

**HILLSBOROUGH TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD**  
**PUBLIC MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

Vice Chairman Dr. Daniel Marulli, as Acting Chairman, called the Planning Board Public Meeting of July 07, 2016 to order at 7:32 p.m. All stood for the Pledge of Allegiance. The meeting took place in the Courtroom of the Hillsborough Township Municipal Complex.

Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli announced the meeting had been duly advertised according to Section 5 of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 ("Sunshine Law").

**ROLL CALL**

Mayor Frank DelCore – Present

Robert Wagner, Jr. - Present

Deputy Mayor Carl Suraci – Arrived 7:34 pm

Robert Peason - Present

**Dr. Daniel Marulli, Vice Chairman** - Present

**Neil Julian, Secretary** - Present

Sam Conard – Present

**Shawn Lipani, Chairman** – Absent

Kenneth Hesthag - Absent

Sally Becorena (Alt. #1) – Present

Stephanie Forrest (Alt. #2) – Absent

Also present: David K. Maski, PP, AICP, Township Planning Director; Eric M. Bernstein, Esq., Board Attorney (Eric M. Bernstein, & Associates); William H.R. White, III, PE, CME, Board Engineer (Maser Consulting P.A.); Susan Baber, CCR, Covering Board Court Reporter; and Caz Bielen, Board Videographer (Premier Media, LLC).

**DISPOSITION OF MINUTES**

None

**DISPOSITION OF RESOLUTIONS**

■ **Montgomery Development, LLC – File 05-PB-19-SR (2016 Extension Request)**

A motion to approve was made by Mayor DelCore, seconded by Mr. Julian.

Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli noted the arrival of Deputy Mayor Suraci at 7:34 pm.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Wagner – yes; Mr. Peason – yes; Ms. Becorena – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mayor DelCore – yes; Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli – yes. Motion carries.

■ **Terrace Industrial Park 08-PB-08-MJF (2016 Extension Request)**

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Peason, seconded by Mr. Wagner.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Wagner – yes; Mr. Peason – yes; Ms. Becorena – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mayor DelCore – yes; Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli – yes. Motion carries.

■ **WSH enterprises, Inc. – Amended Final – File 08-PB-15-MJF (2016 Extension Request)**

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Wagner, seconded by Mr. Julian.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Wagner – yes; Mr. Peason – yes; Ms. Becorena – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mayor DelCore – yes; Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli – yes. Motion carries.

**PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS**

None

**SPECIAL COMMITTEE REPORTS**

None

**BUSINESS FROM THE FLOOR**

None

**CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES**

None

**PUBLIC HEARING – SUBDIVISION/SITE PLAN APPLICATIONS**

Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli announced the change to the order of applications, moving the order to Glen Gery (GG RE Co.); RB Manufacturing, LLC; RETS Partners, LLC; and then Dr. Kumar Ramaswamy (668 Route 206).

- **GLEN GERY (GG RE Co.) – File 15-PB-04-MR** – Block 182, Lots 10, 11, 12, 45 & 46 – 95 Hamilton Road. Applicant seeking Minor Subdivision with Waivers to reconfigure lot lines by merging all five lots totaling 238.7 acres, then subdividing a lot in the southeasterly corner to create one lot consisting of approximately 25.494 acres

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

(Proposed Lot 46), with the remaining lot (Proposed Lot 11) approximately 213.25 acres of remaining land, on property in the M, Mining Zoning District. (EC Review: 03-23-15). **Adjourned from June 09, 2016.**  
**APPLICANT REQUESTING ADJOURNMENT – meeting date to be determined and extension of time to be provided.**

**John Marmora, Esq.**, representing the Applicant, stated an extension of time was provided at the meeting to Mr. Bernstein for an extension through September 30, 2016.

Township Planning Director, David K. Maski, PP, AICP, informed the Board of scheduling availability on the September 1<sup>st</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> agendas.

Mr. Marmora said he intended to have revised plans provided at least ten days before the September 1<sup>st</sup> hearing.

A motion to accept the extension through September 30, 2016 and carry the application to September 01, 2016 without further notice, was made by Mr. Peason, seconded by Mr. Wagner.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Peason – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mr. Conard – yes; Mr. Wagner – yes; Ms. Becorena – yes; Deputy Mayor Suraci – yes; Mayor DelCore – yes; Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli – yes. Motion carries.

