

JACKSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING

MONDAY, May 2, 2022

The May 2nd meeting of the Jackson Township Planning Board was called to order at 7:30 p.m. by Board Chairman Robert Hudak 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: Robert Hudak, Board Chairman Mr. Wall - Municipal Representative
Martin Flemming, Councilman Joseph Riccardi, Mayor's Designee
Len Haring, Board Vice Chairman
Jeffrey Riker
Mordechai Burnstein
Tsvi Herman – Alt #1

Also Present: Sean Gertner, Planning Board Attorney, Ernie Peters, Board Planner, Doug Klee, Board Engineer, Anthony Jacob, Township I.T. Representative, Irina Darrar, Planning Board Recording Secretary, Laura Morrison Planning Board Secretary.

Payment of Recording Secretary, Irina Darrar for March 21, 2022 meeting. **Motioned by Riker/Flemming Yes: Mr. Burtstein, Mr. Herman, Mr. Wall, Mr. Mr. Riker, Mr. Flemming, Riccardi, Mr. Haring, and Mr. Hudak.**

Minutes to be approved from March 21, 2022 meetings. Motioned by Riker/Flemming Yes: Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Herman, Mr. Wall, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Hudak

Mr. Klee Township engineer entered the session at 7: 41PM.

No Engineering/Planning matters were discussed.

Legal matters for discussion:

Resolution # 2020-10 was added to the agenda

Motion by Mr. Wall/Mr. Flemming All in favor among present.

Motion to approve a Resolution 2022-10 Resolution of the Planning Board of Township of Jackson, County of Ocean, and State of New Jersey formally memorialized acceptance of settlement of the project known as Jackson Trails LLC, along South Hope Chapel Road

(Block 2300a Lot 22-29) Riker/Flemming all in favor among present.

Block 3902 Lot 58 Bellevue LLC was carried to August 15th, 2022.

Motion by Riker/Burnestein Yes: Mr. Herman, Mr. Wall, Riker, Burnstein, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Hudak.

Application: Block 401, Lot 9 Right Debow Road

Attorney Salvatore Alfieri's on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Klee stated that this is a continuation of an application submitted on March 21st, 2022. It involves 680,000 sq. feet of floor area and 334,000 worth of sq. feet of office and 646,000 sq. feet of warehouse. Board granted final approval on this application with the understanding the applicant would come back and provide some testimony regarding off-track road improvements associated with Right Debow Road and W. Commodore Blvd. Hopefully, experts can go over the plans and show what the proposal is.

Mr. Peters said that his understanding is that the board heard the application and decided on preliminary site plan approval on December 20th and that this is an application for final site plan approval.

Mr. Peters indicated that the property is still in LM commercial office light industrial Zone. It is still a permitted use. Generally, the board wanted to see the off-site traffic plan. It was going to be prepared for the site; the applicant submitted that with its final site plan application. Our office prepared a report dated April 22, 2022. It asked the applicant to address it, the site traffic plan as well as all the items that were discussed at the preliminary hearing and where you are now.

Mr. Alfieri said that there was a preliminary approval, the board was concerned at that time with intersection alignment, we had agreed that we would go to County, and acquire land to straighten out the intersection, which we have entered into a contract to do, and that contracts are subject to getting if all the approvals, if approved the owner of that corner property at the intersection will convey necessary land to the County or Town, so the road improvements can be done. Board also conditioned the application by having the design presented to the board and Ocean County.

Mr. Ian Bordon president of the professional design service, Airport Road, Lakewood, NJ, a licensed professional planner in NJ, testifying as a planner. This project did receive preliminary site plan approval in December and was memorialized in March. We had applied for preliminary and final concurrently but there were questions about the off-site intersection of Right Debow Road and Commodore Blvd. In preliminary approval, we were asked to do two things: item number one was to develop an engineering plan for the reconfiguration of the intersection of Right Debow and Commodore, have it approved by the County Planning Board, and second to look at the roadway conditions, pavement conditions of Right Debow and Commodore Blvd.

