

**TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD  
PLANNING BOARD  
Monday, September 24, 2012  
Work Session**

The regular work session meeting of the Mansfield Township Planning Board held on the above shown date was called to order at 7:12 p.m. with the following in attendance: Douglas Borgstrom, LaVerne Cholewa, Robert Higgins, Dalpat Patel, Scott Preidel, Robert Semptimphelter, Douglas Walker and Michelle L. Gable, Secretary. Also present were Charles Petrone, Solicitor; Louis Glass, Planner; Harry McVey, Planner; Al Litwornia, Traffic Engineer; Robert Stout, Engineer; and Gary Forshner (Attorney for James Rockwell). Gary Lippincott and Arthur Puglia were absent.

The following was discussed:

**Application Number PB12-03PFSP&V: Manheim Remarketing, Inc., Block 2, Lots 1.01, 2.01 & 3 and Block 1, Lot 5.03:**

The Planning Board agreed to carry this application to the October meeting with no further notice to be given. If they do not attend the October meeting then they must renounce.

**Application Number PB12-02PFSP&V: Dr. James & Teresa Rockwell/Mansfield Investments, LLC, Block 33.04, Lots 9.01 & 9.23:**

Lou Glass commented that his issues are mechanical i.e. signage on the doors; building elevation plan must be submitted; need to specify the types of trees; modify the application to indicate the number of trees that will be bonded; landscaping plans to be modified and testimony is needed on security lighting. Mr. Forshner said the Planning Board needs to be the arbitrator regarding the landscaping.

Robert Stout commented that his issues are technical in nature. The main issue is parking and the testimony is needed on the number of doctors and employees as they have stated in their application they would be limited to three (3) doctors and eight (8) employees and noted if this number goes up in any way it would cause an issue with parking in accordance with ADA standards.

Al Litwornia commented on the pro rata share contribution for Petticoat Bridge Road and Columbus Road and the berm in conjunction with the sight triangle.

Mr. Forshner said the neighbors are concerned with what is going into the berm.

Robert Stout said they have lowered the berm to two feet.

There being no further discussion, the work session was closed at 7:26 p.m.

**Regular Meeting**

The regular meeting of the Mansfield Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Preidel at 7:30 P.M. on the above shown date followed by the Flag Salute and the following opening statement:

The notice requirements provided for in the 'Open Public Meetings Act' have been satisfied. Notice of this meeting was properly given in the annual notice, which was adopted by the Mansfield Township Planning Board on January 23, 2012. Said resolution was published in the Burlington County Times on February 1, 2012, e-mailed to the Burlington County Times, Trenton Times, and Register News, filed with the Clerk of the Township of Mansfield, posted on the official bulletin board at the Municipal Complex, filed with the members of this body, and mailed to each person who has requested copies of the regular meeting schedule and who has prepaid any charge fixed for such service. All the mailing, posting and filing having been accomplished on January 30, 2012.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Board Members:** Douglas Borgstrom, LaVerne Cholewa, Robert Higgins, Dalpat Patel, Scott Preidel, Robert Semptimphelter and Douglas Walker. Gary Lippincott and Arthur Puglia were absent.

**Professional Staff:** Charles Petrone, Solicitor; Louis Glass, Planner; Harry McVey, Planner; Alexander J. Litwornia, Traffic Engineer and Robert Stout, Engineer.

**Public Comments:**

**Chairman Preidel** opened the public comments portion of the meeting on non-agenda items.

Hearing no public comments **Chairman Preidel** closed the public comments portion of the meeting.

**MATTERS TO BE CONSIDER BY THE BOARD:**

**REQUEST TO CARRY TO OCTOBER 22, 2012 MEETING:**

**Application Number PB12-03PFSP&V: Manheim Remarketing, Inc., Block 2, Lots 1.01, 2.01 & 3 and Block 1, Lot 5.03:**

**Chairman Preidel** introduced this Application for Preliminary & Final Site Plan and Variance to install solar energy ground mount system on three (3) sites on the property located at 730 Route 68 in the C-2 Highway Commercial Zoning District noting they are asking to be carried to the October 22, 2012 with no further notice to be given.

A motion was offered by **Robert Semptimphelter** and duly second by **Douglas Borgstrom** to carry this application to the October 22, 2012 Planning Board meeting noting that if they do not attend the October 22, 2012 they will have to renote. The motion carried on a roll call vote taken as follows:

**AYE:** Borgstrom, Cholewa, Higgins, Patel, Preidel, Semptimphelter, Walker  
**NAYE:** None  
**ABSENT:** Lippincott, Puglia

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Application Number PB12-02PFSP&V-2012AMS: Dr. James & Teresa Rockwell/Mansfield Investments, LLC, Block 33.04, Lots 9.01 & 9.23:**

**Chairman Preidel** introduced this Application for Preliminary & Final Site plan with Variances and a Minor Subdivision to construct one (1) 15,900 square foot building of professional office space with the site sharing access with existing professional office space located on Lot 9.23 via an access easement and will also have direct access from Sheffield Drive located on 14 Sheffield Drive in the C-3 Office/Residential Zoning District.

**APPLICANTS ATTORNEY'S COMMENTS:**

**Gary Forshner**, Attorney with Stark & Stark was present representing the applicant. This is a process that has been in the works for four years. Over the last month, they have been working very carefully and closely with the Board professionals, the objectors and their attorney in order to address what they believe are the outstanding issues and they are going to present to the Board this evening subject to the Boards approval. It is one building 15,900 square feet, the agenda said a particular type of offices and he just wanted to remind the board that when they submitted the application they made it clear that it is four different types of office space that the Township ordinance permits, which are administrative, professional, general offices, etc. and they wanted to make it clear that all the various types of offices can be permitted. There will be some restriction on medical space because of the parking requirements that he will go through as he proceeds. They have five difference variances and they all virtually fall into the category of either pre-existing conditions or relief that is necessitated or been finalized pursuant to their discussions and negotiations with the objectors. 1) Frontage – Pre-existing condition based upon the subdivision relief and granted back when the subdivision had been created. They are asking for the one lot to actually have a slightly increased frontage to do a minor subdivision, essentially a lot line adjustment between the two adjacent lots. The reason is so they can pull the septic field outside of the landscape buffer. They have increased the landscape buffer from what the ordinance requires as twenty (20) feet and done a thirty (30) foot landscape buffer. The ordinance does not require it, the neighbors asked them to do it, they are happy to accommodate it. They have pulled the septic field out of the front yard and to accommodate the full thirty feet.

