

TOWNSHIP OF EVESHAM

Planning Board

Minutes

7:00 pm

April 5 2018

Municipal Building

Call to Order

Vice Chairman Parikh made the call to order at 7:02 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, Cortland, Zeuli, Menichini, Levenson, DiEnna, Foster, Mondì, Dave

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

Absent: Marrone, Maratae, Kinney

Meeting Minutes

March 15th, 2018

Motion: Mondì

Second: Levenson

Ayes: Foster, Levenson, Mondì, Parikh, DiEnna, Dave

Unfinished/New Business

1. Barclay Chase at Marlton Urban Renewal, LLC. PB14-16FEN. Amended Final Major Site Plan/Bulk Variance.

880 & 890 Route 70 East and 491 Evesboro-Medford Road

Block 16, Lots 1, 1.01, 1.02, 1.04, 1.05 (consolidated as lot 1.06)

Aristone Tract Redevelopment Project Area

Applicant is requesting a variance to permit the installation of a twelve (12) foot high fence along the property line shared with Lot 1.03, containing the Township's public works yard. Plan also includes 2 fenced dog run areas.

Jeffrey I. Baron, Attorney for Applicant

Witnesses:

- Art Corsini, Owner of Property
- Gary Civalier, Engineer/Planner

Exhibits:

A1: Amended site plan dated 4-5-18.

A2-A13: Series of Photographs of current site. Dated 4-5-18.

A14-A15: Additional photographs of site.

Applicant Attorney Overview:

- Applicant is seeking an amendment to existing site plan at Barclay site.

- Construction on site for 250 Apartment Units has begun.
 - Applicant has realized that they could benefit from a dog walking area, as an additional amenity. Propose 2 fenced areas.
 - Propose a 12 ft. chain-link fence with a polymer cover. Public works site in proximity to apartments and site, warrants fence.

Art Corsini Testimony:

- Talks about status of project. States that they are projecting that the end of May to the middle of June is when the first building would be occupied.
- Talks about why dog area is needed.
 - Other communities managed, notices that many people own pets. Believes that this would be a great amenity. It can be a way for people to socialize, and has been successful in other communities.
 - Fenced in area, including a fake fire hydrant. Designate area for waste pick-up.
- Shows the board where the dog park would be located; orients board to site.
 - Discusses changes to landscape plan within the dog-run area.
 - Agreed to locate landscaping elsewhere per Township request. Place a non functional fire-hydrant.
- Talks about the fence.
 - Request a 12 ft. high fence where 6 ft. is permitted.
 - Concern about renting units with a view of the Public works yard. States that there is a poor view currently, and 6 ft. would not be high enough.
 - States that there will be a green screen hung on the fence to block visibility.
 - Discusses Township Planner's letter. States that the landscaping plan will remain; discusses fence for dog-run area (4 ft; same material as pool area but with vinyl cover). States that dog run is not in the wetlands buffer.

Gary Civalier Testimony:

- Gives professional background; accepted as expert witness.
- Discusses idea of "flexible variance"
 - Standard to prove positive and negative criteria. Proceeds to discuss the positive criteria of permitting a dog fence. Benefits outweigh the detriments, aesthetic improvements and value to site.
 - States that the dog park has more benefits than detriments.
 - No negative aspects to establishing the dog park.
- Discusses purposes of zoning in regards to fence.
 - Concerns the aesthetics of the site.
 - No substantial detriment to zoning or the public good. Only area that would be impacted is the Township's property.

Applicant ends formal testimony.

Leah Furey Bruder, Township Planner

- Review letter dated March 22, 2018.