Mr. MacFarlane will present the report as an engineer. The first exhibit shows the aerial. The second is the overall site plan. The third is the overall landscaping plan. The fourth is the color rendering. None of these have changed since the original approval. There was a condition that

there be no truck traffic was permitted westward from our site towards Right Debow. All truck traffic is directed to South or East towards Commodore Blvd.

Exhibit A 6 shows the geometry that was developed with Mr. Rea's office in coordination with the county Engineering staff. The applicant met with engineering staff. This plan has been approved by the Ocean County Planning Board on February 2, 2022. Mr. Borden noted that the offsite intersection plan has been developed in coordination as well as with the property owner of the affected corner.

Mr. John Rea was sworn in as Professional Engineer with McDonough and Rea Associates, specialty traffic engineering. Mr. Rea said that his office collaborated with PDS on the design of the intersection of Right Debow and Commodore Blvd. The applicant took the property from the resident at the corner to bring Right Debow Road into a 90-degree T intersection with Commodore Blvd. that is accepted by engineering standards for a situation like that when you want to get rid of the angle intersection and turn into a 90 degree intersection. There is 50 feet radius on each corner that is sufficient to allow trucks to navigate through the intersection without encroaching on the centerline. We also prepared to widen along commodore Blvd to provide for a left-turn lane for traffic turning left from eastbound Commodore Blvd into Northbound Right Debow Road. The entire intersection is laid out to according engineering standards. Ocean County engineering staff reviews the plans and accepted them.

Mr. Hudak asked if Mr. Rea knows the number of trucks that will be going through each day the intersection.

Mr. Rea said that he was not at the first meeting, so he does not know if at that time there were any restrictions on that intersection.

Mr. Alfieri stated that there are no restrictions on the hours of operations in this area.

Mr. Rea says that since they don't have a tenant so they don't know exactly what the hours of operation will be. As far as peak hour traffic is concerned, during that morning and afternoon peak hours, when traffic study was done, 20 % of the trips to and from the facility will be trucks and 80% will be employees. Approximately 20-25 trucks at peak hours entering the facility. All trucks will be directed to Commodore Blvd. The county is about ready to start construction of improvements at the Glories intersection. They will be widening at the intersection to provide for three approach lanes on both of the Cedar Swamp Road approaches and on one of the County Route 526 approaches, the others will be two lanes. A new traffic signal system will be installed.

Mr. Hudak said it is hard for him to comprehend how a traffic study can be put together when much of it is hypothetical. We don't know who the tenants are, and the hours of operation.

Mr. Alfieri stated that it is still a permitted use. We can get the trucks on the road being our frontage; we are technically not responsible for offsite improvements. This client step up acquiring property to make important off-site improvements that it legally was not required

doing. Mr. Alfieri said that statement of operations was submitted as part of the preliminary approval, Mr. Bordon will read into the records if you'd like.

Mr. Rea said that we use the institution of transportation engineer's trip rates when we don't have a tenant and we don't know exactly what the operation is going to be. ITE data is accepted by the NJDOT, by the Ocean County Planning Board. It is the best data that we have available.

Mr. Ian Bordon said that part of the initial submittal to the board we had prepared and indicated in the application a statement of operations dated April 26, 2021. This statement does not contain any hours of the operations as warehouses are 24-hour operations as in any warehouse normally. Mr. Bordon read the statement for the operations. The property is located within the LM-Commercial office, a light manufacturing industrial Zone. The warehouse is permitted pursuant to section 244-62A -17. The project does comply with the performance standards in the Ordinance. We had listed 3 things, prohibitions; there were no retail sales permitted, all items are stored in an enclosed building and no warehouse and storage of hazardous chemicals permitted. Also, the statement shows the maintenance of the site, the stormwater, snow removal, landscaping, and utility are the responsibility of the owner.

