

**Call to Order:**

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman McLaughlin who read the following statement: “Notice of this meeting was given as required by the Open Public Meetings Act in the Annual Notice of Meetings. This notice was sent in writing to the South Jersey Times on January 17, 2013. A copy was posted on the second floor bulletin board of Town Hall and a copy was given to the Township Clerk. In addition, notice for this evening’s public hearing was sent in writing to the South Jersey Times in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.”

The Board saluted the flag.

Roll call: Present – Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Manfredi, Mr. Salvadori, Ms. Hui, Mr. Kozak, Mr. McLaughlin. Absent – Mr. Carney, (excused), Mr. Price, (excused), Mr. Sander, (excused), Mr. Caligiuri, (excused). Also present – Mr. Marmero, Solicitor, Ms. Pellegrini, Planner.

**Memorialization of Resolutions:**

1. #13-25 – App. #13-12 – Glenn Ziegler – Rear Yard Variance Approved

Motion by Mr. Fitzgerald, seconded by Mr. Fritz to adopt resolution #13-25. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Kozak, Mr. McLaughlin. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

**Public Hearings:**

1. #13-13 – Dennis Ciocco – Use Variance

Present – Dennis Ciocco, applicant.

Member’s packets contained: 1. A copy of the applicant’s use variance application, survey, and photographs of the property and proposed sign.

The applicant is requesting a use variance in order to be allowed to upgrade his existing business sign with a small changeable copy /LED sign. The property is located at 508 Denise Court, also known as Block13201, Lot 46. The proposed sign is located on Route 322 at the Wild Hairs Salon.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

1. #13-13 – Dennis Ciocco (continued)

Mr. Ciocco was sworn in by Mr. Marmero. Mrs. Farrell stated that the application could be deemed complete by the Board. Motion by Mr. Salvadori, seconded by Mr. Fritz to deem application #13-13 complete. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

Mr. Ciocco testified that he would like to add a small LED sign to his existing sign at his business. Mr. Kozak asked why the applicant was changing the sign. Mr. Ciocco stated that the existing sign is cracked a little and he decided he would replace it with the digital sign so that he doesn't have to climb on a ladder to change the information; he can do it from inside the building. Mr. Marmero asked if the sign would have any flashing or scrolling and would it be one color or multiple colors. Mr. Ciocco stated that the sign will not flash, the message will scroll slowly, and that it will only be one color. Mr. Kozak asked if the applicant will agree that he would adjust the brightness of the sign if any of the neighbors complain. He also inquired as to the time the sign will be illuminated. Mr. Ciocco testified that he will agree to adjust the brightness if there are any complaints and that the sign will turn off at 7:30 p.m. when he closes his business. Mr. Ciocco was informed that he would have to abide by the ordinance that will be in place with regard to the timing of the message as well. He agreed to abide the conditions of the future LED sign ordinance.

Motion passed to open the hearing to the public. There being none, motion passed to close the hearing to the public.

Motion by Mr. Salvadori, seconded by Mr. Fitzgerald to grant the use variance for the sign conditioned upon the applicant abiding by the future LED sign ordinance, the sign not flashing and being one color, adjusting the brightness if it impedes on any neighboring properties, and having the sign illuminated from 9:00 a.m. to 7:30 p.m. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Manfredi, Ms. Hui, Mr. Kozak, Mr. McLaughlin. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

2. #13-14 – 1041 Glassboro Road Associates, LLC – Use Variance

Present – Dante Parenti, applicant’s attorney.

Member’s packets contained: 1. A copy of the applicant’s use variance application, photographs of the property, and photographs of the proposed signs.

The applicant is requesting use variance in order to allow two freestanding signs along Route 322 and a third sign approximately 213 feet off the roadway inside the Monroe Business Park. One of the proposed signs along Route 322 along with the interior sign will identify all of the tenants in the Business Park; the other proposed sign along Route 322 will identify the COPS Monitoring business. The property is located at 1041 Glassboro Road, also known as Block 13901, Lot 28.02.

Mr. Parenti introduced himself as the applicant’s attorney. He stated that they were before the Board to request a use variance in order to allow three signs on the property. He included pictures of the signs currently being used to advertise the various businesses in the industrial park and noted that all of those signs along the roadway and on the corner look horrible. He stated that his client owns four buildings on the lot in question and they are not visible from the street. The area of the signs is all under the fifty square foot requirement; however they are asking for a variance for the height of two of the signs which will be ten feet. The reason for the added height is because there are so many tenants to list on the signs that the font would be too small to read at the eight foot height requirement. Mr. Parenti indicated that they do not know where the sight triangles are located on the property but they would be willing to have the proper Township professional make that determination and they would comply with the sight triangles for placement of the signs.

