

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 8, 2026

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:

John Casadia
David Catalana
Jeffrey DiMatteo
Thomas Tobolski
Sandy Velez
Scott Reale
Robert Odorizzi
Elizabeth Arthur
David Manders

Also present were:

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

PRE-MEETING

Appointment of Vice-Chairman– Mr. Manders explained that the first order of business was the appointment of a new Vice-Chairman.

Mr. DiMatteo nominated David Catalana to serve as Vice-Chairman. The nomination was seconded by Ms. Velez. There being no further nominations, the Board appointed David Catalana as Vice-Chairman.

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Scott Reale: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Northeast Precast, LLC– located on the easterly side of S. Lincoln Avenue between State Highway Route 55 and Sheridan Avenue, Block 7503, Lot 33.01, Tax Map Sheet No. 75, Project No. PBA-26-000013. Amended preliminary/final major site plan approval, to amended Phases 3 and 4, which will constitute the construction of a 241,384 square foot industrial building and a 50,800 square foot parking garage.

Mr. Headley discussed revisions to the project's square footage calculations. It was clarified that the third-floor industrial building area to be immediately fit out is 13,213 square feet, while the overall third-floor area is 30,245 square feet. As a result, the total square footage of the industrial building, excluding the second-story patio, was corrected to 323,153 square feet, replacing the previously reported total. It was also confirmed that the proposed four-story parking garage remains unchanged at approximately 203,200 square feet, with each floor consisting of approximately 50,800 square feet. The applicant stated that, if any future revisions occur, the parking garage could only become smaller.

He explained that this application is for an amended preliminary and final major site plan approval. The applicant previously received Phase 8 approval for the northeast precast concrete production facility. Under the previously approved plan, the site included an existing production building, a second production building, and an office/parking garage building. The current amendment amends those approvals by incorporating office space into the production facility while converting the previously proposed office building into a parking garage. Surface parking areas remain the same as previously approved, and the overall building layout is very similar, with only minor changes to the uses within each building.

Mr. Headley indicated that there were no new variances requested as part of the amended application. The previously granted variances remain applicable and relate primarily to building signage. The signage variances are identified in the Planner's report and are expected to consist of building identification signage similar to that installed on the existing building.

There were some requested design waivers. One waiver concerns the parking lot landscaping requirements. Although the plans initially did not show trees within the parking lot islands, the applicant advised that trees will be installed in the islands to comply with the landscaping requirements. However, the applicant requests a waiver from providing landscaped divider strips within the parking area. Mr. Headley noted that the ordinance requires either five-foot-wide landscaped divider strips or five percent landscaped area for parking lots containing more than 200 spaces. An additional design waiver pertains to the requirement for shrubbery to break up the appearance of sections of fencing. He explained that portions of the fencing surround a dry basin and employee parking area where decorative stone beds are proposed instead of shrubs.

The applicant also requested several perfected plan items to be waived, or partially waived, because the amended plans encompass only this portion of the overall development rather than the entire previously approved site. Earlier approvals included additional site improvements such as the existing batch facility, another production building, laydown areas, stockyard, and related facilities that are outside the scope of the current application. Mr. Headley also noted that stormwater management had been fully addressed during the prior approvals and, therefore, no additional stormwater comments were necessary for this application.

Heller Minor Subdivision- located on the westerly side of South Mill Road between West Landis Avenue and West Chestnut Avenue, Block 3402, Lot 28, Tax Map Sheet #34, Project No. PBA-26-00008. Minor subdivision approval to create one (1) new lot with one (1) remainder lot.

Mr. Headley explained that the property is located along S. Mill Road. Public water is available; however, public sanitary sewer service is not currently available along S. Mill Road. The applicant is proposing frontage and lot width variances due to the lack of sanitary sewer availability. The proposed lots will have approximately 124 feet of frontage, whereas the ordinance requires 160 feet for lots without public sewer. The proposed lots do meet the required lot area requirements.

He noted that there are areas of wetlands located on the property. Although the lots are deep, the mapped wetlands area reduces the developable area of the proposed upper lot (Lot 2801) from the required one acre to approximately 37,500 square feet. While this reduces the developable area, the lot remains sufficiently sized for potential residential development. The applicant provided documentation indicating that no wetlands were identified; however, he advised that a wetlands determination from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) would be required. An engineer's report alone does not satisfy the requirement for final approval purposes. While this documentation may be acceptable for a minor subdivision at the building permit stage, he requested that the applicant revise the plans to include the approximate wetlands line shown on available.

