

RESOLUTION 2017 - 10

**A RESOLUTION OF THE WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
GRANTING SIGNAGE APPROVAL, VARIANCES, WAIVERS AND AN EXTENSION
OF TIME TO FILE SUBDIVISION PLAT TO THE APPLICANT,
WASHINGTON SQUARE URBAN RENEWAL, LLC c/o WOODMONT PROPERTIES
BLOCK 115, LOTS 3 & 3.01
257-269 HURFFVILLE-CROSS KEYS ROAD
APPLICATION #1846**

WHEREAS, the Applicant, Washington Square Urban Renewal, LLC c/o Woodmont Properties whose mailing address is 100 Passaic Avenue, Suite 240, Fairfield, New Jersey 07004 for property owned by Richard Melchert, whose mailing address is 206 Bridgeton Road, Elmer, NJ 08318 is requesting signage approval, variances, waivers and an extension of time to file subdivision plat with variances and waivers; and

WHEREAS, the subject property is located in the Area III of the Washington Square Redevelopment Zone (underlying zone = HC – Highway Commercial); and

WHEREAS, the Applicant had previously received Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for Phase 1, Preliminary Site Plan approval for Phase II and Subdivision Approval under Resolution #2016-13 and Final Site Plan approval for Phase II under Resolution #2016-15; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant now seeks approval for three (3) freestanding signs, variances, waivers and an extension of time to file subdivision plat; and

WHEREAS, public notice of the hearing was provided in accordance with the requirements of Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is requesting the following variance(s), which variances were properly noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12; and

Section 285-231.B – Size, height and number of freestanding signs as follows:

<u>Sign</u>	<u>Area</u>	<u>Overall Height</u>
Town Center (13 tenants)	262.77 sf	22.5 ft
Residences of Washington Square Rothman Institute (2 additional tenants)	76 sf 67.26 sf	6 ft 5 ft; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant is requesting the following waiver(s), which waivers were property noticed in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12; and

Section 220-31.E – Landscaping at base of sign; and
 Section 220-37.A – Sidewalk
 Section 220-38 – Curb
 Section 220-40 – Street Trees

WHEREAS, in support of the application, the Applicant submitted a signage submission received on November 14, 2016 consisting of the following:

Sheet	Title	Date	Latest Revision Date
4 of 35	Phasing Plan	11-05-15	05-04-16
5A of 35	Setback Dimensioning Plan	05-04-16	---
5B of 35	Setback Dimensioning Plan	05-04-16	---
101	Signage Details	11-10-16	---

Sheets 4, 5A and 5B were prepared, signed and sealed by Ronald N. Curcio, P.E., Adams, Rehmann & Heggan, 850 South White Horse Pike, P.O. Box 579, Hammonton, New Jersey 08037-2019, (609) 561-0482.

The signage details were prepared by Rotwein + Blake Associated Architects, P.A., 16 Mirolab Road, Suite B, Livingston, New Jersey 07039, (973) 740-9755; and

WHEREAS, in support of the application, the Applicant also submitted plans for the road extension to Baldwin Boulevard received October 28, 2016, consisting of the following:

Sheet	Title	Date	Latest Revision Date
1 of 50	Cover Sheet	11-05-15	09-26-16
2 of 50	Information Sheet	11-05-15	09-26-16
3 of 50	Soil Logs	11-05-15	09-26-16
4 of 50	Overall Plan/Phasing Plan/Demolition Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
5 of 50	Existing Conditions and Demolition Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
6 of 50	Setback Dimensioning Plan	05-04-16	09-26-16
7 of 50	Setback Dimensioning Plan	05-04-16	09-26-16
8 of 50	Site Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
9 of 50	Site Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
10 of 50	Grading Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
11 of 50	Grading Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
12 of 50	Soil Erosion & Sediment Control	11-17-15	09-26-16
13 of 50	Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Notes and Details	11-17-15	09-26-16

