7:11:47 PM - - DENNIS TOWNSHIP CONSOLIDATED LAND USE BOARD Regular Meeting - November 17, 2022 - 7:00 p.m.

> Attendance: Turner, McEvoy, Watson, Martucci, VanArtsdalen, Penrose, Cowan, Chambers, Walsh, Batastini, Fralinger

Applications:

MOOERS, JAMES AND DEBBIE - Block 67, Lot 31: Located on Fidler Road in a Pinelands Village (PV) district. Applicants seeking variance to build a pole barn in the front yard.

PIERSON-PLEASANTVILLE, LLC - Block 224, Lots 68.01, 73, 74.02, 75.03 and 78.04: Located on Woodbine-Ocean View Road in a Business District (B). Applicant seeking preliminary and final site plan approval, a use variance, bulk variances, waivers from subdivision and/or site plan standards and any and all waivers and/or approvals necessary to add ready mix concrete as an additional use associated with an existing gravel pit. (Continued from September 22, 2022.)

Other Business:

Correspondence.

Resolutions:

- Klebaur
- The Richard A. Hocker Revocable Trust and the Marcia A. Hocker Revocable Trust
- Ocean View Petroleum, LLC

Minutes: October 27, 2022

Bills:

Adjourn.

7:11:47 PM - - Start Recording

7:11:48 PM - - Walsh -call meeting to order 7:12:46 PM - - Walsh - first application James and Debbie Mooers 7:13:22 PM - - Walsh

7:13:26 PM - - Batastini -administer oath to Debbie and James Mooers, Jack Gibson and Michael Fralinger

7:14:01 PM - - Batastini - ask Mr. Mooers if anyone is there on their behalf 7:14:25 PM - - Mr. Mooer - no. Looking to retire, children are grown and wants place to hang-out, fix bikes and place to be. The fencing is to keep dog inside yard because he likes to run. Wants to put pole barn in front yard because no room in rear of property to put it. Front yard has about 600 feet of land between front of house and road and only about 100 feet in the rear. House can't be seen from road; pole barn wouldn't be directly in front of house, but off to side and probably about 300 feet from road; wouldn't be very visible from road.

7:17:57 PM - - Turner - offer to show survey on screen

7:18:10 PM - - Mr. Mooer - asked for survey to be shown.

7:18:27 PM - - Walsh - why not behind house

7:18:36 PM - - Mr. Mooers - not enough room

```
7:19:02 PM - - Batastini - would it be disturbing neighbors
7:19:23 PM -
               - Mr. Mooers - no problem for neighbors and they are in support
                 of it; there is a 110 service existing and would run that to
                 the pole barn. Will just be a place to hang out.
7:20:25 PM
              - Batastini - what will be in barn
              - Mr. Mooers - own a marina that is for sale and will have to
7:20:33 PM -
                 transition some items from the marina; also place for
                 grandchildren.
7:21:16 PM -
              - Batastini - ask for questions from the Board
7:21:30 PM -
              - Penrose - ask for description
7:21:38 PM -
              - Mr. Mooers - has looked at other pole barns in the area and
                 spoke with owners, one on Petersburg Road is about 30' X 40'
                 and using that as a reference because they like it.
7:22:47 PM
            - - Batastini - size?
              - Mooers - 36' X 24' would be sufficient, but if can be a bit
7:22:53 PM
                 larger that would be ok
7:23:34 PM - - Penrose - siding and roof
7:23:40 PM - - Mooers - ceiling height 14 feet; will be able to see from
                 street; would like to put a garden in as well as some plantings
7:25:04 PM - - Turner - use variance is checked on the application, but wants
                 to confirm that it is not
7:25:31 PM - - Batastini -
7:25:36 PM - - Fralinger - no use variance is required, but 2 others are
7:26:04 PM - - Turner -
7:26:08 PM - - Batastini - ask Board for further questions, none, ask
                 Fralinger for his report
7:26:27 PM -
              - Fralinger - engineer's report
7:27:27 PM -
              - Batastini - ask for questions from the public - none - close to
                 public; present form of motion approving application
7:29:13 PM -
               - Mooers - confirm that height to peak of roof probably 19 feet
                 with cupola on top; will be less than 25 feet, probably about
                 20 feet; cupola will be about 3 feet by 3 feet
7:30:33 PM
               - Batastini - re-start form of motion approving application - 36
                 X 24 pole barn with 2 overhangs each 12 feet; will be serviced
                 by electric; reasons for being in front yard, etc.
              - Turner - motion to approve
- Cowan - second
7:32:23 PM
7:32:29 PM
7:32:33 PM -
              - Roll call - all voting members in favor - motion passes.
7:34:30 PM - - Walsh - next application - Pierson-Pleasantville, LLC
7:35:15 PM - - Kevin Balistreri -
7:35:28 PM - - Batastini - believed that Balistreri had finished at last
                meeting
7:35:49 PM - - Balistreri - confirmed that he had finished at last meeting
7:36:04 PM - - Baldini - ask for certain exhibits to be entered into evidence
7:36:35 PM - - Balistreri - no objection
7:36:41 PM -
              - Batastini - will enter said exhibits; administered oath to Ms.
                Morrissey
7:37:23 PM -
              - Baldini - ask Morrissey to state her credentials as a planner
7:37:47 PM -
              - Morrissey - licensed professional planner in the State of New
                 Jersey; state her other credentials
7:38:38 PM -
              - Batastini - is familiar with Ms. Morrissey
              - Walsh - expert Morrissey as an expert
7:38:52 PM
7:39:03 PM
           - - Baldini - questions to Morrissey
           - - Morrissey - visited property and surrounding area, as well as
7:39:12 PM
                 documents submitted, Master Plan. This use would be in the
                 Business District (B). Reviewed variances being requested and
                 believes it can be considered as a conditional use. Referred
                 back to testimony. Addressed purposes of zoning for this
                 project and how this site complies. Described how she believes
                 this use is an accessory use; and mentioned other such similar
                 businesses in the State. Cited cases that were similar to this
                 and how the Court decided in their favor. Explained how this
                 site currently operates with respect to this site and how they
```

