

The following are my personal notes, not official meeting minutes. For official minutes, please go to the Delanco Municipal Building, 770 Coopertown Rd.

Delanco Township Committee meeting on November 29, 2016

Present: Browne, Templeton, Jass, Dillenbeck, Fitzpatrick

Also Present: Mrs. Taylor, Township Planner; Mr. Noll, Township Engineer; Mrs. Lohr, Municipal Clerk; Mr. Heinold, Township Solicitor

Others:

REDEVELOPMENT CONSISTENCY REVIEW – Stanker and Galetto Project, 1000 Coopertown Road

(Preliminary Approval on Entire Project and Final Approval as to Phase I Only)

Fitzpatrick: We received from Nov. 16 a letter from Taylor Design requesting additional info. We received some information from the applicant.

Heinold: Procedurally coming to us for review. Michelle's (Taylor) and Chris's (Noll) letter designate points of discussion.

Michelle Taylor:

-Nov. 23 correspondence – second part is redevelopment plan. Have received preliminary architectural plans – no parking specs. Have to assume it is consistent with that.

-Last item that is important 3C - When we wrote the plan with the applicant, yards are restricted to allow only what is permitted in front yards. Water tower would need to be made as an expectation. The way it has been written is as a C variance or redevelopment plan would need to be amended.

Heinold: When the fire happened at Dietz, one of the first conversations was the accommodation of a water tank. It makes sense for this site. Question becomes where. What I would suggest is that this process is such ... coming to us and then going to JLUB and we receive the plan again with their recommendations. Not sure if water tower has to go in the front yard on Coopertown Rd or if there is some alternate. Not sure if you want to work through that board.

Tedesco (lawyer for Stanker and Geletto): Not following the front yard concern. Tank is 220 feet – not in front yard.

Heinold: It's not in the setback, but it is in the front yard. Redevelopment agreement lists what would be permitted. We clearly need to resolve it. You need a water tank.

Templeton: What is the purpose of a water tank?

Fitzpatrick: Fire suppression.

Templeton: Is the local water system that deficient that you need one? Should everyone have one?

Bronwe: Water tower (missed it)

35 feet high

Malinowski (Board of Stanker and Geletto) – professional engineer, officer in the company, business and engineering background.

Tedesco: How long have you been in the business?

Molinowski :35-38 years.

Tedesco: Have you had occasion to be involved in a design like this?

Malinowski: Yes.

Tedesco: Can you advise the board on the reason for the water tower?

Malinowski: Fluctuations – densities of the storage here. Want to make sure there is enough capacity. Possible that tower isn't needed. Don't have all the information yet – work in progress. Safe bet. That location is the only one that would work. Erring on the safe side to have capacity of water. May only be needed for parts. That is the maximum size of gallons that would be required. Two engineers looked at it – one believes there is enough flow; the other recommends a tower.

Jass: How many gallons?

Malinowski: 500,000 gallons. Sophisticated design.

Jass: You stated it is for the first phase.

Malinowski: For highest possible storage.

Tedesco: This isn't just for RLS. It is to service entire project.

Malinowski: Setbacks make location of it in the back difficult. Conservation easement there.

Dillenbeck: History shows problem with Dietz was lack of a water line. We have a new one now. I think it is good to have a water tank. I know people say it is unsightly in the front but you are closest to the water source there. I applaud the fact that you are putting it in. I don't think you are ever going to need it. 500,000 gallons is overkill.

Malinowski: Without complete design for the systems, we don't know. Could be something smaller.

Jass: Looking to the future of what is around it. Homes could be built.

Templeton: There are already homes across the street.

Jass: Water doesn't diminish if you ran a line for the water in the back.

Templeton: You don't have (missed it)

Malinowski: Height and most concentration – first and second phase and possibly five. We have talked to two engineers.

Templeton: Water lines around full property. No coverage on the other end at all vs. fire suppression.

Dillenbeck: Fire hydrant on the street. One was on the property itself on Enterprise Drive and suppression rendered by the tank, shouldn't be a problem.

