

MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, JANUARY 8, 2024,
1 COLONIAL DRIVE, MANCHESTER, NEW JERSEY

The Regular Meeting of the Manchester Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairman Bill Barron at 6:11 pm on Monday, January 8, 2024.

A Salute to the Flag and Pledge of Allegiance was repeated.

This meeting has been advertised as required by enactment of the Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL:

William Barron	Chairperson	Present
Felicia Finn	Vice Chairperson	Present
Timothy Umlauf	Mayor's Designee	Present
James Vaccaro	Council Liaison	Present
James Teague	Member	Present
Timothy Poss.	Member	Present
Sandra Drake	Class II Member	Present
William Foor	1st Alternate	Present
Samuel Carollo	2nd Alternate	Absent
Joseph Coronato, Jr., Esq.	Board Attorney	Present
Mark Rohmeyer, PE	Board Engineer	Present

MEMORIALIZATIONS:

1. Memorialization of a Resolution for an Administrative Review and Approval
Property Address: 2498 NJ-70
Block: 2 Lots: 6
Applicant: Ocean Energy Holdings, LLC
Case # PB-2023-16

The Applicant was seeking to update outdated technology on site for improved operations. Where methane gas naturally occurs from the decomposition of the garbage, and Landfills are required by permit to destroy the methane gas, currently the methane is partially destroyed by burning and partially converted to electricity through engines. This project will convert the naturally occurring methane gas into useable "natural gas" to provide energy to homes, businesses, vehicles, etc.

Mr. Coronato explained that this was a courtesy review and authority over the landfill is preempted by the SWMA. Any conditions set forth by the Board and agreed to by the applicant were included in the Resolution.

Mr. Barron called for any questions by the public and there were none.

Motion to Approve made by J. Vaccaro and seconded by Timothy Umlauf.

Roll Call: W. Barron-yes, F. Finn-yes, T. Umlauf-yes, J. Vaccaro-yes, J. Teague-yes, Tim Poss- abstain, Sandra Drake-abstain, William Foor- yes, Motion carries.

APPLICATIONS:

1. Preliminary and Final Subdivision and Site Plan Application
Property Address: Lakehurst Whitesville Rd.
Block: 65 Lots: 11, 12, 13 & 14
Applicant: Parkwood Square, LP & Parkwood Center B LLC
Case # PB-2023-05-Parkwood Square, LP

Mr. Barron explained that the Applicant is proposing to consolidate the existing lots and construct a residential development with a commercial component and a mixed-use commercial and garden apartment component in the PB-1 zone.

Mr. Sal Alfieri, Esq, attorney for the Applicant, introduced the application as a mixed-used project in an inclusionary zone requesting conditional, Preliminary & Final Site Plan approval. The Affordable Housing proposed will comply with all requirements including bedroom and income. The Application is variance free, and the applicant is only requesting a handful of waivers. He introduced Exhibits A1-A6 as all the various renderings and plans already submitted to the Board members in their application packets.

Mr. Alfieri introduced Mr. Ian Borden, PE, PP, and he was sworn in to provide Professional Planning and Professional Engineering testimony. His credentials were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Borden will have full-mounted copies of the exhibits delivered to Townhall shortly as he left them at the office and another employee is on his way to bring them to him.

Mr. Borden explained that the project is a mixed-use development, and he described the location of the property. He said that the existing intersection is signalized and that there are no freshwater buffers or wetlands on the site, nor are there any environmental restrictions. It is located in the PB-1 zone and the properties to the east and north are in the PR-15 zone. The property is located in the Pine Barrens National Reserve and is part of the Regional Growth Zone, which is an area designated by the Pinelands capable of commercial and other growth. A certificate of filing with the Pinelands Commission is required and was done.

Mr. Borden went on to explain that Manchester Township performed an extensive review of the Master Plan and there was a change to many zones. An Ordinance adopted in 2017 permitted residential uses in the PB-1 zone, including Townhomes and Garden Apartments. Ordinance 23-41 permitted mixed-uses in the PB-1 zone, which makes the proposed commercial and residential components fully consistent.

Exhibit A2 was introduced as the Overall Site Plan. Mr. Borden explained that there are three (3) uses proposed on the site. Two commercial buildings are proposed, with one being a 2-story, 12,800 SF building and the other being a 3 story, 31,200 SF building with a residential component. All will comply with the uses permitted in the zone. There will also be 166 residential units, including 138 townhomes in 20 buildings, and 28 apartments on the second and third floor of the mixed-use building. All of the proposed apartments in the mixed-use building will be affordable housing. Each townhome will be two- and one-half stories and three bedrooms. There will also be an option for a fourth bedroom in the attic, so the parking provided accounts for four bedrooms per unit.

