

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

January 8, 2025

The pre-meeting of the Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Mr. David Manders at 6:00 PM in the Second Floor Caucus Room of City Hall.

Members Present:

Michael Pantalone
Sandy Velez
David Catalana
Doug Menz
Robert Odorizzi
Elizabeth Arthur
David Manders

Also present were:

Michael Malinsky, Planning Board Solicitor
Yasmin Perez, Planning Board Secretary
Kathleen Hicks, Supervising Planner
Ryan Headley, Planning Board Planner/Engineer
Elizabeth Jambor, Assistant Planner

PRE-MEETING

Rushin Gandhi Major Subdivision- located on the northerly side of Maple Avenue between N Spring Road and N Brewster Road, Block 2503, Lot 43, Tax Map Sheet #25, Project No. PBA-24-0009. Preliminary major subdivision approval to configure one (1) existing lot into twenty-one (21) lots. Eighteen (15) of the lots would be available for the construction of a single-family dwelling and three (6) lots are proposed for a storm water basin.

Mr. Headley explained the applicant changed one of the house lots to a basin lot. Now there are two additional basins with retaining walls. The overall number of variances either stayed the same or increased by one. In the Planning Report, item 6, the variances are A-QQ, which is somewhere around 40. There are lot area variances, and two of them are the basin lots and corner lots. If you remove lots, some variances can be eliminated except for lot depth. It is not a pre-existing conformity because they have created the lot. They can make it a little wider, and then you meet all the area right and you just have the depth. With respect to the minimum developable lot area, most of those would go away. That all ties into the restrictions that are on the lot. For example, if you have easements, drainage swale or piping that goes through your lot, there is an easement associated with the HOA to maintain it right. The easement area gets subtracted from the total lot area, and that is what we classify as the minimum developable area. In this zone that has to be equal to the lot area that's required, so if the lot area is required 13,500 you need that clear without any environmental restrictions or easements. They could all be removed, if the applicant went down to 5-10 lots. There were some changes to the Planning report and they are in bold. There are a significant amount of waivers under 8 with respect to the basins, items A-JJ. We require our basins to meet the same setbacks as if they were a single family home. Every proposed basin has the same problem. The basins up front are six feet deep, and they are basically property line to property line for that lot. The corner lot basin is also a deeper with a waiver for front yard and side yard. There are a lot of basins. They have a few waivers with respect to shade trees in comment 9. Same thing with deeper basins, we do not like them in the front yards in item 10. They submitted a tree survey and calculated 862 trees on the site with a replacement of 687 trees. The applicant is proposing 364 that includes both the deciduous and the evergreen trees. There is still about less than half of what would be required.

Ohm Property Management– located on the westerly side of Mill Road between W Walnut Road and Elm Road, Block 5401, Lot 4, Tax Map Sheet #54, Project No. PBA-24-00058. Preliminary/final major site plan approval to establish a cannabis cultivation facility within an existing industrial building along with additional site improvements. The Applicant also proposes 1,274 square foot and 1,396 square foot additions to the existing building.

Mr. Headley explained that this is a cannabis cultivation facility. The front is a sea of asphalt, and they proposing to remove an area for re-paving. They are proposing to add landscaping, add stone and re-stripe the parking lot. The rear appears to have an access for trucks including an ill-defined loading area. Staff is requesting for that area to be defined, and for unused pavement to be removed. The applicant is proposing the minimum with regard to the site improvements.

Uriah Child Care Center– located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Chestnut and Holly Hill Terrace, Block 3702, Lot 24, Tax Map Sheet #37, Project No. PBA-24-00063. Minor site plan approval, to construct an outdoor playground area and trash enclosure along with associated site improvements to an existing building.

Mr. Headley explained that this building was most recently used as a staffing business. The new owners are proposing to convert a child care facility. The changes that they are proposing are a playground area and a trash

enclosure. They are not changing the parking layout, but have assigned employee parking spaces and drop off parking spaces. They are also adding bollards. They are eliminating the signage variance. The signage is in the right of way, so they are going to relocate it. Staff would like more information regarding the drop off process and any operation. They indicated that there would be five employees.

