

**Mannington Township Planning Board  
Regular Meeting  
July 14, 2022**

**Present:**

Donald Asay, William DeCinque, Richard Eber, Donald Richman, John Sakewicz, Nicholas Culver, Gaynel Schneeman, Robert Schmid, Corey Gaskill, Michael Aimino and David Cadwallader (7:32 pm)

**Absent:**

John Emel, Luke Patrick, Jessica Lynn Winkers, Michael Colletti, Carl Gaskill and Michael Sullivan

The meeting was called to order at 7:04 PM by John Sakewicz, Chairman.

The Sunshine Law Statement was read.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America was recited.

Roll Call was taken to justify that there was a quorum in attendance.

The secretary of the planning board has given adequate notice of the meeting.

William DeCinque made a motion to approve the June 2022 minutes with a correction on the last page to change the word her to here. Donald Richman seconded the motion.

All in Favor.

Tang Friendly Property, LLC  
Block 64, Lot 11 & 11Q  
98 Old Kings Highway  
Mannington, NJ

Howard Melnicove, attorney for the applicant, presented the application for site plan review.

The following people were sworn in:

Gregory Simmons, the applicants engineer.

Corey Gaskill, engineer for the planning board.

Mai Tang, Applicant

Zibin Tang, Applicant

Mr. Simmons reviewed the site plan on page 2 of three dated 5/18/22. This is a revised copy.

Exhibit A1, sheet number two of the sub-packet also reflects building numbers. The building numbers are marked on page A1. These buildings are marked the same as the buildings in the document that the planning board members have received.

Gaynell asked if there were building permits for things after May 17th. The applicants attorney explained that there were no permits, which is in part why the applicant is here today.

Mr. Aimino explained that the existing buildings in question would require permits and have to pass all inspections.

The typical sequence would be that the applicant would go to the zoning board and then be issued construction permits. Then the buildings would be inspected. This would typically happen after preliminary and final approval. The zoning officer is unable to issue permits without the board approval for this application. There can be conditions for existing building approval and then for new building reviewed.

Building number six is in the right of way. This building probably would not have been authorized for expansion of its non-conforming use. The house on the property is still being utilized as a house.

There was some discussion regarding how to approach the application this evening. Mr. Aimino suggested that the board look at each building individually and then look at the plan as a whole.

The board will look at each building individually and review what needs to be done in order to bring the buildings/site into compliance. There was some discussion amongst the board regarding buildings that had not received any authorization prior to construction.

Mr. Aimino suggested a presentation from the applicants engineer in an organized fashion.

Building number seven is a single family property. Building number six used to be an apartment and is currently vacant. The applicant is not asking for this to be used for anything other than storage for the single-family dwelling. It will not be utilized as an apartment. Building number five is an existing agricultural building and there is no change to its proposed use. Building number four has been demolished and rebuilt. Testimony will be provided regarding this building. Building number three is an existing building that has been expanded. Building number two has a frame metal storage building to be used as storage. But a number eight is a greenhouse the portion in the driveway will be removed. Marathon Engineering has indicated that part of the causeway will be removed.

Corey Gaskill reviewed his letter dated June 9, 2022. He provided a general overview and Mr. Simmons agrees with the letter. Building number six is 7 feet into the right away encroachment that existed prior to the current applicant owning the property. The expansion of this building was not along Tide Mill Road, but it is on the opposite side. The expansion is in the setback area which would require a variance.

The masonry farm building is in noncompliance. Building number nine is pre-existing and if this application is approved it would be removed. The lot is subject to CAPRA. The applicants will comply. Corey Gaskill stated that proof of compliance is required.

David Cadwallader arrived at the meeting. (7:32 pm)

Peter Guy located and reviewed the septic system. The plan also shows a septic tank.

Mai Tang is a member of Tang Friendly Properties. The house is currently occupied by the family and all other buildings on the property or for agricultural purposes.