- **RB Manufacturing, LLC** – File 16-PB-09-MSR – Block 201, Lot 11 - 799 Route 206. Applicant seeking Minor Site Plan Approval to allow placement of a new 14 ft. diameter by 25 ft., 17,000 gallon fiberglass vertical storage tank, on property in the LI, Light Industrial District (EC Review: 06-27-16).

**John Marmora, Esq.**, representing the Applicant, introduced the witnesses for the application: Matthew DeCicco of RB Manufacturing, and Robert B. Heibell, PE, LS, of Van Cleef Engineering. Both witnesses were sworn in.

**Matthew DeCicco of RB Manufacturing, LLC**, stated he is the Plant Engineer for RB Manufacturing.

**Robert B. Heibell, PE, LS, of Van Cleef Engineering** said he represented the Applicant two years ago before the Planning Board. At that time, RB Manufacturing was granted approval to build a 31 ft. by 17 ft. concrete pad and storage tank. The construction of railroad tracks was also part of that application. The tank placed was 35 ft. in height. The Applicant now proposes to place a second tank on that pad which is 12 ft. in diameter, 25 ft. in height. The Applicant must first put some structural steel in the tank and pour another concrete slab on top of the existing concrete slab. The ground will not be disturbed. There will be no increase to the impervious surface.

Mr. Heibell said he and Mr. DeCicco appeared before the Environmental Commission. The application has been submitted to three outside agencies, awaiting response. The application should be exempt from SCPB review, as it was two years ago. An application was submitted to the SUSCD and DRCC. An exemption from each is expected. The application is for minor site plan without variances.

Mr. Marmora said the report from the Fire Marshal had no comments. Mr. Marmora posed questions to the witnesses regarding outstanding comments from the Engineering, Planning and Environmental Commission reports.

Mr. DeCicco stated there will not be any ground disturbance or grading. This project is one of convenience for operations. There will be no additional employees or parking associated.

Mr. DeCicco said an error was made in the project description which stated the chemical as being 37% hydrochloric acid when in fact the correct percentage will range from 30 – 32%. Therefore, it is not a chemical that is covered by TCPA.

Mr. DeCicco addressed the discrepancy noted in the existing tank versus the tank size that had been approved. Mr. DeCicco said the tank itself is 40,000 gallons but the usable amount is about 35,000 gallons, at 35 ft. tall.

Mr. Heibell stated the height and the diameter of the tank is the same as approved by the Board. It can hold up to 40,000 gallons, although it currently holds 35,000 gallons.

Mr. DeCicco said the architectural plans will reflect the tank size.

Mr. DeCicco addressed the testing and safety measures. He said there is full security, full fence and close circuit TV, and that it would comply with all EPA and DEP requirements. The tank is very similar to the last tank installed.

Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli asked for clarification regarding the Toxic Catastrophe Prevention Act Program (TCPA), noting the thresholds for the hydrochloric acid is 5,600 lbs. He asked how that equates to gallons.

Mr. DeCicco answered the threshold would be 5,600 lbs. at 37%. Anything less than 37% does not qualify. Each gallon is 10 lbs.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

Board Engineer, William H.R. White, III, PE, CME, stated that was acceptable. Mr. DeCicco clarified for the record that the 37% noted should have been 30%.

Mr. Julian asked if the DPCC, Discharge Prevention Contamination Counter Measures Plan would be updated.

Mr. DeCicco confirmed it would.

Mr. Julian noted the proposed tank would not be subject to SPCC requirements since it does not involve oil, but noted the Applicant would be required to apply for a NJDEP Air Permit.

Mr. DeCicco agreed. He said all will be submitted to the Township before the tank is commissioned.

Open to the Public.

No questions.

Closed to the Public.

A motion to approve, including meeting all requirements by the Township's professionals, and testimony provided by all was made by Mr. Julian, seconded by Mr. Conard.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Peason – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mr. Conard – yes; Mr. Wagner – yes; Ms. Becorena – yes; Deputy Mayor Suraci – yes; Mayor DelCore – yes; Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli – yes. Motion carries.

Mr. Marmora thanked all for allowing the courtesy of hearing the application out of order.

