

**Cinnaminson Township Planning Board**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, December 9, 2025 – 6:30pm**  
**Cinnaminson Municipal Building, 1621 Riverton Road, Cinnaminson, NJ**

Ms. Lauro called the meeting to order and led the flag salute. She read the Sunshine and Public Statements.

Sunshine Statement: 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 Website and by advertising the Regular Meeting in the Burlington County Times and Courier Post newspapers on January 24, 2025. In addition, notice was filed with the Municipal Clerk.

This meeting is a quasi-judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments should be limited to issues that are relevant to what the Board may legally consider in reaching a decision, and decorum appropriate to such a proceeding must be maintained at all times. Please refer to the Rules Governing Public Comment Periods attached to this agenda.

**Roll Call**

Present: Class II: Mr. Minton; Class III: Mr. Segrest; Class IV: Mr. Gallagher, Ms. Lauro, Mr. McGill, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington; Alternate: Ms. Stewart  
Absent: Class I: Mr. Roadside; Class IV: Mr. Maradonna

Also Present: Mr. Heinold, Board Solicitor; Mr. Barbadoro, Board Engineer; Mr. Harris, Board Planner; Mrs. Russell, Secretary

Ms. Lauro read the Board's policy: It is the policy of the Board that no application will be opened after 10:00P.M. It is the policy of the Board that no new testimony will be taken after 10:30P.M.

**Applications**

**#2504 – Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan - De Carvalho Corp., c/o Jerusa De Carvalho Block 806, Lots 5 & 6.01; 1503/1601 Industrial Highway, Cinnaminson; Redevelopment area in BD Zoning District**

• Ms. Lauro reported receipt of a request from the Applicant's Attorney to continue the hearing to the January 13, 2026 meeting. As the notice published and mailed was timely and sufficient, there will be no further notice provided.

Mr. Heinold announced that the hearing for this application will be continued to the January 13, 2026 meeting without additional notice.

Motion by Mr. Minton, seconded by Ms. Woodington to continue the application to the January 13, 2026 meeting.

**Roll Call:**

Those voting in favor: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. McGill, Mr. Minton, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart  
Those voting against: None  
Those abstaining: None Those recusing: None  
Absent: Mr. Maradonna Mr. Roadside

**# 2508 – Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan - Flagship New Jersey Propco, LLC Block 2102, Lot 51; 10 Route 130 North, Cinnaminson; Redevelopment area in BD Zoning District**

- Mr. Heinold explained the application for consideration by the Board is for preliminary and final major site plan approval and the Board, operating as a quasi judicial board, is constrained by the code governing the requirements of the zone where the site is located. He added the application is for a permitted use as designated by the Redevelopment Authority. The Applicant's counsel will provide a more in-depth history and witness testimony, and the Board's professionals will give guidance as to the standards to be applied.
- Mr. Minton added that the redevelopment determination was made by the planner, after exhaustive research, and the Redevelopment Authority, after much deliberation, and this use appears to be a permitted use.

Damien Del Duca introduced Judy Knop, representing the Applicant, Flagship New Jersey Propco, LLC. He stated he will present history and testimony regarding the property, 10 Route 130 North, Block 2102, Lot 51, explaining the site is currently Sweetwater Bar and Grill, which has been closed for many years and was on the market for an extended period of time. Mr. Del Duca reported his client signed an agreement to purchase the property, which is approximately 1.88 acres, and proposes building a new Flagship Car Wash on the site.

Mr. Del Duca explained that Flagship is a Spotless Brands Company with various car wash concepts in various regions of United States. Flagship Brand started in Washington DC and is now expanding to New Jersey, Philadelphia, New York and the Northeastern United States with brand new, state-of-art, "flex" car washes. He explained that flex is a variation of full service car wash where the vehicle is washed in a drive thru wet tunnel with added options for various additional services performed in a dry tunnel and self-service options, all of which are chosen by the customer at the pay station before entering the wet tunnel. Customers may receive a quick wash or add full detail or use vacuum stalls to self-vacuum. The proposed car wash will be full service with added dry tunnel amenity.

Mr. Del Duca explained the Applicant seeks Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. He reminded the Board hears site plan and subdivision applications to determine compliance with all land development regulations and if the application complies, grants approval. Mr. Del Duca reported, if this application does not comply, he will provide proofs that waivers or variances are entitled. He will present the plan, what is proposed in operations, and will show that the plan complies with the many standards and regulations and that any variances or waivers are appropriate.

Mr. Del Duca explained Cinnaminson has a Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 525, and a separate Chapter 411 governing Redevelopment areas. He stated this site is in a Redevelopment area, as Cinnaminson determined in 2002 this site and a large swath of the Route 130 corridor is within the Redevelopment area. Therefore, this application must comply with both Zoning and Redevelopment requirements. He described the presentation of the project to the Township Committee, who act as the Redevelopment Authority. He quoted Chapter 411-4B "The Township Committee, acting as the redevelopment entity within the Township of Cinnaminson, shall review all proposed redevelopment projects within the redevelopment areas to ensure that such projects are consistent with the Redevelopment Plan, redevelopment ordinances, and relevant redeveloper agreements. Said review by the Township Committee shall occur prior to the submission of the redevelopment project to either the Planning Board or the Zoning Board of Adjustment."