Mr. Headley reviewed surrounding properties and noted that the proposed lot widths are generally consistent with the neighborhood. Properties immediately to the north and south contain similar or slightly smaller lot widths, while some properties across the roadway are somewhat wider. The proposed lots would remain larger than many surrounding residential lots in the area.

Prime Development and Construction LLC – located on the easterly side of Holmes Avenue between Walnut Road and Magnolia Road, Block 5112, Lot 40.02, Tax Map Sheet #51, Project No. PBA-26-00011. The applicant requests preliminary major subdivision approval to configure one (1) existing lot into fourteen (14) lots. Thirteen (13) of the lots would be available for the construction of single-family dwellings and one (1) lot is proposed for a stormwater basin.

Mr. Headley stated that this property was previously before the Board for a minor subdivision approval and a Master Plan Street Amendment. The current application represents the major subdivision associated with those prior approvals. The proposal connects the two existing cul-de-sacs and creates a permanent cul-de-sac configuration, with stormwater facilities located in the lower portion of the site. He explained that the current plan is generally consistent with the previously presented conceptual plan, with the primary change being the reconfiguration of the stormwater basin area. The area that was previously shown as a basin has been redesigned as a single-family residential lot, with the stormwater basin relocated elsewhere on the site.

Mr. Headley explained that there were several requested variances, primarily related to lot frontage and developable area. He explained that the applicant worked with staff to determine whether it would be preferable to create several fully conforming lots with larger variances elsewhere or to distribute smaller variances among the proposed lots. The applicant chose to provide a mix of conforming lots and minor frontage variances. Most of the requested frontage variances are approximately five to ten feet below the required standard. He noted that the proposed lots average approximately 85 feet in width, which is approximately five feet less than the required 90-foot frontage. There was a frontage variance associated with Lot 40.18, which is located along the cul-de-sac and is affected by the roadway layout. The applicant is proposing a maintenance access road from the cul-de-sac area. There were also requested developable lot area variances. Mr. Hedley noted that these are common with subdivision applications where utility easements affect lot calculations. In this case, the applicant minimized the stormwater easements, with the

majority of the stormwater system located along the northern portion of the property and flowing directly into the proposed basin area. The affected lots contain a 20-foot-wide utility easement. However, the lots are deeper than the minimum required depth, with proposed depths of approximately 170 feet where 150 feet is required, allowing the lots to maintain sufficient overall area despite reduced frontage.

The applicant requested stormwater basin setback waivers. The stormwater system consists of a tiered basin design, including a series of connected basins. He explained that the upper basin spills into the next basin, which then flows into another basin before ultimately discharging to the final basin. This design approach has become more common due to evolving NJDEP stormwater regulations and requirements. Additional waivers include street tree requirements and perfected plan items. He noted that compliance with the street tree requirements would need to be addressed by the applicant.

Mr. Headley advised the Board that a letter was received from a neighboring property owner expressing concerns regarding the proposed development. He anticipated that the neighbor may appear at the hearing. One of the primary concerns raised relates to the appearance and condition of the neighboring area, including the removal of existing cul-de-sac areas, installation of asphalt driveways, and construction of concrete curb and sidewalks. He noted that the developer would be responsible for completing these improvements as part of the project.

FLAG SALUTE

This meeting is being held in accordance with the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act. Notice of this meeting was given on July 24, 2026, and has been posted on the Official Bulletin Board in City Hall, posted on the City's website and published in the Vineland Daily Journal.

MINUTES

Approval of minutes from June 10, 2026, board meeting.
The Chairman made a motion to approve the minutes.

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

RESOLUTIONS

Mr. Manders read a resolution of the Vineland Planning Board honoring the memory of Planning Board member Michael I. Pantalone. The Board recognized Mr. Pantalone's dedicated service and contributions to the Planning Board and the City of Vineland.

Resolution #6744

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Scott Reale: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Approval of resolutions from June 10, 2026, board meeting.
The Chairman made a motion to approve the resolution.

Resolution #6741

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes

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

Resolution #6742

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Northeast Precast, LLC– located on the easterly side of S. Lincoln Avenue between State Highway Route 55 and Sheridan Avenue, Block 7503, Lot 33.01, Tax Map Sheet No. 75, Project No. PBA-26-000013. Amended preliminary/final major site plan approval, to amended Phases 3 and 4, which will constitute the construction of a 241,384 square foot industrial building and a 50,800 square foot parking garage.

