

**BOROUGH OF FOLSOM
PLANNING/ZONING
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS
MINUTES**

January 19, 2022

CALL MEETING TO ORDER: 7:02 PM

SALUTE TO THE FLAG:

CERTIFICATION: Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act pursuant to Public Law 1975, Chapter 231. Said notice has been advertised in the Hammonton Gazette and is posted on the bulletin board showing the time and place for the meeting.

OATHS OF OFFICE: Appointments and Re-appointments for Board members as follows:

Jim Hoffman – Class III – Term Expires 12-31-2022
Dave Cappuccio – Class IV – Term Expires 12-31-2025
Mike Sutts – Class IV – Term Expires 12-31-2025
Leslie Roberson – Class IV – Term Expires 12-31-2022

ROLL CALL:

MEMBES PRESENT: Joe Pino, Glenn Smith, Jim Hoffman, Dave Cappuccio,
Michael Veneziani, Michael Sutts, Leslie Roberson, Kristian Gummoe-
Lubrano

NOTE: Kristian Gummoe-Lubrano present via Zoom Virtual Live Stream

MEMBERS ABSENT: Greg Schenker

Others Present:	Solicitor:	Carol N. Goloff, Esquire
	Board Engineer:	Jen Heller PP, AICP for Polistina & Assoc., PE, PP
	Board Secretary:	Susan Carroll

NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF OFFICERS: ONE YEAR TERM - 2022

The floor was opened by Chairman Pino who announced nomination and election of Officers for a one year term for the year 2022.

A motion was made for the nomination of Joe Pino (1 year term) for Chairman by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Veneziani. There were no other nominations. A roll call vote was taken with ayes all and one abstention by Mr. Pino. Nays – none

A motion was made for the nomination of Glenn Smith (1 year term) for Vice Chairman by Mr. Pino and seconded by Mr. Cappuccio. There were no other nominations. A roll call vote was taken with ayes all. Nays - none

A motion was made for the nomination of Carol N. Goloff, Esquire (1 year term) for Board Solicitor by Mr. Smith and seconded by Kristin Gummoe-Lubrano. There were no other nominations. A roll call vote was taken with aye all. Nays none.

Solicitor Goloff thanked the Board.

A motion was made for the nomination of Polistina & Associates (1 year term) for Board Engineer by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Hoffman. There were no other nominations. A roll call vote was taken with ayes all. Nays – none.

A motion was made for the nomination of Polistina & Associates (1 year term) for Town Planner by Mr. Pino and seconded by Mr. Smith. There were no other nominations. There was a roll call vote with ayes all. Nays - none.

A motion was made by Mr. Pino and seconded by Ms. Roberson for the nomination of Susan Carroll (1 year term) for Board Secretary. There were no other nominations. A roll call vote was taken with ayes all. Nays - none.

Approval of Meeting Dates for 2022:

A Motion was made by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Smith to approve the meeting dates for the third Wednesday of the month at 7:00 pm. A roll call vote was taken with ayes all. Nays – none.

January 19, 2022	July 20, 2022
February 16, 2022	August 17, 2022
March 16, 2022	September 21, 2022
April 20, 2022	October 19, 2022
May 19, 2022	November 16, 2022
June 15, 2022	December 21, 2022
January 18, 2023 – Re-organization	

RESOLUTION 2022-01: Designating the Official Newspapers of the Borough of Folsom Planning /Zoning Board as the Press of Atlantic City and the Hammonton Gazette.

A motion was made by Mr. Pino and seconded by Ms. Gummoe-Lubrano to designate the Press of Atlantic City and the Hammonton Gazette as the official paper for the Borough of Folsom Planning and Zoning Board. There was a roll call vote with Ayes all. Nays – None

Resolution 2022-02: Appointing Carol Goloff as Planning/Zoning Board Solicitor.

A motion was made by Mr. Pino and seconded by Mr. Hoffman. There was a roll call vote with ayes all. Nays – none.

Resolution 2022-03: Appointing Polistina & Associates as Planning /Zoning Board Engineer & Town Planner.

A motion was made by Mr. Pino and seconded by Ms. Roberson. There was a roll call vote with ayes all. Nays – none.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Veneziani and seconded Mr. Smith to approve the minutes of December 15, 2022. There was a roll call vote with ayes all and three (3) abstentions by Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Cappuccio, and Ms. Gummoe-Lubrano.

