

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Tom Merchel, Township Manager
William Barker, Chairman
Robert Musgnug
Dianne Walker
Melissa Arcaro Burns
Christopher Chesner
Jeffrey Dey
Steve Pazienza
Henry Balikov
David Zipin

STAFF PRESENT:

Nancy Jamanow, Planning Board Secretary
Matthew Wieliczko, Board Attorney
Mackenzi Kelly, Recording Secretary

Mr. Wieliczko stated alternate board member Jeffrey Dey will be voting.

ABSENT: Ryan Vander Wielen

Mr. Barker called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM as a Virtual Meeting by reading the Open Public Meeting Act statement. The Pledge of Allegiance followed a moment of silence. Roll call was listed as above.

Minutes:

October 8, 2020

Mr. Chesner made a motion to approve the October 8, 2020 minutes, seconded by Mr. Zipin. The voice vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with all eligible to vote.

November 5, 2020

Mr. Chesner made a motion to approve the November 5, 2020 minutes, seconded by Mr. Zipin. The voice vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with all eligible to vote.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS

2021-04A Amending Resolution 2021-04A to change the hourly rate from \$25 to \$30 for Planning Board Recording Secretary. Mr. Musgnug made a motion to approve Resolution 2021-04A. The voice vote of the Board was unanimous in favor

2021-10 Adoption of Planning Board Rules and Regulations

Mr. Chesner made a motion to approve Resolution 2021-10 seconded by Mr. Musgnug. The voice vote of the Board was unanimous in favor.

New Business

PB# 2020-11 Big NJ Portfolio/Bancroft, 101 Executive Drive, Block 500 Lot 2-Minor Site Plan with a bulk variances.

Mr. Wieliczko stated James Burns would represent this application. The applicant, Bancroft is proposing minor site plan with site improvements to the vacant office building located at

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

101 Executive Drive for educational purposes. It is a 29,000 square feet building. There is already existing non-conforming issue in regards to a side yard setback and a parking variance as well as several waivers. The applicant has responded to the ERI letter dated 1/7/2021 as well as the Taylor Design letter dated 1/8/2021

Mr. James Burns is from the Law firm Dembo Brown and Burns, representing the applicant Big NJ Portfolio LP they are seeking Minor site plan approval for the proposed occupancy of a vacant office building for educational purposes and related site improvements. The Bancroft School is the proposed tenant. It will provide special needs education for Ages 3-11 diagnosed with Autism and intellectual disabilities. It will be supporting the Bancroft main campus in Mt. Laurel. It is a permitted use in the BP1 Business Park District. The building will remain as is with the interior being changed for educational purposes. The only change is to exchange blacktop area for a playground and to provide an ADA walkway.

They are requesting a parking variance. They are proposing 112 parking spaces where 118 spaces are required. They can provide the additional 10 more spaces however; they will be in an access easement area. There will be testimony regarding parking. They have provided Responses to the professional letters and they can address all the issues in the letters.

Witnesses:

Dave Gilman, Marathon Engineering

Rick Ricciardi, Professional Planner Marathon Engineering

Denis Morgan Senior Vice President of Children Services Bancroft

Dave Ricci and Tim O'Brien on behalf of the applicant Big NJ LP

David Rudzenski stated John Ruiz and Rick Yost are not available tonight. He is the Principle from R2 Architect, and has his license to practice in NJ.

Mr. Burns stated the main testimony would be from Mr. Gilman, Mr. Morgan and Mr. Ricarrdi.

Board Professionals:

Chris Noll ERI Engineer

Michelle Taylor Planner

Dennis Morgan from 500 Regada Dr. Philadelphia, PA. 19146, SVP of Children Services for Bancroft for eleven years. Mr. Morgan gave a brief background of Bancroft, which serves PA, DE, and NJ providing services to children and adults intellectual with disabilities, brain injuries and special needs. The preschool and early education program is currently located in located in Cherry Hill, which serves 40 children from ages 3-11. Bancroft is NJ approved private school and preforms under all requirements under NJ regulations under special education. It is a regional school. Each child is give their own educational plan and goals to achieve independence and success. The majority of the program is designed for one on one instruction. The ages will be 3 through 11 with Autism and intellectual disabilities.