The applicant was represented by Mr. Michael Fralinger, Esq. He explained that the project has been before the Board several times since its initial approvals in 2019 and involves a large-scale development consisting of approximately 159 acres. Existing improvements on the property include the steel fabrication building, the original main production facility, three batch plants, and several accessory structures. Mr. Fralinger explained that the current application involves modifications to previously approved improvements. The second main production building, shown on the plans as the yellow building, was previously approved along with a separate four-story office building with parking areas on both sides. The applicant has determined that incorporating office space directly into the production building would be more functional based on the success of the existing office configuration located above the steel fabrication building. As part of the amendment, the applicant proposes constructing a larger office addition to what will be referred to as Building C. He further explained that the company has experienced an increase in employees and anticipates continued growth. Due to increased parking demand, the applicant proposes construction of a parking garage. The garage application is based on a four-story design, although the applicant has not yet determined whether the final structure will be three or four stories. The proposed garage has an approximate footprint of 50,000 square feet. If constructed as a four-story structure, it would contain a total area of approximately 200,000 square feet and provide parking for approximately 550 vehicles. If constructed as a three-story structure, it would accommodate approximately 400 vehicles.

Mr. Fralinger referenced the Planning Board review letter prepared by Mr. Headley dated July 2, 2026, revised July 6, 2026, and addressed the revised square footage calculations previously discussed. The corrected total gross floor area for the proposed improvements is 323,153 square feet, consisting of approximately 96,152 square feet of office space and 215,436 square feet of manufacturing area. The applicant reviewed the comments contained within Section 8 of the Planning Board review report, noting that Sections 1 through 7 primarily summarize prior approvals and project history. The applicant requested several waivers associated with the current application. Regarding Section 8, the applicant requested a waiver related to fencing and landscaping requirements. He explained that a fence is proposed between the parking area and Building C along the drive aisle. The area behind the fence is a stone drainage swale containing underground piping; therefore, curbing and additional landscaping are not desirable in that location. The fence is intended as a visual deterrent for vehicles traveling through the area, and the applicant requested a waiver from providing shrubbery in that location. The applicant also requested a waiver from parking lot divider strips. He explained that divider strips are not typically utilized for industrial developments and requested relief from that requirement. The applicant confirmed compliance with the parking area shade tree requirements. Mr. Fralinger stated that the applicant intends to provide the required trees and expects the final number may exceed the minimum requirement. He noted that the current plan shows five trees within a courtyard area, requiring approximately 13 additional trees, but additional landscaping is anticipated to enhance the appearance of the corporate office area. Section 9 of the Planning Board review report, the applicant requested several site improvement waivers. The applicant requested a waiver from Section 9A, relating to building entrances being oriented toward the street, explaining that the site is located several thousand feet from Lincoln Avenue and the orientation requirement is not practical for this industrial use. Regarding bicycle parking requirements under Section 9B, he stated that bicycle parking is provided internally within each building. He noted that approximately 10 employees currently utilize bicycles or electric bicycles, and similar accommodations will be provided within Building C. The applicant confirmed compliance with landscaping irrigation requirements under Section 9C. The applicant addressed Section 12, regarding parking calculations and the request to identify the number of spaces within the proposed parking garage. Mr. Fralinger explained that the final number of spaces depends on whether the

garage is constructed as a three-story or four-story structure. He requested approval to provide a range of parking spaces, provided that the minimum number exceeds the anticipated employee parking demand and does not create a variance issue. Section 14, applicant requested waivers and partial waivers because the submitted plans only address the immediate area associated with Phases 3 and 4 and do not represent a full-site development plan. The applicant requested waivers from items that relate to a complete site-wide plan. The applicant confirmed compliance with the trash enclosure requirements and advised that trash pickup will occur on-site. The applicant requested a waiver related to buffer areas, as no buffer areas are shown on the submitted plans. A partial waiver was requested for wellhead protection mapping because the current plan only covers the Phase 3 and Phase 4 areas and not the entire property. The applicant requested a waiver for wetland information, noting that there are no wetlands located within the area subject to this application. The applicant also confirmed that a landscaping plan will be provided. The applicant requested a waiver for lighting architectural plans and elevations for the parking garage because final architectural plans have not yet been completed. Mr. Fralinger stated that the dimensions for the proposed garage were based on another parking garage previously constructed by Northeast Precast, including structural dimensions and site requirements. Architectural plans can be provided for Building C, but not yet for the parking garage. The applicant also reviewed requirements under Section 15.6.15-A and confirmed compliance where applicable. A waiver previously requested regarding parking garage architectural plans will be removed from the plans, as requested by Mr. Headley. The applicant will comply with the remaining requirements. Mr. Fralinger also referenced the Engineering review letter dated July 2, 2026, stating that there were no engineering comments or outstanding issues.

Mr. Fralinger stated that the application is relatively straightforward because it involves modifications to an already approved development. The applicant is changing the dimensions and configuration of the production building and replacing the previously approved office building with a parking garage. No new variances are created as a result of the amendment. While several waivers are requested, many are due to the fact that the current application only addresses a portion of the overall site rather than a complete redevelopment plan.

Mr. Fralinger advised that the applicant's project engineer, Mr. Corey Gaskill of Fralinger Engineering, was also present to answer any technical questions from the Board.

Mr. Gaskill, the project engineer, advised that all comments and questions had been addressed and that he had no additional items to present.

Ms. Hicks raised a question regarding Section 8C of the Planning Board review report, specifically the requirement for parking area shade trees. Mr. Fralinger confirmed that the applicant intends to provide the required number of trees within the parking area; however, because the final placement may include areas surrounding the parking lot and other portions of the site, the applicant requested a waiver related to the location of the parking area shade trees. Ms. Hicks inquired about the approximate number of employees currently employed at the facility, noting the significance of the project within the development area. Mr. Fralinger estimated that the current employment level is approximately 340 employees. He explained that the applicant anticipates increasing employment to approximately 600 to 700 employees within the next two to three years as the facility continues to expand. Mr. Headley clarified that the waiver associated with the parking area shade trees would remain as a partial waiver for location only. Mr. Headley also advised that the Fire Marshal requested installation of a fire department connection (FDC) at the northwest corner of the proposed parking garage. Mr. Fralinger indicated that the applicant had no objection to the request and stated that they would incorporate the requirement into the plans.

A member of the public, Mary Ann Laielli, appeared before the Board and was sworn in. She stated that she attended her first Vineland Environmental Commission meeting on June 8th and had discussions with Mr. Casadia regarding concerns she had related to the Northeast Precast application and the DataOne project. Ms. Lyle expressed concern that, when reviewing the lot and block information associated with the application, she believed the property was identified as being connected with NEP Real Estate/DataOne and questioned why DataOne was not referenced in the current application. She explained that her concerns were primarily related to the progression of the DataOne project and potential environmental impacts associated with that development.

Mr. Headley clarified that the application currently before the Board is not related to the DataOne project. He explained that the property subject to the current application is owned by Northeast Precast/NEP Real Estate Urban Renewal, LLC, which was the original redevelopment entity associated with the precast facility. He further explained that the DataOne property is a separate lot located to the north of the Northeast Precast property and is not part of the current application.

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

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes

Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Scott Reale: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Catalana: Yes

PUBLIC HEARING

Heller Minor Subdivision- located on the westerly side of South Mill Road between West Landis Avenue and West Chestnut Avenue, Block 3402, Lot 28, Tax Map Sheet #34, Project No. PBA-26-00008. Minor subdivision approval to create one (1) new lot with one (1) remainder lot.

The applicant was represented by Mr. Robert Casella, Esq. He explained that the applicant is requesting a frontage variance. The ordinance requires 160 feet of frontage for lots without public sanitary sewer, while each proposed lot will contain approximately 124.35 feet of frontage. He stated that the proposed subdivision would be consistent with surrounding residential area. The applicant intends to complete the subdivision by deed when appropriate.

Mr. Rami Nasser, the applicant's professional engineer and planner, testified on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Nasser explained that the existing lot is approximately 3.5 acres and is proposed to be subdivided into two residential lots. Because the lots will utilize on-site septic systems, the ordinance requires larger lots, including a minimum of one acre and 160 feet of frontage. While the proposed lots exceed the required lot area, the proposed frontage is approximately half of the existing frontage, resulting in the requested variance. He explained that the existing lot contains approximately 247 feet of frontage, which would result in proposed lots of approximately 124 feet each. The applicant is requesting relief from the frontage requirement while maintaining sufficient lot area. He noted that one proposed lot contains approximately 1.9 acres, exceeding the minimum lot area requirement.

