Monroe Township
Planning Board Regular Meeting

March 10, 2016

Call to Order:

The regular meeting of the Monroe Township Planning Board was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman O’Brien. The Board saluted the flag. Roll call was as follows:

Present – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Heffner, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Absent – Mr. Caligiuri, (excused), Mr. Cooper, (excused), Mr. Scardino, (excused), Mr. Kernan, (excused), Mr. Jordan, (excused). Also present – Mr. Rocco, Solicitor. Mr. Heffner is filling in for Mr. Caligiuri as a Class III Member of Council.

Proper notice of this meeting was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act on January 8, 2016.

Chairman O’Brien read the following statement: “Be advised, no new item of business will be started after 10:30 p.m. and the meeting shall terminate no later than 11:00 p.m.”

Memorialization of Resolutions:

1. PB-25-16 – App. #WSP-13-16 – Cakes & Cookies Food Mart, LLC – Site Plan Waiver
   Motion by Mr. Teefy, seconded by Mr. Masterson to adopt resolution PB-25-16. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Ms. Hui, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. PB-26-16 – App. #WSP-11-16 – Drive Time Car Sales Company – Site Plan Waiver
   Motion by Mr. Agnesino, seconded by Mr. Teefy to adopt resolution PB-26-16. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

3. PB-27-16 – App. #1723 – Morgan Development Group, LLC – One Year Extension
   Motion by Mr. Agnesino, seconded by Mr. Masterson to adopt resolution PB-27-16. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr, Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

4. PB-28-16 – App. #1751 – Morgan Development Group, LLC – One Year Extension
   Motion by Mr. Agnesino, seconded by Mr. Crane to adopt resolution PB-28-16. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

Site Plan Waivers – for Board Action:

1. #WSP-14-16 – Mini, LP – Site Plan Waiver
   Present – Steve Watchorn, applicant, Christopher Schubert, applicant’s attorney.

Member’s packets contained: 1 A copy of the applicant’s site plan waiver application and survey.
2. Letter dated March 7, 2016 prepared by Rosemary Flaherty, Zoning Officer.

The applicant is seeking a site plan waiver in order to be permitted to add a U-Haul business to the existing self-storage business. The property is located at 1841 N. Black Horse Pike, also known as Block 201, Lot 45 in the Commercial Zoning District.
Site Plan Waivers: (continued)

1. #WSP-14-16 – Mini, LP (continued)

Mr. Schubert introduced himself as the applicant’s attorney. The site plan waiver is being required as a result of a violation that was issued back in January for the U-Haul business as an accessory use to the self-storage business. When approval was given for the self-storage business the owner also applied for an accessory use but was not aware they had to apply for a separate zoning permit for that use. The illegal signage has been removed specifically the banner signs. Mr. Schubert distributed exhibit packets to the Board which were marked as Exhibit A-1 through A-5. The packets depicted photographs of the site and a survey. The U-Haul trucks park in the front of the site in front of the office for the self-storage facility. They are the standard size panel style truck. There are usually only three to five trucks on the site at any one time but there can be up to eight. The property manager for the self-storage facility handles the rental of the U-Haul trucks so there aren’t any additional employees on the site. The property is well maintained by the property owner. There is a comment in Ms. Flaherty’s letter concerning adding additional landscaping however the site already has landscaping near the front of the property and along the sidewalk area. Mr. Schubert did not feel that they needed to add any additional landscaping as they did not want to block the view of the businesses.

Mr. Watchorn stated that he does rely heavily on drive-by traffic seeing his business. He didn’t want to have any landscaping that would hide his business from the drivers passing by. He felt the landscaping that is in place was adequate for the site. Ms. Flaherty commented that she was thinking of low lying plants that would give the site some color along the highway she wasn’t thinking of shrubbery that would block visibility to the site. She stated maybe some small plants near or around the signage that would give the area some color and be attractive to the people driving past the site. The banner sign is not a permitted use on a permanent basis but used only for grand openings; the applicant should submit a plan for a permanent sign. Mr. Heffner commented that the site is very well maintained. He questioned whether there was a certain number of parking spaces required with the original approval for the self-storage facility and if the added business has reduced the required number of parking spaces. Mr. Schubert stated that he can ask for a copy of the original site plan and if there are any issues they can address them when they apply for their zoning permit. Mr. Watchorn stated that there are two dedicated trucks on the site but at any given time someone can come and drop off a truck; on average there could be four or five trucks on the site at one time. Mr. Crane stated that he didn’t see an issue with parking since people just come in, park go to their storage space and leave, they are not there that long. Mr. Watchorn stated that he is fine with submitting the five hundred dollar escrow for the planner’s review for additional landscaping. Mrs. Farrell stated that the applicant must submit a landscaping plan and the check to the zoning office.