14 of 50	Utility Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
15 of 50	Utility Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
16 of 50	Drainage Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
17 of 50	Drainage Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
18 of 50	Profiles	11-05-15	09-26-16
19 of 50	Profiles	11-05-15	09-26-16
20 of 50	Profiles	11-05-16	09-26-16
21 of 50	Profiles	11-05-15	09-26-16
22 of 50	Profiles	11-05-15	09-26-16
23 of 50	Profiles	11-05-15	09-26-16
24 of 50	Profiles	11-05-15	09-26-16
25 of 50	Basin Sheet	11-05-15	09-26-16
26 of 50	Landscaping Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
27 of 50	Landscaping Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
28 of 50	Lighting Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
29 of 50	Lighting Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
30 of 50	Landscaping Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
31 of 50	Landscaping Plan	11-05-15	09-26-16
32 of 50	Lighting Details	11-05-15	09-26-16
33 of 50	Construction Details	11-05-15	09-26-16
34 of 50	Construction Details	11-05-15	09-26-16
35 of 50	Stormwater Details	11-05-15	09-26-16
36 of 50	Stormwater Details	11-05-15	09-26-16
37 of 50	Utility Details, Water	11-05-15	09-26-16
38 of	Utility Details, Water	11-05-15	09-26-16

50			
39 of 50	Utility Details, Sanitary	11-05-15	09-26-16
40 of 50	Utility Details, Sanitary	02-18-16	09-26-16
41 of 50	Fencing and Rain Garden Details	02-01-16	09-26-16
42 of 50	Miscellaneous Details and Notes	02-01-16	09-26-16
	BALDWIN BOULEVARD EXTENSION		
43 of 50	Typical Sections	02-01-16	09-26-16
44 of 50	Construction Plan	02-01-16	09-26-16
45 of 50	Drainage Plan	02-01-16	09-26-16
46 of 50	Grading, Profile and SCD Plan	02-01-16	09-26-16
47 of 50	Grading, Profile and SCD Plan	02-01-16	09-26-16
48 of 50	Construction Details	02-01-16	09-26-16
49 of 50	Construction Details	02-01-16	09-26-16
50 of 50	Construction Details	02-01-16	09-26-16
1 of 1	Baldwin Blvd. Extension Drainage Area Map	10-20-16	---
1 of 1	Outbound Survey	09-10-15	---
---	Subdivision Maps	03-10-16	---
1 of 1	Open Space Exhibit	12-14-15	03-10-16
---	Stormwater Management Report	11-17-15	---
---	Stormwater Management Maintenance Plan and Report	11-17-15	---
---	Stormwater Conveyance System Report	10-18-16	---
1 of 2	Ladder Truck Turning Moving Plan	02-01-16	---
2 of 2	WB-50 Truck Turning Movements	02-01-16	---
---	Traffic Engineering Assessment	10-26-15	02-02-16
---	ITE Parking Data	03-28-16	---
---	Environmental Impact Worksheet	11-2015	---
---	Environmental Impact Statement	01-16-15	---
---	Addendum 1 to the Environmental Impact Statement	05-04-16	---
---	Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report	12-2015	---

1 of 4	Tree Preservation and Compensation Plan	02-02-16	03-10-16
2 of 4	Landscaping Plan	02-01-16	03-10-16
3 of 4	Landscaping Plan	02-01-16	3-10-16
4 of 3	Landscaping Details	02-01-16	03-10-16
---	Medical Waste Containment & Disposal Plan	03-0-16	
---	Integrated Pest Management Plan	03-10-16	05-04-16
---	Deicing Management Plan	03-10-16	05-04-16
---	Parking Lot Operations & Management Plan	03-10-16	05-04-16
---	Spill Contingency Plan	05-04-16	
C1	Medical Building – Cover Page	11-05-15	---
---	Medical Building – Exterior View	---	---
A1	Medical Building – First Floor Plan	11-05-15	---
A2	Medical Building – Second Floor Plan	11-05-15	---
A3	Medical Building – Exterior Elevations	11-05-15	---
A4	Medical Building – Exterior Elevations	11-05-15	---
A5	Retail Buildings A & B – Floor Plan and Exterior Elevations	11-05-15	---
A6	Retail Building C -- Floor Plan and Exterior Elevations	11-05-15	---
---	Assisted Living and Memory Care Building – 8 pages	11-05-15	---
---	Townhouses and Clubhouse – 23 pages	11-05-15	---

Sheets 1 of 50 through 50 of 50, the Stormwater Management Report, and the Stormwater Management Maintenance Plan and Report, and Tree Preservation Plans, 1-4 were prepared, signed and sealed by Ronald N. Curcio, P.E., Adams, Rehmann & Heggan, 850 South White Horse Pike, P.O. Box 579, Hammonton, New Jersey 08037-2019 (609) 561-0482.

The Outbounds Survey and the Subdivision Plat were prepared, signed and sealed by Richard A. Heggan, P.L.S., Adams, Rehmann & Heggan.

