TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, April 14, 2015

Vice Chairman Owens called the meeting to order. The Secretary, Mr. Lechner, read the commencement statement.

Roll Call:

Ms. Costa	Absent
Mr. Dintino	Present
Mr. Dority	Present
Mr. Guevara	Present
Mr. Jones	Absent
Mr. Mercado	Present
Mr. Owens	Present
Ms. Pinolini	Absent
Ms. Washington	Absent
Chairman Kricun	Absent

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, were qualified as experts.

The Vice Chairman seated Mrs. Pinolini for Chairman Kriucm and Mr. Dority for Mr. Jones.

Minutes for Memorialization

Mr. Mercado made a motion to approve minutes from February 10, 2015, seconded by Mr. Dority

Roll Call:

Mr. Dintino	Yes
Mr. Dority	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes

Mr. Mercado made a motion to approve minutes from March 10, 2015, seconded by Mr. Dority.

Roll Call:

Mr. Dintino	Yes
Mr. Dority	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes

Blackwood Fire Company District #4	Courtney Review Bay Additions

No one from the fire company or a representive was present.

Clementon Ventures, LLC #141032INCM	Minor Site/ Bulk C Block: 14401 Lot: 4

This application was in front of the board March 10, 2015, however, the meeting was stopped due to the applicant being short one notice.

Mr. Brennen, Board solicitor, stated that they had stopped right before talking about the board professionals letters. Before he turned it over he gave a brief summary of the testimony given March 10, 2015.

Testimony from March 10, 2015:

Appearing before the Board was Jay Mintzer, Esq. representing the applicant. Gary vespia, applicant was sworn in along with Jack Gravlin, PE, who was qualified as a professional.

Mr. Gravlin gave background on education and other projects. Mr. Gravlin explained to the board that this site is being converted into a dental office. This property is half (.5) acre in the high way commercial zone of Blackwood Clementon Road and College Drive. The site now has entrances on both roads. They would like to take the two off of College Drive and make one new entrance. There will be a reduction in impervious coverage from 75% to 69.3%. Using exhibit A-1, showing the proposed landscaping. The existing parking lot will be repaired then overlaid with new curbing, except for the curbing on the county roadway. Along with a new trash enclosure they will be planting 96 plants and trees around the property. There will be all new lighting including LED shoebox lighting fixtures. All the utilities currently on the property will be used.

For signage, they are proposing a monument sign that will have "Welcome to Gloucester Township" incorporated within. The only thing that they ask is that the township maintain it. Also, two (2) façade signs one on the front and the other on the side of the building.

There are several variances needed. First, is the rear yard plans. They are proposing 19.9 ft., where 30 ft. is required. This is due to the irregular shape of the lot and that they are using the existing building. Next, the monument sign at 72 sq. ft. and the maximum is 50 sq. ft. It is also 9 ft. in height where 8 ft. is allowed. The façade sign the faces Blackwood-Clementon Rd. is 79 sq. ft. and the maximum allowed is 47.3 sq. ft. The façade sign that faces college dr is 46.5 sq. ft. and the maximum allowed is 47.3sq. ft. they feel that it is necessary to have the sign this size for safety. To give someone enough time to see the office and make the necessary

lane change to access the driveway. Another reason for the bigger signage is that Shop Rite is 11 ft. taller than their ground floor.

They have reviewed Mr. Bach's letter and are in agreement with it. Mr. Bach questioned the vestibule, the arch that extends to the sidewalk. Also, if there is going to be doors on both sides of it. They applicant replied that it's a closed vestibule and they will have doors on both sides. Mr. Bach recommend that the doors on both side be a condition of approval and don't object to anything else, what they are doing is an improvement not a detriment.

Mr. Lechner is concern with the fact they are doing new curbing all around the site. The concern is with the visual and how it will look with all new curbing except for a small portion. The applicant replied that section is minimal and they are trying to minimize cost, especially with putting in all new sidewalks. Within a few years the look of the new will blend with the old.

They were in agreement with Mr. Lechner's letter with the exception pof the sidewalks which was just discussed. They also added that they have met with the county board and they didn't have a problem with it.

With no questions from the board the application was opened to the public. With no on from the public wishing to speak the public portion was closed.

Mr. Mercado made a motion to approve the application with said conditions, seconded by Mr. Dintino.