- Applicant has gone through her letter.
- Discusses the screening fence. States that original site had woods, once that was cleared, showed unattractive site. States that eventually DPW will move from the site; township will sell property to be redeveloped.
- States that the 12 ft fence is justified up until redevelopment is complete and in accordance with master plan. Applicant agrees to this, as long as the redeveloped site is not for industrial use. Applicant will remove fence at time of new site.
- Mr. Parikh asks if someone else purchases the property, then what would happen? Ms. Furey Bruder replies that the new owner cannot say anything about the fence as it is not on their property.
- Discusses the dog park; no variance needed as it is an accessory use.
 - States that she thinks the applicant should use a decorative fence as opposed to a chain-link fence for aesthetic purposes. Mr. Baron replies that they cannot agree to that due to the cost. States that the chain-link fence will be vinyl-coated, and will not look bad. Ms. Furey Bruder states that if they go with the chain-link fence, that they use black and not green. Applicant agrees. Ms. Furey Bruder wants to note that she is not recommending the chain-link fence. Mr. Baron states that the chain link fence would be permitted under Township code, and there is no variance needed anyway.

Public Comment: None

Board Comment:

- Mr. Levenson asks about potential winds in regards to the fabric in place at the 12 ft fence. Applicant states that they talked to manufacturer, and it will only move if soil moves itself. The applicant will maintain the soil to make sure the fabric stays put.
- Mr. Cortland asks where else one might find a 12 ft fence. Applicant states that it would mainly be seen for recreational uses such as a basketball or tennis court. Mr. Baron states that the fence is only temporary; and to ensure that the applicant can rent units. Mr. Cortland asks if the fence was not anticipated in the original site plan? Applicant stated that it was not until they cleared the area, that they saw the issue. Ms. Furey Bruder states that a 6 ft vinyl was originally approved. Ms. Walters notes that at time of approval, the DPW site would be moved along further than expected, but it is not at this time. Mr. Cortland asks that if applicant acquired DPW site if they would add dog runs? Applicant replies no.
- Mr. Parikh asks if there is a walking path from the buildings to dog park? Mr. Corsini states that there will be a sidewalk for access.

Board Attorney Overview:

- Applicant seeks an amended preliminary/final site plan.
- Applicant propose 2 dog park areas
- Applicant proposes a 12 ft. temporary chain link fence between property and DPW lot.
- Applicant agrees to the following as Conditions of Approval:

- Maintain mesh screening on fence
- Fence will be temporary until DPW site is redeveloped to use that is non-industrial.

Motion to Approve PB 14-16 FEN

Motion: Cortland

Second: Foster

Ayes: Dave, Mond, Foster, DiEnna, Levenson, Menichini, Zeuli, Cortland, Parikh

Meeting takes a recess at 7:46 pm, resumes at 7:53pm.

2. FT Equities, LLC. PB 17-13. Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan

600 Route 73 North, Block 6.04, Lot 1 (C-1 Zone District)

Applicant proposes to demolish the existing structure on property in order to develop the site with a 5,371 sq. ft. Royal Farms convenience store with gasoline filling stations.

Damien Del Duca, Attorney for Applicant

Ms. Walters notes that some people were left off the list by Tax Assessor's Office by mistake. The board did address the issue, and applicant proceeds at their own risk. Applicant understands that if people are absent, they can appeal. Applicant did send letters to those who may not have come tonight, and board cannot require applicant to come back later.

Ms. Walters also notes that the service station use is a "conditional use." Applicant must meet all conditional requirements, including the fact that landscaping has to be 25% of the front yard area. If they do not, applicant needs to appear before the Zoning Board. Mr. Del Duca states that the applicant will comply.

Witnesses:

- Matthew DiGiulio, Representative from Royal Farms
- Nathan Mosley, Traffic Engineer
- Sam Renauro, Engineer

Exhibits:

A1: Depiction of Royal Farms

A2: Aerial photograph of site dated October 9th, 2017 with superimposed site plan

A3: Colorized rendered site plan.

A4: Canopy Elevations updated.