Mr. Gertner reminded the board that preliminary approval was granted with the statement of operations understanding that the statement of operations talks about. Mr. Gertner does not recall orders the Resolution articulate any particular hours of operations because respectfully everyone can be left to their recollection, I'm not trying to make Mr. Alfieri's case, but in this particular circumstances under which the board is reviewing this application at this point is narrow. I would ask to refresh everyone's memory if Mr. Bordon can go over what type of warehouse, this is. Is it an Amazon-type distribution warehouse?

Mr. Bordon said the ordinance states a simple permit warehouse.

Mr. Alfieri said that those warehouses are usually more sq. feet. The one proposed is way smaller.

Mr. Gerner said that in his recollection that the design itself that happened approved by the board is self-limited to the types of uses.

Mr. Peters stated, that in fairness to the applicant, it is a County highway. County gets to decide whether or not traffic signals will be installed if the warrants are not met. I don't think it is a terrible idea for the Township Engineer to have on record what the traffic counts are at the intersection that is going to experience growth. This is coming what else might becoming. Mr. Rea indicates that at a level of service C we don't even bother looking at whether or not a traffic light is necessary. What happens if something else gets built, at some point have individual developers responsible when they cross a threshold to build a traffic light, it is import the Municipality needs to have it on file with the township engineer, so at some point in the time we decide to look at traffic master planning along some of the County highways, we can say full development and this might get us to the point where we may need a traffic signal and the

Municipality may want to visit County on its own and say this is the development that we had and now it is growth that occurred in the last decade or so and have a conversation with the County.

Gram Macfarlane was sworn in. Professional planner and engineer, Certified Municipal engineer, the principle of professional design services. Testifying on roadway condition report dated March 30, 2022. He stated that during the preliminary approval there were a lot of discussions about what kind of physical condition Right Debow Road was in. The report summarized all the information about the road condition. The pavement is generally 26 feet wide from West Commodore for the project site, for about a length of 2,800 feet and a width of 40 feet at the RT 195 overpass at the bridge. There are some areas of isolated pavement failure, but none of them are severe. There is no significant lack of drainage collection. Stripping and shoulders were evaluated as well, also a series of asphalt cores, we concluded that the surface course had an average thickness of 2 inches along the length of the roadway. Road also has a subbase average thinness of 5 inches. Overall we found that road pavement is in good condition. We did make some recommendations, pavement is worn because it has not been overlaid in quite some time, and overlay should be planned in the next few years.

Mr. Riker asked if there are signs of alligatoring.

Mr. McFarland said it is very mind, alligatoring would generally have poor drainage or poor subgrade and not adequate material thickness.

Mr. Hudak asked about the main road that we had discussed, the returning radius, and all that, we have not discussed Right Debow Road and as a Municipal Road, it was constructed as you said approximately 25 years ago. I assume it was not constructed to withstand the truck traffic, in your professional opinion you have 80,000 pounds of tractor-trailer coming down the road every 2 minutes, how long do you think this road will last. Bear in mind that the report states that the road is in adequate condition.

Mr. Macfarlane said that there is a lot of speculation involved. I cannot answer that question directly. The way how I evaluated this road, if it was built today, it would meet the definition of a major collector.

Mr. Hudak asked Mr. Klee if he had a chance to review the report regarding the road condition and verify it.

Mr. Klee said that he did not do a site inspection. He relied on the applicant's representation, license engineer, soil samples were taken. Mr. Klee said there was nothing in the report to make him suspect or cause him to go out and question if it was accurate or not.

Mr. Riker asked if two tractor-trailers are waiting to make a left or right turn, is the condition that you are constructing adequate to handle it?

Mr. Macfarlane said the intersection is under the jurisdiction of Ocean County and will be built to their standards.

Mr. Peters said that Mr. MacFarlane indicated that the area study probably needs cement overlay. Is it something that the applicant is proposed to do?

Mr. Macfarlane said no.

Mr. Peters asked if Mr. McFarland expects the Municipality to be responsible for it.

Mr. MacFarlane stated that this is a Township road and their obligation to maintain the roadway.