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

There will be nursing onsite, practitioners and Therapists. There will be 50-55 personnel. There will be 8 classrooms each with 8 students. The Employee hours will be from 8-3pm. The students will disband the buses at 8:45am and be picked up at 2:45pm. All transportation falls on the onus of the sending school district. They typically use smaller buses, small vans, however they have one big bus. Unusual circumstances when family picks their child up. There are 112 parking spaces proposed, every day need assuming all employees show up every day 50-60 spots and a few for visitors, or parent meetings. There are some special events such as graduation, Halloween parade during the day. In the evening, they may have back to school night, open house, or a spring show. He stated parking for these special events not to exceed 90-95, maybe 100 parking spots. They provide a food program, breakfast and lunch Monday through Friday for all children. The food is at the flagship school program located in Mt laurel. There is space for a cafeteria as well as a multipurpose area. The vehicles used for deliveries will be 15 passenger vans equipped with heating or cooling elements. They will have general supply deliveries from WB Mason, UPS, FedEx and Amazon which are box truck deliveries. They use Waste management with pickups 3 days a week, scheduled during low traffic times between 9am-2pm.

Mr. Wieliczko inquired if the applicant will provide an operations plan to memorialize his part of the testimony. He agreed to provide one.

The play area will be on the backside of the building. They will fence in about 5000 sqft of space. It will be rubber top surface, with sensory oriented equipment. Bancroft uses a thrash bar type of fence, door alarms and cameras. They will have a vestibule that will take a snap shot of a license to check a database for history of illegal activity. They have emergency alarms for lockdowns or evacuation, it is a secured environment.

The applicant agrees to give Moorestown police access to security related incident reports generated at the property. They look forward to developing a great relationship with first responders in Moorestown. He stated there is a profound need for this type of school. He stated that 1 in 52 children around the age of 8 in the US is diagnosed with autism. In NJ it is 1 in 32.

Mr. Wieliczko inquired if the applicant agrees with the conditions to design the playground in safety subcode with N.J and designed by a professional. He also inquired if they will provide plans to the professionals. They will provide their plan Mrs. Taylor and Mr. Noll. They have no objections.

Board Questions: None

Dave Doman, from Marathon Engineering has been a Professional Engineer in NJ for over 50 years and practiced site development for over 20 years. He was accepted as an expert witness.

Mr. Doman provided an overview of the existing conditions. It is a vacant office building. The proposed condition will be educational use. Main site improvements will be the outdoor

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

play area. It will be enclosed by fence; bollards will be provided along the fence. There will also be a new door, by the drop off zone.

Exhibit A1

Shows the back corner of the building where the play area will be, new door and drive aisle as well as a new ADA accessible entrance door.

Exhibit A2

Shows the existing conditions.

They are taking an existing building taking out existing blacktop for a playground. After discussion with the board professionals, they are keeping 2 ADA spaces up by front entrance and are putting three new ones to the left of them.

The surface of the blacktop on the existing ADA spots has alligator cracking, the professionals recommended taking the top surface off and providing a new top course to make is smooth for the ADA paring. The will be providing landscaping to fill in some gaps. Mrs. Taylor recommended putting in a few shrubs on the short side of the building where there is no landscaping. They have agreed to do so.

Mr. Wieliczko stated Marathon's letter dated 7/18/2020 gave a response to the ERI letter dated 1/7/2021. Mr. Doman stated on Pg. 2 of their response letter, they were going to provide a light report, however their contractor has given them information on the existing lights onsite. They may switch out some light fixtures. The applicant has agreed to submit site lighting plan noting existing conditions and agreed to resolve any issues in agreement with the board's professionals. They have agreed to update any newly mounted light fixtures, timers, motion sensors etc. on the plan. Mr. Wieliczko stated after the board professionals review the site light plan and have suggestions for timers, motion sensors or turning lights down at a specific time as a condition. The applicant has agreed.

