

**MANSFIELD TOWNSHIP
BURLINGTON COUNTY
JOINT LAND USE BOARD
January 22, 2024
6:30PM**

REORGANIZATION MEETING

CALL TO ORDER BY SECRETARY:

FLAG SALUTE: *(Led by Secretary)*

OPENING STATEMENT: *(Read by Secretary)* *The Notice requirements provided for in the Open Public meetings Act have been satisfied. Notice of this meeting was published on December 6, 2023. Said Notice was published in the Burlington County Times and Trenton Times, filed with the Clerk of the Township of Mansfield and posted on the official website of the Township of Mansfield. Notice of which contained the date, time and purpose of this meeting stating that formal action will be taken.*

ROLL CALL *(Conducted by Secretary)*

Members Present:	Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Mr. Preidel, Mr. Schwartz, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Wainwright (6:35PM Arrival), Mr. Ocello (Alternate 2), Mrs. Semus (Alternate 4)
Members Absent:	Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Broski (Alternate 1), Mrs. Villegas (Alternate 3)
Also Present:	Patrick Varga, Esq., JLUB Solicitor Chris Noll, P.E. JLUB Engineer Ed Fox, P.P., JLUB Planner Elizabeth A. MacLennan, JLUB Secretary

NOMINATION OF CHAIRPERSON FOR YEAR 2024: *(requested by Secretary)*

Secretary MacLennan opened the floor for nominations for Chairperson. Deputy Mayor Sisz nominated Mr. Preidel as Chairperson. Second by Mrs. Herbert. There being no further nominations, the floor was closed for nominations.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Mr. Preidel, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Ocello, Mrs. Semus

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Wainwright, Mr. Broski, Mrs. Villegas

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

NOMINATIONS FOR VICE-CHAIRPERSON: *(requested by Chairman)*

Chairman Preidel opened the floor for nominations for Vice-Chairperson. Mr. Schwartz nominated Mrs. Herbert as Vice-Chairperson. Second by Mr. Pinto. There being no further nominations, the floor was closed for nominations.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Schwartz, Chairman Preidel, Mr. Ocello, Mrs. Semus

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Wainwright, Mr. Broski, Mrs. Villegas

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

NOMINATIONS FOR BOARD SECRETARY: *(requested by Chairman)*

Chairman Preidel opened the floor for nominations for Secretary. Mrs. Semus nominated Elizabeth MacLennan as Board Secretary. Second by Deputy Mayor Sisz. There being no further nominations, the floor was closed for nominations.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Schwartz, Chairman Preidel, Mr. Ocello, Mrs. Semus

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Wainwright, Mr. Broski, Mrs. Villegas

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

MEETING DATES FOR 2024 “ANNUAL NOTICE”

**RESOLUTION 2024-1-1- RESOLUTION SETTING ANNUAL MEETING
NOTICE FOR THE MANSFIELD TOWNSHIP JOINT LAND USE BOARD FOR
THE YEAR 2024**

Motion to adopt Resolution 2024-1-1 was made by Mr. Borgstrom. Second by Mr. Pinto.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Schwartz, Chairman Preidel

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Wainwright

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

(Mr. Wainwright arrived at 6:35PM)

**APPOINTMENT OF JOINT LAND USE BOARD PROFESSIONALS FOR 2024:
RESOLUTION 2024-1-2- RESOLUTION APPOINTING THE JOINT
LAND USE BOARD PROFESSIONALS**

Motion to nominate Mr. Fox of ERI as Joint Land Use Board Planner was made by Deputy Mayor Sisz. Second by Mr. Pinto. All in Favor. Motion Carried.

Motion to adopt Resolution 2024-1-2 was made by Mr. Borgstrom. Second by Mr. Pinto.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

DESIGNATION OF OFFICIAL NEWSPAPERS:

**RESOLUTION 2024-1-3- RESOLUTION DESIGNATING OFFICIAL
NEWSPAPERS**

Motion to adopt Resolution 2024-1-3 was made by Mr. Pinto. Second by Mrs. Herbert.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Chairman Preidel opened the meeting to public comment. There being no public comment, the meeting was closed to public comment.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn the reorganization meeting at 6:37PM was made by Chairman Preidel. Second by Mr. Pinto.

**MANSFIELD TOWNSHIP
BURLINGTON COUNTY
JOINT LAND USE BOARD
January 22, 2024
6:30PM**

REGULAR MEETING

CALL TO ORDER:

APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES: December 18, 2023

Members in Attendance: Mr. Borgstrom, Mr. Broski, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Ocello, Mr. Pinto, Mrs. Villegas, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel

Members Absent: Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Schwartz, Deputy Mayor Sisz

Motion to adopt the December 18, 2023 meeting minutes was made by Mr. Borgstrom. Second by Mr. Pinto.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mr. Pinto, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel

Nays: None

Abstain: Mrs. Herbert, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Schwartz

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena

Three Abstentions, Four ayes. Motion Carried.

RESOLUTIONS:

**RESOLUTION 2023-12-18 MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTION OF
THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD GRANTING BULK VARIANCE
APPROVAL FOR PROPERTY KNOWN AND DESIGNATED AS BLOCK 42.30
LOT 21, 19 FEILDCREST DRIVE FOR A POOL WITH A PATIO**

Motion to adopt Resolution 2023-12-18 was made by Mr. Borgstrom. Second by Mr. Pinto.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mr. Pinto, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel, Mr. Ocello
(Alt. 2)

Nays: None

Abstain: Mrs. Herbert, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mrs. Semus (*Alt. 4*)

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Broski (*Alt. 1*), Mrs. Villegas (*Alt. 3*)

Three Abstentions, Six Ayes. Motion Carried.

PUBLIC HEARING:

APPLICANT: NIKOLAS VRETTOS

LOCATION: BLOCK 24, LOT 37- 131 PUBLIC ROAD

APPLICATION FOR: USE VARIANCE FOR A TENANT HOUSE

Mrs. Herbert recused herself from this application.

Chuck Petrone introduced himself as the attorney for the applicant. The application before the Board started out as a use variance for the construction of a second residential dwelling on the property; a tenant house. The applicant's conversations with the zoning officer were that a second house was not permitted and determined a use variance was required. Mr. Fox's review letter showed that it did not need a use variance and would be a permitted use. The applicant was requesting that the Board approve the plan that was before them with a slight modification. The proposed tenant house was consistent with the code of Mansfield Township, consistent with the prior approval granted by the planning board in 2003, and is consistent with the deed restriction that was imposed on the property as a condition of that 2003 approval. That approval prohibited any further subdivision of the property but allowed for a tenant house, a farm house, and other farm structures. The property was approximately 31.5 acres it is currently farmland assessed by the Township and is farmed by a local farmer, Paul Shinn. The applicant is going to relocate the house so that it is closer to the existing barns and silos. Looking at the plot plan there was a concrete pad located on the property the house would be moved forward and be close to the barn. It would still comply with all the bulk requirements. Relocation of the proposed tenant house opens up the rear area, making the farming easier and viable. Mr. Petrone said that the applicant recognized Mr. Fox's comments regarding well and septic being required and will maintain the property as farmland.

Nikolas Vrettos was sworn in. Mr. Vrettos is the applicant and owner of the property. Mr. Vrettos confirmed that the property could support well and septic for the proposed tenant house.

Mr. Fox said that there was unique word construction in the R-1 zone that says "any property land, buildings, or premises can be used for one or more of the following uses." Mr. Fox said it was bad grammar but that is what the code said. One of those permitted uses is dwelling units, so the interpretation would be that you could have two houses on this property. Mr. Fox did review the deed restriction for the property. If the property were preserved through the county system it would have been different. The Township does not have a particular restriction that tenant houses on agricultural properties have to have a familial relationship or employment relationship. There are no definitions in the code regarding tenant housing. It doesn't specifically say that a tenant has to work there or be related to anyone else so, because it's a farm, there was a Township Ordinance regarding the right to farm. That ordinance doesn't particularly have any barring towards

using the prior building foundations when the prior building burned down or have any minimum or maximum distances from private property units.

Mr. Fox recommended that a use variance not be required. The three conditions he suggested was that the property be able accommodate a second private well and septic system, the farm continue to be a viable commercial farm, and the rental unit should be registered with the Township Fire Prevention.

Mr. Varga said that page 3 of the deed said that the lots are deed restricted after final subdivision. Subsection C. says that the use of the lots is deed restricted to agricultural purposes; a farm house and tenant house are permitted. There was no restriction on how it was going to be used just that there was a tenant house and farm house. Chairman Preidel confirmed that the applicant was not allowed to subdivide at any time. Mr. Varga confirmed.

Chairman Preidel asked why the tenant house was not going back where it was. Why would you put a house in the middle of a tillable field? The Township wanted to keep the fields and now the house would be in the middle of the field. Mr. Vrettos said that this would minimize any impact to the farm by putting the house on the back of the concrete slab.

Mr. Varga said that the applicant was asking for consistency determination, that what they are proposing is a tenant house and is consistent with the deed restrictions and prior board approval.

Mr. Borgstrom asked if the tree area was where the barns were located. The house was going between the lane and the pole barn.

Daniel Moore of 21 Longwood Lane informed the Board that he has lived there since 2005. His wife and him picked the lot because nothing would be allowed to be built on it. Now this will depreciate the value of his property. Mr. Moore said that he has no problem with the house going where the former tenant house was. It wasn't a permitted use when he moved in. He doesn't want to see a house in the empty field by him.

Mr. Pinto said that part of the deed restriction was for the property to be farmed. If the applicant put the house where the property was farmed didn't that contradict the deed restriction. Mr. Varga clarified that there was no limitation of the location of the house.

Mr. Wainwright asked about a building envelope. Mr. Fox said there was for the R-1 zone which was 200 ft., this use did not have one.

Motion to deem the above application consistent was made by Mr. Borgstrom. Second by Mr. Wainwright.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mr. Schwartz, Deputy Mayor Sisz, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel, Mr. Ocello (*Alt. 2*), Mrs. Semus (*Alt. 4*)

Nays: Mr. Pinto

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Broski (*Alt. 1*), Mrs. Villegas (*Alt. 3*)
One Nay, Seven Ayes. Motion Carried.

COMPLETENESS REVIEW/PUBLIC HEARING

APPLICANT: AATGMN PROPERTY, LLC

LOCATION: BLOCK 70, LOTS 6.01 & 6.02 ROUTE 130 & KINKORA ROAD

APPLICATION FOR: MINOR SUBDIVISION, PRELIMINARY, & FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN

Mr. Pinto recused himself from this application.

Mr. Fox recommended that the application be deemed complete.

Motion to deem the above referenced application complete was made by Chairman Preidel. Second by Deputy Mayor Sisiz.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Schwartz, Deputy Mayor Sisiz, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel, Mr. Ocello, Mrs. Semus

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Mr. Broski, Mrs. Villegas

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

Craig Gianetti of the law firm Day Pitney was representing the applicant. The applicant was seeking preliminary and final major site plan and subdivision approval for the above referenced property. The property is located in the Towergate Redevelopment Area and governed by the Towergate Redevelopment Plan in the R-7 MU Overlay District. The property is approximately 120 acres in size and is mostly vacant. The applicant is proposing dedicated portion of the land approximately 1.8 acres for road way improvements. There was a technical subdivision of the remaining 118 acres into four lots as part of the subdivision application. As a part of the site plan application the applicant is proposing to develop those four lots. The first lot they were proposing an approximately 144,000sq. ft. logistics warehouse whole center and/or distribution center including approximately 20,000sq. ft. of accessory office or flex space, associated passenger parking, and a total of 48 loading spaces. The second lot, lot B, being composed of trailer parking with 77 stalls. In lot C there would be approximately 747,000sq. ft. logistics warehouse including up to 40,000sq. ft. of accessory offices with additional passenger parking, 124 loading docks, 174 trailer spaces, and sound walls. Lot D is being proposed as 4 buildings containing 96 affordable units, an amenity building which will contain one additional accessory on-site superintendent residential unit, and 192 parking stalls. It's unique in the sense that it is an inclusionary development instead of having market rate units as was previously proposed for this site, we have this nonresidential development subsidizing the affordable units. The project is part of a settlement agreement with the Township. It was a part of an affordable housing lawsuit addressing its affordable housing obligation. The site plan and subdivision application were consistent with both the settlement agreement and redevelopment plan. The application is fully conforming, not seeking any variances. In the Board professional review letters, they identified potentially two variances for the buffer to Crystal Lake as well as the minimum outdoor amenity area.

Mr. Gianetti has five witnesses that will testify tonight. Tung-to Lam of Bohler Engineering is the applicant's civil engineer. Mark Ford of Ford and Associates is the applicant's architect for the warehouse buildings. Bill Warwick is the architect for the residential buildings. Joe Fishenger of Bright View Engineering is the applicant's traffic engineer. Jack Zybura is the sound and acoustics expert.

Tung-to Lam was sworn in and his credentials as a civil engineer were accepted by the Board. Exhibit A-1 titled Aerial View showed the area highlighted in yellow consists of two lots, lot 6.01 and lot 6.02 block 70. The site is located at the corner of Route 130 and Kinkora Road. Kinkora Road is also known as Burlington County Route 678. Kinkora Road is under the County's jurisdiction and Route 130 is under Department of Transportation's (DOT) jurisdiction. The size of the property is 120.29 acres and that is including the right of way dedication. There will be some right of way dedication to the county and DOT. The adjacent use to the north of the site is light industrial, to the south is R-1 Zone, to the east is Crystal Lake, and to the west is Kinkora Road. The existing condition of the site is wooded except for one home on Kinkora Road. The remaining 118 acres will be created into four lots. Lot A is 36 acres and will be the first warehouse, Lot B is 1.87 acres of trailer parking, Lot C is the larger warehouse consisting of 69.75 acres, and Lot D is the affordable housing consisting of 8.18 acres. Lot D only had access off of Kinkora Road. Internal roads to connect the lots would be privately owned. Lot D will have pedestrian connection out to Crystal Lake. This subdivision per the redevelopment plan is classified as a technical subdivision.

Exhibit A-2 titled colorized overall site plan showed colored portions on the plan. Those colorized are the proposed improvements. In the background are the wooded areas that were not being developed. On the left is Route 130 and right to the east of that is proposed Lot A. Lot A is a logistic wholesale retail warehouse which is a 144,000sq. ft. building 20,000sq. ft. of the building was for accessory office or flex space with 155 passenger parking spaces, 48 loading docks, and 2 drive up doors. To the east of Lot A is Lot B which is trailer parking lot that consists of 77 parking spaces. Continuing east would be proposed Lot C is 747,836sq. ft. consisting of logistic wholesale or distribution building, up to 40,000sq. ft. office space with 301 passenger vehicle parking, 128 loading docks with four drive up doors, 174 trailer spaces, and a sound wall. Along Kinkora Road is proposed Lot D with four buildings making a total of 96 affordable units, amenity building that contains one accessory on-site superintendent unit, 192 car parking spaces, and a sound wall. Storm water management on the site was tricky due to size. There are five pores of pavement being sprinkled throughout the site, eleven small scale bio retention basins, two small scale infiltration basins, one large scale infiltration basin, and an additional one large scale constructed wetland. A total of 20 BMP beams scattered throughout the site, below ground and above ground. Mr. Gianetti asked if the proposed stormwater design will impact any other downstream stormwater conditions. Mr. Lam testified that it would not. Mr. Gianetti asked if the stormwater system would be privately owned and maintained. Mr. Lam stated that it would be privately owned with an operation's manual.

Mr. Lam went over the January 12th, 2024 review letter from the Board Engineer. In response to comment number 11 based on Mr. Lam's survey, design, and his site visit he believed that there was about 100 linear ft. of pipe within Kinkora Road and travels along Kinkora right of way before it makes a turn onto a paper street. He believes if that pipe is televised and cleaned could reduce current flooding issues. Mr. Lam says as part of Department of Environmental Protection's (DEP) the peak rate reduction has been met. Chairman Preidel how much of a reduction? Mr. Lam testified that it was 50% for the 2-year storm, 10-year storm was 75%, and 100-year storm was 80%. Mr. Lam addressed comment number 36 would be a deed notice and not deed restriction. Number 18 some field permeability rates are required. Mr. Lam said that he would work with the engineer on additional locations adjust the depth as necessary.

The sanitary sewer will have an onsite pump station pumped north on Route 130 through a gravity manhole. It will be on Route 130 heading towards Bordentown near where the McDonalds is. It would connect to the Bordentown Sewerage Authority. The site will have American Water. They can either bring a public main down Kinkora Road or it could be an onsite well with a water tower. The water tower would be located on Lot C.

Off of Route 130 the applicant is proposing a right in right out driveway next to Crystal Lake. There will be a full movement driveway off of Kinkora Road dedicated just for the residential. For Lot C there will be a driveway only for passenger vehicle, no truck traffic off of that driveway. Mr. Varga confirmed that Lot C was full moment driveway. Mr. Lam responded yes only restriction is Route 130 only right in and right out. Mr. Lam was still waiting on DOT approval for driveway design. Mr. Lam said that the light fixtures were being mounted at 20ft. high across, using warm white lights LED with 3,000 color temperature. There would be no light spillage from the site.

The landscaping for this project had two requirements: 20ft. buffer along Route 130 and 30ft. requirement along Crystal Lake. Between Lot C and D, the applicant is proposing 20-foot buffers. The landscape buffer between Lot A and B is 100 feet. The 30-foot buffer along Crystal Lake has a connectivity to walkway. If it is not permitted to be a part of that buffer the applicant would be seeking a variance. The applicant was providing connectivity between the residential development and Crystal Lake. Mr. Fox stated that a variance was not required. Lot A, B, and C would have 184 canopy trees, 754 evergreen trees, and 66 ornamental trees. In Lot D there were 68 canopy trees, 76 evergreen trees, and 37 ornamental trees. There is additional planting within each of the retention basins. Mr. Lam was happy to work with Mr. Fox on the plantings, but DEP required native planting in certain areas that DEP had jurisdiction. Irrigation is provided for the landscaping. A large part of the site was being preserved as wooded; those areas won't be irrigated. Mr. Lam said the site was in excess of 25% for conservation restrictions.

Mr. Lam stated that there was a combination of ground mount signs and building signs. The signs would all be in compliance with the Redevelopment Plan. The applicant was proposing a combination of 20ft.-25ft. high sound wall. The sound wall would be a PVC type finish. The sound wall was to cut off the commercial development from Kinkora Road and also separates the commercial from the residential that was on the site.

Chairman Preidel asked how will it remain car parking? He asked if there was a way that it could be done so that trucks could not get in or out. Yes, this could be done to make it physically difficult for trucks to get in and out. Mr. Wainwright said that would affect fire trucks entering the site as well.

Mr. Lam explained that for the residential area there was an outdoor community area that has a garden that the applicant will add benches. There is a multipurpose court to the left of the garden. Mr. Lam stated that they more than met the 30-foot requirement and would indicate the footage on the site plans. Mr. Fox responded that no variance would be required. The applicant stated that County approval was still pending, Soil Conservations was still pending, DOT was still pending, and water and sewer applications have been submitted to DEP. Mr. Lam's office submitted a response letter today to the professional's review letter.

Mr. Noll inquired about the pipe along Kinkora Road. Mr. Lam said that there was about 30ft. of 18in. pipe and then about 65ft. of 24in. pipe that would be appropriate to clean and televised. The pipe empties into a ditch. Mr. Noll asked if he knew where the ditch goes to. Mr. Lam responded that it continues south. Mr. Noll said that there were existing flooding issues near Third Street. Mr. Noll said that this was a low area and he wanted to make sure the applicant didn't make that worse. Mr. Lam was willing to meet with residents. It was determined that the applicant's engineer with Mr. Noll would come up with a date and time to meet with property owners to discuss existing flooding problem. Any residents that can't attend send concerns to the board secretary.

Mr. Noll asked if the on-site pump station would be private. Yes. Mr. Lam said that it would pump to Route 130 right of way North near the McDonald's in Bordentown. Details on the pump station would be submitted to Mr. Noll. Mr. Lam said there were about 3 or 4 options for the potable water. They would most likely connect to American Water. Mr. Noll asked what has the County said about truck traffic access off Kinkora Road. The applicant deferred to the traffic engineer. Mr. Noll asked Mr. Lam to respond to item 40 referring to site distance regarding visual impact from building B from Kinkora Road. Exhibit A-3 was a sight line exhibit. The line of site complies with the front yard setbacks, building height complies, and they have proposed landscaping. The applicant provided a 10-year growth chart. Chairman Preidel asked if the trees were in the sight triangle coming out the entrance. Mr. Noll said that trees could not be in the site triangle, there were a couple at the entrance that were close. They will need to be eliminated or moved back. Chairman Preidel said the brook by Route 130 floods and shuts the road down. Is that water taken care of and where will that go? Mr. Lam said that there was green space left to address those issues. They have studied that area under existing conditions and under their proposed conditions. The applicant was not changing the flood elevation. They weren't adding any more stormwater to the existing flow. Mr. Borgstrom inquired about the proposed jug handle on the west side of Route 130. He said that there was a pretty good elevation change from that elevation to Kinkora Road. Stormwater management facilities up top won't help what was going on at the bottom. Mr. Borgstrom asked why the jug handle was put at the top of the hill and not the bottom? Deferred to the traffic engineer. Mr. Borgstrom said that he would want to see details on that. Mr. Borgstrom confirmed that the roads would be privately owned and