It requires them to essentially in order to have the setback requirements for the septic met requires them to do this lot line adjustment. It is an accommodate to the neighbors in terms of a lot line adjustment otherwise this is an existing condition. 2) Impervious coverage – They are also able to do this project almost fully conforming if not entirely conforming with the ordinance in terms of impervious coverage. They have had discussions with the neighbors and come up with a plan, which they believe that they will indicate to the Board this evening that is acceptable to them. The ordinance also has a discrepancy with regard to the amount of impervious between 70 and 25 as to whether the 70 applies to the commercial or not. That is an issue they do not need inherently to resolve this evening, they are prepared to ask for relief with regard to that, as he said they are able to do a project that is almost entirely conforming with the impervious requirements of the ordinance but again because of the extensive negotiations and accommodations with the neighbors the project has been modified. It does require relief in order to accommodate those requests. 3) Setbacks – There is now a new side yard setback solely between the commonly owned or commonly controlled properties and the necessity or the creation of that is that they have asked them to move the building further away from the residential lot line, they have accommodated that, it requires them to ask for a five (5) foot variance from the side yard setback requirements. They can fully accommodate that in accordance with the ordinance but again in order to accommodate the neighbors they have requested the variance be granted. 4) Fence – They have been asked to do a fence along the common property line. The ordinance would not allow that within the front yard. Again, it is 100% an accommodation to the neighbors, it provides for an additional buffer to their residents. They are glad to accommodate that but it does require relief. 5) Signage – This has been discussed with the Board as well as the neighbors, their primary issue was the location of the signage. They have accommodated that request as to the location and they will need some relief as to the signage requirements as well.

They also have a list of items that they have negotiated at great length with the neighbors and noted that Mr. Gasiorowski is here and they have gone through this with him and his clients so if there is anything he misstated Mr. Gasiorowski will correct it. They submitted a plan about two months ago, this Board deemed that plan complete, the review letters have been based upon those plans but since then they have made some minor revisions to those plans related to landscaping the buffer area. They have an exhibit that has been shared with the neighbors, which they have signed off on. He believes the professionals have seen it but if they have not they will make sure they see it here tonight. To be clear for the record they are asking the Board to approve the plans that were previously deemed complete but ask they conditionally approve on making the changes shown in the additional exhibit that is to be presented. Some of these requirements in terms of the items that they discussed in terms of settlement are already reflected on the plan. So as to not complicate matters he wants to make sure that A. the Board is aware of what those accommodations are but B. to the extent that they are already accommodated in the plan just simply to ask the Board to condition the approval on modifying the plan consistent with that exhibit that shows those changes.

The following are the accommodations made with the neighbors:

1. Shift the building away from the residential homes that share a common property. This is shown on the plans that were previously seen and that have been reviewed by the professionals, which has already been addressed and accommodated.
2. Add curbed landscaped island in the middle of the parking row, which is on the original plan. Note: They have agreed to it but it will be on the plans they are asking to be approved this evening.
3. The second driveway closest to the residential neighborhood there were no inherent constraints to that but there were questions raised by both the Board professionals and by the neighbors. The accommodation is they would have that as a one way driveway only, ingress only. It would give people one more

opportunity to turn into this property before they went into the residential neighborhood. They or the residents do not want vehicles that are intended for this site to be driving through the neighborhood making u-turns in the driveways. In addition, they will have signage and markings required by the Board professionals to be consistent with this i.e. a do not enter sign from the inside so people do not use it for exiting purposes.

4. The applicant has agreed to put lights for the sign on a timer and have it turned off at 9 p.m.
5. The applicant has agreed to put parking lot lights on timers and to reduce the lighting to simply security lighting only as of 9 p.m. The security lighting will be for the portion of the property facing Sheffield Drive.
6. The applicant has agreed to make the construction entrance the existing curb cut on the lot.
7. He noted that a number of these restrictions and requirements that the applicant has agreed to go far beyond their statutory and ordinance requirements but they have agreed to do so again as an accommodation to the neighbors. The applicant has agreed to restrict future development of the site in a matter to be reduced to a deed restriction satisfactory to the Board Attorney and that the deed restriction shall provide generally that the building footprint will not be enlarged but that the site can be developed in the future subject to this Boards approval or whatever Board or agency has appropriate jurisdiction. The intent is not to further develop the site by a building larger than what is here but in the future for instance this building may become obsolete for whatever reason but that would be subject to the Boards approval. In the future, the site can change otherwise, it will be restricted based upon the footprint that is there. It does not mean they cannot do minor improvements to the site in the future but simply the development you see today is only the development that they are going to have on this site.
8. Focusing on the new building and new use that there be no curbside trash pick up. Noting there is already a dumpster shown on the plan and they have agreed that the trash pick up for this new building be based upon that dumpster and commercial removal of the trash.
9. The applicant has agree to put the mailbox for the new facility near the existing group of mailboxes for the existing building but it would be subject to the approval of the postal services since they have the final say as to the location, type, etc. of the mailboxes. They propose to do them similar if not the same as to what is out there now adjacent to the mailboxes that are there now as long as they get postal service approval.
10. Agreed to do a one story building, which is shown on the plan that the Board has seen utilizing similar architectural features as the existing building on lot 9.23 and the height not to exceed the height of the existing one story portion of the building on 9.23. He was corrected by Dr. Rockwell who noted it will not exceed the height limit because they are going to have dormers.
11. Construction activity – They agreed to not doing outside construction on weekends so they can still do construction internal to the building but they are not going to do external construction on weekends. It was noted that the code does not have that prohibition and that is in accommodation of the neighbors and the residents.
12. Stormwater Management is to meet all State and local requirements, which is part of the application they are asking to be approved as such, but they wanted it made clear on the record. Presuming it is approved they do not think that there needs to be a condition of approval because that is an item that will have been satisfied by

- virtue of the Board review and approval of the application and the plan.
13. Agreed to provide a buffer consistent of some evergreens and a fence along the common residential property line, which is shown on the plan that will be presented this evening.
  14. Agreed to a 30-foot wide landscape buffer across the front of the property as he indicated it is in excess of the ordinance requirements.
  15. They are also providing a small berm, which consists of approximately a 2-foot mound. He knows Mr. Litwornia has some questions on how it was designed and he understands that it was reviewed with their engineer, Mr. Jones who is not only a neighbor but an engineer as well and there were certain accommodations that they were asked to make and were acceptable to everybody. In addition, there is going to be landscaping on top of the berm or within the landscape buffer. It is all shown on the plan but some additional changes are the changes that Mr. Litwornia has requested.
  16. An additional item that came up today with the Board professionals, Mr. Gasiorowski and with respect to what the clients have discussed is the possibility of adding to the plan up to an additional six (6) trees. The arbiter of deciding the necessity for those additional trees is going to be the Board professionals whether it be the Board Engineer or Board Planner. It is proposed to be handled by the Board professionals, Mr. Glass in particular. They are going to be asked to bond for the six additional trees. The location, etc., to be determined in the future by the Board professionals and they will include that in the performance bond. However, because they do not know initially if those are going to be installed what they will do when everything else is done they either ask for a reduction or a return of the performance bond the portion that represents those six trees they will leave as a cash bond. That will survive for up to a year after the performance bond is released. Within that year, it will be up to the Board professionals to decide whether the trees are to be provided for and if it is deemed not to be necessary and they are not requested to do it the cash bond would be released at that point and time.

