GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 12, 2014

Mr. Bucceroni called the meeting to order. Mr. Lechner read the commencement statement.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chairman Simiriglia</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bucceroni</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scarduzio</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Chiumento</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Rosati</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Acevedo</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Treger</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Scully</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman McMullin</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chairman McMullin had the professionals sworn in:

Also Present: Mr. Anthony Costa, Zoning Board Solicitor
Mr. James Mellett, P.E., Churchill Engineering
Mr. Ken Lechner, Township Planner

*Mr. Treger will sit in for Chairman McMullin and Ms. Scully will sit in for Vice Chairman Simiriglia.

Minutes For Adoption

Zoning Board Minutes for February 26, 2014

Motion to approve the above-mentioned minutes was made by Mr. Acevedo and seconded by Ms. Scully.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bucceroni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scarduzio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Acevedo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Scully</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minutes approved.

RESOLUTIONS

Feb. 12, 2014:

#132042C  #132032C
Gregory & Darlene Ribbaudo  Franklin & Catherine Schmidt
Bulk Variance  Bulk C Variance
Block: 10705 Lot: 21  Block: 20502 Lot: 10

#132046C  #132044C
Kimberly Vittorio  Mark C. Felts
 Bulk C Variance  Bulk C Variance
Block: 3001 Lot: 5  Block: 17802 Lot: 7

#142002C  Bulk C Variance
A motion to approve the above mentioned resolutions was made by Mr. Scarduzio and seconded by Ms. Scully.

Roll Call:

- Mr. Bucceroni: Yes
- Mr. Scarduzio: Yes
- Mr. Acevedo: Yes
- Mr. Treger: Yes
- Ms. Scully: Yes

Resolutions Approved.

Feb. 26, 2014:

- #142005CDSPW
- #092008CDFSPal
- Applications for Review
- Anthony Rodriquez
- Zoned: R3
- Bulk C Variance
- Block: 8103 Lot: 32 & 33
- Location: 1701 Hider Lane, Laurel Springs
- 6' fence; above ground pool & deck w/setbacks

Mr. Costa swears in Mr. Anthony Rodriquez and Ms. Jen Gonzalez.
Mr. Rodriguez explains the pool won’t fit within the guidelines because of his irregular shaped lot.
Mr. Mellett states there are no site issues with the fence.

Open to Professionals:
A motion to approve the above mentioned application was made by Mr. Scarduzio and seconded by Mr. Acevedo.

Roll Call:

- Mr. Bucceroni: Yes
- Mr. Scarduzio: Yes
- Mr. Acevedo: Yes
- Mr. Treger: Yes
- Ms. Scully: Yes

Application Approved.

#142007D
Savdeep Bhullar
Zoned: R3
Use “D” Variance
Block: 18310 Lot: 60
Location: 51 Mullen Dr., Sicklerville
2nd kitchen (summer kitchen – gas stove & kitchen sink)

Mr. Costa swears in Mr. Bhullar.
Mr. Bhullar states he has a walk out basement and would like to make use of it with a summer kitchen. It will be for family use only, the basement also an existing office and gym.

Open to Professionals:
No Comments.

Open to the Public:
No Comments.

A motion to approve the above mentioned application was made by Mr. Scarduzio and seconded by Ms. Scully.

Roll Call:

- Mr. Bucceroni: Yes
- Mr. Scarduzio: Yes
- Mr. Acevedo: Yes
- Mr. Treger: Yes
- Ms. Scully: Yes

Application Approved.

#112039CDMa
Edward Pine
Zoned: GI
Bulk C & Use “D” Variance; Minor Site Plan
Block: 8301 Lot: 17
Location: Warsaw Ave., Blackwood
Erection of 60’ (16’ x 60’) double digital billboard adjacent to the NJ State Highway Route 42 right of way.

Mr. Costa swears in Gary Civalier (engineer, surveyor and planner), Frank Montgomery (traffic planning PE project manager), and Ed Pine (owner). Mr. Wade (lawyer) represents Mr. Pine.

Mr. Wade explains the history of the application:
- 10/27/2011 is the date the application was previously approved by the owner.
- 2/9/2012 owner of the property has done the following:
  1. lots 17 &18 have been combined with the county
  2. demolished the residence and removed the septic
  3. back garage kept
  4. small sheds removed
  5. site cleaned up
The applicant would like to raise the height of the billboard to 100’ from 60’.

Mr. Pine gives a brief history of the property and then states issues with the sign height and state rules.
- Mr. Pine spoke with the DOT outdoor advertising director. Mr. Pine was given a vegetation control permit for 300 dollars to trim the trees that will be in front of his billboard, it is routine to get the permit. You have to have all the approvals from your town before you can get this permit. Then Mr. Pine was told that he was denied the permit because the vegetation permit format was going to be changed. The reason given was that a North Jersey company was illegally clearing trees and the delay in permits was going to be statewide. Mr. Pine states that the state hasn’t even started revamping the vegetation permit format and it’s been 3 years.

Mr. Civalier presents:
A1) site plan depicting the height change and the center post (dead center).
A2) aerial of site – all construction will be designed by a professional engineer and submitted to the construction department.

