

The Acting Chairman for the evening, Mr. Weil 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. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Pannu, Ms. Tulman, and Mr. Hundal

Absent: Mr. Cupersmith

Also, present: Chris Norman, Board Solicitor; Rakesh Darji, Board Engineer, ERI; and Jennifer Gaffney, Board Secretary

RESOLUTIONS

ZC2020-009 Patidar Brothers, LLC 102 State Highway Route 73, Block 247, Lot 14
Use variance and bulk variances to permit 1,884 square foot Dunkin Donuts restaurant on A 30,751 square foot parcel (0.7 acre) in MB Zoning District.

Mr. Cohen motioned to memorialize Resolution 21-51 for ZC2020-009; seconded Mr. Pannu; none (0) against, one (1) abstention

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Pannu, Ms. Tulman, and Mr. Hundal

Abstentions: Mr. Leoncio

Nays: None

ZC2020-012 Maasi Shamilov, 5 Stead Court, Block 213.04, Lot 50
Bulk variance approval to permit an existing rear-yard deck with additional retaining wall structures to remain within rear-yard.

Mr. Cohen motioned to memorialize Resolution 21-52 for ZC2020-012; seconded Mr. Pannu; none (0) against, two (2) abstentions.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Pannu, and Ms. Tulman

Abstentions: Mr. Leoncio and Mr. Hundal

Nays: None

ZC2021-026 FR Tattoo Studios, LLC DBA Altar House Tattoo, 102 Berlin Road, Block 142, Lot 1
Use variance relief and waiver of site plan for by-appointment only boutique tattoo studio

Mr. Cohen motioned to memorialize Resolution 21-53 for ZC2021-026; seconded Mr. Willard; none (0) against, one (1) abstention.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Pannu, and Ms. Tulman

Abstentions: Mr. Hundal

Nays: None

ZC2021-027 Animal Welfare Association, 509 Centennial Boulevard, Block 207, Lot 11
Bulk variance relief for various signs throughout Animal Welfare Association campus.

Mr. Cohen motioned to memorialize Resolution 21-54 for ZC2021-027; seconded Mr. Leoncio; none (0) against, one (1) abstention.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Pannu, and Ms. Tulman

Abstentions: Mr. Hundal

Nays: None

ZC2021-029 Darren Nguyen, 113 Moonlight Terrace, Block 240, Lot 9.
Bulk variance(s) relief and/or waiver(s) for the existing non-conforming fencing.

Mr. Cohen motioned to memorialize Resolution 21-55 for ZC2021-029; seconded Mr. Willard; none (0) against, none (0) against, one (1) abstention.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Pannu, and Ms. Tulman
Abstentions: Mr. Hundal
Nays: None

ZC2021-030 Rakesh Patel, 32 Callison Lane, Block 213.19, Lot 7.
 Bulk variance relief for a proposed patio, pool equipment and fencing installation.

Mr. Cohen motioned to memorialize Resolution 21-56 for ZC2021-030; seconded Mr. Willard; none (0) against, one (1) abstention.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Pannu, and Ms. Tulman
Abstentions: Mr. Hundal
Nays: None

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Mr. Weil motioned to approve the Minutes from the November 11, 2021, meeting; seconded Mr. Willard; none (0) against, one (1) abstention.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Pannu, Ms. Tulman, and Mr. Hundal
Abstentions: Mr. Leoncio
Nays: None

OLD BUSINESS

Voorhees Rt 73 Development Group LLC (Wawa) O1/RR Zone Case #ZC2020-002 Route
 73 & Kresson Road CR 671
 Block 220, Lot 9 & 16

Mr. Norman indicated that tonight's hearing is a continuation from first hearing on May 6, 2021, followed by the second hearing July 8, 2021. This is the third hearing.

As a matter of general housekeeping, Mr. Norman indicated to the public that if they had participated previously, that testimony remains on the record, in the minutes and is duly noted. There is no need to repeat any of those comments when the meeting is opened to the public for comments and questions.

Mr. Norman indicated that there are a few loose ends that need to be tied up this evening, including cross-examination.

Mr. Weil turned the meeting over to the applicant's attorney, Mr. Tim Prime, Esq.

Mr. Prime indicated that in the prior meetings the applicant provided all the testimony and are ready to cross-examine the objectors professionals. They are also ready to allow the objectors professionals and the public to cross examine the applicant's professionals.

Prior to beginning the cross-examination, Mr. Prime asked to recall their traffic engineer Mr. Nick Verderese. Mr. Verderese previously testified May 6, 2021.

Mr. Prime stated that the applicant submitted to the Board, copying the objector's attorney Mr. Sobel, a Concept Plan based on an updated survey that was obtained. The purpose of this concept plan is to strictly show that the sidewalk proposed could be installed entirely in the right-of-way of Kresson Road. This was accomplished by shifting the bypass lane on the other side of Kresson Road. By doing so, the Concept Plan shows that all of the sidewalk fitting in the right-of-way.

The proposed sidewalk runs from the TD Bank, down Kresson Road, across the site frontage, along the properties on Kresson Road and completes at Bridge Drive, the adjacent residential street.

Mr. Prime requested Mr. Verderese join as a panelist to show the Board the plan. Mr. Nick Verderese was admitted as a panelist.

Mr. Norman asked for Mr. Verderese to confirm that he was still under oath from prior testimony.

Mr. Verderese shared his screen for all participants to see the Concept Plan. Titled "Concept B – Driveway Access & Bypass Lane Plan" dated 11/8/2021. Mr. Norman stated that this plan will be entered as Exhibit as A-8.

Mr. Verderese stated that it is similar to Concept A presented at the prior meeting. That plan was updated based on the prior testimony provided by the public and the impact to the neighboring properties. In the updated plan, the applicant is able to shift the widening.

Mr. Verderese continued that they would hold the curb line at the north. Mr. Verderese showed where the bypass lane would exist and showed that the lanes in the south were widened. The westbound lanes remain in their existing configuration consisting of a bike lane and a 12-foot travel lane. The edge of pavement that's located will be formalized with a curb and behind that will be a 4-foot sidewalk.

Mr. Verderese indicated that this plan was submitted to the county informally and they received feedback from them that they felt the design was acceptable and met their standards. The applicant will seek final approval from the county as a requirement if approved for site plan and variances.