**Ron Gasiorowski** was present representing the objectors. He has listened to the comments of his colleague and he is satisfied. He asked that Mr. Joseph Jones who is representative of the citizens group that is present here be sworn and ask him if he has listened to the comments and if the comments of Mr. Forshner concord with what he and the engineer negotiated with so he will know that in the future that so long as they are compliant they have agreed with the citizens.

**Mr. Forshner** said their understanding or their offer to the residents were that they will make these offers and these representations and these agreements so long as there is no further objection from any party, whether represented by Mr. Gasiorowski or not either in these proceedings or in a subsequent appeal. If there is objection, they have the right to withdraw from this settlement and from these conditions. They hope that not to be the case, they certainly take Mr. Gasiorowski to his word and Mr. Jones will have an opportunity to speak momentarily so they trust and hope there will not be objections are any appeal but they do need to reserve their rights on that to the extent that there might be.

**Solicitor Petrone** said for the limited purpose of Mr. Gasiorowski's request have Mr. Jones sworn in and verbally tell the Board what Mr. Gasiorowski is telling us. He cannot be a witness because he is representing a client. He wants his client to be the witness to say yes I concur with the representations of the applicants' attorney. Then they can get into the application as a traditional application by the applicants representatives then open it to the public in a normal course of events. He does not want any members of the public who are here now

and hearing Mr. Jones have the opportunity to testify right now think that they won't be also be given the opportunity at the right time but this is a unique situation because of the current litigation that is involved with as part of the application process.

**Mr. Forshner** asked Mr. Gasiorowski as part of his comments confirm to the board and for their purposes that assuming that all of this is approved and acceptable that the litigation will be dismissed with prejudice as well. **Mr. Gasiorowski** said he thought it had been resolved and noted Mr. Forshner is correct.

**Joseph Jones**, 11 Sheffield Drive, Columbus, New Jersey was sworn in Solicitor Petrone to give testimony on this application. **Mr. Gasiorowski** asked Mr. Jones you retained me to represent your interest as well as the interest of numerous neighbors with whom you reside on properties adjacent to the subject application, did you not. **Mr. Jones** said I did. **Mr. Gasiorowski** asked we have appeared on several occasions and he believes over the past several months you have been meeting and conferring with the engineer for the applicant as to a series of negotiating items. **Mr. Jones** said that is correct. **Mr. Gasiorowski** asked would you agree with me and my colleague that those items, which were set forth on the record adequately, describe what you have agreed to with the engineer. **Mr. Jones** said they do. **Mr. Gasiorowski** asked would you also represent that you have in fact also presented these items collectively to all of the parties whom I represent who are a part of your group and they have also agreed to give you the authority to appear this evening and affirm on the record that they are acceptable to that. **Mr. Jones** said that is correct. **Mr. Gasiorowski** said you also recognize of course although we cannot control it, it is possible that there is a party out there unrepresented by me and unknown to you who may file an objection to the applicants application, if that happens it basically would go back to square one. **Mr. Jones** said understood. **Mr. Gasiorowski** said just for the record would you also agree that while obviously you and Dr. Rockwell were adversaries in this matter once you had sat down and attempted to come to a conciliatory agreement he in fact has been forthright in attempting to resolve this amicably as he as done. **Mr. Jones** said absolutely. **Mr. Gasiorowski** also stated in his dealings with your professionals as well as Mr. Forshner everybody has been extremely cooperative. Sometimes people disagree over things, he thinks Dr. Rockwell realized that, he had an adversary who was going to oppose this and sat down and basically came to an agreement and he wishes him good luck with his project.

**Gary Forshner** said they are ready to proceed to present the formality of the application as it is currently presented to justify the relief that has been requested and address any comments from the Board or their professionals. He then introduced John Kornick and asked that he be sworn in.

#### TESTIMONY:

**Solicitor Petrone** swore in John Kornick who is a Licensed Professional Engineer in the State of New Jersey and Delaware, he has a Bachelors of Environmental Science from West Virginia University and a Civil Engineering degree, Bachelors of Science from Drexel University. He has appeared before Boards in Burlington County, Camden County, Cape May County, Atlantic County and he thinks Gloucester County as well. The Board accepted his credentials as a Professional Engineer to give testimony on this application.

**Gary Forshner** said from a housekeeping prospective they had submitted plans and supporting application materials to the Board in support of that and asked if they wanted to deem those as part of the record here this evening and they will just present to the you the specific portions of those plans that are necessary in order to go through that. **Solicitor Petrone** said they are already part of the record as part of the application package and revisions thereto. What they traditionally do is just the plans that are going to be referred to here at this setting are identified and marked.

