The Chairman called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the “Open Public Meeting Act” and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Senges

Absent: Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cohen

Also, present, Mr. Stuart Platt, Board Solicitor, Alen Arnautovic, Associate Stuart Platt’s Office, Ben Matlack, PE, CME, CFM, Board Engineer, Corrine Tarcelli, Zoning Board Secretary

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Willard motioned to approve the minutes from May 10, 2018; seconded by Mr. Daddario; none (0) against, with no (0) abstentions.

**RESOLUTIONS FOR APPROVAL**

 Mr. Willard motioned to approve the Resolution for Case #ZC2018-004, Timothy and Stephanie Turner, presented before the Board on May 10, 2018; seconded by Mr. Daddario; none (0) against, Mr. Weil and Mr. Cupersmith abstained.

 Mr. Willard motioned to approve the Resolution for Case #ZC2018-008, James Snyder, presented before the Board on May 10, 2018; seconded by Mr. Daddario; none (0) against, Mr. Weil and Mr. Cupersmith abstained.

**OLD BUSINESS**

**Donna McCart and Robert Sheeks**

1021 Hudson Avenue

Block 137, Lot 1

Case #ZC2018-007

Robert Sheeks was sworn in to testify. He had previously submitted an application for a gazebo. When he submitted the application for the gazebo Mr. Sheeks stated that is when he was informed he needed a variance for the pavers since they were not in compliance. He took extensive measures to reduce the size of the gazebo and move it to another location. Therefore, Mr. Sheeks withdrew his application for the gazebo, having made the modifications to the size of the gazebo and therefore, no longer required a variance. However, he wanted the paver patio to remain with side yard and rear yard setbacks of four feet where 15 feet is required and where no grading, construction or alteration is permitted within 5 feet of a side or rear property line. Mr. Senges asked how large the paver patio was. Mr. Sheeks stated 487 sq. feet. Mr. Platt inquired as to why he couldn’t meet the 15 foot setback. Bringing the pavers back 15 feet would place them on the pool skirt. Mr. Sheeks stated he simply replaced pavers that had been on the property for years due to the fact that they were dilapidated and initially discovered under several inches of dirt. Mr. Sheeks indicated he believed his new paver patio was grandfathered and in compliance with the ordinance. He continued to state he was unaware that he was in violation since he was merely replacing what was already there. He also mentioned there was no previous approval for the patio on file within the Zoning Department. He also stated he was a landscaper and was not aware he needed to pull permits in order to replace the pavers. Mr. Sheeks continued to state he removed two trees in order to place the pavers.

Jeff Senges inquired as to whether or not the pavers could be moved to another area within the back yard and requested Mr. Sheeks provide proof as to why he needs the pavers to remain where they were. Mr. Sheeks stated he was not able to provide a need.

The meeting was opened to the public. Joseph LaRocca, 11 Cambridge Way, Voorhees, New Jersey testified in support of the application. Mr. LaRocca indicated that he was in support of the application but he was not familiar with the subject property, does not reside within 200 feet of the subject property, and does not understand the nature of the application. Mr. Platt requested the individual be seated in that he was not here on behalf of this application and was there on behalf of the Khmer Buddhist application. Seeing no one else, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Senges made a motion to deny a Bulk Variance relief from Sections 150.12(B)(1), of the ULDO to all the paver patio to remain as constructed with a side-yard and rear-yard setbacks of 4 feet where 15 feet is required and where no grading, construction or alteration is permitted within 5 feet of a side or rear property line due to the fact the Applicant was unable to provide justification as to why the pavers should remain; seconded by Mr. Cupersmith.

Abstentions: Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio.

Nays: None

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Safety In Groups**

2515 Evesham Avenue

Block 207, Lot 4.18

Case #ZC2017-007

Correspondence received from Hangley, Aronchick, Segal, Pudlin and Schiller requesting an additional one year extension pursuant to the Zoning Board’s Resolution #16-015 from June 30, 2018 to June 30, 2019.