Applicant Attorney Overview

- Site located at 600 Rt. 73 North
- Route 73 North and Lincoln Drive.
- Current Site: Office building with First Trust Bank
- Proposed Site: Royal Farms Convenience Store with gas station.
 - Based in Maryland; expand in the South Jersey area.
- Site 2.5 acres
- Site is located south of the AMC movie theatre; near property

- Proposed building of 5,371 sq. ft; 8 gas pumps.
- Applicant is seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval.
- Convenience store with gas station is considered a “service station” and is a conditional use under the Evesham Township Zoning Code. It is permitted as long as conditions are met. If not, then applicant will require approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustments (ZBA).
- Discusses variances due to existing non-conforming conditions of the site. This is a result of the unique lot shape; and multiple front yards in the site.
 - Parking areas in front yard setbacks.
 - Propose loading zone in front yard; due to multiple front yards.
 - Ask relief from shade trees (waiver/variance)
 - 3 Variances for Signage.
 - 1 freestanding sign near driveway proposed on Route 73.
 - 166 sq. ft. proposed; 60 sq. ft. required. Will reduce to 120 sq. ft. This sign lists gas prices.
- Slight reduction of impervious coverage.
- Applicant has talked to planning board staff multiple times; in possession of their review letters. Have narrowed down most of the issues; only a few items remaining.
- Discusses the list issue of notifying neighboring property owners and the mistake. Stated that they sent certified letters as soon as possible to those who did not get the application the first time. The applicant did not want to delay this application any further, as it has been delayed already.

Sam Renauro, Engineer Testimony:

- Gives qualifications as licensed engineer; board accepts as expert witness.
- Gives overview of site plan.
 - Existing site will be demolished.
 - Access on Lincoln Drive and Route 73.
 - Gas Station with 8 Pumps: faces Route 73
 - Restrict access “right-in/right-out”
 - Full access driveway on Lincoln Drive.
- Cross-access with AMC Theatres and Shopping Center
- Discusses the reduction in impervious coverage.
- Talks about layout of the store; gas station canopy.
- Royal Farms= deliveries are from large vehicle (gas).
- Convenience store deliveries will be from box or smaller types of trucks.
- Dumpster will be located in rear of site. Trash enclosure will be opposite of Route 73 side.
- Crosswalk from Lincoln Drive to the site will meet ADA requirements. Will incorporate different texture/color.
- Keep the same number of trees behind berm.
- No changes in stormwater management except in driveway.
- Discusses landscape plan. Mentions that they will work with Township Planner.
- 53 parking spots are proposed and 53 spots are required.
- Discusses location of the loading area/zone.

- Located near gas tanks/North of Canopy.
 - Other deliveries: will park in parking spaces.
- Discusses landscaping plan.
 - Shows details and shade trees.
- Discusses Service Station as a Conditional Use; and what the applicant complies with. Lists all the conditional uses that need to be met; and states how the applicant complies with each use.
- Discusses variances requested.
 - Impervious Coverage: 59.2% proposed; 59.4% current; 55% required.
 - Parking Setbacks:
 - 50 ft. front yard set back; 37.8 ft. proposed
 - 15 ft. side/rear set back; 5 ft. proposed (maintain current layout)
 - Loading Area: required/not permissible in front yard.
 - Notes that the technically the site's front yard is Lincoln Drive East. Whole property functions as a front yard.
 - No loading area near AMC site; due to location of gas pumps.
 - Perimeter Buffer
 - 15 ft. required/ 5 ft. proposed.
 - Line adjacent to AMC theatre: existing condition.
 - Spacing of Shade Trees
 - 2 shade trees on canopy in front of Rt. 73
 - Promote visibility of store/ride-byes.
 - Continue to work with Township Planners.
 - Signage
 - Freestanding sign: 60 sq. ft.; 10 ft. setback. Proposed 120 sq. ft. with 10 ft. setback. Cannot reduce sign further as it displays gas prices.
 - Signs located in front of store: 2 facade signs at 91 sq. ft.
 - Discusses size of channel letters of canopy sign. Total of 37.58 sq. ft. 2 signs at 20 sq. ft.
- Ms. Furey Bruder asks a point of clarification regarding the sign on the plan for the freestanding sign? Applicant on site stated 25 sq. ft. where 22 sq. ft. is permitted; applicant will conform to 22 sq. ft.
 - Asks about Lighting proposed. Applicant requests that they want to use their own energy efficient lighting for the internal site. Can comply with streetscape.
 - Asks about sidewalks. Applicant states that they will be provided.
 - Asks about the color of the ballards?
 - Applicant states that some are Blue per ADA requirements; and rest yellow.
 - Asks if applicant agrees that the dumpster will be enclosed? Applicant agrees.
 - Asks if applicant agrees as a COA to add landscaping at base of site? Applicant says yes.
 - Asks applicant if the freestanding sign will be internally illuminated, as consistent with ordinance. Applicant says yes.