Mr. Del Duca outlined the letter sent on July 7, 2025 along with the proposed plan for the Committee's review. The Planner and Committee reviewed the plan and the project was presented at the August 4, 2025 Township Committee meeting. The Redevelopment Authority determined a car wash is a permitted use in this zone and adopted resolution 2025-135 on November 10, concluding the Applicant satisfied this required and the

application is considered to be in agreement with the Redevelopment Plan and ordinance. Mr. Del Duca explained that under Chapter 411-8, car washes are permitted provided they meet four conditions which the Governing Body concluded this does. The primary requirement is that it be adjacent to a service station or convenience store and this site is neighboring Wawa and McDonalds, as well as Eagle Auto Service Station. He stated the plan satisfies the other three requirements and is now before the Planning Board seeking approval.

Mr. Del Duca introduced the following exhibits:

A-1 - aerial photo of the site

A-2 - color rendering of site plan submitted for approval showing the restaurant to be demolished and the 13,481 sq ft building to be added. It shows the location, bordering Route 130 North, and site circulation. The site is located at the intersection of Colonial Square Drive to the west and to the back is a driveway and to the southeast, Old Branch Drive leading to Branch Pike

A-3 - architectural 3-dimensional renderings of the building to be constructed showing what the building and building signage will look like

A-4 - shows the signs and testimony will be provided about the signs, their details, sizes and dimensions

A-5 - tax map shows the property, Lot 51, showing Route 130, McDonalds/Eagle Service Station and Wawa, and showing the roadway system surrounding the site

A-6 - copy of Township Committee Resolution 2025-135

Mr. Del Duca introduced the witnesses who will provide testimony: Judy Knop, Flagship employee; Jose Lazo, Civil Engineer; Derk Keil, Architect; Andrew Feranda, Traffic Engineer; and Creigh Rahenkamp, Planner. He reported the witnesses will provide testimony to address requirements in the ordinance, and will provide comments raised by the Board's professionals in their review letters. He indicated variance relief sought under Chapter 525 to approve plan with no loading area, which is not needed and is a better plan to not have additional paving and stormwater run off if not needed. Additionally, waivers relating to signage and relating to fire and access lanes will be addressed by testimony. He concluded that any relief needed is minor in nature.

The Applicant's witnesses were sworn by Mr. Heinold; Judy Knop, Spotless Brands; Derek Keil, BL Companies; Jose Lazo, BL Companies; Andrew Feranda, Shropshire Associates; Creigh Rahenkamp, along with the Board's Professionals: Joe Barbadoro, Engineer, and Brett Harris, Planner.

Mr. Barbadoro reported that all requirements of completeness, noted in his letter of December 5, 2026, have been provided. He recommended the Board deem the application complete.

#### **Completeness/Notice**

Motion by Mr. Minton, seconded by Mr. McGill to deem the application complete.

#### **Roll Call:**

Those voting in favor: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. McGill, Mr. Minton, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart

Those voting against: None

Those abstaining: None Those recusing: None

Absent: Mr. Maradonna Mr. Roadside

#### **Hearing**

Ms. Knop stated the business began in 2020 and has grown by aggregating brands into the Spotless Brands from throughout the United States. She described the company's regional focus and explained that the Flagship brand began in Washington DC, Maryland and Virginia with 40 car washes and are growing up the East Coast with

two sites under construction in New Jersey, one in Long Island, one in Pennsylvania and multiple sites planned throughout New Jersey. Mr. Del Duca asked Ms. Knop if his introductory statement was factually accurate and she agreed that it was. Ms. Knop explained that Flagship operates under the Spotless Brand and this project will trade under Flagship.

Referring to exhibit A-2, Mr. Del Duca asked Ms. Knop to explain the process for customers. She explained that the Flagship customer focus is on experience, stating that the process is easy to understand and navigate. Customers will enter off Old Branch Drive, will pay either in the membership lane or credit card/cash pay lanes and where they will be greeted by an attendant who will explain the options and will help process the payment. The attendant will help navigate customers as they exit the pay station, circulate counter clockwise into the building and proceed through the wet tunnel in the car. When they exit the wet tunnel, they may then leave the site or circulate back through the property and pull into one of two dry belts where employees vacuum the interior and wipe dry, or can circulate to self-vacuum and self-dry area. She described the services offered in dry belt areas, interior vacuuming, inside window cleaning and final wipe down and dry off.

Ms. Knop testified the hours of operation will be 8:00AM to 8:00PM daily, and the peak hours will be Saturdays from 11:00AM to 3:00PM. She testified there will be 10 to 12 employees. Ms. Knop pointed out the employee parking area in 14 angled spots, not required in the ordinance, but is the model for Flagship. She stated that many employees take public transportation.

Mr. Del Duca reviewed the four conditions to be met under Chapter 411-8L. There cannot be a self-service car wash, must have one attendant present and one manager on call and available during open hours. Ms. Knop described the employee's functions with 1 or 2 working the exterior monitoring pay stations and vacuuming area, cleaning up trash and ensuring traffic is circulating without problems at pay stations, 2 employees work in the wet tunnel and 4 employees on each dry belt. There will be some light back and forth sharing of resources depending on need, and an onsite manager.

Mr. Del Duca reported the third condition that the site must be immediately adjacent to lot used as an auto service station, auto repair shop or convenience store. As he addressed this in his introductory comments, Ms. Knop confirmed this to be factually accurate. The site is next door to an auto service station and Wawa is located across Colonial Square Drive.

Mr. Del Duca explained the second condition is that the car wash shall comply with conditions and noise regulations in relation to adjacent residential uses. Ms. Knop stated the hours will be 8:00AM to 8:00PM so will not be open when noise ordinance is in effect and will comply with all noise requirements.

Ms. Knop explained the average vehicle will spend 3-5 minutes in the wet tunnel and 6-8 minutes in the dry tunnel. She testified that employees monitor traffic flow throughout the site to move customers through quickly and can speed up the wash tunnel if needed.

