

**Township of Gloucester  
Planning Board Agenda Revised  
September 11, 2012  
7:30P. M.**

**Salute to the Flag  
Opening Statement  
General Rules**

Meeting will start at 7:30 P. M.

No new applications will be heard after 10:00 P. M.

All persons testifying before the Board must be sworn in.

The Board Chairperson reserves the right to hear applications in any order

**MINUTES FOR MEMORIALIZATION**

**Minutes for Memorialization - June 12, 2012**

**RESOLUTIONS FOR MEMORIALIZATION**

Gloucester Twp. Planning Board  
Approval for Redevelopment of Gloucester  
Environmental Services, Inc. (GEMS)  
Landfill Superfund Redevelopment Area  
& Recommending the same to Twp.  
Council for approval & adoption

Block: 14003, Lots: 25 & 26  
Block: 19601, Lots: 3, 14 thru 25  
Block: 19602, Lots: 2, 3 & 10

#111034SPWC  
One Cingular/AT&T

Site Plan Waiver/Bulk C  
Block: 15302 Lot: 33

**APPLICATIONS FOR REVIEW**

Correspondence –Steven Bach Associates - Compliance Plan satisfying  
conditions for Marketplace @ Chews Landing

Meeting Adjourned

**TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER  
PLANNING BOARD**

**Tuesday, June 12, 2012**

---

Chairmen Kricum called the meeting to order. The Secretary, Mr. Lechner, read the commencement statement, and all professionals were sworn.

**Roll Call:**

Mrs. Costa	Present
Mr. DelDuke	Present
Mr. Dunn	Absent
Mr. Guevara	Present
Mr. Jones	Present
Mr. Mercado	Present
Mr. Moffa	Absent
Mrs. Musser	Present
Mr. Pearce	Present
Mrs. Washington	Present
Chairman Kricum	Present

Also present is Edward Brennan, Esq. who swore in the Board professionals, Steven Bach PE, CME, Board engineer and Kenneth D. Lechner, PP, AICP, Board Planner, and both were qualified as experts.

Chairman Kricum seated Mr. Guevara for Mr. Dunn.

**Minutes for Memorialization**

**Resolutions for Memorialization**

**Applications for Review**

#121024MC Sara & Richard Howard	Minor Subdivision/ Bulk C Variance Block: 2102 Lots: 2, 2.01 & 4
------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------

Appearing before the Board was Addison Bradley, PE for the applicant. Also appearing was Mr. & Mrs. Howard. The applicants were sworn in.

Mr. Bradley explained to the Board, using an enlarged map, where the property is located. The properties both front the Black Horse Pike. The lots are located between a cemetery and an industrial business park. Along with making the lots conforming, they will be asking to add an additional garage. The property has

adequate frontage on the Black Horse Pike on lot 4 where the house is located. Lot 2 has 45 ft. of frontage that will be absorbed by lot 4. Lot 2.01 is only 16 ft., and by adding it to lot 4, they will have conforming lots.

Chairman Kricum asked if they agree with the planners' and engineers' comments. They agree to all the comments except for the sidewalks. The cemetery and the industrial park both do not have sidewalks. If they put sidewalks in, then it would be just the property in between them that would have sidewalks. Mr. Lechner understands what they are saying. However, there are sidewalks across the street. There are also sidewalks on the same side as the property further down. Mr. DelDuke asked if they know for sure if the cemetery will not have sidewalks in the future. Mr. Bradley stated that they cannot afford sidewalks, and if they are forced to have them, then they will have to pull their application.

Mrs. Musser asked what are they going to do with the other lot their house is not on once the variance is granted. Mr. Bradley replied that it could one day have a house built on it. Mrs. Musser felt that it is a safety issue. Mr. Bradley suggested that if they were granted the waiver for the sidewalk now if it comes to a house being built then they would have to be put in them. Mr. Lecher's concern was that if that day came, how they would know and how they would enforce it.

Mrs. Howard added that her family built their house in 1923. A person in a nursing home owned the property next door until they passed away. There was a man who bought it. He lost it, and the bank offered it to them. Not only do they share a driveway with the property, but they have also been taking care of the property. They found out the lots were not conforming, and they were worried about the lots being merged from the tax assessor. The property is higher than where the sidewalk would be and would require additional money being spent on a retaining wall. Mrs. Musser asked if the cemetery has sidewalk now. Mr. Bradley replied that it does not. The Board has no problem with waiving the sidewalk.

The requirement for the frontage is 50 ft. There are existing 17 ft., and they are going down to 12 ft. Mr. Bradley stated that there are a total of 150 ft. of frontage off the Black Horse Pike. They are asking for a seconded garage, which would also serve as a pool house. There is an existing small pool house. The main purpose for the seconded garage is to fit their vehicle. The maximum height they are allowed is 15 ft., but they are asking for 20 ft. There will be a seconded story. However, it would not be habitable. They plan to use it for storage. Mr. Lechner was not opposed to the seconded garage. Mr. DelDuke asked if the one existing is non-conforming. Mr. Bradley replied that it is non-conforming; they received a variance for it. After reviewing what the standard is and what they are proposing, the Board granted their variances.

With nothing further from the Board, Chairman Kricun opened the application up to the public. With no one from the public wishing to speak, the public portion was closed.

Mr. DeIDuke asked that when everything is completed if there be three lots. Mr. Bradley reviewed, using the lots and where they will be within the applicants' properties.

Mrs. Washington made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Jones.

Roll Call:

Mr. DeIDuke	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mr. Jones	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pearce	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricum	Yes

#121020PFMSCUAC Embree Asset Group, Inc. Pep Boys	
------------------------------------------------------	--

Appearing before the Board was Craig Pergoy traffic engineer

Chairman Kricun reviewed where they left off from when they presented to the Board on May 22 and how the order of the night would be.

Mr. Pergoy stated that he is familiar with the site and the application. Since they could only do so much work in one day, seventeen (17) parking spaces are adequate. Also, when cars are getting oil changes, they are in the drive isle until they go into the building. So, if you take the two (2) oil bays away and take the five (5) days per the ordinance, it would be 20 spaces. They have seventeen (17), which is three (3) less than the ordinance requires. The four (4) employees that will be parking will not be affected.

