. Schooling continued as previously testified, the dead end would present some congestion and having 2 parking areas, and the loop there will be an increase of flow on site and moving the building forward makes the properties align on the East and West and it makes for a more harmonious look and it allows for the refuse enclosure to be moved to the back, and with looking at the negative criteria there are multiple areas where there will be a benefit or an elimination of the issues and the storm water management meets all requirements and there will be no increase of run off and the lighting on the site has been submitted under the plans, and they do meet all lighting requirement and there will be no spillage and the site access and circulation there has been an improvement, and there will be a good flow, and there will be no detriment to County Line and aesthetically moving the building and parking forward and the only negative impact makes the building closer to the eastern property line and there is still a significant wooded buffer to the neighboring lot. Mr. Alfieri asked if the positive out weights the negative. Mr. Schooling said yes. Mr. Flemming mentioned that the impervious percentage went up, what is the percentage of the impervious coverage on site. Mr. Burneyko stated 72.6% where 75% is the maximum. Mr. Hudak asked if Mr. Peters concurs with the testimony provided. Mr. Peters takes no exception taken from the variances, and this is a better layout for the applicant, it's safe and does improve the visuals on County Line Road.

Opened public comment; seeing no use the "raise hand" function; motion to close the public portion by FLEMMING/ Haring.

Yes: All in favor among those present.

Motion to approve by FLEMMING/ Haring. Yes: Jozwicki, Brito, Wall, Flemming, Haring, Hudak.

Motion to adjourn at 8:13 p.m. by HARING/ Dolan. Yes: All in favor among those present.

Respectfully submitted,

Danielle Sinowitz,
Planning Board Recording Secretary