

MINUTES OF THE
EAST BRUNSWICK TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

August 5, 2021

STATEMENT - Open Public Meetings Act

FLAG SALUTE

ROLL CALL -

PRESENT:

Steve Philips, Acting Chair
Amy Papi
Ivan Wynter
Deepak Arora
Steve Pepe
Chester Brandt
Cathy Decker

ABSENT:

Christine Rampolla
Leon Gurevich

ALSO PRESENT:

Jay Weiner, Esquire
Keith Kipp, Director Planning/Engineering
Jason Cline, Engineer
Aaron Blessing, Zoning Assistant

MINUTES

June 17, 2021 - Motion to approve by Mr. Pepe,
second by Mr. Wynter. Minutes approved.

OLD BUSINESS

Application #Z-21-13 - Shitu - Proposed detached
garage with home gym amenities located at 25 Oakmont
Avenue, block 309.03, lot 27.27, in the RP zone.
Mandatory date September 30, 2021. Carried without
further notice to September 30, 2021, in the East
Brunswick Municipal Court Room.

NEW BUSINESS

Application #Z-19-03 - JB Cocoa - Proposed

construction of new production facility located at 9 Cotters Lane, block 29.04, lot 9, in the PI zone. Mandatory date September 30, 2021. Motion to approve by Mr. Arora, second by Mr. Pepe. Application approved with conditions.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion to adjourn by Mr. Arora, second by Mr. Brandt. Meeting adjourned at 9:11 p.m.

THE CHAIRMAN: The township is using the telephone meeting format in an effort to mitigate the chance of exposure to COVID-19 as a part of the township's ongoing effort to slow the rate of transmission and to avoid overwhelming our treatment centers. The dial-in information and agenda have been posted on the township web site and are posted on EBTV for members of the public. Members of the public can call in with the number provided if they have any questions for the zone -- of the zoning board members. You'll have 3 minutes to speak. Should you have any further comments or questions, the planning and engineering office is always available by e-mail and phone. Each member of the public shall only have one opportunity to speak during the public portion. Thank you in advance for your patience as we implement this technology to continue to move the township forward during the health emergency.

For the record, this is the August 5, 2021, East Brunswick Township Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting. In accordance with the Open Public Meeting Law, on December 22, 2020, notice of this meeting stating the time, date, and location was sent to the Home News Tribune, filed with the township clerk, and posted on the bulletin board in the lobby of the municipal building. A copy of this notice will be incorporated in the minutes of the meeting.

The zoning board will not hear any case beyond 10:30 -- 10 p.m. with the exception of any hearing in progress at that time and will terminate all testimony at 10:30 p.m. The chair reserves the right to call any application in an order different from that appearing on the agenda.

At this point, we are -- I'm going to ask those of you to stand for the pledge of allegiance.

(Flag salute)

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Okay, Aaron, if you could call the roll.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Decker.

THE CHAIRMAN: Miss Decker was on.

MS. DECKER: I'm here. I was muted.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Brandt.

MR. BRANDT: Here.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Pepe.

MR. PEPE: Here.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Gurevich. Mr. Arora.

MR. ARORA: Here.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Wynter.

MR. WEINER: Ivan, you're muted.

THE CHAIRMAN: He's waving his hand yes.

MR. BLESSING: Okay. Miss Papi.

MS. PAPI: Here.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Philips.

THE CHAIRMAN: Here.

MR. BLESSING: Chairwoman Rampolla.

THE CHAIRMAN: Not here. In the absence of Miss Rampolla, as the vice chair I will be running the meeting this evening.

Okay. On the agenda we have the minutes of June 17, 2021, and I'll look for a motion from somebody who is eligible to vote.

MR. PEPE: I'll make a motion.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have a motion from Mr. --

MR. PEPE: Pepe.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Do we have a second?

MR. WYNTER: I'll second.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Who is that? I'm sorry.

MR. BLESSING: Wynter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Wynter. Okay, now, among those eligible, are there any additions, deletions, corrections, or changes to the minutes as presented? Hearing none, Mr. Blessing, could you please call the roll of those eligible.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Arora.

MR. ARORA: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Wynter.

MR. WYNTER: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Pepe.

MR. PEPE: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Decker.

MS. DECKER: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Papi.

MS. PAPI: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Philips.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

Next piece of business we're going to go to is under old business, application Z-21-13, Shitu. This was the proposed garage with the gym facilities that was continued for tonight's meeting, as requested, that this be continued until September 30. That would mean that this meeting will then be held at this point in the courtroom. So anybody who might be Zooming in from town who wish to be part of this application this evening, we'll be noted that it is not going to be on tonight's agenda other than being acknowledged. It will be continued until the 30th of September. Also be aware that the applicant is not required to put out any further notices, so should you have been involved in that application and you're -- and you've called in to listen, be advised it will not be held this evening and will be moved to the courtroom on the 30th September at 7:30 p.m. or thereafter that night.

Did I clarify that correctly,
Mr. Weiner?

MR. WEINER: Yes, that is fine, Mr.
Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So anybody who might be on, Aaron, who is part of that, if there's people from the public, be aware that, you know, we're not going to hear that this evening.

Okay, the other piece of business we have this evening is under new business. It's application Z-19-03, and I see JB Cocoa, Mr. Pape.

MR. PAPE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, board members, board professionals, good evening. My name is Kenneth Pape of the firm Heilbrunn Pape, and this evening I have the privilege and the responsibility of representing your applicant, JB Cocoa. This is an application for site plan approval. There's some limited bulk variance relief, and there is a D variance for the height of the building, and may I ask if Mr. Weiner could confirm on the record receipt of our notices and confirm that the board has jurisdiction of the application.

MR. WEINER: Yes, Mr. Pape, I was actually just going to interject and place that on the record. I've had an opportunity to review all of the notice proofs. They are sufficient. The

board has jurisdiction to hear this application.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. Then if I may, I'll do a very brief opening statement. I'll introduce you to our witnesses, give you brief outline of the presentation, and then we'll look forward to moving forward.

This is an application for property on 9 Cotters -- 9 Cotters Lane, which is an unusually shaped property. It is a true flag lot with an extremely long driveway. Nine Cotters lane has for many years, as best as I can tell a little more than 60 years, had an industrial building. As your professional staff has so ably accounted in their report, there is -- there is approvals that go back a long, long time.

Our client acquired this property in 2015. That 2015 purchase followed our presentation to this board in December of 2014. In December of 2014, as the contract purchaser, JB Cocoa came before this board with a minor site plan and a height variance and requested permission to build a 50-foot-tall building, and at that time, the proofs demonstrated that the building was to accommodate the cocoa processing equipment.

This evening we have a different application, one that we think is far superior to the one that we first presented. When we first came before the board, we had an older building that we were attempting to retrofit, and our clients just eventually got to the point and said retrofitting is not the way to go; we will remove the building in its entirety and we'll place -- we'll build a fresh building. The building can then be located on the property in a way that creates the greatest utility and safe circulation. So we're not working around an existing building.

In 2014, the technology that was available to the cocoa business required tall silos, and we had 12 70-foot silos as part of our approval. Those silos were for the storage of raw product before it had been processed. The current application has no silos. The equipment is now entirely under roof. So we still have a 50-foot tall building, but we have our silos or storage incorporated inside the building. I think that you'll see as we move on that not only do we have a new building, we have a very attractive building. I don't know if anyone will ever see it with a 500-foot-long driveway, but we have a very attractive building.

The presentation to you this evening will be made first by Steve Schwartz. Steve is an the engineer from Dynamic who is responsible for the plans that are before you, and he will present those plans in their entirety. He'll be responsible for introducing a number of exhibits and also sharing with you the exchange that he has had with your professionals to make certain that these plans are in the good shape that they are tonight.

Our second witness will be Craig Peregoy. Craig is a traffic engineer and his -- I've asked that he be prepared to describe to you the on-site circulation, the safety of our driveway location, and the adequacy of all of our loading areas and our parking, and also to demonstrate to you that we can accommodate all of the anticipated truck movements on site.

I have available this evening the design architect. I did not intend to call him unless there are architecture questions from board members or professionals, and the person whose name says Keith Soltis is really not Keith Soltis. It's really William Ross, but he couldn't figure out how to change the name from Keith Soltis to William Ross. So Mr. Ross is our architect and is available.

Also with us this evening, very important, from Singapore is Mr. Tey. Mr. Tey is the owner, and he had to get up very early to be on this Zoom with us this morning. Again, I did not intend to call Mr. Tey. I do have some proffers, some facts to share with the board on behalf of Mr. Tey that I'll place on the record at the appropriate time during the evening.