Mr. Shoveling, objector did not have any questions for the traffic engineer. The only concern was that if they do get more than expected, the overflow would be parking in McDonalds. After a short conversation, it was agreed that the employees would be informed not to park at McDonalds. If parking at McDonalds ever becomes a problem, Pep Boys will pay to have signs put in stating "For McDonalds parking only." With that, the objectors withdrew their complaint.

Chairman Kricun opened the application up to the public, with a time limit of five (5) minutes per person.

Joanie Blackwell informed the Board that she has a print out as to where her house is to the application site. They are concerned with the property value going down, the noise, and the smell of oil. She was also concerned with the additional traffic the business will cause, any pollution from the run off of oil, and the closeness of the building. Ms. Blackwell continued that the appearance of the building is not going to match the others in that area, and there is not going to be enough parking. Mr. Aithal answered Ms. Blackwell that they are within New Jersey's guidelines for noise, and the air guns being used are made to be quiet compared to others. They will also have a policy to have the rear doors closed unless they are driving a car in. Additionally, they are going to have fencing and trees to serve as a sound barrier. Ms. Blackwell's last concern is that if they were to no longer occupy the building, then it would leave a rather large abandoned building.

Mr. Bill stated that the rear of his house faces Pep Boys. He is concerned that if a car were to break down, then it would sit in their parking lot for a long period of time. Mr. Aithal replied that Pep Boys is not the kind of business that has a tow truck and works on car that break down. They mainly do oil and tire changes. Ms. Mathern also added that they do not want their property to look like a junkyard and would not allow any car to be on their property for a long period of time.

Catharine Henry stated that she has lived there for over fifty-five (55) years and feels that it is going to be one big mess.

Dave Hock stated that he is concerned with the roll through oil changes. If there were ever an overflow of cars waiting in the line, it would fill up the lot and then hinder the flow of traffic. Mrs. Mathern replied that the way they configured the lot, the cars will be driving around the building, and even with several cars waiting in line, it still would not be in the way of the parking lot. Also, oil changes are not the only thing that they do like Jiffy Lube. They figured their average time frame for a service call is about two (2) hours.

Kelly Hock was concerned with their air tools. Even when the high school down the road has a game, she can hear them as if they were closer. Chairman Kricum replied that there is a State requirement that they have to meet when it comes to sound. Mr. Aithal added that they are within the State's requirements, along with the air gun, they use being quieter than most.

Mrs. Blackwell asked with the tools they use, would she hear them from 200 feet away and the fumes in the air. Mr. Aithal replied that the street itself is loud and remaindered her what he stated earlier about the states requirements and the quiet air tools. Ms. Mathern replied that the car are not running while they are serving them and if they have to be for they will be hooked up to a vent system.

Ms. Blackwell continued that cars waiting in line for service would be emitting fumes. Chairman Kricun reminded the public that this area is zoned for commercial use.

Mr. Bill did agree that they don't do heavy mechanical work. There are cases where people will drop off their cars and what happens if they are waiting for a part. Ms. Mathern answered that they could possibly have a car waiting for a part but that car would be brought inside. Chairman Kricun inquired about the two (2) sized of Pep Boys. Ms. Mathern explained that they have just a Service and Tire Center and they have Super Centers.

Mr. Joe doesn't feel that is a proper place for a Pep Boys since it's so close to homes. He feels that they would be better to be further down Blackwood Clementon Road.

Dave Hock asked about the block building they have for storage and that the Board said it wasn't on the plans. Mr. Lechner replied that it was on the plans it just need to be clarified better and it since has been.

With no one else from the public wishing to speak the public portion was closed.

Mrs. Costa wanted to know about the sign they previously talked about that was going to be on the corner. Mr. Lechner replied that they have been working together but they are limited to what they can do due to the signal boxes for the traffic lights. They will keep working together to come up with something appropriate.

Mr. DeIDuke asked what they do to control the drainage and run off issues with the oil. Ms. Mathern replies that they have an oil and water separator, along with a spill kit. In addition the floors have a slight slope that goes to a drain. It then would drain into a double walled waste chamber. There is also a hotline employees can use if a spill is large and uncontainable. All oil is stored within the building and there is no chance of contamination. Mrs. Musser asked what does a spill kit do. Ms. Mathern explained that it has a sock boom around the spill, gloves and the emergence number for them to call.

Mr. Pearce asked what the maximum amount of oil is stored before pick up. Ms. Mathern replies that they have a 100-gallon tank for oil and 100 gallon tank for anti-freeze. When they are 70% percent filled they call a pick up.

Mr. Mercado asked if there is going to be an increase in landscaping for the back bays. Mr. Aithal replied that they are working with the Township. Mr. Lechner added that they provided evergreen trees and would like more then they proposed. He also asked that they added on their plan a note that mentions that there may be additional landscaping per the Township Planner. Mr. Aithal added that they are also doing a fence along with the evergreens.

Chairman Kricun asked that Mr. Lechner review the items not to be waived. Mr. Lechner replied a letter for absent of wetland, copy of recycling report, improvement impact statement, traffic impact and loading zone.

Mr. Guevara made a motion to approve the application subject to the applicants continued work with the planners, seconded by Mr. Mercado.

Roll Call:

Mr. DeIDuke	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pearce	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricum	Yes

Chairman Kricun informed the Board that Vice Chairman Dunn has with drawn from the board due to personal issues. He was an outstanding member and served the town well.