- Discusses shade trees. Applicant will comply.
- Discusses landscaping and architecture. Applicant states that they will use brick veneer in the same manner of brick; which is indistinguishable and very attractive.
- Asks if all rooftop equipment will be screened. Applicant says yes.
- Ms. Arcari goes over her review letter.
 - Asks if applicant will provide white striping to encourage people to walk to the store and not the loading area.
 - Discusses the proposed right-in/right-out on Route 73: asks if this will be used for the tractor trailers? Applicant says yes. Asks about if box trucks will use this as well? Applicant says no due to their size.
 - Mentions improving site distance to assist those making a right on lincoln drive: cut down berms/trees in site triangle area only.
 - Asks if any variances will have impact on surrounding areas? Applicant says no, fits in with uses on Route 73.

Matthew Digiulio, Testimony:

- Gives background as site selector for Royal Farms in the tri-state area.
- Provides testimony on Royal Farms: sells gasoline and has convenience store. Hot/prepped foods on site; proposed seating outside.
- Hours of Operation: 24/7 consistent with brand.
- Maximum amount of employees at a given time
 - Max of 10 (including “gas jockeys”)
 - Peak 7-9 am; lunchtime; and 5-7pm.
- Discusses deliveries. Only gasoline is delivered by an 18 wheel truck. All other deliveries are in box trucks.
- States that deliveries are done on off-peak hours; during early evening/mid-afternoon.

Nathan Mosley, Traffic Engineer Testimony:

- Gives qualifications; accepted as expert witness (has testified in front of board previously).
- Discusses traffic report from October 16, 2017.
 - Counts on Rt. 73, Lincoln Drive, Holtec Drive.
 - 7am-9am; 4-6pm weekdays & 11am-2pm on Saturdays traffic study was done.
- August 2017 Traffic Counts. Performed traffic counts as well. Also counted in October due to school.
- Talks about primary access points of the site.
- DOT: not many issues from meeting. Application was deemed complete from DOT; response in 4-6 weeks.
- Full-movement access to Lincoln Drive.
 - stop controlled to accommodate movements on Harvest Road.
 - Cross-access to Marlton AMC shopping center.
- Majority of traffic is considered “pass-by”

- 75% of people are already on road: it will not add a lot of new trips to traffic around the area or net much impact to network of site.
- Not many “new” trips generated from use. Will be similar/comparable to today. More driveway traffic, but not much more on the roadways.
- Levels of Service Analysis. Provides testimony on the level of service during peak conditions on Route 73 Driveway, Lincoln Drive/Harvest Road Driveway.
- Talks about comments from Board Professionals.
 - Discusses left hand turn on Lincoln Drive. Mr. Parikh asks about drive aisle and queuing? Mr. Mosley addresses. Mr. Zeuli asks about going left instead of right? Mr. Mosley replies no, it would take longer to make a left. Mr. Mosley discusses distances on driveway and stop distances.
- Plan meets ASHTOE standards.
- Looked at accident reports from 2015-2017 on Lincoln Drive/Route 73. States that there was only 2 incidents in that area, and no incidents related to site distance concerns.
- Site has adequate and safe ingress/egress, and no adverse impact on surrounding roadways.

