Board Chairperson, Ms. Augustine called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the "Open Public Meetings Act" and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

Roll Call:

Present: Mr. Vandegrift, Mr. Nicini, Ms. Branch, Mr. Ravitz, Mr. Schallenhammer, Ms. Augustine, Mr. Schwenke

Absent: Mr. DiNatale, Mr. Kleinman, Mr. Platt

Also present was Chris Norman, Board Solicitor, and Jeremy Noll, Board Engineer.

Mr. Norman swears in Board Engineer Jeremy Noll.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Nicini makes a motion to approve the minutes of the June 10, 2026, Planning Board meeting, seconded by Mr. Ravitz. Motion carries by the assenting voice vote of all present board members, excluding Mr. Vandegrift, Ms. Branch, and Ms. Augustine, who must recuse themselves.

Mr. Nicini makes a motion to approve the minutes of the June 24, 2026, Planning Board meeting, seconded by Vandegrift. Motion carries by the assenting voice vote of all present board members, excluding Mr. Ravitz, who must recuse himself.

MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

PC#26-014
Cutler Properties, LLC
Minor Subdivision
120 Fairview Ave
Block 3, Lot 6
Resolution of Approval

Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to approve the resolution, seconded by Ms. Augustine. Motion carries by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Mr. Vandegrift, Mr. Nicini, Ms. Branch, Mr. Schallenhammer, Ms. Augustine
NAYES: None
ABSTAIN: Mr. Ravitz (Recuse), Mr. Schwenke (Recuse)

NEW BUSINESS

PC#26-016
Dean Development Associates, LLC
Amended Site Plan
122 Route 73
Block 252, Lot 9

Mr. Baranowski, applicant's attorney from law firm Hyland Levin Shapiro approaches the board to provide testimony on the subject application. Board solicitor Mr. Norman notes for the record and public present that the current application is only for architectural updates, and no changes to the site plan or previously court ordered site plan approval are being proposed. Mr. Baranowski testifies that the applicant is seeking approval for an amendment to the previous Final Site Plan approval for the property and explains that the amendment is just for design change with an update to the architecture of the commercial building. He states that the applicant last appeared before the board last year for an extension of the final site plan approval through August 25, 2026,

and they also received their NJDOT permit issued on March 13, 2026. Mr. Baranowski explains that in the process of progressing with the previously approved development, the aesthetics of the commercial complex were re-evaluated, and they are now proposing a new architectural design for the building. Mr. Baranowski testifies that the applicant is seeking design waivers for the new proposed architecturals, and adds that they are not seeking a variance, but just design waivers which have a lower threshold for relief.

Mr. Kent Werner, the applicant's architect from JRP Architecture approaches the board and is sworn in. Mr. Werner testifies that their firm was brought onto the subject project to make the previously approved architectural renderings more contemporary and he begins briefly going through the design changes and new materials proposed for the updated design. He notes the following for the new design elements and materials: a stone veneer for the building façade consisting of stone panels laid out and applied to the structure, metal roofing, a canopy that extends over the sidewalk, and other building paneling consisting of various materials. Mr. Werner explains that there are varying protrusions off the building façade and the materials on the building façade vary, but not every 40 ft as outlined in the Townships' ordinances. He explains that this would therefore be a design waiver the applicant would need. For a review letter comment regarding articulation of building entrances and doors, Mr. Werner testifies that a design waiver would also be needed for this item. Regarding a review letter comment on choice of building façade materials, Mr. Werner explains that the brushed concrete and other materials chosen for the façade are meant to bring a more contemporary and refreshing aesthetic to the building. He states that the materials also contrast with other nearby buildings along Route 73. Mr. Baranowski explains that this comment also called for a board interpretation as to whether the more contemporary building materials would satisfy the design requirements. Regarding a review letter comment on projections, recesses and changes of elevation along the building façade, Mr. Werner explains that they have tower elements across the façade as well as overhanging elements and the building materials themselves provide texture throughout. He reiterates that the materials and design of the building are meant to make the site more modern.

Mr. Ravitz asks if the original architecturals for the building can be shown for the public's view. Board Secretary Mr. Thapa brings the renderings of the original architectural design up onto the courtroom TV monitors. Mr. Vandegrift asks Mr. Werner why the architectural design of the building was changed from the original to the one currently being proposed. Mr. Werner states that it was at the request of the applicant. Mr. Baranowski asks Mr. Werner if it is to make the design of the building more contemporary. Mr. Werner confirms this as well. Mr. Nicini asks if requests for changes in the architecturals were made by the board in the previous application for the site. Mr. Schwenke states that as the board had rejected the entire application previously, no requests for changes in the architecturals had been made by the board. Mr. Vandegrift asks Mr. Werner if the new proposed design meets Township ordinances for Route 73. Mr. Werner states that he believes it meets the ordinance requirements. Mr. Baranowski explains that the current proposal requires design waivers that are being requested of the board. Mr. Vandegrift states that in the old design for the building, there was more visual distinction between storefronts along the front façade compared to the new one. Board engineer, Mr. Noll explains that many of the design waivers are interconnected, such as item #'s 1, 2 and 4 in the review letter. He states that if the columns from the original design were still in the new proposed one but just with the updated aesthetic, there would be fewer waivers needed. He asks why the columns were removed from the present design aside from possible aesthetic updates and states that having them would help break up the front façade and reduce the number of waivers needed. Mr. Baranowski asks Mr. Werner if more separation-type features can be added to the architectural design of the building. Mr. Werner confirms he can add more separation features to the building.

