

The Chairperson called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the "Open Public Meetings Act" and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

Roll Call:

Present: Mr. Vandegrift, Mr. Kleinman, Mr. Rashatwar, Ms. Branch, Mr. Schallenhammer, Ms. Augustine, Mr. Schwenke

Absent: Mr. DiNatale, Mr. Nicini, Mr. Platt, Mr. Ravitz

Also present are Chris Norman, Board Solicitor, and Jeremy Noll, Board Engineer

---

Mr. Norman swears in Board Engineer, Mr. Noll.

MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

PC#24-022  
217 N Rumson Ave LLC  
Minor Subdivision  
6 Alluvium Lakes Dr  
Block 230.31; Lot 47.01

Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to memorialize the resolution, seconded by Mr. Vandegrift. Motion carries by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Mr. Vandegrift, Ms. Branch, Mr. Schallenhammer, Mr. Schwenke  
ABSTAIN: Mr. Kleinman (Recuse), Mr. Rashatwar (Recuse), Ms. Augustine (Recuse)  
NAYS: None

PC#25-002  
Eureka Stone Quarry Inc.  
Minor Site Plan  
1222 Berlin Rd  
Block 262, Lot 3

Mr. Rashatwar makes a motion to memorialize the resolution, seconded by Ms. Branch. Motion carries by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Mr. Vandegrift, Mr. Kleinman, Mr. Rashatwar, Ms. Branch, Mr. Schallenhammer, Ms. Augustine, Mr. Schwenke  
ABSTAIN: None  
NAYS: None

PC#25-004  
Premier Pet Op Co  
Change of Use & Minor Site Plan  
1006 Kresson Rd  
Block 207, Lot 4.23

Ms. Augustine makes a motion to memorialize the resolution, seconded by Mr. Kleinman. Motion carries by the following Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Mr. Vandegrift, Mr. Kleinman, Mr. Rashatwar, Ms. Branch, Mr. Schallenhammer, Ms. Augustine, Mr. Scwhenke  
ABSTAIN: None  
NAYS: None

## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to approve the set of minutes from the April 23, 2025 meeting, seconded by Mr. Rashatwar. Motion carries by assenting voice vote of all present board members, with Mr. Schwenke and Ms. Branch recusing.

## NEW BUSINESS

PC#25-003

Safe Storage USA

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan w/ Conditional Use and Bulk Variance

802 Cooper Rd

Block 207; Lot 10

Appearing before the board is the applicant's attorney, Peter Flannery of law firm Bisgaierhoff. Mr. Flannery provides a summary of the application and site location, stating that the site is at 802 Cooper Rd, a triangular-shaped property at the intersection of Cooper and Centennial Rd. He explains that the application is for a preliminary and final major site plan with conditional use, bulk variance and design waivers to consolidate two lots and construct a 'flex industrial' facility consisting of three buildings with associated parking, landscaping, lighting, etc. Mr. Flannery testifies that the light industrial use that the proposed operation is applying as falls under the conditional uses for the O3 zone of the site. He states that the proposed operation is a flex space, a combination of office and industrial use and not self-storage. Mr. Flannery states that the spaces at the site would be leased to tenants such as plumbing or electrical companies, art studios, and similar types. He testifies that the applicant seeks three variances for front and parking setbacks as well as for clearing. Mr. Flannery states that design waivers are being sought for sidewalk, fence, and loading zones.

At this time, the following professionals of the applicant's team are introduced and sworn in: Michaela Maguire, applicant's civil engineer from Stonefield Engineering, Daniel Whitney, applicant's representative from Whitney Development, and Marchela Traina, applicant's planner from Stonefield Engineering.