**Mr. Kornick** described **Exhibit A-1**, which is a site rendering of the site plan proposal. It is overlaying on top of an aerial that shows the adjacent parcels and it also reflects the

discussions they were having with respect to the modified landscaping that was proposed along the front and side yards. **Mr. Forshner** said this plan is a couple of things, one is it is based upon the original plan as submitted to the Board, reviewed by the Board professionals with the exception of the changes that Mr. Kornick has just indicated. **Mr. Kornick** said it does. **Mr. Forshner** said obviously it is a rendered plan as well. **Mr. Kornick** said correct. **Mr. Forshner** asked in all other regards it conforms with the plans that have been submitted formally as part of the application. **Mr. Kornick** said correct. **Mr. Forshner** then asked Mr. Kornick to review the plans. **Mr. Kornick** said they have a new site plan with a one-story 15,900 square foot building that is located on the backside of a proposed parking bay. The project incorporates improvements that are on lot 9.23 and they are proposing their improvements on lot 9.01. They are asking for a minor subdivision or a lot line adjustment to accommodate the construction of the septic system in the front yard and that is outside of the proposed landscape buffer that was agreed upon with the neighbors. That location has also shifted towards the south so they are greater than 200 feet from all the adjacent wells and their proposed well on this project. They are proposing an 8-foot wide concrete sidewalk along the front of the building and 71 parking spaces up in front, 27 will be designed at 9 ½ feet wide by 15 feet deep. There are two reasons they did this proposal one is to reduce the amount of impervious on the site and the ordinance does allow for 40% of the total parking proposed to be compact car parking as long as it is not segregated and pushed within certain parking bays. They are treating stormwater run off in two forms. The first form is conveying a portion of the run off from the parking area into a grass swale that will eventually discharge into a combined infiltration extended detention basin. They are also collecting roof run off and putting them into dry wells to segregate or to disconnect impervious coverage, which is all in conformance with the DEP regulations for stormwater management. They are proposing one form of ingress into the project and it is an 18-foot wide driveway and has been reduced from a 24-foot wide driveway, two reasons, one is to ensure that anybody coming in will obviously come into the facility but also it is adequately signed to deter people from leaving out of that driveway. Normal access or at least for egress would be proposed through a connecting driveway to the adjacent parcel on lot 9.23 and they have two forms of egress coming out of that parking lot onto Sheffield Drive with eventual discharge onto Columbus Road. **Mr. Forshner** asked if he recalls correctly, it not only requires the cross access easement but there was cross drainage. **Mr. Kornick** said there is cross drainage. What they are doing is proposing an outlet structure so once you get past the infiltration component of the basin the outlet works will go into work. It will discharge into an existing pipe that is on the down streamside of this little extended detention basin, which will eventual discharge into the wet pond on lot 9.23. They also have a new improvement and it has been brought up in past designs but they will put or install a drywell system or a dry fire hydrant system and it will allow connections for the fire company to come in to draw water should it be needed for these buildings or neighboring facilities. As mentioned the site will be serviced by an on site septic system. That application is going to be submitted probably within the next week and they will have a new well proposed on the backside for potable water. As discussed, they do have a proposal for a 30-foot wide landscape buffer and then a 20-foot wide landscape buffer around the entire perimeter of the facility because it is adjacent to a residential uses or residential zone. They are installing a 6-foot high board on board fence along the common side yard and then they are installing four (4) trees to accommodate the comments from that neighbor. Along with that they have some American arborvitae that they are proposing as per the discussion that they recently had and that is in front of lots 1.02 and he believes 1.01 of Block 33.03 and then accommodating that would be additional trees as per the agreement should that need to be installed in the future. They do have a trash enclosure that will accommodate the trash services for the facility and they have provided truck turning movements and plans that show that a trash truck can come into the facility, unload the trash and come back out. **Dalpat Patel** asked about the existing hedge and the fence. **Mr. Kornick** said this is the existing hedge and the neighbor

has either a split rail or a fence that comes into roughly the front of the house. She asked for a board on board fence to buffer the project during the construction knowing that the trees are coming in at 6-foot heights. They are a little bit younger, they are not as aggressively grown at that point so she wanted additional buffering during construction and the hedge is going to stay there.

**Solicitor Petrone** swore in Dr. James Rockwell, 1 Woodview Court, Columbus to give testimony on this application.

**Dr. Rockwell** then reviewed Exhibit A-2 – Pictures taken by Dr. Rockwell – Figure 1- Neighbor at 18 Sheffield Drive, this is where the fence and four more trees will go. **Mr. Kornick** says there is nursery stock on the site and because of the improvements they are proposing the nursery stock are the evergreen trees that you do see there are going to come out of the property. **Dr. Rockwell** said not the two big ones that are seen there; Figure 2 – Same view as Figure 1 but back further; Figure 3-View from proposed project looking towards the Cottrell property; Figure 4-View from proposed project looking towards the Mr. Jones' property. **Mr. Forshner** said this has been what was proposed to the neighbor and you have heard Mr. Jones and Mr. Gasiorowski indicate that this is acceptable. **Mr. Patel** asked if the hedgerow. **Mr. Kornick** said the hedgerow that exists varies in species within the hedgerow. **Dr. Rockwell** said he does not think that is what the neighbor wants and they are doing what the neighbor wants noting that the trees that are shown do not drop their leaves. **Solicitor Petrone** asked if the fence is just going along the common property line with 18 Sheffield. **Mr. Kornick** said it is, it is beginning at the turning point of her existing fence but it will be on Dr. Rockwell's property and it is a board on board white vinyl fence.

**Mr. Forshner** said he knows there was conversation between you, Al and John about the height of the berm and asked if it has been resolved. **Mr. Litwornia** said it could be addressed as a condition of approval. **Mr. Forshner** asked what he wants it to say. **Mr. Litwornia** said they want to maintain the sight distance from the existing driveway for people making left turns and right turns. **Mr. Kornick** said what Mr. Litwornia is asking us to do is modify the sight triangle to a 35 mph site triangle, which will adjust it further east into their property and then make sure that their berm does not have any conflicting elevations within that sight triangle so that the view is not blocked. **Mr. Patel** asked high is the berm. **Mr. Kornick** said the berm agreed upon with the neighbors is approximately two feet above the back of the sidewalk elevation. The original proposal submitted to the Board was roughly four feet and with the accommodations or changes that they had made with the landscaping buffer they have agreed upon reducing that size of the berm. **Mr. Forshner** said he thinks everyone preferred this design including lower berm height and that was after extensive discussions with Mr. Jones in particular and his neighbors weighing in on it during a site visit actually at Dr. Rockwell's home and seeing how that would work and his understanding is everyone, as you heard, has agreed to it. **Dr. Rockwell** said he met Mr. Jones at the site, they talked at length on looking a different things, they also took a ride to his house where he showed him the American arborvitae, he asked how about something like this and he said absolutely that would be perfect and that is where they made the agreement.

**Chairman Preidel** asked if Mr. Forshner had anything else. **Mr. Forshner** said he would like to bring his planner up to complete their testimony and make sure that record is clear regarding the off tract contributions. **Chairman Preidel** asked Mr. Kornick to point out where the building is over 15 foot where 20 foot is required. **Mr. Kornick** said it was one of the requests of the neighbors during their discussions and negotiations and what they had done was shift the building towards the south.