APPLICATION 05-PB-2021: Bonnie Plants, LLC, seeking a Preliminary & Final Site Plan Approval and Variances at 1201 Mays Landing Road, Block 101 – Lot 1. The property is located in the Rural Development Zoning District.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Fred DeClement Attorney for Bonnie Plants, LLC, who noted the Application was unusual because the property had a County line that went through it. The County Line Greenhouses were in the back. The Applicant needed to go before two Boards, but addressed the development proposed for the Folsom side of the property. Bonnie Plants recently purchased the property from Mr. Berenato. The Applicant proposed 30 open air green houses on the Winslow side and a 500 sq. ft. loading dock with a 16,000 sq. ft. pole barn/warehouse on the Folsom side. The site was Agriculture and the Zone was RD Zone (Rural Development). There were three 200’ reports from Winslow’s Assessor, Hammonton’s Assessor, and Folsom’s Assessor. The notices were provided to everyone on the lists and the copies provided to Folsom were accurate copies of the originals which were provided to Winslow.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Lance Landgraf, licensed N. J. Planner, AICP Certified. His company LB Landgraf & Associates assisted Mr. Scullo with the presentation. Mr. Scullo was occupied with another presentation at the time. Taylor Watson was in attendance via Zoom virtual live stream. Mr. Watson was the in-house Engineer for Bonnie Plants, LLC and was in Alabama. Mr. Watson had a positive covid test and participated via Zoom. Mr. Watson explained the plans were prepared by Mr. Scullo’s office and it depicted the almost 12 acre site with the front portion of it being in Hammonton along the roadway (Mays Landing Rd.). Folsom was located at the bottom part of the site. The bulk of the greenhouses would be located in Winslow. The county/municipal boundary line was the cause of the relief the Applicant was asking for. The proposed greenhouses were approximately 149,000 sq. ft. The green houses were being constructed in an area which was cleared for farming in the 1930’s. The property address was

1201 Mays Landing Rd. It was on the right hand side of the board (Site Rendering), the portion in Hammonton was against the roadway, Folsom was behind that, and Winslow, Camden County was at the top left of the site. North was pointing up to the right of the plan.

The proposed 149,000 sq. ft. greenhouse would be located in the back portion of the property. A 16,000 sq. ft. loading barn and loading dock in the front area with gravel areas of circulation and gravel parking area, a small storm water basin in the front, and large storm water basin in the back. The site was in a Rural Development District in Folsom and a Rural Area in Winslow, but Agriculture was promoted in both of the Districts in Winslow and Folsom. No improvements were proposed in Hammonton. All of the development was either in Folsom or Winslow Township. The area in the back of the property has been farmed over the years. From aerial photographs found from the early 1930's it was farmed for a long time. It went fallow and was re-cleared and has been sitting fallow for quite some time now.

One of the items on Ms. Heller's letter for Completeness requested tree locations. The Agricultural Use did not require planting and the Applicant requested a waiver for the tree locations. The Board's Solicitor requested clarification for the waiver request and if it was for the location of any trees or for planting or re-planting. The Board's Engineer's representative clarified Checklist Item 21 was for the location of trees 6 inches or more in diameter. The information was not provided and recommended the Applicant either request a waiver or provide the information. Mr. Landgraf's reason for not providing the tree locations was because it was cleared for Agriculture in the past.

He pointed out the yellow & red County/Municipal line(s) on the Exhibit which caused the Applicant to need some relief for Lot Area, Set Back, and Lot Coverage. If the line was not there, they wouldn't need a set back because the line divided the lot in two different Municipalities and two different Counties which created the need for a 30 ft. setback.

He explained the second Variance for Lot Area. The portion in Folsom was only 3 ½ acres and 5.5 acres were required. The entire site was 11.7 acres in Folsom and Winslow. The Applicant met the requirement overall, but the Municipal Boundary Line cut the property in half.

Similarly with Lot Coverage, because a portion of the site was in Folsom, the Zoning Ordinance only permitted 10% Lot Coverage where 20.4% was needed. If the whole property were considered with what was allowed in Folsom, Winslow allowed 80% Lot Coverage in their Zone. It was high for an Agricultural District, but they permitted 80% Lot Coverage in their Zone.

The overall site the Lot Coverage there would be 59% permitted. What was proposed in both municipalities were 33%. The applicant would be below what was permitted overall on both of the properties based on Lot Area of each Township/Municipality.

Solicitor Goloff reviewed the Lot Coverage with Mr. Landgraf. The Applicant proposed 20.4% in Folsom where 10% was permitted. The Applicant was proposing 39% in Winslow where 80% was permitted. The proposed overall coverage was 33.1% for both towns where Folsom was 10% and Winslow was permitted.

Mr. Landgraf justified the Variances could be granted under the C1 Hardship Variance and the C2 Flexible C criteria which was to advance the purposes of Zoning. He focused on the Hardship aspect of it. He read from the Municipal Land Use Law Section 40:55D-60 & 70C. Variances fall under jurisdiction of the Planning/Zoning Board as permitted. The Board may, by reason of 1.) Exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, or by reason of exceptional topographic conditions, physical features or by reason of extraordinary exceptional situation uniquely affecting a specific piece of property, the strict application of any regulation would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties. He explained the Municipal Boundary Line bifurcating the lot was certainly odd. It was rarely in the lots. When the lines were drawn we try and follow the property boundary lines. This one went through the middle of the property at a very odd angle. It was an odd situation for this location for this site. If this one lot was all in Folsom, Variances would not be needed. The minimum lot size requirement was 5½ acres, 3½ acres were in Folsom and there was another 7 or so acres in Winslow. There was 11 ½ acres. The total lot area was 10 acres in 2 municipalities.

