

CINNAMINSON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD
MEETING
November 24, 2020

MR. BEDNAREK: In accordance with Section V of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975, notice of this meeting was posted on the Township bulletin board and by advertising this Regular Meeting in the Burlington County Times on January 19, 2020, and in the Courier Post on January 18, 2020 and by advertising this Regular Meeting in the Burlington County Times on November 18, 2020 and in the Courier Post on November 18, 2020. In addition, notice was filed with the Municipal Clerk.

Zoom Meeting ID: 923 868 6246
Password: 203375

For members of the public who wish to attend using a telephone, call one of the following numbers: +1 929 205 6099 US, +1 312 626 6799 US, +1 253 215 8782 US, +1 301 715 8592 US, +1 346 248 7799 US, +1 669 900 6833 US, and enter the above listed Meeting ID and Password.

Members Present: – Mr. Bednarek, Ms. Birbeck, Mr. Jones, Ms. Lamon, Mr. Marshall, O'Malley, Mr. Segrest and Mr. Maradonna.

Also Present: Mrs. Rucci, Board Secretary, Douglas Heinold, Board Attorney and Mike Angelastro, Board Engineer.

MR. BEDNAREK: Planning Board Discussion – Amended Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

MR. HEINOLD: We as the Planning Board adopt the Town Master Plan and any elements thereto.

MS. O'MALLEY: She joined the meeting at 6:30 p.m.

MS. GALELLA: Attorney for the Township for Affordable Housing. She gave an overview of the Amended Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. Cinnaminson Township has always been compliant with its Third Round Affordable Housing obligations. Right now we are in the Third Round which runs from 1987 to July 1, 2025. Back in 2015, the Courts assumed jurisdiction of Affordable Housing. Towns need to get approval of their Third Round Housing Plans from the Court. Back in 2019, Cinnaminson Township received Court approval for their Third Round Affordable Housing obligations. Housing Element and Fair Share Plan is part of the Master Plan. It is a component of the Master Plan. There are two parts – The Housing Element is Part 1 and the Fair Share Plan which goes with the Affordable Housing is Part 2. In August, 2019, the Planning Board adopted a Fair Share Plan, but we had to make some Amendments to it. The Township wants to do a Market to Affordable Program between 12 and 14 Units. The Township will use Tri-Ad to administer the Market to Affordable Program.

Frank Banish prepared the Amended Plan. Frank Banish is the Planner for Affordable Housing for Cinnaminson Township. He prepared the August, 2019 Plan for Cinnaminson Township. It

is the same plan the Planning Board adopted in 2019 except for two exceptions - the Market to Affordable Program and Habitat for Humanity Program. She referred to page numbers 19 and 20 of the Amended Plan. We have a hearing tonight. The plan will be adopted via a Resolution and then it would go to Township Committee. The Township Committee would decide if they want to endorse it. The final step goes to the Mount Laurel Judge. The Judge has to approve it. The Hearing is scheduled for January 11, 2021.

The Board Members had no questions.

MR. BEDNAREK: He opened the public portion of the meeting. No one came forward.

MR. BEDNAREK: He closed the public portion of the meeting.

A MOTION IS MADE BY MR. MARSHALL seconded by Ms. Lamon to adopt the Amended Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan as presented. ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE, Ms. Birbeck, Mr. Jones, Ms. Lamon, Mr. Marshall, Ms. O'Malley, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Maradonna and Mr. Bednarek, no opposed, motion passes.

MR. BEDNAREK: Case #2004 – Case #2004 – Bajwa Enterprises, LLC – Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Bulk Variances– 2601 US Route 130, Block 702, Lots 23 and 24.

MR. BURNS: Attorney for Bajwa Enterprises, LLC.

MR. HEINOLD: He swears in Mr. Agresta – Applicant's Engineer, James Miller – Applicant's Planner and Andrew Feranda - Applicant's Traffic Engineer and Dil Bajwa – Applicant.

MR. ANGELASTRO: He referred to the review letter from November 2, 2020 – He referred to the Site Plan Review Letter – Variances Requested – He spoke to the applicant's Engineer and they intend to provide all variance information that was in our letter. They are requesting a couple of waivers that can be handled later in the meeting. As far as completeness, I recommend it be deemed complete.

MR. BURNS: We are requesting Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval and Bulk Variance approval associated with the proposed gas station and convenience store expansion and related parking. The property is located at 2601 US Route 130, Block 702, Lots 23 and 24. As indicated in your review letter, the uses proposed are permitted uses. The proposed use of parking is permitted use in the Industrial Zone.

