

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

Chairman Lodato called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

Chairman Lodato read the following statement: "This is a regular meeting of the Tinton Falls Planning Board and is being held in compliance with the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice of this meeting has been given by posting on the Bulletin Board of the Municipal Building and by advertising in the Asbury Park Press and The Coaster."

ROLL CALL:

Present: Chairman Lodato, Mr. Clayton, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Romanov, Mr. Mirarchi, Mr. Natter, Mr. Markoff, Mr. Holobowski
Absent: Councilman Nesci, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wallace
Others: Dennis Collins, Esq., *Board Attorney*
Thomas Neff, *Board Engineer*
Christine Bell, Board Planner
Trish Sena, *Board Secretary*

All present stood for a Salute to the Flag.

.....

PLANNING BOARD BUSINESS-

CITIZENS SERVICE ACT COMPLIANCE- Chairman Lodato indicated that Councilman Nesci, Ms. Brown, and Mr. Wallace are absent this evening and gave advanced notice of said absence to the Board Secretary. No objection to their absence is made.

PROFESSIONAL REPORTS — None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES-

Chairman Lodato indicated that the Board has received the minutes of the June 23, 2021, meeting, and asked for a motion to approve the minutes as submitted.

Mr. Mirarchi offered a motion to approve the minutes of the June 23, 2021, meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Romanov.

Roll Call:

AYES: Mr. Mirarchi, Mr. Romanov, Chairman Lodato, Mr. Clayton, Mr. Natter
NAYES: None
ABSENT: Councilman Nesci, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wallace
INELIGIBLE: Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Markoff, Mr. Holobowski
ABSTAIN: None

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

Chairman Lodato indicated that the Board has received the minutes of the August 11, 2021, meeting, and asked for a motion to approve the minutes as submitted.

Mr. Mirarchi offered a motion to approve the minutes of the August 11, 2021, meeting, the motion was seconded by Mr. Clayton.

Roll Call:

AYES: Mr. Mirarchi, Mr. Clayton, Chairman Lodato, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Romanov, Mr. Natter, Mr. Markoff

NAYES: None

ABSENT: Councilman Nesci, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wallace

INELIGIBLE: Mr. Holobowski

RESOLUTIONS- None

CONTINUED BUSINESS-

PB2021-06 Stavola Realty Company: 157 Hamilton Road & 1810 Wayside Road. Block 109, Lots, 12.01, 13.01, 15, 16, 18-24, & 29.02. Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision & Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan

Attorney Collins noted for the record that Stavola Realty Company has requested to carry PB2021-06 to the January 12, 2022, meeting at 7:00 PM without any further notice or publication.

NEW BUSINESS-

PB2021-07 Mid-Monmouth Tech Center: 1200 Pinebrook Road. Block 114, Lot 13.02. Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan

Attorney Collins noted for the record that the notice to adjourning property owners and affidavit of publication have been reviewed and are in order as to form. The Board has jurisdiction to hear this matter.

Mr. Christopher DeGrazia, Esq. introduced him as the Attorney on behalf of the Applicant.

Attorney Collins sore in the following witnesses:

John Rea, P.E.- Traffic Engineer

Steven Spinweber- Applicant Representative

Michael Marinelli, P.E.- Applicant' Engineer

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

The following exhibits were entered into the record:

A-1 *Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan, entitled "Mid-Monmouth Tech," prepared by Scott H. Turner, P.E., of Menlo Engineering Associates, dated January 14, 2021, last revised May 14, 2021, consisting of sixteen (16) sheets.*

A-2 *Aerial Photograph of Site*

A-3 *Aerial Photograph with Site Plan Superimposed*

A-4 *Colored Elevations of Proposed Building*

A-5 *Floor Plan of Building*

A-6 *Perspective Image of Proposed Building*

Mr. DeGrazia briefly described the application before the Board this evening, stating that the Applicant is proposing a 60,800 square-foot warehouse building in the Borough's Industrial Office Park (IOP) Zone. He explained that this site previously obtained approval in 2001 to construct an industrial office park similar to the application being presented tonight. This site also received approval in 2007 to construct a sports complex. He noted that the areas that were previously approved for development have been fully disturbed.

Mr. DeGrazia called Mr. Marinelli as the first witness.

Mr. Marinelli placed his credentials on the record and the Board accepted him as an expert in the field of Engineering.