The negative criteria was there were 2 properties.

The positive criteria was they qualified for the hardship. It would not be a substantial detriment of the good and it would not impair the intent and purposes of the Zoning Plan or Zoning Ordinance. It would not be a significant impact to the properties surrounding it. Adding the greenhouses would allow the product to be grown on site and would not have the trucks coming in and out of the property that they had in the past. Tractor trailers bring plants into the site to be packaged and shipped out on smaller trucks. Growing the plants on site would reduce the number of trucks bringing plants because the plants will be grown on the location.

There wouldn't be a significant impact to the properties surrounding it. Adding the green houses and growing the product on site, would eliminate trucks going in and out of the property as they had in the past. The products which come in tend to end up shipping in on trucks from other facilities and sending out to retail sales. This (green houses) will allow them to grow the herbs and vegetables into plant format to sell to retail buyers. There will be smaller trucks – 26's – 30's will come in and out of the site at a much lesser rate. Tractor trailers would not bring the big products in and out of the property. They don't want to have the responsibility of the trucks. They want to grow the product here and ship it directly out. The Applicant did not want to bring it in, change hands, repackage it, and send it back out. This was the reason why they were doing the greenhouses and the packing/shipping facility there.

The site was adequately sized. It will be operated as one sole property, not multiple lots in multiple municipalities. The Agriculture Use was permitted in the RD (Rural Development).

It would not impair the intent and purpose of the Zone Plan since it was a Permitted Use. The operation would not need a site plan or variance if the municipal boundary line was not breaking through it. It was the only reason for the request of the Variance. The Master Plan encourages Agricultural Use and it purposed the benefit of general health, safety, and welfare by operating the permitted Use in a Zone which permits that operation. It was typical for all of the variances. There was nothing else which caused the variances other than the lot line for the Municipalities.

There would not be any impact to the Zoning Plan or Zoning Ordinance. It was a better plan for the access to the site. The trucks going on and off Mays Landing Rd. will be reduced by the project.

Questions from the Board were taken. The Applicant will go to the County for road access and egress off of the road. It would be handled separately by their Engineer. Once they received the Approval from the Board, they would seek all of the other necessary Permits and Approvals as part of the Condition of Approval. There would be no new access proposed. They will need to show the County they were not significantly increasing the traffic on the roadway. The access was in Winslow. It be done in Camden County. Vehicular access to the agriculture use will be above the hill. There was an access in the hill (of the road). The road changed to a State highway also. Any Approval granted by the Board will be conditioned on outside agency approvals. Pinelands gave a Letter of No Interest. A Certificate of Filing was not necessary since it was an Agricultural Use and Pinelands didn't get involved in Agricultural Operations unless it was processing.

A Site Rendering dated 1-19-2022 prepared by Sciullo Engineering Services, LLC was labeled A-1 and was used for demonstration.

The setbacks to the actual property line were for the greenhouse 72' to the property line and on the other side was 40'. The barn was 40 feet to the property line on one side and couldn't meet the setback on the side where the Folsom/Winslow County/Municipal line went through it.

There were no other questions from the Board.

Ms. Heller requested more detail on the circulation through the site and where trucks entered in from the highway. Mr. Landgraf pointed out the access driveway. It was located on Mays Landing Rd. in the town of Hammonton. Traffic travelling from the north would make a right into the site. If traveling from the south, would make a left. Two driveways joined and go into the site from behind then to the north of the existing buildings, and then east of the buildings in the back, then into the site for circulation. Trucks and cars would enter the same way. The trucks would go into the front of the loading area, pull forward, and back in. Any smaller trucks or vehicles that came in would park in the front. The vehicles would back out the same way. The area was separated with gravel. It would all be gravel.

There was no proposed signage. Ms. Heller requested the Architectural Plan be presented because it was not included with the packages. Mr. Landgraf presented a Plan prepared by Shirk Pole Building, East Earl, Pa. dated 9-16-2021. It was marked Exhibit A-2. He pointed out the 5 loading docks in the front with a side door which would not be used. The Plan was an early design plan. The door would be on a different side and was not proposing access to that side. The doors would be taken off the building with access by man doors and the loading dock. The barn was in the front.

She noted the Zoning Officer of Folsom allowed the construction of some temporary greenhouses. It was Conditioned on going before the Planning Board for Site Plan Approval. Mr. DeClement responded because of duality the applicant was dealing with they were trying to

get a Building Permit for the greenhouses. Since the primary portion of the greenhouses were located in Winslow the State Construction was contacted and they deferred it to Winslow. A temporary Building Permit was issued, but Winslow was against it. They wanted them to go before the Board. Nothing was constructed, but there was clearing. There were storm water issues and it was decided to present everything and do what they were supposed to do with the situation of the property line.