Motion passed to open the hearing to the public. There being none, motion passed to close the hearing to the public.

Mr. Rocco reviewed the conditions of approval. The applicant must submit a landscaping plan and additional escrow as well as applying for the zoning permit. Motion by Mr. Teefy, seconded by Mr. Agnesino to grant the site plan waiver approval subject to the above stated conditions. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Heffner, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. #WSP-15-16 – Thanh Vu/Nail Salon – Site Plan Waiver

Present – Thanh Vu, applicant, Robert Pisani, applicant’s architect.

Member’s packets contained:  1. A copy of the applicant’s site plan waiver application and survey.  2. Letter dated March 7, 2016 prepared by Rosemary Flaherty, Zoning Officer.
2. #WSP-15-16 – Thanh Vu (continued)

Mr. Pisani and Ms. Vu were sworn in by Mr. Rocco. Mr. Pisani displayed a floor plan for the Board. He stated that they are not making any structural changes to the building. There is a reception area, a room for waxing, storage area and coat room, bathroom, ten pedicure stations, six hair stations, a shampoo station, six nail polish chairs, a nail polish center, and a bar area. There is an existing garage that will be used for storage. With regard to the parking area, Mr. Pisani stated that the parking area is existing; however, if they need additional parking the back yard is big enough that they can add additional parking in the future. He designed the parking lot so that no one will have to back out onto Main Street. There are three existing apartments above the commercial use; two are occupied and one is vacant. They have provided three parking spaces for the tenants.

The front of the building is mostly windows. The applicant is proposing to install draperies on the windows and would like to have lit signs depicting the services offered by the salon. There is an existing sign on the building which will be changed to the salon’s name and backlit as well. Mr. Pisani showed a sketch of the proposed sign that will replace the existing signage. He stated that all the utilities are existing within the building. Ms. Flaherty stated that she would like to reserve comment on the proposed signage after she has a chance to see the actual proposal from the applicant’s sign company with regard to the size and design as there is a requirement that the signage can only use ten percent of the façade. Mr. Agnesino expressed his concern with customers making a left hand turn out of the site. It was agreed that the applicant would install signage at the egress to indicate there is a right hand only turn out of the site onto Main Street. Ms. Hui inquired about trash pick-up on the site. Ms. Vu stated that the trash will be located in the rear of the building. They do have trash containers from the Township and Ms. Vu stated that they will not generate a lot of trash and will not need a dumpster. With regard to parking, Ms. Flaherty stated that three parking spaces are required for each chair and two parking spaces for each dwelling unit. The applicant is proposing twelve customer parking spaces, one handicap parking space, six employee parking spaces, and three tenant parking spaces. Ms. Flaherty requested that the tenant spaces be designated on the plan and signage utilized to identify those spaces so that customers do use those parking spaces. It was determined that the applicant does have enough room to provide additional parking spaces if necessary. Ms. Flaherty asked if the applicant agreed to provide a copy of each employee’s cosmetology license when she submits for her zoning permit. Ms. Vu stated that she will provide copies of the licenses. Mr. Pisani stated that the building was inspected and they did receive a Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Rocco reviewed the conditions of approval for the Board. The first condition is that the applicant receive approval from Ms. Flaherty with regard to any proposed signage, the right hand turn only sign, additional parking spaces if deemed necessary in the future in which the applicant will have to return to the Board for approval, submission of the cosmetology licenses for each employee, and proof the residential uses have been inspected. Motion by Mr. Teefy, seconded by Mr. Agnesino to grant the site plan waiver subject to the above noted conditions. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Heffner, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

3. #WSP-18-16 – Kimberly Sacco – Site Plan Waiver

Present – Kimberly Sacco, applicant, James Sacco, applicant’s spouse.