FLAG SALUTE

Public notice pursuant to the Open Public Meetings Act was given on December 17, 2024 by posting written notice on the Official Bulletin Board in City Hall, and mailing written notices to the Daily Journal, City Clerk, and the Board members.

RE-ORGANIZATION

Election of Chairman- David Manders

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Abstain

Election of Vice Chairman- Michael Pantalone

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Abstain
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Election of Board Solicitor- Michael Malinsky, Esq.

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Election of Conflict Board Solicitor- Kristopher Facenda, Esq.

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Election of Board Secretary- Yasmin Perez

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Election of Substitute Board Secretary- Alena Broshchan

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes

Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Election of Board Planner/Engineer- Ryan Headley

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Election of Alternate to Sign Plans and Approvals- Ryan Headley

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

MINUTES

Approval of minutes from the December 11, 2024 board meeting.
The Chairman made a motion to approve the minutes.

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Abstain
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

RESOLUTIONS

Approval of resolutions from the December 11, 2024 board meeting.
The Chairman made a motion to approve the resolution.

Resolution #6674

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Abstain
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Resolution #6675

David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Abstain
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

PUBLIC HEARING

Rushin Gandhi Major Subdivision- located on the northerly side of Maple Avenue between N Spring Road and N Brewster Road, Block 2503, Lot 43, Tax Map Sheet #25, Project No. PBA-24-0009. Preliminary major subdivision approval to configure one (1) existing lot into twenty-one (21) lots. Eighteen (15) of the lots would be available for the construction of a single-family dwelling and three (6) lots are proposed for a storm water basin.

The applicant was represented by Steven Yost, Esq. This application is for a final preliminary and final major subdivision approval for 15 buildable lots, with a total of 21 lots. Six of those lots are proposed for storm water basins. The subdivision is located within the R-3 zone, so it is a permitted use for residential homes. They proposed public sanitary sewer to be made available to all the lots, creation of a couple of new streets and cul-de-sacs which will be extended.

Gregory Schneider, Licensed Engineer and Planner, testified on behalf of the applicant. The layout of the subdivision is unique because it has a multiple cul-de sacs. It was dictated by the master plan road map that the city adopted. There are residential developments to the east and west. The master plan was to eventually connect those roads. If the site to the west is developed, additional roads are proposed there. Exhibit A2, photo depicting overall site with the basins and the proposed residential developments. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the lot into 15 family dwellings and six lots for storm water management. He addressed the Planning Report dated January 3, 2025. There are a number of variances associated with this project. They meet the requirements for minimum lot area for all of the buildable lots. The lot area variances are for the basin lots. Those lots are not buildable due to the unique configuration of the subdivision. Those basins are placed there due to drainage patterns. There are a number of lot frontage variances, however a majority of these variances are for drainage. It is the same situation for the lot width variances. The application meets the minimum developable area for all the buildable lots. There are variances for lot depth, because of the way the road is proposed in the middle of the existing lot. The frontage is on Maple Avenue, so it is impossible to get the actual lot depth that is required by ordinance. Their main concern was meeting the requirement for the lot area. They reduced the number of lots from 18 to 15. There are also variances for minimum developable area. The ordinance requires that the minimum developable area be the same as the lot area. The proposed lots do not meet that requirement, mostly because of the telecommunications 10 foot easement from the right of way. There are waivers from Storm water Control standards. The applicant will comply and work with Mr. Headley regarding the basin access drives. Waiver for storm water management basin fencing (split rail fence proposed vs. black vinyl-clad chain link required). The split rail fencing is more visually appealing, but they can comply if there is an issue. There are a number of basin front setback waivers. Vineland treats basin lot setbacks the same as the residential, because of the unique configuration of the site. The basin side setback requirement is 15 feet. He explained that the justification is the same as the other variances. In order to hold all the storm water required on the site, the setbacks for the various the basins have to be smaller than required. Same justification for the basin rear setbacks. There are a number of waivers requested for shade trees. Street shade trees, Maple Avenue (0 trees provided vs. 6 trees required at 1 per 50 feet of frontage). Street shade trees, Proposed Street (34 trees provided vs. 46 trees required at 1 per 50 feet of frontage). Street shade trees, Concetta Lane (5 trees provided vs. 14 trees required at 1 per 50 feet of frontage). Street shade trees, Loretta Lane (5 trees provided vs. 12 trees required at 1 per 50 feet of frontage). They do not meet the number required, because of site triangle requirements. The applicant is willing to meet with the Planning Division suggestions. There are a number of waivers required from the Community Design standards. Location of storm water management basin which requires a fence, Basins 1 and 3 through 8 (front yard provided vs. side or rear yard required). The ordinance states that “No storm water management basin which requires a fence shall be located in a front yard. A storm water management basin that is two (2) feet or less in depth shall not be required to be fenced”. Shape of a storm water management basin in a front yard, Basins 1 and 3 through 8 (Curvilinear edge required). They are also requesting a waiver for the shape of the storm water basin in the front yard. The applicant meets all the parking standards. The applicant has submitted Tree Replacement Plan (Sheet 25) that lists the trees being removed as part of the proposed project. The tree placement chart is based on a study area of 1 acre in size and estimates for additional areas which are permitted for sites greater than two acres in size. The estimates are based on the number of trees in an average forest acre. The total amount of trees to be removed that are greater than 6” diameter at breast height, based on the calculations permitted by ordinance, are 862 trees. His office did a sample for the kind of trees on the site, and by the ordinance it was determined 687 trees would need to be replaced. The applicant is proposing 364 trees, because of the grading and the storm water management. There is not much of an area to save trees. Most of the area on the east side near the Foxmoor Development will be buffered with trees. Trees will also remain on the west side of by Maple Avenue. The applicant agrees to the contribution of the remaining trees.