There were no other questions from the Ms. Heller. Completeness was given by Ms. Heller and she noted Checklist Item 21 was deficient – location of trees 6 inches or more in diameter as measured 4 feet above ground level outside of wooded area. A waiver for this Checklist Item was justified with Mr. Landgraf's explanation of the site had been farmed. It was recommended the Application be deemed complete.

A motion was made by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Pino to Deem the Application Complete with a waiver for Checklist Item #21 trees 6 inches or more in diameter because it was in an Agricultural area. A roll call vote was taken with ayes all.

Joe Pino	Yes
Glenn Smith	Yes
Dave Cappuccio	Yes
Michael Veneziani	Yes
Michael Sutts	Yes
Leslie Roberson	Yes
Kristin Gummoe-Lubrano	Yes

Ms. Heller requested information about the number of trucks coming in and out of the site every day, the number of employees, the hours of operation, and if noise would be generated from the greenhouses or the barn.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Gregory Taylor Watson, PE with Bonnie Plants LLC. He addressed the operations and the way the site was set up. They (Bonnie Plants) brought County Line Greenhouses and were shipping plants in (to the site) with 18 wheelers and coming out on route trucks going to the store. Building the site would enable the company to grow what they needed there and support the region from this facility. They would be planning a total of about 15 route trucks coming out of the station. It was a seasonal operation from March thru June. The goal was to make the facility self-sufficient to operate solely from this facility. Materials would need to be brought in such as pots, packs, and seed. The barn would be for storage and materials and also for planting the pots. The plants come in a plug format. It was a small format. They are potted in pots, taken to the greenhouse and laid down where they will grow to store readiness. Once they get to store readiness, they are picked up off of the floor, put on racks, and put on route trucks to the retail store.

The greenhouse operation was not noisy. Inside the greenhouse the most noise typical was fans. Most greenhouses warrant fans and shutters to pull air thru to circulate. These have natural ventilation in the houses and they have a full roof which opens and closes depending on the weather. No noise effect as far as operation goes at this facility.

Solicitor Goloff asked Mr. Watson to clarify if the 15 route trucks were 15 per day or 15 per week. He responded: The trucks would be coming out. It was 15 different kind there from March thru June. The trucks are going and picking up their store volume each day and taking out to the store. They liked to be early before the traffic - early in the morning to later at night. The trucks were not interfering with typical traffic patterns. They were getting to the stores typically before daylight. They fill their racks and were on the road mostly 12 hours a day. Mr. DeClement stressed from Mr. Landgraf's testimony the facility would actually make life easier there. It wasn't going to bring more. Somebody would have envisioned standing issues would make more traffic, but the goal was to make less. Before they brought vegetable plants and herbs from different stores to be able to facilitate packaging and taking it out from this location. It will be eliminated because the greenhouses will facilitate more onsite growth. It will eliminate the deliveries of the plants that would be then loaded on to the trucks and be delivered to the Lowe's and Walmart's. The goal was to put this in and eliminate that.

Ms. Heller questioned what happened the rest of the year if the operation was to grow between March and June. She asked what happened in November. Mr. Watson responded, typically the route trucks will be there for the peak time, but after that they will be either rentals or a lot of it local work and from the corporate office. They will go home during that time of year. The station will be operational, but the greenhouses won't be full. Everything will be maintained and taken care of. It was not as much traffic out of the facility, not as much growing, not getting as much to stores. It will be a slowed down version of spring and summer. Still a little bit going out of the facility maintaining. What typically was done was they over load racks that Home Depot and Lowes during the peak season to keep up with consumer demand, but once the demand lessens they start taking racks out of the facilities and out of the stores. We still have something on the racks but it is less volume. It's not as much of a heavy operation during those slower times of the year in the winter and fall.

There were no other questions from the Board for Mr. Gregory Taylor Watson.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Rojelio Cantu Jr., Bonnie Plants Station Manager for the facility. He corrected Mr. Watson about the operation and explained during the winter months there were no operations. Operations began the middle of February to the middle of July spring season. From the end July to the middle of September in the fall season was a very reduced operation. Typically there would be about 3 box trucks in and out for that month and a half. After September the place is shut down for maintenance. No plants will be grown there and there would be no operations until next February.

During the off peak season there were currently 3 employees and during peak there were about 20 on site employees. Ms. Heller requested clarification with regard to the 15 route trucks to justify if the 15 parking spaces on site would be sufficient parking for the site. The 15 parking spaces would be sufficient because the laborers on site were farm laborers and were brought to the site by van. The box trucks that came in were brought on site by the drivers. They came in each morning early, load up, and leave. A lot of the time they take the vehicle home at night. They didn't bring their personal vehicles there. There may be 5 trucks left over night. Those trucks are rented. When the season is over, they go back. They didn't stay there all the time.