Mr. Richard J. Goldstein, Esquire, legal representation for the corporate applicant requested a one-year extension of the Use Variance due to unrelated unforeseen circumstances resulting in their inability to raise the necessary funds. The application is for preliminary and final plans for three group homes for developmentally disabled individuals with an ancillary stand-alone recreation building for use solely by the residents of the group home and their guests within the Main Street Complete. He stated over the last year significant progress has been made in the applicant’s fundraising efforts. However, more time is needed to obtain additional funding. Mr. Goldstein also stated in addition to the obvious benefits this project brings to the table, the units will also support the Township’s affordable housing requirements.

The meeting was opened to the public. Seeing no one, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Cupersmith made a motion to approve the application for a one-year extension of the Use Variance, Amended General Development Plan and Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approvals; seconded by Mr. Daddario.

Ayes: Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Cupersmith and Mr. Senges.

Nays: None

**Sturbridge Lakes Association**

20 Brookview Drive

Block 229.13, Lot 10

 Mr. Lawrence J. Luongo, Jr. Esquire represents Edward Ferruggia, President of the Board of Trustees of Sturbridge Lakes Association. He stated his client is seeking Bulk Variance relief from Section 152.015(D)(1)(b) of the ULDO to permit the construction of a 25’ x 15’ sunshade structure with a front yard setback of 15 feet where 30 feet is required. Mr. Ferruggia, 4 Hardwick Drive, President of the Board of Trustees was sworn it to testify. Mr. Ferruggia stated the project was approved by the Association. The residents have requested over the past several years that a shade be provided over the picnic area and over an area of the pool that is currently left exposed to the sun. Mr. Platt inquired as to why they are not able to meet the setback. Mr. Luongo explained the irregular shape and topography of the property prevents the applicant from being able to satisfy the 30-foot front yard setback requirement. Mr. Edward stated if they were to move forward it would be in the middle of the lot where kids run and play and that would be a safety issue. He further stated the shade structure could not be moved forward because it would cause the foundation to be located on sand and the structure would not be as accessible to guests. He stated the lot is narrow, irregular and presents several challenges.

The meeting was opened to the public. Seeing no one, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Weil made a motion to approve Bulk Variance relief from Section 152.015(D)(1)(b) of the ULDO to permit the construction of a 25’ x 15’ sunshade structure with a front yard setback of 15 feet where 30 feet is required; seconded by Mr. Willard.

Ayes: Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Cupersmith and Mr. Senges.

Nays: None

**Khmer Buddhist Temple**

1234 Haddonfield-Berlin Road

Block 262, Lot 6

Case #ZC2018-004

 Mr. Platt summarized the case presented before the Board stating the Applicant, Khmer Buddist Temple was Seeking approval for an Amendment to the Final Site Plan previously approved by the Zoning Board on July 9, 2015, which permitted the development of Phased construction for a Worship/Temple Building, A community Ceremonial Building, Ceremonial Wall, four formal Mediation Gardens together with continued use of an existing dwelling and garage on site. The Amendment to the Site Plan is to seek approval for Phase 2A for the project to permit a permanent structure to be constructed on a temporary basis (Pole Barn) for the Applicant to hold its religious services until the Worship Center/Temple can be constructed for the same purpose. In addition, the Applicant will seek a Variance and/or Design Waiver from Section 154.010B(12) of the Voorhees Zoning Ordinance to permit temporary parking for the permanent temporary Worship Center on a graveled parking area and associated drive isle with no curb where said Ordinance Section requires all parking and loading areas to be paved and all access ways, driveways, drive isles, loading areas and parking bays or other parking facilities to be curbed. In addition, the Applicant will see a Variance and/or Design Wavier from Section 154.007(B)(3)(a) of the Voorhees Zoning Ordinance to not have lighting at the proposed temporary parking area where said Ordinance Section requires minimum lighting within a parking area shall not be less than 0.25 foot candles. Also seeking any and all other variances, waivers, and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals

 Mr. David Paterson, Attorney, Esquire of Maressa and Patterson, 191 West White Horse Pike, Berlin, NJ 08009, Attorney for the Applicant introduced the Applicant’s professionals. Mr. Brad Barker, Bannett Group, Paul Witthohn, P.E., Project Manager, Yun Or, KBHA, Project Manager, Alexander Khan, Temple Director were sworn it to testify. Elaine Powell, Zoning Board Officer, Zoning Board of Adjustment for Voorhees Township was also sworn in to testify.

