

November 16, 2011

TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING BOARD

Wednesday, November 16, 2011

Chairmen Kricum 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 | Absent |
| Mr. Guevara | Present |
| Mr. Jones | Present |
| Mr. Mercado | Present |
| Mr. Moffa | Present |
| Mrs. Musser | Absent |
| Mr. Pillo | Present |
| Mrs. Washington | Present |
| Chairman Kricum | Present |

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

Chairman Kricum seated for Mr. Guevara for Mrs. Musser.

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 |
|-------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

Appearing before the Board is Howard Geneslaw, Esq. representing Gloucester Forty Two associates. Also appearing before the Board was Susan Bass Levin, employed by Cooper Health System representing the applicant and Alfred Handy; PE was sworn and quailified as a professional.

Mr. Geneslaw thanks the Board for having a special meeting. Mr. Geneslaw reviews that this application's propose the construction of three (3) off premises advertising signs. Two (2) of the signs would be non changeable and the other would involved a multiple message board. There has been a lengthily planning progress which resulted in the first site plan of phase one. There will be other phases once more specific developments are identified. The applicant was picked by the Township as the redeveloper and a redevelopment agreement was made. The agreement provides certain benefit to the township that was discussed in a prior meeting before the Board. The redevelopment plan allows for four (4) signs, however they are only asking for three (3) as part of this application. They are asking for approval for signs that are up to 16 feet by 16 feet for up to a total of 960 square feet and up to a height of 16 feet. They are asking to up to 16feet since there is a possibility of a smaller sign depending on what the sign company wants. This is a straight forward application with no variances. As a result there will be two witnesses called

November 16, 2011

tonight. One is a representative of the applicant and the other is the professional engineer that prepared the plans.

Ms. Bass Levin explains that she is president of the Cooper Foundation which is part of the Cooper Health System, which is the sole owner of the Gloucester forty-two associates. Ms. Bass Levin explains her schooling background and various development projects. She has worked with the Cooper team for over a year now to decide how to best develop the 113 acres in a way that is best for the Township. Ms. Bass Levin continues that they are in conversations with developers but have not yet reached an agreement with one. The current plan is that a portion would be developed by a third party developer and the other portion be kept for medical use. There were previous discussions that there would be a hospital but that is not the case. There will be some sort of medical office type of use. This type of development does take a long time to negotiate a deal and develop plans for the project that is best suited for both Cooper and the Township. Phase one, the off premise advertising signs, is just a 1st part of a much larger development project. The signs are a necessary way to bring in revenue to offset the development project. Two of the signs will be traditional signs and the third will be a digital multi message sign. They will be contracting with a sign vendor that will be responsible for fulfilling the signs, which will be done according to building code and standards. At this time they have not identified a vendor yet for the sign and are requesting some flexibility. The plan is to go out with a RFP to sign the vendor that they have approval for three signs. Then the RFP will determine which of the three locations would be a multi message sign and determine the height according to the DOT regulation. They came to the Board for approval for the signs that don't exceed that are set forth in the application. The signs will comply with the redevelopment plan and DOT regulations. For clarification there will not be any tobacco advertising and a sign will not be left blank for more than sixty (60) days. They will update the board on which sign will be the multi message board and the size of the signs.

Mr. McKenna wanted clarification of the location of the signs as well as flexibility. Ms. Bass Levin clarifies that she meant which of the three would be the multi message board. The location of the signs on the plan is where they are going to be. Mr. Geneslaw adds that the flexibility they are asking for is to change the direction of the sign they will only be seen from route 42 as the ordinance states. They change in angles would only be to get the best point of view while following the guidelines.

Mr. DeDuke asked that since they are V shaped signs that they will be aligned together. Mr. Geneslaw replies that more than likely they will but since they don't have a sign vendor lined up yet it's hard to answer for certain. There might be a slight elevation for the south or north bound traffic to allow for better visibility. Mr. DeDuke questions that they are asking for three which means they are giving back the fourth. Ms. Bass Levin replies that they are asking for three right now but they do have a fourth as stated in the redevelopment plan. They don't plan as of right now to have a fourth sign. Mr. DeDuke also asks with the spacing of the three signs now are they allowing room for the fourth. Ms. Bass Levin replies that with the amount of space for the sign it is not practical to have a fourth.

Ms. Bass Levin summarizes that in addition to the revenue to help start the redevelopment project the off premises signs will provide a direct economic benefit to the township. The agreement provides that for the first five years the township will receive 12% of the net revenue from the signs. Then from years six through fifteen the township will receive 6% of the net revenue all up to a max annual payment of \$45,000.00. In addition, with the multi message sign the Township will be provided ten individual advertisement displays within a twenty-four hour period for the fifteen years of the agreement.

November 16, 2011

Mr. Handy directed the Board to sheet four of the plan set that was submitted. Mr. McKenna questioned if it the same as the plans from the redevelopment agreement. Mr. Geneslaw replies that it is very similar the only changes are additional survey data and maybe some additional zoning requirements. The location of three off site sign, site layout and access roads have not changed. Mr. Handy continues that the site is roughly 106 acres between Davis town road to college drive and route forty-two to route 168. The new bridge that spans route 42 is now completed. They have placed the signs with an approximant orientation so that the motorist traveling on route 42 can see the signs. The sign locations are dictated by the DOT since it's a state highway. They have submitted the plans to the DOT to obtain a permit. The reason the three sign are in the locations that they are is due the DOT requirements of the distance between the signs. There will be gravel driveway to each sign and the site distance was checked for the maintenance vehicle to have a safe view of the on coming traffic he would be exiting into. The V-shaped signs are most of the time at the same elevation which helps the structural stability. Mr. Handy refers to a page from the packet that showed an example of a V-shaped sign. The signs may have the pole in the ground at either ends or the middle, however the actual sign will never move. The location of the pole would depend on the sign vendor. They are safely away from the wetlands as instructed. The application for a sub conservation district permit went that morning. Any comments on the permits they will be addressed for the approval will be contingent on getting them. Mr. Handy explained that he signs chosen were smaller, 16x60 square feet, which is below the maximum square footage allowed by the DOT.