Mr. Borden explained that 10.5 Pinelands credits are required to be purchased and redeemed.

A centralized clubhouse is proposed in the townhome section of the project with a splash park, and a 21,000 SF recreation area. There will be off-street parking provided as well. 639 parking spaces are required for all uses proposed on the property and 651 parking spaces are provided. There are 9 ADA parking spaces provided, 2 spaces in the office building and 7 spaces provided at the mixed-use building. The applicant is agreeable to relocating the ADA parking spaces as requested by the Board and the Engineer. There will be 2 off-street parking spaces provided for each residential unit, and the guest spaces are accounted for as 1.5 spaces per unit. Most of the parking spaces in the front of the mixed-use building is commercial, with residential parking in the rear.

Of the 651 spaces, 8 are credited because of the EV ready spaces provided. One of the EV spaces will be changed to ADA as requested.

The applicant will be requesting a waiver for the 9'x18' proposed spaces where 10'x20' spaces are required because the 9'x18' spaces are the standard size for the industry. The driveways are 9'x20'.

The traffic circulation plan includes access for emergency vehicles, which can certainly traverse the loop roads.

The second design waiver is the setback for the guest and office parking. 245-28(D) requires 20 ft, where 15ft is proposed for the guest parking and 11 ft for the front parking. This only affects 18 spaces.

The next previously requested waiver was for the separation of buildings where 12 ft is required, and 10 ft is proposed. The applicant will amend the plans and comply with the required separation so that no waiver is required.

There are five driveways proposed to adjoining roads, three of which are right in/right out and two of which have left turn lanes. Both roads are county roads, and they are waiting for comments and approval.

The site meets all lot standards including 13.7% building coverage where 20% is permitted, the building height of all four (4) building types meet and comply with requirements where the max height is 40 ft. The mixed-use building is 35 ft, the office building is 26 ft., the townhomes are 20 ft., and the clubhouse is 24 ft. Refuse sites are provided and will all have a solid enclosure. There are 7 provided where 2 are required.

The property owner and the association are responsible for the maintenance of the streets, parking, drainage, trash and recycling, and the recreation area. The site will be serviced by public water and public sewer and will connect to projected improvements as is permitted. An application is pending for the water and sewer and Manchester will own the water and sewer hook-ups.

Mr. Borden also noted that the Engineer review letter asked to provide testimony about the general construction of the project, and he asserted that the smoke, dust, noise, etc. will not impose an issue to the neighbors and they will comply with all requirements.

Mr. Borden explained about the landscape plan and said that it is important to maintain a quality road scape, so the applicant is proposing evergreen hedges to screen the headlights. There will be 200 deciduous trees, 160 evergreens and 863 shrubs. All of which will be over and above what is required.

Mr. Borden testified that there are three signs proposed. A monument sign at each driveway entrance, 6 ft. in height and small signage area, as well as one commercial sign in front, setback 15 ft., 18 ft in height and there will be no digital or animation. The wall signage will comply.

Mr. Borden stated that the site lighting would be residential friendly, with no spillage of light on adjoining properties.

Mr. Borden testified that the applicant and his firm took great care in designing the stormwater management infrastructure with the proposed removal of total nitrogen runoff. The plan includes small scale drywells and small-scale retention basins. The applicant will comply with all technical requirements in the Morgan Engineering review letter.

Next, Mr. Borden explained the conditional use requirements. 20.8 acres are proposed where 5 acres is required. 8 units per gross acre are permitted and proposed. A ground floor shopping plaza is provided. The building is setback 75 ft from county roads. The applicant is proposing a 75 ft side setback where 50 ft is required. The required 1500 SF splash pad is provided. The applicant complies with all floor area requirements and height requirements. The project complies with the 2 ½ story requirement and is only proposing 13.7% coverage where 20% is permitted. The 28 proposed affordable housing units comply with the requirements. The project complies with the 30 ft height requirements and all minimum distances between townhome buildings. They are required to have two outdoor refuse sites, of which 7 are provided. The applicant is providing 21,000 SF of recreational area where 500 SF is required. The applicant will comply with all the required parking. The project will be paved and curbed to provide adequate drainage. All off-street parking is fenced. The site will have public water and sewers. The road will comply with the 26 ft width and no on-street parking will be permitted. The

driveways for ingress and egress will not be within 200 ft of the intersection. There will be an HOA provided as well as a centralized mailbox. The 20% affordable housing complies, and the 10.5 Pinelands credits will be purchased and redeemed.