Referencing exhibit, A-2, Mr. Marinelli gave a brief overview of this site as it exists today. This property is approximately 10.14 acres with frontage along Pine Brook Road and is located in the IOP Zone. The surrounding areas to the North and the West are undeveloped. As depicted in the existing conditions plan, approximately 60% of the site is already cleared. Mr. Marinelli indicated that there is an existing detention basin located on this site. The construction of this detention basin commenced when the site was approved for a sports complex in 2008. Referencing exhibit, A-3, a colorized rendering of the site plan, Mr. Marinelli indicated that the lightly green shaded area depicts the existing detention basin. The proposed development is located north of the detention basin.

The Applicant is proposing to construct a 60,800 square-foot warehouse which includes 54,720 square-foot warehouse space, and 6,080 square-foot office space. There are two driveway locations on the North-East and North-West corners of the site with access off of Pinebrook Road.

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

There are 114 parking spaces proposed whereas 36 are required, and six ADA parking spaces are proposed whereas 5 are required.

Mr. Marinelli indicated that there is no prospective tenant at this time, however, the structure was designed to accommodate office space in the front of the building on either corner.

The loading portion of this warehouse is located in the southern portion of this site. There is full circulation access around the building. 16 loading spaces are proposed on site. The circulation plan provides adequate movement for multiple tenants and visitors. This site will require new utilities.

The Applicant is proposing a 50-square-foot sign that is compliant with the Borough Ordinance. The sign will be located on the Western side of the Eastern driveway.

The refuse for this site will be handled internally with compactors and balers and will be managed through a private refuse company.

Mr. Marinelli testified that the Applicant is proposing significant landscaping throughout the site. He noted that the professional review letters referenced the removal of existing trees on Pinebrook Road. He indicated that there are seven trees being removed in total, he explained why these trees need to be removed. The Applicant is proposing to provide nine new trees in the same general area. 24 shade trees are being proposed as well as 20 evergreen trees and 338 shrubs.

In regard to lighting, the Applicant is proposing 17 pole mounted LED fixtures, three of which are mounted at 24.5 feet high, therefore a design waiver is required. The reason why these lights are higher than what is permitted in the Ordinance is because the loading zones need to be properly illuminated for safety purposes. He further explained that because the proposed building is 45 feet tall, the light poles will not be visible. Exhibit, A-6 is a perspective rendering which illustrates how the proposed lights are not visible. In addition, the Applicant is providing 14 additional LED fixtures as well as eight wall-mounted fixtures. He explained that the Applicant is requesting a variance to exceed .1 footcandles at the property line at the two driveway locations.

As previously discussed, there is an existing detention basin on site, the Applicant is reutilizing the basin, however, they are making all necessary improvements and upgrades to ensure it is in compliance.

Mr. Marinelli indicated that the Applicant has obtained the necessary NJDEP Permits for wetlands and flood hazard area. He explained that this project pre-dates the new 2021 NJDEP regulations and therefore follows the previous. Chairman Lodato asked when the permits were obtained, and Mr. Marinelli stated that they received approval on June 8, 2021. Mr. Neff clarified that the applicability is based upon when the application was submitted.

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

Attorney Collins clarified for the record that the Board previously reviewed the updated Stormwater Management Ordinance in March of 2021. He explained the DEP required municipalities to adopt a new Stormwater Regulation. Any Applicants who previously applied for NJDEP permits are protected by the Time of Application Rule. Therefore, the new regulations do not apply to this project because it was submitted prior to the new guidelines being adopted.

Mr. Baldwin inquired about the size of the proposed basin and if it is necessary for a building of this size? Mr. Marinelli explained that it is intended to be operated as a dry retention basin. Mr. Neff takes no exception to the proposed size of the basin and explained that it is a conservative design that provides extra storage if need be.

Chairman Lodato asked Mr. Marinelli to describe the riparian buffer that is illustrated on the plans. Mr. Marinelli explained that because the detention basin was constructed prior to 2008, a wetland was thus created throughout the basin area. Exhibit A-2 details the basin area and drainage swale that was initially constructed. He gave a brief description of the NJDEP permitting process as well as the flood hazard and conservation area permits.

Chairman Lodato asked for further clarification on the required cleanup on the property that was mentioned earlier this evening. Mr. Marinelli explained that this is about the fourth time that this site has attempted to be developed. It was originally set to be developed as an industrial site, therefore there were some chemical spillage issues, site cleanup was then necessary. Referencing exhibit, A-2, he explained that there is active environmental cleanup occurring at the site. There was known contamination on this property that was found and remediated.