In summary, as Mr. Prime earlier stated Mr. Verderese gave another run-down of the concept plan. There will be a sidewalk that runs on the north side of the roadway from TD Bank's driveway all the way down to Birch Street. The sidewalk moves in and out of landscaping requirements and appurtenances that are within the right-of-way. There may be some mailboxes that need to be reset, along with some driveway aprons to be reconstructed.

This plan provides a portion of missing sidewalk from Route 73 to the ball fields. There will only be an 800-foot section left without sidewalk. This is a definite benefit to pedestrian safety. After having heard from the public's concerns this plan was created.

Additionally, the concept plan shows the new proposed driveway, which hasn't changed much from what was previously seen. The island is larger, the radius was changed to improve the sight line. The plan has met the county's standards for sight distance requirements for the driveway.

The plan shown has the same landscaping as previously shown, just rearranged based on the adjustments. The sign is also the same, just reoriented due to the new improved radius.

Mr. Verderese stated that the sign is relocated, and it is a 5-foot setback from the side property that is a church.

Mr. Prime stated that this sign variance request is being added because of the amount of landscaping required and the relocation of the sidewalk, the sign would not be visible at the 15-foot setback.

Mr. Prime asked Mr. Verderese to comment about the driveway not being the primary concern by the members of the public, but the access to the driveway.

Mr. Verderese commented that he testified at the first meeting in May, he listened to the second meeting and recently relistened to the first meeting again. The overwhelming concern seemed to be about the overall additional traffic that Wawa would generate on Haddonfield-Kresson Road.

Mr. Verderese stated he would like to speak to 2 points regarding the concern. First, without a driveway on Haddonfield-Kresson Road people that are coming and going from the West are still going to use Haddonfield-Kresson Road in some way. If they are entering the site, they won't make it all the way down to that driveway, but they would find some residential cut through to get out to Route 73. They will still travel Haddonfield-Kresson Road to at least the ball fields. Additionally, anyone that leaves the site will turn right on Haddonfield-Kresson Road and all that same traffic volume will be driving by.

Mr. Verderese stated that the bulk of the comments provided by the public was issues with the volume. With regards to the design of the Wawa, it is designed based on the county's standards, and the applicant is confident it will be approved. With regards to the safety of the driveway, Mr. Verderese has no concerns and has not heard anything stating any concerns.

Mr. Verderese added that the driveway is just 2 properties away from the Commercial zone, just next to Mr. Sobel. If the driveway was relocated to that location, it would eliminate the need for a use variance on the application.

Mr. Verderese stated that whether the driveway would exist as applied for or at the other location, it would have the exact same traffic volume. The exception is that where the current driveway is proposed, 200 feet further from the traffic signal, has a nice design with the bypass lane. Mr. Verderese is confident in expressing to the Board that it be a positive to grant the variance at this location, as it is a better alternative than having it within the commercial zone. Being within the commercial zone and closer to the traffic signal, would have a lot more conflicts and merging and diverging traffic from the signal.

Mr. Prime added that the lot they are proposing for the driveway being 2 lots from the commercial zone and stated that the uses on both sides of the proposed driveway are non-residential uses, even though they are zoned Residential. The two lots on either side are a church and a law office. Mr. Verderese confirmed that to be correct.

Furthermore, Mr. Prime stated that the 2 homes that are closer to TD Bank are not located within the residential zone, they are located in the MB Zone, the same zone as the Wawa building.

Mr. Prime stated that he had no further questions and turned it over to the Board.

Acting Chairman, Mr. Weil indicated that the speed limit out to 73 would be reduced from 45 mph to 35 mph and asked what the process was for that to occur, or approval granted. Mr. Verderese said that the county stated they were considering making that speed limit change. The county would pass an ordinance that changes the speed limit on the roadway.

Mr. Hundal asked what the downside of a right turn having only, eliminating the left turn. Mr. Verderese stated that the following roads would be used as a cut through – Partridge Drive, Willowbrook Way, Peregrine Drive and Sunbird Drive. Leaving the traffic on the roadway is what a county road is designed to do, keep the traffic on that roadway and not in the residential roadways.

Mr. Weil asked if there were any other questions from the Board. There were no further questions.

Mr. Prime indicated that the applicant has no further testimony to provide and if Mr. Sobel wanted to start his cross-examination with Mr. Verderese he could proceed, as they have concluded their presentation subject to any redirect.

Mr. Norman stated that this was already opened up to the public in prior hearings and received comprehensive testimony from the neighbors. Mr. Norman suggested that after Mr. Sobel's cross examination, the meeting should be opened up to the public to comment only on the new material that was presented as due process.

Mr. Weil turned the meeting over to Mr. Sobel who was then promoted to panelist. Mr. Sobel requested that Mr. Plevinsky be promoted to panelist for the purposes of screen sharing.

Mr. Norman asked Mr. Sobel if the screen share consisted of materials that have not been seen yet, or materials previously shared. Mr. Sobel stated that it is materials that have not been seen but are relevant to the witness. He could not be cross examined at the last meeting; he was not there.

Mr. Plevinsky shared a power point presentation that included newspaper articles. The first article on the screen was from Burlington County Times regarding PDQ, First Watch restaurants coming to Route 73 in Evesham and a quote from Patrick Downey of Dynamic Traffic.

Mr. Sobel asked Mr. Verderese to confirm that he testified using studies from Mazur and Dean & Dolan going as far back as 2017. Mr. Verderese confirmed that to be part of the information that they used for their study.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese's company has gone back to the Kresson Road area to survey whether the speed, traffic or the like since the 2 surveys were completed in 2017 and 2019. Mr. Verderese stated that they have not physically gone back, they have reviewed published traffic volume data from Street Light.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese agrees that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the traffic in 2020. Mr. Verderese agreed.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese would agree that since school has resumed in September 2021, the traffic has resumed back to pre-pandemic traffic. Mr. Verderese indicated that he would not agree to that, as he has not seen any information published by the Department of Transportation that has confirmed that.

Mr. Verderese stated that they are using pre-pandemic volumes and supplementing with Street Light and other methods to confirm accurate volumes.

Mr. Sobel asked if there was any particular reason why Mr. Verderese's company did not go back and complete actual studies of Kresson Road, near the driveway since this application has been going on for 7 months.