 Mr. Platt stated the Board approved the Use Variance to allow for the Temple which included the actual site plan approval on how it is going to be built, the layout, the systems, stormwater, lighting, landscaping, etc. Therefore, the site plans remain with the Zoning Board. The Zoning Board did permit site plan approval in a phased development process. The Applicant is appearing before the Board to amend that application. They would like to re-phase the project by downsizing the temple facility temporarily and have associated parking and no lighting associated with that. Mr. Platt further stated that some people may be here from the public because of violations of the approvals. He advised the Zoning Board is a Zoning Board of Adjustment, and not a Zoning Board of Enforcement. The Board grants or denies variances and site plan approvals. The Board does not address violations. Although the Board is aware of the violations, the Board has to review the application from a legal standpoint as if the violations did not occur. That’s not to say the Board has to accept the credibility of the witnesses for this Applicant based upon prior history.

 Mr. Platt requested Elaine Powell, Zoning Officer, be sworn in to testify. Elaine Powell was sworn in to testify.

 Mr. Platt requested Mr. Paterson discuss how the project was originally phased and what the applicant would like to change. Mr. Paterson stated two of his witnesses are professionals and would like to have them recognized. Mr. Barker was recognized as an expert before this Board in the past. Mr. Wilhoun, P.E. has a degree in Civil Engineering, has been licensed in the State of New Jersey as a professional engineer, has prepared land development plans for over ten years and has testified for land development applications for other boards in the past. Mr. Wilhous was recognized as an expert in his field.

 Mr. Paterson stated the property is located on Haddonfield Berlin Road. The Board in December, 2015 granted a Use Variance. The Variance included a house of Worship, a minor subdivision for the lot, meditative gardens, community center together with decorative walls. The applicant was not in a zone that was permitted. It was in the B Zone. The Zoning Board approved the application for the Use Variance with the variances that were being requested. One of the conditions was the Applicant had to return to this Board to obtain site plan approval which they did in July, 2015. That approval indicated there would be four phases to the project. The first phase would be along Haddonfield Berlin Road where the existing house is right now that would include a garage that would soon be known as pole barn and also a decorative wall along Haddonfield Berlin Road. Phase II would be considered the temple or worship center as well as the meditative gardens. Phase III was the community center, sidewalk, site improvements and Phase IV was additional parking that would be needed.

Mr. Senges inquired as to whether or not everything in Phase I was complete? Mr. Paterson indicated Phase I is basically complete. The Applicant is not prepared to move onto Phase II to build the worship center because they are still fund raising as other religious groups do, they have to raise funds before they can build.