The trucks arrive early in the morning to load up. The trucks usually try to leave at 4:00 in the morning. The trucks were loaded in evening. When they come back the plants were ready and all they had to do was to put them on trucks and leave out the next morning typically about 4:00 in the morning. They have to be at the store before the store opens.

Mr. Watson explained there were 5 truck which stay overnight. They are loaded up the night before and stay on the site. There were 10 or so drivers who load their truck up at night. They were local people and take the truck home. Those trucks are out of the site at 5:00 or 6:00 the night before. There were 5 trucks which move out 4:00 the next morning. The trucks were loaded up at the end of the day. Ten (10) of those leave that night the rest stay overnight and leave about 4:00 am. There were 4 or 5 truck drivers that would bring their personal vehicles and drop them off there, take trucks, and go out.

Ms. Heller confirmed about 5 trucks leave at 4:00 am. The other trucks have already left. They will come back at night, get loaded up and leave to go home. At 6:00 am it would not be all 15 trucks leaving at once. It would be approximately 5 or 6.

Ms. Heller questioned the trucks arriving at the site at 4:00 AM and if they able to enter in to the site or if there was a gate for security. Would the operations be open so trucks would not be lining up on Mays Landing Rd. or if there was anything keeping anybody from getting into the site? Mr. Watson responded there was no gate. Trucks bringing in materials were able to enter into the site.

Ms. Heller requested a Condition of any Approval granted by the Board for the sake of the road and adjacent properties and traffic in and out (of the site) early in the morning that no vehicles or trucks are parked or queued up. Trucks arriving have to be able to enter into the site as a Condition of Approval. This was to avoid any parking on the hill (in the road) or trucks idling in front of any residential neighborhood or neighbors.

There were no other questions from the Board for Mr. Cantu.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Jay Sciullo Professional Engineer responsible charge for submitting plans to the board. He was available via Zoom virtual live stream video. Mr. Sciullo designed the plan. Ms. Heller questioned if the driveway widths were sufficient for the trucks entering the site. Mr. Sciullo confirmed they were.

There were no other questions from the Board for Mr. Scuillo or any of the presenters of the Application.

The Meeting was opened to the Public.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Robert Seiverlich, 110 Huntington Drive, Winslow Block 8903 – Lot 8. Mr. Seiverlich had concerns about Bonnie Plants coming into their community and taking out all of the trees when there were plenty of other lots around. He asked to use Exhibit A-1 Site

Rendering. He was also concerned with the truck traffic. He addressed Mr. Landgraf's request for a hardship (Variance). He asked why they should be granted a reason to build on a smaller lot when the boundaries were already set. He pointed out the location of his house using Exhibit A-1 and noted he had to build his house on 3 ½ acres and had to go by Pineland's. He didn't understand the why a change would be made to any of these Variances. They were set there for a reason. They were set there for the public, quietness, and for their pleasure. Mr. Seiverlich was aware the Applicant also needed to get Approval from Winslow and noted if Winslow turned it down, he didn't see the purpose of Approving this pole barn.

He requested a traffic study and noise study be completed. He saw box trucks and tractor trailers. There was a parking issue. Tractor trailers have already been backed up on Mays Landing Rd. and already have done property damage to people across the street. Mr. Seiverlich noted the plans did not show a house. He pointed out the location of a house not shown on the plans which belonged to Linda Ingemi. The house was situated in Winslow. The Applicant wanted to bring trucks in at 4:00 in the morning. They had diesel trucks which were loud. They sit there and idle. He couldn't see how people could sleep. He thought the entrance needed to be moved and the exit needed to be presented somewhere else. The Applicant spoke about 15 trucks. Mr. Seiverlich noted, hypothetically speaking 15 trucks, and hypothetically thinking that tractor trailers are not going to be coming in and out, and hypothetically thinking how many employees will be brought in.

He questioned if any of the employees will be housed. The Applicant talked about farm workers being brought in a van. He heard talk about some of the properties were going to be used for housing employees.

There was a bi-level which would be completely surrounded by the whole operation. He couldn't see how their property value wouldn't continue to stay. The neighbors who were there with him were all worried about their property values. Mr. Seiverlich pointed out the location of his house using the Site Rendering marked Exhibit A-1. He remarked it was a good photo taken in the summer when the trees were blooming and blossoming. He indicated the location of his house and noted: all he did was look at dirt and construction. He could see right through the woods and can see what was going on. He pointed out a drainage ditch which will cause problems. Insects, reptiles, and any other animals in the woods will be attracted to it. He requested more studies to be done for fertilizers blowing around in the air. The greenhouses will be 16 feet high and will have electric in them, heated floors, trays that slide the plants out during the day for sunlight and slide back in. He didn't know if they would be motorized or pull out by hand. He described the structures as permanent green *warehouses*. He will have 15 of them behind his house, and will see greenhouses on the whole back of his property. Mr. Seivelich requested some kind of concessions be made and didn't believe the Variance was a hardship because Bonnie Plants knew what they were buying before they bought the facility. He proposed the application be turned down until a traffic study to see how many trucks will be coming in and out and how much traffic will go by in the summertime. It was a main artery for people who go to the shore. There was a hill that went down. Speeds change from 50 to 40 mph. Cars will not be able to stop. He requested a pollution study and a noise study done because the greenhouses will make noise that he will hear day in and day out. His property line will have 40 feet then greenhouses. Trees were already taken down and he didn't know why the all of the trees were