Mr. Nasser also addressed potential wetlands concerns. He stated that an environmental review was conducted, and no wetlands were identified. However, he acknowledged that a formal determination from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) may be required at the building permit stage. He explained that the applicant is requesting a variance as a precaution in the event NJDEP identifies wetlands or wetlands buffers on the property. The applicant requested a variance allowing Lot 28.01 to have a developable lot area of approximately 37,500 square feet if a 150-foot wetlands buffer applies, where 43,560 square feet (one acre) would otherwise be required.

Mr. Nasser provided testimony regarding the requested C(2) variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2). He stated that the benefits of the proposed subdivision outweigh any potential detriments and that the application advances the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law, specifically the promotion of appropriate population densities and the preservation of the environment. He noted that the proposed lots will comply with required setbacks and will remain compatible with surrounding residential properties. He further stated that the subdivision would only result in one additional residential dwelling and would have minimal impact on the surrounding area. He stated that the requested variances can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without impairing the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance or master plan.

Mr. Nassr reviewed the Planner's report. The applicant requested a waiver from Section 9A of the report, which requires additional information regarding existing structures and related site details, including items such as mailbox locations. Mr. Nasser confirmed that the applicant would comply with all remaining requirements of the report. He also confirmed that the proposed lots will have public water service but will utilize private septic systems.

Ms. Hicks explained that the one-acre developable area requirement is based on a worst-case scenario where a property relies on both private well and septic systems. Since the proposed lots will have public water service, the water availability is relevant to the evaluation of the developable area.

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

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Scott Reale: Yes

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

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

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Scott Reale: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

Prime Development and Construction LLC – located on the easterly side of Holmes Avenue between Walnut Road and Magnolia Road, Block 5112, Lot 40.02, Tax Map Sheet #51, Project No. PBA-26-00011. The applicant requests preliminary major subdivision approval to configure one (1) existing lot into fourteen (14) lots. Thirteen (13) of the lots would be available for the construction of single-family dwellings and one (1) lot is proposed for a stormwater basin.

The applicant was represented by Mr. Matthew Robinson, Esq. He was accompanied by Mr. Phil Black, principal of Prime Development, who would provide factual testimony, and Mr. Rami Nasser, who would provide testimony regarding the subdivision plan and requested variances.

Mr. Robinson explained that the variances requested as part of the current application are consistent with the variances previously granted by the Board during the minor subdivision approval. He stated that the applicant has not expanded the requested relief and has maintained continuity between the prior approval and the current subdivision application. Mr. Robinson acknowledged that the applicant has received inquiries and comments from neighboring residents and members of the public regarding the project. He explained that the Master Plan for streets and roads identifies the proposed street connections, and the applicant is not seeking any revisions to those planned connections. The proposed roadway layout reflects the intended street pattern established in the City's planning documents. Mr. Robinson stated that the primary variances associated with the application relate to lot frontage requirements. He noted that all proposed lots comply with the required 13,500-square-foot minimum lot area requirement. The applicant designed the subdivision to remain consistent with the surrounding neighborhood character and lot configurations, avoiding excessive density compared to the existing conditions.

Mr. Phil Black, owner of Prime Development and Construction, LLC, testified on his own behalf. He testified regarding current projects in the area, including homes under construction along Spring Road and Holmes Avenue associated with prior phases of this development. He advised that two homes on Spring Road and two homes on Holmes Avenue are currently under construction and nearing completion. Mr. Black reviewed photographs depicting four recently constructed or nearly completed homes. The photographs were marked into evidence as Exhibit A-1. Mr. Black confirmed that two of the homes shown are located on Spring Road and two are located on Holmes Avenue. He stated that the homes shown are representative of the type of single-family homes proposed for the lots included in the current application. Mr. Black explained that while the front elevations and interior layouts may vary depending on buyer preferences and selected models, the proposed homes would be similar in size and style to those depicted in Exhibit A-1. He confirmed that each of the proposed 13 single-family homes would include a two-car garage and driveway parking. Mr. Black testified that the proposed homes would generally consist of approximately four bedrooms and two-and-one-half bathrooms, with average building sizes ranging between approximately 2,200 and 2,500 square feet. He stated that the homes are intended to be consistent with the character of the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Black explained that the project is intended to proceed in multiple phases. The next phase would involve McMahon Drive and the stormwater basin area, followed by a subsequent phase involving Jamic Road, with the final remainder area located along Holmes Avenue. He testified that site work typically requires approximately six to eight months to complete, followed by an additional construction period of approximately six months for the homes. In order to minimize disruption to the surrounding neighborhood and maintain a manageable construction schedule, the applicant intends to focus first on the McMahon Drive portion of the development. Construction on the Jamic Road portion would not begin until the McMahon Drive area has progressed through construction and home sales.

