

ERIC S. GOLDBERG
DIRECT DIAL NUMBER
(609) 791-7013
E-MAIL
egoldberg@stark-stark.com
DIRECT FAX
609-895-7395

OFFICE: 993 LENOX DRIVE LAWRENCEVILLE, NJ 08648-2389

MAILING: PO BOX 5315 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-5315

609-896-9060 (PHONE) 609-896-0629 (FAX)

WWW.STARK-STARK.COM

October 27, 2022

Via Email Only (jgillespie@parkermccay.com)

John C. Gillespie, Esquire
Parker McCay
9000 Midlantic Drive, Suite 300
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054

Re: Chesterfield Township Committee October 27, 2022 – Hearing on Adoption of Redevelopment Plan

Dear John:

This will summarize our conversations over the last few days regarding the above referenced matter. I represent Save Old York, a 501c(4), that is in opposition to the proposed redevelopment plan.

At tonight's hearing, I have one witness to present, Carlos Rodrigues, a professional planner. As we discussed, each speaker will be limited to approximately 5 minutes. I understand that the Committee may allow an extra minute or so if the speaker is in mid-thought and raising a worthwhile issue. While I disagree that it is appropriate to limit expert testimony to just 5 minutes (in order to truly be heard in a meaningful way, an expert witness may need to speak for longer than 5 minutes), I acknowledge the Committee's rule for tonight that all speakers get allotted the same amount of time. There is no exception for expert testimony.

In lieu of Carlos providing his full testimony, which would be approximately 15-17 minutes, it was agreed that he will submit in writing what would have been his oral testimony. This written submission is attached and will become part of the record as if Carlos had provided his testimony in full tonight. Instead, Carlos will speak for about 5 minutes and provide some of the highlights of the attached written testimony.

You had indicated that it is not the policy of the Committee for this hearing to mark the written submission as an exhibit, but rather, you will just note that it is part of the official record of tonight's hearing. This email is sufficient, and there is no need to physically present this attachment tonight.

Both Carlos and I will be virtual tonight and the intent is that you will see about the possibility of introducing me at the start of public participation. At that point, I would give a very brief introduction and then call Carlos to testify. Regarding Carlos' qualifications, he will simply note that he is a licensed planner. There is no need to spend his allotted time reviewing professional credentials, there is no voir dire and he will automatically be deemed to be accepted by the Committee as a professional land planner. After Carlos, any other interested parties would be given an opportunity to be heard.

If you have any questions, please feel free to call me on my land line or cell phone. Thank you for your time this week to discuss the procedural rules for tonight.

Very truly yours,

STARK & STARK
A Professional Corporation

By: Eric S. Goldberg
ERIC S. GOLDBERG

ESG/bmc
Enclosure

**Chesterfield Town Council 10/27/2022 – Hearing on Redevelopment Plan for Old York
Country Club**

Testimony from Carlos Rodrigues, FAICP / PP

PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS

Master's in City and Regional Planning, Rutgers University 1982
Licensed Professional Planner in New Jersey
Past President of New Jersey Chapter of American Planning Association
Former Faculty in Graduate Planning Program, Rutgers University
Visiting Lecturer in Planning, Columbia University and Princeton University
Editor, 4th Edition, Complete Guide to Planning in New Jersey

MASTER PLAN CONSISTENCY

The stated purpose of tonight's hearing is to consider the Planning Board's determination of whether the proposed Redevelopment Plan for the Old York Country Club (hereinafter OYCC) property is "not inconsistent with the town's Master Plan", and presumably to adopt said plan.

The actual language in the statute requires a determination of the proposed Plan's "relationship to definite local objectives as to appropriate land uses, density of population, and improved traffic and public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities and other public improvements" (NJSA 40A:12A-7(1), as well as "any significant relationship of the redevelopment plan to (a) the master plans of contiguous municipalities, (b) the master plan of the county in which the municipality is located, and (c) the State Development and Redevelopment Plan" (NJSA 40A:12A-7(5).

With respect to the question of the consistency with the local Master Plan, the Redevelopment Plan clearly admits, at page 17, that "the closure of the Old York Country Club was not anticipated at the time of the most recent Master Plan Reexamination Report in 2017. As a result, the Master Plan does not provide any specific recommendations regarding the potential redevelopment of the property".

The Redevelopment Plan tries to dance around this obvious inconsistency by stating that "However, the development of the Rehabilitation Area with a warehouse facility is not inconsistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan. The primary goals of the Township's Master Plan are the preservation of the agricultural industry, and the protection of the rural character of the community. This Redevelopment Plan does not

remove any active farmland from productive use, nor is this property targeted for agricultural use or preservation”.