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully Submitted

---

Courtney Mosiondz  
Recording Secretary

**A RESOLUTION OF THE GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING  
BOARD ADOPTING THE PLAN FOR REDEVELOPMENT FOR THE GLOUCESTER  
ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, INC. (GEMS) LANDFILL SUPERFUND  
REDEVELOPMENT AREA AND RECOMMENDING THE SAME TO  
TOWNSHIP COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL AND ADOPTION**

WHEREAS, under Resolution R-12-02-040, Gloucester Township Council requested the Planning Board to undergo a preliminary investigation of the issue of whether the Gloucester Environmental Services, Inc., (GEMS) Landfill Superfund Area qualified as a "Redevelopment Area", under the standards set forth in the New Jersey Statue, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, the property in question is designated on the Tax Map of the Township of Gloucester as Block 14003, Lots 25 & 26; Block 19601, Lots 3, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 & 25; and Block 19602, Lots 2, 3 & 10, hereinafter referred as to the "Property", and

WHEREAS, a Preliminary Investigation for Determination of Eligibility for Declaration as an Area in Need of Redevelopment for the Property was prepared by John J. Cantwell, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., and George R. Stevenson, Jr., AICP, P.P., of Remington & Vernick Engineers, Inc., dated February 2012, hereinafter referred to as "Investigation", which was presented to and reviewed by the Gloucester Township Planning Board on April 24, 2012; and

WHEREAS, on April 24, 2012, the Gloucester Township Planning Board found that the GEMS Landfill Superfund Area qualified as a "Redevelopment Area", under the standards set forth in the New Jersey Statue, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1 et seq., and recommended that the Gloucester Township Council approved the property as a Redevelopment Area; and

WHEREAS, on July 23, 2012, the Gloucester Township Council passed Resolution, R-12:06-148, accepting the recommendation of the Planning Board and designating the GEMS Landfill Superfund Area and associated property as a Redevelopment Area; and

WHEREAS, Remington & Vernick Engineers, Inc., were commissioned to draft and present a Redevelopment Plan for the property (hereinafter the "Redevelopment Plan") which was presented before the Gloucester Township Planning Board by John J. Cantwell, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., and George R. Stevenson, Jr., P.P., A.I.C.P., on August 14, 2012 for review and comment; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board expressed continued concern that any redevelopment consider the limitations on the cap on the GEMS Landfill including lifespan of the cap, concerns regarding potentially piercing the cap through redevelopment and maintaining communication with State and Federal authorities regarding the maintenance and remediation of

the GEMS landfill site, and specifically contacting both State and Federal authorities prior to beginning any improvements on the property.

NOW THEREFORE, upon motion duly made by Mr. Pearce and duly seconded by Mr. Owens and unanimously adopted by the Planning Board;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of Gloucester Township hereby approves the Plan for Redevelopment of Gloucester Environmental Services, Inc. (GEMS) Landfill Superfund Redevelopment Area as presented by Remington & Vernick Engineers, Inc., on August 14, 2012 and recommends that the Township Council of Gloucester Township adopts the Redevelopment Plan with the comments and suggestions as set forth by the Planning Board.

ATTEST:

GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING BOARD:

\_\_\_\_\_  
KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY

\_\_\_\_\_  
ANDREW KRICUN, CHAIRMAN

#### CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this resolution of memorialization being adopted by action of the Board on this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2012 represents a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Gloucester Township Planning Board at a meeting held on the 14th day of August 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY

**A RESOLUTION OF THE GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD  
MEMORIALIZING A MINOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL  
FOR NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC  
APPLICATION NO: 111034M**

WHEREAS, on August 14, 2012 consideration was given to the application of New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, (hereinafter "Applicant") for the property located at Block 15302, Lot 33 (hereinafter "the Property") for minor site plan approval with waivers for the expansion of a telecommunications facility; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is appearing before the Board proposing to upgrade the currently existing two hundred ten (210) foot lattice tower to enhance the currently existing system by placing an additional three (3) antennae on the tower at one hundred ninety one (191) feet and placing new equipment within the existing equipment shelter on the Property; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Quinn, Esquire appeared on behalf of the Applicant to present the application stating that the Applicant intends to improve the currently existing lattice tower on the Property to provide upgrades in equipment and technology on the tower and within the currently existing equipment storage unit. Mr. Quinn indicated that the Applicant is proposing an additional three (3) antennae which will accommodate 4G technology and will increase bandwidth to accommodate demands within the marketplace. Mr. Quinn further stated that there are no proposed site improvements to the Property and no additional antennae as the three (3) proposed will be replacing current antennae. Mr. Quinn also stated that the proposed use is a permitted use in the Neighborhood Commercial District and no variances are required as all conditions on the property are existing non-conforming conditions and are not being exacerbated in any way with improvements. Mr. Quinn stated that the Applicant is requesting a waiver from submission of a site survey as no site improvements are being proposed. Mr. Quinn noted that the proposed additional antennae have no negative impact on the neighborhood and there is no proposed change to maintenance of the Property or signage on the Property; and

WHEREAS no member of the public appeared to speak on the application; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board having received reports from professionals and other advisors to the Board including, without limitation, the Zoning Officer, Board Engineer, Board Planner, County Planning Board, Traffic Commander, Fire Marshall, Tax Assessor, Water Department and Municipal Utilities Authorities having heard testimony from the Board Planner and Board Engineer makes the following factual findings in conditionally approving the subject application for preliminary and final major site plan approval with variances and waivers:

1. Existing Zoning: NC – Neighborhood Commercial
2. Intended Use: Telecommunications Tower

3. The application implicates the following provisions of the ordinance:

- a. Bulk Zoning Requirements in NC [§415(F)]
- b. Telecommunications Towers and Antennae Requirements [423(C)]

**§415.F - NC - Neighborhood Commercial District**

Description	Required (Other use)	Proposed	Conforms
Lot size (min.)	1 acre	0.275 acres	enc
Lot frontage (min.)	100 ft.	100 ft.	yes
Lot Depth (min.)	300 ft.	125.25 ft.	enc
Building coverage (max.)	15%	3.5%	yes
Lot coverage (max.)	50%	5.2%	yes
Front yard (min.) - existing equipment shelter	20 ft.	±32 ft.	yes
Side yard (min.) - existing equipment shelter	10 ft.	±20 ft./ ±55 ft. <sup>1</sup>	yes/yes
Rear yard (min.) - existing equipment shelter	25 ft.	±68 ft.	yes
Building height (max.)	35 ft.	< 35 ft.	yes

<sup>1</sup> = Scaled data  
 enc = Existing nonconformance

**Telecommunication Towers and Antennae Requirements**

Description	Required	Proposed	Conforms
Lot size (min.)	2 acres	0.275 acres	enc
Telecommunication tower height (max.)	150 ft.	210 ft.	enc
Telecommunication tower/antennae			
Property line setback (min.) 1.5 x 210' = 315'			
Front property line(east) - water tower	315 ft.	71 ft.	enc
Side property line (south) - water tower	315 ft.	23 ft.	enc
Side property line (north) - water tower	315 ft.	±481 ft.	yes
Rear property line (west) - water tower	315 ft.	31 ft.	enc
Co-location	yes	yes	yes
Incidental signage	yes	n/p	---
Fence enclosure height	8 ft.	8 ft.	yes
Historic district/site	N.P.	n/p	---

<sup>1</sup> = Scaled data  
 enc = Existing nonconformance  
 n/p = not provided  
 N.P. = Not Permitted

4. The Board Planner reviewed the following plans:

- a. Day Pitney Transmittal Letter dated 07/28/2011.

- b. Land Development Application Form and Proposal dated 08/01/2011.
- c. Land Development Checklist and Checklist Waiver Request Form.
- d. At&t Disclosure Statement dated 08/13/2008.
- e. Second Amendment to Lease Agreement dated 05/01/2007.
- f. Electromagnetic Emmissions Analysis, as prepared by dBm Engineering, P.C., dated 06/22/2011.
- g. Revised rigorous Structural Analysis report, as prepared by GPD Associates, dated 07/27/2011.
- h. Engineering plans, as prepared by Dewberry-Goodkind, Inc., consisting of the following:

<u>Sheet</u>	<u>Plan Description</u>	<u>Date/Latest Revision</u>
T-1	Title Sheet	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-1	Site Plan	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-2	Compound Layout Plan and Elevation	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-3	Antenna Plan and Details	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-4	200 ft. Property List	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011

- 5. The Board Planner, Kenneth D. Lechner, PP. AICP, issued a report dated September 14, 2011 recommending certain revisions, clarification and/or modifications to the plans with which the applicant agreed to comply to the extent that they had not done so already or had not requested waiver from the same.
- 6. The Applicant requested waiver from submission of survey as no site improvements are being proposed.
- 7. The Board Engineer, Elissa C. Commins, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., of Birdsall Services Group, reviewed the following plans:
  - a. Plans entitled, "AT&T, Site Number: NJL03520, FA Number: 10010130, Site Name: Erial, Modification to Existing Cell Site," consisting of five (5) sheets, last revised 06/30/2011, as prepared by Dewberry-Goodkind Inc.;
  - b. Township of Gloucester Land Development Application Checklist and W-9;
  - c. Revised Rigororous Structural Analysis Report, dated 07/27/2011, prepared by GPD Group;
  - d. Electromagnetic Emissions Analysis, dated 06/22/2011, prepared by DBM Engineering, P.C.; and
  - e. Camden County Planning Board Application.
- 8. The Board Engineer issued a report dated August 18, 2011 indicating the need for several revisions, clarifications and/or modifications to the plan to which the applicant agreed as a condition of approval notwithstanding waivers requested and approved by the Board.
- 9. Current Board Engineer, Steven Bach, P.E., R.A., P.P., C.M.E., of Bach Associates, reviewed the report of August 18, 2011 and agreed with the recommendations and insight contained therein and adopted the same as if it was his own.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after considering the foregoing facts the Board concludes that New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC's application for minor site plan approval with waivers has substantial merit and should be approved subject, however, to the following conditions:

- A) Compliance with all Township, County, State and Federal rules, regulations and ordinances.
- B) Approval of all appropriate reviewing agencies including without limitation, the MUA, County Planning Board, Traffic Commander, Fire Marshall, Soil Conservation District, Department of Transportation and Police Department.
- C) Compliance with the Board Engineer's report and comments at the public hearing
- D) Compliance with the terms and conditions of the Board Planner's report and comments at the public hearing.
- E) Compliance with all representations made by the applicant at all public hearings.
- F) All existing easements on the property shall be provided to the Board Solicitor for review. All proposed or required easements shall be subject to the Board Solicitor's review and approval. All proposed or required easements for residential properties shall also be subject to three point notification (first contract of sale, deed into first home owner and plan notation.)

WHEREAS, a motion was duly made by Mrs. Costa and duly seconded by Mr. Pearce to approve the Minor Site Plan with waiver from providing a site survey with conditions as set forth more fully above and in testimony of the Applicant, and a roll call vote on the motion was recorded as follows:

Those Eligible to Vote	Those in Favor	Those Opposed
Mr. Pearce	x	
Mrs. Costa	x	
Mr. Mercado	x	
Ms. Shinn	x	
Mr. Owens	x	
Mrs. Washington	x	
Chairman Kricun	x	

ATTEST:

GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING BOARD:

\_\_\_\_\_  
KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY

\_\_\_\_\_  
ANDY KRICUN, CHAIRMAN

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this resolution of memorialization being adopted by action of the Board on this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2012 represents a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Gloucester Township Planning Board at a meeting held on the 14th day of August 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY

**A RESOLUTION OF THE GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD  
MEMORIALIZING A MINOR SITE PLAN APPROVAL  
FOR NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC  
APPLICATION NO: 111034M**

WHEREAS, on August 14, 2012 consideration was given to the application of New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, (hereinafter "Applicant") for the property located at Block 15302, Lot 33 (hereinafter "the Property") for minor site plan approval with waivers for the expansion of a telecommunications facility; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is appearing before the Board proposing to upgrade the currently existing two hundred ten (210) foot lattice tower to enhance the currently existing system by placing an additional three (3) antennae on the tower at one hundred ninety one (191) feet and placing new equipment within the existing equipment shelter on the Property; and

