

Cinnaminson Township Planning Board
Regular Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, August 25, 2026 – 6:30 P.M.

Cinnaminson Municipal Building, 1621 Riverton Road, Cinnaminson, NJ 08077

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 25, 2026. 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 I: Mr. Horner; Class II: Mr. Minton; Class IV: Mr. Gallagher, Ms. Lauro, Mr. Maradonna;
Alternate: Ms. Stewart.

Absent: Class I Designee: Mr. Roadside; Class III: Mr. Segrest; Class IV: Mr. McGill, Mr. Snyder,
Ms. Woodington.

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

Case #2606 1001 Taylors Lane, LLC – PWD, R-4, RRCL Zones

**Blocks 305/307, Lots 12, 14/2, 2.01 –1001 Union Landing Road, Cinnaminson – Minor Subdivision
Approval (to create two (2) reconfigured lots from four (4) existing lots)**

Hearing

David Frank, Attorney for the Applicant, explained the application for subdivision of four (4) that will result in (2) two lots that will conform to all standards. He introduced Ben Young, Applicant's representative, and Mark Malinowski, the Applicant's engineer. Mr. Young and Mr. Malinowski were sworn by Mr. Heinold.

Mr. Frank explained the purpose of the minor subdivision is housekeeping. One (1) resulting lot will be the former landfill which is now closed and subject to DEP supervision. The remainder of the area is not subject to those constraints and has a potentially broad future which has not presently been determined. The uses allowed on the remaining lot would be different uses from those that would be allowed on the landfill. Mr. Young confirmed the purpose of the subdivision and that there were no future plans as of this time.

Mr. Heinold acknowledged that Mr. Malinowski had been recognized as an expert witness before this Board in the past and is recognized tonight.

Mr. Frank introduced the following exhibits:

A-1 – color aerial of the sites

A-2 – minor subdivision plan

Mr. Malinowski referred to A-1 to show the outlines of the proposed lots. He described the land to the north as a regular land mass and to the south, the landfill, cutting out of the subdivision to take the environmental area out of the area that has potential for future use and development.

Mr. Malinowski referred to A-2 to describe the existing and proposed configuration of the subdivided lots. He noted the plan shows the lot lines that are to be consolidated. He confirmed that the lots would be perfected by deed. Mr. Malinowski reported approval from the Burlington County Planning Board had been obtained. Mr. Frank asked Mr. Malinowski if the subdivided lots would comply with all standards, which Mr. Malinowski confirmed they will.

Mr. Malinowski explained that completeness items requiring waivers, listed in Mr. Barbadoro's letter dated August 24, 2026, under Section II, Submission Information, items #27 through #30 are items that would be required were this a site plan or when the site is developed and does not apply for a subdivision plan adjusting lot lines with no proposed use or development at this time.

- Mr. Minton asked if Mr. Malinowski was familiar with the portion of the road vacated by the Township, which he confirmed as a section of Union Landing Road vacated. Mr. Minton noted as this plan incorporates that vacated road, this improvement was anticipated at the Township Committee level. Mr. Malinowski agreed. Mr. Minton added that the proposed subdivision will include three separate zoning districts and asked if a change of use is being requested. Mr. Young stated no change of use is requested at this time.

Mr. Malinowski explained in Mr. Barbadoro's letter, under section IV. Performance Standards, a signed, dated copy of the original survey plan is requested. Mr. Malinowski stated this was done by a previous engineering agency that is no longer in business, therefore it is not available. The plan submitted has been certified by PS&S, LLC.

Hearing Open to the Public

Ms. Lauro opened the hearing to the public.

- Renee Oler Davis, 2108 Hunter Street, Cinnaminson – expressed concern as a resident of what type of development is possible on these lots and what impact would development have on traffic. Mr. Heinold explained that should a development application be submitted, a public hearing would be held before the Planning or Zoning Board giving residents an opportunity to comment and ask questions, but at this time there is no development planned. Mr. Heinold added the lots have a mixture of zones with various uses possible.
- Jarmilla Shepherd, 215 Front Street, Palmyra – representing the Civic Club of Riverton, East Riverton and Palmyra – asked for clarification of the area to be subdivided. Mr. Young showed the site where Sea Box exists and showed the area to be subdivided on the subdivision plan.
- Mona Washington, 908 James Avenue, Cinnaminson – asked if the proposed redevelopment is on the dump site. Mr. Young explained there are no plans for development. He showed on the plan where the old dump was capped and is still under supervision of the DEP.
- Genie Francis, 804 Bellview Avenue, Cinnaminson – shared her concern as several of her family members who worked at Hoeganaes, developed cancer. She stated this was a superfund site and even though capped, is still poisonous.