Mr. Peters asked if Mr. MacFarlane review the report with the Township engineer, if the Municipality has a plan to improve the road and if he shared the report with the Township engineer.

Mr. MacFarlane said he did not.

Mr. Peters asked the applicant to go over the frontage improvements and street frontage improvements for the site.

Mr. MacFarlane said he believes that it is minimal frontage improvements proposed. Literally, after 3 days we finished compiling all our data and preparing our report. The section of the road out from the bridge past the sites was fully overlaid, and photos are included in appendix B at the back of the report, so the road is fully improved and overlaid with a curve along the site frontage.

Mr. Gertner suggested reporting to the Municipal engineer if they are working that up, so when all the improvements are done the road is upgraded as well simultaneously.

Mr. Alfieri said, that he wants to remind all this is a final approval, the two primary conditions of preliminary were the infrastructural intersection improvements and the road conditions. We've addressed the intersection improvements. We've gotten County approval., it's designed obviously in far superior condition to what it exists today. As it relates to the road condition we've agreed that we'll work with the Township professionals as part of a developer's agreement to pay our fair share, if and when the town decides to repave or resurface the road we will pay our share and we will address any conditions that remain open as part of the preliminary approval. We request the board to grant us final approval.

Public comments: Motioned by Flemming/Riker Yes: Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Herman, Mr. Flemmin, Mr. Riker, Mr. Wall, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Hudak

Application was approved. Motion by Flemming/Riker Yes: Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Herman, Mr. Wall, Mr. Riker, Mr. Flemming, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Hudak

Block 5301, Lot 12-146 North County Line Road, LLC

Kr. Klee stated that this is an application that the board carried from March 21, 2022. If the applicant has provided revised plans, the applicant should go over the revision. We do have a reduction overall in the floor area. There is still a basement area, if we include that basement area, the required parking is 114 spaces, and 99 spaces are provided. There are also signed setback variances for the proposed business site.

Mr. Peters said he has a report dated April 26, 2022. There is still confusion with the calculation for the retail space. The site plan indicates 5,484 sq. feet. Can't quite figure out where it comes from, need an explanation. The question was about tractor-trailers leaving the site. On the Northside of the building, there are small walls for the loading docks; it appears it might be like threading the needle to get a tractor-trailer out of there.

Gregory Howk on behalf of the applicant 146 North County Line Road LLC. The last time we were here the board wanted us to get that parking variance down, to shrink the building size to assist and tie in to bring that parking variance down, specifically the basement –Mezzanine area. The applicant has gone to the drawing board and I think we are able to bring you something satisfactory to you. Our parking variance has been reduced by one-half, by dropping the square footage of the building by 3,308 square feet, which reduces our parking demand. There was the main focus on a rear buffer. So now we gave you a full buffer across the whole side of the site. Now we are looking for a parking variance for 15 spaces, whereas before we were asking for a variance to reduce by 29 spaces.

Mr. Gram Macfarlane was sworn in as a Professional Engineer and Planner, a certified Municipal Engineer. The principle of professional design services. Exhibit A- 22. The site plan drawing that was submitted was revised date April 11. It shows the revision layout of the project buildings' footprint, the footprint was reduced a little bit from what we had. The project was revised to provide a full 25-foot buffer along the rear property line. Previously we were asking for relief of that 25-foot buffer, but now we made it fully conforming and we do ask for that area to be inspected after clearing. A meeting will be held by the Township forester and then supplemental planting that we are required in that buffer will be added to provide screening as per the recommendation of the Township forester. The floor area of the building has been reduced. The total proposed now is 22,791 sq. feet. We also have revised the floor for the Mezzanine area in the basement. The next exhibit will be A-23, the basement plan. A small portion of the basement will be finished; the rest would be slab-on-grade unoccupied.