WHEREAS, Christopher Quinn, Esquire appeared on behalf of the Applicant to present the application stating that the Applicant intends to improve the currently existing lattice tower on the Property to provide upgrades in equipment and technology on the tower and within the currently existing equipment storage unit. Mr. Quinn indicated that the Applicant is proposing an additional three (3) antennae which will accommodate 4G technology and will increase bandwidth to accommodate demands within the marketplace. Mr. Quinn further stated that there are no proposed site improvements to the Property and no additional antennae as the three (3) proposed will be replacing current antennae. Mr. Quinn also stated that the proposed use is a permitted use in the Neighborhood Commercial District and no variances are required as all conditions on the property are existing non-conforming conditions and are not being exacerbated in any way with improvements. Mr. Quinn stated that the Applicant is requesting a waiver from submission of a site survey as no site improvements are being proposed. Mr. Quinn noted that the proposed additional antennae have no negative impact on the neighborhood and there is no proposed change to maintenance of the Property or signage on the Property; and

WHEREAS no member of the public appeared to speak on the application; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board having received reports from professionals and other advisors to the Board including, without limitation, the Zoning Officer, Board Engineer, Board Planner, County Planning Board, Traffic Commander, Fire Marshall, Tax Assessor, Water Department and Municipal Utilities Authorities having heard testimony from the Board Planner and Board Engineer makes the following factual findings in conditionally approving the subject application for preliminary and final major site plan approval with variances and waivers:

1. Existing Zoning: NC – Neighborhood Commercial
2. Intended Use: Telecommunications Tower

3. The application implicates the following provisions of the ordinance:

- a. Bulk Zoning Requirements in NC [§415(F)]
- b. Telecommunications Towers and Antennae Requirements [423(C)]

**§415.F - NC - Neighborhood Commercial District**

Description	Required (Other use)	Proposed	Conforms
Lot size (min.)	1 acre	0.275 acres	enc
Lot frontage (min.)	100 ft.	100 ft.	yes
Lot Depth (min.)	300 ft.	125.25 ft.	enc
Building coverage (max.)	15%	3.5%	yes
Lot coverage (max.)	50%	5.2%	yes
Front yard (min.) - existing equipment shelter	20 ft.	±32 ft.	yes
Side yard (min.) - existing equipment shelter	10 ft.	±20 ft./ ±55 ft. <sup>1</sup>	yes/yes
Rear yard (min.) - existing equipment shelter	25 ft.	±68 ft.	yes
Building height (max.)	35 ft.	< 35 ft.	yes

<sup>1</sup> = Scaled data  
 enc = Existing nonconformance

**Telecommunication Towers and Antennae Requirements**

Description	Required	Proposed	Conforms
Lot size (min.)	2 acres	0.275 acres	enc
Telecommunication tower height (max.)	150 ft.	210 ft.	enc
Telecommunication tower/antennae Property line setback (min.) 1.5 x 210' = 315'			
Front property line(east) - water tower	315 ft.	71 ft.	enc
Side property line (south) - water tower	315 ft.	23 ft.	enc
Side property line (north) - water tower	315 ft.	±481 ft.	yes
Rear property line (west) - water tower	315 ft.	31 ft.	enc
Co-location	yes	yes	yes
Incidental signage	yes	n/p	---
Fence enclosure height	8 ft.	8 ft.	yes
Historic district/site	N.P.	n/p	---

<sup>1</sup> = Scaled data  
 enc = Existing nonconformance  
 n/p = not provided  
 N.P. = Not Permitted

4. The Board Planner reviewed the following plans:

- a. Day Pitney Transmittal Letter dated 07/28/2011.

- b. Land Development Application Form and Proposal dated 08/01/2011.
- c. Land Development Checklist and Checklist Waiver Request Form.
- d. At&t Disclosure Statement dated 08/13/2008.
- e. Second Amendment to Lease Agreement dated 05/01/2007.
- f. Electromagnetic Emmissions Analysis, as prepared by dBm Engineering, P.C., dated 06/22/2011.
- g. Revised rigorous Structural Analysis report, as prepared by GPD Associates, dated 07/27/2011.
- h. Engineering plans, as prepared by Dewberry-Goodkind, Inc., consisting of the following:

<u>Sheet</u>	<u>Plan Description</u>	<u>Date/Latest Revision</u>
T-1	Title Sheet	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-1	Site Plan	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-2	Compound Layout Plan and Elevation	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-3	Antenna Plan and Details	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011
Z-4	200 ft. Property List	06/21/2011 / 06/30/2011

- 5. The Board Planner, Kenneth D. Lechner, PP. AICP, issued a report dated September 14, 2011 recommending certain revisions, clarification and/or modifications to the plans with which the applicant agreed to comply to the extent that they had not done so already or had not requested waiver from the same.
- 6. The Applicant requested waiver from submission of survey as no site improvements are being proposed.
- 7. The Board Engineer, Elissa C. Commins, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., of Birdsall Services Group, reviewed the following plans:
  - a. Plans entitled, "AT&T, Site Number: NJL03520, FA Number: 10010130, Site Name: Erial, Modification to Existing Cell Site," consisting of five (5) sheets, last revised 06/30/2011, as prepared by Dewberry-Goodkind Inc.;
  - b. Township of Gloucester Land Development Application Checklist and W-9;
  - c. Revised Rigoroous Structural Analysis Report, dated 07/27/2011, prepared by GPD Group;
  - d. Electromagnetic Emissions Analysis, dated 06/22/2011, prepared by DBM Engineering, P.C.; and
  - e. Camden County Planning Board Application.
- 8. The Board Engineer issued a report dated August 18, 2011 indicating the need for several revisions, clarifications and/or modifications to the plan to which the applicant agreed as a condition of approval notwithstanding waivers requested and approved by the Board.
- 9. Current Board Engineer, Steven Bach, P.E., R.A., P.P., C.M.E., of Bach Associates, reviewed the report of August 18, 2011 and agreed with the recommendations and insight contained therein and adopted the same as if it was his own.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after considering the foregoing facts the Board concludes that New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC's application for minor site plan approval with waivers has substantial merit and should be approved subject, however, to the following conditions:

- A) Compliance with all Township, County, State and Federal rules, regulations and ordinances.
- B) Approval of all appropriate reviewing agencies including without limitation, the MUA, County Planning Board, Traffic Commander, Fire Marshall, Soil Conservation District, Department of Transportation and Police Department.
- C) Compliance with the Board Engineer's report and comments at the public hearing
- D) Compliance with the terms and conditions of the Board Planner's report and comments at the public hearing.
- E) Compliance with all representations made by the applicant at all public hearings.
- F) All existing easements on the property shall be provided to the Board Solicitor for review. All proposed or required easements shall be subject to the Board Solicitor's review and approval. All proposed or required easements for residential properties shall also be subject to three point notification (first contract of sale, deed into first home owner and plan notation.)

