

TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday, July 12, 2011

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

Roll Call:

Mr. DelDuke	Present
Mr. Dunn	Present
Mr. Guevera	Present
Mr. Jones	Absent
Mr. Mercado	Present
Mr. Moffa	Present
Mrs. Musser	Present
Mr. Pillo	Present
Mrs. Washington	Present
Chairman Kricun	Present

Also present is Michael McKenna, Esq. who swore in the Board professionals, Elissa Commins, PE, CME, Board engineer and Kenneth D. Lechner, PP, AICP, Board Planner and both were qualified as experts.

Chairman Kricun seated Mr. Guevara for Mr. Jones.

Minutes for Memorialization

Mrs. Musser made a motion to approve minutes for May 24, 2011, seconded by Mr. Mercado.

Roll Call:

Mr. DelDuke	Yes
Mr. Dunn	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mr. Moffa	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pillo	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Absent
Chairman Kricun	Yes

Mrs. Washington brought to the Boards attention that she was not present at the May 24, 2011 meeting. All were in favor of changing the record to reflect so.

Resolutions for Memorialization

Chairman Kricun explained to the Board that more time is needed to review the responses in regards to the Board Engineer, Conflict Engineer and Solicitor. With the help of Mr. Dunn, Vice President, they will be reviewed and asked the Board for a motion to do so.

Dunn made a motion to extend the services for thirty (30) days, seconded by Mrs. Musser.

Roll Call:

Mr. DelDuke	Yes
Mr. Dunn	Yes

Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mr. Moffa	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pillo	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricun	Yes

Mr. Dunn made a motion to extend services for Conflict Engineer CNE Associates, seconded by Mr. Pillo.

Roll Call:

Mr. DelDuke	Yes
Mr. Dunn	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mr. Moffa	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pillo	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricun	Yes

Mr. Dunn made a motion to extend services of solicitor, seconded by Mrs. Musser.

Mr. DelDuke	Yes
Mr. Dunn	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mr. Moffa	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pillo	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricun	Yes

Applications for Review

Interchange Redevelopment Plan 0-10-44	Block: 13199 Lot: 1 Block: 13198 Lot: 1 Block: 13106 Lot: 1 Block: 13105 Lot: 1 Block: 13104 Lot: 7, 9 & 12
---	---

Mr. Lechner clarifies that the Ordinance should read 0-11-17, not 0-10-44 as the agenda reads.

Appearing before the Board is Howard Geneslaw, Esq. representing Gloucester Forty Two Associates.

Mr. Geneslaw explains that they went over the Board's concern and made some changes since they were last in front of the Board. The original plan was from 2006 and has since been amended to provide greater flexibility. A factor in the revision of the plans is the change in the economy and the completion of the construction on Route Forty-Two (42). This is not a proposal for a hospital campus; its purpose to create tax repole and jobs. The plan now has significant revisions to post greater controls and limitations. Some of the limitations will come from zoning ordinances, and others will come from DOT regulations. There are also provisions to have a more environmentally-friendly type of development. This may include solar panels and electric charging stations.

Mr. McKenna clarifies this is not a new matter. This is just to address some of the changes that have been made.

Chairman Kricun asks for more detail for car dealerships and signage since those were the main concern for members of the Board.

In the matter of car dealerships, they have put restrictions: 1) they must be at least between 10-20 in size and 2) no more than 30 acres. There are also screening requirements which follow the township zoning ordinance. In the matter of off premises signs, they have restricted them to be only along on Route Forty-Two (42). Also, as with the existing zoning code, the sign shall not occupy tobacco products, and it will not be attached to any buildings. They will have limited access to avoid climbing and unauthorized entrances. Signs can only be blank for 60 days. After those 60 days, a charitable message will be displayed. Most importantly, there is a limit of four (4) signs. They will also be using the DOT regulations with regards to the sign dimensions and distance from the right-a-way.