Mr. Headley explained that it is twice the current value of each unplanted tree, which we calculate at \$500 per tree. It would be \$1,000 per tree, and they are short 323 trees. That would be \$323,000 and that is pretty significant.

Mr. Schneider explained that the variances could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good, and it will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance. Exhibit A-3, aerial with additional lots of the surrounding area in the same zone. It shows lot sizes that are smaller than proposed. Those lots do not meet the lot area requirements. They are proposing lots that meet the lot area requirements, and they are consistent with the neighborhood. If the developed lots had the same easements, they would also require variances.

The application meets the positive the positive criteria required under the land use, and it meets a number of the purposes of zoning. It meets Purpose C, promotes adequate light air and open space.

The proposed subdivision is consistent with the neighborhood. It also promotes the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentration. There is a need for housing and the applicant meets that

reason. It meets Purpose I, promotes a desired desirable visual environment. The type of homes proposed are a typical residential design that is consistent with the neighborhood.

Mr. Pantalone wanted to know if the applicant has considered eliminating some variances by proposing fewer lots. He understands that they would still have lot depth variances, but the other variances can be eliminated. .

Gregory Schneider explained that he believed they were appropriated because of the lot size being met.

Mr. Odorizzi indicated that the developer could build a larger house if the lots were larger.

Mr. Headley explained that the majority of the variances outside of basin lots has to do with the minimum developable lot area which is due to the easements. If they made the lots wider and added area to the home lots, then yes they effectively they would probably lose lots. They could get rid of a majority of those variances, but there is nothing that can be done about the depth. The lot area variances are only for the basin lots.

Ms. Hicks explained the requirements for the meeting the yard dimensions on basin lots because she wrote them. The Planning Board was concerned with basins being in front yards. They were approving major subdivisions with a basin in the front. They did not like the aesthetics, but the board recognized the grade and where the water was going. They have been giving consideration to justification for that situation. Regarding the yard dimensions, there was a situation where the basin was on the property line and water went into the basement next door. The board took the position that they did not want basins on property lines. They wanted yard dimensions met to prevent any lateral movement of water, and that is the reason that provision. She did not hear justification for why they did not meet any of the yard dimension on the basin lots. They are meeting the state's storm water regulations, but they are not meeting our regulations.

Mr. Headley explained indicated that there are several waivers with respect to basin distance from a dwelling. There is a 50 foot distance requirement away from a well, septic system or dwelling. There are several here that have that issue.

