



You couldn't pick a better place.

PLANNING BOARD
Tuesday, February 20, 2018
APPROVED MINUTES

OPENING: The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Hugh Dougherty at 7:39 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Hugh Dougherty.

OPMA STATEMENT: Read by Hugh Dougherty in compliance with the Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL

- **Members in attendance:** Betty Adler; Kevin McCormack; Carolyn Jacobs; Hugh Dougherty; Marlyn Kalitan; Sam Kates; Moly Hung; and Sheila Griffith.
- **Professionals in attendance:** Lorissa Luciani, PP, AICP, Director of Planning; James Burns, Esq., Solicitor; Jacob Richman, PP, AICP, Planner; and Stacey Arcari, PE, Planning Board Engineer.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Adoption Meeting Minutes from February 5, 2018. Carolyn Jacobs made a motion, which was seconded by Sam Kates, to adopt the Meeting Minutes from February 5, 2018. Affirmative votes by Adler, Jacobs, Hung, Kates, Kalitan, and Griffith. Minutes are approved.

Agenda Item 1:

17-P-0038

Block(s) 148.01 Lot(s) 13

Zone: Highway Business (B2) Zone

Relief Requested: A preliminary and final major site plan with bulk (C) variances to construct a 3,512 SF restaurant (First Watch) along with various site and signage improvements.

Jay Several (First Watch)

1012 Haddonfield Road

Cherry Hill, NJ

Applicant's Representatives: Don Ryan, Esq. – Applicant's Attorney; Jay Several – Applicant; Bruce Belskey – Director of Real Estate Mid-Atlantic Region for First Watch; John Pettit, PE, PP – Applicant's Engineer & Planner; and Nathan Mosley, PTOE – Applicant's Traffic Engineer.

Exhibits Submitted: A-1: Presentation Plan.

Mr. Ryan introduced the application for the proposed First Watch restaurant and gave a brief overview of the proposed site improvements. Mr. Ryan noted the pending issues regarding Camden County Planning Board's recently submitted review letter with regard to the driveways and access to the site from Haddonfield Road.

Mr. Mosley submitted Exhibit A-1 and indicated the location of the two existing driveways to the subject site. Mr. Mosley stated that the applicant's current plan proposes two (2) full access drives with internal two-way circulation. Mr. Mosley explained that a recent review of the application by Camden County, who has jurisdiction over the Haddonfield Road right-of-way, brought up concerns about left turn conflicts and therefore they are more in support of an inbound only southern driveway and an outbound only northern driveway. Ms. Mosley stated that their review is not yet complete; however, such a determination would mean the applicant would have to alter the plans to accommodate that type of circulation pattern. A discussion ensued regarding how such a County determination would affect and/or change the internal traffic flow. Mr. Pettit stated that the applicant considered a "return lane" in front of the proposed restaurant; however, it was deemed to not be feasible as the applicant would require significant variance relief, particularly with the required residential buffer and parking setbacks. Ms. Luciani stated that the Department of Community Development does not support the County's proposed access plans. Mr. Several noted that they discussed the circulation issue with the County weeks ago and based upon that prior conversation the applicant amended their plans for a one-way access plan to a two-way access plan with two (2) full movement driveways. Subsequently, explained Mr. Several, the County's consultant traffic engineer, Maser Consulting, issued a follow-up review letter on February 19th stating they preferred a one-way circulation pattern.

Ms. Luciani noted the Board's jurisdictional issue in that any approval the Board may grant is conditioned upon County approval; therefore, any significant change needed in the site plan due to the County's review would require the applicant to come back to the Board for new approvals, particularly if such a determination by the County would necessitate the need for substantial site plan changes. A discussion ensued about the viability of the application and it was determined that testimony could proceed subject to the understanding that depending upon the County's determinations, the applicant may have to come back to the Board with a revised site plan. Ms. Luciani noted that ultimately the Department of Community Development would make the call in regard to whether any changes in the site plan would constitute a substantive change requiring the need to reappear before the Board. If a substantive change is not required to the site plan, the application may not have to reappear before the Board.