Mr. Rami Nassar, professional planner and engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Nasser explained that the property is located between two existing residential developments and that the proposed

street layout is largely dictated by the City's Master Plan of Streets. The Master Plan requires the extension and connection of existing streets, resulting in the applicant's need to connect the existing roadways from both sides of the property. Mr. Nassar explained that the proposal includes the extension of Jamic Road through the property and the extension of McMahon Drive, including the removal of existing temporary cul-de-sacs. He stated that the existing cul-de-sacs were originally designed as temporary improvements because they did not fully comply with the Master Plan of Streets. The current application provides for the streets to be completed as originally intended, with the temporary cul-de-sac areas removed and replaced with continuous roadways. Mr. Nassar explained that once the cul-de-sacs are removed, the affected portions of the right-of-way will revert back to the adjacent property owners. Existing front yards, landscaping, and driveways affected by the roadway improvements will be reconstructed and reconfigured as necessary to create standard residential frontage conditions. Mr. Robinson confirmed that the responsibility for completing these improvements, including costs associated with the roadway modifications, will be the responsibility of the developer.

Mr. Nassar reviewed the existing conditions of the property and explained that the site has been disturbed historically. During field investigations, the applicant identified remnants of deteriorated structures, including what appeared to be former chicken coops or evidence of prior agricultural activity. He stated that the property had likely been unused for approximately 30 to 40 years, allowing the area to become overgrown and naturally reforested. He explained that the location proposed for the stormwater management facilities is within the area of previous disturbance. He reviewed the stormwater design and stated that the proposed system was developed in accordance with current NJDEP stormwater management requirements. Due to the size of the property and current regulations, the stormwater system consists of multiple interconnected basins. Mr. Nassar reviewed the stormwater management design with the Board. He explained that the system was designed to address the 100-year storm event, which is based on approximately 12.18 inches of rainfall within a 24-hour period. The first basin will collect runoff and discharge through piping to subsequent basins. The second and third basins will each address additional portions of the site, with all stormwater ultimately flowing into the larger final basin. Mr. Nassar stated that the proposed stormwater system will significantly reduce both the rate and volume of runoff from the property. He explained that the final basin occupies a substantial portion of the site and was intentionally designed larger than the minimum required in order to protect surrounding residential properties. He testified that the applicant could have reduced the size of the basin and created additional lots; however, the applicant chose to provide larger stormwater facilities to minimize impacts on neighboring properties.

Mr. Robinson confirmed that Lot 40.03 is owned by an entity controlled by Mr. Black and that the applicant will work cooperatively to address the stormwater discharge area. Mr. Nassar explained that a deed notice will be placed on the property to inform future owners that the stormwater basin overflow will discharge onto the property. The purpose of the notice is to ensure that any future purchaser is aware of the existing condition. Mr. Nassar stated that the stormwater design calculations demonstrate a significant reduction in runoff impacts. He testified that the proposed system reduces runoff rates by approximately 70 percent and reduces runoff volume by more than 80 percent. He explained that even in an extreme storm event, the proposed basins are designed to capture and control runoff before it reaches the adjoining property. Mr. Nassar further explained that the rear portion of Lot 40.03 will remain wooded, providing additional natural buffering. Mr. Robinson confirmed that approximately 100 to 120 feet of existing wooded area will remain in place. The applicant also agreed that any future individual lot grading plan will include appropriate measures, such as swales, to direct runoff away from any future dwelling.

Mr. Nassar reviewed the Planning and Engineer's reports and requested confirmation of the requested variances. Planning report, Section 6, applicant requested variances for Lot 40.06: Lot frontage and width variance to allow approximately 79.4 feet where 90 feet is required. Lot 40.10: Lot frontage and width variance to allow approximately 84.49 feet where 90 feet is required. Lot 40.11: Lot frontage and width variance to allow approximately 84.97 feet where 90 feet is required. Lot 40.13: Lot frontage and width variance to allow approximately 84.57 feet where 90 feet is required. Lot 40.14: Corrected plan information reflects approximately 85.04 feet of frontage and width where 90 feet is required. Lot 40.17: Lot frontage and width variance to allow approximately 79.7 feet where 90 feet is required. Lot 40.18: Frontage variance for the stormwater basin lot due to the existing temporary cul-de-sac frontage. The frontage is needed only to provide maintenance access for the basin and will not create regular traffic. Mr. Nassar confirmed that all proposed lots exceed the required 13,500-square-foot minimum lot area, except where developable lot area calculations are affected by easements.