Mr. Borden set forth the required waivers as:

- 9'x19' width parking spaces where 10'x20' are required, the proposed complied with RSIS requirements.
- setback parking for guest and office because they are provided a sufficient safety island which will be landscaped.
- loading area for the office building because there will likely be no large trucks for the delivery of supplies.

Mr. Borden completed his testimony.

Mr. Barron opened up to questions from Board members.

Ms. Finn stated that she was concerned about the bedroom in the attic, and she feels that this will cause an issue with parking.

Mr. Borden stated that the applicant already agreed to Deed Restrict no bedroom in the finished basement and that there are 2.5 spaces provided for each of the townhouses, which meets the RSIS requirements for 4 bedrooms, with 1.5 spaces for guests in addition to that.

Mr. Rohmeyer confirmed that that was the minimum required by the state.

Mr. Finn said that she would like to see more.

Mr. Alfieri stated that Ms. Finn was entitled to her opinion, but the law states that RSIS controls standard so that every town cannot make up their own rules.

Ms. Finn asked if there would be a means of egress in the attic and Mr. Borden said that this would be a question for the architect.

Ms. Finn then asked where the mailboxes would be located, and Mr. Borden said that they are proposed in the clubhouse parking lot. She also asked to confirm that there are 7 garbage receptacles proposed and Mr. Borden confirmed. Ms. Finn also asked if there would be lighting on the signs and Mr. Borden said they would be internally lit, but that there would be no digital messages or flashing.

Mr. Umlauf expressed his concern that the refuse areas in the mixed-use building were too close to the handicap parking and they might interfere with the swing gates. Mr. Borden said that the handicapped spots will be moved closer to the entrance of the building. Mr. Umlauf stated that he never saw a development where all the mailboxes were at one centralized location and that they should be distributed better for better access for the residents. Mr. Borden explained that there will be two separate mailboxes for the townhomes and the garden apartments, but that the applicant will ultimately be guided by the Postmaster as to location of the boxes. Mr. Coronato said that it would be a condition of approval to agree to discuss the mailbox location with the Postmaster, to which Mr. Borden agreed.

Mr. Umlauf said that he was concerned about the 4 ft chain-link fence proposed and Mr. Borden explained that it needed to be an open fence because a solid fence would require a variance. Mr. Umlauf asked to make sure the chain-link fence would be black, and Mr. Borden agreed to that.

Mr. Umlauf asked about the ease of access to the EV spots and how they were being installed with no garages. Mr. Coronato said that the cost of the installation to make EV ready is expensive and he would like to see some type of outlet on the exterior of the townhomes for each dwelling for EV for the projected EV Boom. Mr. Umlauf said that he would discuss the aesthetics with the Architect.

Ms. Finn asked about the square footage of the Townhomes and asked why there were no windows in all the attics. Mr. Alfieri explained that the applicant has no authority to deviate from the building code and will comply with all codes.

Mr. Vaccaro asked how the EV spots work and Mr. Borden explained that the applicant is required to make the spots EV ready and that the service provider would come in and install it at some point. Mr. Umlauf wanted to know how the applicant intends to keep random people from charging at their stations and feels that there should be a way to limit the use of the stations to residents and patrons.

Mr. Teague asked if there were two chain link fences proposed and Mr. Borden said there were not.

Mr. Vaccaro asked why the applicant wanted to deviate from the required parking spot size and Mr. Borden explained that the applicant would like to use what is accepted country wide and in all surrounding townships. Mr. Vaccaro answered that we are Manchester not every other town. He then asked how many handicap spots and Mr. Borden explained. Mr. Vaccaro said that he would like to see more handicap spots and Mr. Borden answered that the applicant meets requirements, but they will look into adding more. Mr. Vaccaro asked if the lighting in the monument signs would always be on, and Mr. Borden explained that they would always be on, and the internal illumination would not be turned off. Mr. Vaccaro agreed that they would need to be on all the time. Mr. Borden said that it is safer that way.

Ms. Finn asked if the applicant would be proposing to put bollards in front of the mixed-use building and the office building. Mr. Borden replied that they do not usually, but they do have a 12 ft offset and they can certainly take a look at that.