The reality is very different. The OYCC lands are shown as agricultural in the Master Plan’s land use plan map, and are zoned for agriculture in the town’s zoning map. Could the Planning Board and the town be sending any clearer a signal that if the land use is going to change, it should change according to the Master Plan and the zoning, ie revert to agricultural? While the proposed Redevelopment Plan would not remove any active farmland from productive use, it would, if adopted and implemented, remove land that could be farmland, and that is zoned for agricultural uses, and replace that with a completely foreign and unrelated use, that is not anticipated in the Master Plan.

Significantly, nowhere in the 2017 Master Plan Reexamination Report is there a discussion of warehouse / distribution facilities or any similar type of large footprint commercial uses as being appropriate for this town, with one very narrow exception. The Master Plan simply does not contemplate any type of big box, large footprint, heavy vehicle intensive uses on lands zoned for agricultural uses anywhere in town. Period.

The Master Plan Reexamination Report goes on to state that “Chesterfield Township is unique among rural municipalities in New Jersey. It is not because of its size, wealth, population characteristics, or natural resources. [...] What does make Chesterfield different is the bold leadership, vision, and persistence of this municipality to successfully craft an equitable alternative to conventional “sprawl” development.

What better poster child for conventional sprawl development than a giant warehouse on land zoned for agriculture in the middle of nowhere? Access to two county roads, that eventually lead to Route 206 and ultimately to the NJ Turnpike does not make this site appropriate for the uses proposed in the Redevelopment Plan.

The Redevelopment Plan also states that “the setbacks and buffering required shall serve to maintain a rural aesthetic on Old York Road and Bordentown-Georgetown Road”, that “the operations of such a facility will generate minimal truck traffic impacts on local roadways in Chesterfield”, and that “the size and shape of the property allow for substantial setbacks and buffering of the facility to minimize visual impacts to the character of the community”.

“Minimal truck traffic impacts on local roadways?” “Minimize visual impacts to the character of the community?” What planet are we on? Anyone with any experience of

large warehouse uses knows that these statements are completely baseless and gratuitous.

The Redevelopment Plan would also allow up to 10,000 sq ft of retail at this location. Does anyone think this is a good location for retail – again, in the middle of nowhere?

The Master Plan Reexamination Report speaks eloquently of a town that was once the toast of New Jersey’s planning circles, for implementing the most robust Transfer of Development Rights program in the state and committing to both preserving its rural character and accommodating equitable growth. That model is the exact opposite of the model which is being promoted tonight – an opportunistic grab at a future ratable that tramples on every planning principle embodied in your planning documents.

Until recently, Chesterfield was on a very different track – in 2015 the town rezoned lands in the OP – Office Park district to Agricultural. The Master Plan Reexamination Report clearly states that “the central goal of the Chesterfield Township Master Plan is to promote the industry of agriculture”. The same report discusses a number of actions pertaining to historic preservation, farmland preservation, Transfer of Development Rights, school facilities, bicycle / pedestrian planning and conformance w/ the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (hereinafter State Plan). Not even a peep about warehouses.

The zoning for large-scale warehouse distribution facilities is a “race to the bottom” that is unfortunately afflicting many towns in New Jersey, including many rural towns. The zoning for these facilities is never accompanied with appropriate investments in road infrastructure, with the result that many small rural or semi-rural communities are literally overwhelmed with truck traffic. A number of communities, including nearby communities, have straight out changed their zoning recently to eliminate warehousing as a permitted use. Chesterfield does not need to go down that road, because it currently allows warehouses as a permitted use only in a very limited area – the Office Park (OP) district – next to the New Jersey Turnpike – unless this Redevelopment Plan is approved.

STATE PLAN CONSISTENCY

The Redevelopment Plan claims that it is consistent with the 2001 New Jersey State Plan. The site in question is mapped largely as Planning Area 4 (PA4) -- Agricultural Planning Area, with a small portion in the Planning Area 2 (PA2) – Suburban Planning Area.

The delineation criteria for PA4 are (a) population density of less than 1,000 people per sq mile; (b) area greater than 1 sq mile; (c) land currently in agricultural or natural resource production or having a strong potential for production; and (d) undeveloped wooded tracts; vacant lands; large, contiguous tracts of agricultural lands; and other areas outside Centers predominantly served by rural two-lane roads and individual wells and septic systems. In other words, lands similar to the site in question.

