

TOWNSHIP OF EVESHAM

Planning Board

Minutes

7:00 pm

March 1 2018

Municipal Building

Call to Order

Vice Chairman Parikh made the call to order at 7:05 pm

Flag Salute

Statement of Conformance with Open Public Meetings Act

Vice Chairman Parikh made the statement of conformance with the Open Public Meeting Act and the Municipal Land Use Legislation

Roll Call

Present: Parikh, Zeuli, Levenson, DiEnna, Foster, Mond, Dave, Maratea

Also Present: Walter, Furey-Bruder, Rehmann/Loughney, Arcari, Snee, Kinney, Bittner

Absent: Marrone, Cortland, Menichini

Meeting Minutes

February 1, 2018

Motion: Levenson

Second: Foster

Ayes: Parikh, Zeuli, Levenson, DiEnna, Foster

Continuation of Scheduled Matters:

PB 17-13 will be moved to the March 15th, 2018 Meeting. No further notice is required.

Unfinished/New Business

1. Presentation by New Jersey Future.

Potential Work with Evesham Township on the Mainstreaming Green Infrastructure Initiative.

Louise Wilson: Green Infrastructure Manager at NJ Future

- Discusses what NJ Future is: a nonprofit/nonpartisan organization focused on smart growth, and sustainable development. Work to help make vibrant communities.
- Explains what NJ Future does, gives personal background, etc.
- Talks about water and conservation efforts.
- Discusses the “Mainstream Green Infrastructure Program.”
 - Describes how the program works, work with state agencies to remove regulatory obstacles.
- Talks about green infrastructure and their benefits to prevent flooding and other water issues.
- Talks about green roofs and green streets.
- Shows pictures of installations done throughout the state.

- Talks about the possible work that they could do in Evesham.
- NJ Future would like to have Mayor and Council establish a resolution of engagement which would lead to a memorandum of understanding.

Board Comment:

- Mr. Zeuli asks at what point is NJ Future engaged? Are they involved all the way, or just provide a checklist? Ms. Wilson responds that they will work with the town and the municipal action team. The town will tell them what to do and they'll do it. Mr. Zeuli asks if this is project specific? Ms. Wilson responds that it's not so much project specific as an overall idea. Ms. Furey Bruder responds that they'll do overview of storm water code, stay within DEP regulations, but improve green infrastructure. She gives some examples. Mr. Rehmann also adds comments regarding proposed work and green infrastructure.
- Mr. Mondy asks about the cost and construction? Do they have case studies to show the cost savings of green infrastructure? Ms. Wilson responds yes. Mr. Mondy asks about the maintenance costs of certain infrastructure? Ms. Wilson states that they provide education and assistance to ensure it can be maintained.

Ms. Wilson asks if there is any reason for NJ Future not to approach the Council? Mr. Parikh says that would be fine. Ms. Furey Bruder states that the Planning Board can recommend to council that they will propose a resolution. She continues that they need Township Council to enter a "Memorandum of Understanding." The Planning board can just recommend if Council should consider the agreement with NJ Future. Mr. DiEnna asks if this is mandatory or optional? Ms. Furey Bruder responds this is not anything specific at this time, just a recommendation.

Motion to Recommend Memorandum of Understanding to Council:

Motion: DiEnna

Second: Mondy

Ayes: Parikh, Zeuli, Levenson, DiEnna, Foster, Mondy, Dave, Maratea

2. Republic First Bank d/b/a Republic Bank PB 17-16

178 Greentree Road, Block 2.01, Lot 7.01 (C-2 Zone District)

Applicant proposes to construct a 2,993 sq. ft. Republic Bank with Drive-thru

Lauren D'Allesandro Attorney for Applicant

Witnesses:

Sharon Hammel, Republic Bank Representative

Katie Voucher, Architect

Dave Fleming, Engineer

Nathan Mosley, Traffic Engineer

Exhibits:

A1: Architectural Rendering of the Site

A2: Rendered Site Plan dated 2-13-18.