- John Wagner, 539 Zeisner Avenue, Cinnaminson – stated his property backs up to this land and both sides of his property border it. Asked why it needed to be rezoned. Mr. Young explained that the dump property cannot have anything built on it, but the other side could be developed. He reiterated that there is no development planned at this time. Mr. Wagner expressed strong feelings toward this subdivision and any plans for future development. Mr. Heinold reiterated should there be a development proposal in the future, there will be a public hearing process. Mr. Heinold explained that, under the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), the property owner is entitled to the relief sought.
- Mr. Minton expressed his opinion that this subdivision is a positive, as the Applicant now has the right to build a residential development on the northern portion and if the lot is consolidated, it will have less of an impact on the properties on Zeisner. The Board could redirect access away from the Zeisner area. Mr. Wagner asked whether there was a proposal to install curbs on Broad Street/River Road. Mr. Minton reported the County has proposed overall traffic calming along Broad Street through the river towns, but no final plans have been submitted.
- Mona Washington – expressed her belief that with any development in the area, East Riverton suffers in terms of the environment and change in the culture of the area. She understands that it is a mixed-use area but is uneasy with the big companies as they have a bad track record and would like to see preservation of the family-feel of the community. She referred to a past study of the superfund site where residents were told they were safe because the water runs the other way, but now there are cancer clusters. She feels that East Riverton gets the short end of the stick.

Hearing Closed to the Public

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

Mr. Frank concluded his presentation, restating the Applicant is seeking a conforming minor subdivision of two conforming lots and has established this on the record. He respectfully requested approval of the application.

Comments of the Board

There were no further comments from Board members.

Determination

Mr. Heinold summarized the application as a straightforward subdivision proposal with no requested variances. He noted that the requested waivers were supported by the testimony presented regarding the plan submission. The subdivision, if approved, will be effectuated by deed. He confirmed that Mr. Barbadoro is satisfied with the waiver regarding technical compliance of the survey submission. There are no other conditions to be imposed and any future development will require an application before the Board.

Motion by Mr. Minton, seconded by Ms. Stewart, to grant Minor Subdivision Approval consistent with testimony provided and with the recommendation by Mr. Barbadoro that the application be deemed complete subject to four (4) waivers in accordance with Mr. Heinold’s summation and noting that any development application would require public hearing before the Board.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Horner, Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Minton, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart.		
Those voting against:	None		
Those abstaining:	None	Those recusing:	None
Those absent:	Mr. McGill, Mr. Roadside, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington.		
Those not voting:	None		

**Case #2604 995 Taylors Lane, LLC – IND Zone
Block 610, Lot 3.01 – 995 Taylors Lane, Cinnaminson – Preliminary and Final Site Plan Review
(additional parking lot with 92 tractor trailer parking spaces which is accessory to and at north end of
the existing 1,199,750 square foot warehouse)**

David Frank, Attorney for the Applicant, introduced witnesses, Mark Malinowski, the Applicant's engineer, and Tim Shaw, the Applicant's representative. Mr. Malinowski and Mr. Shaw were sworn by Mr. Heinold.

Mr. Frank stated that Mr. Malinowski had been previously qualified as an expert witness.

Completeness/Notice

Mr. Frank reported the Applicant's professionals reviewed Mr. Barbadoro's letter dated August 24, 2026 and were prepared to comply with all plan detail and design compliance noted in the letter, which Mr. Malinowski confirmed.

Mr. Barbadoro reviewed his letter dated August 24, 2026, citing the outstanding items under Section II, Submission Information, as #20 plan delineation of any proposed phasing, #36 sight triangles, #37 vehicular and pedestrian circulation, as well as requirement for #8 environmental impact statement, #9 traffic impact report and #10 solid waste/recycling report and had no objection to deeming the application complete and granting waivers for the items noted, if testimony would be provided as to each point noted.