Mr. Senges requested they continue to discuss Phase I and inquired as to whether or not Mr. Paterson stated that Phase I was basically complete. Mr. Or stated Phase I is not complete. They are currently working on the wall however, it is not complete. They need to complete the decoration and the beams. Mr. Senges stated he wanted to make sure he understood that the wall is not complete. Mr. Or stated “Yes, that is correct”. There is still decorative work that needs to be done as well as the gates. Mr. Platt indicated the other point of confusion is the pole barn and a garage. He requested Ms. Powell to illuminate the Board on Phase I regarding the garage/pole barn. Ms. Powell stated there have been no final approvals or COs issued for the pole barn. Although it was approved, the proper construction permits were not completed and final inspections have not been made. Mr. Senges asked Mr. Or if the plan was to complete Phase I before doing anything else. Mr. Or stated because everything is made by hand it has taken a lot longer to finish than anticipated. They are planning to complete Phase I by the end of this season. Mr. Senges questioned whether or not it was reasonable to expect to finish everything with the exception of the ornamentation. Mr. Or stated they are attempting to obtain additional volunteers. Mr. Platt stated that it was the Board’s understanding the items in Phase I, the pole barn/garage, the wall, decorative elements, beams, gates would be completed before Phase II. Mr. Platt also stated as he understood it there was no application to amend Phase I. The whole idea was to have the wall completed before the Worship Center. Mr. Senges stated when the Board sat on the initial application all testimony regarding the wall and it’s elements was presented to be a very important ingredient to the beauty of the project but also included leaving a large amount of trees, which did not happen. The wall being in Phase I was very important to the Board in the approval process. The wall would present a very clear, and pretty picture of what was being built and would also provide a visual and sound buffer so he feels as though it is very important that Phase I be completed prior to embarking on Phase II. Mr. Senges also stated that a comment was made that the Applicant is short on manpower. He indicated his concern would be the Applicant would take the manpower from the wall and start working on Phase II and the wall would then become Phase III. The Board cannot agree to that. Mr. Or stated without the temporary worship building, they do not have the money to build the temple. We need the worship building for fundraising. Mr. Senges asked whether or not the Applicant has the financial wear withal to complete Phase I. Mr. Or stated “Yes”. Mr. Senges stated it is not an unreasonable request to complete Phase I prior to starting Phase II. Mr. Platt stated if the Board grants approval, the wall has to be completed with the exception of the ornamentation prior to being able to use, occupy and make use of the worship center. Mr. Or stated he understood. Mr. Platt stated there cannot be any excuse for not having the money or fundraising to complete the wall.

Mr. Platt stated regardless of the fundraising issue, the wall will have to be completed before anything else can be occupied and used. Mr. Platt inquired as to whether or not any construction of Phase II has begun. Mr. Paterson stated “No”. Mr. Senges requested Mr. Paterson define what he means by permanent/temporary in regards to the worship center. Mr. Paterson stated if the worship center were to be called temporary, then there is an ordinance with a time limit. If it were to be called permanent/temporary, then the Applicant could put up a temporary worship center that can be utilized that will be taken down and replaced with a permanent temple. Mr. Senges inquired as to when the Applicant would have the appropriate funds to be able to build the permanent center. Mr. Or stated they will be ready within five to ten years. Mr. Senges asked when Phase I and Phase II will be complete. Mr. Or stated five years. Mr. Platt inquired what happens if the Applicant is not able to raise the funds and the temple cannot be constructed within five years. Mr. Or stated they would remove the temporary worship center and abandon the project. Mr. Platt confirmed whether or not that was Mr. Or’s testimony and Mr. Or responded “Yes”.

Mr. Platt inquired as to whether or not associated parking would be included in Phase II. Mr. Barker stated Phase IIA includes the 5,200 square foot permanent/temporary workshop building as well as a concrete parking for handicap accessibility, 30 spaces for regular use for the worship building with a stone drive, as well as the inclusion of a basin moved from Phase II to Phase IIA including the piping that goes to the basin. Mr. Senges inquired as to whether or not this is a fully functional building with heating and electricity. Mr. Barker stated it was a fully functional building for public occupancy with an occupancy count of 96 people and will meet fire code. Mr. Willard requested Mr. Barker describe a pole barn. Mr. Barker stated it is a pre-fabricated building with wood trusses and poles. It’s a more cost effective approach to place poles in the ground with footings and horizontal bars across to support the sheathing of the building. It is a relatively inexpensive structure that will meet all the codes. He also stated that all of the necessary permits will be pulled for the structure. It will take approximately two days to put up the building. A separate company will fit out the building. Mr. Senges asked what the total construction time would be from start to finish. Mr. Or stated five weeks. Mr. Platt inquired as to whether or not there will be seating in the worship center. Mr. Barker stated there will be no seating; only mats will be utilized to worship.