Tedesco: 50 foot wide conservation. Three or four foot berm – mature plantings. Can barely see through.

Jass: Water pressure – most would be at the first building. How would it benefit everyone else?

Dillenbeck: It would only used if fire suppression system was disabled.

Malinowski: pump and pressure system from the town. One engineer says we don't need it.

Dillenbeck: System would be charged 60-90 pounds.

Templeton: Does pump have its own power source?

Malinowski: Will have to go through DCA and be submitted to building department for approval.

Heinold: In order for water tank to be where it is proposed, it will need a variance. I would recommend further conversation with engineer. We are doing consistency review here tonight.

Tedesco: Unless this board deems it consistent.

Heinold: If JLUB reviews...we should hear from them. Michelle should relay the questions, but we are doing a consistency review now. If the Board denies the request, their recommendation comes back to us.

Fitzpatrick: Bill has interjected the info that qualifies the purpose of it. He knows more about this than most members of our board. Michelle should be able to direct us as to why it would have to go to JLUB. There is a berm and vegetation to block the view. We want a building there that doesn't have a disaster. We recommended a water tower. It should be OK at this level. If it goes back to them, it's coming back to us and we will approve

Browne: I'm with the mayor. Residents want fire safety. Redevelopment agreement allows us to relax regulations.

Templeton: It's not a free pass.

Heinold: We can't say this is consistent.

Tedesco: Can't find the objection in the code.

Taylor: (Read from the township code) Building line is the line of the building.

Tedesco: If we had known about it, we would have dealt with it.

Heinold: 3-4 committee members have indicated their views which Michelle can take to the board.

Tedesco: Haven't had a chance to review what I received from Noll.

Noll: Water tower – assumed you would be submitting calculations justifying size of tower for review.

Tedesco: Building permit. Part of the challenge...showing five phases of construction – 3 more phases. They broke out parking in those phases because they don't know the use. One of the things I'm hoping you are going to do tonight so we don't get into a long discussion with JLUB about parking. 4 for 1000 of office 1 per 10000 manufacturing, 1 per 5000 of warehousing. The only phases we are sure of are 1400 office total 80000 sq feet of warehouse. 420 parking spaces available on site. If all was manufacturing and we know it won't be, we are short two spaces. Development of this property requires flexibility to do it that way. 139 spaces included in phase 1 and 2 development. 112 parking spaces available + (lost the number here). Considerable amount of thought has gone into this. We just don't know what will be there. We would love to because then we would have tenants. Don't want to be in a debate with Land Use Board. Thought this committee would bless what they wanted to and those items would be off the table for JLUB.

Heinold: Number 5 on Noll letter. 423 parking spaces provided.

Tedesco: We believe parking is sufficient.

Noll: If phasing changes, there may not be enough parking at the end, but they can adjust. Phasing numbers aren't necessarily sequential.

Heinold: You are providing an additional bank of parking if needed.

Tedesco: Yes.

Noll: On the tank, is absolutely not the answer on providing the size of the tank. 35 feet high with 500,000 gallons – 50 ft diameter.

- Almost 60 at 30 feet high.

Noll: Just need to know the scope.

Taylor: There was no parking issue – appears to be sufficient.

Fitzpatrick: Doug, we can't deal with the tank tonight.

Heinold: Michelle will relay concerns to the board and it will come back to the committee.

Taylor: Easier to go back to JLUB.

Tesdesco: Noted that there were matters being relayed to JLUB. May I know specifically what they are?

Heinold: You will get a letter from Michelle and JLUB.

Taylor: JLUB is the body for design standards. You will have by Friday.

Templeton: How much will planning board deal with this?

Taylor: Site plan. Most correspondence was lighting and landscaping. Engineer's letter with storm water will be similar.

Templeton: Lighting spec in here. Looking at GE lights specified – not dark skies. Now LED lighting as per GE was designed for auto dealerships due to extreme brightness.

Taylor: Talked about that. JLUB will be dealing with that. Will be sure Mr. Dougherty looks at that.