taken down. He proposed the Variance be made 100 feet for the people on Huntington Drive so a fence could be put up and fast growing trees like a hemlock be planted to block the sound. It will help the property values. He didn't believe he could sell his house right now because of the development and didn't believe it was the point of Bonnie Plants. Mr. Seivelich did not know the hours of operation. The Applicant vaguely spoke about the hours of operation. He noted it was a 7 day a week operation – 7:00 to 7:00. He has been living on a construction site for the last couple of months. They have started to dig the drainage ditch. There weren't site plans in place and construction has begun. Material was dropped off which he assumed was for the pole barn. He listened to people about construction on New Year's Day, Martin Luther King Day, Saturdays, and Sundays and didn't understand what the operation hours were. He saw more than 20 employees working there. There will be 15 greenhouses - 16 feet high lining the back of his property and his neighbor's property. It was an eyesore and will drop the property values. He suggested painting the back of the greenhouse to match the woods, or put up a privacy fence, and plant some trees on the outside of the fence.

He mentioned the water table was down low in Winslow. He didn't know where all the water was coming from. The three municipalities: Hammonton, Winslow, and Folsom. He didn't know where the water was coming from because the water table was down low right now.

Mr. Seivelich explained he was not there to make any concessions, but was asking for the plans be turned down until a traffic study was done and completed. Then a better educated guess of what should be done could be made.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Jeremy Boden, 112 Huntington Drive. He had three main concerns. He had a straight shot to the field where his property was located. There was construction every day all day. He had 3 young children. He lost privacy to his property and his pool. His concession was please plant some trees there for privacy.

His well was a stone's throw from what was there. He asked, what waste water if any was coming into that property. There was a drain installed in the back and asked what was going on there. His well was nearby. It was something he needed them to understand and asked what chemical will be used.

He also heard the rumor of seasonal living there. In addition to the neighbors, he had concerns for his household and standard of living. These were his 3 concerns: Waste water, privacy, and seasonal labor.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Keith Seary, 114 Huntington Dr. Mr. Seary didn't have much to add to what his neighbors already said, but the traffic on Mays Landing Rd. was definitely a major concern. He was concerned about how long it may take for a big truck to turn into the site. It was very dangerous coming off over the hill and was very concerned with the safety of it.

He questioned the number of employees. He understood there would be 15 drivers and 5 employees total planting. He didn't see how it was feasible. He didn't feel the operation was fully explained. The part about the traffic and the timing the trucks would be there was very confusing. He understood some trucks would be coming at night and some would be leaving in

the morning. Mr. Seary asked, how many shifts and if they will be working thru the evening. He asked if there will be any lights shining into the homes. The fertilizer and run off was a big concern of his as well. He would like to know if there were plans to house employees on the property because they would be neighbors to that property. There were big concerns because they had children in the area so they could feel safe.

Solicitor Goloff swore in Christopher Begley, 1395 Backline Rd. He noted he was the only Folsom resident. His only problem with the variances was not to be in a rush to grant all the variances because he drove on the road every single day for work. He would like to see what the traffic ramifications were going to be. Especially in the summer in low light condition in the early morning and in the evening. Trucks going in the summer seemed like it was something worth looking into before the variances were granted. The variances, setbacks, and measurements were there for a reason. Why be in a rush to let them do whatever they want.

There was no other comments from the live public.

There were no comments from the public via Zoom virtual stream.

Mr. DeClement responded to questions from the Board. The number of tractor trailers will be reduced since now everything will be grown on the property. Currently, the tractor trailers brought the plants on site. Then they were switched into smaller trucks. They were actually 30's. The greenhouse building will be 149,000 square feet partially in Folsom. The tractor trailers bringing the product in will not have to come here as often anymore because it will be grown there. Seeds will come in, be planted, grown, and go out on smaller trucks. This will be a much lesser impact. There will not be tractor trailers coming in and out of the site like they do now.

There shouldn't be parking on Mays Landing Rd., but will be eliminated completely with the Condition the Board placed on any Approval the Applicant might get.

Mr. Cantu managed the property this season and was questioned about the volume of traffic. During the last peak season there was 3 to 4 semi-trucks entering in per day. With this facility there shouldn't be more than 1 or 2 semi-trucks per week carrying supplies like pots and soils. There were 15 delivery box trucks per day with or without the new facility. The box trucks did not idle because it was wasted fuel. Mr. Cantu kept the semi-trucks parked furthest away from the neighborhood so not to disturb them during the night. A lot of those (semi-trucks) were refrigerated and had to keep the refrigerator running.