Mr. Cupersmith inquired as to what would happen if more than 96 individuals showed up to attend an event. Mr. Or stated not all people will go inside the structure. Mr. Paterson inquired as to how many people show up Monday through Friday on each day. Mr. Or stated approximately 70 people. Mr. Senges stated previous testimony was 200 people including people outside of the worship center. Mr. Platt asked how many people attend during major holidays. Mr. Or stated 500 to 1,000 people. However, they are not all inside the building at the same time. Mr. Platt asked during the major holidays, given 500 to 1,000 people will come to the site, how many will actually be inside the worship temple? Mr. Or stated between 70 or 80 people. Mr. Platt, asked whether or not they would exceed 96 individuals. Mr. Or stated no, they would not exceed 96 individuals. Mr. Platt stated initially the parking was designed based upon one space per three congregants. Now there is testimony that as many as 1,000 people may attend. How will they be able to accommodate 1,000 people parking within 30 parking spaces? Mr. Or stated they will car pool. Mr. Platt, on the high holy days were you advised it was okay to park on the property? Mr. Or stated ‘Yes’. Who by the Township stated this would be okay. Mr. Or could not recall. Mr. Platt asked Ms. Powell if the Board were to approve the worship center that they claim will have a maximum occupancy of 96 people, 30 parking spaces, is it allowable under our ordinance and when they have more than 30 cars, can they park anywhere else on the property not in designated parking spaces? Ms. Powell stated ‘No’. According to Title 39, all parking spaces are required to be on the lot. Parking is not allowed in an open field setting unless it was approved by the Board. Mr. Senges reiterated the Applicant would have to apply for a special permit. Mr. Platt stated there will be at least three days per year where the Applicant is going to exceed the number of designated parking spaces. Mr. Paterson stated “Absolutely”. Will the Applicant go before the Board three times a year to obtain special parking permits? Mr. Or stated they will apply for the special permit for parking and they will shuttle individuals to and from the site. They also plan to carpool from Philadelphia and therefore there will be less cars. Mr. Senges for the record stated that should the Applicant need to do anything other than their normal operation, the Applicant will have to come before the Zoning Board to obtain a special permit. Ms. Powell stated when it comes to high holy days, the Zoning Department does not issue special permits for overflow parking; parking lots will need to be established. Mr. Senges stated the Applicant will need to submit a parking plan since there will be anywhere from 500 to 1,000 individuals attending at any given time in particular the high holy days. Mr. Platt stated in order for the Board to approve a site plan, the Applicant is going to have to tell the Board where they’re going to park. He further stated the Applicant does not have sufficient parking areas to handle what are recurring events where there is not going to be sufficient parking onsite. The code clearly requires there be onsite parking and a plan will have to be submitted. The property itself cannot be a gigantic parking lot.

Mr. Senges stated another house of worship came before the board previously and they too had inadequate parking. The condition of their approval was before they could congregate, they had to provide a detail plan as to where they were going to park, where the spaces were going to be. He further stated Voorhees Township does not provide a permit that allows individuals to park on lawns or open spaces. Mr. Senges stated the Applicant cannot expect the Board to approve something when they do not know what they are approving. The Applicant must submit a plan.

Mr. Platt stated if the Applicant wants to have temporary parking associated with the smaller worship center, they need to submit a plan and that plan has to show ample parking spaces for people to drive to and park their cars properly. He further stated when the mosque came before they Board, they had a similar issue and they created a temporary parking field, a dedicated area. They also acquired additional property when they expanded and they came before the Board and the Board approved their application. Unfortunately, the Board cannot approve what they don’t know. The Applicant’s engineer will have to submit a plan so the Board can vote on it.