The basement area is reduced significantly as well. Exhibit A-24 is the updated first-floor plan. The rear bump out of the building was eliminated. Exhibit A- 25 is the second floor. The open area in the middle will be dedicated to offices, an open lobby area, and conferences. Exhibit A- 26 Mezzanine space originally was much larger than now. It is an amenity space for the occupants of the building and it is much smaller. If the mezzanine and basement area is included in the floor space, the parking requirement is 114 spaces. We ended up with 99 and a loading area. We are asking for the waiver for the loading area, since it is a little bit small than the ordinance requirements, and no tractor-trailers or deliveries will be conducted. This can be a

condition of approval. We have received a review letter from Mr. Peters. The letter notes relief for a side yard or setback of the parking area. Board recalls this is an amended application, previously board did grant us relief for the West parking area, but we have extended it with the application, initially that relief was for the end of the building, and with this revision design that relief is requested for the entire property line. We proposed 7 feet where 10 feet is required. We have some relief on the bottom side of the project where we have 3 parking spaces proposed. Both professionals pointed out relief for the sign. The sign is located right about that area, relief was granted with the original application. We are asking for the same relief to the signage. Mr. Peters mentioned adding some street trees along the front of the property, we agreed to comply with that. We do have a small design waiver request with the trash enclosure; it is located in the back center of the site. We do have landscaping proposed on both the West and East side of the enclosure, there is a fence enclosing it.

Mr. Riccardi had a question about the Mezzanine; clarify what type of the area that would be.

Mr. Howk stated that it is the amenity space that employees can go and use for a brief period.

Mr. Richard Tokarscki was sworn in, 1729 RT 35, Wall New Jersey. He stated that he prepared the plans. The basement level was decreased, and unused square footage was reduced from 4,274 to 3,208. We did this by shrinking unusable space and increasing the slab on the grade unexcavated area. House trap is used as an architectural slang for the backflow prevention room. All commercial buildings after 9-11 are required to have backflow prevention. The mezzanine and basement will not be used simultaneously so that will decrease parking demand. A- 24 main level plan. Mr. Tokarscki said that the gross square footage of the building is taken from the inside of the exterior perimeter walls, and retail components, which was 5484 gross square feet, we took the perimeter from this line across the front and excluded stairs in the back which serves the office upstairs and across the backline and that gives us roughly 5400 square footage. Exhibit A- 25 has moderate changes on the floor. We straightened out the back of the building, with a minor reduction in the square footage. A-26 Mezzanine level, we took off significant square footage, it is slightly less than 800 square feet. The mezzanine used to wrap around the entire perimeter in a U- shape, square footage has been minimized and we only have 800 square feet. The total reduction of the square footage is 1800 square feet.

Mr. John Rea was sworn in. A professional Engineer, focusing on traffic engineering. Professional Engineer with McDonough and Rea Associates, specialty traffic engineering He said that Mr. Klee indicated that if we take the square footage of the basement out of the calculation of the parking, we would meet the parking requirement, and have 99 parking spaces, where 98 is required. There will be no office space in the basement, it will be used for the mechanical and other rooms to make the building function, will be an area for the storage, and there will be no employees there on a regular base. In terms of consideration, we are asking for relief from the parking situation.

Mr. Peters said that Mr. MacFarlane indicated that the area study probably is in need of an overlay. Is it something that the applicant is proposing to do?

Mr. Macfarlane said no.

Mr. Peters asked if Mr. McFarland expects the Municipality to be responsible for it.

Mr. MacFarlane stated that this is a Township road and their obligation to maintain the roadway.

Mr. Peters asked if Mr. MacFarlane review the report with the Township engineer, if the Municipality has a plan to improve the road and if he shared the report with the Township engineer.

Mr. MacFarlane said he did not.

Mr. Peters asked the applicant to go over the frontage improvements and street frontage improvements for the site. Mr. MacFarlane said he believes that there are minimal frontage improvements proposed. Literally, after 3 days we finished compiling all our data and preparing our report. The section of the road out from the bridge past the sites is fully overlaid, and photos are included in appendix B at the back of the report, so the road is fully improved and overlaid with a curve along the site frontage.