WHEREAS, a motion was duly made by Mrs. Costa and duly seconded by Mr. Pearce to approve the Minor Site Plan with waiver from providing a site survey with conditions as set forth more fully above and in testimony of the Applicant, and a roll call vote on the motion was recorded as follows:

Those Eligible to Vote	Those in Favor	Those Opposed
Mr. Pearce	x	
Mrs. Costa	x	
Mr. Mercado	x	
Ms. Shinn	x	
Mr. Owens	x	
Mrs. Washington	x	
Chairman Kricun	x	

ATTEST:

GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING BOARD:

\_\_\_\_\_  
KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY

\_\_\_\_\_  
ANDY KRICUN, CHAIRMAN

#### CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this resolution of memorialization being adopted by action of the Board on this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_ 2012 represents a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Gloucester Township Planning Board at a meeting held on the 14th day of August 2012.

\_\_\_\_\_  
KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY



**BACH Associates, PC**  
ENGINEERS • ARCHITECTS • PLANNERS

August 6, 2012

Township of Gloucester  
Chews Landing-Clementon Road, at Hider Lane  
PO Box 8  
Blackwood, NJ 08012-0008

*For Your Information*

Attn: Ken Lechner, Township Director / Planner

Re: Marketplace at Chews Landing, LLC  
Paramount Realty  
1236 Chews Landing Road  
Block 206.01, Lots 2 & 3  
Review No. 2  
Bach Project No. GTPB-2012-16

Dear Mr. Lechner:

The applicant has provided an engineering drawing entitled "Site Compliance Plan, Children of America, Plate 206, Block 20601, Lots 2 & 3, Township of Gloucester, Camden County, New Jersey, prepared by Consulting Engineer Services, dated 7-16-12, no revision.

This plan satisfies the conditions delineated our previous review letter dated July 5, 2012.

If there are any questions or if any additional information is required please contact this office:

Very truly yours,  
BACH ASSOCIATES, PC

Steven M. Bach, PE, RA, PP, CME  
President

Cc: Gloucester Township Planning Board Members  
Edward Brennan, Esq., Planning Board Solicitor  
Morris Levy, Marketplace at Chews Landing, LLC

S:\GTPB2012 Gloucester Twp Planning Board\16 Marketplace at Chews Landing, LLC\Docs\GTPB2012-16 Review No. 2.doc

# TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER

## Interoffice Correspondence

---



**TO:** Zoning Board of Adjustment

**FROM:** Kenneth D. Lechner, PP, AICP, Director/Planner  
Alisa Ortiz, Zoning Officer  
Department of Community Development & Planning

**RE:** **APPLICATION #102006CPFSS Amended**                      **Escrow #7352**  
**Gloucester Township Housing authority**  
**BLOCK 14102, LOT 17**

**DATE:** September 12, 2012

The Applicant requests amended preliminary and final major site plan and subdivision approval to construct an 80 unit inclusionary affordable housing apartment complex with community room within the RA - Residential Attached District. The project is located on the extensions of Loch Lomond Road West and Melbourne Lane west of Erial Road.

Use variance approval for a 100 unit inclusionary affordable housing apartment complex with community room was previously approved by Zoning Board of Adjustment Resolution #102006CDMSPFMSP adopted March 11, 2010.

The amended plans have been reviewed for conformance to the Land Development Ordinance of Gloucester Township and the following comments are offered for your consideration.

- Applicant: Revere Housing Associates, LLC, 183 Main Street Rochester, NY 14604 (telephone #856-793-2082).
- Owner: Township of Gloucester, P. O. Box 8, Blackwood, NJ 08102.
- Engineer: Steven M. Bach, PE, Bach & Associates, PC, 304 Whites Horse Pike, Haddon Heights, NJ 08035 (telephone #856-546-8611).
- Surveyor: James A. Conway, Jr. PLS, Bach & Associates, PC, 304 Whites Horse Pike, Haddon Heights, NJ 08035 (telephone #856-546-8611).
- Architect: Steven M. Bach, RA, Bach & Associates, PC, 304 Whites Horse Pike, Haddon Heights, NJ 08035 (telephone #856-546-8611).
- Attorney: Albert K. Marmero, Esq., Long Marmero & Associates, LLP, 44 Euclid Street, Woodbury, NJ 08086 (telephone #856-848-6440).

### **I. INFORMATION SUBMITTED**

1. Long Marmero & Associates, LLP Transmittal Letter dated 8/16/12.
2. Land Development Application Form and checklist dated 8/16/12.
3. Environmental Constraints Map (Aerial Photo) , as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC dated 8/10/12.
4. Recycling Report, as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC dated August 2012.
5. Drainage Calculations, as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC dated 8/09/12.

6. New Jersey Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual, Appendix A, Low Impact Development Checklist.
7. Stormwater System Maintenance Plan, as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC dated August 2012.
8. Flood Insurance Rate Map, Site identification.
9. Environmental Impact Statement, as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC dated August 2012.
10. Boundary Topographic Survey, as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC comprising one (1) sheet dated 8/14/12.
11. Boundary Topographic Survey, as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC comprising one (1) sheet dated 8/10/12.
12. Architectural plans (12 Unit Building), as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC consisting of the following:

<u>Sheet</u>	<u>Plan Description</u>	<u>Date / Latest Revision</u>
1	First Floor Plan (12 Unit Building)	August 2012
2	Second and Third Floor Plan (12 Unit Building)	August 2012
3	Front and Rear Elevations (12 Unit Building)	August 2012
4	First Floor Plan (16 Unit Building)	August 2012
5	Second and Third Floor Plan (16 Unit Building)	August 2012
6	Front and Rear Elevations (16 Unit Building)	August 2012