Mr. Verderese asked for Mr. Sobel to confirm what type of studies he was referring to. Mr. Sobel stated traffic in-person studies, for speed, not relying solely on data that was collected. Mr. Verderese restated once more that they relied up on the surveys and Street Light to confirm accurate volumes.

Mr. Sobel asked if there was a change in convenience store's change in operation to include curbside pickup, door dash, grubhub, uber eats, etc. Mr. Verderese stated that he is familiar. Mr. Sobel asked if there is a provision for this location to accommodate patrons in that manner. Mr. Verderese confirmed that they do.

Mr. Sobel asked how Mr. Verderese's number consider the service mentioned, currently with numbers at 76% passerby and 24% destination, he asked if the post-pandemic numbers take into account the new lifestyle changes that people have adopted. Mr. Verderese stated that whatever that change may do to it, the numbers are based on what the industry requires them to use. Those requirements are based on the Institute of Traffic Engineers and data published by the Department of Transportation. Mr. Verderese stated that they do not go out and try to figure out based on a change in society, for example a restaurant's patronage may go down and that could affect results. Mr. Verderese confirmed once more that they are using standard trip generation rates that have been published by the Institute of Traffic Engineers, 11th edition, and because this is a State Highway, they rely on the Department of Transportation's data.

Mr. Sobel asked when the latest edition was published, Mr. Verderese indicated within the past year.

Mr. Sobel stated that Wawa as a corporation has advertised heavily within the past 6 months for their curbside pickup and delivery options and asked if Mr. Verderese would agree. Mr. Verderese stated that he has no idea, nor is that information necessary for his traffic analysis.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese's study included a traffic analysis on a Friday afternoon from Memorial Day to Labor Day. Mr. Verderese indicated that they choose normal traffic volumes to base their study, not high traffic days, as required by the industry. Mr. Verderese continued to state that everything in the traffic study meets the standards of the Department of Transportation. Out of his office 25-30+ applications are submitted to the Department of Transportation per year, which is among the highest submitted throughout the State of NJ.

Mr. Sobel compared the 2017 with the one done in 2019 and noticed that the evening hours stopped at 5:30pm in 2019 but 6:00pm in 2017. Mr. Verderese stated that he did not know the reason for that, however as mentioned previously he used another data source from Streetlight Data just before COVID. Where there was 3 points of data, they used the highest of the 3 to provide the most conservative of an analysis as they could.

Based on the data provided, Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese ever checked the speed. Mr. Verderese stated that he did not check the speed, especially since the speed will be reduced. Any speed traveled today would not be accurate against the 35-mph speed limit in the future.

Mr. Sobel stated that the report references that during the week majority of the traffic is passerby traffic, however on the weekends it bumps up to be around 50% destination traffic. Mr. Verderese stated that is accurate but elaborated so that the data was understood by Mr. Sobel. Mr. Verderese continued the 76% data is a slew of studies at different uses similar to this use, the 50% is what the NJ DOT has stated. There is no published data for a Saturday, so the NJ DOT conservatively uses 50% for the weekend.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese's study considered all of the surrounding residences. Mr. Verderese stated at the time of the application they reached out to Voorhees and Evesham and at that time there were no significant generators identified by the Planning Boards.

Mr. Sobel referenced the traffic report dated June 22, 2021, page 4 and read the following:

“Through consultation with Evesham and Voorhees Planning Boards, there are no other developments in the vicinity of the site that have been approved but not yet constructed that are identified as significant traffic generators”

Mr. Sobel asked what Mr. Verderese meant by “significant traffic generators”.

Mr. Verderese stated that “significant” is defined by the NJ DOT & IET as one hundred trips, and through their research and discussions, no significant traffic generators were identified.

Mr. Sobel introduces an article published in Burlington County Times about PDQ & First Watch being approved on Route 73 in Marlton and asked if Mr. Verderese was familiar with the location that it was approved. Mr. Verderese stated he was not.

Mr. Sobel continued to state that it is 1/8th of a mile North of where the Wawa is located.

Mr. Norman interrupted to indicate that this hearing is about the property located in Voorhees stating that he is now bringing up a property that is 1/8th of a mile away and asked for Mr. Sobel to provide the basis for relevance.

Mr. Sobel stated that it is relevant as he quoted the report stating that after checking with Voorhees and Marlton Planning Boards that no projects were planned that would be significant traffic generators. Mr. Sobel stated he was trying to suggest that some of the information in the report is not 100% accurate.

Mr. Prime stated that they do not know the traffic volumes of the 2 new restaurants, so it is immaterial and irrelevant.

Mr. Norman reiterated that it has nothing to do with the site/property, and we need to continue with addressing the site that is before us. Mr. Sobel respectfully disagreed stating that if you add on additional projects, there is additional traffic.

Mr. Norman stated that this property is a permitted use on Route 73, the only alteration is the additional property for secondary access.

Mr. Sobel stated that the point he is trying to make is that the traffic that could be coming from PDQ and Target will utilize those roadways, entering and exiting. Those roads include Evesham, Kresson, and Route 73. He stated that if anything was developed within 3 miles of the property, it could impact the traffic.

Mr. Norman asked where Mr. Sobel was going with his line of questioning, as he is not an expert traffic engineer. Mr. Sobel stated he does have an expert that will be testifying and is asking cross examination questions.

Mr. Norman asked why he did not want to introduce his expert and continue, Mr. Sobel stated that he wanted certain things on the record prior to introducing his expert.

Mr. Prime interrupted and stated that Mr. Sobel states that the businesses are located 1/8 of a mile, when in actuality they are 3/4 of a mile and raised concern that Mr. Sobel is making up testimony.

Mr. Norman stated that Mr. Sobel was painting the record.

Mr. Sobel stated 1/8 of a mile, 3/8 of a mile, regardless it is all within the circle that was given in the article. Mr. Sobel continued that the Board has a right to listen and hear what projects are in the vicinity that could impact traffic on Kresson Road.

Mr. Prime stated it has been asked and answered, it's time to move on.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese is familiar with a project on 136 Route 73 in Voorhees. Mr. Verderese stated that he is not.

Mr. Sobel referenced another article regarding a Urology practice. Mr. Norman stated that articles could not be admitted into the record as the authors are not available to be cross-examined. Neither can be accepted as evidence.