Mr. Marinelli briefly discussed the variances and waivers the Applicant is seeking this evening. The first variance is relative to the lot area, the Ordinance states that the maximum lot area for warehouse uses shall be 10 acres, whereas the subject parcel is 10.14 acres. He stated that exhibit, A-3 illustrates that the site is not being overdeveloped as only approximately 60% of the site is being developed. Therefore, the .14 request is de minimis in nature. The Applicant is also proposing to fill in and build in portions of freshwater wetland area, therefore, a Bulk C Variance is required. He explained that the wetlands that are to be filled in are the wetlands that were created as a result of the 2008 approval, the NJDEP has reviewed this proposal and has approved it.

The Applicant is requesting a waiver for the driveway setback, the Ordinance permits driveways 20 feet from lot lines whereas 13.1 feet is proposed to adjacent Lot 31. This is due to the overall curvature of the driveway. The second design waiver is for loading space size, the Ordinance requires loading spaces to be sixty-feet long by fifteen-feet wide, whereas the Applicant is proposing a loading zone that is 13.5 feet wide. He explained that the 13.5 feet is typical of this type of warehouse.

A waiver is also required for the maximum permitted illumination at property lines, 0.25 footcandles is proposed whereas 0.1 is permitted.

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

Mr. Clayton inquired about the number of tenants that would occupy the proposed building and Mr. Marinelli stated that there are no prospective tenants at this time, however, the site lends itself to two tenants, where one tenant is preferred. Mr. Marinelli clarified that this proposed structure is a traditional warehouse and is not intended to be used as a flex-space.

Chairman Lodato stated that since this project is a proposed warehouse, why is the name of the development Mid-Monmouth Tech Center? Mr. Marinelli explained that Mid-Monmouth Tech Center is the same name as the 2001 approved plan.

Chairman Lodato asked Mr. Neff if he has any objection to the proposed lighting? Mr. Neff stated that he has no objection to the proposed lighting on site.

Referencing exhibit, A-4, Mr. Marinelli described the proposed elevations of the building and stated that the height of the structure complies with the Ordinance.

Mr. Mirarchi questioned how the building would work with two tenants and Mr. Marinelli explained that if there were two tenants the interior fit out would include a separation.

Attorney Collins clarified for the record that the permitted office space would be limited to 10%.

Attorney Collins asked Mr. Marinelli if the Applicant would comply with any outstanding comments in both Mr. Neff & Ms. Beahm's review letters, and Mr. Marinelli confirmed that they would.

Regarding the parking, Mr. Neff inquired how the Applicant calculated 114 proposed parking spaces whereas 35 are required by Ordinance? Mr. Marinelli explained that the site was designed with flexibility because there are no tenants at this time.

Mr. Clayton and Mr. Neff asked about the proposed trash enclosures on site, as it was previously mentioned that the trash will be stored inside the building. Mr. Neff explained that typically the Board usually sees sites with proposed trash enclosures, he asked the Applicant to clarify how the trash will be managed. Mr. Marinelli explained that usually the exterior dumpster locations are difficult to maintain. The Applicant is proposing compactors that are attached to the building, employees of the building would have access to the trash facility. The proposed compactor is in a loading bay; therefore, it does not have to be screened. Mr. Neff asked that this proposed compactor be shown on the site plan. Attorney Collins stated that it would be a condition of approval that there be no outdoor trash storage.

Mr. Neff indicated that the Borough requires either sidewalk be provided along the frontage of the property, or a contribution to the Borough's Sidewalk Fund be made. Mr. Marinelli explained that the Applicant is not proposing any sidewalk and has agreed to make any necessary contribution to the Borough's fund. Mr. Neff has no objection to the Applicant making a sidewalk contribution.

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

Mr. Neff asked if the Applicant had any further information on the proposed signage, or will they comply with the Ordinance. Mr. Marinelli confirmed that the signs will comply with the Ordinance.

Ms. Bell asked the Applicant to provide brief testimony on the architectural plans. The Applicant noted that their Architect could not be here this evening due to a COVID-19 exposure. Referencing exhibit, A-6, Mr. Marinelli briefly discussed the overall design of the proposed building. He explained that the Applicant designed a building that has windows on all sides of the structure, as well as three-tone colors. Even within the areas of the façade that are solid in color, there are horizontal and vertical lines to provide shadow to create depth. Mr. Mirarchi asked about the proposed colors and Mr. Marinelli indicated that they are three different shades of grey. Awnings are also proposed over the entryways. Nine street trees are proposed along the frontage of the building to provide additional screening from the roadway.