Ms. Maguire testifies on behalf of the application. She states that the site has two frontages: one on Cooper Rd, a county road, and another on Centennial Blvd. Ms. Maguire explains that a portion of the site on lot 9 had formerly been a one-story office building which is no longer present. She states that the western corner of the site has wetlands, and no changes are being proposed in the application on that portion of the site. Ms. Maguire testifies that the applicant is proposing three single-story flex industrial buildings for a total gross floor area of approximately 56,737 square ft. She adds that the proposed buildings A, B and C all meet height requirements and parking is proposed at the center of the site in front of the proposed units in the buildings. For parking spaces, Ms. Maguire states that each unit is proposed to have allocated three spaces. On variances being sought, Ms. Maguire testifies that the applicant seeks various parking variances for parking setbacks at the Cooper frontage and rear of the property. She testifies that site and parking space access is from two driveways both along Cooper Road and the applicant proposes to limit left turns out of the easternmost access onto Cooper. Ms. Maguire states that the applicant also agrees to install sidewalks along the sides of the property, including along Cooper Rd which is a county road. She adds that the applicant also agrees to the board engineer's comment regarding placement of a bike rack onsite. Regarding impervious coverage, Ms. Maguire explains that the applicant proposes 50.5% at the site, which complies with the 60% maximum for the property, and for tree clearing, the applicant is requesting a waiver as they propose 74% clearing, which is higher than the 70% maximum for the site. She notes that the proposed clearing had also been higher previously, at 85% but they were able to lower it following discussion with the board engineer. For site grading, Ms. Maguire explains that elevations across the property vary significantly, which requires cutting of higher areas and filling of lower to make the site safe and accessible for use. She testifies that a retaining wall is also proposed on the western side of the site, west of building C as the grades are lower in that area of the site.

For stormwater management, Ms. Maguire testifies that a combination of underground infiltration systems and above-ground bioretention basins are proposed to capture roof runoff and collect motor vehicle surface onsite before being infiltrated. She states that a storm trap settler unit and a sediment forebay are also proposed to further assist with stormwater management. She testifies that for the two above-ground basins the applicant is required to place 4ft split-rail fencing around them for safety, so they are requesting a waiver for front yard fencing onsite. Regarding utilities, Ms. Maguire explains that the applicant proposes connections to the existing mains on Centennial Blvd and for the sanitary connection, a pump station is also proposed due to the elevation of that area of the site. She states that all lighting is concentrated near the access drives of the site to minimize light spillage onto neighboring properties. Ms. Maguire states that the mature vegetation along the northern and western portions of the property will be kept, and any areas of the site that will not be occupied with proposed improvements will have landscaping added. For vegetation to be added to the property, Ms. Maguire notes that 820 plants are proposed, including 106 trees, which is an increase of 74 trees from the original submission. Mr. Flannery states that the applicant will also comply with the township fire marshal's comments on the plans.

Board engineer Mr. Noll goes through the review letter with the applicant's team. Mr. Noll asks Ms. Maguire if the applicant has discussed with the county regarding the proposed sidewalk along Cooper Rd and whether the applicant agrees to connect sidewalks along the property into the site. Ms. Maguire states that the applicant has submitted to the county but has not had specific discussions with them regarding the sidewalk. She states that the applicant can comply with creating the connection by moving the sidewalk to the south of Building A. Mr. Noll asks Ms. Maguire for a breakdown of the traffic impact study. Ms. Maguire shares some of the findings of the traffic study: no service level changes were found for intersections in the surrounding area with the proposed development. Mr. Noll asks for an overall summary/conclusion of findings from the traffic impact study. Ms. Maguire testifies that the study found no impact to traffic overall for the surrounding area with the proposed development. Mr. Noll informs the board that the current intersection has a C level of service, so the applicant is noting that the same traffic level of service will continue with the proposed development. He adds that the 19 additional trips found in the study for the morning and evening peaks tends to be on the lower end for such developments.

Mr. Vandegrift asks what time in the evening the traffic study was conducted. Mr. Noll states that the study notes the times as 7AM-9AM and 4PM to 7PM. He states that the study was done at the weekday peak on Wednesday. Ms. Augustine asks Ms. Maguire about the access drives along Cooper Rd and which ones do not allow a left turn out. Ms. Maguire states that the northern access drive will allow both left and right turns to exit the site, but the southern access will only allow right turns out. Mr. Noll states that the county engineer will also review the traffic study for access onto Cooper Rd. Ms. Branch asks if access drives to the site are only along Cooper Rd. Ms. Maguire confirms this.

Mr. Noll suggests to the applicant that the current proposed parking of 107 spaces be reduced, as doing so will also aid clearing amount, parking setback, and basin size for the site which in turn will allow reduction of the total clearing to the maximum of 70%. Mr. Flannery states that Mr. Whitney will testify further about proposed parking.