would do same on this site without the need to transport product to another site and back to this site again. Described other uses in the area - masonry business; construction, welding facility; Cape May County Public Works; and contractor storage area. One business also deals with concrete production. This property has an existing non-conforming use on it and the principle is to bring a non-conforming use into a more conforming use. Described the Diminishing Asset with respect to this property. Discussed why this proposed use on this site is appropriate and will not created additional impact. Proposed use is consistent with current use of property; provides business service to area; there is sufficient space; zone is intentioned for business use; not in a conservation zone; among others. Her professional opinion is that this project is an efficient use of the land and particularly suited to the property; is an accessory use and a use related to the surrounding land uses among other reasons and the positive criteria is satisfied. Discussed negative criteria - referred to 2012 Master Plan and proposed businesses permitted in the Business zone, as well as it's goals and objectives. Discuss why use variance is being requested, as well as other variances. Feels that the largest impact this project would have on site is the height, but it would not be the highest structure in the area and would not substantially impact as it could only be seen briefly in passing. Discussed traffic impact and that there would be no substantial impact from this facility. Noise studies were done and it was determined that there would be noise, but only for about 3 minutes when the material is being dumped into the trucks; would not be a continuous noise and would only be during daylight hours and not create any substantial impact. State reasons and benefits why this project should be permitted.

- 8:12:21 PM - Baldini cited cases that had been referred to in tesimony 8:13:47 PM - Batastini ask Baldini to follow up by email to him and Mr. Balistreri with that information
- 8:14:23 PM - Batastini had some technical difficulty during Ms.