The Applicant added diesel truck fueling. His client discovered that there is a need for truck parking along Route 130. They met with the Economic Development Team and reviewed the proposed concept plans. We were advised that the Township supported the proposed use on the site. We made the changes recommended by the Economic Development Team. My client purchased property from the Dare Brothers. Truck drivers advised my client that there is a need for truck parking along Route 130. My client was advised that there was a problem with tractor trailer parking overnight and during the day, in retail centers along Route 130. This application is designed to take these trucks out of retail centers and put them in a safe and secure location, that has little or no impact on neighboring properties. The proposed lot will be safe and secure. If approved, we will work with the Police Department and the retail stores to let them know that this place exists and to direct them there for parking.

MR. ANGELASTRO: The Applicant will provide all of the information except for a couple of items as requested. One is identifying trees over six inches in caliber on the site. I don't see a need to identify these trees on the site only to remove them as part of this project. He recommended that the waiver be granted. They will revise the plan.

MS. O'MALLEY: She wanted to deem the Application complete.

MS. BIRBECK: She wanted to deem the application incomplete. She doesn't see a trucker's motel as a permitted use.

MR. BURNS: We are not proposing a trucking hotel. We are proposing a parking lot for the trucks.

MR. HEINOLD: He referred to Code 525-62 - What is permitted in the Industrial Zone refers back to both the commercial zone uses and business development zone uses. There is a specific permitted use under Code 525-62(j) which talks about parking as a principle permitted use.

MR. MARSHALL: He read 525-62(j) – Open Air Parking lot excluding automobile junk yard and display of used motor vehicles for sale.

MR. HEINOLD: They did go to Economic Development. They are seeking approval as an Open Air Parking Lot.

MR. BURNS: It is providing a use that we were told was needed. We did what we thought was proper to make sure we were presenting a complete application before this the Board.

MR. HEINOLD: The Board has the ability to impose conditions, if there are concerns raised. The Code language permits Open Air Parking as a permitted use. It was stated in our Board's Engineer's review letter on November 2, 2020.

A MOTION IS MADE BY MS. O'MALLEY seconded by Mr. Jones to deem this application complete with the option to revisit completeness items. ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE, Mr. Jones, Ms. Lamon, Mr. Marshall, Ms. O'Malley, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Maradonna and Chairman Bednarek, Nay, Ms. Birbeck, motion passes.

MR. BAJWA: He is the managing member of Bajwa Enterprises, LLC. He owns the subject property and gas station with the convenience store adjacent to it. He received approvals for these uses from this Board over the last number of years.

MR. BURNS: He referred to his introduction on why they are before the Board tonight. Were my statements true?

MR. BAJWA: Yes.

MR. BAJWA: There is a need for truck parking. There is a Fleet System, for truck fueling and billing. People can make reservations online. He advised that trucks are parking in lots along Route 130 and in neighborhoods. He identified the need for truck parking. He put together a concept plan for review by

the Economic Development Committee. The Economic Development Committee was helpful and gave me their input. The Economic Development Committee made recommendations. The purpose of the meeting was to make sure the project was permitted. He purchased the property from the Dare family. The subject property is located next to his current business.

The proposed hours of the gas station are 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. If this application is approved, he will contact the Police Department and the retail businesses. He will contact the retail businesses to let them know. The drivers pay online. He is proposing a scale at the site.

Signage – He is looking for signage to identify the use. He will improve the property. He wants to bring improvement to the area.

MR. HEINOLD: In addition to the surveillance, there is an employee on the site. Is it a gate man or security officer?

MR. BAJWA: He will have a security camera and an employee on the site to make sure the site is maintained.

MR. MARSHALL: Is this person also working at the gas station?

MR. BAJWA: He will not be at the gas station. Only at the site.

MR. SEGREST: What are some of the recommendations made by the Economic Development?

MR. BURNS: The Applicant originally proposed other structures on the property including a large garage area to help service vehicles as needed, but the Economic Development Committee didn't think it was appropriate for the site. We agreed to remove the larger structure.

MR. AGRESTA: I would echo that comment.

MR. BURNS: The scale was recommended. The Economic Development Committee also wanted to know how the property would be maintained and secured. We also took that into consideration.

MR. BAJWA: We see different trucks on different days. Most of the truckers stay 3, 4 or 5 hours.

