

JACKSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD MEETING

Monday, August 21, 2023,

The August 21st, 2023 special meeting of the Jackson Township Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Board Attorney Mr. Shea with a salute to the flag by all present. The Planning Board attorney Me. Shea read the Open Public Meetings Act Statement noting that adequate notice has been provided and advertised in the manner prescribed by law.

Roll Call: Mr. Bressi-Mayoral Designee Mr. Wall-Administrator
Mr. Burnstein Mr. Heller -Alt II
Mr. Flemming Ms. DeMarzo -Alt I
Mr. Sullivan Dr. Campbell
Mr. Riker Mr. Herman
Mr. Haring

Also, Present are Robert Shea Planning Board Attorney, Ernie Peters, Board Planner, Doug Klee, Board Engineer, Anthony Jacob IT Department, Laura Morrison Planning Board Secretary, and Irina Darrar Planning Board Recording Secretary.

Motion to approve a voucher for Planning Board recording secretary Irina Darrar for August 21st, 2023 Riker/Burnstein All in favor among present.

Motion to approve minutes from July 17th, 2023 Motion Sullivan/ Riker yes: Bressi, Burnstein, Riker, Heller, Sullivan, Wall, DeMarzo Flemming, Campbell.

RESOLUTION # 2023-23 OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWNSHIP OF JACKSON, COUNTY OF OCEAN, STATE OF NEW JERSEY GRANTING PRELIMINARY & FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL WITH REQUIRED VARIANCES AND DESIGN WAIVERS FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A MIXED-USE BUILDING FOR JAMES R. JOHNSON, JR., CAROL HORDICHUK & DAVID JOHNSON, BLOCK 2603, LOTS 29, 30, & 31.

Motion Burnstein/Riker Yes: Bressi, Burnstein, Flemming, Riker, Heller, Wall, DeMarzo, Campbell.

Changes to Agenda:

Block 4101 various lots. Jackson Woods Southeast section will be carried to November 6th, 2023 Motion Burnstein/Riker all in favor among present. Notice will be required.

Block 2301, 4201, 4203, Lots 1,2, 26.01, 28,29 30-2, 15 and 56, Block 57, Lot 1 Jackson Development Company –Jackson 21 will be carried to November 20th, 2023. Notice will be required. Motion Riker/Sullivan all in favor among present.

Motion Burnstein/Riker Yes: all in favor.

Applications

Block 8101 Lot 10, 715 Bennett's Mills LLC

Donna Jennings on behalf of the applicant. The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final major site plan approval with bulk variance relief to construct an approximately 16,377 sq. feet second-story office space on an existing retail building located at 715 Bennett's Mills Road. The subject property is located in the NC Neighborhood Commercial Zone. In addition to the site plan approval, the applicant is also seeking 2 bulk variances as follows maximum impervious coverage where 60 percent is permitted and 87 percent is proposed, and setback from the non-residential side yard property line where 10 feet is required and 2.5 feet is proposed. Also, the applicant seeks a design waiver from the minimum parking requirement where 189 spaces are required for parking and 180 spaces are proposed. The applicant has received reports from the Environmental Commission report dated March 2023, the Traffic safety report dated April 12, 2023 fire safety dated June 29, 2023, Board Engineer July 1, 2023, and Board Planner, August 11, 2023.

Mr. Klee stated that the original submission required several variances regarding signs. The revised plans were submitted that eliminated those variances. He stated that we are dealing with the maximum impervious coverage as well as parking area setbacks to non-residential property lines. Mr. Klee needs testimony from the applicant regarding the variances. The proposal is a two-story addition. This is like a redevelopment project. The addition is going to go in the middle of the existing building. There is a roof area on either side. There was an indication on the plans, that it will be utilized for something, but Mr. Klee is not sure for what. He will leave it for the applicant to describe. In regards to the outdoor areas, if there are any utilities. There is a Dunkin Donuts involved. Mr. Klee wants to know if there is any existing roof fence that will be impacted. Mr. Klee also wants to know why impervious coverage cannot be reduced to be more conformed to the Ordinance, meaning a reduction of the floor area proposed. Some testimony from the applicant regarding the variances request is needed. Landscaping is limited to some street trees. Mr. Klee wants to know if the applicant can do a little better as far as the landscaping.