Mr. Rohmeyer asked Mr. Borden to explain how the parking is sufficient. Mr. Borden answered that for the townhouses, 345 spaces are required, and 276 spaces are in the driveways and the remaining 69 spaces are provided though out the complex as well as in the guest lot. Mr. Rohmeyer asked Mr. Borden to explain what is provided for pedestrian access and he said that sidewalks are provided though out. Mr. Borden then explained that the applicant is not proposing any uses that are not permitted and the proposed uses would be retail, office, childcare, fitness, grocery, convenience store, etc. Mr. Umlauf asked how many cubic yards the garbage and Mr. Borden said that he will have a discussion with waste management, but he knows that there will be compactor units that don't make noise and they will be electric. Mr. Umlauf then asked if there would be more than one pick-up per week and Mr. Alfieri explained that it would be a problem for the management to look into. If there is a problem with the number of pick-ups, they will have to add more. Mr. Coronato said that the Board would recommend that the HOA provide a minimum of twice per week pick-ups and Mr. Borden said they would.

Ms. Finn asked if the HOA would be for the garden apartments too and Mr. Borden confirmed that it would, and they would enjoy all the same amenities as well.

Mr. Coronato expressed that he is concerned about the traffic flow with a grocery store and Ms. Finn said that she did not think that the proposed parking would not be enough for that use. Mr. Coronato followed up that if the applicant was proposing to put a grocery store in that it would need to be restricted and it would need to come back before the Board.

Mr. Vaccaro said that he is concerned about snow removal and how the applicant would remove the snow from the site. Mr. Borden stated that the snow would remain on the site and Mr. Alfieri said that the HOA would manage that, and it would definitely not be put into the public street. Mr. Coronato said that it would be a condition that snow removal shall not be in a public street.

Mr. Rohmeyer asked to confirm that the retail uses would submit for zoning permits separately and Mr. Borden confirmed that they would. Mr. Alfieri explained that the

mixed-use building would be constructed right away because of the affordable housing component.

Mr. Umlauf asked if the affordable units would be for sale or for rent and Mr. Borden confirmed that they would be for rent.

Mr. Barron asked what the difference is between a garden apartment and a townhome and Mr. Borden explained that the garden apartments would only be on the second and third floor of the mixed-use building.

Mr. Barron asked why the plans indicate that the sewage would be provided by septic and Mr. Borden said that it was a typo, and the sewage would be public.

Mr. Barron asked if garbage trucks can maneuver through the site and Mr. Borden confirmed that they would. Mr. Barron then asked if they would agree to Title 39 enforcement of speed and parking on the street and Mr. Borden confirmed that the Applicant would, and that Manchester Police could ticket and tow.

Mr. Barron then asked if there would be a sprinkler system and Mr. Borden said that they will provide those plans as required and will install sprinkler systems as required by the fire and building codes.

Mr. Barron asked if the office building was permitted in the zone and Mr. Borden confirmed that it was and there were no plans for any specific uses yet.

Mr. Barron asked what the driveway sizes were, and Mr. Borden testified that they would be 9ft. x 20 ft.

Mr. Barron then asked about the signs and building signs and Mr. Borden confirmed that they would all be in compliance with the Ordinance.

Mr. Barron then asked Mr. Borden to explain Pinelands Development credits. Mr. Borden testified that it was set up as a planning tool to preserve the core of the Pinelands. Portions of Pinelands in the Regional Growth zone can buy credits from other property owners in the preservation area that cannot be built.

Mr. Rohmeyer asked to explain what would be in the clubhouse and Mr. Borden explained that there would be meeting rooms, etc.

Mr. Rohmeyer then asked what outside approvals are required and Mr. Borden responded that County, Township Water and Sewer, Ocean County Soils District, Pinelands Commission, and DEP were required approvals for this application.

Mr. Rohmeyer then asked how the applicant came into this site layout and Mr. Borden said that the Applicant felt it was important to put commercial on the county road. They developed the Townhomes geometrically for good backyards and clubhouse and recreational area locations.

Mr. Barron asked what the distance was between driveways and intersections and Mr. Borden explained that they were 360 ft. away from the intersection and 140 ft. away from the retail driveway.

Mr. Teague asked how many bedrooms were in the apartments and Mr. Borden answered that there were 5 units with 1 bedroom, 16 units with two bedrooms, and 7 units with 3 bedrooms. Mr. Teague asked who solicits the uses for retail and Mr. Borden explained that they HOA would manage it and the individuals would come in on their own for zoning permit applications.