13. Engineering plans, as prepared by Bach & Associates, PC consisting of the following:

<u>Sheet</u>	<u>Plan Description</u>	<u>Date / Latest Revision</u>
C-1	Cover Sheet and Index of Drawings	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-1	Demolition Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-2	Site Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-3	Grading Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-3A	Road Profiles	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-4	Utility Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-4A	Sanitary Plan & Profile	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-5	Landscaping Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-6	Lighting Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-7	Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-7B	Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Notes & Details	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-8	Details Sheet	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-9	Details Sheet	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-10	Sanitary Sewer Details	7-02-09 / 8-10-12
SP-11	Vehicle Access Plan	7-02-09 / 8-10-12

## II. ZONING REVIEW

1. Multi-family apartments is not a listed permitted use in the RA- Residential Attached District [§407].

Description	Required (Other Use)	Proposed Lot 1	Conforms
Lot size (min.)	2 acres	8.136 acres	yes
Lot frontage (min.)	200 ft.	> 200 ft.	yes
Lot depth (min.)	400 ft.	> 400 ft.	yes
Building coverage (max.)	10%	10.2%	no <sup>1</sup>
Lot coverage (max.)	25%	29.6%	no <sup>1</sup>
<b>Front yard (min.)</b> <b>Melbourne Lane</b>	<b>100 ft.</b>	<b>26.95 ft.<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>no<sup>*</sup></b>
Loch Lomond Drive West	100 ft.	38.34 ft.	no <sup>1</sup>
<b>Side yard (min.)</b>	<b>30 ft.</b>	<b>25.67 ft.</b>	<b>no<sup>*</sup></b>
Rear yard (min.)	75 ft.	84.35 ft.	yes
Building Height (max.)	40 ft.	±32 ft.	yes
Density	3 du/ac.	9.83 du/ac.	no <sup>1</sup>
<b>Parking</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>no<sup>*</sup></b>
Accessory Building Limitations (Community Center)			
Front yard (min.)	N.P.	no	yes
<b>Side yard (min.)</b>	<b>30 ft.</b>	<b>13.89 ft.</b>	<b>no<sup>*</sup></b>
Rear yard (min.)	75 ft.	> 75 ft.	yes
Other Building Height (max.)	15 ft.	n/p	---

<sup>1</sup> = Variance approved by Zoning Board of Adjustment Resolution #102006CDMSPFMSP adopted March 11, 2012 (see table below).

N.P. = Not Permitted.

n/p = Not provided.

\* Variance required.

Variance Expiration: The applicant is advised that variances will expire unless construction commences within two (2) years of the date of the granting of the variance.

2. The following variances are approved by Zoning Board of Adjustment Resolution #102006CDMSPFMSP adopted March 11, 2012.

Description	Required (Other Use)	Proposed Lot 1	Conforms
Building coverage (max.)	10%	13.15%	no <sup>*</sup>
Lot coverage (max.)	25%	32.7%	no <sup>*</sup>
Front yard (min.) – Loch Lomond Drive West	100 ft.	11.95 ft.	no <sup>*</sup>
Rear yard (min.)	75 ft.	30.44 ft.	no <sup>*</sup>
Density	3 du/ac.	12.29 du/ac.	no <sup>*</sup>
Parking	199	160	no <sup>*</sup>

3. The following requirements apply to free standing signs.

SIGN STANDARDS (FREE-STANDING)			
Description	Required	Proposed	Conforms
Number (max.) - §526.W(2)	1	1	yes
<b>Area (max.) - §526.R(1)</b>	<b>10 sf</b>	<b>22.75 sfg</b>	<b>no*</b>
Letter size (min) - §526.R(1)	5 in.	n/p	---
Height (max.) - §526.W(2)(c)	5 ft.	Ft.	yes
Property line setback (min.) - §526.R(8)	10 ft.	≥ ±12 ft.	yes

### III. APPLICATION SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

The amended application has been reviewed for completeness in accordance with the Township of Gloucester Land Development Ordinance §817, Submission Checklist for preliminary major site plan and subdivision requirements.

The Applicant must provide the following required checklist items or request a waiver.

**We do not recommend waiving underlined items**

1. "Final Subdivision Plat for (Name of Development)" [Checklist #18(f)].
  - a. We recommend the cover sheet be titled, as follows:
    - i. "Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Subdivision Plan."
2. Name and address of the applicant and the owner, and signed consent of latter, if different from the applicant. [Checklist #24].
  - a. The cover sheet must be revised to identify the property owner.
3. The names, addresses, block and lot numbers of all property owners within 200 feet of the development [Checklist #33].
4. The total upstream acreage in the drainage basin of any water course running through or adjacent to development including the distance and average slope upstream to the basin ridge line, where applicable. [Checklist #63].
  - a. We would defer to the Board engineer.
5. Acceleration/deceleration lanes. [Checklist #75].
6. Sight triangle easements at intersections. [Checklist #86].
  - a. Consideration should be given to provide a sight triangle at the intersection of Melbourne Lane and entrance driveway.
7. Center line profiles at horizontal scale not less than 1" = 50' for all existing adjoining streets and proposed streets [Checklist #96].
  - a. We would defer to the Board engineer.

### IV. WAIVER COMMENTS

The Applicant is requesting a waiver from the following checklist requirements.

**We do not recommend waiving underlined items**

1. Four (4) copies of the Traffic Impact Report (see §815) [Checklist #7].
2. Locations of all existing structures and their uses within 200 feet of the tract. [Checklist #34].
3. Traffic channelization [Checklist #76].
4. Fire lanes [Checklist #77].
  - a. We would defer to the Fire Marshal.
5. Loading areas and number thereof [Checklist #80].

**V. VARIANCE COMMENTS**

The application as submitted requires the following variances:

**§407.F, Area, Yard, Height and Building Coverage**

- 1. Front Yard: (26.95 ft. provided v. 100 ft. minimum required).
  - a. The variance applies to the setback from Melbourne Lane (Bldg. #1).
- 2. Side Yard: (25.67 ft. provided v. 75 ft. minimum required).
  - a. The variance applies to the setback from side property line (Bldg. #6).
- 3. Side Yard: (13.89 ft. provided v. 75 ft. minimum required).
  - a. The variance applies to the setback from side property line (Community Ctr.).