Mr. Peters stated that they have a report date, of August 11, 2023. The property is located in the NC Neighborhood Commercial Zone. The uses proposed are permitted in the Zone. The existing site is about 21,400 square feet. The applicant is putting about 16,000 square feet on top, utilizing the existing perimeter of the site. Mr. Peters suggested to the applicant when they ask for the variances relief and design waivers, the Board reconciled the design standards in 2023.

Mr. Yehuda Back was sworn in. Licensed Professional Engineer in NJ. He stated he worked for New Line 6 years ago. Graduated from OCC and NJIT. Mr. Back stated that the exhibit A-5 is the aerial view. He stated that the site is currently a one-story structure housing around 21,000 square feet of retail. Proposing to pave the surface stormwater basin over to provide additional parking that is needed to construct the second story to the one-story structure which will house around 16,000 sf of office space. On the right side of the site, there is a vacant building. Mr. Back believes it is a Wawa, and to the left, is an Auto body shop. Mr. Back stated there will be a

facelift to the building and parking will be repaved and restriped, adding landscaping. Now shade trees are proposed, but the applicant will comply with the Ordinance. Currently, the stormwater basin takes all the water off of the site. For the larger storms, it runs off into Manhattan Street. The applicant is proposing to contain all the stormwater on the site, it will infiltrate into the ground and additionally, the applicant will provide pre-treatment in the form of one of the applicable MTDs. Mr. Back stated that he is asking for two bulk variances. One is for the maximum imperial coverage of 84% where 60 % is permitted. Currently, the site has around 77% impervious coverage which is above the 60 % permitted. The second variance is the setback from the nonresidential side yard property line. The applicant is asking for 3 feet setback variance. Where 10 feet is requested. Existing on the site now is 5.5 feet. The applicant is not asking for any sign variances. Mr. Back stated that the design waiver that the applicant is asking for is for the minimum parking. The requested is 181 the applicant is proposing 171. Handicap and electric parking space requests will be met.

Mr. Flemming recused himself at 7:36 PM.

Ms. Jennings asked Mr. Bank if any landscaping improvement could be done for the site.

Mr. Back stated yes and that Exhibit A-8 shows large islands. Those islands provide 10 feet of width which the applicant needs. The red areas show how the applicant can expand the traffic islands, whatever the Ordinance requires. Mr. Back stated that there proposing 6 new office suites, and office hours will be 9-5 PM. About 18 employees. Currently, 7 existing retail offices operate from about 8 AM to 9 PM. The outside light will remain the same, no changes will be made. Mr. Back stated that he was in touch with the fire official, and he wants more fire hydrants. The applicant will provide it. Mr. Back stated that he is in touch with the county. The county has its master plan. As soon as the County tells the applicant to add another lane, the applicant will add it. As of now, no improvements are proposed on either roadway.

Mr. Peters asked how Mr. Back was going to reconcile the loading area and the fire lanes.

Mr. Back said that there was enough area there. There are 40 feet from the base of the curb to the back of the building. Fire lanes shall be a minimum of 20 feet, he said he would like to be 24. Keeping at 24 feet there is still sufficient space for the loading and unloading area. Mr. Peters needs in writing that the back of the building is not going to be used for parking.

Mrs. Jennings said the applicant agrees that there be no parking in the back.

Mr. Back stated that currently there is one trash enclosure. He said that there was also one in the back.

Mr. Peters wants to know where the trash enclosure is going. He said the Board cannot give preliminary and final if they do not know where the dumpsters are going.

Mr. Back says that he is 99 % positive that the dumpster location will stay the same, except the screening will be provided. One or more will be added if needed.

Mr. Peters stated the rear of the building when the occupants leave the building, they will be facing the West and will be exiting the South part of that stairwell. When they leave the building, how are they getting there.

Mr. Back stated that they are proposing a four-foot sidewalk back there. He believes there is enough space for that.

