

# ALLOWAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD

Township Municipal Building, Auditorium  
49 South Greenwich Street  
Alloway, New Jersey 08001

## MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING – December 10, 2014

Meeting called to order at 7:00 P.M.

Statement of adequate notice of meeting was read and the flag salute performed.

**Present:** Allen English, Walter Leslie, Beth Reilly, Kristen Coleman, Alexis Coleman, Betsy Burden, Craig Kane, Warren Wieting, Ron Zarin (Alternate No. 1), Jack Cianfrani, Tracy Stites (Alternate No. 2) , Phil Donohue (Alternate No. 4)

**Absent:** Pat Jamison (Alternate No. 3)

A Motion was made by Kane, seconded by Cianfrani, to approve the minutes from the November 12, 2014 meeting. Unanimous voice vote with Member English abstaining.

Chairman Coleman opened the meeting to the public for comment on matters not on the agenda. None.

Public comment closed.

Resolutions: None.

Business: Salem County Mennonite Church (B 111, L 10) – Conditional Use Application/Site Plan Waiver

Solicitor Albano advised that Members Reilly (Committeewoman) and Wieting (Mayor's designee) should not vote on the referenced application as, if the matter is denied, it could be appealed to the Township Committee.

Ross Levitsky, Esquire, Applicant's attorney, and Applicant's representative, Amos Stoltzfus, appeared and were sworn in by Solicitor Albano.

Solicitor Albano confirmed the Applicant met the noticing requirement to the newspaper and owners within 200' of the property. Additionally, he advised that N.J.S.A. 45:27-25 requires approval for a cemetery from the governing body of the municipality.

Kerry Engelhardt, P.E., P.P., of the firm of Sickels & Associates, was sworn and reviewed the firm's December 3, 2014 letter. She advised that with testimony by the Applicant as to providing an EIS (#8) and reasons for why the requested relief should be granted (#25) she had no objection to waivers being granted and the application deemed complete.

Mr. Levitsky questioned the Applicant who testified that the cemetery will be small in size (approximately 60 gravesites) and used only for members of the church and their immediate family members.

A motion was made by member Kane, and seconded by Member Burden, to deem the application complete. A roll call vote was taken with 10 affirmative votes and two (2) abstentions.

Thereafter, Ms. Engelhardt reviewed the technical portion of the December 3, 2014 letter and the Applicant's representative, Amos Stoltzfus, advised he is a Trustee Chairman of the Church. He advised the Church bought

the property in January 2013. The building's prior use was as a school for approximately 51 years. The continued use will be as a combination school/church for members of the Mennonite community. Currently there are approximately 50 members of the church consisting of 10 families. The church meets on Sunday for services and Wednesday evenings for bible study/meetings. The school operates five days per week with approximately 22 students for nine months during the year.

The church/school will use the existing stone parking area which accommodates approximately 40 cars, with overflow being on the grass. The cemetery, if approved, will be 50' x 100', surrounded by a two-rail PVC type fence which will be installed either at the cemetery's inception or at the time of the first burial, and accessed over the grass. The cemetery is approximately 300' from the existing building. The church currently has no plans to expand the cemetery.

Member Leslie questioned why the distances from the existing building and other structures on the property had not been located upon the map. Mr. Levitsky advised the church was trying to minimize costs, but will supply at the Board's request.

Member Cianfrani questioned what would occur if the church was abandoned and who would maintain same. It was generally accepted that the township may have to maintain same, but the township would have enforcement capabilities through the Zoning Office.

Member Kane, also a member of the Environmental Commission, questioned whether the soils had been tested for the practicality of using the site as a burial ground, whether wetlands exists thereon, whether a percolation test had been performed, as well as whether the Department of Health had been consulted regarding regulations governing use of embalming fluids, etc. Mr. Levitsky advised he will inquire of the Department of Health, as well as providing a soil test pit to determine the water table elevation.

Member Zarin questioned whether the caskets are encased in a vault. The Applicant advised they are not.

A motion was made by Member Donohue, and seconded by Member Reilly to open the meeting to the public for comment.

Fred Edwards, 71 Woodstown-Alloway Road, advised that graves are generally 4' x 8'.

A discussion was had as to whether graves would be sold. The Applicant advised the gravesites are not sold. Mr. Stoltzfus additionally advised that no cremation sites would be used at the site.

A motion was made by Member Donohue, and seconded by Member Burden, to close the public portion of the meeting.

Thereafter, a motion was made by Member Kane, and seconded by Member Leslie, to grant the conditional use as a cemetery with waiver of site plan review, and Applicant to provide a water percolation test, evidence that the Department of Health does not have jurisdiction and/or providing a letter advising of its outside agency approval, as well as providing detail to the plan as to the distance from the cemetery from other structures on the site and drive over the lawn to the cemetery.

A roll call vote was taken with 10 affirmative votes, and two (2) abstentions.

#### Robert Taffett (B 26, L 2/3) – Minor Site Plan for Kennel

Dr. Taffett appeared at the meeting for the purpose of discussing completeness only. He advised he has obtained an updated survey as requested to Sickels & Associates, however, must provide 18 copies to the engineer and

Board evidencing the location of the area to be used as a kennel, and distances/setbacks from intended use site from other structures on the site.

Additionally, a Checklist must be completed and submitted for the Board's and professionals' review. Items 8, 22, 23, 25, 28, 32, 39, 41, 48, 49, and 50 from the Checklist must either be provided or waivers requested. Ms. Engelhardt had no objection to providing waivers for the above items as no new development is proposed. However, Item 25 should be identified on the plan and testimony provided at the meeting regarding same.

A motion was made by Member English, and seconded by Member Reilly, to deem the application complete pending submission of the above mentioned Checklist item.

A roll call vote was taken with 11 affirmative votes, one (1) abstention.

Chairman Coleman opened the meeting to the public for comment on matters not on the agenda.

Joseph Myers, 26 Lakeview Drive, advised he had several questions regarding the application, however, was advised the testimony and question period would be discussed at the January meeting once proper notice to the newspaper and property owners within 200' were noticed.

An issue was additionally raised as to whether Applicant would require SADC approval to operate a kennel on the property as same is preserved farmland. Applicant is to inquire of the CADC and/or SADC regarding same.

Public comment closed.

Correspondence: No comment.

The Board Secretary was requested by the Mayor to hand deliver to members information on establishing a subcommittee to review simple minor subdivisions (no variances or waivers requested) to be implemented in the coming year.

Member English requested the Board go into closed session to discuss yearly appointments. A motion was made by Member Burden, and seconded by Member Reilly, for same at 8:10 PM.

The professionals and public were excused.

The meeting was reopened at 8:21 PM.

Thereafter, on motion by Member Donohue, seconded by K. Coleman, the meeting was adjourned at 8:21 PM. Unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Suzanne D. Pierce  
Planning Board Secretary