Mr. Several described the operations of the proposed First Watch restaurant which is a breakfast, brunch, and lunch restaurant only. Hours of operations are from 7am to 2:30pm everyday with 12 to 14 employees on the maximum work shift. Eight (8) to eleven (11) deliveries will be made per week which will occur after the business is closed, from 2:30pm until the early evening by way of box trucks and WB-40's. The restaurant is proposed to have 122 seats inside and 16 seats outside. Mr. Several noted that prototype First Watch restaurants have signage on the front and sides of the building and that their tagline notes "Breakfast Brunch Lunch" along with their name and logo. Mr. Belskey noted the progression of First Watch's expansion in the mid-Atlantic area. Mr. Belskey expects 488 customers throughout each day and also detailed First Watch's community outreach efforts.

Mr. Pettit reiterated the proposal for a 3,500 SF restaurant with various site and signage improvements including sixty (60) parking spaces and access improvements to the site. Mr. Pettit noted the applicant proposed decorative concrete at the entrances, new buffer fencing, and new landscaping and lighting. Mr. Pettit stated that the applicant intends to convert the existing pole-mounted sign into a monument sign. Mr. Pettit noted that reduction in lot coverage; however, the applicant still requires a variance as the coverage still exceeds the maximum permitted. Mr. Pettit stated that the applicant's updated plans have eliminate the need for variances for right-of-way parking, residential parking, and residential buffer setbacks; however, they still require a variance for non-residential parking setback as 4.5' is proposed where 5' is required. A discussion ensued about ways to eliminate the variance; however, it was determined that such a request is de-minimus.

Mr. Pettit discussed the proposed signage and related variance requests. Mr. Pettit stated that he believes all proposed signs are necessary and noted that while the monument sign requires a variance for its location, it is more aesthetically pleasing than a pole-mounted sign. A discussion ensued amongst some Board members with regard to the need for a second façade sign on the principal frontage and Mr. Pettit stated that in addition to it providing branding for a company new to the area, it is also architecturally pleasing. Mr. Belskey confirmed other First Watch locations have this branding on their buildings. A discussion ensued regarding the size of the façade signs and what size would be permitted. Mr. Pettit noted that the Zoning Ordinance would permit 135 SF of sign text on the principal façade; and that the applicant only proposed 128 SF of sign text total on the facades (north, south, and west) combined. Mr. Pettit opined that the façade signs on the non-principal frontages are appropriate for the speed of the road as well as for visibility and identification purposes. Mr. Pettit clarified that the sign text area of the proposed monument sign would comply with the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Pettit went through the Department of Community Development's and the Planning Board Engineer's review letters and noted what waivers were still being requested and what is being eliminated. Lastly, Mr. Pettit stated he will work with the Department of Community Development on an appropriate material type for the base of the proposed monument sign.

Mr. Mosley gave an overview of the traffic assessment and a discussion ensued regarding traffic gaps created by nearby signalized intersections. Mr. Mosley stated that he believes this plan proposal facilitates the safest access and circulation patterns to, through, and from the site.

Public Discussion: Ms. Mary Ellen Kern of 1011 Mercer Street questioned why a County official is not represented on the Planning Board. Solicitor Burns stated that the County has their own meetings and Ms. Luciani added that the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) does not provide for a County representative to sit on local Boards as they are governed under separate. Ms. Luciani noted, however, that the Township does coordinate with the County on projects where the County has jurisdiction. Ms. Kern asked whether any trees would be cut down and Mr. Several stated that only those in the front and sides of the building would come down.

Motion: Following the reiteration of the conditions by Solicitor Burns, Moly Hung made a motion, which was seconded by Sam Kates, to approve the application. Affirmative votes by Adler, McCormack, Jacobs, Dougherty, Hung, Kates, Kalitan, and Griffith. The application is approved.

Resolutions:

None.

Meeting Adjourned: at 9:15 PM.

ADOPTED: 3/5/18



SAMUEL KATES
ACTING CHAIRMAN

ATTEST:



LORISSA LUCIANI, PR, AICP
PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY