

**MANSFIELD TOWNSHIP  
BURLINGTON COUNTY  
JOINT LAND USE BOARD  
March 11, 2024  
6:30PM  
SPECIAL MEETING**

**CALL TO ORDER /FLAG SALUTE/OPEN PUBLIC MEETING STATEMENT**

The Notice requirements provided for in the Open Public meetings Act have been satisfied. Notice of this meeting was published on February 25, 2024. 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.

Chairman Preidel called the meeting to order followed by the flag salute.

**ROLL CALL**

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

**APPROVAL OF PRIOR MINUTES: NONE**

**RESOLUTIONS: NONE**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**APPLICANT:** COX AUTOMOTIVE C/O STATE ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES (MANHEIM)  
**LOCATION:** BLOCK 1, LOT 5.03; BLOCK 2, LOT 1.01; BLOCK 3, LOTS 1&2, 155 AARONSON ROAD AND 735, 741, AND 770 NJ ROUTE 68  
**APPLICATION FOR:** AMENDED PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN W/D (2) USE VARIANCE

Kevin Sheehan of Parker McCay introduced himself as the attorney representing the applicant. The property is located in the C2 Highway Commercial District. The applicant is seeking amended preliminary and final site plan approval with a D2 Variance related to the non-conforming use. The proposal is to construct a drive thru automobile fixed imaging tunnel as an accessory structure. There will be three of them on the site. Two of them will be just under 2,000sq. ft. and one will be just over 1,000sq. ft. the facilities will automate digital photography of the vehicles which is currently taking place on site but will automate them and allow them to do it more efficiently. The current use is permitted as an existing non-conforming use.

Brad Devereux introduced himself as the consultant to the applicant. Mr. Devereux has done project management and environmental permitting. The applicant proposing to install fabric structures that will take digital photography of the cars. It does the condition report of the vehicles checked in before and after detailing. Exhibit A1 is an ariel view of the site. Mr. Devereux showed where the facilities would be located on the site. Mr. Sheehan confirmed that photography of the vehicles was already being performed on site but being performed manually. Exhibit A2 is a photo of what the structures look like. Mr. Sheehan asked if this would require more employees on the site. Mr. Devereux said no. Mr. Sheehan asked if will allow for more vehicles to be brought onto the site. Mr. Devereux responded no. Mr. Sheehan asked if it would allow the applicant to auction more vehicles on the site. Mr. Devereux said no. Mr. Sheehan asked is the structures will generate any new impervious surface. No, it will be put on existing pavement. Mr. Borgstrom confirmed that where these structures were being located would not obstruct any fire lanes or emergency access for vehicles. Mr. Devereux said no. Mr. Fox referenced his March 6<sup>th</sup>, 2024 review letter. He stated that the number of structures on the site are increasing, but it was no increase of the business activity on the site. Mr. Fox recommended a number of waivers. Mr. Fox said he had questions regarding lighting. Would there be any light spillage? Is there sufficient lighting? There was fixed lighting on the entrance and exit and any emergency lighting. The applicant agreed to pay for non- residential affordable housing impact fees. Mr. Devereux said that they would. No engineering was needed for this application. The site will not affect drainage or stormwater and it is existing impervious coverage. Mr. Broski inquired about whether the structures have doors or will it be open. The structures will have doors. Mr. Pinto asked if the vehicles will be on jacks. No, the vehicles will be on the ground and the cars will drive over the cameras.

Mark Malinowski of Stout and Caldwell introduced himself as the engineer for the applicant. Mr. Malinowski said that the site complies with all the bulk variances. There was no increase in impervious coverage. One of the structures was 26ft. x 40ft. and the other two structures were 32ft. x 62ft.

Mr. Sheehan stated that the positive criteria would be that the site promotes the general welfare, provided sufficient space, and promotes the free flow of traffic. There was sufficient lighting located on site. The structures could be added without changing circulation or adding any new impervious coverage. The application would not change drainage patterns, neighbors will see no effects, and no new employees or vehicles on the site.

Chairman Preidel opened the meeting to public comment on the above hearing.

Velupillai of 23 Sherwood Lane said that in regards to the automation of this will you use x-ray or chemicals? Mr. Sheehan responded no just video. Is it underground? No. Will you be adding any noise pollution? No.

There being no further comments, the meeting was closed to public comment.

Motion to approve the above application was made by Mr. Borgstrom. Second by Mr. Pinto.

Roll Call Vote:

Ayes: Mr. Borgstrom, Mrs. Herbert, Mr. Pinto, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Wainwright, Chairman Preidel, Mr. Broski, Mr. Ocello, Mrs. Villegas

Nays: None

Abstain: None

Absent: Mr. Grouser, Mayor Mojena, Deputy Mayor Sis, Mrs. Semus

All Ayes. Motion Carried.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD:**

Mr. Varga gave an overview of the completeness review. It is not a requirement to have a completeness hearing. The engineer or planner would deem the application complete instead of during a public hearing. The members that were not present at the previous meeting were in agreement to do away with completeness hearings.

Mr. Varga gave an update to the Board on a Technical Review Committee (TRC) is. A TRC would be created and adopted by Ordinance by the Township Committee. The TRC would be made up of a couple of Board members and the Joint Land Use Board (JLUB) Professionals. The purpose of the TRC would be for Major Site Plan applications to be reviewed and hash out and concerns prior to the JLUB hearing. This would streamline the application process making it able to be heard in less hearings. Mr. Pinto asked if decisions are made by the TRC then the rest of the Board doesn't get a say? Mr. Varga stated that the TRC doesn't make decisions for the Board. The application would still be heard by the Board. Mrs. Villegas asked if when these TRC meetings happened would there be a list of the revisions made for the public. Mr. Varga said no. Mr. Fox said that his review letters to the Board would indicate a change was made. The TRC can also be used for Minor Site Plan approval, but the application would have to be completely conforming with no variances. Mr. Schwartz asked how the public would know about the application if it was approved by the TRC? Mr. Varga said there was no notice given for Minor Site Plans. Chairman Preidel asked the Board to think about the two TRC options. It was agreed by the Board that Mr. Varga would supply them with sample ordinances.

#### **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 meeting at 7:16PM was made by Mr. Pinto. Second by Mr. Broski.

Respectfully Prepared and Submitted by,

---

Elizabeth A. MacLennan  
Joint Land Use Board Secretary