**Mr. Forshner** asked Mr. Kornick to show them location of the curb cut that is going to be used for construction purposes, the approximate location of the mailboxes and the approximate location of the sign. **Mr. Kornick** said with respect to the construction entrance their plans that were submitted identify the construction entrance on their soil erosion and



sediment control sheet, that location is roughly where an existing curb cut exists, and they are going to utilize that for all construction activities until construction is complete. The boxes currently for this facility on lot 9.23 are located on Sheffield Drive and the neighbors have asked them to locate all of their mailboxes adjacent to that pending approval from the postmaster. The sign is located behind the sight triangle easement, it is right around the existing property line between 9.01 and 9.23, and it is within the landscape buffer.

**Solicitor Petrone** swore in John Pagenkopf, Planner who is a licensed Professional Planner in the State of New Jersey, he has been practicing planning for over 20 years, a member of the American Institute of Certified Planners, which is a national certification group and he has testified as an expert through out New Jersey, Delaware and Pennsylvania. The Board accepted his credentials as a Professional Planner to give testimony on this application.

**Mr. Pagenkopf** said in preparation for tonight's testimony he has reviewed the Master Plan, the ordinances, the plan that has been submitted tonight as well as a site visit. They have five variances to discuss, which are lot frontage, lot coverage, signage, minimum side yard setback and the fence that has been discussed. The site is relatively flat but the shape of the site while it is rectangular it has an angled frontage on Sheffield Drive and it has a stormwater management basin, drainage easements and wetlands, which give it somewhat of a contorted net building area to work with. Concerning lot frontage the minimum required lot frontage is 150 feet. Ordinance 65-17C requires the minimum 150 and not to exceed 200 feet. The existing lot frontage on lot 9.01 is approximately 343 feet. Lot 9.01 has been widened about forty feet to the south to accommodate the deepened landscape buffer 30 feet and the new location of the septic field. It has also be widened to eliminate some other variances and to the site plan and circulation. The lot frontage on lot 9.23 to the south has been reduced by roughly 40 feet and a new variance has to be created for that lot as well. Proposed lot frontage for lot 9.01 383 feet more or less and for lot 9.23 563 feet more or less. Other C-3 sites in the proximity of this parcel have frontages also in excess of 200 feet. Lot 9.23 has two frontages, one 545 feet the other 340 feet. Southwest of them across Sheffield is lot 9.01 those frontages are 300 feet and 493 feet respectively noting that a precedence has been set in the C-3 district. As far as lot coverage, Ordinance 65-17h states that the maximum lot coverage is 25%. While the current proposal rendered for the lot is 32.5% an earlier design had been done, which brought the impervious close to the required 25% coverage but to accommodate the deeper buffering, they have some insufficient single loaded parking, in revised design to accommodate a lot of the site improvements per the neighbors their impervious coverage is up to 32.5%. They will say the stormwater management design has been designed to accommodate this impervious coverage so there should not be flooding or any problems with the design. They think the current site plan best minimizes any impacts to the neighborhood and maintains residential character along the Sheffield Drive streetscape. Regarding signage Ordinance 65-113. 1E1 – Does not permit freestanding signs in the C-3 office residential district. The site needs signage, if they did not have signage they would be afraid that potential guests might drive past the offices into the neighborhood so they believe the signage that is proposed, which is consistent with other signage in the neighborhood will help to keep the commercial traffic in the commercial area and not encroach into the residential areas. Else where in the C-3 district in the Mansfield Center there are two freestanding signs as well as on the Mansfield Commons site has three freestanding signs. Therefore, again precedence has been set in this neighborhood for freestanding signs. The sign has been placed within the buffer so relief will be required for that but they believe having that inside the buffer and the proposed evergreen trees behind that will give good buffering and/or screening as well as visibility for the sign. In regards to the side yard setbacks Ordinance 65-17G permits a minimum side yard setback 20 feet. They are proposing a setback of 15 feet, which is on the southern side. They could accommodate the 20-foot setback by moving the building north but by bringing the building south closer to the other commercial, they are giving a greater setback between the proposed office building and the adjacent neighbor. They think it

is an improvement as far as any impact to the neighbor but again it requires a reduction of 5 feet into that side yard to the south and the fence is the front yard and drainage easement. Ordinance 65-102C 1 and 2 prohibit fences in front yards and in drainage easements. This 6-foot tall white PVC fence is going to provide supplemental buffering and screening to the residential neighbor to the north. The fence will enhance the buffering but will not impact any sight triangle easements nor will it impact any surface drainage or subsurface drainage so they believe the variance will be justified to help achieve a better screening to the north. As a professional planner he believes these variances can be granted without damaging the ordinance or the zone plan, they are needed to help reinforce a better design for the use in the neighborhood.

#### **PROFESSIONAL COMMENTS:**

**Louis Glass, Planner** referred to his report dated September 4, 2012, which goes over the newest/latest plan that has been submitted. He said on page 2 he lists the five variance request, which Mr. Forshner has already explained; point C. on page 2 is a checklist of waivers from the Townships checklist, which are almost all engineering items noting he does not have a problem with the from a planning viewpoint; page 3 item D. Request for variance to have a coverage requirement from 25% to 32.5% - he indicates there is one place in the Township Zoning ordinance where it allows commercial office buildings to have 70% coverage but through what he considers to be a printing error the 70% was never mentioned in the body of the C-3 district so to him it is questionable whether the variance is even needed but the applicant has chosen to ask the Board for the variance to give them the extra protection that he is looking for. **Solicitor Petrone** said when the ordinance was revised and sent to the codification service the codification service erroneously changed the bulk schedule for this zone to the 70%, it was another zone that had actually changed so the 25% is what the town governing body was requiring for this zoning district and it was noted that it has corrected to reflect 25%. He said from the applicants' perspective they testified for a variance indicating the burden of proof on them for the variance to permit the 32.5% as opposed to 25%. **Mr. Glass** said the next variance is the freestanding sign. The applicant has indicated in this district free standing signs are not allowed, the sign they are proposing is the exact mirror image of the one that is on the existing office building, so since that was granted by the Board as a variance previously and the sign is identical he has no objection to that request. He did add under #3 an additional variance because under the regulations signs are not allowed in the buffers. Now had they stayed with the Township requirement of 20-foot wide buffers they would not need the variance for the sign location but since they expanded the buffer from 20 to 30-feet it lapped over into where the sign is located so technically they need a variance to have the sign in the buffer zone and he has no objection to that either because the increased width of the buffer serves the function of helping out the neighbors. Item #4 under the new plans they are showing next to the building entrance doors a sign mounted on the walls indicating where the tenants are located by the suite numbers. They are comply with the sign dimensions listed in the C-3 Zoning district but he felt in analyzing the proposed signs they have there, which is 3-feet high by 2-feet wide next to the door, by the time they get done listing the suite numbers and adding space the remaining area is not long enough to hold many tenants names unless you have very small letters. He thinks the sign plaque is too small and recommended they expand the width by one foot making it a total of three feet. **Mr. Forshner** said they could accommodate that request. **Mr. Glass** said Item#5 they do need a new building elevation plan since the applicant has dropped down to a one story plan with a wider footprint it no longer fits the previous building elevation plan and they do not know how many doors there are on the building. **Mr. Forshner** said that is acceptable to the applicant. **Mr. Glass** said Item#6 the Board had previously allowed a waiver for not submitting the community impact statement and he is not taking any exception to that waiver. Item#7 need testimony as to the limitation of the occupancy being limited to no more than three (3) doctors and eight (8) employees for those doctors. Item#8 they are recommending the buffer along