In responding to the comments of the letter, Mr. Frank asked Mr. Malinowski if there was proposed phasing for this project, and Mr. Malinowski confirmed there is no phasing to this application. Mr. Frank asked Mr. Malinowski if the project involves sight triangles with regards to public access, and Mr. Malinowski explained that all sight triangles were previously established, and entrances and exits are on Taylors Lane. Mr. Malinowski confirmed there are no changes proposed to vehicle or pedestrian circulation to the public access and interior circulation is described on the site plans. Mr. Frank asked, with regard to environmental impact statement, if this is a fully developed site, and Mr. Malinowski confirmed it is. Mr. Frank reserved testimony on the traffic report for Mr. Shaw. He asked Mr. Malinowski if the project proposed any additional solid waste facilities, and Mr. Malinowski confirmed there was nothing additional.

Mr. Frank asked Mr. Shaw to explain his role with the company. Mr. Shaw stated he is the Vice President of Development and Management of the Northeast Region at the logistic properties company. He testified that he is familiar with the site and the tenant's operations. He reported visiting the site and interactions with the tenant. Mr. Frank asked Mr. Shaw if this application will result in additional traffic or if its intention is to address traffic already coming and going. Mr. Shaw stated it is to address traffic issues on site. Mr. Frank asked if the project will generate any increase in solid waste, and Mr. Shaw stated it would not.

- Mr. Minton asked Mr. Shaw if he was familiar with the application originally presented for development of 1.5 million sq. ft. warehouse of which 1.2 million sq. ft. was built. Mr. Shaw stated he was familiar, however his former colleague was more involved than he. Mr. Minton reminded Mr. Shaw that a traffic study was completed for the parcel with that application and asked him to remind the Board of the site's shortcomings and failures associated with that study related to the site. Mr. Shaw stated he was not aware of any. Mr. Minton noted this application proposes additional parking for ninety-two (92) trailers to the site but Mr. Shaw has testified there will not be an impact on traffic, when the report noted that traffic is below standard and required certain offsite improvements. Mr. Minton reported that based on the prior report's recognized issues, money

was posted to make offsite improvements to reduce traffic for the benefit of the public and this Board wants to make sure that it will not have further impact on traffic.

Mr. Malinowski stated this is for trailer parking, not tractor trailer parking, and will not bring ninety-two (92) additional trucks. Mr. Minton noted that testimony of what the trailers are used for will be required.

The discussion continued with Mr. Malinowski explaining that fifty-two (52) additional loading docks were approved for the 1.5 million sq. ft. building which incorporated fifty-two (52) additional tractor trailers as opposed to the 1.2 million sq. ft. building that was built. Additionally, there are one (1) or two (2) less trailer spaces on the site because of site issues during construction creating fifty-four (54) different parking scenarios that are different from the 1.5 million sq. ft. building that was proposed. Mr. Minton added the property owner gave an in-kind contribution to study the intersection at Taylors Lane and River Road. Mr. Heinold suggested the Board may want an analysis from Shropshire, the original traffic engineer, as to what was previously done and what is proposed now. Mr. Frank clarified the concern is not what is on site but the off-track traffic issues.

- Mr. Minton explained the Board's concern with granting a waiver for completeness where the traffic report would normally be required, with testimony given that there is no impact to daily movements and build out is 20% less. He was in favor of Mr. Heinold's suggestion to have that confirmed by the traffic engineer. Mr. Malinowski added that the original application approved (300) or (400) additional car parking spaces on the north side of the building that were not added.

Mr. Taylor asked if the use in the building is now creating insufficient truck parking areas or is this a new expansion or new operation that will demand (92) additional trucks. Mr. Shaw stated the additional parking is to support the existing use. Mr. Taylor noted there are (216) parking spaces now and (92) new proposed. He asked if the purpose is due to a struggle to find places to park trailers and is this hampering the current operations of the business, but there is no change in operations. Mr. Shaw confirmed there is no change in operation.