And our final witness, the most important person is Allison Coffin, our professional planner, and after hearing the fact witnesses, Ms. Coffin will present to you the proofs to justify the granting of the variance relief that we request.

I'd like to begin by thanking your board professionals for being so available to us. We've met with them. We've met with them during the day. We've been on the phone with them. Mr. Cline and his staff got us his report in ample time for us to review it and to be prepared this evening. I don't want those courtesies to go unthanked.

Mr. -- with permission, Mr. Chair, I'd like to begin by introducing Steve Schwartz to you, ask that he be sworn. We'll share his credentials, and then we'll go into his substantive presentation

with your permission.

THE CHAIRMAN: That's fine. Let's get started by swearing him in.

Mr. Schwartz, can I ask you to raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear that the testimony you're about to give this evening regarding the application before us is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. SCHWARTZ: I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please state your name, professional affiliation for the record.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Steve L. Schwartz, professional engineer. I have a BS, a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering from Rutgers University. I've testified before multiple boards in New Jersey as well as East Brunswick multiple times, and I'm currently a senior principal at Dynamic Engineering.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Schwartz, your licenses in the State of New Jersey are in good standing?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, sir.

MR. PAPE: And the plans that we will be presenting to this evening -- be presenting to the board this evening, are they your work product?

MR. SCHWARTZ: They are.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chair, may I ask that you allow Mr. Schwartz to testify as an expert in his field of professional engineering this evening.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody from the board have approval?

MR. ARORA: Yes, I approve.

THE CHAIRMAN: Second?

MR. PEPE: I'll second.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor?

Hearing no nays, Mr. Pape, Mr. Schwartz can proceed.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Schwartz, I'm going to ask if you could begin by identifying the exhibits from which you'll testify this evening. Perhaps identify them and then -- how will we put them on the screen this evening. Is it Mr. Kipp or is it Mr. -- is it -- who is going to control the screen? We could --

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Pape, your professionals do have the capability to share their screens. Oh, and he's already done so, so they have the floor.

MR. PAPE: Thank you, Mr. Blessing.

Mr. Schwartz, if you could introduce the

exhibits one by one. Take a few moments as you do so.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Is the first exhibit shown now?

MR. PAPE: Yes.

MR. WEINER: Call this A-1, and if you could identify it, Mr. Schwartz.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct, this is our overall aerial exhibit. It's dated 8-5-21.

MR. WEINER: Overall air exhibit; is that how you called it?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Overall aerial.

THE CHAIRMAN: Aerial.

MR. WEINER: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It's dated tonight, 8-5-21. It's at a scale of 1 inch equals 150 feet, and north is to the top of the page.

Our second exhibit is A-2. It's titled aerial exhibit. It's also dated 8-5-21 with a scale of 1 inch equals 50 feet.

And our third exhibit is titled site plan rendering. It is dated 8-5-21, and the scale is 1 inch equals 30 feet.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Schwartz, if we could go back to A-1, I have a couple of questions just to place some facts on the record.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure.

MR. PAPE: So the yellow outline on the property, would you confirm that that yellow outline is the outline of our client's property.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It is.

MR. PAPE: And we're looking at the existing conditions on the site?

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

MR. PAPE: And it would appear that this building is an industrial building in a sea of industrial buildings.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That is correct.

MR. PAPE: And that would appear that in -- on this side of Ryders Lane and this side of the Turnpike, there is no residences, it's strictly an industrial area.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Absolutely.

MR. PAPE: And we're not at the edge of it; we're kind of in the middle of it.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yup.

MR. PAPE: Okay. If you could take us to A-2 just for a moment.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure.

MR. PAPE: A-2, if you could -- we can

see with greater clarity the driveway. Could you give the board members an approximation of the length of that -- the leg portion of the driveway.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It's a little over 800 feet, so it's quite substantial compared -- set back from Cotters Lane.

MR. PAPE: And it was acknowledged that there's some current development in front of it, but currently, what appears that what is in front of it is entirely a woodland; is that an accurate statement?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct, that is true.

MR. PAPE: Those are existing conditions that you're beginning to work with. If you could take us to A-3, and I'm going to ask if -- before we go into the specific statutory elements of the site plan -- and I know that you're very prepared to do that -- if you could just do an overview of what our client is proposing to do on the site.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure. So this exhibit is a partially rendered version of the site plan that was submitted to the board with the landscape improvements superimposed. At the center of the exhibit is the proposed building with a 145,098-square-foot footprint. It includes office, manufacturing, shipping, warehouse, and storage uses, which are all permitted within the PI zone. A major feature of the proposed building are the eight external declined loading docks and the two at grade internal loading docks that are along the western facade of the building.

Other proposed site improvements include a 10-by-20 trash enclosure for garbage and recycling at the southeastern corner of the building as well as new sidewalks, utilities, landscaping, and new lighting. Go ahead. Sorry.

MR. PAPE: No, thank you. So I'm going to ask if we could go through the elements of the site plan and I'd ask that you speak to each of them. The first is grading of the site, and this property is already and has been for 50 plus, I think 60 plus years improved with an industrial building, and are you relying on the existing grading, or will you be regrading the site?

MR. SCHWARTZ: A majority of the proposed site is at existing grade with exception of a few areas, especially where the -- there's a raised loading area where they keep tractor trailer spaces under proposed conditions, so we are cutting that a bit for the proposed loading docks. We're

also doing some minor regrading at the northern and eastern portions of the site to accommodate the new drive aisle to circulate -- the fire circulation around the building, as well as some small cut areas for the underground basin, but a majority of the site is maintaining existing grades.

MR. PAPE: So would it be an accurate statement to say that there's limited cut and fill and the site balances. There's no import or support of soils.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It's very minimal, yes.

MR. PAPE: Then I'm going to ask if we can go to the second element of site plan, and that is stormwater management, and I will tell you, Mr. Schwartz, that other than you and Mr. Cline, all the rest of us find stormwater management boring, so I'm going to ask if you have gone over the detailed report that Mr. Cline provided to you in advance of the hearing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I have, and Mr. Cline and I have discussed at great lengths, and we're in agreement with the stormwater.

MR. PAPE: So there is a couple of comments in there. I'm going to ask will you place on the record that you're familiar with Mr. Cline's requirements and you can and you will comply with all of them.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: So I'd like to talk a little bit about the drainage as follows. Did you design this drainage system to be 100 percent compliant with the township and the DEP stormwater regulations that were in effect at the time of design?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: And is this drainage system a privately owned and privately maintained drainage system?

MR. SCHWARTZ: It is.

MR. PAPE: So would it be an accurate statement that this is a modern drainage system and that it is a drainage system that creates no burden for the township and that it will be privately maintained at the sole cost and expense of the property owner?

MR. SCHWARTZ: That is correct.

MR. PAPE: I'm going to go on to the next topic of landscaping, and on this property, it appears to me that in the middle of the industrial park there is limited opportunity to landscape. I'm going to ask if you could describe where you

preserved the woodlands and where you have introduced landscaping.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure. We tried to preserve the woodlands to the western portion of the site to the greatest extent practicable. There were some increase into and some trees removed to accommodate the loading operations due to the new building. There also is a little bit of tree removal along the northern and eastern property lines. We are proposing new screening along the eastern property line to offset, and we overall trying to provide as many trees as possible for the site as is.

MR. PAPE: It appears to me that in staff's report there's a statement that 16 trees are required and you're introducing eight shade trees; is that accurate.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That is, yes.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chair, when we were before the board in 2014, we had a similar situation, and we asked if we could make a cash contribution to the township for those trees that we could not really find a place to install. We would again ask for permission to make a contribution to your tree fund for the eight trees that are not shown on the plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pape, can you qualify why the area that I guess would be the southwest corner there would not be appropriate for any additional trees. Just clarify that.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Schwartz -- and it's the last question that Mr. Schwartz and I prepared about 2 hours ago. Mr. Schwartz, could you point out -- please answer Mr. Philips.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Absolutely. So the existing trees along the western and the southwestern corner of the site are all existing. Actually, to add additional trees in that area we'd have to further remove trees to be able to provide them. There are trees proposed on each of the landscape islands and as long as -- as well as the western side of the building, and then obviously we tried to add as many trees as possible along the eastern side of the building to offset those trees that are being removed due to the drive aisle.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can you clarify the forest area that you described as you don't want to infringe upon taking more trees out of, how old, how tall, what those trees might be like.