Sheffield be listed as a landscape buffer easement. Putting into an easement adds protection to the neighborhood in that the applicant cannot add any improvements in the buffer nor can they remove the trees because it is in the easement. Item#9 they need to have more details on the security lighting. They do not know what the intensity of the building security lighting is. Sincere there are houses across the street they want to see the specifications so they do not get an excessive amount of security lighting and they do not know it is going to run for 24 hours or have a cut off time. Item#6 Mr. Forshner explained for enforcement purposes as to the additional number of trees that maybe added after the project is complete they need to change the wording on the plan to an exact amount. They have agreed on six (6) extra trees that way they could include it in the bond estimate, which means both sides agree it will not exceed six (6) trees but it is needed for bonding purposes because that is the only enforcement mechanism the Township has once the project is under construction. Item#11 there is no inclusionary housing contribution for commercial buildings in New Jersey at this time. **Mr. Forshner** said all of that is acceptable but the only thing they need to supplement the record with is the occupancy question. **Mr. Kornick** said with the respect to the parking lot lay out and the number of employees and number of doctors they are asking for the application is for a professional office, medical office and/or general office space. At the time of the application the applicant does not have an end user so they utilized the operation they have on the adjacent parcel and in there at any point and time at a maximum they typically have between roughly three doctors and the employees range depending on the time of day. They feel the parking count they provided is adequate and it reflects what they propose on site once build out is complete.

**Al Litwornia, Traffic Engineer** referred to his report dated September 24, 2012. The applicant modified the plans before he had the notes that they wanted from fire protection in movements and all the fire protection items are covered. Still did not get cross access agreements between the two facilities, there should be some protection for the pedestrians if the building is not going to be constructed in whole, need architectural plans as discussed by Lou Glass, and need testimony on how a vehicle is going to access the basins. The location of handicap signs is a question and the applicant indicated putting them on the building and when they looked at the side walk it was six foot in width, which is not very large, usually you have a two foot overhang from a bumper, which gives you a 4-foot sidewalk before you get to the building phase, usually you want a 2-foot shy distance between that and recommends that they work with the applicant to modify some of the parking lay out because he made the spaces adjacent to the building 9 ½ x 18. If you have a two-foot overhang then you really only need a 16-foot space as opposed to an 18-foot space noting they have given design waivers for this before. **Mr. Kornick** clarified the sidewalk across the front it eight feet and noted he will work with Mr. Litwornia and Mr. Stout to modify the site plan regarding the parking lot lay out, which would be a design waiver from 18-feet to 16-feet in some places. **Dr. Rockwell** said no one pulls up over the curb now. **Mr. Litwornia** said they talked about modifying the berm and noted they need to maintain the sight distance at 35 MPH speed limits and they have to make sure the sign is not in the sight triangle. He said the soil erosion is noted and they recommend that the first 25-feet be paved and there would be a note on the plans so that if there is dirt tracked onto Sheffield Drive the Township Engineer could call the applicant and have it cleaned up with a sweeper. **Mr. Kornick** said soil erosion does not require a 25-foot wide asphalt drive. **Mr. Litwornia** said soil erosion does require it whenever the locals want it and it is in the soil erosion plan requirements but they usually do not enforce it. **Mr. Kornick** said the problem they have with it is mobilization and bringing an asphalt company out to put in a tracking pad above and beyond what SCS does require. The prior approvals that they did have in this and SCS did approve was just a stone driveway or construction entrance and agreed to work with Mr. Litwornia and determine whether this is required or not. **Mr. Litwornia** said there are sign details that are minor, on the traffic assessment they did have a requirement for some off tract contributions and the office tract contributions were based on the previous phase I plans and as

he recalls the applicant has wanted to go over the fees because they have reduced the size to the building and because they reduced the size of the building they did not go through the minor modification that is in the volume so that it is going to be reduced somewhat from what is applied and what was noted. He noted a requirement for \$3,939 at the Petticoat Bridge Road and Burlington-Columbus Road intersection and \$13,527 at the Petticoat Bridge Road roadway improvements noting that some of the improvements have been made over the last five years and are still ongoing. He has agreed to work with the applicant to come up with revised numbers. **Mr. Kornick** said they will work with Mr. Litwornia to put a depressed curb in a certain area to access the basin and noted there will be other cross easements through out this project.