Applicant ends formal testimony.

Leah Furey Bruder, Township Planner Testimony

- Latest review letter: April 4, 2018.
- Has met with applicant professionals and has gone through several revisions of the site.
- Discusses lighting. States that the Township would like to see similar lighting to have consistency amongst stores. The lighting proposed by applicant, with white fixtures, has no character. Asks for promenade series on Route 73/70 Corridor to unify the sites. States that their lights cannot in the right-of-way, as it would be rejected by PSEG.
- Discusses sidewalks/crosswalks. They just need detail from Engineer, but is satisfied.
- Discusses the ballards. States that she is surprised that it is yellow, has seen black before and is much preferred. Has seen a Royal Farms site with black ballards.
- States that at another Royal Farms; saw an external storage area. Asks applicant to confirm that this will be inside the site. Applicant says this is not proposed for that site.
- Discusses signage. Applicant has reduced size and height, so she is satisfied.
- Discusses landscaping plan. Will continue to work together with applicant. States that they need other texture/height for landscaping for aesthetic purposes. Asks applicant to clarify what they mean by “cut-cuts?” Applicant clarifies.
- Asks about giant chicken in front of Magnolia store, and if this is temporary? If it is, applicant will need a temporary sign ordinance. Applicant says okay. Notes that chicken is just for grand opening, is not a permanent fixture.

Eric Snee, Township Environmental Engineer Testimony:

- Review letter April 5th, 2018

- Discusses Environmental Impact Study.
- States that it is acceptable for a Cultural Resource Survey Waiver.
- Phase 1 investigation: applicant has agreed to comply with recommendations.
- Discusses the issue response based outcome based on findings. Mr. Del Duca responds only comment to letter relates to the entire site RAO; asks the RAO just for area of concern; site-wide RAO would be too much work.
- Mr. Snee states that the Phase 1 called for preliminary assessment update. Discussion ensues.
- Mr. Snee says he will accept AOC specific ROA.
- COA: applicant will work with CME associate to their satisfaction, or come back to the board.

Bill Loughney, Township Engineer Testimony

- Review letter April 5th, 2018.
- Application has provided information about lights, signs, truck turning.
- Applicant has corrected stormwater management/site plan.
- Applicant has corrected previous issue with grading.
- No other comments.

Stacey Arcari, Traffic Engineer Testimony

- Review letter March 25, 2018
- Asks about trash pick-up times. Wants to ensure this is not done in the middle of the night. Asks board to make a condition regarding time.
- Concerns regarding the restriction of Lincoln Drive exit being right-turn only. Concerned as site at a curve; unsure about applicant testimony with driveways and low traffic volume.

Board Comment

- Mr. Levenson asks where the air pumps are located? Applicant shows on site.
- Mr. Mondt asks no trash pick-up or deliveries between 10pm and 6am? Applicant says that it is acceptable. Mr. Mondt asks about frequency of 18 wheeler on site. Applicant states it is fuel on demand; or 1 fuel drop per day. Mr. Mondt asks about landscaping. Ms. Furey Bruder clarifies. Mr. Mondt asks about 120 sq. ft. sign. Ms. Walters asks for more testimony from Royal Farms. Applicant states there are typically four gas prices displayed. Ms. Furey Bruder asks if the gas prices are displayed digitally? Mr. Digulio says no; internally/electronically illuminated.
- Ms. Arcari and Ms. Furey Bruder talk about signage around curve to warn others.
- Mr. Cortland asks about if a letter was issued from the Fire Marshal regarding turning radii? Ms. Walters states that Ms. Kinney, who is not present, should have one, but is not sure due to her absence.
- Mr. Levenson asks for a sign on Lincoln drive regarding pedestrian crossing: applicant will provide.