 Morrissey's testimony and a portion of her testimony was not recorded, confirmed that her testimony was being recorded through the Township's system. Since it was being recorded on Township's system, should be all right.
- 8:16:44 PM - Batastini ask Board for questions of Morrissey none. Ask Mr. Balistreri for cross-examination.
- 8:17:21 PM - Balistreri questions to Morrissey
- 8:17:42 PM Morrissey respond to Balistreri regarding height; that prior applications included a recycling facility; good civic design and arrangement and creative development techniques apply here; public benefit helps with local businesses and able to serve more people due to the shelf-life of the product and time it takes to bring in from their other sites; agrees that there are other concrete plants in the area, but this project would provide competition and pricing; confirm that there is a difference between storing and using construction equipment.
- 8:27:34 PM Balistreri screen shared asked questions to Morrissey
 8:28:12 PM Morrissey responses to Balistreri questions believes this site is well-suited to uses existing and proposed; discussed Centers uses; referred to goals and uses section of 2012 Master Plan this site is in Business zone and doesn't intrude into any Residential zone; confirmed that a portion of the site is in an R-3 zone but the area being referred to for this project is in the middle of the Business zone. This is not a traditional use in the Diminishing Asset Theory. Confirm that application was presented with a D-1 variance request.
- 8:34:19 PM - Balistreri no further questions.

```
8:34:36 PM - - Baldini - says he is in compliance with the Court Rule
8:35:19 PM - - Balistreri -
8:35:26 PM - - Morrissey -
8:35:32 PM - - Batastini - ask Baldini if the has any other expert
8:35:45 PM - - Baldini - no, that is his case
8:35:54 PM - - Batastini - at this point coming back to Board; as Mr. Gibson
                to present the engineer's report
8:36:47 PM -
              - Gibson - engineer's report
8:41:16 PM - - Batastini - ask Board for questions of Gibson - none.
8:42:00 PM - - Batastini - ask Baldini if he is willing to agree to positions
                 of Gibson
               - Baldini - will to agree to Gibson's recommendations
8:42:26 PM
8:42:51 PM
               - Batastini - open to public; ask Balistreri if he wants to take
                 a break or jump in with any opposition
8:43:54 PM - - Balistreri - whatever the Board wants to do, but if there are
                 any other members of the public he would let them go first;
                 renewed his request regarding res judicata - doesn't believe
                 criteria met and would like to have addressed
8:45:46 PM -
               - Batastini - ask Balilstreri if he thinks it makes more sense to
                 bring this up after all testimony is completed
               - Balistreri - thought it may save some time to do it now, but
8:46:44 PM -
                 will do whatever the Board wishes
8:47:39 PM - - Batastini - believes it's best to make that decision after all
                 testimony finished - poll Board as to their thoughts; also
                 advise Balistreri that there may be some Board members who have
                 not heard all of the testimony regarding this application and
                 may have to listen to what missed.
               - Batastini - explain the meaning of res judicata - has
8:50:06 PM
                 application been substantially changed from previous
                 application to overcome the res judicata rule or is it similar
                 to previous application; doesn't think appropriate to address
                 now
8:54:42 PM -
               - Balistreri - willing to wait and also willing to submit a brief
                 if requested
8:55:14 PM -
               - Batastini - doesn't want to deny his request, but he can
                 withdraw request
              - Watson - do it at end
- Walsh - do it at end
8:55:45 PM -
8:55:56 PM -
8:56:06 PM - - Balistreri - will withdraw request
8:56:24 PM - - Batastini - ask it want to take short break or continue - take
                 10 minute break - come back at 9:05 p.m.
8:57:09 PM -
8:57:15 PM - - Pause
9:09:25 PM - - Resume
9:09:53 PM - - Roll call - all back
9:10:03 PM - - Batastini - back on the record - open to public - none.
9:10:43 PM -
              - Balistreri - Stoney 9 LLC is his client. There are tenants in
                 the property that are not his clients, but are opposed. Stoney