MR. SCHWARTZ: The trees are pretty

substantial. If you don't mind, I can go back to Exhibit A-2. As you can see, the entire front area or western portion of the site is all heavily wooded.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It's a pretty dense and mature buffer.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. It was important to get that on the record. By the way, on a different note on this picture, can you qualify when the picture was taken since we obviously know that the area that says PI zone has now been sufficiently changed, and if -- you dated this today, but this is not a reflection of today.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct. It's dated today, but it is not taken from today. If you give me one second to just go back to our aerial map included with our site plan. So these aerial images were from taken from 2015 high-resolution orthophotography.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so then as testimony, you testify that with the exception of the fact that there is now significant amount of work done on a piece of property that is not this one that there are otherwise no significant changes to that picture from the aerial photograph.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's correct.

MR. PAPE: I would -- there is one other alternative, Mr. Chair. In the last application, which the board accepted the contribution, one other thing that could occur is we could try to do evergreen infill in the forest. We could go into the forest and try to do evergreen infill. It would appear there's very little for us to be buffering or screening ourselves from.

THE CHAIRMAN: I would not disagree, Mr. Pape. I would say I would leave that up to Mr. Kipp and the zoning operation to determine whether or not they prefer to have a couple more trees or a contribution in kind.

MR. KIPP: If I may, Chairman, I do think that the contribution would be good, and our Shade Tree Commission would put the trees to good use. I think it would be not a waste of our time, but I don't know how fruitful it would be to try and fill in that area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, now, as long as we get that clarification, Mr. Kipp, then that sort of puts that issue to bed for the board tonight.

MR. PAPE: With permission, Mr. Chair, I'll move on to the lighting elements of the plan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, can we just step back for a second, Mr. Pape. Qualifying where -- looking at the plan as presented, where is the runoff going to be staged?

MR. PAPE: Sure.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Our stormwater basin is underground. It's at the western portion -- I'm sorry -- the southern portion of the building, and then all runoff is carried at a controlled rate and ultimately discharges through a stormwater easement at the northwestern portion of the site of lot 4 and then ultimately is carried out to Cotters Lane.

THE CHAIRMAN: And it's your testimony that the properties to the north, which appear to be about 4 to 6 feet below this property, will not have any water intrusion onto their properties from you.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's correct. We're substantially reducing runoff on the surrounding properties.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Pape, just for clarification for the board, the easement for the runoff that was just referred to, is this a preexisting easement, or is this one that is contemplated and still needs to be formalized?

MR. PAPE: It's in place. It's in place.

MR. WEINER: Okay, thank you.

MR. PAPE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pape. I'm sorry I didn't --

MR. PAPE: No.

THE CHAIRMAN: Please proceed.

MR. PAPE: Appreciate your thoroughness.

So, Mr. Schwartz, we're to the fourth element of the site plan, and that fourth element is lighting. I'm going to ask if you could describe the lighting scheme that you have developed. Important for the board to know how tall are the lights, what type of light fixture has been used, and can you confirm that there's no spillage on anyone else's property from our light fixtures.

MR. SCHWARTZ: All the new lighting is LED and efficient. The lighting is -- a majority of it is either 18 or 20 foot tall. There are a few poles that had to be 25 foot just to be able to provide some additional light in areas where we were trying to use a light fixture within the landscape areas. All the lighting meets the township code

requirements. Mr. Cline's letter, he did pick up one hot spot that was under one of our 20-foot -- 25-foot poles, which we will address in compliance when we do some revisions, but other than that, all the lighting is fully compliant, cut off, and does not spill over onto the adjacent properties.

MR. PAPE: Thank you.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the area in the northwest corner where it looks like at night it would get dark.

MR. SCHWARTZ: The drive aisle? The drive aisle in the northwest?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SCHWARTZ: All new 18-foot LED fixtures are proposed along that driveway.

THE CHAIRMAN: And do you know off-hand how many poles that would be?

MR. SCHWARTZ: About 34 total throughout the entire site.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, but you don't know how much on that particular I guess flag entrance.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I think it's four. It's around four. There's not a lot. I can certainly count for you if you like. I can bring up the lighting plan.

MR. CLINE: I come up with nine.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we seem to have a discrepancy.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Let me I tell you what, I'll bring up the lighting plan just to clarify.

MR. KIPP: I agree with Jason for the record.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Perfect. There you go. So it's nine.

MS. PAPI: Mr. Chairman, I just have a question. This is Amy. In talking about lighting, and I was reviewing the items that we received. Is the light above FDC standard, is that something that the fire marshal in East Brunswick highlighted?

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's something that we would definitely provide. I did see that in the comment letters. I'll make sure to coordinate that with the architect to ensure that that's there.

MS. PAPI: Thank you.

MR. PAPE: May we proceed?

THE CHAIRMAN: Please.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. So, Mr. Schwartz, Mr. Peregoy, your associate and expert in traffic, will testify in detail about the on-site

circulation, but I'd ask if you could share with the board that as part of the design of this site that you introduced all of the appropriate turning templates for all of the vehicles that will traverse this site to make certain that they can all safely maneuver around the building.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's correct, and based on previous comments, additional features were added, such as a stop bar and stop sign at the northeastern corner of the building, double yellow line striping around clockwise of the building, and the do-not-enter signs at the southwestern portion of the building just to make sure any employee/visitor traffic is separated from any loading operations to the west.

MR. PAPE: My second question -- and it follows that statement -- is if you could -- using this exhibit, share with the board how your design keeps the passenger vehicles, the employees' vehicles, completely separate from the trucking movements on site. So at first blush, it might look like we're looking at -- we're looking at free movement, but, in fact, you controlled it.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Absolutely. So right as you enter the site there is a 10-square-foot directional sign that essentially has visitors and employees circulating around the building clockwise. There's a do-not-enter signs here. So as they're ending their shift, they'll be going backwards counterclockwise, always staying on that portion of the building. On the directional sign, all the loading and unloading operations will direct all trucks to head to the western portion of the building where they will operate solely within the western portion and then head back out through the driveway.

MR. PAPE: As far as the adequacy of the parking, I'll ask the question of Mr. Peregoy, but as the designer of the site, could you confirm that the parking that is shown complies with the ordinance and there's no deficiencies.

MR. SCHWARTZ: That's correct. We even included the three electric charging stations, as well, per code.

MR. PAPE: Very good. I'm going to ask if we could go to the --

THE CHAIRMAN: Could he show us where the charging stations are, please.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Absolutely. These three spaces right here, they're all level 2 electric

charging, and they comply with the current statute that just was issued I believe this month or the end of last month, these three spaces right here.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, and with regard to the refuse pickup, I'm going -- the approach would normally be, from what I understand, by going around to the north of the building, the east of the building, and then going to the lower right-hand corner there for the south to pick up the refuse; is that correct?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, refuse will be -- it's a front loading refuse pickups. They'll come in through the loading and unloading areas at the western portion of the site. Again, this is all done off hours, and then they'll circulate counterclockwise after they hit the trash enclosure to the southeast and then circulate counterclockwise back out to the driveway.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, so they are going to break that barrier of no entry.

MR. SCHWARTZ: The do-not-enter signs, correct, are posted for vehicular traffic circulating clockwise. Again, the loading and unloading is only done off hours. I think it's only going to be about once per week, and that will be done counterclockwise through the loading and unloading area.

THE CHAIRMAN: Through the loading and unloading area. Okay, so they would breach that one spot there in order to make that happen.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, that's correct.

MR. ARORA: Yeah, I have one question, Steve, if you don't mind. Does the new building has sprinkler systems, like the modern sprinklers?

MR. SCHWARTZ: I believe it does, yes. I'm sure the architect could answer that just to confirm.

MR. PAPE: But I can -- yes, it's a fully sprinklered building.

MR. ARORA: Okay. Thanks.

MR. PAPE: So --

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pape, I'm sorry.

MR. PAPE: No, no, this is very efficient. You're assisting us.

Mr. Schwartz, the last question I have for you is signage, and if you could just speak to the location of the signage and the type of signage that is proposed.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Sure. So in addition to the 10-square-foot directional sign that I just

discussed, we're also including a 48-square-foot monument sign. It's essentially the same sign that was already approved by the board back in 2014, except it has an updated logo, and it just carries the number 9. It's a masonry sign, number 9 on it, with the JB Cocoa logo, and it's externally lit.

MR. PAPE: And if you could, on this -- on A-3, show us where it is.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It's at the -- right at the entrance on Cotters Lane on the southern portion of the access drive.

MR. PAPE: So, Mr. Schwartz, my final questions for you are, are you familiar with all of the staff reports that were provided to us prior to the hearing.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I am.

MR. PAPE: Are there any requirements or directions or requests in any of those reports that you cannot comply with?

MR. SCHWARTZ: No, we can definitely fully comply with all the comments that were provided.