- Mr. Horner asked how many more trucks are anticipated in and out of the site, if not (92) more than how many per day coming in and out. He asked why (92) are proposed if (92) are not needed. Mr. Shaw stated that it is his understanding that the site is packed with trucks and it takes a long time to park, squeezing in to one stall where there are already two trucks on either side. The expansion will allow more flexibility in parking and is intended to only support the existing use. Mr. Frank asked if there were new customers or only existing customers, and no additional trips. Mr. Shaw stated the tenant told him there are no additional trips. Mr. Heinold noted that this appears counterintuitive and that the Board may need the tenant to provide testimony. The increase from (216) spaces by an additional (92) spaces suggests that truck traffic will also increase.

Mr. Frank explained there is no proposed change in use suggested, and as a condition of approval, Shropshire will gather information from the tenant as to specific truck trips to be provided to the Board and professionals to determine what other improvements will need to be made to address offsite traffic.

- Mr. Minton asked Mr. Shaw if he was familiar with an event that took place on or around July 4, 2026, where, because of operational impacts at the Maersk facility, Taylors Lane was shut down and police had to respond to take control of the roadway for a significant period of time. This was because the facility was not properly staffed and trailers were stacked up on Taylors Lane. Mr. Shaw stated the property manager may have more information. Mr. Minton added that this incident took police off the road to manage the facility. He expressed that the Board needs to understand what happened in order to grant a waiver for traffic report.

Mr. Heinold noted there is potential for a condition of approval to be imposed requiring a traffic study and testimony, providing all of the issues are known and allowing for public comment and then the Board may decide. For the purpose of completeness, the Board may deem the application complete subject to a requirement for a traffic impact statement, and with the understanding that the Board will address and may not act tonight dependent on further testimony regarding operations.

Motion Mr. Minton, seconded by Mr. Horner, to find the application complete as noted.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Horner, Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Minton, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart.
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Those absent:	Mr. McGill, Mr. Roadside, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington.
Those not voting:	None

Hearing

Mr. Frank stated the Applicant agrees to comply with Board Engineer's letter. The Applicant and professionals reviewed the Board Planner's letter and addressed the landscape comments. His client recognizes their obligation to replace failed or damaged landscaping and suggests if there is a plan to replant in alternate locations that will offer better protection, the Applicant is open to that.

Mr. Frank introduced the following exhibits:

A-1 – colored aerial of the site

A-2 – color rendering of window of site plan (showing definition)

Mr. Malinowski referred to A-1, noting the property lines of the site and existing 1.2 million sq. ft. warehouse, parking at the southeast end of site, access points on Taylors Lane and trailer parking on Taylors Lane, front and rear of building with trailer parking opposite the dock. He described the stormwater controls with a wet pond at the rear and corner of Taylors Lane and Broad Street, and the substantial amount of underground infiltration systems located in the parking lot, loading dock area and in the area to the northwest of building. The project proposes developing the green area/grass area to the northwest end.

Referencing A-2, Mr. Malinowski showed the entrance to the northwest end of the building and the area along the northwest end of building of proposed (92) trailer parking spaces on paved parking with concrete bollard system. He explained the stormwater in place was designed to handle the addition 300,000 sq. ft. of warehouse that was approved and not built. There is substantially less coverage than was originally approved and the stormwater facilities can adequately handle the site. He explained runoff will drain along swales on the northwest end of the proposed trailer parking to underground systems. Mr. Malinowski explained the proposed buffering on the northwest end from Broad Street and additional landscaping on the northeast end of the parking lot to provide a buffer from Taylors Lane. There will be additional lighting to illuminate the area with wall mount on side of warehouse and pole mount fixtures to illuminate the main portion of trailer parking providing access circulation within Maersk.

Mr. Frank reported the plan complies with stormwater management and Township bulk ordinances and design standards. He added the Applicant is amenable to adding landscaping along Taylors Lane per the Planner's comments and will work with him administratively to bulk up the landscape to provide better buffering of the

trailer parking area. Mr. Taylor also requests shade trees at corners along the entrance front and proposed parking and the Applicant has no issue providing that and with changing the species of screening from narrow type evergreens per his comments.