MS. O'MALLEY: Are there any shower facilities?

MR. BAJWA: We do have shower.

MS. BIRBECK: You are looking at a facility like Bordentown?

MR. BAJWA: Yes.

MR. BIRBECK: She is concerned about the trucks there. She stated people will be sleeping there.

MR. BAJWA: He is not proposing that there.

MS. BIRBECK: She expressed concern about the traffic and trucks.

MR. BURNS: The testimony was the nearest truck stop facilities are Paulsboro and Bordentown. I don't think the testimony was that we are going to be like Bordentown.

MS. BIRBECK: Are the spaces rented or free?

MR. BAJWA: They have to reserve.

MS. BIRBECK: How are you justifying the cost.

MR. BAJWA: They can get fuel and go to the Convenience Store.

MS. O'MALLEY: The testimony was the average driver stays 3 to 5 hours.

MR. BAJWA: If there are two drivers, 4 hours. A single driver may stay 5 to 6 hours.

MS. BIRBECK: She thinks there will be more trucks on the road and more traffic.

MR. BURNS: Is it a fact that you will be servicing trucks that are already existing on Route 130? You are not creating more truck traffic.

MR. BAJWA: I don't think we are creating any more traffic.

MR. BURNS: It is not the intention to create more truck traffic. It is designed to meet a need for what is existing currently in Town. It is designed to address concerns to allow trucks to safely park. This is an Industrial and Commercial Zone.

MR. MARSHALL: He spoke about tractor trailers parking in East Riverton.

MR. AGRESTA: He presented and explained the following Exhibits:

Exhibit A-1 – Site Plan Aerial

Exhibit A-2 – Surrounding Area Aerial

Exhibit A-3 – Site Plan Rendering

Exhibit A-4 – Signs

MR. AGRESTA: Exhibit A-2 – He described the surrounding properties. I think what we are proposing is consistent with our surrounding areas. I think what we are proposing blends in with what is around us.

EXHIBIT A-3 – Site Plan – We are proposing an expansion of existing facility. He described the Site Plan.

One Variance is for the lot coverage. We took extra effort to make sure this basin works correctly and will continue to work. The land slopes from east to west. We really tried to mirror that with our site improvements. We left out the curbing for the asphalt along the easterly property line there to preserve the natural sheet flow of water. We wanted to preserve the tree line along the existing site.

He reviewed the lighting and landscaping on Union Landing Road. Lighting is along the easterly and westerly property lines. The site is well lit throughout. We feel we provided adequate lighting to

provide extra security for the site. Landscape – We went heavy on the Union Landing portion of the site because it is the most visible.

He met with the Remington and Vernick Engineers. We worked closely with the previous Engineer to produce a product that everyone was comfortable with.

MR. ANGELASTRO: He referred to the November 2, 2020 review letter.

Page # 3 – Section 525-65.A-1(m)(8) – The 27 parking spaces is adequate to support use.

Page #3 – Section 525-110-B(2)© - The easterly and northerly side of parking lot no curb is being proposed and that is to facilitate storm water drainage. It is his understanding that stormwater is going into their storm water system.

MR. BEDNAREK: He asked about the parking spaces. He asked Mr. Agresta to show the Board where the drive through lane was located.

MR. AGRESTA: He identified the drive-through area.

Page #4 – Section 525-110-B(2)(k) – Parking is not permitted within the front yard setback.

MR. MARSHALL: This is not a loading space and there is no building line. This is a parking space.

MR. ANGELASTRO: A variance is not required.

MR. ANGELASTRO: Page #4 - Section 525-83.1-C/6(E)(1) – Maximum permitted is 45 percent where 83 percent is proposed. It is a parking lot. We are meeting all State rules. I think a variance should be considered.

Section 525-83.1-C/6(C)(6) – A minimum of 5 percent of the parking area in the Industrial Zone is to be landscaped. The Applicant is requesting a variance due to the nature of the project.

Section 525-65-A(1) – The Conoco is an existing condition – No variance is necessary.

Section 526-110-B(2)(a) – 10’x20’ parking space is required – 10’x18’ proposed – He supports this variance.

Sections 525-121-E - 525-121.0(1)-525-121.0(1)-.411-12B(12)(g)-525-121-E(3) – all relate to the Signs. We can look at those when we get testimony from the Applicant’s Planner.

Section 525-66(G) - Trash Enclosure

MR. AGRESTA: He identified the trash enclosure area.