The stated goals of the State Plan for land use in PA-4 are to: “Enhance economic and agricultural viability and rural character by guiding development and redevelopment into Centers. In the Environs (which is where this site is located) maintain and enhance agricultural uses, and preserve agricultural and other lands to form large contiguous areas and green belts around Centers. [...] Development and redevelopment in the Environs should maintain or enhance the character of the area.”

The Redevelopment Plan claims that “The redevelopment and rehabilitation activities envisioned in this Redevelopment Plan will advance the intent and goals of PA-4 and PA-2. By redeveloping an already improved site with existing on-site wastewater disposal and infrastructure, the redevelopment project will not encroach upon valuable agricultural or other open space lands. Moreover, the envisioned development is compatible with the surrounding land use character and takes advantage of access to major transportation routes. As such, a redevelopment project promoted by this Redevelopment Plan can also bring off-farm economic development opportunities to support the nearby rural communities.

It is also misleading to characterize the OYCC site as one with “existing on-site wastewater disposal and infrastructure”. The OYCC facility has a modest septic system capable of handling the needs of the small clubhouse, and sufficient well water for the club house and watering of the golf course. The water and sewer needs of the proposed warehouse facility are of much larger magnitude.

The reality is that the Redevelopment Plan completely mischaracterizes the intent of PA4. Nowhere in the section of the State Plan dealing w/PA4 does it say that random warehouse / distribution facilities are encouraged in the middle of nowhere. In fact, there is no mention of warehouse / distribution centers anywhere in the section on PA4. Such a facility might make sense if located in a designated Center, with adequate public water and sewer, and preferably associated with local agriculture or industry. This site has none of those traits. The Redevelopment Plan is patently inconsistent with the State Plan.

Furthermore, the State Planning Commission recently released a guidance document advising municipalities on appropriate locations for zoning for warehouse facilities. The OYCC site does not meet the stated location requirements.

WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT PLAN (WQMP) CONSISTENCY

The Redevelopment Plan is also plainly inconsistent with the WQMP for the area, and with multiple NJDEP regulations, as stated clearly in the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection – Bureau of Watershed and Land Management letter to Active Acquisitions OY, LLC -- the prospective developers of the site, dated 7/15/2022, rejecting the prospective developer’s application, and referencing the 5/6/2022 denial of a requested site-specific amendment to the Tri-County WQMP.

This should not come as a surprise, since the State of New Jersey’s intent has for many years been to align the provisions of the State Plan with the WQMP provisions. Sewer service areas are intended to service Centers, not the Environs, where this site is located. Allowing sewer service areas outside of Centers enables sprawl. The State Plan is the State of New Jersey’s anti-sprawl blueprint, and the WQMP process is meant to reinforce it. The same approach is clearly embodied in your Master Plan, as described previously, which equally abhors sprawl.

So all in all, I would have to say that what is being proposed is completely inconsistent with the mainstream planning policies embodied in the town’s Master Plan, the State Plan and the State’s WQMP regulations. And that’s all I really have to say about consistency tonight.

I would, however, like to make some additional observations regarding what I perceive to be a blatant misuse of the redevelopment statute.

This Redevelopment Plan is proposed for a site that was designated as an “Area in Need of Rehabilitation”, on the basis of what I found to be a very specious Preliminary Investigation. There was literally no basis for designating the site as an “area in need of redevelopment”, no matter how hard one tried to stretch the meaning of the various criteria. So the site was designated as an “area in need of rehabilitation’. We now have a Redevelopment Plan that proposes the wholesale redevelopment of the site, with no rehabilitation whatsoever, except for the tiny “black house”.

Let’s look at this situation more closely. The redevelopment statute offers two distinct paths for a town to more forcefully intervene in the land use arena: rehabilitation and redevelopment. The criteria for designating such areas are distinct and the motivation

for their designation is, I believe, also distinct. While both types of areas are implemented through “redevelopment plans”, the objectives of each plan are distinct, although they may overlap to an extent. And while condemnation is not authorized in areas in need of rehabilitation, we also have non-condemnation redevelopment areas. So why would the Legislature go to the trouble of setting up a process with these two, distinct paths?

Rehabilitation is defined in the statute (NJSA 40A:12A-3) as meaning “an undertaking, by means of extensive repair, reconstruction or renovation of existing structures, with or without the introduction of new construction or the enlargement of existing structures [...] to eliminate substandard structural or housing conditions and arrest the deterioration of that area.”