                 9 - Deborah Carr and Robert Carr are 50/50 owners of the LLC -
                 call his first
              - Paul Kerlinger - resident of Cape May, NJ -
9:13:11 PM -
9:13:45 PM -
              - Baldini - wants to make sure that anyone in favor will have an
                 opportunity to speak
9:14:16 PM - - Batastini - anyone in favor will have an opportunity to speak
           - - Batastini - ask if anyone in the public
9:14:34 PM

    - Batastini - administered oath to Dr. Kerlinger
    - Balistreri - questions to Dr. Kerlinger

9:14:56 PM
9:15:18 PM
9:15:37 PM - - Kerlinger - state his education, credentials and professional
                 background. Primarily studies birds and their habitat and
                 economics of birding; has testified for the State; has
                 published papers, books, articles, economic tourism regarding
                 same. Has done work for U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and
                 received recognition for his work; among other work and rewards
```

```
in Cape May County for eco-tourism, horseshoe crabs and red
                knots.
9:22:31 PM - - Baldini - submit that Kerlinger may be an expert in his area,
                but that expertise doesn't apply to this project.
9:23:20 PM - - Balistreri - disagrees with Baldini
9:23:40 PM - - Baldini - property has only a very small portion that is
                conservation and that area isn't relevant to this application
9:24:53 PM - - Balistreri - Dennis Township has a long history of protecting
                wildlife and habitats, believes entire property and all 3
                zoneson it must be considered
9:26:04 PM - - Baldini - this is a land use application and not a mining
               operation and should be brought up at that time
9:27:15 PM - - Balistreri -
9:27:58 PM - - Baldini -
9:28:05 PM - - Balistreri - testimony intends to show conservation impact on
                both the land use and the mining
9:29:00 PM - - Batastini - needs time to digest what both Baldini and
                Balistreri have said and decide who is right. Can take a break
                to allow him to do that, which will take probably at least a
                half hour or continue
              - Balistreri - would like Kerlinger qualified as an expert
9:30:10 PM
9:30:36 PM
              - Baldini - believes that Balistreri is trying to get Kerlinger
                qualified as an expert to add weight, but doesn't understand
                how Kerlinger's testimony applies and if he was a planner, he
                would understand.
9:32:43 PM
              - Balistreri - respond to Baldini - doesn't understand how
                Kerlinger's testimony isn't relevant
9:33:16 PM - - Baldini and Balistreri - back and forth on Kerlinger's
                qualification as expert and purpose of his testimony
9:34:13 PM - - Batastini - ask Balistreri if his client is within 200 feet
9:35:01 PM - - Balistreri - not sure, right across the street, can check on.
                Also apologize for not providing a CV for Dr. Kerlinger
9:35:44 PM -
              - Batastini -
9:35:59 PM
              - Baldini - in response to 200 foot question - they do not show
                up on the list
9:36:23 PM
              - Batastini - it is now 9:36 - can't possible answer question
               without looking at some case law.
9:36:45 PM
              - Balistreri - has no objection to continuing until the next
               meeting
9:37:12 PM -
              - Batastini - trying to make determination as to whether to
                continue now or not
9:37:35 PM -
              - Balistreri - not trying to be difficult, but Kerlinger has
               significant credentials and expertise
9:38:24 PM -
              - Batastini - Board can make its determination as to relevance
              - Balistreri - doesn't want to hold up, but thinks decision as to
9:38:40 PM -
                be made prior to his testimony; also has other experts he wants
                to call
9:39:42 PM -
              - Batastini - has to look into the matter - call for another 5
                minute recess and may be a bit longer or it may be held over to
                the next meeting.
9:40:35 PM - - Baldini - suggest proceeding with the objector's next witness
           - - Balistreri - ususally the planner does clean-up and the only
9:40:52 PM
                other expert he has available at this time is a planner
```