Mr. Umlauf asked about the runoff and Mr. Borden said that the runoff details need to be drawn on the map. Mr. Umlauf asked what the recharge is for the commercial and the clubhouse, where Mr. Rohmeyer answered that it would go to an infiltration basin.

Mr. Barron opened for public questions for the engineer.

Gail Apgar of 53 Columbus Blvd was sworn in. She said that she was afraid that this application would set a precedent for all of Manchester and she is afraid it will get too congested. Mr. Coronato explained that this was a time for questions only for Mr. Borden and that the time for comments would come later. Ms. Apgar then asked if Mr. Borden thought that the Applicant could add some garages. She also asked if there would be storage and restaurants added. Mr. Coronato said that the garage question and restaurant questions would be better suited for the Architect, but that Mr. Borden could answer the storage question. Mr. Borden said that the Architect could answer questions related to storage of family-related items.

Mr. Coronato asked what the circulation was in regard to commercial vs. residential and Mr. Borden answered that most of the commercial parking would be in the front and is in the rear as well as side access. Mr. Coronato asked what the parking ratio would be for the apartments and Mr. Borden answered that it would be 2 spaces per unit. The applicant is required to provide 55 spaces and that is what is provided. Mr. Coronato asked Mr. Borden to explain which spaces were dedicated and he did. Mr. Barron asked if the spots themselves would be indicated and Mr. Borden said they would be numbered 1-28 for the units. Mr. Coronato asked if the applicant would be willing to designate the remaining spots by marking them as well and Mr. Borden responded that they could, but it wouldn't be good planning and the other spots should be shared.

Ms. Apgar asked how many stores there were going to be, and Mr. Borden said that he did not know yet. Mr. Coronato reiterated that each individual store would have to submit a zoning permit.

Alice DeVito of 2016 Fourth Ave was sworn in. She asked if the retail was part of the HOA and who would be in charge of extermination if required. Mr. Alfieri answered that the HOA/management would handle that. Mr. Coronato explained that the HOA would be the landlord. Ms. DeVito also expressed that she was concerned about the splash park with children by the commercial property. Mr. Borden said that the recreational and splash pad area will be fenced in and centrally located by the clubhouse with sidewalks and crosswalks for access. Ms. DeVito asked if they were aware of building code updates.

Marge Marranca of 6 Fawnhollow Ln asked when the application was submitted to the Pinelands Commission. Mr. Borden said that he does not have the date of submission, but he has the Certificate of Filing. Ms. Marranca asked if the Pinelands approved the application and Mr. Borden explained that the Pinelands only reviews the application after final approval is obtained. Mr. Marranca then asked why there was an issue with the Board asking not to ask with the waiver for the size of the parking spots and Mr. Borden testified that it was because it goes against state regulations. Ms. Marranca then asked if it goes against Manchester's and Mr. Borden confirmed that he understands that it does. Ms. Marranca asked if the applicant gets more spaces this way and Mr. Borden confirmed that they do. Ms. Marranca then asked how the applicant is intending the water the landscaping and Mr. Borden testified that it would be sourced from a private well. Ms. Marranca asked if they received a permit for the private well and Mr. Borden said that the well proposed will not require a water diversion and allocation permit.

Susan Giglia of 3 Tavistock Ln was sworn in. She said that all these questions seem to relate to Brooklyn style living and she wanted to know how many people they expect. Mr. Borden said that he has no idea and Ms. Giglia said 166 units x 4 bedrooms could be about 6-7 people per unit and it would contribute to more buses and traffic. Mr. Alfieri said that the number of people living in a community is not a zoning consideration. Ms. Giglia said it should be and asked if taxes are a Planning Board question. Mr. Alfieri said that taxes are not a Planning Board question, and the number of people is not a Planning Board question. Ms. Giglia commented that she thinks the applicant is pulling side steps to get away with more bedrooms. Mr. Alfieri objected, and objection was sustained.

Ken Kertis of 5 Tavistock Ln, was sworn in. He wanted to know if the applicant does not receive the waivers for the 9 ft. vs. 10 ft. spaces, how many condos would be lost? Mr.

Alferi said that RSIS requirements only regulate residential, not commercial, so it wouldn't affect the number of townhomes. Mr. Borden said the applicant would lose about 10 ft. of commercial space. Mr. Kertis said that he does not want this application to set the precedent with parking. Mr. Borden said that this only affects the commercial, not the townhomes. Mr. Kertis asked what the setback was to the parking. Mr. Borden said that it only affects 18 spaces. Mr. Kertis asked why they do not just leave it where it is, and Mr. Borden stated that he believes the applicant qualifies for the waiver.