Mr. Peters stated that he appreciated the applicant taking the dated site and improving it, this is the Board's opportunity to make the site safer, or better from a traffic perspective or a layout perspective. He stated one of those things is having curb ends at the end of parking areas and crosswalks that are delineated so people know where they're going. Mr. Peters stated that the design needs to be done according to the ordinance standards. Mr. Peters has a question if Mr. Back prepared the sketch showing the waiver-free parking layout provides all the curb ends providing the correct radius areas for landscaping.

Mr. Back stated that he did not, just the radiuses and the widened islands, he does not have the sketch with the curb endings, and he said he usually irons that out as he goes along based on the professional review letters which the applicant will comply with.

Mr. Peter's concern is if a person is coming in from Bennett's Mills Road there are no curb islands, not one up against the building, and not one for the parking space that is perpendicular to the front of the building. So instantly the applicant will be down 3 more parking spaces. Mr. Peters stated in the fairness to the Board either ask for the waiver that says, we don't think the parking requirements are too high and we think we can sustain the waiver of parking, or ask for the parking or ask of the waiver of the design standards for the curb ends. It has to be one or the other.

Mr. Peters had a question about the pedestrian circulation, he stated that it appeared that the front entrance to the second floor would be opposite, and it looked like a bow tie of curb islands right across the way, he wants to know if is this a sufficient layout is created by taking the parking instead of being parallel to the front of the building and now having a parallel to Manhattan, there is not a straight line for someone to walk to that main entrance. Mr. Peter's concern is that we are going to have a new traffic circulation layout for people to get used to. More importantly, people are going to go to that main entrance, so half of the site all the people that are going to come at 8 -9 AM, if there is no parking in the back, they are parking in the front. Mr. Peters suggested the parking layout parallel to the front of the building as it is currently and then just get rid of two parking spaces, and have them strike their curb, so people can walk through.

Mr. Klee stated that he would've indicated at least two additional trash enclosures that are going to be put behind this building if needed. Mr. Klee also needs a clarification on how many parking spaces will be proposed.

Mr. Back said 189 is required and 179 is proposed and then the applicant is losing an additional 7, so a deficit of 17 spaces.

Mr. Sullivan wants to have a guarantee if the Board gives a waiver for the parking that the existing shrubbery area and areas that are used buffers would be built up a little better and will have better coverage.

Mr. Back said yes.

Mr. Wall stated that the traffic circulation around the drive-through is a disaster, totally conflicting. If the emergency apparatus needs to get in, there are conflicts in getting in and out. Mr. Wall stated that this was a failed circulation and wanted to know if the applicant was approving that.

Mr. Back stated that the traffic engineer can testify to this, but he believes that there will be better stripping there.

Mr. Bressi stated that the stripping was not going to help since the traffic backs up almost into Manhattan Street.

Mr. Riker stated that lobbies are not full-time occupied and before the Architect comes before the Board to testify that they are not fully occupied might lead us to consider parking because they are not office spaces. Mr. Riker would like to see some testimony on that.

Mr. Herman announced that the application Block 801, Lot 62 and 63, 394 Chandler Holdings LLC will be moved to the November 6th, 2023 meeting. Motion Sullivan/ Riker is all in favor of the present.

Mr. Back stated that the applicant would provide the trash enclosure. Will provide screening for those, and they will be placed in a good location in the rear of the building. Not along the buffer, they are not allowed within 10 feet, they will be along the back of the building.

Ms. Jennings said that the architect would say that the exit in the rear is an emergency exit only, not a main entrance, people will not be coming in or out.

Mr. Back stated the applicant will add stripping and the proper signage that is necessary to make sure that there is a clean safe circulation around the site.

Mr. Back stated that the applicant would enlarge the islands. In doing so the applicant will lose 15 spaces, which brings the applicant down to 164 from 179. The applicant will not be adding any EV spaces. 8 was proposed originally and that will be kept. The parking will be milled, repaved, and re-graded.

Shiman Greenbaum was sworn in. Registered Architect in the state of New Jersey. He is testifying as a professional architect. He stated that the applicant has an existing retail space that has underutilized parking, which the traffic engineer will speak about. The applicant plans to add a second-story office space on top of the retail and in this way be able to argument the square footage and be able to increase the retail for the site. To do that we will be losing a portion of a single retail space on the ground floor, which would be our main entrance. There will be a small lobby, mail room, janitor closet, elevator, and stairs. Mr. Greenbaum stated that there was a question about existing towards the South versus exiting towards the North. He believes that by

code and by fire code, once you are out of the building, you are out. He said 40 feet of space at the rear of the building, is more than adequate to be able to safely exit the occupants of the second floor. He stated that the A3 exhibit is a floor plan. He stated that there was a question if the building would remain in operation while the construction was performed. He said the applicant had an instructional engineer look at the building. The current building can handle the second floor on top of it. The way it was built, the structure is strong enough. He stated that the tenants that will be coming to the facility, will not be constantly staying, so the applicant will not constantly need parking.

Mr. Greenbaum stated that the proposed outside terrace will be used for people taking phone calls, etc. The applicant will have six tenants. There was a question about the square footage of the common area. He agreed with Mr. Riker that the common space area is not utilized the same way as the other space and what he calls non-simultaneously use spaces in the industry. So when we total together the staircases, the lobby space, mail rooms, and the bathroom, none of those spaces will be adding tenants to the buildings, the applicant is reducing its footprint by about 1,600 sq. feet, give or take a couple of feet. Mr. Greenbaum stated that the canopies are used in architecture and it is crucially important to retail and offices.

Dr. Campbell stated she had her usual question about the solar.

Mr. Greenbaum stated that he had not discussed that with the owner. He thinks it can be done.

Scott Kennel was sworn in. He is with McDonough and Ray Associates. Located at 1431 Lakewood Road, Manasquan, NJ, principal with McDonald's Associates with over 35 years of traffic and transportation planning experience. He stated that his office prepared a traffic impact analysis on April 19, 2023. He stated that the first task that was accomplished was conducting accentuate traffic counts at the site driveways onto Manhattan Street and on Bennett's Mills Road. The traffic counts were conducted in December from 7 a.m. to 10 a.m. and 3 to 6 p.m. Mr. Kennel determined that the peak hours occurred from 8:30 to 9:30 AM and 3:15 to 4:15 PM. The traffic volumes on Manhattan Street two way, and the site Railways range from 530 in the morning to 7800 in the afternoon. Bennets Mills is expected to have a higher volume with a morning peak hour of approximately 1,060 vehicles and in the afternoon approximately 930 vehicles. That is a two-way traffic. He stated that the next step was to determine how much additional traffic would be generated by the site with the approximately 16,000 square feet of general office space. The Institute of Transportation Engineering trip generation manuals consulted as recommended by Ocean County and its industry standards, it was determined that during the peak street hour, the additional office space proposed here would generate approximately 25 additional trips during the morning peak hour and in the afternoon peak hours. The next task was to determine how the traffic would be assigned to the area roadway network. Mr. Kennel took into consideration the existing traffic patterns at the site. The existing roadway network determined that approximately two-thirds of the site traffic will be oriented to Bennett's Mills Road driveway and the balance of the orientation to Manhattan Avenue. Consistent with Ocean County Planning Board protocol, the traffic volumes are expanded to a design year of 2033. The base traffic volumes are expanded based on traffic growth data published by the New Jersey Department of Transportation, which resulted in an approximately 10 % increase in the

base traffic volumes. Analyzing the site driveways the Bennett's Mills Road driveways in the 2033 no-build condition would be a level service D at approximately 26 seconds of delay per vehicle exiting the site. Whereas with the additional office space delays increase by approximately 1 second to 27 seconds. 27 seconds is the average delay for existing vehicles during the morning peak hours. During the afternoon peak hours, it's a level service C with an average delay per vehicle of approximately 22 seconds. Manhattan Street Access currently operates on a level service B and will continue to operate on a level service B with an average delay per vehicle of 11 to 12 seconds.

Mr. Kennel stated that the applicant will have 156 spaces, 8 are EV spaces. It equates to 164 spaces provided. The existing facility and its uses based on his numerous observations generate a park and demand of anywhere from 50 to 60 vehicles. The additional office space would generate approximately 70 additional vehicles.