throughout his career - described several. Has also done work

9:41:57 PM - -

9:42:03 PM - - Pause 9:48:59 PM - - Resume

9:49:00 PM - - Batastini - Board will determine if Kerlinger qualifies as an expert

9:50:01 PM - - Roll call - all present

9:41:39 PM - - Batastini - will look into and get back

9:50:14 PM - - Batastini - Board will determine if Kerlinger qualifies as an expert

```
9:50:35 PM - - Walsh - how many times as he testified and recognized as an
                  expert in New Jersey in court and other
9:51:06 PM - - Kerlinger - 90 times - 8 in New Jersey
9:51:30 PM - - Walsh - any questions from Board for Kerlinger
9:51:46 PM - - VanArtsdalen - his relevancy to the case
9:52:15 PM - - Batastini - only way to know if his testimony is relevant to
                 the matter is to listent
9:52:45 PM -
               - Batastini - Kerlinger can continue
9:53:02 PM -
               - Balistreri - questions to Kerlinger
9:53:11 PM -
               - Kerlinger - respond to Balilstreri - familiar with site; backs
                 up to Great Cedar Swamp which is a unique site and recognized
                  for its white cedar, birds, and is protected wetlands.
9:55:50 PM -
               - Balistreri - refer to screen share and refer to copy of 1994
                 Master Plan (Balistreri having technical difficulty with Zoom,
                  logged off, waiting for him to log back on)
9:58:14 PM
               - Turner -
               - Balistreri - back on - refer to excerpt from 1994 Dennis
9:58:27 PM
                 Township Master Plan - read portion that had been highlighted
                  into the record. Asked for definition of "edge areas"
               - Kerlinger - basically it is a buffer area between roads and
10:00:13 PM -
                 other types of habitat; advise that area in question on the
                 subject site is an edge area; mentioned protected birds on the
                 list shown that reside there. Confirm that birds on the list
                 from 1994 are still using the Great Cedar Swamp as their
                 habitat. He also advised that some numbers have declined, some
                 have risen and others have been added, such as the bobcat.
                 Also read an excerpt regarding bird life and fauna - agrees
                 that area is unique and needs protection.
10:04:59 PM - - Balistreri - asked Kerlinger to read another excerpt regarding
                 natural resources into the record, which he did. Referred to
                 requirement contained in that Plan for an Environmental Impact
                 Study.
10:06:40 PM -
               - Kerlinger - confirmed that he had not seen an Environmental
                 Impact Study for this area.
10:07:06 PM -
               - Baldini - were all excerpts read from 1994
               - Balistreri - yes, all were from the 1994 Plan
10:07:24 PM -
10:07:39 PM -
               - Baldini - asked that they be entered as exhibits and that they
                 be provided to him
10:08:08 PM -
               - Balistreri - thought that they had been, but would confirm and
                 send again
10:08:36 PM - - Batastini - were they sent to the Board
10:08:51 PM - - Balistreri - yes, earlier today to the Secretary
10:09:22 PM - - Balistreri - refer to map showing area in question, including
                 the Great Cedar Swamp - questions to Kerlinger
10:09:57 PM -
              - Kerlinger - respond to Balistreri
10:10:06 PM -
              - Baldini - objects - has not seen document
              - Batlastreri - map and other documents were sent to the
10:10:29 PM -
                 Secretary
10:11:03 PM -
               - Baldini - would prefer that Kerlinger tell what he know or
                 doesn't know, feels that Balistreri is feeding him leading
                 questions
               - Batastini - thinks this may be the appropriate time to pick
10:11:43 PM -
                 this up in December since Baldini and the Board members haven't
                 seen all of this information being referred to
10:12:30 PM -
               - Baldini - if Kerlinger almost done, may as well
              - Batastini - as Balastreri how much longer
- Balestreri - thinks another 10 or 15 minutes - continue with
10:12:51 PM -
10:13:08 PM -
                 questioning Kerlinger
               - Kerlinger - respond to Balestreri - refer to map shown and
10:13:36 PM -
                 describe the Great Cedar Swamp area and location. Also, advised
                 that if area is destroyed, it can be restored but it takes
                 years. He believes if this application is approved, that the
                 noise, ruckess and trucks will affect the animals living in the
```

```
area. He also advised that he knew of no ecological benefits
                  to adding the concrete plant. He also testified as to
                  eco-tourism and birding in Cape May County and Dennis Township
                  and people don't go birding where there is dust, noise and
                  trucks. Birding is year-round, but mostly in the Spring and
                  Fall, which is the "shoulder" season for Cape May County.
10:22:07 PM -
               - Balistreri - read section from applicant's application
                 regarding no impact on endangered and threatened species
10:23:11 PM - - Kerlinger - doesn't agree that there will be no impact or
                 disturbance and that there will be significant disturbance
10:23:47 PM - - Batastini - ask Baldini for cross now or wait until next month 10:24:03 PM - - Baldini - will wait until December meeting
10:24:58 PM - - Batastini - matter will be continued to 12/22/22, no further
                 notice necessary and will pick up with cross-examination
10:25:38 PM - - Walsh - next up Resolutions
10:25:50 PM - - Batastini - Klebaur Resolution
10:26:56 PM - - Watson - motion to approve
10:27:08 PM - - Penrose - second
10:27:18 PM - - Roll call - all in favor
10:28:06 PM - - Batastini - Hocker Resolution
10:28:55 PM - - Cowan - motion to approve
10:29:11 PM - - Martucci - second
10:29:18 PM - - Roll call - all in favor
10:30:04 PM - - Batastini - Ocean View Petroleum - Resolution
10:31:32 PM - - Walsh - motion to approve
10:31:41 PM - - Cowan - second
10:31:46 PM - - Roll call - all in favor
10:32:26 PM - - Walsh - 10/27/22 minutes
10:32:40 PM - - Voice vote - all in favor
10:32:48 PM - - Walsh - bills
10:33:45 PM - - Turner - motion to pay bills
10:33:53 PM - - McEvoy - second
10:33:59 PM - - Roll call - all in favor
10:34:41 PM - - Walsh - no further business, meeting adjourned.
10:34:56 PM - -
10:35:04 PM - - Stop Recording
```