Mr. Del Duca asked Ms. Knop to explain how deliveries are made and the frequency and type of materials received. Ms. Knop testified chemicals used in the wash process are delivered once every two weeks in a Fed Ex-type box truck. She testified that deliveries arrive prior to opening for the day. Mr. Del Duca concluded this is the reason no loading area is proposed.

Ms. Knop addressed trash collection on the site. She reported trash receptacles and towel cans are located at the back of each stall and are monitored by employees working the exterior throughout the day. She testified the trash and towel cans are emptied, at a minimum, at the end of each day or throughout the day as needed. Mr. Del Duca concluded his questioning of Ms. Knop and the Board had no questions at this time.

Mr. Del Duca introduced Mr. Lazo, who described his professional licensing, educational background and work experience. He reported testifying before similar boards throughout New Jersey and holds a license in Civil Engineering in good standing in the state. The Board accepted Mr. Lazo as an expert in professional civil engineering.

Mr. Lazo confirmed that Mr. Del Duca's introductory comments were factually accurate. Using exhibit A-2, the rendered site plan, he described the overview of the site plan and layout of the car wash. He explained that customers enter the wash tunnel side of building, adjacent to pay station. He described the location and function of the bypass lane used as a "bail out" or "escape" lane should there be a reason the customer cannot enter the wash tunnel. Reasons for this include the presence of a roof luggage rack or bike rack that would not clear the height bar or declined payment. The lane gives employees the opportunity to guide customers away from the wash tunnel to the paved area to correct any issues. He explained this lane is located between the building and Route 130. Mr. Lazo reported that, in addition, there are 19 vacuum spaces each 13' wide by 20' long, and 14 angled parking spaces and conventional perpendicular parking spaces each 20' long.

He explained the trash enclosure at the southeast section of the site will be modified and adjusted as the proposed location encroaches on the side yard setback. Mr. Lazo testified that it will be moved adjacent to the five parking spaces at southeast corner of the building. He explained that one tree will be removed to accommodate the change in location of the trash enclosure. Trash will be removed by commercial trash hauler.

Mr. Lazo explained that customers choosing only conventional wet wash, will exit the site or they may return to the self-vacuum spaces. In the event that vacuum spaces are full, there is adequate space at the end of the vacuum parking area to turn around and go back in the opposite direction.

Mr. Lazo pointed out the current access along Colonial Square Drive, explaining this will be maintained and the other access on Old Branch Drive will be kept and modified at the opening. He reported the existing access on Route 130 will be closed off, leaving access to the car wash from the rear of the site. Mr. Lazo testified that all stormwater requirements will be complied with. He confirmed receipt of Mr. Barbadoro's review letter and testified they will comply with his stormwater and grading comments. Mr. Lazo stated the plan does comply with landscape requirements and agreed to work with the Board's Engineer and Planner to comply with any comments in their review letters. He testified that the plan complies with lighting requirements.

Referring to page 3, section A-2 of Mr. Barbadoro's review letter, Mr. Del Duca asked Mr. Lazo to explain the need for a variance as no loading zone is being proposed. Mr. Lazo explained no loading zone is proposed because it is not needed with this use. He reported having a loading area would add to stormwater runoff with additional pavement coverage. He explained no loading zone is consistent with other Flagship car washes.

Mr. Lazo acknowledged Mr. Barbadoro's comment A-3, regarding the use of off-street parking or loading area for sale, repair, dismantling or servicing of any vehicle, equipment, materials or supplies. He testified there will be no servicing or detailing of vehicles in the parking lot.

Section A-4, requiring revised plans to show the required minimum 12' wide fire lanes around two sides of the building, unless additional requirements are imposed by the Fire Marshal. Mr. Lazo stated no additional comments have been received from the Fire Marshal. He pointed out the 15' wide drive aisle to the west of the building along parking spaces. Additionally, he noted on the south portion of the site, south of the building, a 15' drive aisle can be another access for fire lanes. Mr. Lazo testified that he will work with the Engineer and Fire Marshal as to their preference for fire lane placement and will work with the Engineer to add striping to the lane or provide signage designating it as a fire lane. Mr. Lazo believes the plan complies with the requirement by providing fire access around the building and a fire can be safely and properly fought based on this design.

Mr. Del Duca reported the Applicant's professionals searched the ordinance related to the definition of a drive thru business in response to comment A-5 of Mr. Barbadoro's letter. The comment requires revised plans or a waiver from access and stacking lanes serving drive-through businesses, which shall not be located between the building and any adjacent street. The Applicant's professionals found that all references are in context of a drive-through restaurant or bank or similar use. He stated it is the Applicant's contention that a car wash is not intended to be a drive-through under the ordinance. Mr. Del Duca stated if the Board does believe it applies, the pay stations where stacking will occur on the east side of the site are not between the building and roadway. Located between the building and road is the circulation into the wet tunnel and if customers exit and want the dry tunnel, they circulate clockwise around the building to access the dry tunnel from the west side to the north side. He noted that no matter which way you rotate the building, cars will be accessing the car wash services.

Mr. Lazo addressed the Site Circulation comments noted in Mr. Barbadoro's letter. He explained that the bypass lane, noted in Section B-1, between Route 130 and the building where cars enter wet tunnel, is an escape lane for cars that cannot enter the wet tunnel will have a mode of exiting the tunnel entrance area. He testified that will comply with the request in Section B-2 to add striping and "Do Not Enter" signage to the egress from the parking area on the west side of the building. Mr. Lazo testified that car turning template was provided for the area at the end of the vacuum area satisfying the comment in Section B-3.