Mr. Paterson stated if the Board were to approve the application they can make it a condition of approval that their engineer meet with the Board’s engineer to create a parking plan to provide for a number of people the Board’s engineer believes the Applicant can accommodate on site. In the meantime, they will also have an opportunity to speak to the Indian temple located across the street to see if they will allow the Applicant’s congregation to park there. Additionally, the Applicant has been given permission to utilize the parking lot located at the lake in Gibbsboro and plan to shuttle individuals back and forth from there to the site.

Mr. Platt stated he felt as though it was only fair to the Board and to the public that the Applicant submit a parking plan. The Board cannot approve something sight unseen. During the hearing for the Use Variance, the Applicant testified that parking would not have a detrimental impact to the neighborhood. However, the impact of traffic and parking is in fact a detriment to the neighborhood. The Applicant stated they would have sufficient parking on site for the larger high holy events and they don’t.

Mr. Matlack echoed Mr. Platt’s comments. Mr. Matlack stated he does not want to work with the Applicant’s engineer to see what the site can handle. He does not want to back into how many people are allowed to attend because unfortunately there is no way to enforce that. He feels as though the Board needs to get an understanding where the temporary parking is going to be located and if there is going to be off-site parking, the Board will need to know where that is and how the shuttle system is going to work.

Mr. Senges asked Mr. Paterson whether or not the Applicant fully understood that until Phase I is complete, he cannot obtain a C.O. for Phase II. Mr. Or stated he understood.

Mr. Senges closed this portion of the hearing and opened to the public.

Mr. John Pacana, 10 Devonshire Drive, stated he is a licensed professional engineer in multiple states including New Jersey. He has been watching the project with interest since it started. He agreed with the Board. He has been watching this wall close to a year and it’s not near to completion. He appreciated the Board’s recommendation that no further amendments or grants of approval be given until the wall is complete. The cinder block wall is an eyesore. He further stated there is vegetation that is two courses high. Many neighbors couldn’t come because of graduations and end of year events and requested Mr. McKenna voice their concerns as well. He implored with the Board for the Applicant to make the wall presentable. He personally reviewed the plans and feels as though the structure is magnificent. Although he feels as though he probably will not see it complete in his lifetime. He stated the wall is unsightly and unpresentable. The wall needs to be finished and it needs to look great. The professional center across 561, is handsome. He stated the community is proud to have it in their neighborhood. The wall is just an aggravating sight. Mr. McKenna also stated he was concerned because there was testimony it would cost a quarter of a million to a half million dollars to construct a 5,000 sq. ft. pole barn. He would like to see the wall finished first.

Dawn Varava, 23 Devonshire Drive. Ms. Varava stated she would like to address the issue with the wall as well. Ms. Varava feels as though the wall is unsightly but more importantly, she feels as though there is a safety issue. The wall is being made with wood and heavy concrete and doesn’t look like something professionals are building. It looks as though they really don’t know what they are building. Ms. Varava has been watching the progress for a year and the only thing that gets bigger are the wooden frames. Secondly, at the last event, every space of the land had cars parked on it. So many cars that they were parked in our neighborhood. If they put up any type of structure they will never be able to get any more cars on that land. What’s going to happen when they build a massive temple?

Robin Middleton, 21 Devonshire. Mrs. Middleton stated when the Applicant has an event, they have speakers and play loud music. Her home is located in the back of the development as far back as possible and they have to close their windows because the music is so loud. She inquired as to whether or not they are going to need bigger speakers and there will be more noise once the worship center is built? The local residents should not have to close the windows in order to hear their TV.

Mr. Platt stated he hopes the Applicant hears what the residents from the neighborhood are saying. He stated what the Applicant is hearing is that they are part of the community and they might want to consider the noise from the speakers as well as the traffic. People are home on the weekends. They work all week. Maybe the Applicant should consider that being part of the community means that when residents state the noise is excessive, the Applicant should be cognoscente of that and take their comments into consideration. Mr. Platt stated he felt as though the neighbors as well as their comments were very reasonable. He hopes the Applicant hears what the neighbors are saying.