Mr. Barker inquired about the lighting behind the building. Mr. Doman stated there are trees and vegetative buffers. It is an all-industrial area with no residential buildings.

Exhibit A3

This shows the site photo exhibit of existing site lighting in the rear. Mr. Doman stated hey will provided extra details for the ADA parking. They have agreed to all recommended conditions of approval.

Taylor Design Group letter
Response letter dated 1/8/2021.

Mr. Wieliczko stated the only concern is the installation of the masonry dumpster. The concern the applicant has is their experiences with damage to these structures.

Mr. Doman stated now there is a concrete slab there. The applicant has proposed to put a privacy fence around there area. They have experienced in the past with graffiti or

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

repairing the structure. They are asking for a waiver to propose a fence enclosure instead. Mr. Doman stated it is well hidden in the back of the building and not easily visible. They feel a PVC slatted fence will be a sufficient screen from the neighbors. Mr. Wieliczko stated they have withdrawn 3 landscape waivers.

1. E7 Foundation

2. E2 on page four regarding screening shrub masses along Executive and Lancer Dr. Mr. Doman stated they do want to request those two waivers proposed improvements are behind the building and any additional landscape would not screen anything new with the building.

They are also requesting environmental landscaping waivers.

Mr. Burns stated they also are complying with the letter dated 9/8/2020 by the Fire Official. Michelle Taylor stated under E7 the comment was directed to three crepe myrtle trees, which are very small. Mrs. Taylor wants the applicant and board to be aware, that her concern is if they put a barrier this would prohibit kids from running into the next yard which is a loading area. She stated that was up to them.

E2 primarily for the board they think it is lacking, it has been well maintain. There is a significant slope and they did not think anything was required along the frontages.

Rick Riccardi from Marathon Engineering is a Licensed Professional Planner in NJ. Mr. Burns stated they are seeking a parking variance for the number of spaces. They are providing 112 spaces, where 118 spaces are required for a commercial use; not an education use. The educational requirement has not been defined for this zone.

Mr. Riccardi stated CH180-73h the ordinance requires 118 spaces with 5 handicapped spaces. This was decided under the SRI zone. Currently there are 123 spaces with 6 handicapped spaces also 10 spaces within in the access easement. These 10 spaces have always been part of the property; the total now is 132 spaces. They are taking out 11 spaces plus the 10 spaces in the easement area, leaving them with 122 spaces. On a day to day basis they anticipate 55-60 employees and possibly some guests. On special events, they anticipate up to 100 guests. They are below the number of spaces required. Under the negative criteria, there will not be any substantial detriment to the public good. There are no residential uses near the site. The positive proofs under NJSA 40;55d2, shows they conform under Section A, which he cited. This project will promote the general welfare of the residents of NJ. It is a permitted use and is located in a Metropolitan planning area and it also located within a state approved sewer service area. It will not be incompatible with state, county local land use planning. This site provides space to accommodate and education facility for people with special needs. The project promotes the conservation of historic sites and districts, open spaces, energy resources and valuable natural resources within the state to prevent urban sprawl. The project does not have a detrimental impact on the public good.

Mr. Wieliczko wanted to clarify the applicant is proposing to use 112 spaces on site plus 6 ADA spaces and still have use of the 10 additional spaces on the west end.

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

Mr. Burns stated they will be primarily using the 112 spaces, however after discussion with the professionals they are requesting the variance to avoid the need to use the 10 additional spaces and to keep parking more onsite close to the building.

Mr. Wieliczko inquired if the applicant would provide a copy of the ingress/egress easement that includes the additional spaces. Mr. Burns agreed.