Member’s packets contained: 1. A copy of the applicant’s site plan waiver application and survey of the property. 2. Letter dated March 7, 2016 prepared by Rosemary Flaherty, Zoning Officer.
Site Plan Waivers: (continued)

3. WSP-18-16 – Kimberly Sacco (continued)

Ms. Sacco was sworn in by Mr. Rocco. Ms. Sacco stated that she is planning to lease space in
the Monroe Business Park, specifically Unit D1, to hold cheerleading practices for the Spirit
Cheers organization. The hours for practices usually run from 4:30 p.m. to 9:00 p.m. Monday
through Friday and Saturday from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. Occasionally they may have practice
on a Sunday. There are plenty of parking spaces in front of the building and along the side of the
building. They are proposing a banner sign for their grand opening which will be sometime in
April. They also have a proposal for an awning over the doorway of the unit which she is thinking
about having installed but not right now. They are not proposing any other signage at this time;
however the landlord will put their organization’s name on the directory in front the site and also
on the one further down the drive aisle. There can be anywhere from ten to thirty children at one
time in the building. Ms. Flaherty commented that they may be able to have the name of the
organization right on the awning which would be easier and probably cheaper. Ms. Sacco stated
that she did inquire about the name on the awning and the company stated they can print the name
on the flap of the awning.

Ms. Flaherty asked if the applicant will be hosting any tournaments at the facility. Ms. Sacco
stated that she would not be hosting any tournaments but perhaps a showcase at the start of the
season when the teams have their routines completed so that friends and family can come to see
them. Mr. Rocco asked the ages of the competitors. Ms. Sacco stated that they start at age three
and can go up to age eighteen. Mr. Agnesino asked how the children are dropped off and picked
up from the site. Ms. Sacco stated that the parents of the younger children from age nine and
below, usually stay and watch. The older children usually get dropped off and picked up. Ms.
Sacco stated that she does not let any child leave the facility until she knows a parent is there to
pick them up. James Sacco was sworn in by Mr. Rocco. He testified that inside this facility there
is a very comfortable waiting area for the parents and a viewing area where they can look down
and watch the practices.

Mr. Rocco stated the only condition is that the applicant will need to obtain a Certificate of
Occupancy. Motion by Mr. Crane, seconded by Mr. Teefy to grant the site plan waiver with the
above noted condition. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Heffner, Mr. Crane, Ms.
Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

4. #WSP-10-16 – 4644 Black Horse Pike, LLC- Site Plan Waiver

Present – William Nash, applicant’s attorney, David Greenspun, Program Director, Doug
Reichert, Clinical Director and Administrator of the Behavioral Crossroads facilities.

Member’s packets contained: 1. A copy of the applicant’s site plan waiver application and
survey. 2. Letter and photographs dated March 7, 2016 prepared by Rosemary Flaherty, Zoning
Officer.

Mr. Greenspun was sworn in by Mr. Rocco. The applicant is proposing to utilize this site as a
sober living facility. They were previously issued a permit in July of 2015 for the use; however
Pinelands approval was never obtained. The applicant has since received an exemption from the
Pinelands Commission. The property is located at 4644 South Black Horse Pike, also known as
Block 6101, Lot 2 in the RD-C Zoning District. The applicant prepared a power point
presentation for the Board that included photographs of the site and facilities on the site. The
photographs depicted both before and after pictures of the property outside and inside the
facilities.
4. #WSP-10-16 – 4644 BHP, LLC: (continued)

Mr. Nash stated that the purpose of the sober living facility is to provide a safe, secure, supported residence for clients with addictions. The clients are in a clinical treatment program during the day and need a safe place to go in the evening. The sober living facility is a non-clinical, safe, supported bubble for clients to stay in the evenings until the next day’s treatment. There are requirements for being a resident of the facility. All clients must be enrolled in a clinical treatment program and when they are in the residence they will have daily chores and other responsibilities. The facility provides food and shelter but it does not mean they can do whatever they want in the house or apartments. The clients are transported to the gym several days a week and there is programming inside the house to keep them occupied until the next day’s clinical treatment. Clients who are in the program have various addictions and are required to remain sober. If any of the clients do not remain sober they will be asked to leave the sober living facility. They are taught that there are consequences to their actions. Mr. Teefy asked where a client will go if they are asked to leave the facility. Mr. Greenspun replied that they usually go back to family; there is always an emergency contact person and the facility does have contingency plans in those types of situations. The goal is to keep the other residents of the house safe and from anything triggering their addictions.