Mr. Malinowski reported the parking area will be fenced and the existing fence will be moved to accommodate the proposed trailer parking. Mr. Minton asked what type of material will be used. Mr. Malinowski reported it will be chain link fencing. Mr. Minton noted that existing black iron ornamental fence surrounds the perimeter with black chain link in the back along the landfill. Mr. Frank reported the proposed planting will be between street and fence. Mr. Minton explained that the applicant applied for a fence permit after the landscaping was in place, which is why it is behind the landscaping with a very narrow five-foot setback. Mr. Frank reported the Applicant is agreeable to add to existing landscape to soften the streetscape and the landscaping will be on the street side of the additional fencing along Broad Street. Mr. Frank reported the Applicant is also amenable to reducing the mulch area, as requested by Mr. Taylor, but will need clarification on that point.

Mr. Taylor asked if the additional parking spaces are accessory to the principal use and will not be rented out by this tenant or any tenant in the future. Mr. Shaw confirmed the spaces are for use by the tenant. Mr. Taylor recommended this be an ongoing condition of approval to prevent this from becoming a separate truck rental lot not associated with the principal warehouse use. Mr. Minton expressed agreement with this point. Mr. Heinold confirmed this could be enforceable as a condition. He believes, from an operational perspective, it is highly unlikely that this tenant would want other operators to be parked on site. Mr. Taylor expressed concern that the site may be deemed too small for the tenant in the future and the Township may be faced with some other issue and this condition would allow that this would not happen.

Mr. Barbadoro addressed one remaining comment from his letter regarding signage and requested testimony if the Applicant intends to add signage. Mr. Shaw stated there would be no additional signage. Mr. Minton noted there are current compliance issues with the sign ordinance that will need to be addressed.

Discussion continued regarding the fencing and architectural standards and design requirements of the industrial redevelopment zone. Mr. Malinowski could not recall the specific linear feet along Broad Street to be fenced. Mr. Frank reported his review of Township Code 411 mostly pertains to redevelopment along the Route 130 corridor. Mr. Minton acknowledged the choppiness of the ordinance but believes this site has been interpreted to allow for ornamental fencing. Mr. Frank asked if the preference would be for ornamental fencing behind the landscaping along Broad Street to match that on Taylors Lane. Discussion continued as to the open spacing of ornamental fencing and if a solid fence might be better suited for the purpose or may be more offensive. Mr. Taylor noted a textured gray vinyl fence, that is not solid bright white throwing a lot of reflection, might be a consideration as, over time, plants die and the purpose is not to block a building or parked cars but the backs of many different colored trailers, some with open doors, that create a visual patchwork. A solid fence with plantings on the street side may soften the visibility of the fence and create immediate buffering while the plants mature. Mr. Malinowski pointed out this is a substantial distance, pointing out the area of proposed parking and proposed fence line.

- Mr. Minton recalled storage of excess dirt piles from the original project that have been knocked down but not yet eliminated. He asked if this will be used in the grading of the parking area. Mr. Malinowski reported the site is pretty level at this point and does not anticipate using that soil. Mr. Minton asked if it could be used as berms and Mr. Taylor suggested, if sculpted properly, berms could create a visual along the fence. Mr. Minton

reported the certificate of occupancy was issued based on the anticipation that those piles would be used for future expansion and believes the dirt stored in piles must be addressed.

Property maintenance issues were discussed. Mr. Minton reported as recent as August 15, 2026, a code violation was hand-delivered to the tenant regarding the exterior appearance, trash throughout the parking lot, trailer parking occurring on the proposed lot, along with signage not in accord with the statute. Mr. Shaw was not aware of the violation as it was not shared with the property owner. Mr. Shaw was familiar with the issue of trash from his visit to the site earlier that morning. Mr. Minton noted all outstanding property maintenance must be addressed as a condition of any approval.