Board Professionals:

Michelle Taylor noted it is technical variance based upon how the site is laid out and are adjacent to the building; also based on testimony they think it is a justified variance. It has not been the board's practice using chain link enclosures. She stated if the board agrees she would suggest additional plant material. She would like them to be maintained. She stated there is an overhang over the door. The architect will provide information. Mr. Barker stated it is the rear of the building in the pickup area. Mr. Wieliczko inquired if the architect could provide details of overhang that is acceptable to the board's professional. Mr. Burns stated they have their architect on the phone. Mr. Rudzenski stated there is no issue providing this information.

Mr. Balikov had a question regarding the playground's surface. Mr. Wieliczko stated as a condition of approval that the playground will be installed and designed by professionals and will be in compliance with NJ Playground safety sub codes and NJ Barrier free sub codes and will contain detail of playground surfacing and edge treatment.

Mrs. Taylor stated they would provide details on the handicapped parking to Mr. Noll's and her office.

Mr. Wieliczko stated the applicant has agreed as condition of approval to acceptable improvement to the additional paving and site curbing in the ADA area including a new top coat.

Mr. Doman stated they will be removing top surface of asphalt off and put new on for the 5 new spaces done in a manner that is acceptable to the board's professionals.

Mr. Noll stated they should meet out there to identify the area that is in need of repair. Mr. Doman agreed they could meet onsite.

Mrs. Taylor stated the only other issue the board has to decide is the separation of the bus drop off area and the adjacent industrial loading area.

Mr. Burns stated the applicant routinely addresses the parking lot every two years and will make sure it is kept up to proper conditions.

Mr. Noll went over three checklist waivers:

1. They have provided a grading plan. They are recommending that waiver.
2. Item 4 proof of compliance for soil testing. He stated it is not necessary because of minimal disturbance to the site. They are recommending that waiver.
3. Item 6 LOI site since it is already developed and the limits of development will not be increased. The mapping shows the wetlands are greater than 375 feet from the limits. They are recommending that waiver.

Mr. Noll stated regarding the parking variance, 112 spaces. He suggests going down to 111-110 because they will lose one space from the new ADA layout.

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

He stated the applicant has proposed water usage is 10 gallons per day per employee and student. He asked them to provide that in writing to send to the utility department. They agreed.

Mr. Wieliczko, stated the setback issue is an existing non-conforming issue; it is not a variance that is necessary. It was stated in the review letters for the board. Mr. Wieliczko inquired about their position on the trash enclosure position and providing Green bushes on that curve.

Mr. Ricci stated his concern regarding the bushes is that it would block visibility on Lancer Dr. for vehicles pulling out. He stated their experience with the concrete enclosure is they get hit by the trash trucks and they do not look good. He would agree to some type of fencing with landscaping around it. It is not a cost issue.

Board Questions:

Dianne Walker does Bancroft run throughout the year. Dennis Morgan stated they do run a 180-day school year in addition to an extended school year from the day after 7/4 to the middle of August. She feels it would be hot for kids, and inquired if there is any consideration of putting shade over the playground. They love the site because they are close to Mt. Laurel, which has an indoor play area and a pool, the children can take advantage of those resources. They have designed some playgrounds at Bancroft with canopies however; they have discussed it regarding this property. Their concern with putting trees in that area is a cleanup issue and a potential issue with cleanliness. They are more inclined to put a canopy up which provides more screening and cover.

Mrs. Walker inquired about how the egress/ingress of the access road operates. Mrs. Jamanow stated it is a one way and exits off Lancer. She stated since all ADA spots are in the front of the building will that be a problem. Mr. Doman stated there would be an Ada accessible route for any drop-offs. Mr. Barker inquired if there are exit doors to the playground from the parking area. Mr. Morgan stated there is a plan to have a doublewide gate with a crash bar, which they would need per DOT requirements. Mr. Barker stated isn't a chain link fence just as likely to be hit by a fence than a solid one. Mr. Ricci stated it is, but it is much easier to be repaired. Mr. Ricci feels the fence is safer.

Mrs. Taylor stated there were two areas used for a dumpster over two parking spaces with a concrete pad. The dumpster location was moved to the parking area. If you delineate an area and protect it, it is more reliable. She stated if you do not repair a fence, it will start decay. It has been the board's practice to require masonry enclosures. Mr. Barker defers to the professionals on this one.

Public Comments: None

Mr. Wieliczko stated the summary of the application. The parking variance is under the commercial use, which requires 115. Testimony given shows this will be an educational use and they need 110-111 and with the 10 additional spaces give them up to 122. The applicant has no issues with the variance given it is a technical one. They agreed to give the ingress and egress easement. The applicant has agreed to all conditions of approval

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

and recommendations in the professional letters as well as working with them. They agreed to the Fire Official's letter.

Conditions:

1. Agree to develop the Educational Facility under NJ DOE requirements.
2. They will provide an acceptable site lighting plan.
3. They will provide written operation plan.
4. They will provide the playground design that is acceptable to the board's professionals as well as state requirements.
5. Agree to provide improvements to the existing pavement and meet with professionals onsite to address the alligator cracking and other concerns.
6. Agree that the new ADA spaces comply with all ADA regulations, update all site plans, and identify ADA parking spaces.
7. Agree to update the architectural plans to be consistent with the updated engineering site plans. Mr. Dambo stated that has already been done.
8. They have also agreed to the conditions in the review letter regarding the stairs, fencing, and railing in the location of the new drop off area.
9. Agree to provide additional landscaping at the building wall facing the shared accessible drive.
10. Agree to provide details for the overhang over the door.
11. Mr. Wieliczko stated in regards to the trash enclosure, being it is not unique requirement and it is consistent with prior applications, as well as the additional plantings in the curved area be included in the motion. The applicant asked that the additional landscaping not be required.

Mr. Merchel made a motion to approve the application, without the additional plantings, however with the stated conditions, seconded by Mrs. Arcaro Burns. All eligible board members voted yes with Mr. Balikov abstaining.

New Business

Public Hearing for the Preliminary Investigation of Block 3000 Lots 2, 3, 3.01, 3.02 & 5 to determine if the property is an Area in Need of Redevelopment. (Moorestown Mall) – Michelle Taylor, PP, AICP, Taylor Design

Mr. Barker stated the Council requested Planning Board make a recommendation.

Mr. Merchel recused himself due to tax appeals

Mr. Wieliczko gave a summary stating this resolution is from 10/2020 was referred to the Planning Board by Council. It is the first step to determine if the property meets criteria to determine if it is an area in need of redevelopment. If the board determines that it does meet one or more of the criteria, Town Council will adopt a resolution and it will come back to the Planning Board.

Mrs. Taylor stated you should have a report dated 11/24/2020, revised and or adopted on 12/3/2020. She stated the revision and adopted date would change due to this hearing.

Mrs. Taylor gave a presentation regarding Block 3000 Lots 2, 3, 3.01, 3.02 & 5 to

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

determine if the property is an Area in Need of Redevelopment. She stated based on NJ40A-12A5 criteria b,d and h qualifies this parcel as an area in need of redevelopment. The Planning Board agreed.

Board Comment:

Mr. Barker stated the board needs to focus on is this an area in need of redevelopment, as the Mall is in distress. Mr. Barker supports Mrs. Taylor that this area is in need of redevelopment based on the b, d, and h criteria. Mr. Musgnug stated his concern has to do with Preit already announcing they have sold 4 acres and to build housing. Mrs. Taylor stated that it is in the report, they are at stage 3 and council has to determine it is consistent with what the board determines. Then there is this redevelopment phase and it will come back to the board for evaluation and then have public hearings, etc. Then they would have to come back the board again for and site plan approvals.

Mr. Wielczko stated tonight is not for site plan approval, the board is only acting on the formal referral to the planning board to make a determination if this is an area of redevelopment. There are many more steps in this process. This will go back to council, and they will take the next step with the redevelopment agreement and will come back to the Planning Board again and back to council. He stated Mr. Bernard's report dated on 12/19/2020, it has been posted on the township site. His report addresses the criteria b, d and h criteria. Mrs. Taylor agrees with his report.