MR. ANGELASTRO: Section 411-12(B(13)(b) – the Applicant is revising the Plans to conform with the Ordinance.

After speaking with the Applicant’s Engineer, they will revise plans to reflect the necessary information. The only one we should consider a waiver on is Section 330-101 (1)(I) – location of any trees over 6 inches in caliper. About a half of dozen of these trees exist on the site. They will be identified on the plans to be removed. He supports this waiver. The other items the applicant said they would provide as necessary.

Page # 7 – the Applicant will comply with all comments noted on page #7.

Page #8 – The Applicant will comply with all comments noted on Page #8

Page #8 - Item # 6 - Width of right of way adjacent to Lot 24 – We acquire additional right of way from Lot 24 as part of this project to even out the right of way line. Mr. Agresta identified the area on the plan.

Page #9 - The Applicant will comply with all comments. The Application will require a new NJDOT access permit. It is my understanding that the Applicant has applied to the NJDOT for the new access permit.

Page #10 - The applicant will comply with all the comments.

Page #11 – Item #I (4) – Remington and Vernick recommends that the Landscaping along Union Landing Road be replaced with a double row of evergreens ten feet on center. The Evergreens will provide a better buffer. Mr. Agresta advised that they will work with Remington and Vernick.

Page #12 – The Applicant will comply with all the comments.

Page #13 – The Applicant agreed to make any changes to the plan to accommodate (inaudible).

MR. MILLER: Applicant' Planner

Exhibit A-4

This is a permitted use at this location. I believe that this is an integrated use. A use which combines two or more uses. Here you have an open air parking lot which is permitted use in the Zone and an existing convenience store use. Both uses are permitted. This property is situated where basically the Township has chosen to concentrate all of its Industrial Development. The Industrial area generates truck traffic which will benefit from this use proposed this evening. He referred to the character of the entire area and how this fits in to that area and how it will service those uses which are both existing and probably going to be developed in the future.

We are proposing site designed to accommodate trucks.

Parking Variance - 39 spaces required. We are proposing 27. The Planning Board Engineer stated that 75 percent of the Dunkin Donuts patronage will be by the drive through. That is consistent with Dunkin Donuts data. The site is also designed to accommodate trucks. A lot of the patrons will be parked in the truck area. The variance allows the site to respond to the use which is a convenience store and Open Air Trucking uses. It allows the site to operate in a more efficient matter. There are no adverse impacts for this relief. There is no potential detriment from this relief. He believes it is a better Zoning alternative.

This relief has a number of benefits. The variances reflect a unique character of use which is a combination of the convenience store and parking and fueling facility for large tractor trailers. The tractor trailers require large parking spaces and driveways to accommodate the wider turns. There is a significant benefit. The landscaping islands would interfere with the circulation of the trucks. The relief of the curbing standard would help the drainage system. They are significant benefits.

No significant negative impact from these variances. He described the surrounding areas.

The benefits out way any potential detriments.

Variance for the Number of fuel dispensers. It serves two different categories of vehicles. Often it takes 10 minutes to fuel a truck. The benefits allow the use to operate efficiently. I believe the benefits of the relief far out way any potential detriments and advances the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law.

Variance for parking dimension variance. The 10' x 18' spaces are fully appropriate for this use. The benefits of those spaces are It is a better Zoning Alternative.

Variance for the Sign – Most of the relief out lined in the Remington and Vernick letter has to do with the dimensions of the signs are slightly different that the Ordinance. The Freestanding sign is a little bit taller, but is a good deal smaller than ordinarily permitted by the Code. The monument sign is not changing, the sign on Union Landing Road will be moved slightly to better identify the entrance to the parking area. The signs are pre-existing non-conforming. I believe they are entitled to remain as currently designed. The yellow sign – this is a functional sign. It is a third free standing sign. It identifies where the scale is. There is no detriment to this sign. It is a better Zoning alternative.

MR. BEDNAREK: Is scale sign lit?

The Applicant wasn't sure if the scale sign was lit?

MR. MILLER: Trash enclosure set back variance – No impact on the adjoining properties. It is a permitted use. It is a better Zoning alternative.

He referred to the Negative Criteria.