Mr. Sobel then stated he would rephrase and ask if Mr. Verderese is aware of a 15,000 square foot high-intensity medical office was built and is being used right outside of Virtua Hospital within close proximity of Kresson Road. Stating that people visit the medical office, work at the medical office, and use Kresson Road to get there.

Mr. Verderese stated that he is not aware and that he can only use information that is given to him when requested from various agencies. He also is not certain if it would have any impact to the property.

Mr. Weil asked if that property is located on the northbound side of Route 73, south of BJs. Mr. Darji stated that is correct. Mr. Weil asked the distance from the property. Mr. Darji stated that it is about a mile and a half from the site on the other side of Route 73.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese was aware of Cornerstone at Marlton, a new apartment complex behind the PDQ and Target that involves lower and moderate-income housing. Mr. Verderese stated he is not. Mr. Sobel asked if he is aware that there are 64 units and a senior neighborhood there. Mr. Verderese stated he is not sure, however even if there are 64 units, 100 trips would not be generated, so that would not be included in the analysis.

Mr. Verderese took the opportunity to educate Mr. Sobel that whenever a new development is added to a roadway, it is added in a pre-development condition which raises the values before you do your analysis. All it does is raise the baseline, so it decreases the percent of the impact your site has. So, if all of those sites combined generated 200 trips total, for an example, and some went through the intersection – it would just add to what is there and then our impact would just be a small percentage to the overall traffic.

Mr. Verderese reiterated that they rely on the information that they receive at the time that they are preparing the study. They met with 2 agencies, the projects mentioned were not brought up during that time. There is background traffic growth, they use percentage growth to identify for smaller uses or larger uses that are further from that site.

Mr. Sobel asked when those inquiries were made with those agencies. Mr. Verderese stated within a couple months before the submission date.

Mr. Norman asked that Mr. Sobel's questions be relative to a real nexus to the site and application, because we can go around in circles and define every development within 2 miles of the site, but that is a relevance issue and this is getting very attenuated.

Mr. Sobel stated they will move on to the next area.

Mr. Sobel referenced the traffic report dated June 22, 2021, page 9 and 10 and stated it describes Route 73, Kresson Road, and Braddock Mill Road. You can turn on Kresson Road is located where the 2 lanes turn into Kresson Road entering right near the proposed driveway. Mr. Sobel quotes the study:

“As shown in the table above, the westbound approach, and northbound and southbound left turn lanes currently operate at levels of service “E” or “F” during the analyzed peak hours.”

Mr. Sobel asked if that was an accurate statement. Mr. Verderese stated it was right from the study, yes.

Mr. Sobel asked if there would not be any vehicles added even using percentages during the peak hours to the Wawa. Mr. Verderese stated that there was a small volume making a left turn.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese was familiar that there was a left lane and a right lane coming into that. Mr. Verderese stated he was not sure what Mr. Sobel meant by that. Mr. Sobel stated that there are 2 turn lanes that merge into one lane. A lane that can turn into TD Bank and one that continues straight.

Mr. Verderese stated that there are 2 lanes that come from the signal, and at the location where the TD Bank is, the 2 lanes merge into 1 which happens before you get to Mr. Sobel's property. Mr. Sobel confirmed.

Mr. Sobel stated that there have been a number of accidents that have occurred in that area of where the merge is located and asked if Mr. Verderese had any information to the contrary. Mr. Verderese stated that he has no information specific to that location.

Mr. Sobel asked if it was ever pulled from the police records the number of crashes occurring from Route 73 & Kresson Road through Birch Street. Mr. Verderese stated the only crash data that was pulled was from the centralized location of the intersection of Route 73 & Kresson Road.

Mr. Sobel asked that if he stated he had information from 2015 to present day that there have been approximately 100 accidents from Route 73 & Kresson Road through to Birch Street if Mr. Verderese would have any information to rebut that. Mr. Verderese stated he has no information on that full stretch, he stated that he is sure that there were some crashes that were within the influence of the traffic signal.

Mr. Weil stated that Mr. Sobel stated that there were approximately 100 crashes and asked if Mr. Verderese could rebut that and asked how many actual crashes have occurred. Mr. Sobel stated he has information that there is between 95-100 crashes that he could share with everyone. He continued to state there was one that happened last week, and that they happen all the time. Mr. Sobel also stated that he goes to his office in the morning and picks up glass.

Mr. Weil stated that he lives in the area and that they have come from the TD Bank, and that he is familiar, and this questioning needs to move along.

Mr. Prime addressed the Zoning Board stating that the Open Public Meetings Act allows the Chair and the Board to set any parameters it wishes as far as the conduct to their meetings. Mr. Prime requested that the Board limit the cross examination for both parties of any witness to ten minutes, as this has become a filibuster to prevent the Board from acting on the application this evening. He stated that he will abide by the same limitation.

Mr. Sobel respectfully disagrees and stated the witnesses that have come forward 2 to 3 times. He stated with no offense that they have had ample time to come forward, and they have had to wait until the 3rd hearing to cross examine the witnesses.

Mr. Prime stated once again that he would like to have his request acted on for the record. Mr. Norman stated that the Board can act on that, and also indicated that for cross-examination it is one thing for providing testimony, it's another for providing cross-examination. This evening feels as though it's a fishing expedition with talking about every property within the vicinity of the proposed site and the traffic that is there. Mr. Norman indicated that Mr. Prime's request is a reasonable limitation.

Mr. Weil stated that he would like to move the hearing along as well, that he wants Mr. Sobel to be able to get his cross-examinations in, but it needs to be relevant and succinct to the project. Mr. Weil stated that he is leery to put a 10-minute limit on the matters, but if we do not get to the crux of the matters Mr. Sobel wants to address, he will put the limitation on.

Mr. Norman indicated that it has been an hour and is currently 8:03pm and asked when acting chairman, Mr. Weil would like to terminate cross-examination.

Mr. Weil asked Mr. Sobel how much longer he has left with his cross-examination. Mr. Sobel stated he doesn't believe he has much more, maybe 8-10 minutes. He is taking a lot of his questioning and trying to be respectful.

Mr. Weil indicated that Mr. Sobel should continue.

Mr. Sobel continued stating that it was indicated that the speed limit would be changing from 45 mph to 35 mph and asked Mr. Verderese if that was accurate. Mr. Verderese stated that they agreed they would do that as a condition of approval. However, the speed limit change was something that the county was already considering prior to Wawa coming forward with the application.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese was familiar with any studies that had been completed where in municipalities when speed limits are changed, drivers continue to drive the speed that was previously posted.