Mr. Vandegrift asks if there is any vehicular access around the rear of the site. Ms. Maguire states that there is no rear vehicular access around buildings A or C to maintain the existing mature vegetation onsite. Mr. Vandegrift asks how the fire department would be able to handle a fire at the site from the rear without rear vehicular access. Mr. Noll states that the original plans had the rear buffers cleared but he recommended the applicant not clear those areas to reduce clearing onsite and not be as close to the AWA to the north of the site. Mr. Noll adds that the proposed buildings are one-story. Mr. Schallenhammer states that for other similar storage sites in the township rear/360 vehicular access was requested for fire department access and the applicants had agreed on that condition. Mr. Schallenhammer states that those buildings were, however, greater than one-story. Ms. Maguire states that they would be willing to meet with the fire marshal to address any concerns. She adds that fire department vehicles would be able to access buildings via the current proposed circulation with the proposed buildings all being one-story.

Mr. Schwenke asks if a tree compensation analysis has been completed for the site. Ms. Maguire notes that 579 trees would have to be compensated for or replaced onsite. She states that from the time of the original application submission, the applicant is now keeping 129 more trees. Mr. Noll notes that the township's current tree compensation requirement is \$300 per tree removed. Mr. Noll asks Mr. Schwenke if the board would like to stay with \$300/tree for tree removal compensation. Mr. Schwenke confirms this. Mr. Schwenke notes that the total tree compensation amount required for the removal of the 579 trees would be \$173,700. Mr. Vandegrift asks what the applicant's current proposed tree clearing percentage is. Mr. Noll states that the applicant proposes 74% tree clearing for the site.

Ms. Augustine states that she appreciates the applicant's reduction of tree clearing from the original 85% to 74%. She asks if it is just a matter of the number of parking stalls that is preventing the applicant from reducing clearing further to comply with the 70% maximum. Ms. Maguire testifies that in addition to the proposed parking, clearing would still be needed for the proposed bioretention basins to follow all requirements. For options to further reduce clearing to the 70% max, Ms. Maguire explains that the applicant has considered moving some of the above-ground stormwater infrastructure underground and possibly reducing parking spaces along Cooper Rd that are not adjacent to the building units. Ms. Branch asks if it is possible to have just one proposed building rather than three to help reduce clearing. Mr. Flannery states that Mr. Whitney could address such questions as they relate to marketing.

Mr. Rashatwar asks if the applicant has received an LOI from the NJDEP yet. Ms. Maguire states that they have applied to the NJDEP but have not received an LOI. Mr. Rashatwar asks about the buffers for wetland areas onsite set by the NJDEP. Ms. Maguire states that at a pre-app meeting the NJDEP anticipated having a 50-ft Wetland Transition Area buffer for the site, which is what the plans are designed off. She states that if the buffer were set to be higher, the applicant would need to revise the plans accordingly. Mr. Noll adds that if the NJDEP sets a higher buffer for the WTA, the applicant would need to return for an amended site plan and the LOI would need to be issued before any construction could begin.

Ms. Augustine asks if there would be any detriments with the applicant moving some of the proposed stormwater management infrastructure underground. Mr. Noll recommends the applicant go with that option. Ms. Augustine asks if that could be made a condition of approval. Mr. Noll states that the board should just not grant the clearing variance. Mr. Schallenhammer asks why the proposal to move stormwater systems underground was not part of the original plan. Ms. Maguire states that the applicant had a combination of above-ground and stormwater systems initially as well. Mr. Schallenhammer asks if funding is an issue for moving the stormwater systems underground. Ms. Maguire states that funding is not necessarily an issue. Mr. Noll states that the NJDEP prefers to see variety in stormwater systems and the above ground bioretention basins also provide aesthetic appeal with plantings and habitat. Ms. Maguire testifies that an additional stormwater pretreatment system would also be needed to treat vehicular surface if the current systems were moved underground. Mr. Noll adds that above-ground systems are also easier to maintain due to visibility.