Solicitor Goloff clarified right now the neighbors were experiencing trucks on Mays Landing Rd. Mr. Cantu was not aware of any truck sitting out on Mays Landing Rd. It was not permitted and he did not encourage it.

Solicitor Goloff questioned housing for laborers. Mr. Cantu explained, he had housing in Sicklerville that was rented for the laborers. A Condition was suggested for no housing proposed at the site without coming back to the Board. Mr. DeClement commented, the migrant workers came in from different locations. They had 2 or 3 vans. The vans hold about 15. The vans came in, but they leave. There was no migrant like a typical farm where they came in for a season

where they would have a camp. Currently the Applicant did not have a labor camp, but couldn't guarantee anything for the future. If the Applicant were to have a labor camp in the future, the Applicant would have to come back to the Board.

Solicitor Goloff clarified: There was no onsite housing for migrant workers proposed.

Ms. Heller made the public aware in the event they were to do this (farm labor camp/migrant housing) they will have to be back here in front of this Board and Winslow.

There was a house associated with the property, but it was not in Folsom. The house associated with the property was in Hammonton. Solicitor Goloff reiterated the question: Is there any proposed housing for migrant workers. The answer was No.

Mr. Cappuccio excused himself and stepped off of the dais 8:35 pm

Solicitor Goloff requested information regarding the public's concern about wastewater and fertilizers onsite because of the neighboring well(s). Mr. Taylor addressed the runoff on the site. Ms. Heller questioned where the water runoff went from the inside of the greenhouses after the plants were watered and fertilized. Mr. Taylor responded that it would be routed to the pond. On the forward end of the greenhouses there was a concrete corridor down the middle and sidewalk branches going down each bay. There was no fertilizer in the actual greenhouses. When the plants were potted, there was a fertilizer that was a controlled release fertilizer. It was a pelletized fertilizer. It was actually potted and mixed in the soil when the plants are actually potted. Once there put down in the greenhouses, they were watered.

The potting operation happened in the pole barn. The run off from watering the plants goes directly into the ground. But there was no fertilizer no chemicals nothing going from the greenhouse into the storm water basin. There will be spraying in the greenhouses, but Mr. Taylor was not familiar with the process. Mr. Cantu responded, they only use granular fertilizer or spray. Mr. Taylor explained, the fertilizer was granular. It was potted in the pole barn.

Mr. Cantu explained, they had a routine spray for pesticide for things like bacterial disease on the plants. The water stays on the plants and/or the ground directly below it. He had been doing this for 21 years and never saw water come out of those greenhouses. It gets into the proposed ground including under our (inaudible).

Ms. Heller explained there was an issue with the chemicals were sprayed onto the plants and the water was running off into the ground. The residents were concerned if the chemicals were getting into their wells if the water infiltrates into the ground. Mr. Cantu explained: it goes straight into the ground with inside of the greenhouses. Solicitor Goloff confirmed: the ground beneath the greenhouses. Mr. Cantu confirmed: Yes the ground below or on the pots that we set and some ferns.

Mr. DeClement explained: there was a drip irrigation system in there. They didn't have sprinklers running 24/7. They were trying to minimize the water that was being thrown down on

the ground. Mr. Cantu agreed: Absolutely yes, because you don't want the plants to grow faster than you can to get them out to the center you kind of starve them for water until you can get them out in the field. They get just enough water to grow. In his experience he hasn't found that things were over watered and that there's a whole lot of extra water going in the ground. It was minimal.

Solicitor Goloff noted, it was a legitimate question from members of the public. We just need to clarify it.

Mr. Cantu explained, especially didn't want to over water – just want to water just enough to keep the soil slightly moist. If it's soaked, it gives root rot and all the plants will die.

Mr. Cappuccio rejoined the dais.

A Board member questioned if the entrance was in Hammonton. Another board member explained there were 2 entrances. One was in Hammonton and one was in Winslow. It was questioned if the road studies were the Borough's responsibility or if it fell on the applicant to have the County Approve the entrances. Ms. Heller explained it fell on the County. The County will review this because it was a site plan and impacts the County. It was on a county roadway. Atlantic County will review this for the portion that is up to the Hammonton boundary. Atlantic County will review it and they will also review the driveway in Hammonton to make sure that it is sufficient for the Use inside the site. Our approval would be conditioned upon favorable review from Atlantic County. The whole site is going to depend on all of the other agencies and other government agencies that have jurisdiction. It was not just Folsom. It would also be Winslow/Camden County.

Issues were addressed where the Folsom side of the property did not have frontage on Mays Landing Road and the property was in 3 different Townships; the set back to one of the lines was null and void because they owned on both sides of the line; and how the setback worked since the Applicant owned the property next to it (on both sides of the line). Ms. Heller explained, the site was being looked as an overall site because the line didn't have an impact. The circulation of the entire site acted as a whole. It was why we had the Applicant explain the whole operation. A four foot high fence with the wire mesh backing was recommended in the Engineers Report and it was agreed to by Mr. Scullo. The site had to be looked at as a whole because if the Folsom portion was only considered, we would have a 0 zero lot line. It would not make any sense.