MR. PAPE: So if you would confirm on the record that you can and you will comply with all of the staff reports.

MR. SCHWARTZ: I can and will comply.

MR. PAPE: Okay. Mr. Chair, I have nothing further of Mr. Schwartz on direct. He is available to you and your professionals for examination at this time.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Schwartz, just clarification. Leave that picture up. There's always -- in addition to having a street level stop, is there going to be a stop sign at that corner before you enter Cotters Lane?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, stop sign and painted bar at Cotters Lane, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, and that area there then will also be considered grass; is that correct?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, the area shown in green on this exhibit are grass, that's correct, except it will --

THE CHAIRMAN: So you'll have a certain --

MR. SCHWARTZ: -- trees.

THE CHAIRMAN: You'll have a service or something to make sure that that grass area there doesn't get unkempt; is that correct?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Correct.

MS. PAPI: Mr. Chairman, this is Amy. A

lot of my questions have been answered, and I truly appreciate that. I have highlighted things I was going to ask, but you've all spoke about them and you've highlighted them. How about a fire hydrant in the rear of the building.

MR. SCHWARTZ: There is currently a fire hydrant proposed at the rear of the building. It's shown on our utility plan. So we do actually already comply with that. I don't know if the -- and we're also meeting the separation requirements for a travelway between fire hydrants.

MS. PAPI: Okay.

MR. CLINE: Mr. Schwartz, if it turns out that the comment from the fire official about the fire hydrant is asking for an additional hydrant you would be willing to do that, correct?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Absolutely, yes.

MR. PAPE: And, Mrs. Papi and Mr. Cline, we did receive an April 6 report that was generated by Shawn Verdi, the fire marshal. We were pleased that he described -- he said everything looks good on the site and utility plans as far as the additional hydrants and vehicle circulation after reviewing, and as per our conversation, a red light will be added above the FDC, so we'll make certain that we comply with his written report.

MS. PAPI: Thank you.

MR. PAPE: Yes, ma'am.

MR. CLINE: Thank you, Mr. Pape.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pape, moving onto a different seasonal question, where does the snow go?

MR. SCHWARTZ: Any snow that's required to be handled will be done -- be hauled off site. There is simply just not enough room on the site to store snow so it will have to be taken off site.

THE CHAIRMAN: So it's -- you understand that you'll have to safely and effectively remove it according to all standard environmental requirements.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: And you'll be doing that on your own and you have arrangements or facilities in order to make that happen.

MR. SCHWARTZ: It will be made, yes, via private hauler.

THE CHAIRMAN: Private hauler.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Cline, is there anything in particular in relation to that that you might be concerned about or looking for in particular as far as perhaps a plan or something to

be submitted?

MR. CLINE: Not as such because snow removal is one of those cases where the applicant is kind of self-motivated to bring it into compliance if he wants the site to function in wintertime, and it is -- I have to admit it is somewhat constrained there because the only place that you could try to push snow there's already trees there. So that's something that would arguably be self-correcting because it's in the applicant's interest to solve that situation.

MR. WEINER: Okay.

MR. CLINE: And as Mr. Schwartz and Mr. Pape said, I know you guys find stormwater not exactly exciting, but we did discuss it at length in my comments and concerns, and I'm satisfied that the applicant can get there from here if they receive approval.

MR. WEINER: Thank you.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Schwartz remains your witness.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anyone on the board have any other questions? Mr. Kipp.

MR. KIPP: Yeah, I just have one quick comment. I do agree that this is not only a great improvement for the site, but it's a great improvement from the last application, but one thing I wanted to point out to Steve. The gas service -- and I'm sure there's an easement on the adjacent lot to the east, but with all the construction that's taking place on that lot, I would just advise that you follow up with PSE&G and make sure that that gas service is still applicable through that lot.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, that's something that me and Mr. Pape had also talked about. There are some existing easements on the site that will need to be extinguished and/or put back into place because they do go around the existing building, which would be covered with new building, but that's something that definitely will need to happen.

MR. PAPE: There's self-serving easements that exist to bring the utilities a certain route, which will be -- which we will extinguish and then we'll reroute.

MR. KIPP: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PAPE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else from the board have any other questions of this particular witness? Sounds like we're done for the time being, Ken.

MR. PAPE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Move to the next.

MR. PAPE: I'll take a moment here to do a brief description of JB Cocoa's operation. When we were before the board in 2014, we described JB Cocoa is an international company that formed a United States company, JB Cocoa EBNJ for purposes of purchasing this property. They are -- they provide a chocolate product to the industry. They process cocoa butter and cocoa -- comes in as bricks and then it's processed into a very, very fine high-quality powder. They distribute to -- throughout the country to the high -- high-quality chocolate distributors. Best example is Lindt and Mars. And at the site, the product comes in in bulk, and it is processed to a very, very high quality, a very fine quality, and then is packaged and distributed around the country. That is the operation that takes place in this building. There are offices that are associated with it, and there are storage areas. It's not a warehouse for other purposes. They store their raw product and their finished product. This would be an owner occupied single-tenant building. It's designed 100 percent for JB Cocoa's requirements.

Their office is a small office. They anticipate that they will have 16 office employees, and a work day in the office is 9 to 6; 9 to 6 is the anticipated work day, and the work days are Monday to Friday. The processing requires 11 employees, and typically there's one shift, but when demand arises, they go to two shifts and on occasion they go to three shifts. Theirs is a 24/7 operation on demand, exactly the same operation, exactly the same operation that was presented to the board when we were before the board the last time. The only real changes are the evolution of the equipment and the ability to eliminate the 70-foot-tall silos, and all the equipment can now be maintained inside the building.

So on behalf of our client and speaking with permission from Mr. Tey, those facts are proffered to the board, and they are offered to the board as an accurate statement of the business operation.

If I may go to the next witness, and that is Mr. Peregoy, and we'll have his -- have him sworn and share -- I don't see him.

MR. PEREGOY: I'm here.

MR. PAPE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. PEREGOY: I find myself craving a chocolate bar now after that.

MR. PAPE: I want you to know that you're the ones that asked us to Zoom. If we weren't Zooming, there would have been samples. Just for the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: There can't be -- we have to turn that down, Ken. You know that.

MR. PAPE: We would just leave it on the table.

MR. CLINE: Mr. Pape, very briefly before you get in with Mr. Peregoy, you were talking about the staffing and such. Is it anticipated that the construction of this new building will result in additional jobs, expansion in employees?

MR. PAPE: Well, currently, it's not being used for the cocoa processing. The building is not in the best of repair, and there are limited tenants there. So we will be creating those jobs, and those are all -- they are all -- trying to find the right word -- they're skilled jobs. So there will be new jobs created.

MR. CLINE: Thank you.

MR. PAPE: Surely. Mr. Peregoy is a traffic expert. That is his field. He is with Dynamic Traffic. If we can swear him in and we'll share his credentials.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, Mr. Peregoy, do you solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give this evening regarding the application before us is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. PEREGOY: Yes, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please state your CV on the record.

MR. PEREGOY: Sure. My name's Craig Peregoy. I have a bachelor's degree in civil engineering from Virginia Tech. I'm a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey, and I testify pretty much on a nightly basis as an expert in traffic engineering. Been doing this for over 20 years now, and I have appeared in East Brunswick a number of times.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chairman, may I ask that the board accept Mr. Peregoy as an expert in his field of traffic engineering and allow him to so testify.

MR. ARORA: Yeah, I accept Craig as an expert.

THE CHAIRMAN: All in favor? Any

opposed? Hearing none, then, please proceed, Mr. Peregoy.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Peregoy, I'm going to ask if we could begin on Cotters Lane, and I'm going to ask that the very first portion of your testimony would be to describe the driveway connection from our site to Cotters Lane, and if you could share with the board that it is -- that it is safe and that the horizontal and vertical conditions that exist there have been taken into consideration in your design.

MR. PEREGOY: Yes, certainly, and obviously, you know, we're looking at an existing driveway that has historically for apparently over 60 years served an industrial facility, so the curb radii and the design of the driveway are appropriate. We're about midway between Ryders Lane and where Cotters bends around the corner, so we have great visibility and certainly a safe and efficient design. It's operated for years and will continue to operate effectively.

MR. PAPE: So straight and flat.

MR. PEREGOY: Straight and flat. It's an 800-foot-long boulevard to the property.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. I'm going to ask if you could -- I asked briefly -- I asked briefly of Steve to describe turning templates. I'd like you to go into some detail, articulated vehicles, emergency vehicles, the type -- trash removal vehicles. If you could confirm that those turning templates were created and are part of the materials that were provided to the board and that you have confirmed that all those vehicles can safely maneuver the site.