Mr. Teague asked if the population question from before could be explained. Mr. Rohmeyer answered that the Building Code requirements handle accommodations for population consideration.

Rob Maris of 3142 Route 547 was sworn in. He said that traffic is a concern and he wanted to know where it would be routed. Mr. Barron interjected and said that he thinks that might be a question for the traffic engineer.

Karen Guadlip of 17 Lois Ln. was sworn in. She asked why the applicant has to build something that takes up every inch of the property. Mr. Alferi asked Mr. Borden to talk about coverage. Mr. Borden said that this area was designated as a Regional Growth Area zone in 1981, which was over 40 years ago. The applicant is proposing 14% coverage where 20% is permitted. They also are proposing less units than what is permitted. Ms. Guadlip said that she couldn't buy a piece of property because of the Pinelands. Mr. Borden explained that it was different because it is just residential and not commercial. Ms. Guadlip said that the traffic is going to be unbelievable. Mr. Barron interjected again and said that question would be better suited for the traffic engineer. Ms. Guadlip said that she was concerned about the proposed attic bedrooms and fire. She also asked if the clubhouse would be a place of worship. Mr. Alferi said that it would not be. It is ancillary to the townhomes and the HOA, and the use and it is not permitted in the zone. Ms. Guadlip asked how many kitchens would be in each home. Mr. Coronato answered that only one kitchen is permitted in single family residential homes. Ms. Guadlip asked about the garbage pick-up. Mr. Borden confirmed that no parking is proposed near the garbage receptacles. Mr. Coronato asked Mr. Borden to discuss the radius and circulation plan for access to the garbage trucks. Mr. Borden testified that there would be access for emergency vehicles and garbage trucks. Ms. Guadlip asked if cars would be permitted to park on Ridge Ave. Mr. Borden said they would not be permitted to park there because it is a county road.

Mr. Barron closed the public questions for Mr. Borden.

A 5-10 Minute Recess was announced by Mr. Barron.

Mr. Coronato explained that because of the construction on Colonial Drive, the water in the bathrooms was shut down. He allowed for a 15-minute break so that the public could go and use the restroom at another facility and return back to Townhall when finished. He announced that he would handle the Redevelopment Project while waiting for the people to return.

Mr. Barron introduced the applicant.

Mr. Rohmeyer explained that this is in reference to the Redevelopment Plan located at Block 62, Lots 30 & 30.01

Jeremy Lan of Active Acquisitions was sworn in. He explained that the amendments to the Redevelopment Plan were due to the Pinelands Review of the Redevelopment Plan. They were concerned with the recreational component and wanted to assure that they assess a Pinelands credit against that, and they wanted to make sure that all roof tops were solar ready, which is state law. The Council had their first reading last week.

Mr. Rohmeyer confirmed that it has gone before the Council for the first reading. After the Planning Board's review, it will go back to the Council again for the second reading.

Mr. Barron asked if there were comments from the Board and there were none.

Mr. Barron asked for a motion to send the Redevelopment Plan to the Council for second reading. Ms. Finn made that motion, seconded by Mr. Vaccaro.

Roll Call: W. Barron-yes, F. Finn-yes, T. Umlauf-yes, J. Vaccaro-yes, J. Teague-yes, T. Poss-yes, S. Drake-yes. Motion carries.

ADMINISTRATION SESSION:

Mr. Barron called for payment of the bills.

Mr. Umlauf read the billing report into record:

We are in receipt of (1) invoice from Colliers Engineering totaling \$46.25 and .25hrs. The services are in support of:

Project No.	Project
MCP0096 (1)	Manchester Apartments, LLC

The services are in support of Correspondence; Application Review; Resolution Preparation; and Preparation for and Attendance at Planning Board Meetings.

Mr. Umlauf finds the charges to be reasonable and appropriate and recommended approval.

Mr. Barron asked for a Motion to pay the Bills.

Ms. Finn made that Motion and Mr. Teague seconded that Motion.

Roll Call Vote: ALL IN FAVOR
NONE OPPOSED

Mr. Barron asked for a Motion to approve the December 4, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

Mr. Vaccaro made the Motion; Mr. Teague seconded that Motion.

Roll Call Vote: ALL IN FAVOR
NONE OPPOSED

Mr. Barron returned to the Parkwood Square testimony.

Mr. Alfieri introduced John Rea, PE.

Mr. Rea was sworn in and stated his credentials as a licensed PE in NJ with 48 years' experience. He received his undergraduate degree from NJIT and his graduate degree from NYU. He has previously testified before Manchester. The Board accepted his credentials.