A3: Site line studies for signs.

A4: Site line study for signs.

Board Attorney Overview:

- Applicant is seeking to construct a 2,993 sq. ft. Republic Bank, with 3 drive-thru areas on a 5.94 acre pad site at Greentree Road and North Maple Avenue.
 - Currently on site is a CVS and Arby's.
- Frontage on Greentree Road: C2 Zone District.
- Mapletree Shopping Center: received approval in 2004.
- Applicant has been before board years ago for the Republic Bank site located on Rt. 70. Proposed site is similar to that location, although it will be smaller.
- Address Planning Board Professional comments in testimony. _

Sharon Hammel Testimony:

- Senior Vice-President and Chief Retail Officer of Republic Bank.
- Proposed site is part of expansion program for Republic Bank. First store opened in Evesham in 2014. 24 stores currently exist, plans for 50 stores to be opened within the next year.
- Hours of Operation:
 - 7:30am to 8pm: Monday- Friday
 - 7:30am to 6pm: Saturday
 - 11am to 4pm: Sunday
- 11 Employees will be proposed for the site. Maximum of 8 employees at one time.
- Driver is always in the vehicle for deliveries.
- Confidential trash, so they do not need a dumpster on site.
- Front vestibule (front corner) of site is where the ATM will be located.

Katie Voucher Testimony:

- Gives qualifications; accepted by board as expert witness.
- Brand important to Republic Bank: create certain type of architecture with glass, to give a modern and sleek appearance.
- Describes architecture of building and materials. Mentions that a green wall will be placed at the rear of the site.
- Building similar to that on Route 70, except smaller. Mentions that the cubed entrance is not diagonal like on Route 70, but parallel to the rest of the building.
- Discusses lighting package. States that it is similar to what is at Route 70.
 - 17 ft high LEDs.
 - Silver/metallic painting to match rest of building.
- Discusses the proposed signs.
 - Pylon Sign: same as site on Rt. 70. Sign is 17 ft tall and internally illuminated.
 - Directional signs: only 1 illuminated. Illuminated sign is placed at Greentree Road on site (internal driveway to enter).
 - Facade sign: “advertising poster size box.”
 - Box sign that is mounted to building. Advertise the services that the bank offers.

- Mr. Furey Bruder asks about the poster signs, and who the audience would be? Ms. Fleming states that the signs would only be seen by customers, not visible off-site.

Dave Fleming Testimony:

- Gives qualifications; accepted by board as expert witness.
- Parcel was originally designed for a bank. The current proposal will lower the impervious coverage as what was originally approved.
- 2,993 sq. ft. building located in the C2 Zone.
- 26 Parking spaces on site, 2 will be Handicapped/ADA compliant.
- 2 Way Traffic Entering Site
 - 18 ft. by-pass lane for emergency vehicles.
- Infrastructure planned to accommodate a bank site; will extend sewer/water. Notes the detention basins nearby the property.
- Discusses the Variances Requested.
 - West Boundary Buffer: 10 ft proposed, 15 ft. required. This is located next to the Brightview site, provide bypass lane.
 - Mr. Parikh asks if this is an issue? Ms. Furey Bruder says no as a bank drive-thru is different than a fast food drive thru.
 - Drive-Thru Stacking: Ordinance requires 7 stacking location, site proposes 4 stacking locations.
 - Design Waiver: Loading Zone. Applicant requests no proposed loading zone.
 - Sign Variances:
 - Zoning compliant sign packages.
 - Approximately 10 variances for signs.
 - Freestanding/Pylon Sign: variance for width. Max 18 inches, proposed 23.12 inches.
 - Directional Signs:
 - Max square footage is 2.5 sq. ft.; proposed 6 signs with 3.5 sq. ft.
 - Ordinance requires 1 sign per curb cut; 6 internal direction signs proposed.
 - Freestanding Sign: 2nd Sign in center of Greentree Road.
 - Max height is 8 ft.; 17 ft. proposed
 - Size of copy area is limited to 70 sq. ft. Proposed 136. 2 sq. ft.
 - Facade Sign: Need variance for face area.
 - Letters illuminated with opaque background.
- Ms. Furey Bruder asks about the square footage on the freestanding sign? Applicant clarifies. Ms. Furey Bruder states that they don't need a variance for the square footage of the signs.
- Ms. Walters goes over the sign requirements.
 - Facade sign: 2 are permitted; 11 are proposed. Ms. Furey Bruder notes that it is not a variance on the area; just number of signs.