MR. PEREGOY: Yes, we have, and as part of the submission package, we showed those turning templates. I reviewed those, went through those with Mr. Schwartz, and certainly, for the loading operation, it works very well. We have the full circulation around the building for emergency vehicles, and we've checked to make sure the garbage truck makes the around, and this is designed to handle the traffic that it's designed for.

MR. PAPE: So I see driveways going around a square building. If you could just speak directly to each of those turning movements as you go around a corner. Did your templates include those portions of the driveway?

MR. PEREGOY: Yes, they did, and I think this is a great layout in the fact that we can

separate the passenger vehicles from the trucks. As you come up the long driveway, that first right turn takes you into the truck loading court, so at that point, the trucks have now been removed from the travel stream. Vehicles proceed straight going around the side, the north side of the building to the back of the building and then into the parking area. They reverse that flow on the way out.

There is -- in the northeast corner we did put a stop bar just because you're kind of coming around the corner of the building, and we also provided those double yellow lines to keep people to the right. The visibility is adequate there, and typically, you're not going to have too much -- this isn't going to be a heavily traveled thoroughfare, so we're not too concerned about, you know, frequent encounters at that corner, but we did want to make sure that we just controlled that area, but certainly from a vehicle circulation perspective, passenger vehicles, the garbage vehicle can make all those maneuvers that are required, and again, the truck court, we have a full turnaround. That circle that you see, tractor trailers would completely turn around, so we have excellent maneuverability on the site.

MR. PAPE: As far as parking, if you could describe the -- where the parking is located, if you could confirm that its location is appropriate for the employees, and if you could confirm that the parking is adequate for the employee needs.

MR. PEREGOY: Yeah, and again, that parking is accessed via the circulation around the building. It's on the south side of the building proximate to the entrance, away from the truck loading activity, so all the parking maneuvers for passenger vehicles for employees are not going to be impacted at all, are not going to be anywhere near the truck maneuvering, which is a good thing, so I think this is a good -- it's a good location and an efficient design for this type of facility.

In terms of the number of parking spaces, your ordinance requirements if you do the math for the various uses, the office, the warehouse, and the manufacturing portions, we meet that requirement, your ordinance requirement, and I think more importantly, you have an operator who knows their operation, he's building this facility, and they're comfortable with the number of parking spaces, so from your ordinance -- from a perspective

of your ordinance and just practicality, we certainly feel that the parking supply is more than sufficient.

MR. PAPE: Thank you for the detail in your response. I'd ask you if you could just share from your perspective as a traffic engineer, do you find that this site has been well designed for safe traffic movements by both passenger vehicles and all the anticipated truck movements?

MR. PEREGOY: Yes, absolutely 100 percent, this is -- I've done a number of these industrial warehouse facilities, and this is a fantastic design in terms of separating trucks and passenger vehicles and just in overall flow in the way the operation would be. I think it's an improvement over what you have out there today, as a matter of fact.

MR. PAPE: I was going to make that point, and thank you, that one of the -- although there's great expense for our client to demolish an existing industrial building and build a new one, by building something new, all of the good guidance that Mr. Peregoy and Mr. Schwartz gave to our client is now part of the plan. It's no longer a retrofit.

Mr. Chair, I have nothing further of Mr. Peregoy. He is available to you and your professionals for examination.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Well, thank you, Mr. Pape. I do have a couple of clarifying questions for Mr. Peregoy.

First things, at what point is there any indication that there would be a need for any of the tractor trailers that would be otherwise backing into the loading docks to proceed to go around the building the other way?

MR. PEREGOY: No, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Counterclockwise.

MR. PEREGOY: The passenger vehicle parking area will not be traversed by tractor trailers at all. There's no need to. Even if a tractor trailer pulled in and for whatever reason was at the wrong time and all the loadings docks were full, they're able to completely spin around and head back out. They do not need to traverse around the side of the building or the back of the building.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, that was one question. A second would be the step van type deliveries, UPS, FedEx, et cetera, and anything similar that might be or somebody who might be

coming to the site to do work on piping or plumbing or something like that, where do they go?

MR. PEREGOY: Yeah, those vehicles would be able to traverse around to the employee parking area, the standard parking spaces. We checked to make sure the garbage truck can make it around. That's generally bigger than your typical UPS, Amazon, FedEx, and generally, they're going to be doing their business in the office portion of the building, not by the loading dock, so it would be preferable anyway for them to be in the passenger vehicle parking area.

THE CHAIRMAN: And so they're going to also traverse around the building clockwise, drop off whatever they've got, and then proceed out counterclockwise.

MR. PEREGOY: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: And they will be made aware of that so that they don't create a crisis at some point, you know, as they traverse through where they're not supposed to.

MR. PEREGOY: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, and -- all right. Those are my two questions. Thank you.

Anybody else from the board have any other additional questions of Mr. Peregoy?

MR. KIPP: I have a question, Chairman. Keith Kipp.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Kipp.

MR. KIPP: Steve, if you're still out there, can you go to A-1, the overall aerial exhibit, please. Thank you.

Craig, the route for the trucks when they exit onto Cotters, would you say they would be heading south to get to Ryders Lane, the county road, which would lead to, you know, many different aspects for the trucks and that's probably the easiest route for them in and out?

MR. PEREGOY: Yes, I would say so. I'd say that makes the most sense, and if you look at the Cotters Lane intersection with Ryders Lane, it's kind of blown out a little wide for that truck, that ease of the movement for trucks. Obviously, there's a lot of other industrial facilities back there. So I think that's clearly the preferred route.

MR. KIPP: Okay, and I agree, and I'm all in favor of getting the trucks onto a county road and off the township road as quick as possible. But one problem we've been having with that intersection of Cotters and Ryders is on the

northerly side the radius is just a little too tight for the tractor trailers. Would the applicant consider widening that slightly just to make it -- we know it's an existing problem, but the trucks -- the applicant will be contributing more truck traffic to that. Would the applicant consider a slight modification to that northerly curblin?

MR. PAPE: Sure, Mr. Kipp, the answer is yes, and that would be beneficial to all, and all includes our client. I would ask if we could meet at the site and examine the right-of-way maps to determine what's available and work with Mr. Peregoy and with Mr. Cline to come up with that modification.

MR. KIPP: Absolutely. Thank you very much.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Pape, if I may to just get this properly as a potential condition should the board move favorably would be that the applicant is to widen the northerly curblin at Cotters Lane subject to approval of township staff?

MR. PAPE: And, Counselor, and availability of right-of-way.

MR. WEINER: Staff and availability of right-of-way.

MR. PEREGOY: It may not be -- there's a pretty wide concrete island there so the better method may be to modify that as opposed to the northerly curblin that ties into the bridge and the Turnpike. You know, maybe the language shouldn't necessarily say the northerly curblin. You know, there may be another way to achieve the same thing is what I'm saying.

MR. WEINER: Understood.

MR. PAPE: So we visit the interconnection of Cotters with Ryders with the goal of making it a safer access point.

MR. WEINER: Applicant is to modify the inter -- what was the phrase you used, Mr. Pape?

MR. PAPE: I would say the interconnection of Cotter and Ryders.

MR. WEINER: Interconnection of Cotters Lane and Ryders Lane subject to approval of township staff and availability of right-of-way.

MR. PAPE: Yes, sir, that sounds -- that's a condition that we've comfortable accepting.

MR. WEINER: Okay. Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. WEINER: You comfortable with that language, and members of the board?

THE CHAIRMAN: I am. I was wondering if Mr. Kipp felt it might be worthwhile to consider having a truck turn only as an option; otherwise, they go down Cotters Lane and go into the industrial park.

MR. KIPP: Like I had mentioned, I would prefer them to get to Ryders Lane as quick as possible.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, I don't know what their routes are, what their plans are, so I leave it as an open question unless Mr. Pape can shed any light on it.

MR. WEINER: Only in knowing and being familiar with the area, I would think that a left turn only out of the driveway would -- I mean, I can't speak, but they ultimately would get to the same place by accessing out to Ryders Lane. Even if they wanted to go the other direction towards Tices Lane, a right turn on Ryders will take them there but probably in a safer way. So I don't know if, Mr. Pape, if you're comfortable with a left turn only.

MR. PAPE: I'm not, and as we look at this, you can see that there is -- I can't count that far, but there's got to be two dozen plus warehouse buildings all in this area, and those of us who grew up in East Brunswick know that this has been in place going back to the 60's. I think that the road system works. Making these improvements will make it work better. Distinguishing this one operation from all the other operations I don't think is appropriate.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think that's fair, Mr. Pape. I just was curious whether or not there was some movement on the part -- I don't even know what the people who are now developing that area that used to be all trees over there is -- their requirements are, either. So that's fine.

