



PLANNING BOARD
Monday, October 7, 2013
DRAFT MINUTES

You couldn't pick a better place.

OPENING: The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Carole Roskoph at 7:30 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Chairperson Roskoph.

OPMA Statement: Read by Chairperson Roskoph in compliance with the Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL

- Members in Attendance: Carole Roskoph, Chairperson; Carolyn Jacobs; Larry Terry, Sr.; Brian Bauerle, Sara Lipsett; Hugh Dougherty; and Sangeeta Doshi.
- Professionals in Attendance: Paul Stridick, Secretary; Jim Burns, Esq, Planning Board Solicitor; Stacey Arcari, Planning Board Engineer; and Jacob Richman, Planning Technician.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC:

There were no comments from the public.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:

Approval of Meeting Minutes from September 16, 2013: Larry Terry made a motion, seconded by Carole Roskoph to approve the meeting minutes from September 16, 2013. Affirmative votes by Roskoph and Terry. Minutes are approved.

Agenda Items 1:

13-P-0021

Block(s) 340.02 Lot(s) 7

Zone: Shopping Center (B3) Zone.

Relief Requested: A minor site plan with bulk (C) variances for the creation of a bypass lane, a modified parking configuration, a small building addition, signage, and various site improvements.

JANAM Corporation (Dunkin Donuts)

1550 Kings Hwy North

Cherry Hill, NJ

Exhibits Submitted:

None.

Discussion: Applicant JANAM Corporation (Dunkin Donuts), applied for A minor site plan with bulk (C) variances for the creation of a bypass lane, a modified parking configuration, a small building addition, signage, and various site improvements; located at 1550 Kings Highway North, Cherry Hill, New Jersey (Block 340.02 Lot 7. The property is owned by Dunkin Donuts of NJ, Inc.

Application was represented by:

- Peter Rhodes, Esq. – Attorney for the Applicant
- Jack Gravlin, PE – Engineer for the Applicant
- Alan Lauer – JANAM Corp.

Mr. Rhodes introduced the application for minor site plan and bulk (C) variances for the Dunkin Donuts at Ellisberg Circle Shopping Center. Mr. Rhodes called Mr. Gravlin to the stand to testify in regard to the site plan.

Mr. Gravlin described the site, the cross easements in place, and the various proposed site improvements. The idea, Mr. Gravlin attested to, was to construct a new circulation pattern for the drive-thru and bypass lane, a new parking layout involving angled parking, and a proposed walk-in box (for refrigeration storage). Also detailed were the existing conditions of the site, specifically how the current layout of the parking and circulation was very constricting and it created safety issues. Along with the changes to the circulation and parking, additional landscaping and curbing were proposed and a new drive-thru sign. The

landscape strips and islands would create more greenspace than what currently exists. The purpose of the walk-in box, as it was testified, is to add more storage space so that deliveries could be made only once a week instead of two times a week.

The issue of the sign was then brought up. Mr. Gravlin testified that a variance would be needed to permit a 17' 7" high sign where only 17' high signs are permitted. It was attested to that this is a corporate issued sign and it is highly unlikely to get a new sign issued that meets the ordinance requirements. Furthermore, the taller sign would be for visibility and safety purposes. Six design waivers were also requested as part of the application. Four would be existing non-conformities but the other two, a reduce drive aisle width and a reduced drive-thru bypass lane width, was requested. Mr. Gravlin concluded by saying the proposed improvements would improve the overall site.

The issue of the sign variance was brought up by the Board to which Mr. Rhodes said that it would be very difficult to get Dunkin Donuts corporate to issue a new sign (one that would be 17' in height). Councilwoman Lipsett opined that the sign could be buried seven inches into the ground, thus the height would only reach 17' above grade. Mr. Rhodes then raised clearance concerns in that the sign would be over the pedestrian right-of-way and that he wasn't sure if the sign would meet safety standards. Ms. Arcari noted that the regulations stipulated that a 7' clearance between the sidewalk and the jut out of the sign would meet the standards and that even with the sign buried 7", there would still be 7' 5" of clearance. The applicant agreed to the Board's condition and asked the variance to be eliminated for the sign height in that the sign being buried would only an allowable height of 17'.

Mr. Lauer then appeared before the board to talk about the deliveries that take place on-site. Currently, there are two deliveries a week (one a weekday late morning and one a Saturday afternoon). The new walk-in box addition would allow deliveries to be needed only once a week and that the preferred delivery date is on a weekday late morning.

The Board then raised concerns over the two-way circulation pattern behind the loading area in that it contradicted with the overall counter-clockwise flow proposed by the applicant. Mr. Gravlin said the purpose was to allow cars to enter the site behind the proposed walk-in box addition and turn left into the spots located to the west. The Board expressed further concern in that if no spots are available, it turns that portion of the site into a cul-de-sac as cars try to turn around. The applicant obliged the Board by removing the two-way designation and making it a one-way in keeping it with the counter-clockwise circulation pattern. As a side note, the applicant said that they would provide the cross-easement documents to the Department of Community Development. Also of contest was the location of the bollards to be placed on site as proposed by DCD. The applicant rejected the placement of bollards all along the north and west boundaries of the site, but said it made more sense to just place bollards along the northwest corner of the site to prevent cars from trying to turn right as they pass out through the drive-thru lane. The applicant subsequently agreed to place through bollards on the west side of the site along the parking spaces closest to the northwest corner. Furthermore, the applicant agreed to make a curved arrow pointing from west to south to help guide cars out of the drive-thru lane.

Mr. Stridick questioned that applicant as to how tractor trailers (who will make the deliveries) will exit the site once they have off-loaded their load. Mr. Gravlin testified that they trailer will enter the site and exit out through the existing parking spots to the north before continuing towards Haddonfield Road (a cross-access easement exists).

Mr. Rhodes then raised the issue over obtaining a Letter of No Interest from NJ DOT. Ms. Arcari stated that in order to waive that requirements, she would need information regarding the traffic generated on site. If it satisfies the Township's requirements (in that it won't exceed the volume thresholds), then the request for the waiver from NJ DOT can be waived. The Board then asked the applicant to clarify if the proposed sign would create site line issues, to which Mr. Gravlin indicated on the plan that no views would be obstructed by either the landscaping or the clearance of the sign.

Additionally, the applicant stated that there would be no proposed lighting changes but that they would agree to let the Planning Board Engineer come out to the site to determine if any additional lighting is needed. Lastly, the applicant agreed to allow Township Inspectors to come out to see the condition of the existing pavement. If spots need to be re-worked, then the applicant said they would saw-cut and replace pavement as needed.

Public Discussion: Seeing no public comments, Chairperson Roskoph closed that portion of the meeting.

Motion: Following Solicitor Burns' reading the conditions imposed upon the application, the variances needed (and also the elimination of the sign height variance), and the main points of the presentation, Brian Bauerle made a motion which was seconded by Hugh Dougherty, to approve the application for a minor site plan and bulk (C) variances with the noted conditions. Affirmative votes by Roskoph, Jacobs, Terry, Lipsett, Bauerle, Dougherty, and Doshi. Motion passes unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 8:13 PM.