It is clear to me that, in setting up these two distinct mechanisms, the Legislature intended to distinguish between situations that would primarily call for the rehabilitation of existing structures (the “repair, reconstruction or renovation” previously mentioned) – which appropriately constitute “rehabilitation” – from situations that might call for extensive demolition, land assemblage, possibly condemnation – what is commonly referred to as “redevelopment” with a capital R.

In addition, there is every reason to believe that what is being proposed is a clear example of what is known as “fiscal zoning”, that is, the use of zoning to pursue fiscal objectives, in defiance of what the adopted Master Plan would recommend. Fiscal zoning is not legally authorized in New Jersey, under either the Municipal Land Use Law or the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law and the courts have repeatedly made that clear. The fact that the proposed zoning opens the door for cannabis cultivation on the site is very troubling, from this perspective.

The complete and total lack of a planning basis for rezoning this property from agricultural to commercial is clearly driven by a naked desire to maximize fiscal revenues for the town, as well as to maximize profit potential for one and only one prospective developer, a practice known as “spot zoning”, which is also expressly illegal in New Jersey. The Redevelopment Plan will create a new zoning designation that will be unique to this property, that will allow for uses that are not permitted anywhere else in town, and that are entirely unsupported by the town’s planning documents. That constitutes a textbook case of spot zoning.

The 5/26/2022 meeting minutes of the Township Committee (see Attachment A) clearly indicate that fiscal considerations are first and foremost in the town’s

deliberations regarding this property. The adoption of the proposed Redevelopment Plan will constitute a transparent attempt to use the redevelopment statute to benefit a single property and a single developer in exchange for the prospect of enhanced fiscal revenues for the town, to the detriment of the town's entire planning framework.

So in my opinion, if this Redevelopment Plan is adopted, the town will be going down an uncharted and rather risky road, and in violation of multiple provisions of both the Municipal Land Use Law and the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, with unpredictable and possibly unpleasant consequences.

Thank you for your consideration. I am happy to answer any questions you might have.

Attachment A
Chesterfield Township Committee Meeting Minutes for 5/26/2022

CHESTERFIELD TOWNSHIP REGULAR SESSION MAY 26, 2022

The Township Committee met on the above date in the Municipal Complex, 295 Bordentown-Chesterfield Road, Chesterfield, New Jersey. The meeting was called to order by Mayor Panfili at 6:30 p.m. followed by a flag salute and moment of silence.

ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Present: Belinda Blazic, Denise Koetas-Dale, Michael Russo and Mayor Lee Panfili.

Absent: Jeremy Liedtka

Also present: Thomas A. Sahol, Township Administrator; George Morris, Township Attorney; Joseph Hirsh, Township Engineer; Caryn M. Hoyer, Township Clerk; Rachel Fryc, Deputy Clerk, Chief of Police Michael Davison and Troy Ulshafer, Public Works Foreman.

The Open Public Meetings Act Statement was read and compliance noted.

AGENDA MATTER(S) REQUIRING RECUSAL(S)

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Mr. Russo made a motion seconded by Ms. Blazic to approve the May 12th minutes. Voice vote – All ayes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS PERTAINING TO MATTERS ON THE AGENDA

Mr. Russo made a motion to open to public seconded by Ms. Koetas-Dale. All were in favor.

Susie Mahon, 16 Chest-Crosswicks Rd. asked if the ordinance regarding solar panels that is on for introduction tonight has to do with the HPC handling of solar panels in the historic district. Mayor Panfili replied yes.

Agnus Marsala, 42 Crowell Drive asked where on the Township website she can find Resolution 2022-5-9. Ms. Hoyer replied that the resolutions are not on the website until they are adopted.

Mr. Russo made a motion to close public comment seconded by Ms. Blazic. All were in favor.

ORDINANCES FOR INTRODUCTION

ORDINANCE 2022-9

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 130 OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD RELATING TO SOLAR ENERGY FACILITIES OR STRUCTURES

Motion by Ms. Koetas-Dale seconded by Ms. Blazic to introduce Ordinance 2022-9. Voice vote – All Ayes. The public hearing for this ordinance will be at the Township Committee meeting on June 23rd

ORDINANCES FOR ADOPTION

ORDINANCE 2022-8

AN ORDINANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD AMENDING CHAPTER 183 OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD TO ESTABLISH PARKING RESTRICTIONS ON PORTIONS OF WRIGHT DRIVE AND THORN LANE

Motion by Ms. Koetas-Dale seconded by Mr. Russo to open the meeting to public comment on Ordinance 2022-8. Hearing no comments, Mr. Russo made a motion seconded by Ms. Blazic to close public comment. Motion by Mr. Russo seconded by Ms. Blazic to adopt Ordinance 2022-8. All were in favor.