MR. PAPE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anybody else from the board have any other questions of Mr. Peregoy?

MR. BRANDT: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly. Go ahead, Mr. Brandt.

MR. BRANDT: Mr. Peregoy, I know that fire signed off on this application, but I'm just concerned that a -- I'm sure that a regular fire engine would be able to traverse those turns on the eastern side of the building. I'm concerned about

possibly a ladder tower if it was ever needed, which is considerably longer than a regular fire engine.

MR. PEREGOY: Yeah, I mean, you know, the fire department has signed off on it. I think they feel comfortable that they can make the proper routing. You can get basically to any point of that building. I understand what you're talking about, the northeast corner, that turn.

MR. BRANDT: Correct.

MR. PEREGOY: I believe a ladder truck could make that turn, but they wouldn't even necessarily need to because they'd be able to come into the truck court, obviously easily -- tractor trailers can do it -- and proceed along the opposite direction, the counterclockwise direction, to get to any point in the building. So they certainly have that ability to access any point there.

MR. BRANDT: They have that option. Okay. Thank you. That's all I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from any other board members or staff?

MR. CLINE: Mr. Chairman, just a brief observation at the risk of, you know, sounding like I'm on the applicant's staff, but the changes to the circulation made from when this was first brought in as an application to this version are significant and have made a significant improvement. The circulation is a lot safer than the first time I looked at this.

MR. PAPE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: And, Mr. Cline, I was on the board when we approved it in 2014, and it was a jumble of five or six different businesses that were using portions of it, and it looked like it was put together by a jigsaw puzzle. So I would tend to concur that a single new developed building makes it a lot easier for changes to be made and for compliance to be met.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. We had all -- we had diverse businesses, including a school bus operator all work. This is different.

THE CHAIRMAN: The last time in 2014, there was a school bus operation that was renting the parking lot area, yes.

MR. PAPE: Right, yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: I remember that. The other -- Mr. Pape, since you brought it up, though, my recollection on the height was 50 feet, not 70. You've mentioned 70 a few times, but I think it was 50.

MR. PAPE: It was 50, Mr. Chair, but there were 12 silos that were exempt from height. They had been ruled by the -- by the township that the silos were exempt from the height, and they were 12 70-foot silos. They're gone. Yes, we did have a 50-foot building then, and tonight we're asking for that same 50-foot building, but the 70-footers are gone.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thanks for that clarification, Mr. Pape.

MR. PAPE: So.

MR. CLINE: Mr. Chairman -- sorry, Mr. Pape. Mr. Chairman, speaking of the previous version that I saw was the 2019 submittal for something similar to this but not quite the same, but over the course of the intervening time, it's evolved to improve from even what was initially submitted.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, the only thing they kept the same was the application number.

MR. PAPE: Is that right?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, it still says 19 dash.

MR. PAPE: This one's been in process for 2 years.

MS. PAPI: Very impressed.

THE CHAIRMAN: Anything else from the board or from staff? If not, then, Mr. Pape, please continue.

MR. PAPE: Surely. So we do have -- we do have Mr. Ross, the architect, here. I heard all at the beginning of the meeting as people were talking about these very large plans, those very large plans of architecture that you have. I did not intend to make an architectural presentation. Often for industrial building I don't. I just submit that the plans as provided to you with compliant -- limited and compliant signage identifying JB Cocoa are the plans that we are asking this board to approve. If you wish to hear from Mr. Ross, he is available to present the architectural elements of the building. I defer to you, Mr. Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: Depending on the answer to the question I'm going to ask will determine if we need to have him.

MR. PAPE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Significant movement throughout much of the country regarding solar power and solar panels on roofs and/or green on roofs. Is

it possible for your architect to address any of those trends that are going on right now with regard to this building.

MR. PAPE: Well, Mr. Ross, I'm going to ask if you could give us a thumbs up or thumbs down if you're available to speak to green elements of the design. And I've lost Mr. Ross.

THE CHAIRMAN: He's not on there.

MR. PAPE: He's not on.

THE CHAIRMAN: He's not visible.

MR. PAPE: Oh.

MR. ROSS: I'm available.

MR. PAPE: There we go. Mr. Ross, are you comfortable speaking to the green elements of the building design?

MR. ROSS: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, then let's swear him in, Ken.

MR. PAPE: Sure. Mr. -- where did you go?

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Ross.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Ross, if you would --

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Do you solemnly swear that testimony you're about to give this evening regarding the application before us is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MR. ROSS: Yes, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please state your name, professional affiliation for the record, and the brief CV.

MR. ROSS: I'm William Ross. I received my Bachelor of Architecture from the New Jersey School of Technology. I'm a licensed architect in the State of New Jersey, and I'm an associate with the architectural firm Parette Somjen Architects.

MR. PAPE: Is your architectural license in the State of New Jersey in good standing?

MR. ROSS: Yes.

MR. PAPE: And are you personally familiar with the building that we're asking this board to approve?

MR. ROSS: Yes.

MR. PAPE: And, Mr. Chair, I'd ask if you would allow Mr. Ross to testify as an architect this evening.

MR. ARORA: Yeah, I accept him as an expert.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any objections? If not, I'll listen for an aye. All opposed?

Hearing none, Mr. Ross, please proceed.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Ross, if you could share with the board the green elements of the design, if you could -- I'll call them LEEDS-like elements of the design.

MR. ROSS: Of course. So all of the electrical fixtures will be low consumption. They'll be LED lighting fixtures. Plumbing fixtures will be low-flow code compliant fixtures in that sense. In regarding the potential of solar, we will have an allowance in the roof structure if the applicant does wish to proceed with the option of solar.

MR. PAPE: So by allowance, are you advising the board that the roof will be designed to bear the weight load associated with solar?

MR. ROSS: Correct.

MR. PAPE: So the installation of solar then becomes the option of the occupant.

MR. ROSS: Correct.

MR. PAPE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have any idea of the preference or indication from the applicant that that's something that they would consider?

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chair, each and every one of the industrial applicants wants it. It's a -- there's a cost factor and to determine what the current state and federal benefits that are available to someone who wishes to avail the solar. I think the most important part of the testimony is the building is designed to handle it, and everybody's motivated to put it up there if you can make it make sense.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I'm sure that you would have the complete cooperation of the East Brunswick building and zoning department if you chose to do that.

MR. PAPE: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

MR. KIPP: You absolutely would.

MR. PAPE: Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anybody from the board have any other specific questions regarding the architecture, the outside facade, anything regarding this particular building?

Could we get a clarification from Mr. Ross of what the outside textures will be or how they will be visibly appear.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Ross, I'm going to ask if you could put that very beautiful perspective, the last page of your firm's sheet, if you could put the

perspective up, and while that -- so we're at A-4 I believe, Mr. Weiner.

MR. WEINER: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Yes. So A-4, if you could read the title block in, Mr. Ross. Perspective. You're good.

MR. ROSS: Okay. Yeah, so this is the perspective. This is from the southern corner of the site looking north.

MR. PAPE: And if you could describe the materials that are proposed to be used and briefly point out the articulation and the architectural features of the building.

MR. PEREGOY: So the building facade will consist of tilt-up concrete panels that are then painted, with windows in occupiable areas, curtain walls in the storefront area of the main office lobby, and elements of sun shade over the main entrances.

MR. PAPE: Is the cornice or the treatment -- if you can describe the treatment along the top of the building.

MR. ROSS: This is a part of the tilt-up concrete panel that is painted red.

MR. PAPE: There's a specific question that was raised by Mr. Cline in his report noting that there's an elevator servicing the building. Will it be necessary for there to be any additions on the roof as a result of that elevator?

MR. ROSS: No, it is a machine roomless elevator, and there is no need for a penthouse.

MR. PAPE: Thank you.

I have nothing further of Mr. Ross. He is available for your further examination.

MS. PAPI: I don't know whether this is a silly question, Mr. Chairman, but can a helicopter land on the roof of that building? No. Okay.

THE CHAIRMAN: And the air conditioning units are where?

MR. ROSS: All mechanical units will be roof mounted and properly screened.

THE CHAIRMAN: Sound attenuated I'm assuming.

MR. ROSS: Correct.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Anybody else from the board or from staff have any specific questions of Mr. Ross?

MR. BRANDT: I have one, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Ross, are they precast panels going up, prefabricated panels.

MR. ROSS: At this time, I don't know if they're going to be precast or cast in place.

MR. BRANDT: Okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Any other questions from anybody on the board or staff? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Ross.