Mr. Lazo explained the realignment of the entrance and the shifting of the bypass lane further south to soften the geometry at the Old Branch Pike access point as requested in Section B-6. He reported after discussion with Mr. Barbadoro, the entrance will be moved 5' down toward property line to better align driveway line and soften the curves of the entrance. He believes this can be done entirely within the property without triggering DOT permit or encroaching on right of way of adjacent neighbor.

Mr. Lazo testified the Applicant will add a curb ramp on Colonial Square Drive at Route 130 as suggested in Section C. This will be done with DOT approval.

In section G. Planting Designs, Mr. Barbadoro requests testimony regarding the parking lot landscaping, at minimum required to be 8%. Mr. Lazos testified there is 11% landscaping coverage. He further testified one tree is proposed for removal between McDonalds and the pay stations due to grading between properties and to provide necessary separation between back of curb at pay station and property line. Two other trees will be protected, preserved and maintained during construction. Mr. Lazo testified they will comply with all lighting requirements.

Mr. Del Duca addressed the issue with signage as described in Mr. Barbadoro's and Mr. Harris' letters. He referred to two sheets showing proposed signage in exhibit A-4. There will be a monument sign at the intersection which complies with requirement for height, size and location and do not propose pylon signs

identifying business. Façade signs are proposed on three sides of the building; on north side adjacent to Route 130, south and parking sides. The façade signs on north and side two ends are Flagship Carwash signs for branding and customer visibility. One is to be located on the rear or south side due to the access point from Branch Pike. The additional façade signs on the west side are the entry, exit only and office directional signs. There are no signs proposed on west side although elevations show a sign on west side, a sign is not proposed in that location.

Mr. Lazo pointed out the clearance bar sign to the right of the pay station. He described the signs that designate the lanes for members and paying customers which identify where to go and the clearance height permitted to enter the tunnel. He stated these are directional and informational signs. Mr. Del Duca explained the sign provision of Chapter 562-L allows for directional signs no greater than 2 sq ft. The sign above the pay station varies from 13 sq ft to 35 sq ft, directing to member, credit or cash lane, which are in the same area and are on poles. Mr. Del Duca stated the ordinance does not allow pole signs. These are not identification pole signs on the roadway but are on poles to provide clearance needed to drive through wash tunnel. Vehicle must fit under this sign to get enter the building which is why they are on poles. Mr. Lazo testified he considers these directional signs.

Discussion continued regarding additional signage including vacuum parking signage for the free vacuums, information identifying the vacuums and providing time limits, QR code survey signs in vacuum space area, and dumpster enclosure signage. Mr. Del Duca stated that all signs provide direction and information. He summarized the ordinance limits one façade, and regardless of their function, four façade signs are proposed. Two are Flagship Car Wash signs and the others denote the entrance, exit only and office for a total of five, with the last three being directional. He described the size of the signs with the entrance sign being 4.4 sq ft; the exit sign being 6.8 sq ft; and the office sign being 4.8 sq ft. He reported that all exceed the 2 sq ft maximum allowed in ordinance. Mr. Lazo testified the larger signs provide information for customers to know where to enter and exit, and for visibility due to set back from the road.

Mr. Del Duca asked Mr. Lazo to explain the queuing data collected by Flagship. Mr. Lazo explained that Flagship several car washes in Washington DC, Maryland and Virginia were studied to determine 16 cars can queue between pay station and leading to the wet tunnel and 15 to 20 cars behind the pay stations.

- Mr. Minton asked Mr. Lazo if the vacuums are for customers only. Mr. Lazos confirmed they are. Mr. Minton asked if thought had been given to the need for relief from setback requirements related to the modification at Old Branch Road. Mr. Lazo stated at this point he does not see the need for relief, adding the key is if we can align the road and stay within our property will not impact the setbacks. Discussion continued regarding access as a straight run going out Branch Pike. The Applicant is willing to flatten out geometry at back access road as long as it does not trigger DOT access permits or encroach on other property.

- Mr. Minton asked if the relocation of trash enclosure due to the setback requirement will make the plan worse. Mr. Lazo explained they are willing to move the enclosure to meet the requirement. Mr. Heinold shared his opinion that moving the trash enclosure up to the island where parking spaces, would require removal of a tree and put the enclosure in the island. He believes the better placement or design is to leave it where it is unless the Board professionals disagree. Mr. Del Duca stated the Applicant agrees to ask for the variance.

- Mr. Minton asked if the Applicant is willing to work with the Engineer on landscaping at the base of the pole signs required to show height dimension. The Applicant will comply.

- Mr. Minton pointed out the three additional façade signs—4.4 sq ft ‘entry’ sign, 6.8 sq ft “exit only” sign, and 4.8 sq ft “office” sign—are close in size to the court room ceiling tiles, therefore relatively small façade signs and according to Mr. Lazo’s testimony, two are façade and three are directional and informational.

Mr. Del Duca introduced Mr. Kiel, who stated he has been a licensed architect for 13 years with licenses in good standing in the state. He was accepted by the Board as an expert witness. Mr. Kiel described the rendered elevations shown on exhibit A-3 showing the architecture features and building materials. Mr. Kiel described the view from east to Route 130, the proposed gable roof forms and architectural details in compliance with the development ordinance. He explained the shifts in wall plane to break up the visual and stone veneer water course around building, as well as metal panel wall siding with shiplap profile along with horizontal belt courses around structure and accent material around the façade.

Mr. Del Duca stated that Cinnaminson has a robust set of architectural design standards in Chapter 411. Mr. Kiel confirmed the project will comply with all those requirements with the general intent to create architectural interest and substance for building and will comply with that intent and specifics of the ordinance. Mr. Kiel described the view from Route 130 heading north and the vacuum stalls. He pointed out on exhibit A-3 the red canopy awnings and signage to expedite navigation around the site.