Mr. Gertner suggested reporting to the Municipal engineer if they are working that up, so when all the improvements are done the road is upgraded as well simultaneously.

Mr. Alfieri said, that he wants to remind all this is a final approval, the two primary conditions of preliminary were infrastructural intersection improvements and the road conditions. We've addressed the intersection improvements, and we've gotten County approval. It's designed obviously in far superior condition to what it exists today. As it relates to the road condition we've agreed that we'll work with the Township professionals as part of a developer's agreement to pay our fair share and when the town decides to repave or resurface the road we will pay our share and we will address any conditions that remain open as part of the preliminary approval. We request the board to grant us final approval.

Public comments Motioned by Riker/Flemming Yes: Mr. Burnstein, Mr. Herman, Riker, Flemming, Mr. Wall, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Hudak.

Application was approved. Motion by Flemming/Burnstein Mr. Herman, Mr. Wall, Mr. Riccardi, Mr. Haring, Mr. Hudak

Application: Block 4601 Lot 4 and 5 –GM Equities, LLC

Mr. Klee stated this is an application for preliminary site plan approval associated with the construction of a 3,800 sq. foot office and 38,258 sq. foot warehouse building on the subject property. The application is variance free, with the exception of lot width where 175 feet is

required and 172 are provided. The application is impacted by the construction overlay zone which requires a valid letter of interpretation for it to be deemed complete. The applicant is requesting a waiver from that requirement. Some testimony from the applicant will be needed, as it is a threshold issue. Local environmental commissions had no concern as of October 20th, 2021. The applicant has provided a traffic impact analysis, which should be reviewed with the board. Bureau of traffic safety indicated no concerns as of July 15, 2022. Parking is in compliance with the Ordinance standards. The site is not impacted by Wetlands; there is a stormwater management basin near the site. We are just questioning how the pipe is going to be put in the limited area and how it will be maintained.

Mr. Peters stated that we have a report dated April 15th of this year. The property is located in a highway commercial zone. What the applicant is proposing is permitted in this zone. We need a statement of operations. We had a question about some architectural conditions and overhead doors into the buildings, what their intent is in terms of the use, and also concern about the vehicle circulation. Testimony about the number and dumpster location is needed. The building has no tenants so we don't know how many units, how it will be broken up. This might require a lot consolidation.

Attorney Adam Pfeffer on behalf of the applicant. The site is approximately 5 acres. The applicant is seeking to construct a warehouse which will be 38,285 sq. feet of warehouse and another 3,800 sq. feet of mezzanine area. It is a permitted use, the only variance we will be seeking for the lot frontage which is an existing condition. The site is 172.33 feet and 175 are requested. As far as the solar will be rooftop, for minimum exterior lighting for the site.

Ian Borden was sworn in. President of professional design services since 2006. Working in the engineering field since 1983. Licensed as a professional planner in NJ. The first exhibit is photography. The site does contain areas of Wetlands. The second exhibit –is a site plan. The Wetlands are located on the Northern side, on County line road, it is a very small portion and another one is an isolated Wetland adjoining the property. We had submitted an application for DEP; we are waiting for the site inspection. We are proposing on this site a single building, as having an office, showroom garage, warehouse, and shop. This site is in a highway commercial zone, and that use is permitted under the highway commercial zone. We did provide a statement of the operations. All the activities will be performed inside the building, no outside storage of the material or the equipment is permitted. We have 9 tenants identified on the architectural plans. There was a question about joining lot 6 which is to the East here. The house that was there has been removed, and that adjoining property lot six and lot seven was the subject of the site plan that was approved by the Zoning board for the same use. It was also approved for the office, shop, warehouse, and garage. Buffer is not required, because the Jackson Township ordinance requires buffer for the Residential Zone, none of these are Residential Zones. Township ordinance requires 54 parking spaces, we are providing 54. There are loading zones proposed. We have one loading dock in the rear and one in front. Each of the tenants has a single garage door. The highway commercial Zone allows a maximum height of 35

