

The Vice-Chairwoman called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the "Open Public Meetings Act" and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

Roll Call

Present: Mrs. DeMesquita, Mr. Murray, Mr. Waters, Mr. Rashatwar, Mr. Vandegrift

Absent: Mr. Fanelli, Mrs. Kerr, Mr. Nicini, Mayor Mignogna, Mr. DiNatale, Mr. Ravitz

Also present was Stuart Platt, Board Solicitor and Rakesh Darji, Board Engineer

MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTION

AQUATIC HOLDINGS, LLC
PRELIMINARY & FINAL SITE PLAN
BLOCK 14; LOT 13
PC 14-003

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Vandegrift motioned to approve the minutes dated March 12, 2014; seconded by Mr. Rashatwar. Motion carried by the assenting voice vote of all board members present, with the exception of Mrs. DeMesquita and Mr. Murray, both of whom abstained.

CORRESPONDENCE

KHMER TEMPLE HUMANITARIAN ASSOCIATION
BLOCK 262; LOTS 6 & 6.01
PC 14-005

Appearing before the board was Mitchell Grayson, attorney for the applicant.

Mr. Grayson stated that, there was an approval granted by Resolution 09-012 on April 22, 2009 for 4 office buildings with one flex building. His client purchased this property and the property next door. They will be coming in to the Zoning Board for site plan approval for the two adjacent lots but want to protect this approval in the event something unexpected happens.

Mr. Platt questioned why he was seeking an extension at this time because the permit extension act of 2012 protects this approval until the end of this year.

Mr. Grayson stated that, they are about to make some substantial investments in the adjoining property and did not want to wait until the last minute. They are asking for a 2 year extension beyond the end of this year. They are not looking to change any of the conditions.

The application was opened for public comment.

Seeing none, Mr. Murray Motioned to close the public portion; seconded by Mr. Rashatwar. Motion carried by the assenting voice vote of all board members in attendance.

Mr. Murray motioned to extend the approval for the GWD, LLC entity for two years with the following conditions and stipulations:

- 1. The approval is extended until December, 2016.
- 2. All conditions contained in Resolution #09-012 shall remain in effect.

Seconded by Mr. Rashatwar; motion carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mrs. DeMesquita, Mr. Murray, Mr. Waters, Mr. Rashatwar, Mr. Vandegrift

NAYS: None

Mr. Platt advised Mr. Grayson that, if they do come in for a use variance for the Temple and the existing house is part of that application that will trump the approval they are seeking tonight.

Mr. Grayson confirmed that they will want to use the house for religious services because there will be a couple monks living there and there would be visitors from time to time. The service use would be for no more than 8 people.



NEW BUSINESS

SJF CCRC, INC.
SITE PLAN WAIVER
BLOCK 199.06; LOT 35
PC 14-004

Appearing before the board were, Angelique Kuchta, attorney, Marian "Alex" Alston, Director of Facilities at Lions Gate and David Wisotsky, Bohler Engineering.

Ms. Kuchta stated that, they are seeking approval for a waiver of site plan approval for the installation of a walk in cooler that will sit on an 11' X 11' foot concrete pad in the delivery area of the existing CCRC facility.

Mr. Wisotsky submitted exhibit A1, an as built drawing of the entire campus dated August 23, 2013 showing the area where the freezer is contemplated. Drawing A2 is dated January 16, 2014 and is a minor site plan showing the loading area as it exists today. The loading dock has been designed for trucks to enter off either Haddonfield-Berlin Road or Laurel Oak Road. Deliveries are made in typical box trucks and tractor trailers. The concrete pad is 121 square feet in size and on top of that will be an 83.5 square foot walk in freezer. To make up the grade there will be a ramp installed. Trucks will continue to unload as usual and staff will walk down the ramp to put things in the freezer.

The applicant agreed to comply with the letter prepared by Environmental Resolutions, Inc. dated April 2, 2014.

Mr. Alston stated that, they are currently outgrowing freezer space in their dietary kitchen. From the hours 6:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. staff will have access to the freezer. It will always be locked and the keys will be maintained at the security area. The area where the freezer will be located is under security camera surveillance.

The application was opened for public comment.

Seeing none Mr. Murray motioned to close the public portion; seconded by Mr. Vandegrift. Motion carried by the assenting voice vote of all board members present.

Mr. Murray motioned to grant the waiver of site plan for the installation of 121 square foot concrete pad and an 83.5 square foot freezer subject to the following conditions and stipulations:

1. Compliance with the review letter prepared by Environmental Resolutions, Inc. dated April 2, 2014.
2. Any prior conditions of approval not inconsistent herewith remain in effect.

Seconded by Mr. Vandegrift, motion carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mrs. DeMesquita, Mr. Murray, Mr. Waters, Mr. Rashatwar, Mr. Vandegrift

NAYS: None

MORI PROPERTIES, LLC
AMENDED FINAL SITE PLAN
BLOCK 225; LOT 6
PC 14-006

Appearing before the board was Mr. Barry Lozuke, attorney and Dr. Rajendra Patel, applicant.

Mr. Lozuke stated that, they are seeking amended final site plan approval and the reason is to request a variance as it exists today. It affects Section 152.102 (E) in the MB Zone where the applicant takes advantage of a reduced parking setback that is permissible for adaptive reuse of certain buildings. In this particular case there is some compensatory procedures for parking setbacks, one of which is what they are seeking a deviation from. If they take advantage of adaptive reuse they must erect an opaque fence within the landscape buffer area that remains. The ordinance does not distinguish between front yard setbacks of parking areas or rear or side yard. A fence would typically be required when buffering from adjoining properties is the desired effect. In this case, because the ordinance does not distinguish, they would have a fence in the front yard of their landscape design.

Mr. Lozuke added that, the plan submitted is a sheet from the approved site plan and is an area already under construction. There is a mixture of fairly substantial natural landscaping and berm types of buffers. The installation of a fence would hide some of that and that would be a detriment. They are seeking relief to eliminate the fence.

Mr. Murray stated that, the review letter addresses the Leyland cypress and the recommendation to put it on the street side of the path to provide adequate room for growth. He remembers from a previous hearing that the adjoining property owner was concerned that the development of this site would block the signage for the Library. He wanted to make sure that these plantings were not going to cause any blockage to either the users on this site or to the adjoining Library site.

The application was opened for public comment.

Seeing none, Mr. Vandegrift motioned to close the public portion; seconded by Mr. Murray. Motion carried by the assenting voice vote of all board members present.

Mr. Murray motioned that the amended site plan be approved and the opaque fence eliminated subject to the following conditions and stipulations:

1. Compliance with the review letter dated April 3, 2014 prepared by Environmental Resolution, Inc.
2. The planting of the Leyland cypress is subject to the review and approval of the Board Engineer to ensure that the planting will not block the signage of the users of this site or to the signage on the adjoining Library site.

Seconded by Mr. Vandegrift; motion carried by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mrs. DeMesquita, Mr. Murray, Mr. Waters, Mr. Rashatwar, Mr. Vandegrift

NAYS: None

.....
There being no further business before the board the Vice-Chairwoman adjourned the meeting.

Carole Pfeffer, Secretary