Mr. Barker and Mr. Chesner agree with b, d, and h criteria as well.

Public Comment: None

Mrs. Arcaro Burns made a motion recommending (Moorestown Mall), is determined to be an area of redevelopment pursuant to NJSA 40A-12A-5 sub sections b, d, and h, seconded by Mr. Musgnug. The voice vote of the Board was unanimous in favor with Mr. Merchel abstaining.

New Business

PB#2020-08 Reconstructive Orthopedics / Miles Technology Building/ 300 Route 38, Block 3201, Lot 7 discussion of submitted Sketch/Conceptual Site Plan.

Mr. Wielczko stated there is a provision in the ordinance that allows an applicant to submit proposed site plans or proposals and have them reviewed for comment. This is not a formal application; there will be no votes this evening. He stated it is important not to make any predeterminations. The board can probe and ask questions about the applications. This is a courtesy review and comment.

Mr. McAndrew stated this is informal they are looking for guidance from the board.

Witnesses:

Joe Desilva; Client Representative

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

Rick Ragan; Professional Planner
Rod Ritchie; from Taylor Wiseman and Taylor
Nathan Mosley; Traffic Engineer
Dan Nichols; Architect

Professionals:

Chris Noll; Board Engineer
Michelle Taylor; Board Planner
All sworn in together

Mr. Ragan stated the Miles Building has been vacant for a while; they are pleased to bring a new user for that building in Reconstructive Orthopedics.

Joe Desilva is the CEO of Reconstructive Orthopedics. It is a group of orthopedic surgeons and have been in business for 44 years. They provide outpatient care. They have eight locations, one in Moorestown and their administrative office is located in Marlton. They have run out of space where they are now to expand. The street visibility here is desirable. The plan to move their outpatient and physical therapy outpatient care to this facility from their current facility also in Moorestown. They will be closing their Marlton office and they will be going into the second floor of the Miles building. They also want an urgent care portion for muscle skeletal issues. They will have Physical therapy on the second floor. They will be sole tenant they will sub lease to 3000 sq. ft. to Ivy Rehab. They will be leasing the total space.

Exhibit A1

Shows existing building

Mr. Ragan stated they would be talking about the site plan and the relationship with the parking and driveways to that building.

Exhibit A2

This shows the Site Plan

Pleasant Valley Rd. is at the top and Rt 38 to the left. There is a traffic signal at the intersection. The existing driveway comes out to close proximity to the route 38 intersection. The staff recommends the driveway be eliminated because it will become a traffic issue. They are proposing a one-way access road around to the back of the parking lot so they would not have to leave the site once they come to the site. The roadway encroaches on a 100 setback along 38.

They are proposing to put in shrubs along the new driveway, so you cannot see the road. This would allow for complete circulation around the site. This would require a variance, if they were not able to do this the road there is within 100 feet of Pleasant Valley rd. If the road stays, the customers would have to leave the site to come back onto the site. Mr. Desilva stated there is no room to turn around, as a result it would be easier to go out to the road a turn around. If parking you may be able to back out, however the spaces get

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

filled quickly. They are also proposing a new parking lot to the right. It will take them up to six spaces per 1000 feet. This is what the ordinance suggest for medical use. They will add trees as well. They will keep the visual the same along Pleasant Valley. They will upgrade the current parking spaces in the parking lot. They will have a main entrance, an administrative entrance, urgent care entrance, physical therapy and another entrance in the back for the doctors and staff to go up to the second floor. They redoing the loading area and making it a green space for employees to use for lunch. There will be no loading area; everything comes in through services such as FedEx and UPS.