Mr. Jost explained that Mr. Gandhi is proposing to build houses that are 1,800 to 2,500 square foot in size. He does not want to build bigger houses, because he is providing houses that would be affordable to the middle class.

Mr. Gandhi testified on his own behalf. Exhibit A-4, two colored renderings of the proposed homes to be built at the site. He is proposing to build a subdivision, which will bring value to the neighborhood and the community. This subdivision would improve upon what is existing in the area. He is proposing to construct homes that will be 1,800 to 2,500 square feet. The homes will have two car garages and they will have landscaping. He owns the Ramada Inn, and they have made improvements to since purchasing it.

Kevin Sheppard, member of the public, 2305 Scarpa Drive, wanted to know if there were any environmental impact studies for this project. This lot is the home to ray southern tree frogs, which are on the New Jersey's endangered species list. This hearing has been being postponed since the summer, and now it is winter when they are all hibernating. The applicant is requesting too many variances.

Jordan Palmeri, members of the public, 2322 Maple Avenue, made comments concerning the application. He had handouts that were distributed to the board and staff. He would like this application to be denied based on R-3 zoning regulation violations and personal testimonies. This developer is attempting to blatantly violate rules and regulations set forth by the City of Vineland regulations and master plan through his desire to prioritize profit over our policies. He is actually seeking over 100 variances and waivers. He went through the R-3 residential standards and purposes. He also went over the conservation of forests and trees, open space and farmland protection.

Charlene Stuby, member of the public, 1599 E Walnut Road, had a question about the price range of the proposed homes.

Mr. Malinsky stated that there was no affordable housing component been proposed.

Tiffany Simmons Palmeri, member of the public, 2322 Maple Avenue. She has concerns with this project. The developer is asking for a total of 60 variances for both drainage basins and residential lots and an additional 40 waivers. The zoning code is supposed to preserve the character of those neighborhoods already established. The lot sizes proposed are out of character with those in the neighboring development as well as lots surrounding the outside of the development. Exhibit O-3, map of colored coded map of properties. Exhibit O-4, exploitation of those figures that she testified to.

Leah Arcidiacono, member of the public, 2300 Maple Avenue, stated that this plan it disregards the city's zoning standards and threatens to undermine the character, safety and environmental health of our neighborhood. There is a violation of R-3 zoning purpose. There is an environmental concerning the tree frogs

and some other animals. There are drainage basins that are too close to property lines. Those proposed basins are going to be located in front yards, which propose hazards to children and pets. Adding 15 homes will increase traffic on Maple Avenue.

Shirley Morrison, member of the public, 2437 Concetta Lane, she agrees with her neighbors. Her home is the home that they are cutting through the cul-de-sac for a basin. It will be less than 20 feet away from her home, and they will probably have a negative impact. Her husband was in the marines and he has PTSD, so they chose a place that would offer privacy. She also have a mother with dementia and she is a roamer. She chose a cul-de-sac for the safety, and she now knows that it is a temporary cul-de-sac. When this was designed, there was no consideration for her house.

Nicholas Page, member of the public, 768 Foxmoor Drive. His main concern is water here, and he has a basement that will be 75 feet from 2 basins. He has pump running constantly when there is moisture in the ground. He wanted to know why they chose a specific location for two of the basins, because water does not run uphill. The way they are designed it going to cause flooding. This property is not large enough to jam all the houses they are proposing. The city's water lines and sewer lines are capable of supporting 15 more houses. He is also concerned with the basins.

Robin R. Dappling, member of the public, 2337 Scarpa Drive, the developer is trying to put a square peg in a round hole here. He is respectfully asking the board to deny these variances.

Charles Morrison, member of the public, 2437 Concetta Lane, his wife also spoke earlier. He also does not support this development.

Mr. Schneider explained that the applicant will comply with the entire engineering Report. This proposed development is not out of character for the neighborhood. It meets the requirements of the R-3 zone for the lot area besides the basins, and it is similar in size to the neighboring area

Mr. Jost stated that Mr. Gandhi has a right to develop his property under the law, and so that is why they are before the board. However, the applicant is not insensitive to the complaints and objections to the neighbors. This is a common complaint with construction near developments. Mr. Gandhi we would like an opportunity to amend the application, so he will submit an amended application with a reduction of lots.