The facility also prepares their clients with skills during their stay such as resume writing and how to search for jobs so once their treatment is over they are better prepared to go home. Mr. Nash stated that they have an exemption letter from the Pinelands and that they received their zoning permit back in July 2015. There was a question concerning any proposed signage with Mr. Nash stating that they are not proposing any signage as they do not want to draw attention to their facility. Mr. Greenspun stated that there are two wells on the property; one for the house and another for the apartments. Each well has half horsepower which produces more than enough water for the entire site. There is also a separate irrigation well. With regard to the septic systems there are three septic systems on the property. They have been certified that they are in proper working order and that paperwork was submitted to the Township. The facility utilizes the township trash and recycling receptacles which are adequate for their needs.

Mr. Greenspun described the different uses on the site. The access drive is off of the Black Horse Pike; as you drive down the driveway there is a small landscaped island with a flagpole, a small building that was a shed/office space, there is a single family home, and another building containing three residential apartment units. There is also another shed that will be utilized by the clients. With regard to parking at the property it is possible to park more than fourteen vehicles; however the clients do not have cars at the facility and the only vehicles on the site are the ones used to transport the clients to and from their clinical treatment facility, the gym, and meetings. Prior to them paving the driveway it was crushed stone but there were serious drainage issues with the runoff flowing back into the house and flooding into the landscaped island. There were photographs shown in the power point depicting the site before the applicant made improvements. The applicant did not do any outside structural work on the existing buildings. Photographs were also shown of the renovations to the outside and inside of the house and the apartment building as well as the improved landscaping on the property.

Mr. Greenspun pointed out surveillance cameras located in the house and stated there are over thirty cameras on the property both inside and outside. They are not permitted to have cameras in the bedrooms or the bathrooms. The cameras are recording activity at the site twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week and those recordings are kept for well over a month. With regard to the single family house, there are three bedrooms that can sleep up to eight people. The three apartment units have two bedrooms each with two people in each room. There are very strict guidelines under the NJARR, the New Jersey Association of Recovery Residences, and if they do not adhere to those guidelines they will lose their certification.
They do not medically treat the clients at the sober living facility; all of the clients are treated at
the clinical treatment facility located in Turnersville. The clients are usually in the clinical
program from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. They are dropped off and picked up by a staff member from
the sober living facility in a sixteen passenger van. After treatment they are transported to the
gym and then back to the residences. After dinner they attend a clinical support meeting. These
meetings are held in various locations locally and it is very important that the clients attend these
meetings as a means of socialization which replaces their previous harmful social activity. After
the meetings they return to the residences and its lights out at 11:00 p.m.

Mr. Rocco asked if the clients are allowed to have visitors. Mr. Greenspun stated they do not
allow visitors on the property at this time. They may in the future, if clinically approved, have a
family day where a client’s family can visit with them for a couple of hours. There are certified
recovery coaches at the sober living facility to supervise clients at all times whenever they are at
the residences. Usually there are two coaches, one male and one female, who are Narcan trained
as well. Ms. Hui asked if the residences are shared by both male and female clients. Mr.
Greenspun replied that the males will occupy the house and the females are housed in the
apartments. Ms. Hui asked if there are measures taken to keep the clients at the site. Mr.
Greenspun stated that it isn’t a forced program; the clients can choose to leave at any time. If
they leave no one at the house can stop them; however the coaches are trained to talk them into
staying at the facility. There are also hotline numbers where they can talk to someone from the
clinical program. All of the clients are there on a voluntary basis and recognize they do not have
a safe place to go after their clinical treatment is over for the day. The clinical program and
housing program are privately operated. The clinical treatment program accepts various
insurances which is how they get their funding and the housing program is ancillary to them.