**Robert Stout, Engineer** referred to his report dated September 13, 2012. They spoke with the applicants engineer noting 99% of them are technical in nature, they revolve around stormwater, and grading and drainage updates that they have agreed to do. He needs clarification on two items. The first they did not ask for a waiver for lot 9.23 from supplying a topo but he is okay either way. The second is something was on the previous application, one of the variances is for the separation between the wells and asked if it is going to be 200 feet from any well. **John Kornick** said the well location will be separated 200 feet from their proposed septic and any other septic within the area. **Mr. Forshner** then asked for a waiver of the topo for the existing lot. **Mr. Stout** said he has no problem with that because they are not changing any of the front elevations. Just for the record, the testimony for the parking is three (3) doctors and eight (8) employees is the total count. **Mr. Kornick** said correct. **Solicitor Petrone** advised the applicant if there is any deviation when he does get tenants that the deviation will result in a requirement that more parking spaces be provided either because there are more doctors or because of the type of tenant that is going to go into the building could result in non-issuance of a zoning permit and/or a certificate of occupancy. **Mr. Forshner** said they understand. **Mr. Stout** said testimony is needed on the existing location of the trash dumpster to make sure the size is adequate for the office needs and if they are going to meet all the county recycling requirements. **Mr. Kornick** said they will increase the trash enclosure size to what they have proposed now because they have combined the two for that same size building and they can provide a lay out within that dumpster area of how they meet the standards for both recycling and regular trash. **Mr. Stout** said because of other issues in town with security lighting he asked for a foot-candle level that they anticipate for lighting levels, number of lights, as they are not looking to have an issue with any of the neighbors so they can have something that they can physically measure. **Mr. Kornick** said they spoke with the neighbors to reduce the lights to at least a minimum of 50% of the proposed illumination during normal operating hours and they will look at the lighting on the building façade, he believes the existing conditions have typical residential light fixtures on the building façade that adequately light the building for security purposes and will discuss whether they need a pole or two along the building frontage just for the purpose of security. **Mr. Stout** asked if all the lighting will be shoebox style down lighting. **Mr. Kornick** said correct, they are using LED lighting, and those lights do have the options to reduce illumination directly in the fixture. **Chairman Preidel** asked about the stormwater. **Mr. Stout** said stormwater there are a lot of issues that are open in fact he has a full page of technical issues that need to be updated on the stormwater, a lot of it is meeting the DEP criteria. They said they will meet the requirements, TSS removal, and infiltration. They just questioned the methodology of how it is being done, he has talked with Mr. Kornick, and he is working on revising that. Again, they have not seen the revised calculations for the new plan but there is fifteen items they need to address for that and they will have to meet all of the requirements.

#### **BOARD COMMENTS:**

**Chairman Preidel** asked what is going to happen with the pile of dirt on the existing lot and he wants to make sure there is going to be no storage of soil on the lot. **Dr. Rockwell** said the soil is there for this specific project and it will be gone once the project is complete.

## **PUBLIC HEARING:**

**Chairman Preidel** opened the public hearing on this application.  
Hearing none the public hearing was closed.

## **SOLICITOR'S COMMENTS:**

**Solicitor Petrone** said the motion would be for approval of waivers, variances, minor subdivision and preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of the 15,900 square foot building that has been the subject of this application. The variances have been enumerated, they will include the sixth variance for the location of the free standing sign within the now thirty (30) foot buffer along Sheffield with the understanding that if it was a twenty foot buffer as required as opposed to the expanded the variance would not be required. The waivers are as identified in the review letters together with the waiver discussed by Mr. Litwornia to permit certain traffic parking spaces to be reduced a sixteen foot minimum to accommodate some flexibility in the lay out of the parking lot. The minor subdivision, which is a lot line adjustment between lots 9.01 and 9.23 to accommodate some of the requests from the neighboring property owners and the preliminary and final site plan approval as discussed for 9.01. Subject to conditions that revised plans be submitted complying with this approval, the applicant complying with the review letters of the Board professionals, the revised plans incorporating the roughly sixteen items that the applicants attorney had put on record at the outset as to the agreement between the applicant and the neighboring property owners as agreed through the testimony from Mr. Jones, that the driveway closest to the residential properties will be indentified as one way in with the necessary signage and markings on the site, the deed restriction as discussed by the applicants attorney restricting future development of the property as well as the necessary easements between 9.01 and 9.23 for access and drainage purposes to be submitted for review and approval of the Boards professionals. The mailbox to be located adjacent to the mailboxes for the existing office building subject to the approval of the post office, we may have to see a modification if the post office does not approve that location. There will be the six additional trees to be bonded as part of the bonding for the improvements on the site with the understanding that these six additional trees will be planted upon completion of construction and as required by the Boards professionals. We will permit a substitution of a cash bond when the applicant requests a release of the performance bond as being posted. The cash bond for the six additional trees will be held for a period of one year at which time a determination will hopefully have been made as to the necessity and/or the location of these six additional trees. The berm height is to be two feet and is not to conflict with the site triangle along Sheffield. The construction traffic to utilize the existing curb cut on lot 9.01 on Sheffield. The sign details, the width of the façade sign to be expanded by one foot based on comments of the Board Planner. New building elevation plan to be submitted that hopefully coincides with the revisions that have been made to the site plan. Security lighting details to be provided and coordinated with the Board Engineer and Board Planner so that the illumination levels during security portion of their lighting do not conflict with the residential properties. The applicant will work with the Board Traffic Engineer regarding parking space size and lay out of the parking spaces. Also work with the Traffic Engineer with respect to the pedestrian 25-foot paved area along Sheffield and coordinator on vehicular access to the basin and as to the traffic contributions the amounts to be finalized based on coordination between the applicant and the Traffic Engineer. There should be no stock piling of soil after construction. The applicant being made aware that if there is a change in the anticipated tenant breakdown that it may jeopardize the issuance of zoning permits and/or certificate of occupancy if those tenancies would result in the need for additional parking spaces. **Gary Forshner** asked for two clarifications, one is with regard to the off tract contributions not to exceed the number that is in Mr. Litwornia's report and maybe adjust it down depending upon recalculating. **Mr. Litwornia** said the numbers in the quote would be the maximum. **Mr.**

**Forshner** said as for as the concern raised about the parking that concern specifically to as medical and the fact that they cannot increase the medical should not impact any other aspect of their application and they don't want the condition to be perceived as impacting any of the others. **Solicitor Petrone** said it is more or less that you are being made aware that this could happen in the future if the actual tenancies turn into more doctors or medical type of facility that would require the additional parking. **Mr. Forshner** said he agrees and he appreciates they not only making the applicant aware but making that part of the record. He just want to be clear for the record as well that it only pertains to the medical use. **Solicitor Petrone** said correct.

**MOTION FOR APPROVAL:**

A motion was offered by **Robert Semptimphelter** and duly second by **Dalpat Patel** to grant **Application Number PB12-02PFSP&V-2012AMS: Dr. James & Teresa Rockwell/Mansfield Investments, LLC, Block 33.04, Lots 9.01 & 9.23** Minor Subdivision, Preliminary and Final Site Plan with variances and conditions as stated above by Solicitor Petrone. The motion carried on a roll call vote taken as follows:

**AYE:** Borgstrom, Cholewa, Higgins, Patel, Semptimphelter, Walker, Preidel  
**NAYE:** None  
**ABSENT:** Lippincott, Puglia

**Resolution Number 2012-09-11**

(A copy of the foregoing Resolution is spread on the following pages.)