**§426.R, Free-Standing Signs**

- 4. Area: (22.75 sf provided v. 10 sf maximum allowed).

**POSITIVE CRITERIA ("C1" and "C2" variances)**

The Applicant must address and the Zoning Board of Adjustment consider the following in satisfying the positive criteria for the requested variances:

- 5. The Board has the power to grant a variance where by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, shape, or topographic conditions or physical features, or an extraordinary and exceptional situation affecting a specific property, the strict application of the zoning regulations would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the development of such property (basis 40:55D-70c(1)).

Also, the Board has the power to grant a variance when the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by the deviation of the zoning ordinance and the benefits would substantially outweigh the detriments (basis N.J.S.A. 40:55-70c(2)).

**NEGATIVE CRITERIA**

The Board should not grant a variance unless it is clearly demonstrated that said variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance (basis N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70).

The following variances are approved by Zoning Board of Adjustment Resolution #102006CDMSPFMSP adopted March 11, 2012.

**Use Variances**

**§407.B, Permitted Uses: "D1" Use variance**

Multi-family apartments is not a listed permitted use in the RA- Residential Attached District [§407].

**§407.D, Density: "D5" Use variance**

Density: (12.29 du/ac. provided v. 3 maximum allowed).

**Bulk and Setback Variances**

**§407.F, Area, Yard, Height and Building Coverage**

- Building Coverage: (13.15% provided v. 10% maximum allowed).
- Lot Coverage: (32.70 % provided v. 25% maximum allowed).
- Front Yard: (11.95 ft. provided v. 100 ft. minimum required).
- Rear Yard: (30.44 ft. provided v. 75 ft. minimum required).
- Parking: (160 spaces provided v. 199 spaces minimum required).

## **VI. MAJOR SITE PLAN / SUBDIVISION REVIEW COMMENTS**

1. The plan must be revised to provide additional ornamental and shade trees at the following locations primarily to provide shade within the common areas and enhance the aesthetics of the development as per §507.A(1).
  - a. In the rear yards of buildings #1, #3, #5.
  - b. Between buildings #2 and #4 and #4 and #6.
  - c. Within and around the tot lot.
  - d. Open space at the northwest corner of Melbourne Lane and entrance drive.
2. The plans must be revised to provide evergreen trees around the perimeter of three sides of the proposed trash enclosure to enhance the aesthetics of the development as per §507.A(1).
3. The plan must be revised to provide ornamental and evergreen shrubs, perennials, etc. under the canopy of the proposed shade trees within the landscape islands between parking rows as per §507.C(2), Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas.
4. The plan must be revised to provide a mixture of shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen trees and shrubs around the entire perimeter of the proposed stormwater management basin #1 to screen this use and promote desirable viewsheds between different land uses intensities as per §507.B, Buffering.
5. The plans must be revised to provide street shade trees around the proposed cul-de-sac for Loch Lomond Drive West as per §507.D, Recommended Plantings.
6. The plans must be revised to provide additional lighting at the following locations as per §508, Lighting.
  - a. The intersection of Melbourne Lane and entrance drive.
  - b. The proposed cul-de-sac for Loch Lomond Drive West.
7. Consideration should be given to providing ornamental pole mounted lights in lieu of the proposed shoe box style to enhance the aesthetics of the development as per §508, Lighting.
8. The Applicant must provide testimony and the plan revised to provide trash enclosures appropriately sized for the proposed land use as per §510.L, Refuse/Recyclable Storage Areas.
9. The plan must be revised to provide a trash enclosure of masonry construction with the exterior covering compatible with the principal structures as per §510.L, Refuse/Recyclable Storage Areas.
10. The plans must be revised to provide concrete sidewalks around the proposed cul-de-sac for Loch Lomond Drive West as per §516, Sidewalks, Curbs, Gutters & Pedestrian Ways.

## **VII. GENERAL REVIEW COMMENTS**

1. The plan must be revised to provide a detail of the equipment and surface areas within the proposed tot lot as per §511.G, Tot Lots.
  - a. It is recommended the tot lot area be increased to accommodate benches and shade trees.
2. The plans must be revised to provide a detail of the proposed emergency access road.

## **IX. LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE COMMENTS**

The Applicant is advised of the following additional requirements of the Land Development Ordinance:

1. *A soil removal plan if soil is to be removed from the site for use or sale other than the premises subject to this application as per §801.C, Soil Removal.*
2. *A grading plan prepared and sealed by licensed professional engineer as per §814, Grading Approval.*
3. *Affordable housing requirement as per §902, Affordable Housing Fees and Procedures.*
4. *Before recording final subdivision plats or as condition of final site plan approval or as a condition to the issuance of a zoning permit pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:50D-65d the furnishing of a performance guarantee, maintenance guarantee, and inspection fees as per §903, Guarantees and Inspections and §904, Certification or Guarantee Required; Estimate of Guarantee.*
5. *Requirements precedent to construction as per §905, Pre-conditions to Commencement of Construction.*
6. *Construction of off-tract improvements as per §906, Off-Tract Improvements Recapture.*
7. *A zoning permit is required prior to the issuance of any construction permits and prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the Construction Official the Applicant must acquire a Certificate of Zoning Conformity from the Zoning Officer as per §1102, Permits, General, §1103, Zoning Permit and §1104, Certificate of Zoning Conformity.*

## **VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. The applicant must address the underlined items listed above on the site plan.
2. We reserve the right to provide additional comments at time of application for final major site plan approval.

We have no further comments regarding the application at this time; however, we reserve the right to provide additional comments during the Planning Board meeting to advance the planning process. Should the Applicant have any questions or wish to schedule a meeting to review our concerns, please contact our office at (856) 374-3511.

cc: Albert K. Marmero, Esq.  
Steven M. Bach, PE, RA  
Anthony Costa, Esq.  
James M. Mellet, PE