Mrs. Musser asks if there are only going to be four (4) signs or four (4) signs additional to the signs that are there now. Mr. Geneslaw replies that there are none on the property now, and they will only allow four (4). Mrs. Musser thought that the Board wanted no billboards. Mr. McKenna clarifies that the Board was concerned with "no limitations" stated in the prior version. He also suggests that the Board look at this like it's new since it is now a new Board and amendments. Mrs. Musser reviews that the property is 113 acres, and there would be four (4) double faced signs with one pole in the middle.

Mr. Lechner states that according to the code, several types of signs are allowed: double face, back to back, side by side, and a V shaped. All those types would be allowed under this redevelopment plan.

Mrs. Musser is concerned with the spacing of the signs, and she believes that it would look like the express way going into Atlantic City. Mr. Geneslaw refers the Board to the redevelopment plan section 3.1 Paragraph L subsection F-ii and G. Mr. Lechner directs the Board to page sixteen (16) and makes general comments that the guidelines are there. Therefore, the redevelopment plan has uniformity.

Mr. Dunn has an issue with the broadness of the freedom of design. He feels that this should be something really nice. Mr. Lechner explains that if you enforce too much structure, the project could be too mundane. Mr. McKenna comments that if they have to be open to different designs, it might deter development. Mr. Dunn would like to see a map of what are wetlands, buffers, and developable areas. Mr. Geneslaw states that it is a little premature for those figures. They will have that as they start to have developers. If there are too many restrictions, it will be harder to find that developers agree with everything. As they start to develop the property, it will be front of the Board. They want this to be a great property. Mr. Dunn directs the board to page twenty-four (24) section 6.3 and asks why the plan is good from 25 years from the date of adoption. Mr. Lechner explains that it is standard due to developing a major site that was declared a property that is harder to develop. Mr. Geneslaw added that it could always be amended during that period. This expiration period has been in the plan and carried through since it was first drafted.

Mrs. Musser asks if the master plan has been update since 1999. Mr. Lechner replies that it was updated through open space when they adopted the green acre incentive program. There have been some amendments, and the issue was reexamined in 2005. It will not be done again until June 2015. Mrs. Musser agrees with Mr. Dunn and would like to see consistency.

Mrs. Musser has concerns with the property rights and the imminent domain. Mr. Geneslaw states that Route Forty-Two (42) owns it all. Nothing can be changed with it coming before the Board.

Chairmen Kricun opens this application up to the public. With no one from the public wishing to speak, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Lechner does agree with the body of the master and all the surrounding communities' master plan.

Mr. Pillo makes a motion to recommend the plan, 0-11-17, to council as represented. The project is consistent with the master plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Mercado.

Roll Call:

Mr. DelDuke	Yes
Mr. Dunn	Yes

Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mr. Moffa	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pillo	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricun	Yes

#1110110CM Mapri/Big Timber Creek Enterprises c/o Michael J. Piarulli	Minor Subdivision/Bulk C Variance Block: 2301 Lot: 3 Block: 2303 Lot: 1 & 2 Block: 1401 Lot: 1
---	---

Appearing before is Thomas DiPilla Esq. representing the Big Timber Creek Enterprises.

Mr. DiPilla explains that the lot was not recorded but was reflected on the tax map. They have the same lot configuration that was approved prior, but now there is a new zoning district and new required variances.

Mr. McKenna explains that they have been paying property taxes and was approved beforehand. The variances required just go with the clean up. Mr. Lechner has no objection to the application or the variances.

McKenna wants clarification that they agree to both engineer reports. Mr. DiPilla states that they agree with both reports.

Mr. Lechner wants to bring to the Board's attention that the CC open space plan has a conservation plan seeking easement along the timber creek. He has been in contact with the envelopment affair for Camden County, but he has not heard back if they are interested to an easement.

Mr. DiPilla owns the property but is in an agreement with a company to buy it. They will bring this to the company's attention. The company will be in front of the Board soon at which time the matter can be revisited.

