

MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

REGULAR MEETING

Thursday, October 28, 2010

**Manchester Township Municipal Building
1 Colonial Drive, Manchester, NJ**

MINUTES OF MEETING

1. The meeting of the Manchester Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was called to order at 7:00p.m. by Chairwoman Linda Fazio.
2. This meeting had been duly advertised, filed and posted in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.
3. A Pledge of Allegiance and Salute to the Flag.
4. Roll Call:
Members Present: P. Salvia, W. Cook, L. Fazio, K. Vaccaro, J. Hankins, T. Umlauf

Members Absent: J. Vitale, M. Dwyer, H. Glen

Also Present: C. Reid, Attorney
R. Mullin, Engineer
5. Administrative Session:
Approval of Minutes: The minutes for the January 28, 2010 Regular Meeting were **APPROVED** on motion by K. Vaccaro and seconded by T. Umlauf. All in favor, W. Cook abstained.

The minutes for the April 19, 2010 Special Meeting were **APPROVED** on motion by T. Umlauf and seconded by P. Salvia. All in favor, W. Cook & K. Vaccaro abstained.

The minutes for the September 23, 2010 Regular Meeting were **APPROVED** on motion by K. Vaccaro and seconded by T. Umlauf. All in favor, W. Cook abstained.

Payment of Bills:
RFP #7684 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$859.69 for General Board Matters
RFP #83393 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$357.50 for Case 1043
RFP #83394 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$321.75 for Case 1044
RFP #83392 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$393.25 for Case 1042
RFP #83395 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$321.75 for Case 1045
RFP #83400 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$321.75 for Case 1046
RFP #7689 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$286.00 for Case 1041
RFP #7688 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$71.50 for Case 1040

RFP #7687 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$183.75 for Case 1037

RFP #7685 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$36.75 for Case 0612

RFP #7686 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$73.50 for Case 0925-0892

RFP #83391 for T & M Associates in the amount of \$1108.25 for Case 1047

RFP #74466 for Cafarelli & Reid in the amount of \$600.00 for Case 1039

RFP #74465 for Cafarelli & Reid in the amount of \$570.00 for Case 1041

Bills were **APPROVED** on motion by W. Cook and seconded by K. Vaccaro.

ROLL CALL VOTE: W. Cook, yes; K. Vaccaro, yes; P. Salvia, yes; T. Umlauf, yes; J. Hankins, yes; L. Fazio, yes.

Correspondence: The Secretary stated she received a letter from Mrs. Babinski Fairweather asking that Case 0612 be carried to the November 15, 2010 meeting.

The Secretary stated she received a letter from Mr. Alfieri asking that Cases 1042 & 1043 be carried to the November 15, 2010 meeting. All letters did include a waiver of time.

Professional Reports: Mr. Reid has nothing at this time.
Mr. Mullin has nothing at this time.

Case 0612	A T & T Mobility 15 East Midland Avenue Paramus, NJ 07652	Block 99.161 Lot 6 Grant & Scranton Avenue WTR-40 Zone
------------------	---	--

This application is for a Use Variance to erect a 170-foot tall monopole cell tower in a zone where the use is not permitted. The applicant is also requesting preliminary & final site plan approval for the proposed structure & appurtenant equipment.

This application was **CARRIED to the November 15, 2010 meeting** on motion by W. Cook and seconded by T. Umlauf. All in favor. A waiver of time was given.

Case 1042	Shady Pines Construction PO Box 408 Old Bridge, NJ	Block 1.277 Lots 9-11 Lawrence Avenue R-10 Zone
------------------	--	---

This application is for the construction of a single family dwelling on a lot having a lot area of 7,500 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required; a lot width of 75 feet where 100 feet is required; and an improvable lot area of 4,225 square feet where 5,800 square feet is required.

This application was **CARRIED to the November 15, 2010 meeting** on motion by W. Cook and seconded by T. Umlauf. All in favor. A waiver of time was given.

Case 1043	Shady Pines Construction PO Box 408 Old Bridge, NJ	Block 1.294 Lot 5 Southampton Blvd. R-10 Zone
------------------	--	---

This application is for the construction of a single family dwelling on a lot having a lot area of 7,500 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required; a lot width of 75 feet where 100 feet is required; and an improvable lot area of 4,225 square feet where 5,800 square feet is required

This application was **CARRIED to the November 15, 2010 meeting** on motion by W. Cook and seconded by T. Umlauf. All in favor. A waiver of time was given.

Memorialization of a resolution of a variance approval to allow a second floor addition (dormer) to remain on an existing dwelling having a front yard setback from Lawrence Avenue of 16.49 feet where 30 feet is required. Block 1.281 Lot 5, 1412 Larchmont Street. Applicant: Danielle Brandt. Approved at the September 23, 2010 meeting. Case 1039

This resolution was **APPROVED** on motion by W. Cook and seconded by K. Vaccaro.

ROLL CALL VOTE: W. Cook, yes; K. Vaccaro, yes; P. Salvia, yes; J. Hankins, yes; T. Umlauf, yes.

A copy of the approved resolution is attached.

Memorialization of a resolution of a variance approval for the construction of a single family dwelling on a lot having a lot area of 7,500 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required; a lot width of 75 feet where 100 feet is required; an improvable lot area of 2,600 square feet where 5,800 square feet is required; and a first floor elevation 66 inches above the average centerline of the road where it shall not be less than 24 inches nor more than 48 inches. Block 1.304 Lot 6-8, Monmouth Avenue & Bismarck Street. Applicant: Jeffrey Jerman. Approved at the September 23, 2010 meeting. Case 1041

This resolution was **APPROVED** on motion by W. Cook and seconded by T. Umlauf.