RESOLUTIONS

Ms. Koetas-Dale made a motion seconded by Mr. Russo to approve Resolution 2022-5-5. Voice vote – All Ayes

RESOLUTION 2022-5-4

RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING THE TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD AS A STIGMA-FREE ZONE FOR MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS

Mr. Russo made a motion seconded by Ms. Koetas-Dale to approve Resolution 2022-5-5. Voice vote - All Ayes

RESOLUTION 2022-5-5

RESOLUTION AWARDING CONTRACT FOR RESURFACING OF WHITE PINE ROAD NJDOT FY2021 PROJECT

Ms. Blazic made a motion seconded by Mr. Russo to approve Resolution 2022-5-6. Voice vote – All Ayes

RESOLUTION 2022-5-6

RESOLUTION AWARDING CONTRACT FOR THE PICKLEBALL COURT PROJECT AT FENTON LANE PARK

Ms. Koetas-Dale made a motion seconded by Ms. Blazic to approve Resolution 2022-5-7. Voice vote – All Ayes

RESOLUTION 2022-5-7

RESOLUTION REJECTING BID FOR CURB RAMP IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Mr. Russo made a motion seconded by Ms. Koetas-Dale to approve Resolution 2022-5-8. Voice vote – All Ayes

RESOLUTION 2022-5-8

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONVEYANCE OF DUTY PISTOL TO RETIRED CHESTERFIELD TOWNSHIP POLICE PATROLMAN MARVIN AMES

Mr. Russo made a motion seconded by Ms. Koetas-Dale to approve Resolution 2022-5-9 and Resolution 5-10. Voice vote – All Ayes

Ms. Koetas-Dale thanked Sherri Dudas for writing the Sustainable Jersey Grant.

RESOLUTION 2022-5-9

RESOLUTION REQUESTING APPROVAL OF ITEMS OF REVENUE AND APPROPRIATION UNDER N.J.S.A. 40 A:4-87 FOR SUSTAINABLE JERSEY GRANT FUNDED BY THE PSE&G FOUNDATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$10,000 IN THE 2022 MUNICIPAL BUDGET

RESOLUTION 2022-5-10

RESOLUTION REQUESTING APPROVAL OF ITEMS OF REVENUE AND APPROPRIATION UNDER N.J.S.A. 40 A:4-87 FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$75,000 IN THE 2022 MUNICIPAL BUDGET

Ms. Koetas-Dale made a motion seconded by Ms. Blazic to approve Resolution 2022-5-11. Voice vote – All Ayes

RESOLUTION 2022-5-11

RESOLUTION APPOINTING HAILEY MARIE SIMMONS TO THE POSITION OF ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT

TREASURERS BILL LIST

Mr. Russo made a motion seconded by Ms. Blazic to approve the bill list. Voice vote – All Ayes

REPORTS & DISCUSSION

Mayor Panfili addressed the Township Committee stating he has spent the last two weeks analyzing a lot of data from the reports that were presented from the Township Auditors. He has asked Mr. Sahol to run multiple reports and to educate him on the budget. Mayor Panfili received a phone call from another committee member questioning some of the assumptions made in the financial analysis. Mayor Panfili stated that there are two assumptions that he felt were understated in the forecasted statement of revenue regarding the Bentley parcel and Saddle Way area abatements. He agrees that the assumptions are valid. He was surprised that after running two scenarios, one with the warehouse and one without the warehouse, that the scenario with the warehouse only delayed the referendum by two years. He stated we will not reap the benefits of added assessments this year as we have in the past according to the tax assessor. Mayor Panfili said that worst case scenario, three years from now our surplus will be exhausted to the point where we will be about \$1.1 million short to pay our bills and we will need to go out

to referendum. We need to figure out how to create some form of revenue for the town. Mr. Sahol stated that the town is overdue for a revaluation which is anticipated to be done by 2025.