maintained. Mr. Lam confirmed. Mr. Borgstrom said that under fire protection water source the applicant was proposing a water tower and a well with a 4in. line at the warehouse on Lot C. Mr. Borgstrom asked what was being proposed for water protection on the residential lot. Mr. Borgstrom said that those building would be required to be sprinklered per the building code. Mr. Borgstrom said that he only saw one hydrant for the whole site. Mr. Gianetti said that this will be apart of DOT review. The water tower on Lot C was being used for the entire development. Mr. Borgstrom said that there was a domestic 4in. water supply going to the residential buildings. The buildings needed to be sprinklered at least with a 13R system. He will ask for a full 13 system because this was multiple family dwelling units and life safety is very important. Mr. Borgstrom referred to sheet C409 adjacent to the proposed residential building A, where it shows 48 parking spaces, what are the little black rectangles? Mr. Lam said that they were underground infiltration basins. Mr. Borgstrom asked if these basins will support the weight of a 65,000-gallon fire truck. Mr. Lam said yes. Mr. Borgstrom referred to sheet C709 titled landscape sheet. Adjacent to Kinkora Road the plantings that back up to residential building C and D how far off the back of the dwelling units are those trees. Mr. Lam said approximately 15ft. Mr. Borgstrom asked how long of a walk for residents to get to the bus station and are you proposing sidewalks on Kinkora Road? Mr. Lam said at this time there were no sidewalks being proposed on Kinkora Road and the closest NJ Transit bus stop was across from the Pine Motel. Mr. Borgstrom asked the applicant to make pedestrian access easier to transportation. Mr. Borgstrom asked if it was necessary to have a trailer drop lot if there was tractor trailer parking at both of the warehouses. Mr. Lam said it was a permitted use and that it could be used for the warehouse in Lot A or a stand-alone lot. Chairman Preidel confirmed that the applicant could potentially rent out spots. Mr. Borgstrom asked if the Board will be able to see the truck traffic circulation? He asked how will semi-trucks navigate the jug handle? Mr. Gianetti deferred to traffic engineer. Chairman Preidel asked if the pathway from residential to the park was its own entity? Mr. Lam said yes there were 10ft. wide sidewalk. Mr. Borgstrom said that knowing where the bus stops were would be helpful. Mr. Schwartz asked how the walking path crossed the roadway where the trucks go? Mr. Lam said that there were crosswalks identified at different locations and signage. Mr. Fox noted that the applicant was willing to comply with everything in his letter and that the application did not require any bulk or use variances. The applicant will comply with the right to farm deed notice, they will comply with the air pollution control comments, they agreed to comply with the landscape buffering requirements, agree that the applicant's lighting is sufficient, they will comply with signage requirements, testified and complied with solid waste, and sufficient with fencing and walls. In terms of planning the only things that would need to be dealt with in the future would be architectural design and noise pollution control. Mr. Schwartz asked if the applicant would be willing to come back and monitor the flooding after a period of time. Mr. Gianetti said he was not responsible to fix current issues, but certainly can't make it worse. Mr. Schwartz asked if it gets worse are you willing to come back and remediate. Mr. Gianetti said that they aren't the only development going on right now. If it was a design flaw by the applicant the Board Engineer and the town could force them to fix it. The applicant can only go by the town engineer and DEP requirements. If the applicant didn't design the way we were supposed to, the town had enforcement rights. Deputy Mayor Sisz said your saying you're going to meet with the residents to mitigate, but then saying that you aren't going to improve it. Deputy Mayor

Sisz stated that the area was already a highly flooded area and the applicant being there was definitely going to make the situation worse. Mr. Gianetti said that his applicant cannot make the site worse but he never said they are going to improve the existing situation. Mrs. Herbert stated that good developers make good neighbors. She said that the applicant was going to disrupt this area that has been this way for a very long time. Chairman Preidel asked if he was putting in the retention basins prior to developing the rest of the site. Mr. Noll stated that Soil Conservation makes you put the basins in first. Mr. Noll said township Ordinance 65-95.3 says no regrading of lot shall be permitted which would create aggravate water stagnation on the lot or adjacent properties. The applicant is saying that they are going to meet the DEP requirements which they will on reducing the rate, but the volume is not reduced. If you are going to a low area and that area has no relief the volume is what will be the issue. The applicant could meet the DEP requirements and still make the site worse. The Township's Ordinance addresses that issue.

Jeremy Lange was sworn in and introduced himself as director of development for Active Acquisitions. Mr. Lange is also a licensed engineer in the state of NJ, certified flood plain manager, and a designated engineering expert witness. Mr. Lange has 30 years of experience in civil engineering, he is very involved in storm water design. Mr. Lange said that the applicant is going to meet state code and Mansfield code. Mr. Lange said that it will be modeled with volume, which means an unsteady flow type of model, so they have a flow over time with the entire runoff hydrograph with the entire volume. He will do this with the existing conditions and the proposed improvements. If they are making the situation worse, they will definitely correct that. If there is something they could do to improve the situation they will do that. They believe they could make the current flooding somewhat better. Mr. Lange informed the Board that there were changes in July 2023 to the DEP stormwater requirements, they will route those storms so that they will not make it worse. The applicant will do the best they can to get the water surfaces down. It was determined that the retention basins will be noted on the approved plans. Mr. Lam asked for clarification on Mr. Fox's review letter comment number 16 B about the location of the retaining wall in between the landscaping. Mr. Lam said that based on the review a 20ft. landscape buffer was required, but if the retaining wall would require a variance; the applicant would like to ask for that now. Mr. Fox said by pushing the retaining wall towards Route 130, it would require a bulk variance because the structure would be pushed back, but it would be more beneficial for the site.

Mark Ford was sworn in and introduced himself as an architect licensed in over 30 states. Mr. Ford is the applicant's warehouse architect. Exhibit A-14 was a view of the front elevation facing Route 130 depicting building number 1. This building was smaller than the other proposed warehouse building. The building was about 144,000sq. ft. This illustration showed the potential tenant entry areas that are located at the far corners of the building as well as a potential center entrance. It is intended to be multi tenanted. The corner entries had large section of glass, large geometric overhang, accent bands within the concrete wall panels, and other features. The applicant will provide clear story windows to provide natural daylight in the warehouse spaces. The height of the small building was between 46 and 48ft., both within the 60ft. height limits.