- Describes the Pylon Sign. States that it is a monument sign; no estimate of size, perhaps 8 ft. Would be located towards the back of CVS. Make it more of a stand-alone site for the bank.
- States that the variances are justified due to the nature of the signs.
- Provides testimony regarding storm water management and basin.
 - Worked with Board Engineer's staff.
 - Current basin on site. "As Built" condition. States some modifications are required to meet criteria.
- Board Attorney states that the basin is landlord responsibility, however will accept as a Condition of Approval to modify the basin. Ms. Walters states that the COA will be to modify the basin; applicant will deal with the landlord for permission, not in Board purview to oversee maintenance of property.
- Ms. Walters mentions minimum front yard setback: 30 ft proposed and 50 ft. required.
- Applicant Attorney asks Mr. Fleming about landscaping details. He states that they will comply with requirements.
 - Ms. Furey Bruder notes that there are a lot of waivers that they are requesting for landscaping. Thus, the applicant cannot ask for compliance and work with her, discusses purpose of landscaping ordinance. Knows that applicant does not want street trees. Suggests that applicant puts 5 trees on site, not near bank. Applicant agrees, also states they will increase size of landscaping plants.
 - Mr. Parikh asks if there can be a COA for the applicant to work with the Board Planner. Applicant says yes.
- Applicant Attorney asks Mr. Fleming if there are any comments from the review letters that they do not agree with?
 - Stamped concrete with CVS. Applicant states that this is not really needed.
 - Mentions review letters not agreeing with the 24 hour illumination for signs. Ms. Furey Bruder asks which signs will be illuminated for 24 hours? Applicant mentions the signs, states all but one will be turned off at 11pm. Mr. Parikh asks Ms. Furey Bruder to clarify. She suggests that if signs go off at 11pm is fine, however she suggested 10pm due to the area being in a somewhat residential area.
 - Ms. Hammel states that she request the sign variance for the building light to be kept on, as the ATM is open 24/7. This is agreeable.

Nathan Mosley Testimony:

- Gives qualifications, accepted as expert witness in field.
- Prepared traffic study: November 30th, 2017.
- Worked on original application for site in 2003. This included a 3,400 sq. ft. bank facility.
- Conducted a trip generation analysis from original proposal to ne proposed sign.
 - Number of trips generated from bank has drastically decreased due to the internet and online banking.
- Some traffic, but nothing in comparison to what was originally proposed.

- Discusses on-site circulation/on-site queuing on N. Maple Avenue and Greentree Road.
- County has improved the Greentree Road frontage area.
- Discusses the 3 drive-thru lanes in the rear of the building. States that they can accommodate 4 vehicles in the first 2 lanes, and 6 vehicles in the 3rd lane.
- Studied traffic at two Republic Bank locations. Compared traffic/stacking at sites. No issues.
- Analyzed CVS traffic/circulation. Some issues with leaving site between 4pm and 6pm.
- Mr. Parikh asks if they have updated standards for mobile banking? Ms. Arcari notes that every few years, they update trip generation standards.

Applicant ends formal Testimony.