Building number four is the new large building with two floors for food picking and packing. The mezzanine area will be where packing materials will be stored. Currently they are renting the property to the previous owner who farms the land. The applicant plans to grow vegetables and have a greenhouse. These will be Chinese and oriental vegetables grown on the property. The proposed greenhouse for building number eight will be specifically for growing vegetables. Building number six, which was previously an apartment, will not be used as an apartment. The applicant understands that they would need to come back to the board if they would like to make an application to make that unit an apartment again in the future.

Building number one is an office area and will be a lounge area for workers. There are no restrooms in this building. Building number five has new changes and will continue to be a storage building. Building number nine is proposed to be a new building it will be a barn for agricultural purposes – specifically a garage for equipment.

The applicant acknowledges that all permits and approvals are required before construction could occur. Building number two is two shipping containers with a roof that are currently storage. The containers are housing items in storage. The applicant stated that they would be using all of the farmland for planting they do not plan to rent to the previous owners. The current person farming the property is using the three buildings where number nine would be.

Gaynel asked about the pile of bricks and debris. The applicant indicated that they have a fire permit.

Mr. Asay asked about building number six. Should the board expand this non-conforming use. Would the board grant variance for this construction?

Concerns were raised about runoff and the retention basin. Corey Gaskill stated that the applicant will have to comply with the standards with multiple jurisdictions and the stormwater plan. The meadow is title. The regulations are not about quantity but about quality.

There was a question if this application could be approved in tiers. With the applicant consider no action on building eight or nine before going through all of the other process. The applicant's attorney stated that they are asking for approval for the entire plan but would agree that construction of buildings eight and nine cannot proceed until all of the other buildings have their approvals. The applicant agreed but asked about building number eight because it is a hoop construction building.

The only way to bring the application into compliance is to approve a site plan.

Mr. Asay stated the building number six probably would not have been approved if they had come before the board before construction. Mr. Aimino stated that he has seen boards vote in both directions regarding this type of application.

Mr. Asay asked about the removal of building number six.

The applicants agree that there would be no repacking I have product that did not come from what is grown on the farm. The applicants acknowledge that they understand that they would need to come back to the board for a new application should they want to re-pack items that were not grown on the property.

Mr. Eber asked a question about the driveway. Mr. Simmons confirmed the markings that indicate the impervious cover on the plan.

Corey Gaskill stated that the applicant will need demo permits as indicated in his letter on June 9, 2022.

Mr. Aimino spoke about the one variance approval. Buildings number seven and five would not require a variance. Building number six is mostly pre-existing the addition to the building could be instructed to be removed.

There was discussion regarding general comments and setting the corners for the property. The applicant is requesting a waiver. The applicant must comply with stormwater management regulations. The engineer would need to approve this and this can be a condition of approval. A septic inspection may be required by the county. It would be determined by the Salem County Health Department if new bathrooms are required to meet standards.

The meeting was open to the public at this time. The motion was made by Donald Asay and seconded by Richard Eber. Mr. William Hassler, Jr was sworn in. He resides at 50 Tide Mill Rd. He recently went through the process to restore their home and had questions regarding storage buildings and compliance through their usage. He asked that the board not approve building number eight and nine without full compliance. He does have concerns that Tide Mill Road floods with heavy rain. He has only owned the property for two years. He is concerned that the applicant might use the property for a different reason.

The motion to close the meeting to the public was made by Donald Asay and seconded by Richard Eber.

Donald Asay made a motion to approve a variance for building number 6 on the site plan.  
Richard Eber seconded the motion.

**Roll Call Vote**

Donald Asay - No  
William DeCinque - No  
Richard Eber - No  
Donald Richman – No  
John Sakewicz - No  
Nicolas Culver – No  
Gaynel Schneeman – No  
Robert Schmid - Abstained

Richard Eber made the motion to approve the site plan with all of the conditions discussed.  
William DeCinque seconded the motion.

**Roll Call Vote**

Donald Asay - Yes  
William DeCinque - Yes  
Richard Eber - Yes  
Donald Richman – Yes  
John Sakewicz - Yes  
Nicolas Culver – Yes  
Gaynel Schneeman – Yes  
Robert Schmid - Abstained

Mr. Melnicove thanked the board for their time.

There were no members of the public present.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Rebecca Gower Ferguson  
Planning Board Secretary