ROLL CALL VOTE: W. Cook, yes; T. Umlauf, yes; P. Salvia, yes; K. Vaccaro, yes.

A copy of the approved resolution is attached.

Memorialization of a resolution of a variance denial for a Use Variance to operate a solid waste management business where the use is not permitted in this zone. The applicant also requested preliminary and final site plan approval to modify the property to accommodate the proposed use. The Board, however, did not address the site plan portion of the application because the use variance was denied. Applicant: Rosoca Holdings, LLC. Denied at the April 19, 2010 meeting. Case 0913

Mr. Reid stated that this resolution will be ready for adoption at the November 15, 2010 meeting.

Case 1047	Quick Chek Corporation 3 Old Highway Rt 28 PO Box 600 Whitehouse Station, NJ 08889	Block 30 Lot 636 3001 Ridgeway Road HD-3 Zone
------------------	---	---

This application is for a variance to allow an additional 75 square foot freestanding I.D. sign along Ridgeway Road frontage. Ms. Mary Elizabeth Werner, attorney for the applicant was present. She stated they are here this evening asking for a second sign on the site which causes the need for the variance. Mr. Jeffrey Martell, Engineer for Bohler

Engineering was sworn in by Mr. Reid. He gave his credentials and was accepted by the Board. He had the signage site plan dated 10/28/10 marked into evidence as **A-1**. The application is to permit an additional free standing sign on the Ridgeway Road frontage. Quick Chek has a convenience store and fuel sales operation has an existing identification sign on Route 70. The original application was before the Planning Board. They are a permitted use as far as the convenience store, the gas sales is a conditional use. One of the criteria as part of the conditional use is that one ground sign on the parcel. The second sign which they are proposing violates that conditional use criteria. They are proposing an identical sign that is on Route 70. The need for the sign comes from the fact that the parcel is unique because it has frontage on two streets, but it is not a traditional corner lot. The PNC Bank is located on the corner. After building the site, the need for the second sign was evident as the gas sales and identification sign only benefited the travelers on Route 70. The Route 70 sign is not visible from Ridgeway Road. A second variance is being requested for the setback of the proposed sign from the property line. There is a requirement to have the sign setback 25 feet. They are proposing it to be 15 feet from the right of way line because during the original application they granted a 10 foot right of way dedication for county road improvements. If they didn't do that, they would have the 25 foot setback that is required. The further they set the sign back on the property the less visible it is from Ridgeway Road because of the large wooded area on the northern side of the property that was maintained during the original application. They are trying to maximize visibility for people traveling on Ridgeway Road. He discussed the items in Mr. Mullin's letter dated 10/4/10. They are proposing a pylon sign and Mr. Mullin suggests a monument style sign. Mr. Cook asked for Mr. Martell's opinion as to a monument style sign as opposed to a pylon sign concerning visibility from the road traveling east on Route 571. The primary difference is the height of the sign, the typical pylon sign is 18 feet a monument sign would be about 10 feet high. A pylon sign is more visible and seen from a further distance, which is good in a highway setting. In this case, he doesn't think it is required because travelers would be slowing down because of the traffic light at the corner. Quick Chek is not opposed to a monument sign. Mr. Mullin brought up the heavily treed lot to the north of the property and with an 18 foot high sign it may be obscured by the trees where with a ground mounted sign that you could see beneath the canopy. From an aesthetics perspective, a lot of municipalities are going more toward monument style signs as opposed to the traditional pylon sign. Mr. Cook stated winter time would be good because you would be able to see through the trees, but during the spring and summer you wouldn't be able to see it. Mr. Cook asked for a professional opinion, which sign would provide clearer advance notice for travelers. Mr. Martell feels both signs given the roadway, the speed limit, given the nature of the road both signs would provide the proper advance notice for the purpose of turning into the driveway. That is his professional opinion. They did agree to all items in Mr. Mullin's letter. Mr. Mullin stated that if the Board did approve the monument sign, it would have to be located so as not to impact the site triangle. Mr. Martell did agree to that. They would like to propose a 3-1/2 foot brick base so the brick will match the building and columns of the canopy and the supporting structure. The sign would be the same size. They would put a couple shrubs around the base of the foundation with a small planting bed. The Board discussed the pros and cons of a pylon sign versus a monument sign. Mr. Martell had a generic monument style sign marked into evidence as **A-2**.

Mrs. Fazio opened this portion of the meeting to the public. There being no public participation at this time, this portion of the meeting was closed.

This application was **APPROVED with conditions** on motion by W. Cook and seconded by K. Vaccaro.

Conditions of approval are a letter of no interest from the county be provided and that a monument style sign as opposed to a pylon sign with a maximum of a 4' high foundation with matching brick. Also, submit a revised plan and detail of the proposed monument style sign to Mr. Mullin for his approval.

ROLL CALL VOTE: W. Cook, yes; K. Vaccaro, yes; P. Salvia, yes; T. Umlauf, yes; J. Hankins, yes; L. Fazio, yes.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 7:35 p.m. on motion by W. Cook and seconded by K. Vaccaro. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Darlene E. Garcia
Secretary

Dated: November 12, 2010