Mr. Nassar explained that developable lot area variances are requested for Lots 40.09, 40.12, and 40.15 due to 20-foot-wide drainage easements required to accommodate underground stormwater piping. The requested developable area variances are Lot 40.09: Approximately 11,100 square feet where 13,500 square feet is required. Lot 40.12: Approximately 11,093 square feet where 13,500 square feet is required. Lot 40.15: Approximately 11,373 square feet where 13,500 square feet is required. He also identified Lot 40.06 as requiring a developable lot area variance due to site constraints, allowing approximately 12,899 square feet where 13,500 square feet is required.

Section 8, regarding the stormwater management comments, the applicant agreed to continue coordination with the City to finalize design details.

Section 9I, for the service drive requirement, Mr. Nasser requested a waiver from grass pavers and proposed a stone surface instead. He explained that grass pavers are not suitable for areas requiring occasional access by heavy maintenance equipment because they can become damaged under heavy loads. Mr. Headley discussed the potential for stone migration and requested a method to stabilize the stone for confinement. The applicant agreed to install an appropriate stabilization method, and a partial waiver was accepted.

Regarding Section 10, applicant requested a waiver for the requirement to install shrubbery to break up the monotony of the proposed fence for the stormwater basin.

Regarding Section 11, applicant confirmed compliance with shade tree requirements. The applicant agreed to place the required shade trees on the actual lots or on-site and not in between the curb and sidewalks.

Regarding Subsection 12G, applicant discussed plan notation requirements and agreed to work with staff to provide an appropriate legend or notation format.

The applicant confirmed compliance with the remaining report items. Certain final plat items may be deferred until final approval, including items under Section 14, with the exception of specific requirements identified in subsections E and F, including items related to acreage and design waivers.

Mr. Robinson referenced the City Engineering Report dated June 26, 2026. The applicant confirmed that stormwater comments would be addressed through continued coordination with the City.

Item 23, Mr. Nassar discussed the installation of a five-foot sidewalk and ADA passing areas. Mr. Headley advised that the City's preference is for a five-foot-wide sidewalk, consistent with typical City improvements. The applicant agreed to provide the requested sidewalk improvements.

Mr. Nasser provided testimony regarding the requested C(2) variances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2). He explained that the requested relief is driven by the unique configuration of the property, including the requirement to connect existing streets as identified in the Master Plan of Streets. He testified that the benefits of the requested deviations outweigh any potential detriments. He stated that the proposal advances the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law, specifically N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2(e), by promoting appropriate population densities and concentrations while preserving the surrounding neighborhood character and environment. Mr. Nasser explained that all proposed lots meet the required minimum lot area and are consistent with surrounding development. He noted that surrounding properties vary in size, with some lots containing approximately 11,200 square feet and others approximately 15,000 square feet, placing the proposed lots within the range of existing neighborhood conditions. He stated that the proposal completes the intended Master Plan street connections, eliminates existing dead-end conditions, and improves circulation within the neighborhood. He testified that the requested variances are minor in nature, generally involving frontage reductions of approximately five to eleven feet, while maintaining compliant lot areas. The relief can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and without substantially impairing the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance or master plan.

Mr. William Gonzalez, 1146 McMahon Drive, was sworn in and testified regarding the proposed subdivision and extension of McMahon Drive through the existing cul-de-sac. He stated that he had previously submitted a letter outlining his concerns and requested that it be entered into the record. Mr. Gonzalez explained that his property borders the existing cul-de-sac and includes a City easement that would be affected by the proposed roadway extension. While acknowledging the need for development, he expressed concern that the project would significantly impact his property and quality of life. He requested that, as conditions of approval, the developer be required to complete all restoration work at its expense prior to the issuance of certificates of occupancy or release of performance bonds, noting that when his neighborhood was originally developed the roadway was never properly completed after the developer's bonds were released. He also requested that the Board require an environmental impact statement, stating that much of the wooded tract consists of undisturbed land and alleging that the area contains habitat for the endangered Cope's Gray Tree Frog. Additionally, he requested restoration of the cul-de-sac, landscaping, driveway, sidewalks, and drainage facilities, and asked that neighboring property owners receive a detailed construction mitigation and restoration plan identifying how their individual properties would be affected.