Exhibit A-15 was the rendering of warehouse number 2. Mr. Ford explained that this building differs from building 1 because it has docks. The building has the same large geometric overhang, large sections of curtain wall glass, the same concrete detail and paint colors as building 1. Building 2 is slightly higher, 50-52ft. parapet height. The primary building materials on both warehouses would be pre-cast concrete wall panels, aluminum or glass curtain walls, and a large entry canopy feature will be prefinished metal wall panels.

Exhibit A-16 showed the floor plan of warehouse 1. The front of the building would be where the vehicle parking is. The docks on the side of the building away from Route 130. Several smaller areas in the building were designated in the corners of the building and center of the building for multiple office buildouts for multiple tenants. There are 46 docks in the rear of the building and a drive-in door.

Exhibit A-18 is a floor plan for warehouse 2. This is a larger building which was more of a bulk storage or distribution type facility. All four corners were for tenant space. The building was slightly deeper and much taller. The building had a cross dock where you have docks on both sides of the building and four drive in ramps. There are 128 docks. There is rooftop equipment on both buildings. Both buildings are being designed to have Early Suppression Fast Response (ESFR) sprinkler systems. There will be ventilation fans to move air through the buildings. The parapets step up at the corners of the building which serves two purposes, create architectural interest at the corners, and help screen mechanicals that service the building. The rooftop units will be smaller package units that sit on the roof. Chairman Preidel asked if there were any plans on renting out to somebody for refrigeration. Mr. Ford said that the applicant did not have any potential tenants yet. Mr. Ford gave forth color swatches that will be used to paint the warehouses. Exhibit A-33 was labeled color samples. Mr. Ford believed that the building design complied with the Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Fox confirmed that Mr. Ford gave a sufficient architectural response. Mr. Fox said that the building height was based off of the top of the roof and not the parapet so the roof would actually be lower.

Mr. Ocello asked if any of the warehouses would have a second floor. Mr. Ford responded that as of now, no, but tenants may want to have a second floor. The warehouse storage would not have a second floor, but the potential offices may have a second floor. Mr. Fox said that refrigeration warehouses are permitted as part of the redevelopment plan. Mr. Fox asked about backup generators on the site. Mr. Ford said that generators were typically tenant related dependent on the tenants use. Mr. Borgstrom questioned if building 1 would be used as flex retail space. Mr. Gianetti said there would not be retail sales. Mr. Borgstrom strongly suggested diesel fire pumps in the design plan because the electrical grid has been unreliable. Mr. Ford agreed with Mr. Borgstrom. Chairman Preidel opened the meeting to public comment/questions for Mr. Ford as he will not be available at the next meeting. There being no public comment, the meeting was closed to public comment at this time.

William Warwick was sworn in. Mr. Warwick gave his credentials and introduced himself as the residential architect. Exhibit A-7 was rendering of the residential

buildings. Mr. Warwick stated that there were 4 buildings on the site consisting of 96 affordable housing units and an amenity building along with a superintendent unit. The units will be a mix of 1, 2 and 3 bedrooms. Exhibit A-21 was a color rendering of the residential buildings. All four buildings are 3 stories. The building design had a mix of siding; horizontal siding, stone siding on lower walls, and the primary color is white with blue accent color. The buildings have a projected roof and covered area at the entry of the buildings. There was secondary door on the side. Exhibit A-22 shows the rear elevation and side elevation of the residential buildings. It was nearly identical to the front elevation although there is no rear entry just windows on the back of the buildings. Exhibit A-23 is the first-floor plan of the residential buildings. Exhibit A-24 is the second and third floor plan of the residential buildings. A-25 is the second building which shows a little bit of an extension making it appear slightly different than the other buildings. A-29 was a rendering of the amenity building and superintendents unit. It shows vertical siding, stone base, a little bit of horizontal siding on the side, and hv/ac equipment is ground mounted around the perimeter. The amenity building would not have any cooking, just a food warming area. As of right now the mechanical equipment was 5ft. off the building. There will be directional sight signage compliant with regulations. Mr. Warwick addressed Mr. Borgstrom's request of a 13 system he said that typically he would do 13R, but he was willing to investigate what a 13 system would look like. Mr. Fox referred to his review letter page 9 and 10 #31 if the hv/ac systems are all running together it would make quite a bit of noise. He would like the units to comply with state regulations that no more than 8 decibels for constant run. Mrs. Semus asked about handicap accessibility. Mr. Warwick said that elevators were not required in this building, only the first floor will be accessible. The law doesn't require the second and third floor to be handicap accessible. Mr. Borgstrom stated that low- and moderate-income residents tend to use emergency services more because most of their doctors are in the emergency room. Mr. Fox said that elevator was more for corridor units and these are more like stacked townhouses. Mr. Borgstrom asked that the flower beds be non-combustible flower beds. Mr. Borgstrom asked about more storage for the residential units. Mr. Warwick said that the units are designed to meet the code regulations. Mr. Borgstrom said that people have bikes and scooters they would need a place to put them. There was an outdoor bike racks shown on the plans. Mr. Borgstrom asked if the amenity building with the warming kitchen and meeting room had 24-hour onsite management? Mr. Gianetti confirmed that it did. Mrs. Herbert asked how the affordable rentals would work in the affordable housing. Who approves the tenant? Other developers may acquire it when it's not the applicant's bread and butter. There are others out there such as Triad Associates or other affordable housing administrators that do the same process as purchasing affordable housing. Mrs. Herbert confirmed that the recreation courts and amenity building would be maintained by the owner of the property and not Mansfield township. This is correct. Mrs. Herbert asked if Mr. Warwick had any of these buildings built in the area for them to look at. Mr. Warwick would provide this at the next hearing. Mr. Schwartz asked what the capacity of the amenity building's community room and lounge was. Mr. Warwick said that it wouldn't hold large groups. People would have to reserve the space ahead of time.