Mr. Norman stated that he doesn't believe Mr. Verderese needs to answer that question because the speed limit is the speed limit, and you have to presume that people will drive the speed limit. If we went by standards that everyone was speeding nothing would get approved. Mr. Norman stated that he read the minutes and knows that he stated the same thing at the last meeting.

Mr. Sobel reiterated that he was asking if Mr. Verderese knows if any studies exist, not that if it is correct or not, but if a study exists, he's a traffic engineer. Mr. Verderese stated he does not know if there are studies.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese is aware that Virtua Hospital is less than a mile from the site. Mr. Verderese confirmed that he did.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese was aware that Kresson Road is used for emergency vehicles to go east and west because the hospital is located on Route 73. Mr. Verderese stated he is not.

Mr. Prime asked how Mr. Verderese would know that.

Mr. Sobel continued to voice various concerns for vehicles speed on the roadway where the driveway is located, in addition to the use of bicycle lanes on the same roadway.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Verderese had visited the site on a site visit. Mr. Verderese confirmed he had.

Mr. Sobel requested that Concept B be loaded onto the screen and Mr. Verderese asked if the Board had an advanced copy of Mr. Sobel's presentation. Mr. Sobel indicated that they did not, but he could get it to them. Mr. Verderese indicated that it would have been better form to be advised of the exhibits he was presenting ahead of time, not during the meeting. Mr. Verderese continued that it is disrespectful to the Board, it's professionals and the public. Instead, Mr. Sobel is throwing things up on the screen in a flash, no time to read, and the applicant's professionals made sure to submit any and all exhibits 10 days prior to the meeting.

Mr. Sobel shared concept B and first pointed out the disclaimer on the plan and asked how this concept differs from the original. Mr. Verderese stated that the driveway remained the similar. Concept B was created after reviewing with the county and the driveways were expanded.

Mr. Sobel asked how much frontage is between his (Mr. Sobel's) building at 507 Kresson Road to his (Mr. Sobel's) own property line. Mr. Verderese stated that the purpose of the concept plan is to show the roadway, landscaping, and signage.

Mr. Sobel continued to express concerns about line of vision, stopping distance, and sight distance of traffic turning onto Kresson Road. Mr. Verderese stated that they are following the county's guidelines of 305 feet of stopping distance.

Mr. Cohen interrupted stating that at 8:03 there was a discussion on limiting the cross-examination and Mr. Sobel indicated that he would have about 8-10 more minutes of questioning. The time is now 8:15pm and it is uncertain as to where Mr. Sobel is going with his line of questioning, and Mr. Sobel has been afforded a sufficient amount of time.

Mr. Norman advised Mr. Sobel to finish up his questioning.

Mr. Sobel brought up speed limits again this time with reference to the sight triangle.

Mr. Norman indicated that the line of questioning is subject to county approval, that Mr. Verderese is testifying that he has safe ingress and egress, he has concept approval from the county, and asked Mr. Sobel where he was going with this line of questioning. The issues being raised can be brought to before the county planning board, not Voorhees Township Zoning Board.

Mr. Sobel disagreed that the Zoning Board needed to determine if there is a safe sight triangle.

Mr. Sobel asked if there had been any studies completed about whether the left turn lane would be recommended for a project like this. Mr. Verderese stated that they had a meeting with the county, and the county told them what they wanted to see for the site, so they provided it. If the county had stated they wanted a left-hand turn lane, they would have put a left-hand turn lane, instead the county asked for a bypass lane of 20 feet, so they provided it.

Mr. Sobel asked why they wouldn't look at the statistics to see whether or not a left turn lane is needed. Mr. Verderese asked why he would look into that, as it is a county road, and the county asked specifically for the bypass lane.

Mr. Prime had one question for redirect regarding whether or not the Voorhees Police Department reviewed the concept and application to provide a report on whether or not they had concerns. Mr. Verderese stated that they were given a copy, and they had no concerns.

For the record, Mr. Norman stated that from 8:03 to 8:18, the Board afforded Mr. Sobel an additional 15 minutes for his cross-examination.

The meeting was opened to the public for any questions or comments with regards to the cross-examination that was completed.

Mr. Norman reiterated that those who have addressed this application at prior hearings, their testimony is on the record and there is no need to repeat anything that was previously addressed. The comments going forward should be based on and limited to any of the new evidence that was heard this evening.

Mr. Glenn Sloves of 4 Chipley Run, who previously testified, reiterated that he is vehemently opposed to the application being an active cyclist and having concerns for cyclist and pedestrian safety crossing Route 73.

Mr. Norman indicated that the roadway safety concerns should be brought to Township Committee, and Mr. Weil asked if it should be brought to the NJ DOT as it's a state road. Mr. Norman stated that Township Committee may be able to provide guidance on providing safer options for cyclists.

Ms. Patricia Egerton of 50 Downing Lane was sworn in by Mr. Norman, raised concerns about the left-hand turn lanes on Route 73 onto Kresson Road. She vehemently stated that access on Kresson Road is already extremely dangerous which would be amplified by adding the driveway for Wawa.

Ms. Charlene Ackerman of 23 Shenandoah Drive was sworn in by Mr. Norman. Ms. Ackerman indicated that Mr. Verderese's testimony stated that the county was already considering decreasing the speed limit from 45 to 35mph and asked if they gave any reason as to that consideration. Mr. Verderese stated that they did not say why, they just stated they were.

Ms. Ackerman stated that there is a Wawa on Evesham Road that is set up similar to this with a bypass lane. There are no left turns permitted onto Evesham from the parking lot, however many people still make left turns resulting in accidents, and even fatalities. She asked how that would be monitored at this site. Mr. Prime stated that the design of the driveway was designed in such a way to prevent left turns, but it is a police matter to address any traffic concerns. Wawa consents to Title 39 enforcement on all of their sites.

Ms. Ackerman stated that it was mentioned earlier that there were about 100 accidents around Kresson & Kresson-Gibbsboro Road and asked for clarification if those included pedestrians, children, etc. as there is an elementary school located close to the site. Mr. Prime stated that that number was given by Mr. Sobel and that the applicant is unaware of any studies or the information that Mr. Sobel is basing that number on.