Joyce Pacana, 10 Devonshire Drive. Mrs. Pacana wanted to discuss the testimony that was given regarding the fact that they have the money to complete the wall in Phase II. She feels as though if they had the money to complete the wall it wouldn’t look the way it does for a year and a half. She feels as though the wall is horrendous and she’s very concerned if the Board were to grant approval to start phase IIA, she doesn’t believe they will have the money to do the wall first. Everyone she knows that drives by the site states it’s horrendous and really looks awful and there’s wood frames and rebar sticking up out of it. It looks horrible. She stated her neighbor called the police since the workers were working without any safety gear. Mr. Pacana stated she just wants the wall to look presentable.

Gwen DeVera, Voorhees, NJ stated the Township should welcome the Khmer Buddhist. She further stated they are very good people. They will be bringing business to Voorhees and they are going to put Voorhees on the map. She stated she told the Applicant they could do what they want with the property. In her Country that is what they are able to do.

Please note the remainder of Mrs. DeVera’s recorded testimony was inaudible.

Mr. Platt stated no one has come forward to say that the Buddhists were not good people and requested Mrs. DeVera no longer provide legal advice.

Mr. Senges stated the Board believes the Khmer Buddhists are good for our community and for our country and the Board as well as the community wanted this in Voorhees. However, it has to be done properly and it cannot interfere with the enjoyment of other people within the community. The Board’s intention is to make sure this is done properly under the approvals that were granted and going forward there are no disruptions and safety issues.

Joseph LaRocca, 11 Cambridge Way, Voorhees, stated it is obvious there is a safety issue. There have been quite a few accidents on 561. The music is so loud, it echoes throughout the development. We have experienced this three times in the last year from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

Mr. Senges seeing no one further from the public, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Paterson requested approval to move forward to Phase IIA.

Mr. Senges stated the Applicant has to finish the wall first. Since the Applicant has the funds to complete the wall, complete the wall and then move into the building. The Applicant cannot move into the building until the wall is completed because a C.O. will not be issued for Phase I until it is complete.

Mr. Barker stated the structural part of the wall will be completed before the occupancy of the pole barn. The decorative part, to address the public, the reason why it is taking so long is because concrete has to be cured. The reason why we have the metal poles is for the arch to be completed. Once the arches are completed, the decorative parts will be completed. They are currently being made in the pole barn that’s constructed at the moment.

Mr. Willard stated the problem the Board is having is with the high holy days without an understanding of what the parking is going to be. More importantly the Applicant did not have a plan to present before the Board this evening for the parking and therefore the Board cannot guarantee approval. He requested the Applicant continue the application and return before the Board with a plan for the parking.

Mr. Platt suggested the Applicant continue the meeting. The Applicant will need to prepare the plan and have the Board engineer take review it. The plans will have to be on file at least ten days prior to the meeting so the Board can review them in advance. The Board will need a hard date for the completion of the wall minus the ornamentation, a parking plan, as well as a traffic study report. Mr. Platt stated he feels as though it would be prudent to show some progress of the wall prior to the next hearing.

Mr. Platt stated the Board will make a Motion to carry to the next meeting of July 26th, 2018 under the conditions that the Applicant can extend the action date to that date.

Mr. Senges made a motion to approve the request for a continuance; seconded by Mr. Weil.

Ayes: Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Senges

Nays: None

Mr. Platt stated the hearing has been continued until July 26th, and this will act as the Notice. The individuals within 200 feet of the site will not will not receive another letter.

Mr. Platt further stated the architect will have to submit renderings showing what the completed wall is going to look like without ornamentation; that is a completed wall with gates. The structural integrity of the wall as well as the arch has to be complete. The Board will then determine whether or not that will be sufficient. The Board may state the Applicant has to complete the entire wall with the ornamentation.

Seeing no further business Mr. Senges makes a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Weil.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Corrine Tarcelli

 Zoning Board Secretary