Prior to public comment, Ms. Walters and Mr. Parikh go over procedure of public comment for the edification of the members of the public.

Public Comment:

George Greatrex, Attorney

- Attorney representing the Orchards at Greentree.
- States that the Orchards are adjacent to the proposed site: consist of 311 attached townhomes.
- Concerns about significant difference of use of the site, and the change of use/hour of operation.
 - Is going to go from offices/bank 5 day a week operation from 9am-6pm, to a 7 day 24 hour use.
- Concerns about increased traffic; light pollution; noise pollution.
 - Harvest Road: main ingress/egress to the neighborhood. Concerned about increased traffic.
 - States more noise: truck traffic, people eating outside. Asks what kind of buffering for the proposed trees? Key for people to enjoy living in their homes.
- Ms. Walters states that the board does not have the authority to deny the application because it meets the conditions. However, asks if the applicant can do anything to help? Mr. Greatrex responds that yes- applicant can add buffer, and have light poles that solely focus on the site.

Ron and Ann Palakie, 1406 Jonathan Lane

- Homeowners at Orchards at Greentree
- Currently reside across from the bank site; concerned about decrease in property values due to the change in use of the site.
- Asks if there can be a barrier placed on the opposite side of the street to assist with the light, and so it blocks lights for the houses.
- States that this use will create more cars on the street.
- Mentions bus stop that arrives to Harvest Road two times per day: entrance of site is close to this bus stop. Have concerns about safety.
- Discuss accidents and traffic.
- Mentions possible smell of gasoline.
- States that they do not believe the trash will be contained; currently see trash from other uses around property.
- Notes that in the evening hours, the traffic on Lincoln Drive goes back all the way to AMC theatre: already an issue.
- Talks about high volume of traffic on Route 73 and the speed of drivers.

Tom Pastuszek, 403 Jonathan Lane

- States that his neighbors (previous speakers) addressed what he would like to say.
- Notes that he moved to Marlton for a certain quality of life; states that these changes shouldn't impact his quality of life.
- Not involved in process; notes he found out application 8 days ago.
- Notes that traffic studies do not include "near misses" in regards to vehicular accidents.

Lance McCurrley, 4406 Red Haven Drive

- States that she does not live near the site; but walks around the main road a lot.
- Talks about conditions on Lincoln Drive by Route 73. States that the traffic is going to be a lot worse. There is already considerable back-up near the site.

Nancy Lapeadeu-Johnson, 6201 Red Haven Drive

- Discusses how she moved to the community. Is devastated that there will be a gas station in her backyard.
- Mentions about the quality of life for residents; mentions property values decreasing.
- Mentions the swimming pool for the community; fear of smelling gasoline fumes.

Marjorie Robbins, 6101 Red Haven Drive

- Asks representative from Royal Farms why they chose the site, and how many of their other sites are next to residential properties? Mr. DiGiulio states that many Royal Farms are near residential communities, as to create concept of community.
- States that other convenience stores do not back up to communities.
- States that nobody asked the neighbors if this use would be okay.
- Discusses signage in back of property; asks it not be there to be consistent with community.
- Agrees with Ms. Arcari regarding the right-hand turn out of Harvest Drive. States that Harvest Drive is a part of their community.
- States that the applicant did not think about the homeowners in the community.
- Expresses her anger regarding the application.

Public comment portion closed. Re-opened for additional comments from Board.