Mr. Peters suggested that there are two ways to slow down the traffic. One is the raised pavement and the second is relocated to the entrance. Mr. Peters thinks that there should be a differentiation in the pavement, whether it's raised, whether it's different and Mr. Peters thinks it does. The applicant and the ownership take note of it because they don't want people using their site as a cut-through. One they're not spending any money and two they are making it less safe. Mr. Peters would agree short of moving the access point off of Manhattan to a place where there would be more circuitous to get through the site which would slow people down and get them back up through the traffic light, perhaps different types of pavement or some sort of tabletop through the site.

Mrs. Jennings stated applicant would be okay with raised crosswalks.

Andrew Janiw was sworn in. Licensed professional planner. Member of the American Institute of Certified Planners. Works for Beacon Planning and Consulting Service located in Colts Neck, New Jersey. Mr. Janiw stated that A-7 is an aerial photograph prepared by Mr. Janiw's firm with the property outlined in yellow. The property is located within the Township's NC neighborhood Commercial district. The uses that are proposed on the second floor are permitted. The subject property is currently improved with a variety of retail spaces including a Dollar General and Dunkin Donuts, a package store, a nail salon, a pizzeria, a Chinese restaurant, and a physical therapist. The applicant is proposing to construct a second floor, containing 16,377 sq. feet of gross space. The variances that the applicant is seeking are for maximum impervious coverage, 60 % is permitted within the district, the site is at 77% coverage, and 85% impervious coverage is proposed. The applicant is seeking a setback from the non-residential side property line, 10 feet is required, 3 feet is proposed and that is along the easterly property line. The triangle in the picture will be installed parking with parking on the other side. The minimum number of parking stalls 181 has been determined to be the requirement and he believes physically we'll be provided 156 spaces set with the EV credit, it will be 164 spaces.

Ms. Janiw wanted to clarify that the required is 189 and the applicant is at 181.

Ms. Jennings stated that the applicant going to provide essentially 181 spaces.

Mr. Janiw stated that in preparation for this event, he took a look at the Master Plan. In terms of its goals and objectives, that is important because the applicant is reconciling any variances that they have to indicate that the applicant is not doing any harm to the Master Plan, and has objectives specifically for retail and commercial properties. Those include achieving a pattern and mix of land use that achieves various community planning objectives.

Mr. Janiw stated with regard to the reorganization of the trash collection, there is sufficient space to provide more than for the types of uses, the applicant will be able to contain that and able to manage that through private hauling. Regarding the overall appearance of the site, the applicant is substantially upgrading the facility.

Mr. Wall wanted to note that the triangle area at the site is currently green, and wanted to know if the applicant is converting it to parking.

Mr. Janiw stated that that is where the existing stormwater basin is and where the new parking will be placed, and there will be an underground basin in place.

Mr. Wall stated that from what he heard today the impervious coverage is at 77% over what it's supposed to be and the applicant wants to push it further to basically pave the vast majority to about 85 %. Mr. Wall wanted the Board to understand, what they were voting for. If you do, you will eliminate that green area. For Mr. Wall, it is a significant detriment. To remove an existing area and make it further non-compliant, paving over it when he thinks that it's a nice opportunity to increase the landscaping and make the property more attractive to tenants, more attractive to the public.

Public comments are open.

A resident Edward Bannon 22 Abercorn County was sworn in. Mr. Bannon stated that he thinks the entrance needs to be shifted to the next set of aisles here, so it's another 20 feet over to stop that, to make that movement have to do this kind of movement through the parking lot to get back out the other side, essentially just be moving that north entrance from Bennett's Mills, north from Bennett's Mills on 20 feet to that next area of the driveway there.

Ms. Jennings said that the traffic engineer testified that lines up with the driveway directly across, so that we would then make it uneven, Ms. Jennings thinks that this is not a good idea from getting into and out of both sides.

The resident Eric Jones 722 Hyson Road was sworn in. He stated that a lot of times Dunkin Donuts will route the traffic behind the building. He wants to know if there is enough space behind the building to re-route Donkin Donuts.