Ms. Flaherty inquired as to Mr. Reichert’s licensing. Mr. Reichert was sworn in by Mr. Rocco.
He stated that he is the Administrator at the Behavioral Crossroads clinics. There are two clinical
sites, one in Turnersville and one in Egg Harbor Township. They are licensed by the Division of
Mental Health and Addiction Services for outpatient drug and alcohol treatment. The treatment
mainly consists of counseling services. Most of the clients are mandated to attend a clinical
treatment program. Ms. Flaherty requested a copy of the license. Mr. Reichert stated he would
provide a copy of the license to the office. Mr. Rocco inquired as to the requirement for a license
for the sober living facility. Mr. Greenspun replied that they do not have any license requirements
because they are a residence where people live. He stated that is why they are part of the NJARR
where there are a set of standards they have to follow.

Mr. Heffner pointed out that the small shed and fence appear to be on the adjacent lot. Mr.
Greenspun stated that they do not own that lot but those items were there when they purchased
the property. Mr. Nash stated that the applicant will relocate the shed and the fence onto their
property. Mr. Heffner also inquired as to the location of the wells and septic systems. Ms.
Flaherty asked if the applicant could provide a letter from the County which states the wells and
septic systems are adequate for the number of possible residents in the house and apartments.
There was further discussion on this issue with the applicant agreeing to provide a letter from the
County. Ms. Flaherty inquired as to the cost for the improvements to the site. Mr. Greenspun
replied the cost was approximately $150,000.00. Mr. Nash commented that the applicant is
asking for a sidewalk waiver in lieu of installing sidewalk. It was determined that the applicant
would be required to pay $800.00 into the sidewalk fund in lieu of providing sidewalk. The
applicant agreed to this condition.

Mr. Teefy commended the applicant on the type of work they’re doing to help people with
addictions noting that it is something needed in the area. He stated that town is willing to work
with the applicant but wanted assurances with regard to the adequacy of the wells and septic
systems.
Site Plan Waivers: (continued)

4. #WSP-10-16 – 4644 BHP, LLC (continued)

Ms. Flaherty stated that they applicant will also need to obtain permits for the removal and relocation of the shed and fencing as well as for the paving of the driveway. Mr. Rocco reviewed the conditions for the Board. The applicant must provide a letter from the County with regard to the adequacy of the wells and septic systems in relation to the number of possible residents at the site. The applicant must also provide on a plan or survey the location of the wells and septic systems in operation at the property. They must remove and relocate the shed and fencing from the adjacent lot, they must make an $800.00 sidewalk contribution in lieu of installing sidewalk, and they must obtain all required permits. Motion by Mr. Agnesino, seconded by Mr. Crane to grant the site plan waiver subject to the above mentioned conditions. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Heffner, Mr. Cotton. Abstentions – Zero. 6 ayes, 3 nays, motion passed.

Extension Requests for Board Action:

1. #1734 – HRTJ, LLC (Spring Ridge Estates) – Final Major Subdivision

Motion by Mr. Agnesino, seconded by Mr. Teefy to grant a one year extension from June 2016 to June 2017. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Heffner, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

2. #1739 – 110 Whitehall, LLC (Country Village) Preliminary Major & Final Major Sec. 1 & 2

Motion by Mr. Agnesino, seconded by Mr. Teefy to grant a one year extension from June 2016 to June 2017. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Agnesino, Mr. Heffner, Mr. Crane, Ms. Flaherty, Mr. Masterson, Mr. Teefy, Ms. Hui, Mr. Cotton, Mr. O’Brien. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

Approval of Minutes:

1. 2/11/16 regular meeting.

Motion by Mr. Crane, seconded by Ms. Flaherty to approve the minutes from the February 11, 2016 regular meeting. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

Reports:

1. Mrs. Farrell reminded the Board that the next meeting is scheduled for March 31, 2016.

Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

These minutes are an extract from the meeting that was held on the above date and are not a verbatim account or to be construed as an official transcript of the proceedings. The tape of the meeting is stored in the office of the Board.

Ninette Orbaczewski
Clerk Transcriber