- Mr. Minton inquired if the redevelopment authority should be consulted as this project is undertaken as part of a redevelopment plan, prior to the Board taking action. Mr. Frank explained the proposal is consistent with the standards adopted in the redevelopment plan, and therefore believes it is not required to consult with the redevelopment authority to implement. Mr. Heinold reported discussing this with Mr. Taylor and agrees with Mr. Frank's representation that this Board has the jurisdiction to hear the application. If there are elements that impact the redevelopment plan such as financial agreements between the two parties that should be impacted by modification, such as a change in income stream should be able to be assessed, will be a condition of approval. He added the way the redevelopment plan is written, they do not need to go to the redevelopment authority first. Mr. Frank agreed to work together to maintain a viable and attractive site.
- Mr. Minton asked Mr. Shaw the length of the lease between the owner and Maersk. Mr. Shaw reported it is a five-year lease and he believes there are two years left. Mr. Minton noted this goes to Mr. Taylor's point regarding subsequent uses and trailer parking giving rise to concerns about trailer storage rental.
- Mr. Gallagher expressed concern that the Applicant cannot answer if the proposed parking is to be used for storage. He noted the traffic congestion on Taylors Lane and difficulty in making a lefthand turn onto Route 130 north with traffic backup and also the backup turning onto Broad Street. He stated the Board needs to know what is the impact of this addition. Mr. Frank explained that the Board approved an additional 300,000 sq. ft. of building and anticipated demand with additional dock doors and additional trailer parking associated with that. The original approval allowed for significantly more space and this is essentially (40) additional parking space. He reported his experience representing other logistic firms and hearing testimony from traffic engineers where trucks come to a site and drop a trailer then move on. The trailer may dwell there for a day or two days. He believes the site can handle the additional (40) spaces from what was originally approved.

There was a discussion regarding the timeframe from approval to project completion and concerns of asphalt availability as winter approaches. The scenario of beginning site improvements immediately while simultaneously creating a gravel lot to be used now with paving to commence in the spring was considered. Mr. Barbadoro asked if the intent would be to get improvements to landscape and stormwater done and put subbase down to be able to use the lot. Mr. Frank confirmed the Applicant will build as much as they can and over winter may have a temporary gravel parking lot. Mr. Taylor suggested the aprons be addressed to ensure stone is not tracked out onto Taylors Lane. Mr. Frank suggested as a condition of approval, the owner provide periodic street sweeping to minimize tracking stone out onto the street. The responsibility of the tenant to clean up the trash vs. the responsibility of the owner to provide street sweeping was debated.

Hearing Open to the Public

Ms. Lauro opened the hearing to the public.

- Genie Francis – asked how the tractor trailers utilizing the (92) additional parking spaces will get there. Reminded the Board of the traffic backups and incidents that did not involve police. She reported the wait can be (5) traffic lights to turn onto Broad Street.
- Renee Oler Davis – shared concerns that there is too much development in the neighborhood. Stated that her family's home was built in 1930 and there was a beautiful green space where now everything is trucking and feels like I-95. Believes there is too much truck traffic through the neighborhood and referenced an agreement that trucks exit onto Taylors Lane rather than onto Union Landing. Ms. Oler Davis asked about the machines used for grading of the proposed parking lot sharing issues that occurred with the grading at Sea Box that shook and damaged neighborhood homes. She asked that noise pollution also be taken into consideration when choosing landscape plantings and to use more dense evergreens and not just deciduous trees.
- Mr. Minton reported the redevelopment agreement and prior approval remains in effect requiring traffic to exit onto Taylors Lane via the connecting road between Sea Box and 995 Taylors Lane. Ms. Oler Davis stated that trucks are violating the agreement. Mr. Minton will look into the matter. Ms. Davis also asked that construction not begin before 7:00A.M., sharing that there was construction noise the past Saturday beginning at 6:00A.M. Mr. Minton advised residents to call the police non-emergency number so there is a record.
- Jarmilla Shepherd – asked for clarification if the waiver had been granted without answers about the operational questions and asked if a vote will be taken tonight to allow them to go ahead with what they plan or will it be tabled. Mr. Heinold explained that it is to be determined. He has suggestions how to best address the concerns of the Applicant, the Board and the residents. Ms. Shepherd asked what is in the trailers, are they storage or something else. Mr. Heinold explained that needs to be answered. Ms. Shepherd reported issues with traffic backups and jack-knifed trailers. She urged the Board to remember the neighbors in this community.
- Mona Washington – asked about residents' rights in a mixed-use area. She believes that residents cannot object if a business ultimately has the right to do what they want. Shared concerns with truck traffic on Hunter Street and parking congestion. Mr. Heinold explained that the Board when considering an application, gets as much information in order to limit the impact on neighborhoods, improve appearance, and improve upon what was done previously, in a mixed-use area there will be interaction between the residential and industrial uses.
- Jim Francis, 804 Bellview Lane, Cinnaminson – asked what the Township can do to alleviate traffic delays on Taylors Lane at Route 130 and Broad Street. Mr. Minton reported that the Township is working with the DOT to install a dedicated left-turn arrow at the light for traffic turning onto northbound Route 130 and the County is looking to provide relief on Broad Street/River Road through the river towns.
- Mona Washington – remarked that the East Riverton stop on the light rail adds to the congestion.
- Genie Francis – expressed concern that the tenant has only 2.5 years left on the lease, so if approved and they chose to leave, what will the next tenant do.