The applicant's representative, Mr. Daniel Whitney testifies on behalf of the application. On the proposed site use, Mr. Whitney states that no self-storage is being proposed but instead for flex industrial for tenants such as plumbers and similar small business owners. For parking, Mr. Whitney testifies that 3 spaces per unit is the minimum industry standard for flex industrial uses and the spaces would be used by a combination of the business owner, employees and any customers/visitors. He addresses the questions on the number of buildings, stating that with the higher cost of property in Voorhees it is a business decision to have more buildings for greater square footage. Regarding clearing onsite, Mr. Whitney states that the irregular triangle shape of the property also triggers a higher clearing rate with implementing stormwater systems, accesses, etc. He also addresses the questions regarding fire lane access, explaining that they would have added grass paver access for fire department vehicle access but are constrained by the site's clearing limit. Regarding hours of operation, Mr. Whitney states that it would likely be from 7:30AM to 5:30PM or 6PM. For trucks and deliveries at the site he testifies that tractor trailers would not be used, but rather smaller box trucks and similar vehicles for deliveries. On waste disposal, Mr. Whitney states that rather than having a large dumpster for the overall site, they plan to hire a private trash removal company that will provide smaller trash and recycling canisters with wheel

roll offs to the individual units at the site. Mr. Schallenhammer asks where the waste canisters would be located. Mr. Whitney states that they would be placed within the individual units to avoid having them visible on the exterior. Mr. Vandegrift asks if the trash company would remove the waste from the individual canisters onsite. Mr. Whitney confirms this.

Mr. Rashatwar asks if there will be an HOA for the site. Mr. Whitney states that an HOA will not be present, but a management company will be managing the units. Mr. Noll asks if a unit will be used as office space for the management company. Mr. Whitney states that no office space would be used by the management company, but a small space may be allocated for storage of site maintenance equipment such as snow shovels. Mr. Noll asks what the anticipated frequency of trash pickup would be. Mr. Whitney states that waste would be picked up once a week. Regarding security and maintenance onsite, Mr. Whitney testifies that CCTV cameras will be set up throughout the site and will be operated by the management company. He states that any site maintenance will be run through the maintenance company via contracts. Mr. Flannery asks Mr. Whitney if he would be willing to have some of the stormwater systems moved underground to reduce clearing onsite. Mr. Whitney states that he would be willing to move systems underground. Mr. Rashatwar asks Mr. Whitney why Voorhees was selected for the proposed project. Mr. Whitney states that there is a market in the area for the proposed development. Mr. Rashatwar asks if a market study was done. Mr. Whitney states that census data of business owners indicates a demand for such use onsite. Ms. Branch asks if Mr. Whitney is familiar with a nearby office park that has a similar sounding business model to the current proposal. Mr. Whitney states that he is aware of the office park, and they usually are full or have just one unit available.

Mr. Rashatwar and Ms. Augustine ask Mr. Whitney if he is aware of the higher traffic intensity at the Cooper and Centennial intersection during school days after 3pm and 4pm, and Mr. Rashatwar asks how such traffic could be alleviated. Mr. Whitney states that as an option they could change the other access drive to Cooper from allowing both left and right turns out to just right turns to help direct traffic away from the intersection. He adds that the busy times for the site would not coincide with the end of the school day, instead it would be more 4:30 onwards. Mr. Schallenhammer asks how many years Whitney Development has been in business for. Mr. Whitney states that the company has been in business for six years, and he has done business in real estate for fifteen years.

Mr. Schwenke asks if tenants will be provided with signage for their individual units. Mr. Whitney states that individual signage will not be provided, but tenants can hang small signs at the entrances of units and for the overall site a freestanding monument-type sign may be added later. Mr. Noll notes that if a future proposed sign doesn't meet ordinance requirements, the applicant will need to return to the board for a sign variance. Mr. Schallenhammer asks how the tenants would be monitored to prevent storage of hazardous materials onsite. Mr. Whitney states that they would be monitored through the lease agreement. Ms. Branch asks if the applicant has any prospective tenants lined up for the development currently. Mr. Whitney states that they do not as they are seeking board approval first. Mr. Rashatwar asks if the applicant has any other developments pending at present. Mr. Whitney states that they have no other projects pending in New Jersey. Mr. Norman asks if there will be 35 units for the site. Mr. Whitney confirms this.