Ms. Dawn Gellar of 21 Hidden Acres Drive was sworn in by Mr. Norman. Ms. Gellar, who resides in Lost Tree, expressed extreme concern for her two children that travel all over Voorhees by bicycle, often times in Partridge Run, especially the area which doesn't currently have sidewalk and will not be having sidewalk installed. Additional concerns about Kresson Road being used by medical professionals to transport patients to Virtua.

Mr. Verderese stated that if there was no access by a driveway on Kresson Road, only having an entry on Route 73 and kids wanted to walk from Rabinowitz Field to Wawa they would have to walk out to Route 73 to access. Instead, the plans show that they will be able to walk from the field safely by way of a sidewalk that doesn't exist today, and at a closer distance by the driveway, making it much safer for them.

Ms. Martha Wright of 200 Munn Lane, Cherry Hill, NJ 08034 had not testified previously. Mr. Norman swore her in. Requested confirmation of heading southeast on Kresson Road that there is a left turn permitted into the driveway. Mr. Verderese confirmed that to be correct.

Ms. Wright stated that this application does not advance municipal land use law, the driveway does not encourage a transportation route to promote the free flow of traffic while discouraging congestion. The left-hand turn poses a danger to motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. She encouraged the Zoning Board to deny the application.

Mr. Anthony Smeglin of 4 Burbage Street, previously testified. Mr. Smeglin voiced safety concerns with regards to the bike lane and the additional traffic. Also expressed concerns for residential cut-through.

Seeing no further questions or comments from the public, Mr. Weil closed the public comment portion regarding the cross-examination.

Mr. Norman asked Mr. Darji if there was anything additional, he would like to add with regards to the new testimony provided this evening.

Mr. Darji stated that there is nothing additional to add from their review report and what was discussed at prior hearings. He did note that the applicant has been very responsive to the Board's concerns regarding pedestrian safety.

Mr. Darji continued stating that Kresson Road and Route 73 are both busy roads, hence the desired location for a Wawa. The best that can be done is to design a site with improvements (onsite or offsite) to mitigate impacts, to facilitate safe access for motorists, pedestrians, and cyclists. Mr. Darji believes this is accomplished with the revisions that the applicant has made to the design.

Mr. Darji is confident in the testimony and studies provided by the applicant are accurate.

Mr. Sobel requested to cross-examine Mr. Paul Phillips, Professional Planner for the applicant and indicated that he had an additional expert witness to give testimony, as well as cross-examine other professionals.

Mr. Paul Phillips acknowledged that he was still under oath from previous testimony. Mr. Sobel began his cross-examination and referenced a case study from 1967.

Mr. Norman interrupted the line of questioning as Mr. Phillips already provided testimony in support of the use variance. Mr. Norman urged Mr. Sobel to continue should he have questions related to Mr. Phillips prior testimony and to avoid going through the process of having Mr. Phillips repeat prior testimony. Mr. Norman asked Mr. Sobel to proceed in a direct manner and not in the roundabout way he started.

Mr. Sobel continued to quote MLUL and Mr. Phillips prior testimony asking for Mr. Phillips to confirm that testimony.

Mr. Sobel showed Planning Board Resolution 07-005 for Marlton Korean Assembly of God and asked if Mr. Phillips reviewed any of prior resolutions. Mr. Norman interjected stating that the resolution is not before the Board this evening and asked the relevance.

Mr. Sobel indicated on the resolution the lighting requirements. Restrictions were put in place for the church and wanted to know why those restrictions were placed on the church.

Mr. Phillips indicated that he was not privy to that application therefore would have no knowledge as to why conditions were placed on the resolution. Mr. Sobel asked for Mr. Phillips to confirm he agrees that those conditions are limitations. Mr. Phillips reiterated that he has not seen the resolution prior to this meeting, was not a part of the original application, and will not agree or disagree with anything.

Mr. Norman asked again the relevance of Mr. Sobel's questioning and indicated that it seems as though Mr. Sobel is filibustering. Mr. Sobel respectfully disagreed stating that if this is a commercial corridor with RR zoning and there should be limitations, this should be addressed.

Mr. Prime stated that is Mr. Sobel's argument and not cross-examination. Mr. Sobel stated he can make his argument if he's being told he cannot ask these questions. He is asking for clarification, and he is giving clarification.

Mr. Sobel continued referencing a second resolution passed for the church, Resolution 11-009 that allowed the church to have Sunday services and asked Mr. Phillips if he was aware. Mr. Phillips reiterated once again, that this is the first time he has seen this resolution and he cannot speak to it.

Mr. Norman questioned Mr. Sobel's line of questioning once again since it is a different property, a different use and in a different zoning district. Mr. Sobel stated that it is the "next door property".

Mr. Sobel continued to bring additional resolutions forward from 1996 & 2005 referencing various limitations to lighting and low-intensity use, asking Mr. Phillips once more if he is aware. Mr. Phillips responded each time that it was the first time that he's seeing them, so cannot speak to them.

Mr. Sobel asked Mr. Phillips what else has changed on the north side of Kresson Road if there are 2 low-intensity properties on either side of the driveway. Mr. Phillips stated that the point he made during the testimony was that the stretch of road from Route 73 to Birch Street is non-residential in character or zoning. Every property with the exception of the driveway, which is part of this development is either zoned for commercial use or is used non-residentially. The predominant land use is non-residential.

Mr. Phillips continued that if this property is approved, there would not be a single property on that stretch of land that would be used for residential purposes.

Mr. Sobel asked what kind of buffer is provided for the headlights that will be coming out of the driveway onto Kresson Road to limit disruption to the residents living across the street. Mr. Phillips stated that it is no different than cars exiting Mr. Sobel's property.

Mr. Sobel completed his cross-examination and Mr. Prime had no redirect for Mr. Phillips.

Mr. Sobel called Mr. Matthew Sharo of Dynamic Engineering Consultants for cross-examination. Mr. Sobel stated that Mr. Sharo testified in May 2021 with regards to the off-peak hours of deliveries. Mr. Sobel asked Mr. Sharo to define off-peak hours. Mr. Sharo stated those are outside of the morning and lunch rushes.