Mr. Kennel stated that there are a couple of things there. As the drive-through and having the drive-through lane towards the West side of the building, it would cross across several other tenants. You'd have to review the fire Zone and loading zones. It has to be investigated, but I would expect that there would be conflicts with those types of loading and fire zones. As far as the one-way isles and angle parking, the most efficient circulation pattern especially for

commercial development is a two-way aisles and when you go to angle parking, believe it or not, you will end up with a lower parking yield.

Resident Deborah Jones 722 Hyson Road was sworn in. She expressed concern about the rooftop if a fire starts, and how they are getting out.

Mr. Greenbaum stated that the rooftops are governed by code. They do have to have a means of egress from them into the tendency that it serves as a legal exit. No difference if you had an additional room there from a fire code perspective.

Motion to close public portion Sullivan/Riker all in favor among present.

Ms. Jennings stated that the Board heard a lot of testimonies. She just wants to reiterate that the applicant is committed to really bringing that site up to modern-day, re-purposing it, and improving the grading, the drainage, and the aesthetics. She hopes that the Board will approve.

Mr. Klee stated that he would like to see revised plans. I think it is recommended that the Board sees revised plans, so they know what the parking deficiency is.

Dr. Campbell said, she trusts the Board professionals, and a lot of testimony was done with the comments.

Mr. Bressi said that he had a lot of mixed feelings about the application. After all the special testimony, the key point here was of 77 % impervious coverage already, the sewage or the stormwater management super. The improvement of the facility for the Township and what it does in the master plan as far as improving and rebuilding, he thinks it is a plus.

Mr. Shea stated that the Board has a significant stipulation as a condition of approval, that the applicant agrees to, so if the plan does not reflect everything as a condition, they would have to come back.

Motion to approve the application with conditions. Bressi/Riker Haring and DeMarzo voted no, yes: Bressi, Burnstein, Riker, Sullivan, Wall, Heller, Campbell, and Herman.

Mr. Herman stated that the attorney would change due to the conflict of interests. Mr. Shea will not be sitting at the application.

Application Block 4301, Lots 5 and 6. East Commodore LLC

Mr. Klee stated that the application is for a Preliminary and Final site plan of Block 4301, Lots 5 and 6. The applicant is proposing the construction of a mixed-use building involving 80,700 sq warehouse, and 8,600 sq. foot offices. There is a variance required for a deficient parking area, set back to residential use and we just need some testimony from the applicant regarding the building coverage and the impervious coverage that they're based on right now as being conforming but those calculations are based on the exclusions of all Wetlands and Wetlands buffer areas. The site is impacted by the conservation overlay zone and there is a Wetland limit as well as a buffer area indicated on the plan. Some testimony on Dep verification of wetland limit, general operations, and hours of operation is needed. 24/7 operation is proposed. The applicant has provided a traffic impact study.

Mr. Peters stated that his office has a report dated August 15th, 2023. The site is located in the HC Zone and the conservation overlay zone, where contractor's offices, showrooms, garages, warehouses, and shops are permitted. Mr. Peters needs an explanation as to why the site needs tractor-trailer parking for contractors' warehousing. How big is the unit going to be? What is the maximum size of the unit? Mr. Peters does not recall if the statement of operations lists the hours of operations for the site. Mr. Peters stated that he had a chance to talk to one of Mr. Stevens's associates about the variance for the setback. He stated that his report was incorrect. The various relief is from a Zone and not a use. So while there is a residential use, it is in the current zone. So there is not a variance required for a residential setback. So it would appear that it is a conforming application.

Mr. Peters asked the applicant to go through some details of the design waivers. Mr. Peters stated that he is not a big fan of the location of the loading docks, facing the street instead of being in the back of the building.

Mr. Adam Pfeiffer on behalf of the applicant. He stated that there are no variances sought, but there are some design waivers.