Leah Furey-Bruder, Township Planner

- Review letter dated February 2nd, 2018.
- Most items in review letter have been addressed.
- Variance table has also been addressed.
- Discusses comments regarding lighting. Is okay with what applicant has proposed.
- Asks that as a COA, applicant agrees to come back for approval in the event that they need a dumpster on site. Applicant agrees.
- Discusses signage and variances.
 - States that while there are 11 signs proposed, some are minor touches to site, and are not all large signs.
 - Poster Sign: board granted variance for the Rt. 70 location. States that they do not really have a purpose. However, if it is located towards the back of the site, this is okay.
 - Asks that instead of the 17 ft. Freestanding, Pylon sign, if applicant would consider using a monument style sign, similar to a location in Medford on Stokes Road. Applicant states they will have to discuss.

Eric Snee, Environmental Engineer

- Review letter January 29th, 2018.
- Concern with Phase 1 waiver: states that site was historically residential and agricultural uses. Asks that applicant should address this (if pesticides used, any wells/septic systems on site).
- States that in the 2004 Approval for the site; indicated one monitoring well on property. Discusses soil sites.
- Mr. Fleming agrees to provide Phase 1 and other documentation. ERSI needed; will further discuss if needed.
- COA: Applicant will comply with report; if not, will come back for approval.

Ms. Voucher addresses monument sign, brought up by the Township Planner. States that the Medford site has a 3 sided monument site. This type of sign would not look right on the property, and would block. Applicant prefers the Pylon sign for that reason. Ms. Furey Bruder states that she didn't look at sign for visibility; Ms. Walters asks if

applicant can provide documentation to prove pylon sign is necessary for visibility.
Applicant agrees.

Chris Rehmann, Engineer

- Discusses the existing basin on site. Applicant should add height to berm on the south west side, meet 100 year storm requirements. Bank has to update basin to fit standards.
- No other issues with application.

Stacey Arcari, Traffic Engineer

- Review letter dated January 22nd, 2018.
- Most comments have already been addressed.
- Mentions her request for alternate pavement by CVS. States that as long as applicant restripes site, has no problem with this not being included.
- Discusses the turn-around for the drive-thru lanes. States that if there are no issues, then she is good. If this does become an issue, the applicant has an alternative they can go by.
- Applicant agrees to rest of comments.
- Ms. Walters asks Ms. Arcari about the donation box? Ms. Arcari does not know. Applicant states that it is on site, agrees that it is ugly. Mentions that it is the landlord's responsibility, but agreed as tenants to move it and relocate it. Applicant will do what they can in their power. Ms. Walters mentions it can also be handled by the Department of Community Development for the Township.

Applicant Attorney: States that she has the studies to show the board, regarding why the Pylon sign is necessary. *Exhibits A3/A4 are reviewed by Board Attorney and Board Planner.*

- Ms. Furey Bruder states that the documentation provided does not prove anything with monument sign. Mentions that height does not equal visibility. She states that there is a panel at the site, that displays the other businesses. Applicant states that they want their own sign. Ms. Furey Bruder says a monument sign would be fine, would prefer to grant a variance for the setback of the sign.
- Applicant and Board Professionals discuss the possibility of the monument sign. Including size, location, and site triangles.
- Applicant states that they want to vote on the application as is, including the Pylon Sign.
 - Mr. Parikh notes that the building is large enough for visibility and advertisement of services.

Mr. Fleming notes that he has Phase 1 available. Will provide documentation to CME Associates and Township tomorrow (March 2nd).

Public Comment: None

Board Attorney Overview:

- Applicant is seeking preliminary/final major site plan approval for a 2,993 sq. ft. bank with 3 drive-thru lanes.
- Various variances and design waivers requested.
- Variances:
 - No loading zone, where 1 is required.
 - Minimum front yard setback of 30 ft. where 50 ft. is required.
 - Screening buffer.
 - Sign Variances:
 - Directional Sign: Variances in both number and size.
 - Freestanding Roadway Frontage Signs
 - 2 proposed.
 - Propose height of 17 ft. where 8 ft. is required.
 - Fully illuminated sign boxes
 - 11 facade signs requested, where 2 are permitted.
 - Lighting on 2 signs.
 - Permit stacking of less than 7 cars per lane.
- Conditions of Approval Agreed to:
 - No trash/recycling outside of building. If so, will install an enclosure to the Board Planner's specifications.
 - Signs will be turned off by 11pm, except for the Republic Bank sign on building.
 - Basin Modifications: will return to board if this does not work out with landlord.
 - Applicant will work with Board Planner in regards to landscaping.
 - Applicant will provide Phase 1 report and other documentation to Board Environmental Engineer.
 - Comply with board professional reports.
 - Applicant will obtain outside agency approvals.