The Open Space Exhibit were prepared, signed and sealed by Terrence H. Combs, P.P., Adams, Rehmann & Heggan.

The Traffic Engineering Assessment and ITE Parking Data were prepared and signed by Nathan B. Mosley, P.E., C.M.E., Shropshire Associates, LLC, 277 White Horse Pike, Suite 203 Atco, New Jersey 08004, (609) 714-0400.

The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report was prepared by SESI Consulting Engineers, 12A Maple Avenue, Pine Book, New Jersey 07058.

Medical Waste Containment & Disposal Plan, Integrated Pest Management Plan, Deicing Management Plan, Parking Lot Operations & Maintenance Plan, and Spill

Contingency Plan were prepared, signed and sealed by Theodore Wilkinson, P.E., Adams, Rehmann & Heggan.

Sheets C1 through A6 were prepared by Lance Blake, R.A., Rotwein + Associated Architects, P.A., 16 Mircolab Road, Suite B, Livingston, New Jersey 07039, (973) 740-9755.

The Assisted Living and Memory Care Building plans were prepared by Daniel Roach, R.A., Lenity Architecture, 3150 Kettle Court SE, Salem, Oregon 97301, (503) 399-1090.

The Townhouses and Clubhouse plans were prepared by Richard Arzberger, R.A., Sonnenfeld and Troccia Architects, P.A., 53 Main Street, Holmdel, New Jersey 07733, (732) 946-777; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant was represented by Louis Cappelli, Jr., Esquire, at the December 6, 2016 hearing on this matter; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board made its decision in this matter based on the documentation set forth above, the testimony of the Applicant and the Applicant's Professionals and the Board's Professionals made at the time of the hearing on the application and on each of the following:

1. Joseph M. Petrongolo, L.L.A., R.L.A., P.P., Board Planner, submitted a report dated November 15, 2016; and
2. Thomas E. Cundey, P.E., C.M.E., Board Engineer, submitted a report dated November 15, 2016; and

WHEREAS, based upon the above, the Board, at the December 6, 2016 hearing date, finds as follows:

1. Louis Cappelli, Jr., Esquire stated he is representing the Applicant tonight regarding a signage package for this project, and some additional variances, waivers and a request for an extension of time to file the subdivision plat. Mr. Cappelli reviewed with the Board the history of the project and current status of the project. The project is located in a Redevelopment Zone and the Applicant has obtained prior approvals by this Board. Since those prior approvals, the Applicant has made every effort to connect Baldwin Boulevard to the Applicant's project and is still in ongoing negotiations with Atlantic City Electric. Both parties are very close to an agreement wherein A.C. Electric

would dedicate the property to the Township which is necessary to build the road. The Applicant also has one remaining issue with the Gloucester County Planning Board which involves a traffic signal. However, since the final approvals, a lot of progress has been made to complete the various conditions and requirements for moving forward with the project. Tonight, the Applicant is back to address the signage package for the project and to also request a 120 day extension to file the Applicant's subdivision plat.

2. Mr. Cappelli stated the Applicant has agreed to install curbs along Baldwin Boulevard. Also, Atlantic City Electric is requiring the Applicant to install a fence around its facility and for the Applicant to pay for the cost.
3. Mr. Cappelli stated the signage package is critical for the success of this project. The proposed signage package had been submitted to the DRC and has been revised based on discussions with the DRC. Tonight, the Applicant is requesting four (4) variances related to the signage package. Those variances include the square footage for each sign, the height, the limit of one (1) sign per development and right-of-way setbacks. Mr. Cappelli commented on waivers for the Baldwin Boulevard road extension. As to sidewalks being necessary near the A.C. Electric substation, the Applicant does not believe sidewalks are needed at this time. In the event of any future development, the adjacent land owners, ACP, can address the need for sidewalks. However, as to curbing on the Baldwin Boulevard extension, the Applicant has agreed to install curbing along same.
4. Joseph M. Petrongolo, L.L.A., R.L.A., P.P., Board Planner, submitted a report dated November 15, 2016. Mr. Petrongolo testified the Applicant is before the Board for signage approval. The Applicant is asking for three (3) free standing

signs at the Hurffville/Cross Keys frontage. One (1) main tenant sign would be at 262.77 square feet, a second sign for the residential at 76 square feet and a third sign for the Rothman site at 67.26 square feet. Township Ordinance permits up to 50 square feet per sign. Therefore, the Applicant requires a variance for the proposed square footage of each proposed free standing sign.