Mr. Rea testified that they have performed a fully detailed traffic analysis. They have studied this intersection on several different occasions. In April of 2022, they projected 10 years into the future in order to project traffic. The project would increase traffic 1% per year for an Ocean County arterial roadway. The Jackson Trails project with 460 residential units were included in the projection. The mixed-use commercial of 40,000 SF and office commercial were also included in the projection. Traffic from the projected county park was also included.

Mr. Rea said that this was a conservative analysis with the worst-case approach. The project proposes two driveways with right in/right out access closest to the intersection. The county approves the location of the driveways and will require left turn lanes. For the study, they look at peak hours for traffic in the morning and in the afternoon. In the

morning, the project 62 inbound and 80 outbound trips for the driveways and 123 inbound and 109 outbound trips in the afternoon. The calculated levels of service are “A” at the highest and “F” at the lowest. Only an “E” or better is acceptable.

Mr. Rea the 547-571 intersection with 3 lanes on each of the 4 approaches and modern traffic signals. At the morning peak time, the traffic is a level “C” with or without the application. At the afternoon peak time, the traffic is a level “D” with or without the application. The site driveways that are right in/right out operate acceptably. Where left turns are permitted on 571 the intersection performs at a level “C” in the morning and a level “D” in the afternoon. Where left turns are permitted on 547, the intersection performs at a level “C” in the morning and the afternoon. The levels of service will remain the same, even with the additional delay added. The application meets and exceeds the RSIS parking requirements and the Township ordinance. Mr. Rea said that in his estimation, 10 ft. x 20 ft. parking spots are not necessary for the use. They can do the bigger spots with less of a buffer because everything will be shifted closer to the roadway.

Mr. Rea feels that there is a good circulation plan within the project. The roads are 26 ft. wide in accordance with Township ordinance and the turning radius for emergency vehicles is acceptable. Mr. Alfieri explained that the applicant is provided 26 ft. instead of the 24 ft. that RSIS requires because of the Township ordinance. Mr. Rea confirmed that.

Ms. Finn asked if the applicant could move the parking and maintain the buffer without the need of a variance. Mr. Rea said they could, but it is just not as attractive.

Mr. Umlauf asked if the applicant considered delivery from all large trucks impeding traffic flow during construction. Mr. Rea said that it is accounted for in the traffic study. He said that the applicant will work with the Township Engineer with respect to the hours the trucks are acceptable during construction.

Mr. Umlauf said that more times than not on a Friday in the summer that he is backed up to Cassville Rd. Mr. Rea said that Friday in the summer is always rough in Ocean County. We don't want construction traffic at 5 p.m. or 6 p.m. in the evening on a Friday. Mr. Umlauf asked if there was an estimate on the time for construction. Mr. Alfieri said that they have a two-year estimate.

Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. Rea if there was a loading zone requirement for the smaller office building and Mr. Rea said that it was not really necessary for the office but that it was definitely needed for retail.

Mr. Rohmeyer asked if Mr. Rea thought that the applicant provided adequate parking for the residential townhomes and Mr. Rea said he absolutely did. He said that Rutgers just released a study that indicates that existing RSIS requirements are too high.

Mr. Coronato asked if they submitted the application to the Fire Marshal for review. Ms. Kisty confirmed that it had been submitted to Mike Martin for review. She said that she would check with him tomorrow on the status of his review and comments. Mr. Rohmeyer said that Fire Marshal review and approval could also be made a condition.

Mr. Barron asked if there would be bollards in front of the retail. Mr. Rea agreed to that.

Mr. Coronato asked how many cars would be entering during peak hours. Mr. Rea answered that the Ocean County Engineering department accepts the data they use to calculate. More often than not, they overestimate. In the morning peak hours they project 142 trips, with 62 inbound and 80 outbound, and in the afternoon peak hours they project 232 trips, with 123 inbound and 109 outbound. The morning peak out is 7:30 a.m. to 8:30 a.m. and the afternoon peak hour is 4:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Mr. Coronato asked if the school bus circulation was anticipated, and Mr. Rea said that they will discuss that with the school district and figure that out as well as the best bus stops.

Mr. Coronato asked Mr. Rea if the circulation between the office, commercial and residential were all considered, and Mr. Rea confirmed it was. He said a majority of the stops may also be pass-by traffic. They do the study as if it is all new traffic.