Board Comments:

- Mr. Levenson asks about the ingress/egress of property? Mr. Mosely answers his questions regarding access and signs. Mr. Levenson asks about the peak traffic in the evening? Notes that Greentree Road is tied up from North Maple. Asks how people can make left hand turns out of site? Mr. Mosley states that it will take a bit of time, but it is possible. Mr. Levenson asks about armored car delivery? Ms. Hammel answers that it comes two times per week, and comes to the entrance. Mr. Levenson asks if this is blocking traffic? Applicant responds no, you can still pass. Car is only at site for a maximum of 5 minutes. Ms. Arcari notes that this is common at most banks.
- Mr. Levenson asks about the lighting ending at 11pm, and those across the street from the site? Ms. Furey Bruder responds that the area is in a commercial zone. One property is for sale, and the other is a business. States that the area is a commercialized site. Additionally, residents were notified. Ms. walters notes that there is buffering between this site and Brightview.
- Mr. Mondy asks about the Pylon sign and what exactly the ordinance is? Ms. Furey Bruder responds they need a variance to even have the sign at all, as they already have a sign. If it was the only sign in sight, it would be fine, except for the

height variance. She explains the difficulty she has with the sign. States that the testimony presented did not justify why they needed a pylon sign.

- Mr. Parikh says that sometimes Pylon signs are good. Ms. Furey Bruder responds yes, but she has no evidence to evaluate the claim at this site.
 - Mr. DiEnna states that the building itself is a giant sign. Asks if it is appropriate to ask the applicant a suggestion on what to do with application? Ms. Walters responds that he can share his opinion, but not tell applicant hat to do. Mr. DiEnna asks Ms. Furey Bruder her professional opinion. She says that she does not want to undermine the brand, clearly they have a unique architectural style, and have asked for a number of variances. However, she is not convinced the Pylon sign should be at the site.
 - Mr. Parikh says if they can agree on application, but have them work on the one variance with the sign? Ms. Walters says that they cannot approve then work it out later. Relief is different regardless.
 - Ms. Walters notes that there are issues of precedence here. Board's role is not to rezone. The Board's job is to consider the application as it fits in the current zone. Variance is a deviation of the zoning requirements, and the burden is on the applicant to prove that the benefits of granting the variance outweighs the detriment. The flip-side is, that granting this sign variance sets a precedence for future applications.
-
- Applicant Attorney asks if they can address approval of application except for the Pylon sign? Mr. DiEnna asks about the site triangles and signs? Applicant addresses. Ms. Voucher says that the building is branded, but the idea is that the sign is visible from Church Road and down from Maple Avenue.
 - Applicant attorney understands Ms. Furey Bruder's concerns. Makes request to pull Pylon sign from application, and will provide information later. Vote with the rest of the application. Ms. alters states that applicant cannot do a partial sign package. If they pull the sign, they need to come back for approval. Ms. Walters notes that any new information about the sign, is entirely new application.
 - Ms. Walters notes if applicant just asks for preliminary approval tonight, they do not need to re-file for final approval, and wait on the sign. Applicant says they want both preliminary and final approval tonight, but will return for the sign variance.

Motion to Approve PB 17-16

Motion: Mondy

Second: Dave

Ayes: Foster, Levenson, Mondy, Zeuli, DiEnna, Dave, Maratea, Parikh

Public Comment: None

Board Comment: None

Communications/Organization: Next Meeting March 15th, 2018

Resolutions: None

Meeting adjourned at 9:48pm.