Hearing Closed to the Public

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

Comments of the Board

- Mr. Heinold shared that the Applicant is concerned that an adjournment will impact their timeline and ability to complete the project before winter. He noted that parking is an issue now and is occurring on the area without approvals. The Board has enough remaining questions to request testimony from the tenant. He suggested drafting a resolution that captures the essence of what is anticipated should the application be approved at the next meeting, after additional operational testimony from the tenant and traffic-related testimony.
- Mr. Taylor suggested questions might be submitted ahead of the hearing.
- Mr. Minton agreed an adjournment to allow for additional testimony from the tenant and supplemental traffic report and testimony from the traffic engineer would be beneficial. Mr. Frank confirmed that operational

statements and testimony will be supplied where able. He asked if there was anything else that the Board would like to have provided.

Mr. Shaw was asked about conversations with the tenant regarding extending the lease. He believes the lease will be renewed.

- Mr. Minton asked if there was an understanding regarding the site conditions, berms, etc. from Mr. Taylor's letter. Mr. Frank explained the letter notes areas of bare soil where grass is not established. The Applicant recognizes the site is not stabilized and needs to be addressed. He will discuss this with the Applicant and come back with a proposal. Mr. Minton suggested discussing the specific materials for fencing as well.

Hearing Adjournment to September 8, 2026 Meeting

Motion by Mr. Horner, seconded by Ms. Stewart, to adjourn the hearing to September 8, 2026 meeting without need of further notice.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Horner, Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Minton, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart.
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Those absent:	Mr. McGill, Mr. Roadside, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington.
Those not voting:	None

Review of Burlington County Climate Change-Related Hazard Vulnerability Assessment – Presented June 9, 2026 by Tom J. Stanuikynas, Supervising Planner, Burlington County

Hearing

Mr. Minton reminded the Board of the presentation given by Mr. Stanuikynas at the June 9th meeting where a quorum was not present.

Hearing Open to the Public

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

Comments of the Board

There were no comments from Board members.

Determination

Motion Mr. Minton, seconded by Mr. Gallagher, to adopt the Climate Change-Related Hazard Vulnerability Assessment as part of the Land Use Plan Element of the Master Plan of the Township of Cinnaminson and to adopt Resolution 2026-19 memorializing this action.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Horner, Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Minton, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart.
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Those absent:	Mr. McGill, Mr. Roadside, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington.
Those not voting:	None

Resolutions

Resolution 2026-18 – Resolution of the Planning Board of the Township of Cinnaminson Granting Minor Site Plan Approval to Top Line Investments, LLC

Motion by Mr. Minton, seconded by Mr. Horner, to adopt Resolution 2026-18.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. Horner, Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Minton, Ms. Lauro;
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Those absent:	Mr. McGill, Mr. Roadside, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder, Ms. Woodington.
Those not voting:	Alternate: Ms. Stewart.

Approval of Minutes

Approval of August 11, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes was tabled until the September 8, 2026 meeting.

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 receipt of a request for extension from the Burlington County Planning Board to hear the application of 995 Taylors Lane no later than October 5, 2026. This extension was administratively approved and signed by Ms. Lauro and forwarded to the County.

Discussion Items

There were no items for the Board to discuss.

Comments of the Board

There were no comments from the Board members.

Adjournment

Motion by Mr. Horner, seconded by Mr. Gallagher, to adjourn the meeting at 8:32 P.M. The voice vote by the members was unanimously in favor of adjournment.

Prepared by:



Beverly G. Russell, RMC

Board Secretary

Approved: September 8, 2026