Mr. DeSilva stated Mr. Noll knows the site well and there is a wetlands area there. Mr. Ritchie stated they are proposing new storm drains, one in the new parking lot as well as a new storm drain inlet to collect the storm water runoff from the new parking area and convey it to a small basin. They would probably use some type of a manufactured treatment device to handle water quality. Conceptually, they are proposing a water quality squall along the new one-way drive. They have done test pits there with witnesses from Mr. Noll's office. The seasonal high ground water is very shallow and the soils do not drain well at all. They would not be proposing to recharge ground water.

Nathan Mosley from Shapshire Associates. He stated the existing intersection at Route 38 and Pleasant Valley is DOT. The existing driveway on pleasant valley has two points of access. The access closest to the intersection is more in line with one-way traffic flow. This creates a dead end parking situation. This is why they are looking for an alternative circulation path around the building. The second point of access is located about 250 feet back; they are looking to improve this access. Currently it is one lane in and one lane out. They want to widen it to safely enter and exit the facility. The trip generation count from the site will not change the volumes and will be similar with no significant change. They want to eliminate the one driveway while improving the main driveway to provide safety for vehicles entering and exiting. In the internal circulation, they are proposing to relocate the landscape island in order to maintain the 24 ft wide drive aisle throughout the site.

Mr. McAndrew stated the purpose of the one-way drive is to have an escape from the dead end parking. Mr. Mosley agreed.

Mr. Ritchie inquired if the driveway would be helpful for the fire department. Mr. Mosley stated yes it would provide 360 around the building; however, it would have to be reviewed by the Fire Official.

Chris Chesner inquired if they would have dedicated spots for transport deliveries; per Mr. Desilva yes there are about six spaces. Mr. Ragan agreed.

Exhibit A3

This shows the two proposed elevations and a photograph. Dan Nichols stated the sketches are initial concept sketches of how they would treat the building for its new use. There are three conceptual sketches one with the sunshades and steel columns, one

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

without the sunshades, and the third idea they would keep the sunshades and mount them with perforated metal screen like a mural.

Professionals:

Mr. Noll stated the main issue is the access off Pleasant Valley. He agrees from a traffic and safety perspective with what the applicant has proposed and prefers the loop road. The fire official typically ask for roads around the building, so this will meet the criteria. The wetlands in the southeast corner will need to be addressed for a suitable parking layout. Mr. DeSilvia stated they have the ability to fill that and can move forward with the DEP. Mr. Noll stated the parking lot needs to be repaired.

Mrs. Taylor feels putting the driveway there keeps the site self-contained. She said there are things they can do to the building and landscape that can make it all mesh.

Mr. Wielczko inquired if that road goes in the setback would go from the required 100 to 85 feet. Mr. Ragan agreed.

Board Comment: Chris Chesner inquired if the third rendering was a mural or a structure extending from the building. Per Rick, it is a structure and would create a space between the brick wall and the structure itself. They will probably do some creative lighting behind it. Mr. Chesner's concern was that it may be difficult to access the windows with this kind of building. Mrs. Jamanow stated it is important to contact Matt Orsini about the setback. Mr. Barker agrees with the loop road. He also inquired about the number of handicapped spaces and suggested more handicapped spots. Mr. DeSilvia stated it is something they can look at. Jeff Dey inquired they have evaluated the wetlands need for mitigation. Mr. Ritchie does not believe any mitigation is required with a GP6.

Review of the Zoning Board of Adjustment 2020 Annual Report

Mr. Barker stated the report is dated 11/1/2019 to 10/31/2020 will be sent on to Council and the subcommittee.

Mr. Chesner made a motion, seconded by Mr. Musnug to send it along to council and the subcommittee. The voice vote of the Board was unanimous in favor.

Discussion

1. Update on Subcommittees

Nancy Jamanow stated they will have an update on the brewpub subcommittee for the February meeting.

Public Comment: None

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Barker stated the next meeting is 2/4/2021. A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Zipin and seconded by Mrs. Arcaro Burns. The meeting was adjourned at 10:41 PM.

PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING

Meeting Minutes

January 21, 2021

Next Meeting: 2/4/21 at 7:00 pm