He referred to the Public Welfare - The relief we are seeking is going to be beneficial and won't have a negative impact on the surrounding area which is an area heavily dominated by commercial uses and the balance of the area is dominated by Industrial Use. This use will provide a service that will be utilized by the other Industrial within the District. I believe this is a use that will enhance the public welfare. This is a permitted use. It is a fully permitted use under your Code. The site improvements are consistent with the established land use patterns in the area and compatible with the surrounding uses. The improvements are entirely appropriate for this permitted use within the Township. I think this use is going to be an advancement of the Zone Plan and Zoning Ordinance. It is going to provide a service which is going to support other uses within the community. I believe all the requested relief satisfies the applicable criteria and would merit the Board's approval.

MR. MARSHALL: He asked about the height of the scale sign. He looked at the sign that was posted and it was 21 ½ feet.

MR. AGRESTA: It appears to be back lit.

MR. MASHALL: He was concerned about the sign being lit.

MR. BURNS: Do you have an issue with the sign not being lit?

MR. BAJWA: We will have plenty of light. He is okay with this.

MR. MILLER: I think it is better, if it is not lit.

MR. BURNS: We will stipulate that the sign doesn't have to be lit. Mr. Bajwa agreed to the sign not being lit.

MR. MARSHALL: Are you charging for the use of a parking space?

MR. BAJWA: He wasn't sure. They get points. Every time they fill up, they get points.

MR. MARSHALL: They are booking their spaces through the Fleet Services. Your compensation is they will buy fuel and shop at the convenience store.

MR. ANGELASTRO: It is my understanding that the existing canopy has one façade sign and the proposed canopy indicates two façade signs. Are the additional canopy signs going to be considered a façade sign?

MR. MARSHALL: They are variances.

MR. ANGELASTRO: The variance is not required for Section 411-12.

MS. BIRBECK: Can you park in the lot without a reservation?

MR. BAJWA: They can park there.

MS. BIRBECK: What if they are not buying fuel?

MR. BAJWA: Most of the people parking there will buy fuel.

MS. BIRBECK: She wanted to clarify that Mr. Bajwa would charge if the customers weren't buying fuel.

MR. BAJWA: Correct.

MS. BIRBECK: So it is a truck hotel.

MR. BURNS: I don't believe any of the testimony provided supports that.

MR. BURNS: If you are having trucks park there, are you looking for repeat business?

MR. BAJWA: He agreed that he is looking for repeat business.

MR. BURNS: You are not trying to turn this into a truck hotel.

MR. BAJWA: No, we are not.

MS. BIRBECK: She expressed concern about the traffic.

MR. BURNS: He referred to the property being in the Industrial Zone. You are servicing trucks that are already on the road on at existing retail centers illegally parking. Is that a fair statement?

MR. BAJWA: Yes.

MR. BURNS: So, you are not adding new trucks to the roadway.

MR. BAJWA: Right.

MR. MR. HEINOLD: He asked if there would be any consideration for time limitations.

MR. BURNS: This is designed for trucks that need a place to park. It is not designed to be a destination for overnight parking for property owners in Town to place their truck there. They could do it on a temporary basis. Was this designed to have someone drop their truck off and go home?

MR. BAJWA: That is not our plan. It designed for people to stop for 3, 4 or 5 hours.

MR. HEINOLD: Is there any consideration to offer an hour limitation?

MS. O'MALLEY: She suggested limiting how long people can stay in their truck

MR. BURNS: He asked Mr. Bajwa if he had an issue with a 7-hour limitation.

MR. BAJWA: He had no issue with that.

MR. MARSHALL: I would welcome the opportunity for Mr. Bajwa to put some spots aside for residents and charge a fee. There are residents in Town who look for places to park their trucks. Truckers are looking for a safe place to park. When we put hour limitations, it should be for how long a truck is running.

MR. BURNS: They have someone on site to keep it clean and to provide the safety and security concerns. Mr. Bajwa was happy to provide that because it was asked for.

MS. O'MALLEY: She suggested capping the number of hours an occupied truck could stay on the lot. If someone needed to stay longer, they could give them the names of local hotels.

MR. BAJWA: He was agreeable to this. We would welcome that.

MS O'MALLEY: They will comply with State idling rules.

MR. BEDNAREK: Are you numbering these spaces?

MR. BAJWA: Yes.

MR. BEDNAREK: There is a system in place so he will know how long the trucks are parked there.

MR. BURNS: We are happy to work with the local law enforcement.

MS. O'MALLEY: She asked where the showers are located.

MS. O'MALLEY: Will there be fencing?