The height of the signs will be 60 feet. A test was done, to figure the least obtrusive height, by taking a picture of balloons at different heights and then imposing a sign. With a sign 50 feet high they could be seen over the tree line and 75 feet they were sticking too noticeable. The signs, other than what is allowed for the digital sign, won't have other lighting then that standard lights on the actual sign. Which will be upward lighting focused on the sign as per the DOT regulations. There will be no lights on site shinning down on the gravel drive since there will be no buildings on site. The only traffic to the signs will be a monthly maintenance visit. It is the belief that the digital sign can be changed off site. Mr. Handy confirms that all the signs are free standing and won't be attached to any buildings. Also, there will be no tobacco advertising.

Mr. Handy directs the Board to page five (5) of their packet and to the first sign is located by the College Drive Bridge. As of right now there is a dirt path that acts as an access to an open area. The drive ways along cooper roads were chosen as existing farm access paths in, so there is an existing drainage pipe that goes underneath. There is a drainage ditch that goes around the outside of the road that collects roadway run off. As for the gravel drive ways, the engineers report requested gravel with more fines in it, they would like to use more open gravel. This would allow more water to flow through it; help a vehicle if its muddy and larger gravel will prevent the tires come kicking it up. With the next sign, sheet six (6), located at the entrance to route forty-two. The same applies with this sign, the entrance, drainage and gravel drive. The last sign, sheet seven (7), is the closest to David town Road. The access was place from the site distance of cars and also a slight slope. This drive will also be gravel. Mr. Handy then directs the board to exhibit A-1 which shows what the signs would look like when driving on route 42.

Mr. Geneslaw directs the Board to Mr. Lecher's letter page three (3) numbers (10) which talks about flood plain limits. They have reviewed the land and determined that it is outside the flood plain. They will make a note on the plans that it is outside they flood plain. Mr. Lechner comments that there is a map of the flood plains and there is a portion of the property has a different flood classification. There needs to be clarification that the disturbed area from the sign is not a flood area. Mr. Geneslaw proceeded with a waiver for, number forty-nine, architectural

November 16, 2011

rendering and referred to exhibit A-1 for explanation. Mr. Lechner has no objection. Mr. Geneslaw moves on to light, there is no lighting on the site only on the signs themselves. They ask for a waiver since there isn't going to be any buildings on site. Next, is the concrete driveway and curbs. The reason for a waiver for this is the fact that the drive will not be accessed frequently once the construction is done, only monthly maintenance inspections. Another reason for no lighting is to discourage people from going back there. When the area becomes develop that might change. Mr. Lechner expresses concern since it's a high volume area. If the applicant could put a provision that the maintenance check includes making sure they stone are off the road. The applicant was agreeable because they would like the property to remain nice. With regards to the storm water management facility they feel that it isn't necessary since its pervious surface where the gravel is concerned. With parking there is no need for parking spaces since they don't want to encourage people to park there. The only vehicle that will be on site there is for the maintenance check. Moving on the landscaping, since there is no building on site, there is not need to have any landscaping. Landscaping will be added once buildings on the property are constructed. Mr. Lechner would like it included that there is a possibility that that the road will be changed. Once the building starts they don't want people to have to drive around the access roads. The applicant agrees.

Mr. Geneslaw moved onto the engineer's report. The Board was questioning the signs on the Black Horse Pike and that they are empty now with come improvements needed. Mr. Geneslaw stated that they will take care of not having it blank and in the future with the developing they might be taken down. They also are willing to do minimal landscaping. The rest of the comment they are in agreement with or have discussed the issue already.

Chairman Kricum asked if there is a fall down calculation for the signs. Mr. Handy replies that he would assume that would be on the structural engineer that designs the sign. The Boards asked to have on the plans the fall down zone. The applicant agreed.

A discussion followed about council and the financials of the redevelopment agreement.

Mr. Lechner asked about the height of the signs. If its measure from route forty-two or from the base of the sign. Mr. Handy replied that it is measure from the base of the ground out in the field.

With nothing further from the Board and the professionals Chairman Kricum open the application to the public. With no one from the public wishing to speak the public portion was closed.

Chairman Kricum asked for a motion to approve preliminary and final site plan with the conditions.

Mr. Moffa made a motion to approve this application, seconded by Mr. Pillo.

November 16, 2011

Roll Call:

| | |
|--------------------------|-----|
| Mr. DelDuke ₁ | Yes |
| Mr. Jones | Yes |
| Mr. Mercado ₂ | Yes |
| Mr. Moffa | Yes |
| Mr. Pillo | Yes |
| Mrs. Washington | Yes |
| Mr. Guevara | Yes |
| Chairman Kricum | Yes |

1. Would like to thank the applicant for their patience and the presentation.
- 2- Commented that they gave a great presentation that was easy to understand.

Chairman Kricum advised the Board that the meeting in January will be the first reorganizational meeting on the calendar year. He asked Mr. Lechner to start the proposal process and to have them back by the end of December to review.

Meeting Adjourned

Respectfully Submitted

Courtney Mosiondz
Recording Secretary