Mrs. Farrell stated that applicant was asking for a waiver of the certified survey which is needed to deem the application complete. Mr. Marmero stated that the survey would be needed for the sight triangles but if the applicant is going to work with the Township professional to determine their location then the survey would just be for the Board’s benefit to see the location of the signs. Mr. Parenti stated that the sight triangles are probably on the previous site plan and they can go back and refer to that as well. Mr. Manfredi asked why the applicant did not provide the certified survey. Mr. Parenti replied that the property is a twenty-six acre parcel and it would be very costly to have a survey done just to show the area in front of the building where the signs will be located.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

2. #13-14 – 1041 Glassboro Road Associates, LLC (continued)

Ms. Pellegrini agreed to work with the applicant in determining the sight triangles on the property. Mrs. Farrell stated that the office does have a copy of the original site plan. Motion by Mr. Fritz seconded by Mr. Salvadori to grant the waiver of the survey and deem application #13-14 complete. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed. Mr. Marmero stated that the conditions of any approval would include the applicant identifying the sight triangles and showing the locations of the proposed signs. One of the signs will be in the general area of the existing Monroe Business Park sign.

Mr. Kozak stated his concern with the COPS Monitoring business requesting to have their own sign with regard to other businesses in the park then wanting to put their own sign on the property as well. He asked that a condition be placed on any approval that another tenant cannot put their individual sign out front. Mr. Manfredi asked why another business shouldn't be allowed to have an individual sign if they wanted one. Mr. Marmero stated that any other tenant that wanted a monument type sign or any sign out front like the ones proposed would have to come back to the Board for approval. Mr. Kozak commented that there should also be something in the resolution indicating that the applicant would be responsible for the removal of the existing signs on the property and that they police the property with regard to any future signs that might be placed on the property without approval. Mr. Fritz asked if the signs will be illuminated. Mr. Parenti stated that the COPS Monitoring sign will have a spotlight, the others will just be reflective.

Motion passed to open the hearing to the public. There being none, motion passed to close the hearing to the public.

Ms. Pellegrini reviewed her report for the Board. She stated that the applicant has addressed the issue of the existing signs and agreed to have them removed. The sign areas do meet the requirement; however a variance is needed to allow the height of two of the signs to be ten feet instead of the required eight feet. She inquired as to the compatibility of the signs to each other. Mr. Parenti stated that the signs will all be uniform in appearance and color.

**Public Hearings: (continued)**

2. #13-14 – 1041 Glassboro Road Associates, LLC (continued)

Motion by Mr. Kozak, seconded by Mr. Fitzgerald to approve the use variance to allow three freestanding signs along with the variance for the two signs being ten feet in height. The applicant has agreed to comply with the sight triangles determined by Ms. Pellegrini, the signs will be uniform in design, all existing signs will be removed and the applicant will police the property with regard to any others signs being placed on the property without approvals from the Township, and they will comply with all the lighting requirements. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Kozak, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Salvadori, Ms. Hui, Mr. McLaughlin. Nays – Mr. Manfredi. Abstentions – Zero. 6 ayes, 1 nay, motion passed.

**Discussion for Board Action:**

1. #13-07 – Cross Keys Monroe, LLC – Reconsideration

Member's packets contained: 1. Letter dated 7/24/13 prepared by Robert Mintz, the applicant's attorney.

Mr. Marmero stated that the applicant is asking the Board for reconsideration on the use variance he submitted for 96 apartment units in the BP Zone. The applicant is in the process of revising the plan and proposing 72 apartment units with the commercial section being larger; possibly keeping the commercial as one lot or subdividing it into two commercial lots depending on the tenant. The Board must determine if Res judicata applies in this case. That is a Latin term which basically means you cannot hear the same application again. Mr. Marmero advised that the application does meet the requirements of Res judicata. He gave some examples of cases using this principle. He stated that the Board can agree to reconsider the revised application; the approval does not mean the applicant is getting approval for the application but that you agree to hear the changes he made to the previous application.

Motion by Mr. Manfredi, seconded by Mr. Fitzgerald to grant the applicant reconsideration on application #13-07. Roll call vote: Ayes – Mr. Manfredi, Mr. Fitzgerald, Mr. Fritz, Mr. Salvadori, Mr. Kozak, Ms. Hui, Mr. McLaughlin. Nays – Zero. Abstentions – Zero.

**Public Portion:**

Motion passed to open the meeting to the public. There being none, motion passed to close the meeting to the public.

**Reports:**

1. Mr. Kozak made a suggestion that if the Board receives an application for a site plan waiver they should try to ride by the site to assess the property and be better informed as to where the property is located. Ms. Pellegrini agreed and stated that is a good idea for any application submitted to the Board. Mr. McLaughlin agreed as well and stated he does try to ride by the properties.

**Approval of Minutes:**

1. 7/2/13 regular meeting.

Motion by Mr. Salvadori, seconded by Mr. Fritz to approve the minutes from the July 2, 2013 regular meeting. Voice vote; all ayes, motion passed.

**Adjournment:**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:36 p.m.

These minutes are an extract from the meeting that was held on the above date and are not a verbatim account or to be construed as an official transcript of the proceedings. The tape of the meeting is stored in the office of the Board.

Ninette Orbaczewski  
Clerk Transcriber