Roll Call:

Mr. Dintino	Yes
Mr. Dority	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Vice Chairman Owens	Yes

Twin Oaks III, LLC #151011CM	Minor Subdivision/ Bulk Variance

Appearing before the was Robert Mintz, Esq. representing the applicant. Also, appearing was David Guzzo the applicant and Norman Rodgers, engineer was sworn and qualified as a professional.

Mr. Mintz explained that they have been approved and are in the process of building. They are back in front of the board to subdivide the property basically drive a line between the properties making one site into two (2). This subdivision will help with financing. The property has a total of 3.793 acres which has a frontage to Route 42. For that same reason this is why they require the bulk variances. There are cross easements that will stay the same. There is drainage on site that is sufficient and they will have easements within the sites to allow for drainage.

Mr. Rodgers confirmed what Mr. Mintz said and added all the numerical measurements of the property. They meet all bulk requirements with the exception of the frontage on lot 4, parking setbacks for rear and front property lines. The site is approve for emergency vehicles.

They are in agreement with the Planners letter and made a clarification to Mr. Bach's report. The subdivision was file by deed. Also they added that a waiver would be beneficial since no improvements everything on the property is already existing. Mr. Bach was in agreement, however, is looking for the easement that connects to the actual drives to be on the plans. Mr. Mintz replied that he would send a copy of the recording easement and the original site plan.

Mr., Bach also wants to know who will be maintaining the easement in the rear. Mr. Mintz replied that the owner will and that he will provide a conversion chart for the U.S.G.S.

Both professionals were satisfied. There was nothing further from the board. The application was opened up to the public. With no one from the public wishing to speak the public portion was closed,

Mr. Dority made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Mercado

Roll Call:

Mr. Dintino	Yes
Mr. Dority	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Vice Chairman Owens	Yes

Cross Keys MZL, LLC. #151018RDM	Minor Subdivision/ Bulk C Block: 18301 Lot: 10

Appearing before the board was Frank Tedesco, Esq. representing the applicant. Clifton Quay, engineer was sworn and quality as a professional.

Mr. Tedesco went over the location of the site. They would like to subdivide 1.3 acers from the lot. The subdivision is an existing bank pad site within the New Vision Business Park Zone. This is a common subdivision for a bank site. With the subdivision there won't be any construction on the site.

Mr. Quay gave his background information. He also review what Mr. Tedesco had just went over. The pad site meets all requirements in the zone except for parking setbacks. With the subdivision there will be variances. One they will need one for the parking setback from the rear yard setback. Also, one from the side yard setback. The parking

area and site are internal to the shopping center. There won't be any detrimental impact to the neighborhood and the zoning plan. Both the professional letters were review and they are in agreement with all comments. However, there is one thing to clarify that Independence Boulevard is believe to be dedicated to the township.

Mr. Bach commented that their survey is over eight (8) months old instead of six (6) months. In this case it is good enough.

With nothing else from the applicant and no questions for the board, the application was open to the public. With no one from the public wishing to speak.

Mr. Mercado made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Dintino.

Roll Call:

Mr. Dintino	Yes
Mr. Dority	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Vice Chairman Owens	Yes

Ordinance 0-15-08	College Drive Redevelopment Plan

Mr. Lechner explained, this ordinance is similar to the interchange outlet. The changes consist of removing some commercial uses. For example: used car dealer. Also took away plan residential developments. The township has a vision too possibly of having town houses, it will depend on the projects. The board looked at a map and was shown the area that this ordinance effects.

Mr. Lechner continued that the master plan needs to be looked at. The county's master plan and been redone. This will be a 25 year plan which is normal.

The ordinance was open to the public. No one from the public wished to speak.

Mr. Dintino made a motion to recommend the ordinance to council, seconded by Mr. Dority.

Roll Call:

Mr. Dintino	Yes
Mr. Dority	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Vice Chairman Owens	Yes

Mr. Lechner updated the board that there might not be another meeting in April. He was also working on the reexamination report. Would like to present it in June.

Mr. Mercado reminded the board about the disclosure forms. Also wanted to know what was going on with the go cart racing place on Coles Road. Mr. Lechner replied that someone that fallow the same project that was approved has taken over.

Respectfully Submitted,

Courtney Mosiondz

Courtney Mosiondz