5. Mr. Petrongolo stated pursuant to Township Ordinance Section 285-231(B), the height for the main free standing tenant sign is 22.5 feet where a height of 6 feet is permitted. Also, under the same Ordinance section, the Applicant proposes to install three (3) free standing signs where one (1) free standing sign would be permitted for the entire project.
6. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant did originally appear before the DRC with even larger proposed signage. The DRC recommended the height and sizes be reduced. The Applicant has reduced the height and size of the signage. Mr. Petrongolo stated this is a Redevelopment Project, which project is also to be divided by a road. He stated it is not untypical to have a sign on each section of the project. Here, the Applicant is proposing three (3) free standing signs in lieu of four (4) free standing signs for corner properties. This is a unique situation for a regional project. There are unique characteristics of the site and the three (3) free standing signs have been revised to meet the recommendations of the DRC. It would, however, be appropriate to hear testimony from the Applicant as to why the free standing signage is needed for this project.
7. Board Member Dennis asked if there was to be any signage for the Assisted Living project.

8. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant may have façade signage by Township Ordinance but the Applicant is not requesting any other signage at this time for this project.
9. Board Member Centrone asked about the residential sign and Rothman wanting their own free standing sign.
10. Lance Blake, Applicant's Professional Architect, testified regarding the overall plan. Mr. Blake asked the Board to look at the site plan for this location. The site plans show three (3) free standing signs along Hurffville-Cross Keys Road. Mr. Blake, for the sake of identification, identified the signs as Sign A, B and C along Hurffville-Cross Keys Road. Sign A would be the largest of the three (3) free standing signs and a monument sign. Sign A would be for the retail use and would be 262.77 square feet.
11. Mr. Blake stated Sign B would be in the center aisle and serve as a way finding sign and Sign C would be a monument sign for the Rothman facility.
12. Mr. Petrongolo stated Sign A would be the main Town Center sign and Sign C for Rothman.
13. Mr. Blake marked as exhibits the proposed signs. The signs reflect a three dimensional view. As to the Town Center, the proposed sign is to acknowledge the retail use with a 22.5 foot high sign sitting at a base of 2.6 feet. The sign would be made of cultured stone and similar to the building exterior. The signage would be internally illuminated. There would be sign panels that equal 262.77 square feet of signage at a height of 22.5 feet. This sign is necessary for the success of the retail uses to create visibility of the project and to assist the Applicant in leasing the units.

14. Mr. Blake stated Township Ordinance requirement would result in inadequate signage at one (1) free standing sign at 50 square feet at a 6 foot maximum height. Those dimensions would not be enough to make the signage work for this project. More importantly, the proposed signage would not have any negative impact on the area. This area is a Redevelopment Zone with lots of permitted uses and the proposed signage for this project is appropriate.
15. Mr. Blake stated Sign B is the residential sign to be located in the center aisle. This sign is proposed to be 3 feet by 19 feet long which is a low lying sign to serve as a way finding sign. Again, the sign would have the same type of characters, the same theme and internally lit with a light box and blades.
16. Steven Varneckas, P.E., on behalf of the Applicant, stated the residential sign is not for the Assisted Living residential component. He wasn't sure of the name of the residential community but this sign is not for the Assisted Living use and not for the retail use. He had a discussion with the Assisted Living people who indicated their needs is for the small internal monument sign since the property is more of a destination.
17. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant did have a small monument sign.
18. Mr. Blake again stated Sign B would not work at the Township's requirements of 50 square feet which creates a very small sign. What is proposed by the Applicant is an appropriate size of signage for this project with landscaping to be provided at the base. The signage would have no negative impact on this site.
19. Mr. Blake stated Sign C is proposed for the Rothman site. This sign is 67.26 square feet at a height of 6 feet to feature the primary tenant, which is Rothman, although there will be other tenants in the building. Rothman proposes to use

half of the building or approximately 20,000 square feet. The sign would be internally illuminated and similar to the other signs. Rothman has requested the sign design as part of their business model and the Township's maximum 50 square feet of signage for a 40,000 square foot building is very small. Again, the proposed sign would have no negative impact on the site.