feet, the proposed is 35 feet to the flat roof. The site will provide a single driveway to North county line road, the driver will be a right turn in and right turn out only. We did provide a vehicle circulation plan, that shows WB50 traversing the site by circular driveway around the building, with a single access to County line road. We have proposed a ground sign in front of the building that fully complies with the ordinance landscaped according to the zone. The building will be connected to public water and sewer. Public water will not be used for irrigation, an individual well will be provided. We do purpose stormwater basin in the back of the property. The buffer, our intent is to modify the shape of the buffers, we are permitted to do that under a transitionary waiver, sufficient to allow that pipe and space to construct the pipe. That will be a subsequent permit that we would receive once we receive the LOI for DEP.

Mr. Klee asked if the applicant will also need an encroachment into the Wetlands buffer. I'm thinking about the access drive, I'm scaling about five feet that you have to thread this pipe through, but in the long term of maintenance, your typical driveway is going to be 10-12 feet wide. How is this going to get?

Mr. Bordon said that our intention will be to provide a minimum width of 10 feet, to put the pipe in, and also to provide a driveway, all of which would be covered by a DEP permit.

Mr. John Rea was sworn in. Professional engineer with McDonough and Rea Associates testifying on traffic. A licensed professional engineer in NJ. I did a full traffic impact study on this project including the analysis of the site driveway, and the level of the service. It will be right in, right out driveway. The levels of the service will be good till 2032. We will have a B-level service for traffic exiting out into County Line road. We don't need parking variances. 54 parking spaces are required and it is provided.

Mr. David Collins was sworn in. Bachelor's in Architect from Rodger William University, licensed since 207 in NJ. Mr. Collins stated that the front of the building architecturally is really the side. There all the entrances to the units are on the top part of the site plan. There is a rendering viewed as you enter the site, looking down the length of all of the office fronts and what we've done is to break up the length of the building We raised the area where the entrances are. The second floor shows windows and mezzanine offices, also accentuated by the entrance. Building height is 35 feet per ordinance to the top of the quote-unquote flat roof. Regarding rooftop equipment, that type of the building is usually heated only in the warehouse area, usually heated with hanging units that hang from the ceiling, with no exterior equipment.

Mr. Peters stated that it appears to him that the overhead doors appreciate the unit is 16 feet wide or is it 8 feet wide and 10 feet high.

Mr. Collins said there are 2 different types of doors on this type of building. The drive in doors are larger, 10-12 and on the end wall where we have the dock Height doors, there would be smaller 8-10.

Mr. Peters asked, what is the intent to put loading docks facing North County line road?

Mr. Collins said that area was selected for the ability to maneuver a truck into that area.

Mr. Peters said that he tries to understand the layout. It looks like the loading dock is 60 feet long. This is a highway Commercial Zone, I'm not sure if you are driving down the County line road and you see double loading docks in the front yard of the site. It appears to be a loading dock for a 2700 sq. feet building that has an entrance from the Westside, the end unit in the back is an oversized unit that has a loading dock, and is far enough that nobody can see it. In front of the building, two loading docks will be visible from the front of the building.

Mr. Borden stated that they are on end because of the narrowness of the site. A client is trying to accommodate the tenants.

Mr. Peters was still perplexed by having 2 loading docks on County line road.

Mr. Borden said in the front of the building is offset from the driveway and he tried to give flexibility for deliveries. Also, Ordinance allows him to do that layout.

Public comments: Burnstein/Riker all in favor among present.

Mr. Hudak stated that the applicant needs a little more work to do, so he offered to come back on June 20, 2022

Mr. Gertner stated in Block 4601 lots 4 and 5 that matters have been carried to June 20, 2022 meeting without the request of further notice. Waive time through June 30th, 2022

Meeting was adjourned. Motion by Burnsten/Riker all in favor among present.

Respectfully submitted by

Irina Darrar

Planning Board Recording Secretary