A question arose if Folsom could require the Applicant to put trees up. Solicitor Goloff advised: even though that portion of the property is not within our jurisdiction, as an overall operation, and because of public concern; we believe that any approval should be Conditioned upon having appropriate buffers. Winslow can't be made to do it, but it can certainly be put in the Resolution. Since we are all having to look at this as an entire project, it was something the Approval can be Conditioned on.

The Applicants Engineer was asked how far the property lines were from where the green houses were going to sit to every single house. Mr. Landgraf used a scale to measure the distance. He

didn't know where the property lines were, but made approximate measurements. He measured about 240 feet from the back of the pool to the corner of the basin and to the corner of the greenhouse was 360 feet. Another house was 290-300 feet to the greenhouse and another house was more like 400 feet.

Ms. Heller noted the private residential lots had the right to clear within reason. They could clear back to their property line. There were no restrictions. They're not required to keep a buffer. Ms. Roberson noted they didn't want to see them (the greenhouses) either.

Jeremy Boden, 112 Huntington Drive re-addressed the privacy issue. The privacy was misleading by zero privacy. It was more than an eyesore. He lost privacy at his home. If they didn't plant something, he would have to for privacy for all of his guest that come over.

Solicitor Goloff advised Mr. Boden that it could be put in the Resolution if the Application is approved. The board members can put as a Condition that they suggest to Winslow, that buffers be imposed. It would only be our word with their jurisdiction now.

Due to an internet connection issue the Zoom virtual ended. Those attending via Zoom were bumped off.

ENGINEERS REPORT:

The Applicant agreed to all of the conditions in the Engineers Report. Testimony was provided regarding the number of anticipated employees and how the traffic will be when the site is built. A basin fence will be installed and a storm water management basin as built will be provided as Condition of Approval as well as storm water management facility maintenance plan which was a requirement of the storm water regulations. One handicap accessible space within the parking area will be provided. A waiver was needed for the proposed gravel parking lot which was common for this type of Use. Folsom's ordinance required the parking area to be black topped. If the Applicant had to black top the parking area, accommodations for more storm water and more run would need to be made. Gravel will absorb and infiltrate some of the storm water. The Applicant requested to install a gravel parking lot. The Borough's Ordinance does allow the Board to make that determination. A gravel parking lot was appropriate and was recommended. It was up to the Board. The Applicant provided testimony regarding the minimal parking requirements, and indicated that the proposed 15 spaces were sufficient for this Use, and the 5 trucks will be parked overnight within the loading dock area. The applicant testified and demonstrated the traffic and truck circulation throughout the site. It will be made a Condition of any Approval that they seek County Approval for the driveways. The driveways were out of Folsom's jurisdiction. Any Condition by the Board would be Conditioned upon the County Approvals. The applicant indicated there will be no building mounted signage. There is one light that was located within the parking area. The light would just illuminate the parking area. Ms. Heller questioned the Applicant if the LED light could be turned off at night when nobody was there. Mr. De Clement responded it would be put on a timer from dusk to dawn. Ms. Heller continued. The building security lighting was usually a lower wattage typical light in a house and was okay with that. The applicant needed to submit construction cost estimates for any of the improvements on the site. There will not be a performance guarantee based on the new bonding laws, but an inspection escrow shall be provided. A Soil Erosion and Sediment Control

Plan Certification were required. Since the property was split between the two Counties, Mr. Scullo will have one of the County's handle it. It was acceptable because they all followed the same rules. The application was subject to the Approval of any other agency having jurisdiction and all Approval and evidence of the Approvals must be provided.

The application was seeking 3 variances:

Minimum Lot Area 3.5 Acres – 5.5 Required

Side yard setback – 0 proposed – 30 feet required

Maximum Lot coverage – 20.4 % - 10% permitted

The overall site only covers 33% because the portion of the site in Folsom was smaller than what it should be and was mostly encumbered by the building. They're asking for a variance of a lot coverage of 20.4 % - 10% permitted, but the overall site itself only covers 33%. If this entire site was located within one municipality it would still need a variance from Folsom Ordinance, but within reason. We would have two and a half times the lot area. There was also a Waiver from black topping the parking area.

There were no other questions from the Board.

A Motion was made by Mr. Hoffman and seconded by Mr. Smith to Approve the Application. A roll call vote was taken with ayes all. Motion carried.

Joe Pino	Yes
Glenn Smith	Yes
Dave Cappuccio	Yes
Michael Veneziani	Yes
Michael Sutts	Yes
Leslie Roberson	Yes

There was no other business for the Board.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: February 16, 2022 at 7:00 pm

A Motion was made by Mr. Smith and seconded by Mr. Hoffman to adjourn the meeting.

MEETING ADJOURNED at 9:01 PM