Joseph Fishinger of Bright View Engineering was sworn in as the applicant's traffic engineer. Mr. Fishinger gave his credentials to the Board and the Board accepted them.

Mr. Fishinger said that the peak hours from the existing conditions of the site had traffic counts from the intersection of Route 130 and Kinkora Road showed 7:15AM-8:15AM. Traffic engineers grade intersections by delay grades A-F. At a stop sign controlled intersection 50 seconds is the limit, anything over 50 seconds is an F. Mr. Fishinger reported that Route 130 and Kinkora Road is currently failing today. It is about a 2-minute wait in the morning and about 5 minutes in the evening; warrants a traffic signal currently without the development. The state has upgraded their calculations and it still fails. He applied the trip generation, 240 total trips with 100 in and 162 out. He assumed 20% of traffic associated with the warehouses would be trucks. There are five total access points to the site, there's a right in and right out on Route 130, a full movement access near the proposed traffic signal, two full movement driveways to Kinkora Road, and a driveway for the warehouses on Kinkora Road which would be restricted for tractor trailers. For the warehouse commercial trips was split even with 41% of trips coming to and from the North, 42% to and from the South, and 17% of that towards Kinkora Road. All truck traffic was routed separately from the residential vehicle traffic. For residential vehicle traffic 65% is oriented to the North on Route 130 and 21% to the South, and 14% to Kinkora Road. Majority of the traffic was oriented to Route 130 but not all of it.

Exhibit A-32 depicts improvements to the intersection of Route 130 and Kinkora Road. Mr. Fishinger is proposing widening jug handles and a traffic signal at Route 130. The grass median will be eliminated in the middle of Route 130 and replaced with a concrete barrier. If you were coming South on Route 130 in order to access Kinkora Road and the site you would take the jug handle and you would either go straight to go down Kinkora Road or make a left turn to go back North on Route 130 or turn right into the site. The intent is to try and direct as much of the truck traffic as possible through the jug handle. They are adding a third deceleration lane. If you are coming up Kinkora Road you will be able to go straight or make a right turn there will be no left turn. There will be another jug handle to go South. Mr. Fishinger looked at multiple different routes left turns, two lights, etc. DOT is requiring that this section of Route 130 have jug handles as opposed to left turns. Mr. Noll recommended in his review letter advanced signal ahead signs. Mr. Fishinger agreed to work with Mr. Noll and DOT to come up with as best of a solution as they can. All movements at the traffic light and the intersection South of the traffic light will level of service of C or better and all of the remaining driveways will all operate at a B or C depending on the time of day. Mr. Noll said he was in agreement with this version. Mr. Noll asked what steps the applicant has taken to limit the truck traffic going down Kinkora Road. Mr. Fishinger was amenable to whatever the state would allow to redirect as much as they can. Mr. Borgstrom asked how many trucks could fit in the queue space. Mr. Fishinger said that it was long enough for one tractor trailer. Mr. Fox said that the plans are showing sidewalks on Route 130. Mr. Schwartz asked about the hours of operation for the tenants. Mr. Gianetti said that this would be dependent on the type of tenant in the space and because they have no tenant, they are currently asking for 24/7.

At this time the meeting will continue to be heard at the special meeting held January 29th, 2024 at 6:30 PM.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD: NONE

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion to adjourn the meeting at 9:43PM was made by Mrs. Semus. Second by Deputy Mayor Siz.

Respectfully Prepared and Submitted by,

Elizabeth A. MacLennan
Joint Land Use Board Secretary