William Stevens was sworn in. A Vice-President of Professional Design Services, also a professional engineer and planner. He stated that the applicant is proposing to construct a contractor office, garage, shop, and warehouse facility, which is a permitted use. The subject property is located along East Commodore Blvd., known as Block 4301, Lots 5 and 6. It does contain approximately 7.6 Acres. Exhibit -1 shows the aerial view. It is proposed to be developed on the site. On the site now exist two single-family houses, which are proposed to be removed for the construction of this proposed commercial use. Mr. Stevens stated that the application has a valid LOI from the state of New Jersey that was issued on January 2023, verifying the lines as well as the buffers. The buffers along the Eastern line and the rear of the site are classified as exceptional resource value, which means they have a 150-foot buffer. It ends up constraining the site. The applicant is going back to DEP to ask for an averaging plan approval which means that, the applicant can add the buffer in some areas where the applicant can move it around to create this developed footprint. The application is currently at DEP and is currently pending. Mr. Stevens stated that he had prepared some site plans. Exhibit # 2 is a site plan that was prepared in support of this application. Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant has an unusually shaped lot. Mr. Stevens stated that Mr. Peters is correct there are two larger units in the front of the proposed building, and those units will be approximately 17,850 sq. feet. Do have loading docks that will allow tractor trailers to go into each one of those units. Can take a tractor-trailer to load into there, so it's made to be a more minimal warehousing operation. The applicant has many contractors who utilize their deliveries from tractor-trailers. Mr. Stevenson stated that the applicant does comply with the parking requirements. 99 parking stalls are required and the applicant is providing 99. Also, 5 Electric vehicle-ready spaces will be provided. Mr. Stevens is proposing to have two refuse and recycling enclosures, one will be located in the eastern part of the site and one will be located in the rear of the site. An applicant intends that both will be screened. The applicant will comply with the landscaping requirements. This applicant does have Municipal water and sewer. Mr. Stevens stated that the applicant does have Preliminary approval

for JMUA. The applicant will have fire protection, as well as domestic water and public sewer disposal opportunities. Exhibit A3 is a color rendering of what the site is going to look like. The applicant is proposing two stormwater management facilities, both located in the front up along Commodore. Stormwater Management facility complies with the Jackson Ordinance. Mr. Stevens said that the applicant has approval from the Jackson Township Environmental Committee. Also, there is a letter from a fire prevention with one fire hydrant to be added. Mr. Stevens stated that there are 4 waivers that the applicant is looking for. The first is along East Commodore Blvd. He stated that the applicant is proposing a curb along the footage of the site, but he is seeking a waiver from providing a sidewalk there. The second waiver comes back to the narrow shape of the property. The Township Ordinance has a clause that states, that the applicant is not supposed to have parking aisles, or parking stalls that are directly on the Main circulation aisle. In this case, we have it in the rear of the building. The third waiver that the applicant is seeking, the applicant has two driveways going out to East Commodore. It is intended that the Eastern driveway would be for the truck access. The Township Ordinance only permits two driveways if we have frontage that's more than 500 feet. Our frontage is 465 feet. So the applicant is close to what the Ordinance requires. The last waiver is along the Western property line. The applicant is supposed to have a 10 feet wide landscaping strip, which the applicant does have on the Eastern side, but on the Western side, where there is a vacant property, there is a retaining wall in that 10 feet, so technically the applicant does not meet the requirements. Mr. Stevens proposed to add more landscaping.

Mr. Peters asked the 10-foot buffer on the West side of the property contains a 4-foot high wall, which you are saying you would add landscaping to. Be it on the high side, or the low side, Mr. Peter's concern is that we built a retaining wall that requires not to plant on top of it. So we are putting a buffer on the retaining wall. Mr. Peters asked if there is room to put landscaping between the curb, retaining wall, and a property line.

Mr. Stevens stated that this could be an opportunity to plant some shrubbery and some low landscaping.

Mr. Peters wanted to know why there is a loading dock facing the street and why there is not a loading dock in the back of the property.

Mr. Stevens stated it boils down to the constraints of the property.

Mrs. Campbell stated tractor the trailer loading docks in the front are not a look we're looking for. She also stated that the trash has to be moved out of the front.

Mr. Stevens stated that they would look at modifying to something the Board would be happy to see.

Motion to carry the application Burnstein/Riker, all in favor among present.

Application 4301, Lot 5 and 6. 81 East Commodore LLC was moved to September 18, 2023, no further notice is required. Motion Burstein/ Sullivan all in favor among present.

Motion to adjourn Sullivan/Burnstein All in favor among present.

Respectfully submitted by

Irina Darrar

Planning Board Recording Secretary