Mr. Del Duca introduced Mr. Feranda, Traffic Engineer with Shropshire Associates who stated he has been a traffic engineer for 20 years, described his education and professional experiences. Mr. Feranda was accepted as an expert witness.

Mr. Feranda provided a traffic impact study, dated November 10, 2025, to evaluate traffic flow and volumes in the vicinity of the site including Wawa driveways at Colonial Square Drive and Route 130, Branch Pike and Old Branch Drive to determine what impact the car wash would have on the surrounding roadways. He reported that existing volumes were evaluated to determine traffic impact of the future site. Peak periods of the weekday mornings and afternoons and Saturdays were determined. He reported the morning highest hour with 64 trips, half in and half out; afternoon with 128 trips, half in and half out; and 238 trips on Saturday 238, half in and half out. Using volumes and existing conditions, distributed traffic generated by the site to, and into and out of the site, based on patterns established and evaluated and graded the levels of service of the intersections surrounding the area. Mr. Feranda described the level of service for all as acceptable levels, with less than 30 seconds of delay, to be a high C grade or B or better. He reported the delay at Route 130 right turn in and right turn out and at Colonial Square Drive to Route 130 will be delay in the future with a level F of up to a one minute delay. He concluded the location and background traffic is similar under existing and future conditions and the proposed project will not have a material negative impact on surrounding roadway network and area. There will not be an increase in delay at any of the intersections with standard delay along Route 130 but same for any development at this site.

Mr. Feranda reviewed the proposed access, circulation and parking, noting the site is located along Route 130 but bounded by Church Street to south and Branch Pike to the north, and Old Branch Drive becoming Colonial Square Drive with shopping center to the east and west. To the south is Wawa and to the north is McDonalds. The site is surrounded by commercial businesses with access through remnant road with private property in between allowing access to the site at Colonial Square Drive and Old Branch Drive. He noted the driveway will be closed along Route 130. He believes the DOT will look favorably on removing that driveway as it is a beneficial and safer improvement allowing traffic to use existing intersections. He testified that onsite

circulation is safe and efficient and is configured for this site based on the three tunnels. He described the movement through the wet tunnels and to the exit or dry tunnel or self-vacuum area.

Mr. Feranda testified the proposed car wash will comply with New Jersey noise statute for noise control which is 65 decibels at the property lines. He reported extensive noise studies, done in Colorado, studied points of noise at outside vacuum at nozzle when open is 64.3 decibels at 25' from opening at a height of 3'. If closed is 60 decibels. At the exit to tunnel, noise may come out 66.9 decibels at 25' directly in middle of tunnel and at 45 degree angle would drop to 59.7 decibels. He explained that while 66.9 decibels is higher than the 65 decibels limit at property line, there is a significant drop off at another 25 feet to 25 decibels as you distance from tunnel. He further explained there are no residential property within 400' of site and the study showed at 45 degrees, the noise level would drop to 59.7 decibels. Mr. Feranda testified that the site will comply with applicable noise standard at boundary line.

- Mr. Minton asked if continuous streetscaping will be provided along Route 130 at driveway closure so the public will not see an abandoned driveway. Mr. Del Duca confirmed there will be landscaping straight through.

Mr. Del Duca introduced Mr. Rahenkamp who described his educational and professional background, experience and numerous appearances before boards. Mr. Rahenkamp was accepted as an expert in professional planning. Mr. Del Duca asked Mr. Rahenkamp to explain the variance requested for off street loading. Mr. Rahenkamp relying on Mr. Lazo's testimony regarding the loading issue, stated both parking and loading are required to be provided. Asked the Board to make a finding that there is sufficient parking spaces provided for employees and customers. He stated this is one of the uses that does not require loading so does not require a variance, but if the Board finds that it does, it would be a c2 variance. He testified that nothing will be delivered other than on box trucks that can park in a typical parking space so there is no need for a loading area. Mr. Rahenkamp believes the benefit outweighs the detriment, with zero detriment, and the benefit is not wasting space on the site for a function that is not going to happen.

Mr. Rahenkamp referenced the trash enclosure, immediately adjacent to the access drive, McDonalds and the service station across from the restaurant. It is not close to residential impact or less intense use and is a well-designed enclosure and the Applicant will work with professionals on landscape and screening. He stated agreement with Mr. Heinold that this is the right place for it to go, and the Applicant will ask for a variance.

Mr. Del Duca noted in Chapter 411-12C7(g) one fire lane a minimum of 12' wide shall be provided around two sides of a four-sided building unless additional requirements are imposed by the Fire Marshal. Testimony has been provided proving compliance with those requirements. Mr. Rahenkamp explained the building has four sides with pavement access, three sides has sufficient width for fire truck and one side has access but is where cars could be stacked. If a fire occurred while cars are stacked there, would not have access to that side of the building. He noted that a fire truck does not drive immediately adjacent to a burning building and there is ample area on the site to provide fire protection.

Mr. Rahenkamp spoke to the prohibition to stacking access lanes between building and road, noting the building has circulation on all four sides and sits with two public and one private frontage. Therefore it is impossible to not have some access issues. He stated the ordinance is vague while it is clear you should not have the drive through function on a road, cars are circulating the entire site to get to the drive through lane. Cars will access the wet tunnel from all sides of the building and will be protected from public view.