MR. PAPE: Yes, thank you. Allison Coffin is the final professional witness.

Allison, you're here?

MS. COFFIN: I am here.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. Allison Coffin is a professional planner. I've had the privilege of working with Allison for a long time, and we have made presentations to this board in the past. I'm going to ask if you could swear in Allison. We'll share with you her credentials and go right to her testimony.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you're about to give this evening regarding the application before us is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

MS. COFFIN: Yes, I do.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Please state your name, professional affiliation for the record.

MS. COFFIN: Allison Coffin. I'm a licensed professional planner in the State of New Jersey. I'm also certified by the American Institute of Certified Planners. I've had my license and certification for more than 15 years now. I work for James W. Higgins Associates. We're located in Ocean Township, New Jersey. In the time that I've had my license, I've been accepted as an expert witness in front of boards in more than 90 communities throughout the state, but I have appeared several times here in East Brunswick, including for this property in the past.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, I remember.

MR. PAPE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Listen for a motion to accept Miss Coffin.

MR. ARORA: I open a motion to accept Allison.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pepe seconds. Thank you. All in favor? Any opposed?

Hearing none, your witness. Proceed, please.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. Allison, I'm going to ask that you do this in a narrative fashion, a succinct but narrative fashion. I think

that the fact witnesses who have gone before you have placed a very clear image of the operation and the improvements that are proposed. The applicant is requesting a height variance. The 35-foot requirement in the zoning ordinance is not sufficient for the chocolate factory to operate. We need to be at 50 feet. If you could share with the board what you did to be prepared to testify this evening and then if you could identify what obligations we have and take us through the proofs. Please.

MS. COFFIN: Sure. To prepare for tonight, I looked at the application materials. I reviewed my previous notes on the property, the previous applications. I reviewed the aerials. I ate some chocolate, because why not, and met with the other professionals who are presenting in front of you tonight.

The site that we're looking at is 8.0 acres. It's an extremely deep flag lot that has been developed with an industrial building, and the applicant's proposing to demolish the existing structure and construct a new cocoa processing facility. The property is located in an area that's developed with other industrial uses within the PI planned industrial park zone where the proposed use is permitted, but we are requesting variance for height where 35 feet is the maximum in the zone and 50 feet is what the applicant is proposing, which is consistent with the prior application.

It's my opinion that special reasons exist for the granting of the requested variance, and the variance can be granted would you no detriment to the health, safety, and general welfare of the public.

There are special reasons in this case supporting the requested height variance. The ordinance permits a maximum height of 35 feet in the PI zone. The proposed height of this roof will be 50 feet; therefore, that's a D variance. The proposed height of this building in this case, however, is necessary for the proper and efficient functioning of the plant on the site and to have all of the equipment contained within the structure. The processing equipment for this use housed within this facility requires this height to function. The increased proposed height would allow this facility to maintain full and appropriate utilization, secure its future, and result in a more efficient production system while creating new jobs on the

site, and this advances the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law with regard to providing sufficient space in an appropriate location for a manufacturing use and promoting the conservation of energy resources, in this case, in that the plant is being located so that it has convenient access to transportation routes in close proximity to its customers.

It's my opinion that the variance can be granted without substantial detriment. The potential detriment associated with the height variance would be negative impact on light, air, and open space and aesthetic impact. In this site, though, we have a -- in this instance, we have a site that is fully developed with a substantial industrial use already. It's surrounded by other substantial industrial uses, but it is also on a unique lot within this industrial park because the property is a deep flag lot. It looks like a mailbox flag. The building, itself, is more than 800 feet from the frontage, and it's not going to be highly visible from the surrounding area. So it's my opinion that there's no detriment to light, air, and open space or to aesthetic impact from the height proposed.

Approval of the variance would not be inconsistent with the intent and purpose of your master plan and zoning ordinance. The ordinance recognizes that manufacturing uses are appropriate to the zone. The site, itself, already contains industrial use, indicating that it's particularly suitable for this type of development, and the higher roof that's proposed on this unique lot would not impede the goal of developing the area with other appropriate industrial uses.

The master plan has two goals that relate to industrial uses in the township which would be advanced by the proposed redevelopment of this site. One is to continue to evaluate the role of industrial development in the township to ensure that the land use plan is balanced as well as being realistically responsive to regional growth opportunity, and another is to encourage additional tax producing uses in appropriate locations, such as office facilities, to assist in meeting local fiscal needs, to provide professional support services for the residents of the township, and to provide additional local job opportunities, and the proposal before the board tonight advances these purposes.

So for those reasons, it's my opinion

that special reasons exist for the granting of the requested D variance for height. It can be granted without detriment to the health, safety, and general welfare of the public, and the granting of the variance will result in an improvement of the site in a manner which is consistent with the intent of your master plan and development ordinance.

MR. PAPE: Allison, thank you.

MS. COFFIN: You're welcome.

MR. PAPE: I have no examination of Allison Coffin. She is available to the board and to the board's professionals for examination.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does anybody from the board or any of the professionals have any specific questions of Miss Coffin?

I have a legal question for Mr. Weiner.

MR. WEINER: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

THE CHAIRMAN: This board approved a 50-foot structure (audio disruption) to call it that. I guess it's not really anything more than part of the manufacturing process -- 7 years ago. By approving it now, that does not change -- or does it change the fact that somebody came in and wanted to put a 50-foot structure all the way across as opposed to just a limited area where the 50-foot would now be applicable?

MR. WEINER: Well, generally, it's the same applicant, and they were granted a use variance previously. My opinion would be that the new variance together with the new site plan would constitute an abandonment of the prior variance, and therefore, that one is wiped out by the applicant seeking the change and the modification at this point, which is a reduction, and therefore, going forward, the prior variance for the broader scope of 50 feet would be abandoned, and the new variance, should one be granted tonight, would supersede that and the prior one would be abandoned, and I don't want to speak for Mr. Pape, but I do see him nodding apparently in agreement, so since he is -- it's his client, I would ask for him to acknowledge the same and we can put that on the record.

MR. PAPE: Surely. Well said. Thank you. So we have approvals to retrofit the building with 70-foot towers and silos and a 50-foot-tall building. We are prepared to vacate all of those approvals and any rights that came from those approvals upon this board favorably considering the application that is before them this evening, and I would believe -- I believe it would be appropriate

if the board took that action for Mr. Weiner to include that specific statement in a resolution.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Weiner, that's --

MR. WEINER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I don't -- been looking at my notes. If you happen before I look for it have the prior --

MR. PAPE: I got it.

MR. WEINER: -- application number.

MR. PAPE: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: It's Z-14-33. Oh, yeah, Z-14-33.

MR. PAPE: Yup.

THE CHAIRMAN: And Z-14-24 was the site plan and bulk variance.

MR. PAPE: That was --

THE CHAIRMAN: Planning board.

MR. PAPE: Back at that time, the planning board had acted on the application, and after we were finished, they realized that, whoops, and we had to go over to the zoning board to do it again.

MR. WEINER: It was Z-14-33 and Z-14 --

MR. PAPE: Oh, no, the other one -- it's a P.

THE CHAIRMAN: 14-24V was from the planning board.

MR. PAPE: Yeah, 14-24V.

MR. WEINER: P-14-24V and Z-13-33.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was the zoning.

MR. PAPE: Yeah.

MR. WEINER: This will be -- I'll put this in as a condition. Applicant acknowledges those two prior applications and relief granted therein are abandoned -- are abandoned upon approval of the within application. Mr. Pape, are we okay with that language?

MR. PAPE: We are. I think it's well said.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Are there any other -- your examination of Miss Coffin is complete, Mr. Pape?

MR. PAPE: Yes, and the applicant's presentation to the zoning board is complete, all but a very -- I would ask a brief opportunity before a vote just to do a summation.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, we have to go through some of the recommendations and some other letters, Mr. Pape, but --

MR. PAPE: Sure.

THE CHAIRMAN: You prefer to do that before or after we go through the recommendations?

MR. PAPE: No problem.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Does anybody from the board or from the staff have any questions of Miss Coffin? Okay. Then if I can ask to move on, Mr. Pape, to page 11 of the staff recommendations.

MR. PAPE: Yes, sir.

THE CHAIRMAN: Section 6, and I think once again you're familiar with the process so if you would just indicate yes, yes, yes, and --

MR. WEINER: Bear with me, Mr. Chairman, as I flip my pages.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. PAPE: So I'm going to ask that Mr. Schwartz activate his mic, and I'm going to ask that Mr. Schwartz --

MS. PAPI: Page 11.

MR. PAPE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yeah, page 11.