Mr. Noll asks Mr. Whitney if he would be able to proceed with the project if the board did not grant any of the requested variances but approved the application, thereby requiring the elimination of some of the currently proposed parking spaces. Mr. Whitney states that he would prefer to have the currently proposed parking, but if variances were not granted, they should be able to proceed with the development. Mr. Schwenke states that he sees issues with the clearing onsite as well as the proposed parking spaces but also notes that there are options to adjust parking and stormwater infrastructure onsite to make the application more compliant overall. Mr. Whitney states that the applicant would be willing to make the necessary changes for the site to be more compliant with setback, clearing, and other requirements. Mr. Schwenke states that the applicant seems wishy-washy on the choice to agree to the necessary site changes for overall compliance. Mr. Whitney states that while he would prefer to keep the existing proposed parking, he would be willing to adjust the site changes and possibly go before the board later for parking updates. Regarding traffic and onsite circulation, Mr. Schwenke states that with the presence of the two access drives on Cooper Rd, access and site circulation do not seem as big an issue, however traffic at the Cooper and Centennial intersection would still be high around 3pm and onwards. Mr.

Noll notes that the county would also be involved in reviewing traffic conditions around the Cooper and Centennial intersection. Mr. Noll states that his review letter also notes the requirement of sidewalks as part of the township and county's Complete Streets program.

Mr. Schallenhammer briefly reads aloud the description of the O3 zone, the property's zoning designation and asks Mr. Whitney why they did not apply without needing any of the requested variances for the project. Mr. Flannery states that the applicant is willing to eliminate as many variances as possible, but they also have the right to apply for such variances. Mr. Whitney testifies that for the parking and clearing variances, they initially sought to have the 3 parking spaces per unit but following discussion with the board engineer they will have the above ground stormwater bioretention basins, which would require clearing more of the site.

The applicant's planner, Ms. Marchela Traina from engineering firm Stonefield Engineering, begins testifying on the application. She states that for the clearing limit, while 74% clearing is proposed, many of the areas will be replanted with landscaping, which aids in providing a balance between developed, impervious area and greenery. For parking variances, Ms. Traina states that a variance for the front yard parking setback is also being requested, where 25ft is required and 8 ft is proposed. Ms. Traina testifies that as only 5 of the 107 parking spaces proposed are within the front yard setback, the variance is de-minimus, and the triangular shape of the lot also makes such variances needed. Ms. Traina states that a variance for rear yard parking setback is also requested, where 50ft is required and 44.2ft is proposed. She states that a parking stall in this area is approximately 49ft from the rear lot line and backs up to the curb, so the setback of 49ft where 50ft is required is also de-minimus. For waivers, Ms. Traina states that the applicant seeks a waiver for the minimum number of loading spaces, where 3 are required and none are proposed. She explains that as numerous individual units are proposed for business owners, they do not anticipate need for a larger central loading space, and each unit has a loading door so loading can be managed individually for each unit. Ms. Traina testifies that a waiver for the front yard fence is also needed to enclose the bioretention basins in the area for safety purposes. Mr. Schallenhammer asks Ms. Traina if the front yard fence would still be needed if the basins were moved underground. Ms. Traina states that it would not. Mr. Noll adds that the fence around the bioretention basins is a DEP requirement. For the trash enclosure waiver Ms. Traina states that waste removal onsite will be done via smaller trash and recycling canisters for each unit that will be picked up on a weekly basis. Ms. Traina testifies that overall, the project furthers numerous MLUL purposes, and it is her belief that the requested variances and waivers could be granted to the application without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

Mr. Schwenke asks Mr. Noll about the front yard setback variance for 47.2 ft along Cooper Rd. Mr. Noll states that the variance is for the bike rack area, but it could be moved as well.

Ms. Augustine asks about the front yard parking setback variance and the meaning of the note regarding the variance being needed for adequate vehicle maneuverability. Ms. Traina explains that part of the area of the parking lot that is within the setback is also within the drive aisle where cars can exit at a 90-degree angle, and the remaining spots are barely clipped in the required setback and only 5 spaces along the frontage are within the setback. Ms. Augustine asks if other cars could pull in and out of the other spaces if the 5 stalls within the setback were removed. Ms. Traina states that she believes so. Mr. Noll states that if the 5 parking spots were removed the applicant would have to adjust other areas of the parking lot and curbing to allow vehicular circulation in that area. Regarding noise generated from the site, Ms. Augustine asks how the noise produced by tenants will be managed to ensure that noise issues do not arise. Mr. Whitney states that noise matters would be handled in the lease agreements with tenants and if the tenant were to violate noise regulations, they would break the lease and be removed from the site. Mr. Flannery states that the CCTV security cameras onsite would also help monitor noise issues. Mr. Noll asks Mr. Whitney if the lease agreements for tenants would include provisions noting that they would need to comply with all township ordinances, including those on noise generation. Mr. Whitney confirms this. Mr. Whitney adds that all units of the buildings will have insulation, which should inherently reduce noise.