MR. AGRESTA: There is no proposed fencing to completely encompass the property. There is some existing fencing on adjacent lot. It is not our fencing. The only other fencing will be around both basins on the lot. He said he is not an Architect, but he showed the Board the Architectural plan and identified the bathroom area.

MS. O'MALLEY: She asked about loud speaker system. She asked if they were having a speaker system.

MR. BAJWA: Yes.

MS. O'MALLEY: She asked if there were limitations on hours.

MR. AGRESTA: We have to abide by the State Rules – the Noise Ordinance Act. The Applicant is obligated by law to stay within parameters if those rules.

The Township Ordinance is 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM

MR. BURNS: We will comply with the Township Ordinance.

MR. BEDNAREK: He referred to the letter from the Fire Marshal.

MR. AGRESTA: They will comply to the Fire Marshal letter.

MR. BEDNAREK: He opened the public portion of the meeting. No one came forward.

MR. BEDNAREK: He closed the public portion of the meeting.

A MOTION IS MADE BY MS. O'MALLEY seconded by Ms. Lamon to approve the Preliminary and Final Site Plan Application with the variances noted in the November 2, 2020 Remington and Vernick Review letter excluding Section 525-110-B(2)(k), 525-65-A(1), 411-12B(12)(g), 525-121-E(3) and 411-12.B(13)(b) which was withdrawn. Limiting the hours for the loud speaker to 7:00 AM to 10:00 PM, the truck scale sign will not be back lit. The restriction on an occupied vehicle to be parked in the lot is 7 hours. There is not a limit on the unoccupied vehicles. No truck maintenance is permitted on the lot. ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE, Mr. Jones, Ms. Lamon, Mr. Marshall, Ms. O'Malley, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Maradonna and Mr. Bednarek, Nay, Ms. Birbeck, motion passes.

MR. BEDNAREK: There have been numerous applications before this Board that all involve increasing the truck traffic flow through our Township. He found it odd, that in this Application, we are actually containing traffic and putting it on one location instead of all over Town that there becomes an objection towards that. He spoke about other businesses growing and increased traffic. At least this gives it some place to contain it, instead of spreading it all over the place.

MR. BEDNAREK: Ordinance Discussion – Ordinance 2020-14 – Amending Chapter 444 of the General Code of the Township of Cinnaminson Entitled Stormwater Control.

MR. MARSHALL: He gave an overview of Ordinance 2020-14 – Amending Chapter 444 of the General Code of the Township of Cinnaminson Entitled Stormwater Control. There are new Stormwater Regulations. We have to Amend our Ordinance to come into conformance with those regulations.

A MOTION IS MADE BY MR. MARSHALL seconded by Mr. Jones to deem that Ordinance 2020-14 is substantially in conformance with our Master Plan. ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE, Ms. Birbeck, Ms. Mr. Jones, Ms. Lamon, Mr. Marshall, Ms. O’Malley, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Maradonna and Mr. Bednarek, no opposed, motion passes.

A MOTION IS MADE BY MS. LAMON seconded by Ms. O’Malley to approve the Resolution of the Planning Board of the Township of Cinnaminson Adopting Amended Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE, Ms. Birbeck, Mr. Jones, Ms. Lamon, Mr. Marshall, Ms. O’Malley, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Maradonna and Mr. Bednarek, no opposed, motion passes.

A MOTION IS MADE BY MS. O’MALLEY seconded by Ms. Lamon to approve the Resolution for Case #2007 – Resolution of the Planning Board of the Township of Cinnaminson Granting Minor Subdivision and Bulk Variance Approval to 1 Sea Box Drive, LLC, 1 Sea Box Drive, Block 702, Lots 37 and 39. ROLL CALL VOTE: AYE, Ms. Birbeck, Ms. Lamon, Mr. Marshall, Ms. O’Malley, Mr. Segrest and Mr. Bednarek, Abstain, Mr. Jones and Mr. Maradonna, no opposed, motion passes.

MR. BEDNAREK: He opened the public portion of the meeting. No one came forward.

MR. BEDNAREK: He closed the public portion of the meeting.

The next Planning Board Meeting is on December 8, 2020. The Planning Board will discuss the meeting time for 2021 at the December 8th meeting. The January, 2021 meeting is on January 12, 2021.

A MOTION IS MADE BY MR. MARSHALL, seconded by Ms. Lamon to adjourn the meeting. VOICE VOTE: ALL AYE, no opposed, motion passes. The meeting is adjourned.

Duly passed and Adopted

Respectfully submitted

Patricia Rucci