Mayor Panfili reported that he has identified six potential areas in the town that could potentially create revenue. They are: (1) Saddle Way (2) Liquor License (3) OYCC (4) Cannabis (5) Northwest portion of town owned by the State (6) Rt. 537 (WAWA). Ms. Koetas-Dale stated that she was the committee person that called the Mayor. She stated she spoke at length with the Auditor and feels that the Mayor's assessment is accurate. Mayor Panfili stated that the Township Committee needs to consider OYCC's proposed warehouse. Mayor Panfili asked for a motion that we publish the financial analysis on the Township website. Ms. Blazic made the motion seconded by Mr. Russo. Roll Call: YEAS: Blazic, Koetas-Dale, Russo and Panfili. Mayor Panfili also asked that the scenarios be posted on the website prior to the next meeting. Mr. Sahol suggested that the Auditor and Mr. McMahon look at them first.

Mayor stated for the public record the financial analysis states that in 3 years at the current rate of spending the budget surplus will run out approximately 2024-2025 at which time we would need to raise \$1.1 million via referendum. Historically, referendums do not pass. Mayor Panfili suggests the Township Committee and Economic Advisory Board start looking at all options immediately. All were in agreement. Mr. Sahol stated that when we go out to referendum the Police, EMS and services in the development will be among the first items to cut if it does not pass.

Ms. Koetas-Dale asked that we get the school's weigh in as well on how it may affect the school funding based on the assumptions. Ms. Blazic reported that as of today, the school receives \$43,000 annually from the taxes on OYCC today. If there was development at OYCC, the school will receive \$1.2 million annually. Ms. Blazic said that we are the highest tax payers in Burlington County with only 3% of our taxes coming from ratables. She stated we need ratables and cannabis is beneficial and should be considered. Mayor Panfili told the Committee the budget needs to be a topic at every meeting until we have it figured out. He also said that there is one entity out there and we need to start talking with them and have an open mind.

Administration – Mr. Sahol reported that we are down two staff members and thanked the Township Committee for their patience.

New Business – Juneteenth Celebration in Crosswicks at the AME Church will happen again this year on June 18th reported Mayor Panfili.

Old Business – Mayor Panfili attended a cultural festival in Chesterfield this past month where he spoke at length with County Commissioner Singh regarding the need for a round-a-bout at Chesterfield-Crosswicks Road and Old York Road. He will continue to reach out to the County. Ms. Koetas-Dale will contact the County as well.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Panfili reminded the public that all public comments will be limited to 3 minutes per speaker.

Ms. Koetas-Dale made a motion seconded by Mr. Russo to open the meeting to the public. All were in favor.

Dawn Donahue, 79 Bordentown-Chesterfield Road said that we need more ratables in town. She does not want to lose our Public Works or Police departments to a referendum. Ms. Donahue asked the governing body to oppose the "Big Dog" bill. Mayor Panfili asked Ms. Donahue to send him information on the current bill so they can write a resolution opposing the bill. He stated he is in agreement with her and will write a personal letter if needed.

Brett Anderson, 62 Brookdale Way thanked Sherri Dudas for all of her hard work on the Sustainable Jersey Grant. He suggests that the Township hire professionals to look at the full analysis of the projects in town. Mr. Anderson stated that even if the warehouse is approved the referendum will be delayed but still necessary. He says that the developer's presentation has a lot of inaccurate facts and figures and that the Township is responsible to conduct an independent analysis. Ms. Koetas-Dale agrees with Mr. Anderson that the Township Committee should look at the full financial picture. Ms. Sahol stated the community impact is something the developer would pay for not the tax payer.

John Kelly, 40 White Pine Road said that the town has no other choice but to allow the warehouse to be built in order for the town to survive.

Lorrie Thier, 40 Foulkes Lane said that Amazon warehouses are closing down and they will sit empty. She asked that the Township look at what the cost implications will be if we build a warehouse and it is never occupied. She asks that this gets put into our analysis. She wants the community to be involved when the Township Committee is looking into future projects and strongly urges the governing body to find out what the residents want and what they are willing to give up.

Jim Codella, 47 Main Street said that in order to make a dent in the budget the town will need more than one warehouse. This first warehouse is out of sight and even if we build one warehouse the town will still need to go out to referendum in the next couple of years.

A motion to close public comment was made by Mr. Russo and seconded by Ms. Blazic. All were in favor.

Mr. Russo has noticed that people are mowing their lawns and blowing the grass into the street. He says this is a safety issue for motor cycle riders and it also causes issues with the storm drains. Mr. Sahol will look into this further.

Mayor Panfili said that he had the honor of attending a military ceremony last week for a fallen veteran. It was very humbling and reminds us how lucky we are.

A motion to adjourn the meeting was made Ms. Blazic and seconded by Mr. Russo. All were in favor. Meeting Adjourned at 7:43 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Caryn M. Hoyer, RMC
Township Clerk