Mr. Vandegrift asks Mr. Whitney why a standard trash enclosure will not be provided for the site. Mr. Whitney states that a larger central dumpster is not needed given the use of the site. He adds

that having one or two large dumpsters could become a nuisance if they were to overflow, and instead each unit would have 3-yard waste canisters that can be rolled out. Mr. Whitney states that if a specific business needed more frequent pickups that could also be arranged with the waste removal company. Mr. Schallenhammer asks Mr. Whitney who will be maintaining roof gutters and similar portions of the site. Mr. Whitney states that the management company will handle site maintenance.

At this time, Mr. Schwenke announces a brief 5-minute recess. Following the brief recess, the board, applicant's team, and members of the public in attendance returned to resume the hearing.

Mr. Flannery returns to testify before the board and notes that following discussion with the applicant and their team, they decide to withdraw all requested variances in the application but will still be requesting the design waivers. He states that the applicant agrees to eliminate the necessary parking spaces and move stormwater systems underground, among other items discussed in the meeting to make the application conform with township ordinances. Mr. Noll asks Ms. Maguire if all the stormwater systems will be moved underground or if any will still be above ground. Ms. Maguire states that the applicant would still like to have a forebay at the front of the site for stormwater management and if possible, a smaller stormwater management system still above ground but have the systems pulled away from the front yard to avoid need for a design waiver for the fence. Mr. Noll states that it would be aesthetically appealing to have at least one stormwater system above ground as it enhances site appearance and landscaping.

Before opening the meeting to the public, Mr. Norman provides a brief primer to the public on the subject application, stating that the board only can review permitted uses and the proposal of the current application is a permitted use. He further states that planning boards cannot deny applications due to existing traffic conditions on the roads.

Seeing no further testimony, Mr. Schwenke opens the meeting to the public.

Christy Roharo  
34 Brownstone Blvd

Ms. Roharo asks the applicant how the clearing limit will be addressed if all variances are withdrawn from the application. Ms. Maguire explains that moving the rear stormwater management system underground and adjusting the stormwater system along the frontage, as well as removing some of the parking spaces would allow for more vegetation to remain. Ms. Roharo expresses concerns regarding the general clearing of the existing site for the project. She states that she and other residents of the surrounding area have known the subject site to be undeveloped for a long time, and they also fear for the wildlife and habitat loss that the development would cause. Ms. Roharo asks that the applicant respect the wildlife in the area and adds that residents are willing to work with the applicant if they also respect and understand their concerns.

Sara Green  
2 Foxcroft Ct

Ms. Green asks the applicant about the composition of the businesses reviewed as part of the market research conducted for the site. She states that the small business owners within Voorhees operate primarily from their homes and there are also numerous vacant properties/units in other parts of the township that remain unused. Mr. Whitney explains that census data indicates demand for such spaces for small business owners who will eventually grow beyond their space at home. Ms. Green asks Mr. Whitney if he has data on the number of HVAC or other small businesses that could be prospective tenants who would use the units. She adds that the site operation and use seem to be described in a manner that is just a fancy way of noting storage, but just for small businesses. Mr. Whitney states that self-storage has notably shorter lease times and doesn't have businesses being run out of them unlike the proposed units. He states that unlike self-storage units, the building units will have utilities running in them and are significantly larger in size than the average storage unit. He adds that the other small businesses like financial services may not need larger space for their operation, but the proposed

units are catered to businesses like plumbing, HVAC, etc. which need space for storing tools and other items. Ms. Green states that as a small business owner who works with other small businesses, she is aware of the composition of small businesses in town and reiterates her view that the proposed use of the site is still primarily for storage. Ms. Green asks if anything is being done regarding the projected loss of local wildlife and flora/fauna from the proposed development. Mr. Whitney states that the NJDEP has regulations that handle habitat and wildlife loss and there are also no endangered species present at the site. On tree clearing, Mr. Noll states that the DEP sets rules on when/what time clearing can occur so as to avoid disruption to nesting birds and other wildlife.