- **RETS Partners, LLC (2016 Variances)** – File 16-PB-06-SRV – Block 178.02, Lot 421 (formerly known as Block 178, Lot 21) – Southwest intersection of Route 206 and Raider Boulevard. Applicant seeking to amend relief previously granted for minimum front yard setbacks at Raider Blvd (24.7 ft. proposed, 25 ft. previously granted); and Greenfields Lane (22.7 ft. proposed, 23 ft. previously granted). Previous approval for preliminary and final major site plan; bulk variances; and waivers, granted under application #15-PB-06-SRV, Resolution dated 06-25-15. Property is under construction for a child care facility with parking and improvements, on property in the GB District (within the ASD District). (*EC Agenda: 06-27-16*).

**Michael O'Grodnick, Esq. of Mauro, Savo, Camerino, Grant & Schalk**, representing the Applicant, stated the application is for the Kiddie Academy building under construction. Mr. O'Grodnick said the Applicant is seeking a .3 ft. variance to allow for a full brick façade, rather than half brick.

Mr. O'Grodnick introduced **Robert B. Heibell, PE, LS, of Van Cleef Engineering**, sworn in earlier for a previous application.

Mr. Heibell said the Board granted site plan approval, during which a setback had been granted for both the Greenfields Lane and Raider Boulevard front yard setbacks. He said construction has commenced and the foundation is in. Mr. Heibell explained that an inconsistency was found at the time of survey. The plan that had been submitted to the Building Department showed the 2 in. thin brick. The Applicant had thought he could instead use full brick, but that created a variance. The Applicant decided to return to the Board for a variance rather than use the thin brick. The ledge-build in the foundation will support a full brick but in order to do so, the Board would have to grant the additional variances. The brick is an additional 2 in. An additional 3 in. has been requested to allow room. The building is the same size and shape. All other improvements have not changed.

Open to the Public.

No questions.

Close Public.

A motion to approve the additional variances was made by Mayor DelCore, seconded by Deputy Mayor Suraci.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Peason – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mr. Conard – yes; Mr. Wagner – yes; Ms. Becorena – yes; Deputy Mayor Suraci – yes; Mayor DelCore – yes; Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli – yes. Motion carries.

- **Dr. Kumar Ramaswamy (668 Route 206)** – File 16-PB-04-SRV – Block 178, Lot 16 – 668 Route 206. **Revised Plans submitted 06-27-16.** Applicant seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval; bulk variances for relief from: minimum lot width; maximum front yard setback; minimum FAR; and design waivers, to demolish the existing structures and construct an two-story medical office building, with parking, lighting and

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

stormwater improvements, for property located in the GA, Gateway A Zoning District, within the ASD Overlay District (EC Review: 05-23-16 / Revised Plan to Chairman 06-27-16). **Continued from June 09, 2016 without further notice.**

Mr. Bernstein stated for the record that Board members Mr. Conard and Deputy Mayor Suraci had filed a certification indicating they had reviewed the video recording of the June 9<sup>th</sup> hearing. Both are now eligible to vote.

**David Singer, Esq. of Vella, Singer & Martinez, P.C.**, represented the Applicant, Dr. Ramaswamy.

Mr. Bernstein stated Mr. Ingram is still under oath from the June 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Mr. Singer asked Mr. Ingram to review the changes made to the site plan.

**Exhibit A-1** – Colorized Site Plan Exhibit (from 6-9-16 hearing)

**Exhibit A-2** – Colorized Site Plan Exhibit – REVISED Plan dated June 2, 2016

**Exhibit A-3** - Architectural Plan - Front and Side Elevations

**Wayne Ingram, PE, of Engineering & Land Planning Associates, Inc.**, stated they tried to take into account the requests of the Board to revise the proposal to be more in compliance with the zoning standards. Exhibit A-2 was marked.

Mr. Ingram said the main change is that the building was redesigned from being a long one-story building to a two-story structure. The building was moved up towards the road as much as possible, thereby shifting the parking to the rear of the site. A few things were done to make the site more conforming to the zone. The parking is now hidden. The buffer to the property to the south has been increased. The building is much more conforming architecturally. The trash enclosure has been relocated to the west end of the parking lot for direct access for the garbage truck. The changes have reduced the footprint and have given more green space and buffer to the property to the south.

Exhibit A-3 was marked. Mr. Ingram explained the front elevation faces Route 206; the side elevation faces the parking lot. The other side of the building has been dressed up so that the property to the south is not staring at a blank wall as had been the case with the initial proposal.