Mr. Sobel asked Mr. Sharo the time frame of the 3 dairy deliveries per week. Mr. Sharo indicated that would be after the afternoon rush, approximately 1pm.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Sharo is aware if propane tanks will be stored at the Wawa location. Mr. Sharo stated that they will be located at a kiosk outside of the building on the north side.

Mr. Sobel asked Mr. Sharo if the Wawa would be set up with electric charging stations. Mr. Sharo stated he was not aware. Mr. Sobel asked when that decision is made. Mr. Sharo stated once the project is further along in the process. Mr. Sobel asked if their location would impact parking. Mr. Sharo stated that they would not as they would be located on the northeast corner of the site. Mr. Sobel asked what the typical amount of charging stations would be located at a property of this size. Mr. Sharo stated anywhere from 2-8.

Mr. Sobel asked Mr. Sharo if he was aware of any impact that the Grubhub, Door Dash and curbside pickup accommodations impact the site. He stated that he is only involved with proposed sites, so he does not have that information.

Mr. Sobel discussed the site plans prepared by Mr. Sharo, and asked if he was a part of the meeting with the county which lead to the concept B with a wider driveway. Mr. Sharo stated that Mr. Verderese headed up the discussions with the county, and that the only change was the access point on Kresson Road, that the driveway remains to be 25 feet.

Mr. Sobel asked the lights proposed for the site. Mr. Sharo indicated that he testified previously that they are LED. Mr. Sobel asked how bright they were. Mr. Sharo indicated that it varies and is on the site plan that Mr. Sobel has in his possession.

Mr. Sobel asked if there was carry over of the light onto the other properties. Mr. Sharo said there was not.

Mr. Sobel stated that upon reviewing Concept B he could not find where the sign was located. Mr. Sharo loaded Concept B and showed in color where the sign would be located.

Mr. Sobel asked about the landscaping changes. Mr. Sharo confirmed that the same amount and types of shrubs and landscaping remained the same, their configuration has changed. He also confirmed that there would be no retaining walls or fences along the driveway.

Mr. Sobel completed his cross examination and Mr. Prime had no redirect for Mr. Sharo.

Mr. Sobel introduced his witness. Mr. Gordon Meth, a traffic engineer expert, of Robson Forensic, located at 100 East Hanover, Suite 305, Cedar Knolls, NJ 07927. Mr. Norman swore in Mr. Meth. Mr. Meth stated his credentials as an expert to the Board.

Mr. Sobel asked Mr. Meth if he had the opportunity to review the site plan, traffic studies, and visit the site. Mr. Meth confirmed that he had done both, he also indicated that he was involved in independent testimony for a previous application (Tractor Supply) on the same property.

Mr. Meth shared his screen to share an industry publication for information on driveway site triangles and took about 5 minutes to educate the Board on that industry information as it relates to stopping sight distance, operating speed, and recommended site distance. Later marked *Exhibit 06 Driveway Site Triangles*.

Mr. Meth then referenced Concept B to illustrate potential vehicle stops for sight distance. He then discussed the stopping sight distance at the current 45 mph vs. proposed 35 mph, referencing a research project done by the Federal Highway Administration in 1997.

Mr. Norman identified Mr. Meth's exhibit as *Exhibit 02A Sight Distance & Exhibit 02B Sight Distance Proposed Stop*.

Mr. Meth continued with an arial map, *Exhibit 03 Google Map*, showing the traffic on Route 73, Kresson Road, Kresson-Gibbsboro Road, and Braddock Mill Road. The map showed arrows indicating traffic level of service and traffic operation.

Mr. Meth then referenced to *Exhibit 04 Proposed Bypass* illustrating that a left turn lane into the driveway from Kresson Road would cause for traffic to use a bypass lane, cutting into the bicycle lane.

Mr. Meth summarized his issues as the sight distance being deficient, left turn bypass impacting the bicycle lane, exit driveway having minimal traffic benefit, entrance driveway having negative traffic impact, and proposed mitigation is not permanent as the NJDOT can change timings of signals at any time. In conclusion the proposed use variance creates negative traffic impacts for Kresson Road by creating a commercial driveway in a residential zone.

Mr. Prime began his cross examination asking for Mr. Meth to put his summary back on the screen. Mr. Norman identified Mr. Meth's Summary as *Exhibit 05 Summary*.

Mr. Prime asked Mr. Meth if Mr. Sobel told him to waste the Board's time tonight with his testimony. Mr. Meth stated that Mr. Sobel told him that he would have 10 minutes.

Mr. Prime referenced the first item on the summary regarding the sight distance and asked Mr. Meth if that would be determined by the county, as they have site distance and easements that they require, they will examine the plan and determine those distances. Mr. Meth stated that they have jurisdiction over the driveway once it is approved. Mr. Prime asked for Mr. Meth to confirm if the county would review this application. Mr. Meth stated that if the Board denies the application, they will not.

Mr. Prime then asked Mr. Meth if he feels that the Board should deny the application although the county has reviewed the concept and believes the sight distance to be adequate. Mr. Meth stated that is the testimony that Mr. Prime has, and Mr. Meth is laying out the engineering of it. Mr. Meth indicated that it was testified to be informal meetings and informal discussions. Mr. Prime stated that the county has provided review letters. Mr. Prime asked if Mr. Meth has seen those review letters, Mr. Meth stated he had not.

Mr. Prime went to the second item on the summary, left turn bypass impacts bicycle lane, and asked Mr. Meth if he heard the testimony in which Mr. Verderese stated that if the county requested a left-hand turn lane, they would provide one. Instead, the county asked for a bypass lane. Mr. Prime asked if Mr. Meth heard Mr. Verderese's testimony, Mr. Meth stated he had. Mr. Prime asked if Mr. Meth believed Mr. Verderese was lying, Mr. Meth stated that he did not believe he was lying.

Mr. Prime asked Mr. Meth if the decision is the county's, not Mr. Verderese's, not Mr. Meth's. Mr. Meth agreed that it is the county's call.

Mr. Prime continued to go through Mr. Meth's summary as Mr. Meth's opinion, not the testimony that was provided. The last 2 items on the summary reference items that NJDOT has jurisdiction over, Mr.

Prime mentioned that Mr. Meth's opinion is that the application be denied and NJDOT does not have the opportunity to review it. Mr. Meth stated that one of the criteria is to have no negative traffic impact. Mr. Prime stated that to be false that land use law mentions nothing about traffic, that it states it shall not be a detriment to the zone plan or the public good.