Signage was addressed. Mr. Rahenkamp compared other usage where signs provide communication between customer and the business onsite. The proposed signs are not advertising in the traditional way, but provide direction where to go, explaining the rules, and transactional information. He explained the pole signs are height control signs with fonts and wording to make it more attractive and landscaping will be provided at the base. He explained of the five signs, two are façade signs and three are directional and informational. He stated that corner lots are allowed additional signage and as this site is accessed from all sides, it is appropriate and the directional signs are critical to show where to go in an effective way and the design adds architectural interest with the red band with white lettering. The signs are designed in an integrative way and a part of the coloring of the building. The size of the signage is appropriate for their function. The relief sought will not change the character of the neighborhood or have a significant negative impact on the neighborhood. The relief is consistent with the intent and purpose of the ordinance. He added the Governing Body approved the use.

Mr. Heinold asked Mr. Rahenkamp to give an example of a typical use where a separate loading zone would be needed. Mr. Rahenkamp explained typically a retail operation that receives inventory which may come in larger or seasonal deliveries, or a manufacturer or medical facilities receiving materials or supplies that cannot come via common carrier would require loading zones. Retail restaurants such as Wawa or McDonalds require loading zones.

- Mr. Minton suggested the George Kyratas, the owner of the property, may offer context as to why we are here and the efforts he has gone through to date. Mr. Del Duca invited Mr. Kyratas to speak. He was sworn by Mr. Heinold. Mr. Kyratas explained the restaurant, formerly Hathaways and then Sweetwater, closed in August 2024. He described the process of marketing the restaurant for sale beginning June 2023 through restaurant broker, Jay Miller. He explained the broker approached many box restaurants, including Chickie and Pete's and Buffalo Wild Wings, who all rejected the site due to the elevation with the steps at the front and back as no one that has a bar wants steps. He explained that the broker approached higher end restaurants but the demographics of the area do not fit the requirements of these types of restaurants. Again the site was not appropriate due to the elevation and it would not fit their style and would need to be knocked down. The price of the liquor license was also a factor.

Mr. Minton thanked Mr. Kyratas, whose testimony was helpful to the Board and the public. Mr. Minton, in his capacity as Director of Community Development, was privy to these conversations, and the attempts to market this property. He asked Mr. Kyratas if it is his intent to work with the Township to find the highest and best sale of the liquor license, the sale of which the Township will have to authorize. As the Township undertakes other areas of rehabilitation and redevelopment it will be beneficial to keep that license in Cinnaminson. Mr. Kyratas stated the new laws allow for transfer of the license out of town, but he does not want that and will hold this license after the sale and work with the Township.

Mr. Del Duca concluded his presentation.

Mr. Heinold asked Mr. Barbadoro and Mr. Harris if all issues raised in their review letters had been covered. Mr. Barbadoro's letter was extensively reviewed. Mr. Heinold asked for clarification on the stacking issue. Mr. Barbadoro explained a stacking issue would require a waiver. Mr. Del Duca explained, per the ordinance, access in stacking lanes serving drive through lanes shall not be located between building and adjacent street, which he interprets to be behind the pay station. Circulation movement happens around the building but where the people enter and wait to enter the use, will happen between building and McDonalds, not on a street. Mr. Del Duca believes the intent of the ordinance is that stacking is not a visual impact or can lead to traffic back up

on the street. He explained there is no way that stacking could occur on Route 130 as there is no driveway and the access off Od Branch Drive is far from Route 130. He further recalled Mr. Lazo to address his testimony that this use has done studies in other locations and the maximum was 16 and potential stacking is 20. Mr. Lazo confirmed stacking demand of 16 vehicles behind pay station and 4 waiting to enter wet tunnel with space for 9 between pay station and wet tunnel and space for 15 to 20 behind the pay station. Mr. Heinold clarified exhibit A-2 shows area in front of pay station is included in total stack count and asked if there was any possibility vehicles could stack on Route 130 or back up on Old Branch Drive. Mr. Lazo testified there is not.

Mr. Harris asked for confirmation regarding vehicle circulations and limitations to through traffic between Colonial Square Drive and Old Branch Drive related to page 6, section 2 of his review letter. Mr. Del Duca asked Mr. Lazo to review how cars will circulate on the south side. Mr. Lazo explained cars enter from north side, wet tunnel, building side closest to pay station, and exit movement will be on south side where cars exit the wet tunnel and will intersect with driveway. They may exit site or circulate counter clockwise to enter one of two dry tunnels to the north then proceed through the building and would exit out onto the drive to leave the site. All exit and movement are to the south side of the building and Old Branch Drive. Mr. Harris asked if there are circulation limitations on the thru traffic between Colonial Square Drive and Old Branch Drive. Mr. Lazo stated it is private property so no physical limitations. Mr. Minton added that is how the public utilize the area.

Mr. Del Duca referenced that the Applicant will comply with the non-residential development fee of 2.5% of the difference in value between what is existing and what is proposed. Mr. Heinold noted will defer to the assessor as to the final amount.

- Mr. McGill noted on exhibit A-3 there appears to be a speed bump on Old Branch Drive. Mr. Del Duca confirmed that will be removed as it is not proposed and that no speed bumps are proposed on site.

### **Hearing Open to the Public**

Ms. Lauro opened the hearing to the public.