Mr. Costa clarifies with Mr. Wade that the billboard will be in the same exact spot and the only difference will be the height changing from 60’ to 100’.

Mr. Montgomery (traffic engineer) presents the board with:
A3) 2 pages of photos of NB Rt. 42 as you approach the sign location, NB photo facing the sign 60’ vs. 100’, exhibit prepared by his office, and the 2nd photo compares the billboard with the cell tower that is also 100’ high. A4) line of site profile approaching SB Rt. 42, 60’ vs. 100’, no NB picture as you had to be in the lane of traffic.

Mr. Montgomery discusses the difference between 60’ and 100’ on Coles Rd.:
- The additional height will make it nearly impossible to re the sign from Coles Rd.
- The sign runs parallel with Coles Rd. and it’s flat
- Less impact then the prior approval
- NB direction will be enhanced
- Height complies with the DOT standards
- Impact on residents: a. looking at the back of the sign b. seeing another 40’.

Mr. Mellett asks if the view from the east is the same
Mr. Montgomery states it’s (the bill board) just higher no difference in illumination.

Mr. Lechner asks about the view of the back of the sign.
Mr. Montgomery states the sign is in a “V” shape you won’t see a flat surface.
Mr. Lechner asks if Coles Rd. will see the sign.
Mr. Montgomery states yes you’ll see it, the west side won’t.

Mr. Wade states the bill board won’t create a safety hazard because the illumination will be facing the other direction.

Mr. Lechner requests what the owner will do if the trees grow past the 100’ sign.
Mr. Wade states eventually they will have to trim the trees and the pruning along the state highways will have to resume. Mr. Wade presents the board with exhibit A5) which displays leaning trees along Rt. 42 that will have to be trimmed or they’ll end up in the road.
Mr. Lechner states that the ordinance requires testimony on the impact to the community.
Mr. Wade states that the trees are going to be more of an impact.
Mr. Lechner states that 60’ would have been enough when you can trim the trees yet we’ll have a 100’ sign in place.
Mr. Montgomery states the photos are taken from 1000’ away because that is when you should be able to read the sign.
Mr. Wade states marketing recommended raising the height as the investment is significant around 600 to 800 thousand dollars. Mr. Wade has the updated permits.

Mr. Mellett discusses his engineers’ letter dated 12/12/2013. Most issues have been addressed and ask Mr. Montgomery if the change in height of the sign change the separation of the interchanges. Mr. Montgomery states No, it does not affect anything else.

Mr. Mellett asks why a photo simulation wasn’t done for Coles Rd.

Mr. Wade states there were no photos taken from Coles Rd. because the sign isn’t intended for Coles Rd. drivers.

Mr. Lechner states the report requests photos for both.

Mr. Lechner reviews his letter with the applicant: reviews site plan comment page 7 VI A-H.

Mr. Wade states they have asked for a waiver on that issue in the last application. They are going verbatim from the last application and will do everything stated on the last application and subsequent resolution.

Mr. Costa states amended site plan, all waivers given on the last resolution will be followed.

Mr. Lechner states this resolution should reference the last resolution.

PUBLIC PORTION:

Mr. Costa swears in Mr. Robert Kowlakowski discusses 2/26 billboard for Anchor Pool and how this is an additional digital billboard. Mr. Kowlakowski asks Mr. Lechner about the municipal activities being allowed on the digital board.

Mr. Bucceroni states that is already approved as part of the resolution.

Mr. Kowlakowski states they need to determine how many times a year the municipality can use the digital board for advertisements. He states the administration or legal department should get this accomplished and it should be in writing. This way both parties know what is expected. The town can advertise to promote the Gloucester Township identity, pumpkin festival, and historic downtown Blackwood to name a few. He believes people will be coming to council meetings to complain about the digital signs and this way the council will be able to point out the positives of the billboards. Mr. Kowlakowski states that the township should set up the number of ads per day so they can show the benefit of the billboard.

Mr. Wade states the NJ State Police will have access for alerts, the township will have access for economic development, civic messages will be no problem, and no tobacco advertisements will be allowed.

Mr. Kowlakowski states there needs to be some kind of formal agreement.

Mr. Wade states they can present it to the mayor and solicitor.

Mr. Costa states it should state “reasonable and liberal” use of the billboard.

Mr. Kowlakowski states a gentleman’s agreement isn’t good enough an agreement has to be negotiated and signed.

Mr. Wade states they have no problem with a signed agreement.

Mr. Treger asks if the new height impedes on any other billboard.

Mr. Civalier states “no” the sign is not impeding on any other board.

Mr. Treger asks why the extra 40 ft.

Mr. Civalier states the elevation change.

A motion to approve the above mentioned application, with all the previous resolutions conditions and township use clarified, was made by Mr. Scarduzio and seconded by Ms. Scully.

Roll Call:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bucceroni</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Scarduzio</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Acevedo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Treger</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Scully</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application Approved.
A motion to Adjourn was made by Mr. Treger and seconded by Ms. Scully.

Respectfully Submitted, Jean Gomez, Recording Secretary.