Mr. Baranowski, Mr. Werner and the applicant briefly discuss potential updates to the building design. Mr. Baranowski testifies that the applicant can add more features to the front façade of the building that indicate more separation in the façade to the satisfaction of the board, with the only caveat being the specific location of such features in relation to where tenants will be located. Mr. Schwenke goes through the design waivers, stating that the design of the building is subjective and overall, the board finds the loss of the previous articulation of the building design unpalatable. For design waiver #1 regarding variation of façade material, color and texture, Mr. Schwenke explains that this should be addressed with more articulation between storefronts and front spaces, such as with a stone columns or other feature to break up the façade. Similarly, for

design waiver #2, he states that the board would not be willing to grant the waiver as they would like to see more of the articulation and variation in the front building façade returned to the design. For design waiver #3, Mr. Schwenke provides his interpretation of the materials used as being satisfactory, and states that the stone and concrete paneling is nicer than other materials such as stucco. He adds that for the wood used, while not natural it may be preferable given how real wood can rot, split, or otherwise fail. He states that if true metal paneling can be given along with the artificial wood, he would not be opposed to such design. Last, for design waiver #4, Mr. Schwenke states that as the waiver is regarding long uninterrupted blank walls without separation or articulation, it is closely tied to some of the earlier waivers regarding distinctness of the building front façade that the board desires to see and thus should not be granted. Mr. Baranowski and Mr. Schwenke briefly discuss the design waivers and different possible updates to the architectural plans. Mr. Schwenke states that the signs for other tenants at the building should also be more prominent and overall, the board would like to see a revised design that removes the need for design waiver #'s 1, 2,and 4. Mr. Baranowski asks if the revised design for the building could be made a condition of approval. Mr. Schwenke explains that as the waivers for the application necessitate interpretation from board members, the application will need to be deferred and carried to a new meeting date to allow members the chance to review the future revised design.

Mr. Ravitz states that the towers from the original design had a more aesthetically pleasing appearance with more slanted roofs compared to the flattened design that is included in the current proposal. He explains that having the slanted roof towers would also fit better with the character of this area of Route 73. Mr. Ravitz asks why the change in the architectural design was made to the building. Mr. Baranowski explains that the changes were made in consultation with the owner and the aim is to make the building more modern. Mr. Ravitz and Mr. Baranowski continue to briefly discuss the reasoning for the architectural changes to the building.

Ms. Augustine asks why the space for the middle tenant in the building was changed so that their space appears more swallowed up compared to the original design. Mr. Baranowski states that their team will take a break to caucus briefly on the application and will then address further comments and questions.

At this time, the board takes a 5-minute break to allow Mr. Baranowski and the applicant's team time to caucus.

Mr. Baranowski and the applicant's team return from the break and approaches the board to continue testimony. Mr. Baranowski states that Mr. Werner will revise the architectural plans to address the concerns of the board, including adding columns and other articulations to the building façade. He explains that the new design should be conforming to township ordinances such that no design waivers will be needed. Mr. Ravitz asks if the towers columns can once again have peaked roofs as an aesthetic update. Mr. Baranowski states that they will look into incorporating such design.

Before opening the meeting to the public, Mr. Schwenke states that the design waivers sought by the applicant are not being granted currently and the board will be hearing the application at a subsequent hearing where a new design would be reviewed. Ms. Augustine makes a motion to open the meeting to the public, seconded by Ms. Branch. Motion carries by the assenting voice vote of all present board members.

Barbara Silary
175 William-Feather Dr

Ms. Silary states that she agrees that any columns or towers of the building should have peaked or slanted roofs for their design. She asks about site exits and accesses to Route 73 and Signal Hill, if any. Mr. Norman states that the original site plan for the subject property was approved by court order. Mr. Schwenke confirms there is an exit for the site going to Signal Hill Dr. Ms. Silary asks about traffic around the site and expresses concerns regarding traffic circulation. Mr. Schwenke explains that the board cannot hear comments or questions about the site as the site plan was already approved by court order. He adds that the site plans are on file and available for public

inspection, however the applicant is not obligated to provide any renderings or other materials showing the site layout at this time.

Seeing no further public testimony, Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to close the public portion, seconded by Mr. Nicini. Motion carries by the assenting voice vote of all present board members .

Mr. Schwenke asks Board Secretary Mr. Thapa what meeting dates are available for the application to be carried to. Mr. Thapa states that the September 23 meeting date as well as meeting dates in October are currently available. Mr. Baranowski selects the September 23 Planning Board meeting date. Mr. Schwenke confirms that the application for Dean Development Amended Site Plan will be carried to the September 23 hearing.

Seeing no further business before the board or comments from board members, Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Augustine. Mr. Schwenke adjourns the meeting.

Rashane Thapa
Voorhees Township Planning Board Secretary
Minutes prepared by Rashane Thapa. 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