The Chairman entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to postpone the application. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Ohm Property Management– located on the westerly side of Mill Road between W Walnut Road and Elm Road, Block 5401, Lot 4, Tax Map Sheet #54, Project No. PBA-24-00058. Preliminary/final major site plan approval to establish a cannabis cultivation facility within an existing industrial building along with additional site improvements. The Applicant also proposes 1,274 square foot and 1,396 square foot additions to the existing building.

The applicant was represented by Charles Opperman, Esq. The applicant is intending to bring a cultivation facility into the community to an existing property. They are seeking variances for this dilapidated former poultry processing facility. It has been dilapidated for quite some time, and the applicant identified this property in need of repair and remediation. The applicant believes that they are going to significantly improve the quality of this property, improve the conditions of the community around it, and meet the expectations of the community with regard to site improvements.

They are in receipt of the Planning Report along with the Fire Marshal's comments, and they will comply with the conditions set forth by the Fire Marshal. They will also obtain approvals from outside agencies.

This is this is an existing site does have a number of things including existing pavement, and it encroaches right up on the on the on the roadway. There are a number of variances are associated with addressing a pre-existing conditions. They would like to meet or exceed the expectations of the state, county and the Planning Board.

Joseph Odemheiner, Licensed Engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. Planning Report, item, 5, variances for front buffer (0 feet provided vs. 25 feet required). Side buffer, northerly (0 feet provided vs. 5 feet required). The side buffer to the northerly part of the property abuts an industrial facility and the southern property abuts the Landis Sewage Authority property. The southern portion is a wooded area that is existing. There is no development immediately adjacent to them, and to the north there is an industrial property. Along the front of the property there was a paved parking lot that was out to the street, and they did change some of the circulation to have a defined entrance driveway that leads to the parking. In addition to that, they do have a 25 foot buffer that is required for the front. They are proposing a standard parking design for this site. It is standard double loaded parking bay. The edge of the parking field to the right away line, and it is only 21 feet. They cannot provide the 25 feet because of the distance, which is due to the location of the existing building. They would like to keep the asphalt and introduce some of the vegetation. The pest control for this type of facility is critical. The applicant's ideal situation would be to have this building on ten acre parking lot with nothing nearby because it is so critical. Any type of invasive materials within the production is incredibly detrimental. They are not adding the pavement to it because it was already there, and leaving it without additional vegetation would just be better for the operations of the facility.

Ms. Hicks indicted that she had issues with his presentation and this issue of contamination. We have approved 6 cannabis facilities and no one has objected to that 30 foot of front landscaping. The woods on the LSA property would be more contaminant than landscaping in front along the right of way.

Mr. Opperman explained that the applicant does not have an objection to doing beautification of the property. It is a concern to disturb the existing 25 foot strip to then install more vegetation. They could work with the city to ensure that whatever they install does have agricultural purpose. They can install some shrubs or other foliage that would not contribute to the introduction of pest.

Mr. Headley stated that beautification extends beyond just the building, and the site has to be beautified as well. The best way to achieve that is landscaping in the front. There are various areas of asphalt that should be removed and at least grassed. He was not supportive of those waivers.

Ms. Hicks explained that the ordinance specifically to cannabis relieves these facilities of all other other landscaping requirements other than that front buffer. They are not required to put trees within the lot and to put trees along the frontage. For safety aspects she left the sites clear except for the front 30 feet, so she expects them to find the appropriate landscaping that does not contaminate the product.

Mr. Odemheiner wanted clarification with the board, because of the parking and where the building is situated they do not have a full 30 feet. He would like to adhere to the 21 feet.

Mr. Opperman indicated that they would do their due diligence on finding appropriate species.

Mr. Odemheiner went over section 6, medical and adult use of cannabis standards. Side buffer, northerly side (0 feet required vs. 25 feet required). Front buffer (0 feet provided vs. 30 feet required). Fence height (7 feet provided vs 8 feet required). Vegetated Landscaped Front buffer (0 feet provided vs. 30 feet required).

Ms. Hicks indicated that we do like to see some separation between sites. These sites were in common ownership and that is why the site improvements sprawled.