In regard to the architecture, Ms. Bell indicated that she would like to see more variation in the materials to breakup the design a little more. She suggested that as a condition of approval, that the Applicant work with her office to perfect the architecture during Resolution Compliance.

Mr. Mirachi asked the Board if they have any concerns with voting on this application without any architectural drawings and testimony from the architect? Mr. Neff stated that the architectural drawings were provided for the Board this evening in form of two exhibits. Attorney Collins noted that the Board Professionals would further review the architecture as a condition of approval.

Ms. Bell stated that she would like to see different materials and colors, however, her office can certainly work with the architect to make sure it complies with the Ordinance. Chairman Lodato stated that he would also like to see a differentiation in the colors.

Mr. DeGrazia called John Rea, Traffic Engineer as the next witness.

Mr. Rea stated that he calculated the peak hour traffic generation based on the amount of office space and warehouse space. For the morning and afternoon peak hours there will be approximately 40 trips being generated. In the morning it would be heavily oriented toward the inbound trip, and in the afternoon the outbound trips. These numbers are based upon general institute of transportation numbers.

With respect to the truck traffic, because the tenant is unknown at this time, the estimate truck traffic for warehouses is 20% of the overall daily traffic could be truck traffic. Approximately twenty truck-trips would be generated at a warehouse site.

Mr. Mirarchi inquired about the site hours of operation, and Mr. Rea noted that without knowing the tenants, the hours of operation would be whatever is permitted by the Borough. Attorney Collins noted that the Board does not have any restrictions on operations.

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

Mr. Rea further explained that the Applicant is proposing a permitted use and is one that has been envisioned for this property for quite some time. Mr. Neff asked the Applicant to confirm that they do not envision a shipping and receiving center for this site. Mr. Rea stated that this site is not large enough for that type of use. This site is suitable for a small, minimally intense use.

Chairman Lodato inquired who this warehouse will be marketed towards? Mr. DeGrazia called Steven Spinweber, representative of the Applicant for further testimony.

Mr. Spinweber indicated that this project is for an industrial warehouse, however, it is not intended to be a high-velocity distribution site. He stated that potential tenants could be small pharmaceutical drug companies, it would market towards small local companies that need warehouse and office space.

Attorney Collins asked Mr. Spinweber to describe tenants that lease out their other warehouse buildings? He stated that a pharmaceutical packaging company leases out a building in Lakewood, New Jersey.

Chairman Lodato asked if any members of the public have any questions or comments? Hearing none, he asked for a motion to close the public discussion.

Mr. Clayton offered a motion to close the public discussion, the motion was seconded by Mr. Mirarchi, all present voted in favor.

Chairman Lodato asked if Mr. Neff or Ms. Bell had any further comments?

Mr. Neff stated that from an engineering standpoint, the variances and waivers are rather de minimis and the Applicant has provided adequate testimony. He has no further questions or comments.

Ms. Bell echoed the comments of Mr. Neff and stated that her office will work to review the architecture as a condition of approval during Resolution Compliance.

Mr. Mirarchi offered a motion to grant Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval with the conditions set forth by Attorney Collins to Mid-Monmouth Tech Center. The motion was seconded by Mr. Clayton.

Roll Call:

AYES: Mr. Mirarchi, Mr. Clayton, Chairman Lodato, Mr. Baldwin, Mr. Romanov, Mr. Natter, Mr. Markoff, Mr. Holobowski

NAYES: None

ABSENT: Councilman Nesci, Ms. Brown, Mr. Wallace

INELIGIBLE: None

BOROUGH OF TINTON FALLS
REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING BOARD
DECEMBER 8, 2021

PUBLIC DISCUSSION-

Hearing no comment, Chairman Lodato asked for a motion to close the public discussion. Mr. Clayton offered a motion to close the public discussion seconded by Mr. Romanov, all present voted in favor

EXECUTIVE SESSION-None

ADJOURMENT:

Mr. Mirarchi offered a motion to adjourn at 8:26 PM, seconded by Mr. Clayton. All present voted in favor.

Respectfully submitted,


Trish Sena
Planning Board Secretary

APPROVED AT A MEETING HELD ON: March 9, 2022