MR. PAPE: Page 11, Roman numeral 6, recommendations. I see -- does it go onto the next page? There are 19 --

THE CHAIRMAN: Nineteen is the standard, you know.

MR. PAPE: So there are 18 points, and I'm going to do this with a little bit of speed, and I'm going to ask Mr. Schwartz -- I'm going to say to you, can -- please state that you can comply.

So the first one is proposed depressed curb shall be indicated. Mr. Schwartz.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Two says all proposed building access points shall be indicated on the site plans.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Three, circulation shall be to the satisfaction of the board, providing adequate safe circulation for passenger vehicle, trucks, refuse trucks, emergency vehicles. I think that those proofs are before the record, but again, will comply.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Number 4, provide additional spot elevations and top and bottom of curb elevations as referenced in the report.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: And then provide additional ramps or depressed curb at the rear of the property to allow ADA egress in emergency conditions as well

as allow carts to be taken to the refuse enclosure.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Provide an up -- number 6, provide an updated design and calculations as necessary to demonstrate that the water quality requirements to the stormwater rule have been met.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Seven, revise the stormwater design to remove all conflicts with existing and proposed site improvements.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Eight is provide the required major stormwater development summary as required by the township's MS-4 permit in editable electronic format.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: And number 9 is provide updated details for the underground detention basin.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Ten is clarify and resolve the existing headwall and attached piping and improvements.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Eleven, revise the landscaping and limited disturbance on the plans to more closely reflect the proposed work.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Twelve is relocate all proposed landscaping that is proposed in conflict with existing or proposed improvements.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Thirteen is relocate all proposed lighting that is -- as proposed is in conflict with existing or proposed improvements.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: And 14, provide the details on the lighting for the proposed freestanding sign.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Fifteen, provide construction details for all site improvements.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Sixteen, demonstrate adequacy of clearance and cover for all pipes or utility crossings.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: Seventeen, revise the design to address all conflicts of new improvements proposed in direct conflict with existing improvements.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes.

MR. PAPE: And 18 is a catchall that says any other comments or revisions listed above not explicitly listed in this section, being a cross-reference back to the thorough report. Would you state that you can and will comply.

MR. SCHWARTZ: Yes, we can comply.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. Number 19 --

MR. WEINER: Mr. Pape, I'm sorry to interject. Just for clarity, I want to modify the language of 18 to say -- rather than list it above, I want to add list it above in the staff report dated 8-5-21, and the reason for that modification is should this board be -- act favorably and approve this, I want the resolution to mirror the conditions without any ambiguity.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Counselor, I think that's fine, but the report from which I'm working is July 30.

MR. WEINER: Yes, I think it was -- it might have been modifications, but I will put July 30 because that is above it on the top of the page.

MR. PAPE: Very fine. And the very last statement is one for me to make and that is we've looked at number 19 that identifies the other agencies from which approvals must be secured, and we are in agreement with 19's descriptions of outside agencies.

MR. WEINER: Mr. Pape, there were two other conditions I just want to go over, as well. The first additional condition I have was the applicant is to modify the interconnect of Cotters Lane and Ryders Lane subject to approval of the township staff and availability of right-of-way.

MR. PAPE: Yes.

MR. WEINER: Okay, and then the other condition I have was the applicant acknowledges that the relief previously granted in connection with applications Z-14-33 and P-14-24V are abandoned upon approval of the within application.

MR. PAPE: Yes. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pape, there are a couple of other memorandums that we --

MR. PAPE: Yeah.

THE CHAIRMAN: Go over briefly. One is from the code enforcement officer which speaks, you know, is self-evident of condition of some of the garbage and junk and stuff strewn around the property. That's all going to disappear.

MR. PAPE: Yes. We acknowledge that

obligation, and we acknowledge receipt of that report, and we'll comply.

THE CHAIRMAN: And I believe one of the members also mentioned the fire hydrant in the rear of the building by Mr. Vigliotti, the construction official, is looking for that.

MR. PAPE: We'll have to make certain that we are consistent with the construction official and the fire marshal. We'll make sure that we have -- we'll make sure that we clarify their instructions, and we'll make sure that the fire hydrants satisfy both.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. I believe that that covers just about everything, Mr. Pape, so --

MR. PAPE: We have some utility --

THE CHAIRMAN: -- closing statement.

MR. PAPE: Mr. Chair, we had some utility letters that Mr. Schwartz worked with, water and sewer utility letters, and we will comply with all of those, too.

THE CHAIRMAN: Okay, and one last thing. When we have buildings of this age, we don't have any knowledge of it, if in the event that there is a fuel tank underground that disappeared over the course of the last 20 years or 30 years that suddenly pops up that you understand that you would have to comply with the environmental requirements for that.

MR. PAPE: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: In the same sense, if there's any asbestos on property that in the event of your demolition you expose it, that also has to be dealt with according to environmental codes.

MR. PAPE: Sure, and, Mr. Chair, I think that we should make the point that we will -- it's necessary for us to do the presence of asbestos inventory of the building before any demolition begins, and if asbestos is located that we have to properly remove it with permits.

MR. KIPP: Yeah, if I might add also, Chair, that's part of the demolition permit, too. They would have restrictions they would have to comply with.

THE CHAIRMAN: And oil tanks are included in that also, Mr. Kipp?

MR. KIPP: Yes, they are, if they're known.

THE CHAIRMAN: And again, we've been around the town long enough that sometimes they pop up and --

MR. WEINER: As long as, as Mr. Kipp indicates, that they are covered by the applicable ordinance process related to the permitting, then it's not necessary to add it as a condition because they're not going to get their permits if these issues pop up unless it's properly remediated, so we're covered that way and it doesn't need to be added as far as a condition.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good. Okay. Mr. Pape, did you want to have a summation?

MR. PAPE: Think we got to see if the public wants to have anything to say.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I apologize. We've been so efficient this evening, I neglected to think about the public. Thank you.

Mr. Blessing, do we have anybody on this call?

MR. BLESSING: We have no members of the public who are attending this meeting, no.

THE CHAIRMAN: Let's open -- so it's been opened to the public. There are no people from the public who wish to speak, so I'm going to officially close the public portion. Thank you for that.

Okay, Mr. Pape.

MR. PAPE: Yeah, first I'm going to say after such an efficient presentation by your applicant and such a thorough and detailed examination by the board, I'm disappointed that the public didn't get to see what it looks like, but I will say it is my privilege to be representing Mr. Tey and his family all these years. It is my privilege to present this improved plan to you. This is a substantial investment by the Tey family in their property.

I believe that the improvements are across the board. The site improvement are far superior to that which is there, a storm water plan that is modern that isn't currently in existence, a handsome building where currently you have a building that is aging and patched together, and the opportunity to bring a very high-quality business with high-quality jobs to the township are all part of what we ask.

For all of those reasons and with all of the conditions that this board has placed on the record, we respectfully ask the board to consider favorably the granting of the site plan approval and the variance relief as described in that application. Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, Mr. Pape. At this point, I will listen for a motion on this application.

MR. ARORA: I motion to approve.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arora.

MR. WEINER: Approved with the conditions, Mr. Arora?

MR. ARORA: Yes, with the conditions, yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Do we have a second?

MR. PEPE: I second it.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pepe, thank you.

Okay, at this point then, Mr. Blessing, if you could call the roll.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Arora.

MR. ARORA: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Wynter.

THE CHAIRMAN: Can't hear you, Ivan. You voted yes. I think that's what he's saying, yes, okay.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Pepe.

MR. PEPE: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Brandt.

MR. BRANDT: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Decker.

MS. DECKER: Yes.

MR. BLESSING: Miss Papi.

MS. PAPI: Yes. I vote yes for JB Cocoa, and I look forward to having that aroma. That's my favorite thing.

MR. BLESSING: Mr. Philips.

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Pape, having been on the board the last time and saw what you would do then, this is a significant improvement both in terms of the operation and the way it will be coordinated with the town and with the building site, and I am very happy to see the upgrade because what was there before and what still exists there is not exactly an effective operation. So I would say that what you have chosen to change from 2014 are all positive, and I look forward to the opportunity to have a thriving international business arrive onto Cotters Lane. So I will vote yes.

MR. PAPE: Thank you. Mr. Chairman, members of the board and professionals, to each and everyone of you, on behalf of Mr. Tey and personally, thank you. Thank you very much. And good night.

MR. KIPP: Thank you, Mr. Pape.

MR. PAPE: Thank you.

THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, board members.
We'll listen for a motion to adjourn.

MR. ARORA: I give the motion to
adjourn.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very good tonight, Arora.
We have a second from Mr. Brandt. All in favor.
Okay. So long, everybody.