20. Mr. Petrongolo stated the application and the project create a unique situation.

The project has a residential use behind a commercial use. However, you need the residential signage in front to let people know. There is a benefit to having the signage in the front. There will be a dedication of the main road to the Township and thereby the creation of two (2) separate tracks of land for this project. This is a large scale project and Township Ordinance is designed more for smaller size complexes. A sign height of 22.5 feet is at the peak of the sign. The signage would have no detrimental impact to the overall project. This site is within the Redevelopment Zone which is an enhanced area to promote development of the site. The signs will provide benefits to the public.

21. Mr. Petrongolo asked about the number of commercial tenants.

22. Mr. Blake responded thirteen (13) tenants at this point.

23. Mr. Petrongolo stated again, this is a unique situation and unlike other sections in the Township. The property is not on a main road in the Township and, therefore, there is a need for enhanced signage.

24. Theodore Wilkinson, P.E., Applicant's Professional Engineer, testified the County is currently reviewing this project. Mr. Wilkinson stated the free standing signs are currently located on the plans at 10 feet from the existing right-of-way line. However, the County is now requiring the Applicant to provide accel/decel lanes and, therefore, the Applicant may have to push back

the 10 foot right-of-way, which could result in the free standing signs being located at one (1) foot from the finally approved right-of-way.

25. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant has proposed the free standing signage to be located ten (10) feet from the right-of-way. However, the County may take additional land within the ten foot of right-of-way but the free standing signs would still remain at the same location on the plans. The Applicant will maintain at least a one (1) foot distance from any formally approved right-of-way from the proposed ten (10) feet from the existing right-of-way on the plans. However, if the County should move the right-of-way back eleven (11) feet, then the free standing sign would need to be located twelve (12) feet from the existing right-of-way on the plans.

26. Board Member Boyer asked if sidewalks are still to be provided at this location.

27. Mr. Wilkinson responded sidewalks are to be provided at this location.

28. Board Member Centrone asked about signage for the retail.

29. Mr. Varneckas stated since there is no retail lined up at this point in time, there is no retail façade signage proposed beyond what was depicted and approved on the architectural plans.

30. Mr. Petrongolo stated any retail façade signage would need to conform with Township Ordinance. Any retail façade signage beyond Township Ordinance requirements would then have to come back to the Planning Board for approval.

31. Board Member Boyer asked if any additional free standing signs would need to come back to the Board.

32. Mr. Petrongolo stated any additional free standing signs above the three (3) proposed tonight would need to come back to the Planning Board.

33. Board Member Boyer stated he likes the look of the three monument signs and their size is okay. Mr. Boyer stated this is a Redevelopment Zone and there is going to be future development with ACP and Atlantic City Electric. What is the Planning Board to consider for development in front of these areas?
34. Mr. Petrongolo stated the ACP site is a huge area. He does not anticipate any signage on the Applicant's site for the ACP site.
35. Board Member Boyer asked what about a future movie theatre.
36. Mr. Petrongolo responded he would not be surprised if at some point in time a movie theatre might come before the Board for signage on Hurffville-Cross Keys Road. However, Mr. Petrongolo is not sure how much development will occur at the ACP site.
37. Board Member Boyer stated there is nothing we can do at this point about future development but there will be some grand plan for development in the future.
38. Board Member Dennis asked if any signage is proposed at the other end of Baldwin Boulevard.
39. Mr. Petrongolo stated none presently other than the three (3) signs under consideration tonight.
40. Thomas E. Cundey, P.E., C.M.E., Board Engineer, stated there is sidewalk to be installed in the front of this project and the right-of-way. How would the proposed sidewalk not be a problem?
41. Mr. Wilkinson responded by stating the free standing signs may have to be moved back even further to make room for the sidewalks.
42. Mr. Petrongolo stated the sign issue is done. What is the name for the extension of Baldwin Boulevard?

43. Mr. Wilkinson stated the proposed name for the roadway extension is Town Center Boulevard.
44. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant is proposing a four (4) foot high fence along their property line. Township Ordinance doesn't permit a fence in the front yard. The fence is to be installed around the A.C. Electric Company track of land. Mr. Petrongolo has no objection to the fencing and certainly wouldn't want people to walk onto the Utility Company's property. Also, section 237(A) of Township Ordinance would require a sidewalk along the extension of Baldwin. At this point, Mr. Petrongolo has no objection to no sidewalk being installed on the extension at this time since the sidewalk would lead to nowhere. However, any future development on the extension would need to tie the sidewalks into Baldwin Boulevard and would need to provide sidewalk at that time. However, at this point, a waiver would be appropriate for the Applicant.
45. Board Member Boyer asked what do we do about the future.
46. Mr. Petrongolo stated a waiver is only being granted to this Applicant and not as to any future developers who would have to install sidewalks. Any future development along the extension would have to address the sidewalk issue. Any tie into this development would require a future developer to finish those improvements along the road.
47. Board Chairman Frattali stated he wanted curbing on Baldwin Boulevard more than the sidewalk.
48. Board Member Boyer stated there isn't much undeveloped land left in the Township.