**Robert Semptimphelter** left the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

**DISCUSSION:**

**Maximum Square Footage of Garages**

**Chairman Preidel** said he has some photos of an attached garage currently being built on Old York Road. He said, as there is no maximum square footage on attached garages he would like the Planners to draft an amendment to the current ordinance setting a maximum size to be reviewed at the next meeting. **Harry McVey** said they will prepare a draft for the next meeting.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

A motion was offered by **Dalpat Patel** and duly second by **Douglas Borgstrom** to approve the minutes of **August 27, 2012** regular meeting. **LaVerne Cholewa** abstained. Motion carried.

**UPDATE ON FARMLAND PRESERVATION:**

**Harry McVey** said there was a brief discussion on the farmland preservation at the pre-meeting. He knows the map is outdated but we do have a farmland preservation element, which was adopted as part of the Master Plan in 2008 that does up it. It does two things, it not only took the County recommendation, which they have redone but also has some recommendations that the Township would like to add some additional property. He suggested putting the Wainwright properties back in as part of their recommendation to the County so they would at least qualify because they are not on the list they don't qualify even for discussion. He noted that Township has not had the local match in a long time. Generally, the Townships have to put forth approximately 16% of the purchase value toward the farmland assessment, most comes from the County and/or the State. What the County has done with the Township they had reached an agreement that all the development credits are not retired on the farms that the Township has not participated in. Say there is a particular large farm that has a hundred credits they are going to retire all but the sixteen percent that would have been the Township's share. There is a day of reckoning that if the Township doesn't eventually at some point do a TDR theoretically they could come and say we want our money or we are not going to do any further farmland preservation. As far as he knows the Township has no funds, no interest in bonding for

that type of improvement so that means those credits will not be retired. That is a big difference from what the County originally said. Taken that hundred-credit farm they were going to put that whole hundred units back in and he said why would they do that because they are already taking the State and the County funds to retire the bulk of the credits. If you are going to have anything left over just with the Township and they agreed to that. It will affect any potential TDR program and there are some updates. He said a response is due in November and he will provide a written response at the next meeting. **Robert Higgins** agreed that the Township does not want to go out for bonds for this particular capital improvement. **Mr. McVey** said hopefully they could retire all the credits but the worse case scenario would be whatever the Township share is would remain as credits to be distributed and the County would hold those as they do in some of the other towns with TDR.

#### **ACCEPT, RECORD & FILE CORRESPONDENCE:**

##### **Louis Glass Associates**

1. Date: August 21, 2012  
Re: Manheim Remarketing, Inc. (NADE)  
730 Route 68 – Block 1, Lot 5.03; Block 2, Lots 1.01, 2.01 and 3  
Preliminary and Final Site Plan
2. Date: September 4, 2012  
Re: Rockwell Professional Offices  
Sheffield Drive – Block 33.04, Lots 9.01 & 9.23  
Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan with variances; Minor Subdivision
3. Date: September 6, 2012  
Re: Manheim Remarketing, Inc. (NADE)  
703 Route 68 – Block 1, Lots 5.03; Block 2, Lots 1.01, 2.01 and 3  
Preliminary and Final Site Plan

##### **Stout & Caldwell Engineers**

4. Date: September 13, 2012  
Re: Manheim Remarketing, Inc. (NADE)  
Technical Review – Preliminary/Final Site Plan, Variances  
Block 1, Lots 5.03; Block 2, Lots 1.01, 2.01 and 3  
Route 68 & White Pine Road
5. Date: September 13, 2012  
Re: Rockwell Professional Offices  
Technical Review  
Block 33.04, Lots 9.01 & 9.23

##### **Burlington County Board of Chosen Freeholders, Bruce D. Garganio, Freeholder Director**

6. Date: September 13, 2012  
Re: Burlington County Farmland Preservation Program – Acquisition Targeting List (ATL)  
Request for Municipal Review

##### **Burlington County Planning Board, Mia C. Baker, Secretarial Assistant, Secretary to Planning Board**

7. Date: September 11, 2012  
Re: Celestial Church of Christ  
Acceptance of Performance/Maintenance Guarantee

##### **Improvements within County Right-of-Way**

Columbus-Hedding Road, Mansfield Township

8. Date: September 13, 2012  
Re: Mansfield Township Indoor Training Facility

##### **Burlington County Soil Conservation District**

9. Date: July 12, 2013  
Re: Northern Burlington Regional School Bus Maintenance Facility  
Conditionally Certified – Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan

##### **NJPO**

10. Date: July/August  
Re: The New Jersey Planner

##### **Louis Glass Associates**

11. Date: September 19, 2012  
Re: Manheim Remarketing, Inc. (NADE)  
703 Route 68 – Block 1, Lots 5.03; Block 2, Lots 1.01, 2.01 and 3

12.      Date:      Preliminary and Final Site Plan  
           Re:      September 24, 2012  
                   Completeness for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval with Bulk Variances  
                   James Rockwell/14 Sheffield Drive  
                   Block 33.04, Lots 9.01 & 9.23

**LaVerne Cholewa** asked the location of the Northern Burlington Regional School Bus Maintenance Facility. It was noted that it is located out on Route 68. **Harry McVey** said they approval since 2008 if not earlier for the Master Plan for the entire area including a major bus maintenance, which has never been built but it continues. What they are proposing to do is build the garage now but at a much smaller scale and in the same location.

A motion was offered by **LaVerne Cholewa** and duly second by **Dalpat Patel** to accept, record and file the correspondence list as submitted. Motion carried.

**BILLS LIST:**

**Louis Glass Associates**

Mansfield Investments (Rockwell)		\$1,176.00
----------------------------------	--	------------

**Raymond, Coleman, Heinold & Norman, LLP**

Mansfield – Litigation (Jones/Rockwell)	Inv.#13414	\$ 42.00
Mansfield Investments (Rockwell)	Inv.#13293	\$ 56.00
Militch	Inv.#13295	\$ 80.00

**Stout & Caldwell Engineers**

Celestial Church	Inv.#MPB-08-007-0017	\$1,156.25
Mansfield Investments	Inv.#MPB-08-011A-0003	\$ 693.75
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$3,204.00</b>

A motion was offered by **LaVerne Cholewa** and duly second by **Robert Higgins** to approve the bills list as presented. Motion carried.

**NEXT MEETING DATE:**

It was noted that the next regular meeting will be held on Monday, October 22, 2012.

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:**

There being no further business a motion was offered by **Dalpat Patel** and duly second by **LaVerne Cholewa** to adjourn the meeting at 9:10 p.m. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Michelle L. Gable, Secretary

October 22, 2012  
 Approval