- Ronald Valkenburg, 2703 Riverton Road, Cinnaminson – asked if ADA parking provided - this was confirmed as 1 spot of 14 employee parking – asked if there will be any commercial freight deliveries bringing in large product – Mr. Del Duca stated testimony was provided that all deliveries will come through Federal Express type delivery truck and do not expect tractor trailer deliveries based on other operations – Mr. Valkenburg questioned Eagle Auto Service being on other side adjacent to property – Mr. Del Duca noted exhibit A-5 tax map shows Eagle Auto Service on one tax lot 46.01 which is all one lot on same tax lot with McDonalds - Mr. Valkenburg asked if vacuums are for customer use only and asked how this will be enforced - Ms. Knop explained that employees circulate within and monitor the area and there is no access to the vacuum stations without getting through wash tunnel – he asked if there is video surveillance and Ms. Knop confirmed there is – Mr. Valkenburg expressed concerns with vehicles missing the turn off Route 130 using the McDonalds and Eagle lot as a cut through to Old Branch Drive to get to this facility – Mr. Del Duca showed the boundaries of the property on exhibit A-2 stating it is private property – the site adjoins the right of way and customers will not cross private property to get into site – Mr. Valkenburg asked the Board when the RD Zone was revised to allow car washes – Mr. Minton explained he believes it was in 2008 that the code was amended to allow gas station and convenience store to allow Wawa – Mr. Valkenburg expressed concern that there will be a third car wash in Cinnaminson.
- Alice Thomas, 819 Meeting House Road, Cinnaminson – asked if cars will stack up on Old Branch Drive to enter the car wash blocking access to Due Amici next door – Mr. Del Duca does not anticipate this based on

data collected, stacking will not go back to old Branch Drive – she asked if cars will be able to enter Colonial Square shopping center – Mr. Del Duca stated they would have to stack three lanes back and do not anticipate that – testimony is that it is not expected

### **Hearing Closed to the Public**

Since there were no further comments or questions, Ms. Lauro closed the hearing to the public.

- Mr. Heinold noted the unique access layout with the shopping center, and asked if there is any data relative to customer base over time as to repeat customers. Ms. Knop explained the membership business, with 60% of customers being members in similar flex concepts. Mr. Heinold asked in a worst case stacking scenarios, if there was stacking reaching the entry point to Old Branch Drive, what would be done from an operational standpoint. Mr. Del Duca stated testimony shows that this will not happen, but given an extraordinary day, there will be enough employees to police the situation and accelerate the wash belt. He confirmed the Applicant is committed to doing this. There would be no potential for stacking to impact Route 130 and Colonial Square Drive and Old Branch Drive operates as an internal roadway. Mr. Del Duca noted that Old Branch Drive is private property and his client will own this property down to the right of way. This is no different than any other car wash under extraordinary conditions, and has no objection to Applicant not allowing stacking in the roadway. Mr. Heinold stated it is important to have on the record that this is not intended
- Mr. Snyder asked if signage that Old Branch Drive is private property could be installed. Mr. Del Duca reported it was not his impression that this is wanted as this was all right of way and the Township vacated the right of way in 2007 and the average resident may not know that changed. Mr. Heinold noted for overall economics of the shopping center, it would negatively impact the businesses further down and at the shopping center to limit usage.
- Mr. Gallagher asked about the traffic study determining that the intersection at Colonial Square Drive after Route 130 is a grade F. He noted that with Wawa and the gas station, people go out to Church Street more frequently and asked if there was any concern about alleviation of stacking on Colonial Square Drive. Mr. Del Duca asked Mr. Feranda to explained the grading of the intersection. He explained the F grade does not stand for “failure” but rather the length of time of delay, about 55 seconds or more. If there was a lot of traffic, you have to wait for a break to enter the roadway. He further explained that we do not expect the queuing to back up onto the intersection of the Wawa driveway or Old Branch Drive and there is an option for the car wash clients to use Old Branch Drive to go out to Old Branch Drive and use the signal there to make a left-hand turn.

Mr. Heinold asked Mr. Feranda if the driveway to be removed along Route 130 will be replaced with continuous landscaping. Mr. Feranda confirmed this. Mr. Heinold asked if there was any potential to improve the intersection at Colonial Square Drive. Mr. Feranda explained the DOT would not allow a light there because of the proximity to other intersections and there is not much the DOT can do with that intersection which is under their jurisdiction. Mr. Del Duca stated the DOT has jurisdiction over the closure of the driveway and over Colonial Square Drive and portions of Old Branch Drive and DOT approval will be a condition of approval by this Board.

Mr. Del Duca addressed the relief required: variance for no loading zone for the reasons testified; variance for location of trash if Board wants it left where it is proposed on exhibit A-2 and if the Board interprets its ordinance to require accessory structure to not be within setback of principal building; potential waivers for the requirement in chapter 411-12(C)(7)(g) requiring a fire lane minimum of 12' around 2 sides of a 4 sided

building—Mr. Del Duca does not believe the waiver is needed, but if the Board concludes that it is needed, a waiver would be appropriate and reasonable and will work with Mr. Barbadoro--Mr. Heinold asked Mr. Barbadoro if the intent of the ordinance is that the fire apparatus have access to fight fires. Mr. Barbadoro noted the requirement in the letter because no fire lane had been indicated. Mr. Lazos has confirmed they will comply. Mr. Heinold explained this can be treated as will comply so no reason for waiver.

Mr. Del Duca explained that chapter 411-12(C)(7)(i) states access and stacking and serving drive thru business should not be located between building and adjacent street, which he does not believe applies. He believes it is intended for drive thru restaurants and banks, and even if it does apply, believes the Applicant complies because the pay stations are on an internal lot line and the only thing on Route 130 is driving around the building to enter the building. He explained that if it does not apply, the relief sought is appropriate for the reasons given. He further explained that the building has been turned in every direction, because of the nature of this use you cannot have these issues. Discussion continued as to the testimony provided and the intent of the ordinance to define a drive thru business. Mr. Heinold agreed that primary stacking occurs on internal lot line between building and McDonalds and this configuration is the most beneficial to the public in terms of being shielded visually and not creating a situation where it is closer to the right of way or public street where it would impact that street. Mr. Barbadoro point the stacking continues past the pay station up into the front of the primary entrance to the wash tunnel, I think to be correct legally, we should grant a waiver or consider granting relief to allow for the stacking in that location because as Mr. Del Duca indicated, there is no other way that this can be sited that you would never have stacking, you will always have some level of stacking on some frontage.