Board Comment:

- Mr. Parikh is concerned about fumes. Asks applicant to provide testimony. Mr. DelDuca discusses gas regulations in NJ. States that the applicant exceeds standards, and will comply with vent of food smells. Mr. Renauro states that the residents will not smell gas as it is underground gas tanks. Resident (unknown) asks that there will be no food or gas smells? Applicant replies no. Ms. Furey-Bruder asks about food smells. Mentions that another application as a condition of approval, agreed to have scrubbers to prevent smells. Mr. Renauro states that it is not policy to put out any food smells, cannot remove smells, but can take under advisement regarding scrubbers.
- Mr. Zeuli asks how the township would handle wind blowing smells into people's yards? Ms. Walters notes that the applicant complies with NJ law. If they are willing to add scrubbers; anything will help. It cannot guarantee no smells, but they do comply with the standards.
- Ms. Furey Bruder asks about outside trash receptacles. Applicant says yes. Applicant states that site will be LEED Certified and will mitigate any factors. Ms. Walters asks applicant to clarify what LEED standards are. Mr. Del Duca provides testimony.

- Ms. Arcari talks about bus stop. Police Department came back with no issues. Notes that time frames for no-left turns do not stop people; and create enforcement issue. Talks about bus stop issues.
- Applicant amenable to have restrictions on left hand turn: Title 9 Enforcement. Applicant states that driveway meets ASHTOE standards. Discussion ensues.
- Mr. Parikh talks about preventing light pollution; asks about placing buffering trees on side of the applicant, and if residents will allow; work something out to plant trees for residents within reason. This won't be on individual lots; but on easement areas. Mr. Greatrex responds that this would help, and the homeowners can grant a temporary easement.
- Member of public asks about planting trees and what it means? Mr. Parikh clarifies. Ms. Furey-Bruder notes that they'd be evergreen trees about 6-8 ft. high.
- Mr. Parikh asks clarifying questions and discusses lighting style, number of ballards, and no left turn on Lincoln drive.
 - Applicant states that black ballards are fine.
 - Applicant states that they can put in requested light fixtures along perimeter, but not inside curb line. Mr. Renauro talks about lighting; keep light spillage specific to their site. Mr. DelDuca states there will be no light spillage except from driveways.
 - Left-hand turns will have restrictions during peak hours.
- Mr. Del Duca responds to resident comments: approve application as submitted.

Meeting paused at 10:52 pm, resumes at 11:04 pm.

Board Attorney Summary:

- Applicant has asked board to take action on application.
- Conditions of Approval:
 - Warning Signage at Lincoln Drive for pedestrian crossing.
 - No trash outside of enclosures.
 - No rooftop equipment.
 - Ingress/egress of box trucks and oil tankards.
 - No deliveries between 10pm and 6am.
 - Title 49 applied to Township Council
 - Apply to comments in CME Report.
 - Obtain all outside agency approvals.
 - Landscaping will be provided on perimeter between applicant and board planner.
 - Applicant and board planner will work out location of buffer trees for residents.
- Two Outstanding Issues:
 - No Left-turn Restriction. Applicant will work with Township Traffic Engineer in regards to the timing of restrictions.
 - Promenade lighting on entire site. Ms. Furey-Bruder states that if the 9 lights around perimeter are replaced; have no issue. Will use standard lights within lot. Applicant agrees. Applicant will work with board planner.

- Applicant is seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval to construct a Royal Farms convenience store with 8 gas station pumps.
- Conditions of Approval as outlined.
- Variances regarding signage; impervious coverage; and front yard setbacks. Applicant has provided testimony regarding these variances.
- Application is a conditional use, and applicant has met all standards required.

Mr. DiEnna asks if this resolves the problem of the children? Discussion ensues.
Mr. Mondri states that the restrictions on left-hand turns may not prohibit all individuals; but it is a step in the right direction.

Motion to Approve PB 17-13

Motion: Cortland

Second: Mondri

Ayes: Dave, Mondri, Foster, DiEnna, Levenson, Menichini, Zeuli, Cortland, Parikh

Public Comment: None

Board Comment: None

Communications/Organization:

Next Meeting: April 19th, 2018

Resolutions:

PB 17-16

Motion: Mondri

Second: Dave

Ayes: Dave, Mondri, Foster, DiEnna, Levenson, Zeuli, Parikh

Meeting adjourned at 11:22pm.