Mr. Gonzalez further expressed concerns regarding existing drainage problems in the neighborhood, explaining that the current perforated drainage system has been ineffective due to heavy clay soils and that stormwater frequently remains in adjacent yards following rainfall. He stated that removal of the wooded buffer could worsen existing drainage conditions and also expressed concern that extending McMahon Drive would increase traffic by creating an additional connection to Magnolia Road. He suggested that the City and the applicant consider utilizing the proposed stormwater basin to improve drainage for the existing neighborhood and requested that every effort be made to address these longstanding issues as part of the development.

Mr. Black stated that pre-construction surveys and photographs would be completed to document existing conditions and that all disturbed areas would be restored to their original condition upon completion of construction for the four lots affected. The applicant agreed to submit pre-construction photographs, documentation of existing conditions, and a proposed restoration plan for review by the City's professional staff. The Engineering Department will also participate in the inspection process throughout construction to verify compliance with the approved restoration plan.

Mr. David Heck, 1125 Holmes Avenue, was sworn in and expressed concerns regarding the environmental impacts of the proposed subdivision. He acknowledged the property owner's right to develop the land and the City's need for additional housing but emphasized the importance of preserving Vineland's natural environment. Mr. Heck stated that the wooded tract had long been a densely forested area supporting wildlife, including deer and various bird species, and expressed concern that clearing the site had displaced local wildlife. He urged the Board to consider the environmental consequences of future development applications and to preserve the natural character that distinguishes the City. He stated that while he understood the Board's difficult responsibility in balancing development with growth, he hoped environmental preservation would remain an important consideration in future decisions.

Mr. Casadia gave comment on behalf of the Environmental Commission. They wanted the Board to consider the frontage and lot size requirements. They also wanted to know if the applicant plans to adhere to the tree ordinance.

Mr. Robinson wished to clarify one point regarding the requested frontage variances. He explained that when the zoning regulations were amended, the minimum frontage requirement was increased from 75 feet to 90 feet. He noted that many of the existing homes in the neighborhood were developed under the previous 75-foot frontage standard and emphasized that the proposed lots are comparable in size to the surrounding properties and are not smaller than those currently existing in the neighborhood. The applicant complies with the zoning ordinance.

Ms. Carolyn Armstrong, 1097 McMahan Drive, was sworn in and testified in opposition to the application. She stated that she shared the environmental concerns previously expressed by other residents. Ms. Armstrong explained that she has lived in the neighborhood since 1991, when her home was the last residence on the street and the surrounding area consisted entirely of woods. Although additional homes have since been constructed and she appreciates her neighbors, she expressed disappointment that continued residential development has resulted in the loss of natural habitat. She stated that she has enjoyed observing the wildlife in the wooded area over the years, including deer, rabbits, and other animals, and noted that she had recently recorded videos of deer grazing near the cul-de-sac. Ms. Armstrong expressed concern that continued development is displacing wildlife and diminishing the natural character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Mark Scotto, 1125 McMahan Drive, was sworn in and testified in opposition to the application. He expressed concerns regarding increased traffic, on-street parking, and neighborhood density resulting from the proposed subdivision. Mr. Scotto disagreed with testimony that extending McMahan Drive would improve traffic circulation, stating that the larger proposed homes would likely generate additional vehicles per household. He expressed concern that overflow parking on both sides of the street would reduce roadway width and could impede emergency vehicle access, noting that a fire department official had previously commented that parked vehicles already create access concerns. He also voiced concerns regarding the loss of wildlife habitat, stating that he has regularly observed deer, foxes, raccoons, skunks, and other wildlife on his property. He referenced receiving notice that McMahan Drive is scheduled for resurfacing and expressed hope that the roadway improvements would proceed despite the proposed development. He further objected to the requested bulk variances, stating that the reduced setbacks would place homes too close together and negatively impact the quality of life for neighboring residents through increased noise and reduced privacy.

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

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Scott Reale: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

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

Roll Call:

John Casadia: No
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Scott Reale: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

ADJOURNMENT

The Chairman entertained a motion to adjourn.

Roll Call:

John Casadia: Yes
David Catalana: Yes
Jeffrey DiMatteo: Yes
Douglas Menz: Yes
Thomas Tobolski: Yes
Sandy Velez: Yes
Nilsa Rosario: Yes
Robert Odorizzi: Yes
Elizabeth Arthur: Yes
David Manders: Yes

TIME: 8:53 PM

Respectfully submitted,

Yasmin Perez
Planning Board Secretary