Templeton: I want to be sure that things don't get approved because it was said that no one brought it up. I would like something appropriate for the site. Shouldn't look like the Starship Enterprise could land there.

Jass: We have an ordinance regarding lighting.

Taylor: JLUB members have already commented.

Templeton: Concerned about residences across the street from Delanco.

Browne: Dark skies not in the ordinance.

Fitzpatrick: Our ordinance covers what needs to be covered.

Taylor: 91-8 details. JLUB will be determining that. They are the appropriate people to deal with that.

Templeton: Agree

Browne: Came to do a consistency review. Mike is arguing issues that should go to JLUB. What are we doing here is consistency review..

Heinold: Before they go to JLUB, they are here for consistency review with redevelopment plan. Other than water tower, no other large issues. If something is inconsistent, let's highlight. I would suggest highlighting water tower. Anything else, Michelle?

Taylor: Design standards to JLUB – technical issues.

Heinold: Stormwater management referred to board?

Noll: Yes (mentioned specific areas of the agreement noted in his letter.) Comments for the applicant so they will have them when they go to the JLUB. Comment about sewer square footage – sewer fees may be adjusted.

Dillenbeck: Has to be predicated on the build out.

Heinold: We need to have a conversation about that. Issues with Fair Share Contribution.

Tesdesco: Not an issue for site plan.

Noll: Short one tree in the basin in the plan.

Browne: Phases – when did this come about? Is that written in stone?

Tesdesco: Phases 1, 2 are RLS. 5 reserved for RLS. 3 and 4 Stanker and Galetto sign on the building. We have 150,000 sq ft. (pointed to a diagram I couldn't see so it

was hard to follow this part. He didn't use the microphone.) Phases of construction aren't units in the building.

Dillenbeck: If all goes really well and you need more space and building, then what?

Tesdesco: Don't see a place to put anything else.

Heinold: Thought tonight was final phase 1 – preliminary on whole project.

Tesdesco: No – 1, 2,3

Heinold: How are we going to know what is going in there?

Tesdesco: This is a fairly common practice . Asking for final approval on phases1, 2, 3

Taylor: Phase 3 as 150,000. We have it as final on 1, 2, 3. I don't know that I wrote that on the top of the correspondence for this board.

Heinold: Suggest – you have a resolution deeming consistent – final on 1,2,3 preliminary on the rest. Water, grading, utilities, sewer line, design standards outstanding.

Public Comment on this issue: None

Templeton: On outside storage, no permitted outside storage of product or manufacturing

Taylor: Yes

Templeton: RLS has said they use trailers to store materials and product. Is that OK?

Taylor: In loading or parking space. Primary intention is to avoid a yard sale.

Templeton: So storage in trailers is OK.

Taylor: It's not ideal.

Templeton: I noticed on sheet 2 – flood map referenced is for Gloucester County.

Resoution 2106-144 Determining site plan consistent with redevelopment single site plan with certain issues referred to JLUB.

Passed unanimously

Templeton: Voting yes on the legality that it is consistent. Project has a long way to go; it needs a lot of work.

COMMENTS AND REPORTS:

COMMENTS – PROFESSIONALS

Heinold: Final comments on sidewalk so I can get a draft out this week.

CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS

PAYMENT OF BILLS ACCOUNT

GENERAL \$ 35,512.89

P A YROLL 83,877.05

PUBLIC DEFENDER 209.37

ESCROW TRUST 1,068.50

ACCUMULATED ABSENCES 6,221.06
MUNICIPAL OPEN SPACE FUND 206.44

APPROVAL OF DEPARTMENT REPORTS
APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA – Passed unanimously

CORRESPONDENCE

MEETING OPEN TO THE PUBLIC FOR COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS SESSION TWO -
none

COMMENT AND QUESTION SECTION OF THE MEETING CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

Lohr: Calendar for 2017 to be discussed at next meeting. Need to set a date for
Reorganization.

ADJOURNMENT

Submitted by Maureen Barrett