Ms. Commins asks if they have site plan for the two (2) buildings constructed. Mr. DiPilla replies that they do, and they are still figuring out the time frame for the construction of the buildings that have been there for twenty (20) years. Ms. Commins inquires if, that under that site plan, they have any subtitle one (1) which allows the police the right to enforce. Mr. McKenna recalls that it is a driveway and was reflected on a plan with no public access. Mr. Lechner explains the Police Department's Quality of Life Plan which institutes more of the Title 39. Mr. DiPilla states that they have a working relationship with the police department, and they will fill out the form for the Title 39 plan.

Chairman Kricun opens this application to the public. With no one from the public wishing to speak, the public portion was closed.

Mrs. Musser makes a motion to approve the minor subdivision with the conditions, seconded by Mr. DeIDuke.

Roll Call:

Mr. DeIDuke	Yes
Mr. Dunn	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mr. Moffa	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pillo	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricun	Yes

#111025CDM Harry & Marie McDowell	Minor Subdivision/Variance Block: 17502 Lot: 42
--------------------------------------	--

Appearing before the Board is Denis Riley, Esq. representing the applicants.

Mr. Riley explains that Mr. Heck lost this property to a tax foreclosure. Exhibit A-1 shows that Chuck Pulumbo merges the two (2) deeds into one. Because of this, they now need to subdivide. Mr. Riley shows exhibit A-2 which shows a township basin. The township wanted the property for green acres to provided access to the basin. They would like the lots subdivided with an easement to allow for access to the drainage basin.

Chairman Kricun clarifies that the lot was once two, and it was joint as a result of a tax foreclosure. They now want to go back to the original two parts to accommodate the township's request for an easement to have access to the drainage basin.

Mr. McKenna asks Mr. Lechner how this easement gets reflected. Mr. Lechner states that it is on the subdivision plan and suggests that Mr. Riley include it in the deed. Mr. Moffa states that they need access since they are now redoing the basins. It will state that the township is allowed access to the easement and will maintain it.

Mr. DelDuke asks if it is the easement on the lower side. Mr. McKenna states that the plan shows three easements. He asks if they are giving both. Mr. Riley explains that the one they are discussing is the new one; the others are existing ones.

Ms. Commins would like some questions in her report answered. The plan proposed a 12 foot wide road widening, but there is no actual line on the plan. If they proposed a road dedication, they will not need a site triangle easement, but the set back needs to be amended. Mr. Lechner clarifies that the plan does show that Jarvis Road is 37 feet with the existing 25 feet along the frontage, and with the 12 feet, that would make it 37 feet. Mr. Riley states that they will amend their plan for the dedication and revise their plan with the set back.

Chairman Kricun directs attention to the curb and sidewalk not be waived. Ms. Commins explains that during her site inspection, there was a sidewalk up to the property, but then you would have to walk in the shoulder. Mr. Riley replies that it is no problem with the sidewalk on Jarvis but not on Rhode Island. He also asks to waive the contribution to the curb and sidewalk fund since this has been a huge financial burden. Mr. DelDuke asks if all the lot on Road Island will not have sidewalks.

Harry McDowell was sworn in. Mr. McDowell confirms that there are no existing sidewalks on Rhode Island. He states that is the reason they are asking for the wavier to the fund.

Mr. Lechner suggests setting a performance guarantee since it is not on the plan. The Board sets a performance guarantee that it will be done in one (1) year.

Chairman Kricun opens the application to the public. With no one from the public wishing to speak, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Pillo makes a motion to approve the application with conditions and waivers, seconded by Mrs. Musser

Roll Call:

Mr. DelDuke	Yes
Mr. Dunn	Yes
Mr. Mercado	Yes
Mr. Moffa	Yes
Mrs. Musser	Yes
Mr. Pillo	Yes
Mr. Guevara	Yes
Mrs. Washington	Yes
Chairman Kricun	Yes

July 12, 2011

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully Submitted

Courtney Mosiondz
Recording Secretary