Brian Fox  
68 Cornell Dr

Mr. Fox expresses concern regarding the intensity of traffic at the Cooper-Centennial intersection, stating that there is an influx of visitors heading to the shores through the area during the summer months. He adds that the property costs in Voorhees being high, many businesses are seeking other locations to set up and are leaving the township, and a number of former business properties in the township are now vacant. Mr. Fox also expresses concerns about space for landscapers to store trailers onsite, as well as having 3 parking spaces allocated per unit. He adds that for waste pickup the individual bins would be insufficient, and a dumpster would be best, and trash should be picked up more frequently than weekly.

Mr. Schwenke asks what the level of traffic service was when the traffic study for the site had been conducted. Ms. Maguire states that the Cooper-Centennial intersection had a C level of service, which is on a scale from A being best down to F.

Frances Lettieri  
26 Milford Cir

Ms. Lettieri asks whether there will be bathrooms and running water to service the site. Mr. Schwenke states that each unit has a restroom and there is plumbing for the site.

Sharon Bennett  
13 Thornwood Dr

Ms. Bennett expresses concern about the lack of any tenants lined up for the proposed business.

Seeing no further public comment, Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to close the public portion, seconded by Mr. Rashatwar. Motion carries by the assenting voice vote of all present board members.

Mr. Schallenhammer asks Mr. Whitney if tenants with storage trailers would need to leave them inside the units or parked outside. Mr. Whitney states that if tenants have trailers that fit in a standard 18-ft parking space, they can be left outside, otherwise they would have to be stored inside. Mr. Schallenhammer asks who will monitor the storage of trailers onsite. Mr. Whitney states that the site will be monitored by the management company via CCTV. Mr. Schallenhammer asks Mr. Noll if the loading dock spaces are considered parking spaces. Mr. Noll confirms this.

Ms. Augustine asks Ms. Maguire if on the revised plans there would be 24% area backfilled with pervious land. Ms. Maguire clarifies that any disturbed land will be infilled with landscaping. Ms. Augustine asks if part of the landscaping could consist of new trees, shrubs, etc. Ms. Maguire confirms this. Mr. Noll goes through the design waivers requested by the applicant. Mr. Vandegrift asks if waivers will be voted on individually, or altogether with the application. Mr. Norman states that they can either be voted individually bifurcated, or altogether, though certain waivers requested could be considered integral to the overall application.

Mr. Norman outlines for the board the conditions and stipulations for the application if it were to be voted on altogether with all waivers:

1. The applicant agrees to the conditions in the board engineer's review letter dated April 11, 2025.
2. The two lots will be consolidated.
3. The proposed bike rack shall be relocated to eliminate a variance.
4. The applicant agrees to reduce the proposed clearing limit from 74% to the maximum of 70% via elimination of some proposed parking and relocating some stormwater management systems.
5. The applicant agrees to the conditions in the Township Fire Marshal's email.
6. The applicant agrees to contribute \$300/tree for the 579 trees noted in the tree compensation plan.
7. Applicant agrees to obtain any outside agency approvals.

Mr. Norman notes that the design waiver for trash enclosure could be voted on separately as well.

Mr. Kleinman asks if there would be restrictions on tenants storing gasoline and other flammable materials onsite. Mr. Whitney states that there will be restrictions for storage of such materials in the lease agreements, and in addition the building code would also have restrictions for storage of such materials.

Mr. Schallenhammer asks about the number loading zones for the units onsite. Ms. Maguire states that there is one loading zone for each unit.

Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to deny the Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan application for a 3-building flex industrial facility, with related parking, landscaping and stormwater management improvements for the property located at 802 Cooper Rd, Block 207, Lot 10.

Motion seconded by Mr. Vandegrift. Motion carries by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Mr. Vandegrift, Mr. Kleinman, Ms. Branch, Mr. Schallenhammer, Ms. Augustine

NAYS: Mr. Schwenke, Mr. Rashatwar

ABSTAIN: None

Seeing no further business, Mr. Schallenhammer makes a motion to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Ms. Augustine. Motion carries by the assenting voice vote of all present board members.

---

Rashane Thapa

Voorhees Township Planning Board Secretary

Minutes prepared by Rashane Thapa. The minutes are intended to reflect the basic comments and action. Verbatim transcripts of all electronic recordings can be available upon proper request and payment