Mr. Del Duca noted the waiver needed for the number of signs under chapter 411-12(B)(12) allowing one façade affixed to the exterior building, two of which we consider identification and three directional, and chapter 525-116(L) directional do not count toward sign area but cannot exceed 2 sq ft. Will need a waiver for the number of signs and size of signs.

- Mr. Minton stated the Board does not want to create a precedent and asked if an interpretation that the three minor signs be considered directional rather than façade. Mr. Del Duca believes that façade signs refer to brand signs. Mr. Heinold suggested, unless there is an objection by the Board's professionals, that it is a standard process that the Board can deal with to allow two façade signs where one is allowed. Mr. Barbadoro reported there are multiple signs for entry, exit only and office--3 entry, 2 exit only and 3 office signs. Mr. Del Duca stated they are all the same signs. Mr. Del Duca reiterated the relief would be for 2 façade signs where 1 is permitted, and the other is for size that exceeds 2 sq ft of the multiple directional signs.

- Mr. Minton asked if the clearance sign could be considered not a pole sign but an informational sign. Mr. Heinold explained that one of the key improvements of the Redevelopment Area is to get away from the pylon signs of substantial square footage. The signs in question, are not visible from Route 130 and are within the site giving direction to customers about to enter the wash area that they not exceed the height causing damage. He suggests not referring to them as pole signs but rather as directional signs and note that as a condition of approval they will work with Engineer's office to make sure the appearance of those are beautified and there is landscaping around them. Mr. Snyder added these are a safety issue to keep the people going in the right direction and it is a flow thing and will prevent stacking. Mr. Heinold clarified a waiver for size for directional signs and for 2 façade where 1 is permitted is required. Testimony will be that one façade sign will be on the Route 130 frontage and one on the rear of the building at the access point.

Mr. Heinold asked if the Board believes the trash enclosure solution proposed in order to avoid a potential variance or where it was originally proposed is the better solution. A variance would allow trash enclosure in the corner where it was originally proposed. Mr. Minton added a tree will need to be removed if it is to be moved to avoid a variance. There will be signage with the gates closed, and he believes where it was originally proposed would be a better planning model. The Board concurred.

Mr. Heinold advised the motion would be to approve or deny the Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan application for Flagship New Jersey Propco LLC, Block 2102, Lot 51, 10 Route 130 North in the Redevelopment and BD zoning district; granting 2 variances: for the lack of provision of loading zone based on testimony provided by Mr. Rahenkamp and for the trash enclosure where it was originally proposed and based on the testimony provided by Mr. Rahenkamp and others; waivers for stacking to the extent that there will be stacking post pay station that continues onto the Route 130 side of the property as stated on the record and the limitations on the site associated with the necessity for there to always be some stacking associated with the use under that interpretation; granting a second façade sign because of testimony on dual frontage on Route 130 and Old Branch Drive; waiver for size of directional signs exceeding 2 sq ft – the other façade signs are not façade so not granting relief beyond the 2 and not interpreting the height bar with directional signage as pole mounted signs, will be conditional associated with that to work with Engineer regarding plantings and base; Applicant agrees to comply with affordable housing development contribution fee in accord with existing and post development value which will be resolved by the tax assessor as a condition of approval; will work with Board Engineer to add striping for fire lane purpose and will work with Board Engineer to flatten the rear access drive without triggering DOT permit or encroaching on the property and will remove any reference to speed bumps on the property; for the waiver as to the directional signs on the building as well as miscellaneous signs shown on exhibit A-4.

**Determination**

Motion by Mr. Snyder, seconded by Ms. Stewart to approve the Preliminary and Major Final Site Plan with the intended variances and waivers as outlined by Mr. Heinold.

**Roll Call:**

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. McGill, Mr. Minton, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Absent:	Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Roadside

**Resolutions**

**Resolution 2025-17 - Minor Subdivision - Block 201, Lot 1.01; 7-9 Taylors Lane**

Motion by Mr. Minton, seconded by Ms. Woodington to adopt Resolution 2025-17.

**Roll Call:**

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. McGill, Mr. Minton, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Absent:	Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Roadside

**Approval of Minutes**

### **Approval of November 25, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Motion by Mr. Snyder, seconded by Mr. Gallagher to approve the November 25, 2025 Regular Meeting Minutes. The minutes were approved by those members eligible to vote.

### **Meeting Opened to the Public**

Ms. Lauro opened the meeting to the public and since there were no comments or questions, closed the meeting to the public.

### **Correspondence**

Mrs. Russell advised there was no correspondence to discuss.

### **Discussion Items**

There were no Discussion Items.

### **Comments of the Board**

- Mr. Minton welcomed Committeewoman-Elect, Dr. Corrine Taylor-Walls, in attendance this evening. He announced there will not be a meeting on December 23, 2025 and wished everyone a Merry Christmas and Happy New Year.
- Ms. Lauro thanked the Board members for their efforts in the past year.

### **Motion to Adjourn**

Motion by Mr. Snyder, seconded by Ms. Stewart to adjourn the meeting at 9:08 P.M. The voice vote by the Board was unanimous in favor.

Prepared by:



Beverly G. Russell, RMC  
Board Secretary

Approved: January 27, 2026