49. Mr. Cappelli stated the Applicant is also looking tonight for an extension of time to the deadline to file the subdivision plat for this project. Specifically, the Applicant is requesting 120 additional days to file.

50. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant has to file the approved subdivision plats with the County of Gloucester. The County has been working with the Applicant on this project. The Applicant has also been dealing with Atlantic City Electric issues. There are outside causes requiring additional time for the Applicant to finalize this project and thereby necessitating the need for an extension. Mr. Petrongolo had no objection to the requested extension for those reasons; and

WHEREAS, none of the other professionals submitted any reports nor had any comments; and

WHEREAS, the meeting was open to the public and the following individuals commented on the application:

1. Julie Smith. Ms. Smith's first asked why she had gotten a letter about the signage but nothing about the overall project.
2. Mr. Cappelli responded there were no properties within the 200 feet of the project when the original approvals were granted. However, when the Atlantic City Electric land became involved in this project, then additional property owners had to be noticed.
3. Ms. Smith stated she did not see the plans for the signage in the median strip. She stated she is thinking about other projects in the Township where the sign is on the side street.
4. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant's sign is not going on a median strip which divides the roadway but the Applicant is using the median.

5. Ms. Smith asked about the Rothman sign and the façade signs.
6. Board Member Boyer stated façade signage is on the building versus the free standing signage.
7. Mr. Petrongolo stated that is correct. The Applicant may not need any variances for façade signage depending on the size but that issue will be left up to the Applicant.
8. Ms. Smith asked how does this signage compare to Virtua.
9. Mr. Petrongolo stated this is a larger sign. However, as to square footage, the signage is about the same as Virtua. The Virtua height is somewhere between 12 to 15 feet high whereas this sign is 22.5 feet high.
10. Ms. Smith stated she was surprised this project is located across the street from a development and the impact from the project.
11. Board Member Boyer stated the signs are not directly across from the development but a little further down.
12. Mr. Petrongolo stated the signs are all internally illuminated.
13. Ms. Smith stated once this area starts developing there will be more signs, etc. which may look ugly.
14. Board Member Boyer responded we are discussing residential use from commercial use.
15. Ms. Smith asked if there is a residential sign for this project.
16. Board Member Boyer responded there is one free standing sign approved tonight for residential out of a total of three (3) free standing signs.
17. Ms. Smith questioned about other projects.
18. Mr. Petrongolo stated if you take this project into consideration, these free standing signs are different than the normal Black Horse Pike free standing commercial signs.

19. Ms. Smith stated what about Ganttown Road signs.

20. Mr. Petrongolo stated these free standing signs are more esthetically pleasing signs than signs in other parts of the Township per the Redevelopment Plan. The Township is normally limited as to signage but not the same criteria for signs in a Redevelopment Zone. Conceptually, the architectural design of the proposed signs are consistent with the buildings to be constructed and their exteriors. If you look at what is proposed, the signs are much better looking.

21. Ms. Smith stated Rothman is currently located on Greentree Road.

22. Mr. Petrongolo stated Rothman proposes to vacate their current building location since it has become too small for their business operation; and

WHEREAS, based upon the above factual findings, the Planning Board has come to the following conclusions:

1. The subject property is located in the Area III of the Washington Square Redevelopment Zone District (underlying zone = HC = Highway Commercial).
2. The Applicant is requesting signage approval, additional variances, waivers and an extension of time to file the subdivision plats.
3. It was the finding of the Planning Board and Planning Board Professionals that the Applicant had demonstrated both the positive and negative criteria necessary for granting the requested variances and waivers. It was the finding of the Planning Board that the variances and waivers could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and the intent and purposes of the zone plan, zoning ordinances, redevelopment zone and redevelopment plan and that said variances and waivers were required given existing site conditions.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Washington Township Planning Board that the application for Signage Approval, variances, waivers and an Extension of Time to file Subdivision Plat by the Applicant, Washington Square Urban Renewal, LLC c/o Woodmont Properties is hereby **GRANTED** by the Planning Board, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. All of the Agreements and/or representations made by the Applicant as set forth at the hearing in this matter or as contained in this Resolution must be fully satisfied by the Applicant.
2. All of the initial findings of fact, conclusions and conditions as set forth in the "Whereas" recital paragraphs of this Resolution and as set forth above are hereby incorporated by reference herein as further findings of fact and conditions as applicable.
3. The Applicant testified that it will comply with all the terms and conditions of the Planning Board Professional review letters except as noted on the record.
4. The Applicant is hereby granted the following variance(s):
 - a. Three (3) free standing signs on the roadway where only one (1) free standing sign is permitted.
 - b. A free standing sign setback of not less than one (1) foot from the approved right-of-way.
 - c. Signage square footage of one (1) sign at 262.77 square feet, one sign at 76 square feet and one (1) sign at 67.26 square feet where maximum permitted square footage per sign is 50 square feet.
 - d. Height of sign A of 22.5 feet.
 - e. A four (4) foot high fence in the front yard on the Atlantic City Electric property.

5. The Applicant is hereby granted the following waiver (s):
 - a. No sidewalks on the extension portion of Baldwin Boulevard which is not adjacent to the residential portion of the project.
 - b. No street trees on the extension portion of Baldwin Boulevard which is not adjacent to the residential portion of the project.
6. The waivers granted to the Applicant for the sidewalks and street trees on the extension portion of Baldwin Boulevard do not apply to any future development along the extension portion.
7. Applicant is granted an additional 120 days to file the subdivision plats.
8. Applicant is required to obtain any and all necessary Township permits for the installation of the free standing signs.
9. If an inspection escrow, performance bond and/or maintenance bond are required with this application, an estimate of all on/off site improvements (excluding structures) must be reviewed and approved by the Washington Township Engineer. Any required performance Bond and/or inspection escrow and/or maintenance bond must be posted prior to the signing of any plans or deeds.
10. The Applicant shall contact the Planning Board Office to settle any outstanding review and escrow accounts prior to the issuance of any building permits.
11. The Applicant must submit a certification that all taxes on the property have been paid to date.
12. It was the finding of the Planning Board and Planning Board Professionals that the Applicant had demonstrated both the positive and negative criteria necessary for granting the requested variances. It was the finding of the Planning Board that the variances could be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and the intent and purposes of the zone plan and zoning ordinances and that said variances were required given existing site conditions.
13. The Plan is subject to review and approval of the following authorized review agencies, if applicable, with evidence of these approvals to be submitted to the Planning Board office prior to final signature:
 - a. Gloucester County Planning Board;

- b. Gloucester County Soil Conservation District
- c. Gloucester County Utility Authority
- d. Washington Township Municipal Utilities Authority
- e. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection
- f. Washington Township Fire Marshall
- g. Any other outside agency approvals that may be deemed as a necessary approval of and/or required for this project


BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Applicant shall cause a brief notice of this resolution to be published in the South Jersey Times at the Applicant's expense and forward a copy thereto to the Applicant within ten (10) days of the date hereof.

This is a Resolution memorializing the vote taken by the Washington Township Planning Board at the aforesaid meeting held on December 6, 2016 and is hereby adopted at the meeting held on March 7, 2017.

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD


ALBERT FRATTALI, Chairperson

ATTEST:


Secretary

ROLL CALL VOTE

J. Gattinelli, Mayor	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
A. Frattali, Chair	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
T. McPoyle, V. Chair	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
E. D'Orazio, II	YES		NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN <u>X</u>
Joseph J. Perry, III	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
M. D'Ariano, IV	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
M. Martin, IV	YES		NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN <u>X</u>
T. Sparacio, IV	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
J. Bidinger, IV	YES		NO	ABSENT <u>X</u>	ABSTAIN
B. Dennis (Alt #1)	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN
R. Centrone (Alt #2)	YES	<u>1</u>	NO	ABSENT	ABSTAIN

I certify the above to be a true copy of a resolution adopted by the Washington Township Planning Board at a regular meeting held on March 7, 2017, memorializing the action taken by the Board on December 6, 2016.

Christy Mallella
, Secretary

Date: 3/7/17