Mr. Headley explained that that if this were any other industry, we would never allow an interconnection or a parking lot that crosses the line. At a minimum they would have to remove 5 feet on either side. Pavement should only be where pavement is needed.

Ms. Patel explained that a truck will drive through the gate to a garage door. Deliveries on a pallet come in on a big truck. The smaller deliveries are delivered on smaller trucks. They will be unloaded at the garage and unloaded. Some deliveries will be unloaded at the ramp. Pavement will be added if needed.

Mr. Odemheiner went over item 6c, fence height (7 feet provided vs 8 feet required). The applicant is requesting a 7 foot fence. They are willing to comply with the municipality. The applicant already purchased the fence and did not know the 8 foot requirement.

Ms. Patel explained that they have two exits and entrances on the plan. There are four doors to get into the main door. The back entrance has three doors. It is a cinder block building that will be under surveillance interior and exterior. Every door in the facility has access control, so you have to have a key card to get in. The locks turn off at the end of the day so no one can get in even if they do have access. The loading and unloading is done at the loading dock.

Mr. Headley explained that the fencing does not have to go out to the property line.

Mr. Opperman explained that his client would have to make an assessment to consider with that regard in addition to some of the other items.

Mr. Odemheiner went over item 7, waivers from screening, shade trees and landscaping. Parking space width (9 feet provided vs. 9.5 feet required). Parking space row length without a tree island break (15 space row provided vs. 12 space row maximum permitted). This is not open to the public and it will only be for employees. They will work on landscaping the frontage, but especially getting the aisle that has the 15 feet. Item 8, waivers from community design standards. Sidewalks are not proposed along the street frontage of the site. Sidewalks do not exist on abutting properties, therefore sidewalks are not required unless the Board finds that by reason of the particular conditions of the site, its location or surroundings, sidewalks are required to protect the public safety. They estimate about 20 employees maximum shift with 27 spaces provided. They will provide EV spaces to the northwest corner of the parking lot. Site improvements will be done in the first phase, and any expansions will be done in third phase. The applicant will agree with the comments made by the Fire Marshal. There is no proposed signage to the facility.

The Chairman entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the application. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Uriah Child Care Center– located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Chestnut and Holly Hill Terrace, Block 3702, Lot 24, Tax Map Sheet #37, Project No. PBA-24-00063. Minor site plan approval, to construct an outdoor playground area and trash enclosure along with associated site improvements to an existing building.

The applicant was represented by Matthew Robinson, Esq.

Tameeka Johnson Burke, director of the facility, testified on half of the applicant. She is the director and will be overseeing the daily operations. They are highly regulated and inspected by the state of New Jersey. There is a requirement for how many square feet per child and it is 35 square feet. There is approximately 1,400 square feet of classroom space giving them a maximum of 40 children. There will be six staff member. There is no set time so the cars are not showing up all at once. The children would just be getting dropped off and signed in. There is a maximum of approximately five cars at a time. Anticipated hours of operation are from 6:00 AM to 11:00 PM. They are accommodating children's work schedules. There are 13 parking spaces, and they are dedicating employee parking. The entire right side will have will have handicap spaces and will be dedicated for student pickup. Operation will take place Monday to Saturday, and trash will be collected on Sunday. There is a proposed playground with a concrete walkway. The children would walk directly through that entrance and directly to the playground area. That section will be completely fenced off. There are bollards all around the entire edge of that parking lot for safety. She will comply with the staff's requirements for screening. The depicted sign is currently there and in the right of way. She would move it out of the right of way, but would like to keep it one foot off of the property line. She will replace it to 32 square foot sign. Planning Report, item 7, waiver for there are shade trees that exists do not meet the requirements. Item 7c, requesting a waiver only in that any new irrigation. Engineering Report, waiver from 13a, and would agree to be c and d.

The Chairman entertained a motion to close the public hearing. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the application. Mr. Pantalone so moved, Mr. Odorizzi seconded.

Roll Call:
David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman entertained a motion to adjourn.

Roll call:
David Catalana: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Michael Pantalone: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

TIME: 10:42 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Yasmin Perez
Planning Board Secretary