Mr. Ingram reviewed the comments from the 6-28-16 Planning Memo. He said there are three variances described. The first is minimum lot width, which as described in the first hearing, is an existing condition. The second is exceeding the maximum front yard setback. The NJDEP is in the process of determining if the low spot in the front yard is part of the floodplain, so that area cannot be built upon. There is a pipe there that is basically hidden. Mr. Ingram said upon another visit, the pipe had been found, putting the flood elevation at Elevation 71. A permit will be obtained from DEP. He said no issues are anticipated since it is a net fill issue. It is not in any stream buffer. Mr. Ingram said this is one more reason as to why the building cannot be moved any further forward. The last variance is for not providing the minimum FAR. The revised building plan is slightly larger than the previous simply because more interior hallway space is needed now that the building is not a long narrow strip with direct access.

Mr. Ingram said a fourth variance was identified when reconfiguring the building. The gross square footage is now up to 9,200 sf. instead of 8,480 sf. included in the parking schedule. This increase necessitates a parking demand of 37 spaces, where 34 spaces are proposed. Due to the additional hallway space, the revised plan has less area devoted to actual use. The units are actually smaller. He said if the parking was adequate before, it should be adequate now. The Applicant would prefer to ask for the waiver to address this but there is an option to reduce the parking stall width to 9 ft. which would allow for the extra 3 stalls.

Mr. Ingram said they tried to reduce the design waivers as much as possible. He said he agrees all those identified in the report are required. The landscaping has been improved, as was the architectural standards.

Mr. Ingram discussed the lighting. He said LED lighting is proposed but can be switched to metal alloy if preferred.

Mr. White said the difference has more to do with color. LED light is no longer just stark bright white light. Mr. White said the light should be more of a yellowish light.

Mr. Ingram said the manufacturer can address that and provide that type of lighting. He said LED lighting is preferred.

Mr. Maski said that would be acceptable.

Mr. Ingram said as previously stated, the Applicant would not be able to comply with the driveway width due to the narrow lot width.

Mr. Ingram said a detail was provided for signage. The free standing sign was not to scale but was dimensioned. Additional signage has not been provided simply because it is unknown at this time who the tenants will be. He said they will agree to

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

comply with the standards.

Mr. Maski said the lack of a sign plan is acceptable as long as the Applicant agrees that the signs will comply with the ordinance. If a sign is proposed that does not comply with the ordinance, it would require review by the Sign Review Committee.

Mr. Ingram said they have no objection.

Mr. Ingram discussed the comments from the July 6<sup>th</sup> Engineering Memo. He said cross-access will be provided but it will have to be more of a note than a dedicated area since it is unknown at this time how the neighboring lots will be developed. He said the right-of-way dedication is now shown on the plans. There is no objection to providing additional screening for the parking lot.

Mayor DelCore asked if there had been any discussion with the neighbor regarding the screening.

Mr. Ingram said they had not approached the neighbor. The screening in this instance is from the roadway. The building covers most of that. The northern side of the parking lot has a basin adjacent to it. He said a fence could be added, as preferred.

Mr. White said there are a couple of trees between the basin and the parking lot. He suggested filling it in with some evergreen material to make it like a living wall.

Mr. Ingram said that would be acceptable. Sight distance will be determined by NJDOT. NJDOT will determine where the driveway will be located. Ground-mount signage will be clear of the sight triangle.

Mr. Ingram said there is no loading area proposed due to the type of use envisioned. He said the trash enclosure now has direct access to the rear of the parking lot as opposed to a striped area where the can will need to be taken out. A front-load truck will have the ability to pick up the can and put it back down in place. As previously reviewed, a contribution to the sidewalk fund will be made. He said there is no objection to item #9.

Mr. Ingram said additional information can be provided as to the anchoring of the wall, as necessary. The Applicant will comply with items #2 and #3. The Applicant will also comply with everything noted under stormwater, with the exception of two items.

Mr. Ingram said the request at the last meeting was to analyze what the off-site drainage was to the property and beyond, with concerns to the property to the south. Mr. Ingram said their report showed a reduction. There were questions as to the capacity of the system in the State highway. He said there is an existing 12 in. pipe they are not proposing to connect to. Mr. Ingram said the pipes proposed are 18 in. They can be analyzed for capacity but he said in the end, they are bound by the downstream pipes by the DOT. Mr. Ingram stated if their pipes are found to be constricting, they will upsize. Regardless, after that, if there is a downstream constriction, the water will back up and flow in the exact same manner as it is flowing now if there is a back-up in the DOT system. That system discharges at one property to the south at the stream which is at the south end of the neighboring property. Mr. Ingram said whether that water enters across the front or into the stream; in either event, it will not do anything detrimentally to the neighbor because it is the same amount of water or less heading to his property.

Mr. White asked what the flow pattern is.

Mr. Ingram said some of the water goes across the front and into the inlets out in the street. There is a break where it will come and go into that low ravine. He said one of the problems is that the pipe the neighbor has was buried, the other is that it is only 12 in. pipe. That pipe was constructed by the neighbor on his property to attempt to mitigate his flooding issue.

Mr. White asked what is being proposed as part of the drainage improvements for this site.

Mr. Ingram said they will be taking all of that water and piping it to the State system which will take it down to the culvert rather than trying to put it in the hole that is upstream of the neighbor's driveway. Mr. Ingram said they cannot say they will be solving the flooding problems of the neighbor. He said the water will still reach the stream, but it will now be taken across the driveway. This should be a vast improvement for the neighbor's flooding issues.

Mr. Ingram addressed the roof leaders from the building to the basin. He said that scenario simply causes more problems than it solves by overwhelming the basin in smaller storms. The proposal is to take it down stream of the basin so that the water is not going over land. The calculations show that will help the basin function better.

Mr. White asked if the leaders would be discharging to the neighbor's property to the south.

Mr. Ingram said only the rear leaders are, but considering they will be cutting everything else off, it will be a drastic reduction in runoff to the neighbor.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

Mayor DelCore asked if there was any other option for the leaders to flow to.

Mr. Ingram said based on the existing steep drop-off of the property; there is no feasible way of picking the leaders up. The Applicant's property was at 17% impervious with all of that runoff flowing to the neighbor's property. Now there will only be 3 or 4% impervious heading to the neighbor. The rest of the runoff will be cut off and sent to the street. The reduction of what that depression is going to see is even more pronounced. In the 100-year storm, the elevation is at 71 ft., which is only 2 ft. lower than the neighbor's driveway. That is going to be a giant bowl of water in larger storms, no matter what. None of that has anything to do with the Applicant's property. Mr. Ingram said other than that mentioned, they will comply with all other comments.

Mr. Ingram reviewed the outside agency approvals. He said they have approval from the SCPB. They have applications in with the SUSCD, NJDEP, NJDOT, and requested a waiver from the DRCC. The issue with the firetruck turn-around was previously discussed.

Mr. Julian asked if the site improvements will still be within 10 ft. of the wetlands buffer for the revised plan.

Mr. Ingram said they are within 10 ft. but the amount of work being done in that area has been reduced. The parking lot has been pulled back from that area. The trash enclosure is now all that is left within that distance.

Mr. Julian said the buffer would need to be strictly complied with during construction.

Mr. Ingram said the area will be staked and a silt-fence will be provided upstream of where that is to make sure the area is protected.

Mr. Julian asked about the outside agency reviews. He asked if there was any change to the impervious coverage with the new design.

Mr. Ingram said the site is at 17.2% existing, 24.2% proposed, which is essentially the same as previously proposed.

Mr. Julian asked for more detail on the permit filed for the depression area.

Mr. Ingram stated it is a flood hazard permit that is needed because the water backs up. He stated an area was cut off when the neighbor constructed the driveway and elevated it. There is a buried pipe there that was not identified before being the area is overgrown. That pipe provides a link to the two sides, although it does not function very well at this point. The driveway entrance to the Applicant's site barely encroaches on Elevation 71. Mr. Ingram said a fill permit is required to balance out the fill volumes between what has to be filled for the driveway and what has to be compensated to provide that flood volume back for net equality, pre and post-construction. Mr. Ingram said they are moving dirt on the site, taking it out of one floodplain and adding it to another part of the driveway. It will be a "net 0" change to the floodplain. He said that is all NJDEP will be verifying. The area of the driveway encroaching on the floodplain is only 10 – 15 ft.

Mr. Julian suggested planting vegetation in that area that may help soak up the water, like a bio-swale.

Mr. Ingram said they had no problem doing further plantings in the areas they are disturbing.

Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli asked if there are any issues with the grading of that area.

Mr. Ingram said there was not.

Mr. Conard asked what would be used for screening on the south side of property.