Mr. Prime had no further questions. Mr. Sobel had no redirect.

Mr. Sobel asked for Mr. Chepurny to come back for cross-examination. Mr. Prime objected on grounds that Concept B had changes that need to be addressed. Mr. Norman deferred to Mr. Darji asking if there were substantial changes that would indicate the need for further discussion.

Mr. Darji stated that from a planning aspect the changes are de minimis, there is a proposed sidewalk and changes to the geometry of the access point. Mr. Prime stated that the change has not impacted anything on Mr. Sobel's side, and he is here to represent himself, not neighbors. Concept B does not change anything on his side of the property.

Mr. Sobel respectfully disagreed again, stating that there were changes in the dimensions and there's issue with that. Mr. Prime stated that all the improvements are made within the right-of-way. Mr. Sobel stated his landscape architect should be afforded the time to testify whether or not they are or they are not.

Mr. Prime suggested limited testimony. Mr. Cohen agreed to allow Mr. Sobel to continue with limited testimony. Mr. Norman asked Mr. Sobel to stay within the 8-minute time limit. Mr. Sobel stated he would do the best that he could.

Mr. Steve Chepurny, Mr. Sobel's landscape architect was admitted as a panelist. Mr. Chepurny testified previously and confirmed to be still under oath. Mr. Chepurny reviewed Concept B and indicated that the driveway will have a substantial adverse impact on Mr. Sobel's property. 8 holly trees of 4-5 feet tall are proposed at the property line, with no fencing planned for the cartway. The applicant is offering a waiver on the buffer requirements, and the evergreens would not meet that waiver.

Mr. Chepurny brought up a recent survey of Mr. Sobel's property 507 Kresson Road with a revision date of 12/14/2021. Mr. Norman titled the survey *Exhibit 07 – Survey of 507 Kresson Road REV 12/14/2021*. Mr. Sobel asked for Mr. Chepurny to explain the purpose and significance of the survey. Mr. Chepurny indicated that they noticed discrepancies in the prior survey and the concept plan and asked Mr. Stout of Stout & Caldwell Engineers, LLC to perform an updated extensive survey.

Mr. Chepurny indicated that the distance of Mr. Sobel's side property line to Mr. Sobel's house is 19.2'.

Mr. Prime asked if Mr. Chepurny is a licensed surveyor. Mr. Chepurny stated he is not and that he is reading a survey. Mr. Prime asked Mr. Chepurny if he prepared the survey he is testifying about, Mr. Chepurny stated he did not.

Mr. Prime indicated to Mr. Norman and Mr. Weil that Mr. Chepurny is not allowed to testify regarding the survey, if they wanted to discuss the survey the surveyor who prepared it should be speaking to it.

Mr. Norman agreed that reviewing the survey and presenting his findings are outside of Mr. Chepurny's expertise and is therefore not qualified to discuss.

Mr. Sobel stated that one of Mr. Chepurny's qualifications are in grading plans and he should be permitted to testify it as such. Mr. Sobel asked for Mr. Darji to confirm the qualifications of a landscape architect and Mr. Darji agreed that landscape architects are qualified to prepare grading plans and minor site plans.

Mr. Norman told Mr. Sobel to proceed. Mr. Sobel asked for Mr. Chepurny to state his findings with regards to the grading plan. Mr. Chepurny stated that the scaling was inaccurate on Concept B and continued to express concerns in the grading changes with the landscaping specifically a large tree that is in front of Mr. Sobel's property and a 27" grade change.

Mr. Chepurny continued to discuss the tree and added impacts to the koi pond in front of Mr. Sobel's office and how if the tree needs to be removed, the koi pond would be in direct sunlight which would provide an adverse effect.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Chepurny had the opportunity to review the lighting plans on Concept B. Mr. Prime asked if Mr. Chepurny was an engineer or a lighting expert. Mr. Norman indicated that Mr. Chepurny had no expertise to discuss light spillage. Mr. Chepurny continued to speak about the lighting plan.

Mr. Prime objected once more.

Mr. Sobel asked if Mr. Chepurny had anything else to discuss with regards to the plan. Mr. Chepurny did not.

Mr. Prime stated that the lighting plan meets all of the ordinance standards for Voorhees Township and further expressed that if the Board felt fit to approve the application, the applicant would be happy to work with the Board Engineer and Mr. Sobel's engineer to address any concerns that Mr. Sobel may have on any improvements that may affect his property.

Cross examination was completed and opened up for any questions or comments from any Board members.

Mr. Leoncio stated that there seems to be a conflict on the traffic testimony. Mr. Norman stated that for matters that are within the jurisdiction of the NJDOT and the county, and the Board has limited jurisdiction for safe ingress and egress.

With no further questions from the Board, Mr. Weil opened the meeting up for public comment and questions.

Ms. Patricia Egerton of 50 Downing Lane, who testified earlier in the evening, expressed continued concern for safe access and traffic safety with the secondary access.

Ms. Heather Furey of 508 Kresson Road, who testified in previous meetings, asked questions with regards to the road being widened, Mr. Prime stated it will be widened, however he is unsure if it is widened in front of her property.

Ms. Nita Prabhu of 10 Birch Street, who testified in previous meetings, referenced a petition that she organized and discussed Wawa moving the location to another site.

Ms. Deborah Wellings of 34 Christopher Road, having never testified previously was sworn in by Mr. Norman. Ms. Wellings reiterated the same safety concerns of other residents spoke to.

Mr. Cohen requested that Mr. Norman paraphrase a motion.

Mr. Cohen motioned to approve the request for all variances as summarized by Mr. Norman; seconded by Mr. Willard; two (2) against.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Ms. Tulman, and Mr. Hundal
Abstentions: None
Nays: Mr. Leoncio and Mr. Pannu

Motion carried and Mr. Norman stated the 45 days right of appeal from the notice of publication of decision after the memorialization of the resolution in the next month.

Mr. Weil opened the meeting up to the public for any general comments.

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Cohen motioned to adjourn the meeting seconded by Mr. Pannu.

Jennifer L. Gaffney, Zoning Board Secretary

Voorhees Township

Minutes prepared by Jennifer Gaffney. The minutes are intended to reflect the basic comments and action. Verbatim transcripts of all electronic recordings can be available upon proper request and payment.