Mr. Coronato asked to confirm if the 547 entrance would be mainly for the residential where the 571 entrance would be mainly for the commercial. Mr. Rea said that it is all balanced and accounted for in figure 6 of the traffic study. Mr. Coronato asked which roadway will generate the most increased flow. Mr. Rea answered that it would be 25% in each direction.

Mr. Coronato asked to confirm that there would be no left turn out of Road "A" and Mr. Rea confirmed that. Mr. Coronato asked about Road "C", which would be the main entrance from 571 and whether left turns would be permitted. Mr. Rea said that the study showed that in the morning, there are a projected 17 left turns out of the driveway and 15 left turns in and in the afternoon, there is a projected 26 left turns out and 9 left turns in. Mr. Coronato asked if Mr. Rea thought the left turn out of Road "C" would interfere with the intersection and Mr. Rea said he did not think it would and that they are sufficiently spaced to meet the Ocean County Road criteria. Mr. Coronato asked if Mr. Rea thought that the right in/right out on Ridgeway and Lakehurst/Whitesville Rd. would not impede the intersection and Mr. Rea said that he did not think it would but would not suggest adding left turns there. Mr. Coronato asked if that would be a significant time to stop and signal and Mr. Rea said yes.

Mr. Barron asked if large trucks going north on 547 going fast, would have enough time to stop. Mr. Rea said yes as long as all traffic laws and safety regulations are followed.

Mr. Coronato asked if the circulation at the traffic entrance where Road "B" would be improved by a traffic light. Mr. Rea said no because there isn't enough traffic to warrant a signal and the County would never approve it.

Mr. Umlauf stated that the cars would be traveling across four lanes of traffic and Mr. Rea said that it is acceptable according to studies and left turns need to be permitted somewhere because people will do it somewhere. Mr. Umlauf said that people are not going to want to go all the way around and Mr. Rea said that Internal signage can be provided to direct traffic to 571 east. Mr. Coronato asked if the applicant would provide signage to indicate where left turns are not permitted.

Mr. Barron asked if there were any more questions from the Board. There were none.

Mr. Barron opened for questions from the public for the traffic engineer.

Alice DeVito, previously sworn in, asked if the Manchester Police were consulted.

Mr. Rea asked the Board and Ms. Kisty confirmed that it was. Mr. Coronato said that they will follow up with the Police tomorrow.

Gail Apgar, previously sworn in, asked how many stores are shown on A-3. Mr. Rea answered that there are 12 stores at the most. Most stores will take a double unit. Mr. Apgar referred to A-4, which is the office building. She asked if the parking spaces could be made bigger. She said that it would attract more people in wheelchairs and handicaps. She said she doesn't like that they would be moving the parking closer to the road.

Ms. Finn said that the impact would be minimal. Mr. Alfieri said that is not necessary, but the applicant will comply.

Ms. Apgar referred to A-1 and the land across the street. Mr. Barron answered that the land is owned by the County. Mr. Coronato said that we can only address the land before them right now.

Mr. Barron asked if there were any more questions.

Mike Abramczyk of 107B Conastoga was sworn in. He was concerned that the splash park would create more traffic. Mr. Alfieri said that it would be for residents only.

Mr. Abramczyk asked if there was an Environmental Study done. Mr. Coronato said that there was. Mr. Alfieri said that testimony would be provided at the next meeting.

Mr. Coronato asked Mr. Rea to comment on foot traffic. Mr. Rea said that most foot traffic will come from the townhomes and garden apartments. There will be sidewalks and crosswalks. The applicant will add more crosswalks internally. Mr. Coronato asked what the peak hours would be for that. Mr. Rea answered that it would be in the middle of the day in the summer when it is hot. Mr. Coronato asked what the speed limit would be and Mr. Rea said that it will be 25 mph, which is the residential limit, but they are private roads so they could make it less. Mr. Coronato said he felt that 15 mph would be better.

Mr. Alfieri said that he would like to carry the application to the next meeting with no more traffic testimony. Mr. Coronato announced that they would continue testimony for this application at the next meeting on February 5, 2024 at 6:00 p.m. here at 1 Colonial Drive, Manchester, NJ.

Ms. DeVito asked if this would be a gated community and Mr. Coronato said no.

Mr. Barron opened to the public for general comment. There was none.

CLOSED PUBLIC PORTION

Mr. Barron asked for a motion to adjourn, Mr. Umlauf made that motion, seconded by Ms. Finn.

ALL IN FAVOR, NONE OPPOSED.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Amanda Kisty

Secretary to the Board