Mr. Ingram said the building is 15.4 ft. from the property line. Some of the larger trees are now being able to remain due to the redesign of the parking lot. Some of the trees along the property line will remain, reducing the amount of compensation for the project. He said because the building was dressed up, nothing else had been proposed for that 15 ft. area in between. A shrub is now being proposed for the area to the west. Some trees will be provided for additional screening beyond the parking lot. Mr. Ingram said the majority of the rest of the land is either treed and will not be removed, or maintained lawn area.

Mr. Conard said he is concerned with the view for the property to the south.

Mr. Ingram stated there will be a row of shrubs and some inter-mixed trees which will separate the neighbor's view from the parking lot. There are also some shrubs and trees in the back along the base of the building.

Mr. Julian asked if they will still be replacing 42 trees.

Mr. Ingram said they will, and are now able to accommodate them because the parking lot shrank.

Mr. Julian pointed out some will be in the buffer zone, which was acceptable.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

Mr. Ingram said the additional plantings should help restore it to its natural state.

Acting Chairman asked if the lights from the headlights will be sufficiently screened from the south.

Mr. Ingram replied they would.

Mr. Peason asked about the comment from the Maser report regarding ADA compliance with the sidewalk.

Mr. Ingram said a few more spot grades will be added to further comply.

Open to the Public.

No questions.

Close public.

Mr. Bernstein clarified public questions are closed to this witness but that the public may comment at the appropriate time on the application, prior to any action being taken by the Board.

Mayor DelCore asked Board Engineer, Mr. White, if he was comfortable with the drainage plan.

Mr. White said he was. He said his questions asked were to have it demonstrated for the benefit of the record.

A comment was made that that area is in need of work by the NJDOT.

Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli said the two-story building, redesign of the parking, and additional screening more closely follows the requests of the Board. Board members agreed.

Mr. Maski summarized the request: variances are requested for minimum lot width, maximum front yard setback; minimum FAR; parking variance; several waivers as noted in the original Planning review; LED exterior lighting; waiver from having interconnected parking areas; driveway and side yard; parking stall size waiver; and parking aisle waiver.

Mr. Bernstein noted there is also the variance of providing 3 less parking spaces than required due to the increase in square footage of the building. Mr. Bernstein asked Mr. Ingram to provide a brief summary of the options.

Mr. Ingram said the alternatives are either to allow a 3 stall deficiency OR to reduce the parking stall width to 9 ft., which is generally an acceptable industry standard, allowing 1 extra stall in each of the 3 parking sections, for a total of 37 spaces. The proposal is for two stories of 4,600 sf. each, totaling 9,200 sf. The previous proposal was for 8,480 sf. but was exclusively for office space. The estimated usable space for the 2-story revised building is only 7,800 sf. once the hallways, stairways, and elevators are deducted.

Mr. Ingram said the new plan shows a variance but likely has less of a demand on parking due to the reduction in usable office space. The ordinance bases the number of parking spaces on the gross floor area. There would be 2 fewer spaces required if the parking was based on usable floor area.

Mayor DelCore asked Mr. Maski if he had a preference.

Mr. Maski commented that 9 ft. spaces are acceptable but 10 ft. spaces are preferred. The option of having 34 spaces is preferred for this use.

Mr. White said he concurred.

Deputy Mayor Suraci asked if the fire hydrant will be on-site.

Mr. Ingram said he believed the request was to first see where one is located. If not sufficient, they would be required to bring one to the property. Mr. Ingram said the Applicant would comply.

Deputy Mayor Suraci asked if the fire hydrant would be private.  
Mr. Ingram said it would.

Open to the Public.

No comments/questions.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES**  
**July 07, 2016**

Close public.

A motion to approve was made by Mr. Julian.

Mr. Bernstein added approval is with the 4 variances and all waivers, and in compliance with all reports and comments of the Township professionals to the extent mentioned on the record, and approval by same.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Conard.

**Roll Call:** Mr. Peason – yes; Mr. Julian – yes; Mr. Conard – yes; Mr. Wagner – yes; Ms. Becorena – yes; Deputy Mayor Suraci – yes; Mayor DelCore – yes; Acting Chairman Dr. Marulli – yes. Motion carries.

Mr. Bernstein mentioned the agenda items schedule to the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. All were in favor, none opposed. Motion carries.

The meeting adjourned at 8:37 p.m.

*Submitted by:  
Debora Padgett  
Administrative Assistant / Planning Board Clerk*

Approved