RESOLUTION 36-2025

A RESOLUTION OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WASHINGTON, COUNTY OF GLOUCESTER, STATE OF NEW JERSEY (ELIZABETH ROGALE, BLOCK 84.07, LOT 10)

WHEREAS, an application for a bulk variance from the Zoning Ordinances of the Township of Washington has been submitted by the Applicant/Owner, Elizabeth Rogale (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant") with an address of 56 Plumtree Drive for said Property being designated on the Tax Map of the Township of Washington as Block 84.07, Lot 10; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the application is to obtain bulk variance approval to add a second driveway to the property on Plumtree Drive and to add a 10' x 6' deck to the one story in-law suite in a Rural (R) Zone; and

WHEREAS, in support of the application, the Applicant has submitted an application, with attachments, received at the Washington Township Zoning Board of Adjust on April 21, 2025; and

WHEREAS, Elizabeth Rogale, Sean Longfellow and Joseph Petrongolo, L.L.A., R.L.A., P.P., attended the May 12, 2025 meeting of the Washington Township Zoning Board of Adjustment and where they gave testimony as follows:

1. Mr. Petrongolo stated we are addressing a request for a bulk variance for a second driveway on Plumtree Drive and to add a 10' x 6' deck which would increase the amount of impervious coverage.
2. Mr. Petrongolo stated the bulk variance is for maximum impervious coverage per Section 285-41(K) where 25% is permitted and the Applicant is proposing 26.1%. He recommends any approval be for 27% maximum impervious coverage.

3. Mr. Longfellow stated the Applicant had previously received approval for an in-law suite to the existing residence. However, the proposed second driveway and deck were not part of same. He stated we are requesting approval to add a 10' x 6' attached deck to the existing in-law suite. He stated we are requesting a second driveway off Plumtree Drive. There are other homes with two driveway entrances. This is a corner property with a long road frontage.
4. Mr. Petrongolo stated the proposed deck addition has no impact to the setback. The deck would have a minor impact but no adverse impact. He had no objection to the granting of the second driveway off of Plumtree Drive and the variance for impervious coverage; and

WHEREAS, the meeting was made open to the public and the following individuals testified as follows:

1. James Early of 52 Plumbtree Drive stated he is the next door neighbor. He stated the second driveway would be located on his side of the property and next to his driveway. He stated he had concerns about the future with the new driveway and what if they sell property.
2. Mr. Petrongolo stated the variance does run with the land. He stated this house is not a duplex and the in-law suite cannot be used as a rental. This is an approved in-law suite.
3. Mr. Early stated there is already one driveway for the property but now they want to have two (2) driveways. This property will turn into a duplex if the second driveway is approved.
4. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant needs relief to get the second driveway. There is a bend in the road necessitating the second driveway to the in-law suite. This is a

single family home. The Applicant must come before the Board for a second driveway.

5. Mr. Early stated this is a high traffic area. He bought his house for privacy. The closest driveway is 150 feet from him.
6. Mr. Petrongolo stated the proposed second driveway meets the required setback. The driveway is 12 foot wide.
7. Mr. Early stated what happens when he sells his home. The person will pull up and see this driveway next to his driveway.
8. Mr. Petrongolo stated he is not a real estate broker and can't comment on value. He stated your driveway is within five (5) feet of the property line. He doesn't anticipate any impact.
9. Mr. Early asked what about the in-law suite.
10. Mr. Petrongolo stated the Applicant had previously come before the Board and was granted approval.
11. Dr. Camara of 51 Plumtree Drive stated he has been a good neighbor but he is now challenging the second driveway. He is okay with the deck but not the driveway. He stated there are circular driveways in the neighborhood but not separate driveways and this will make the property look like a duplex. The in-law addition looks beautiful and he is not challenging the in-law suite.
12. Dr. Camara stated no one else in the neighborhood has a second driveway. Why wasn't this brought up when the in-law suite was approved. The addition looks beautiful but a second driveway will have that look.
13. Courtney Brown of 57 Plumtree Drive stated she lives across the street. She want to echo the same concerns. She is concerned about a separate driveway and the impervious coverage impacts. Why a separate driveway versus a wrap around for

an estate look. The addition is great. Why not access through the home. She is a concerned neighbor about the appearance with the second driveway.

14. Mr. Petrongolo asked about landscaping of the second driveway.
15. Mr. Longfellow stated we plan to add landscaping. He stated there is a difference between a driveway and a wrap around driveway.
16. Mr. Petrongolo stated a wraparound driveway would increase impervious coverage and he is not sure if it would work for this corner property and the house location on the lot.
17. Mr. Petrongolo stated the requested relief would have minimal impact. He stated no drainage impact from the improvements. There will be additional landscaping added; and

WHEREAS, based upon the information above, the Board concluded as following:

1. The property which is the subject of this application is located in the Rural (R) Zoning District of Washington Township.
2. The Applicant is requesting a variance to add a twelve (12) foot second driveway on Plumtree Drive and a 10' x 6' attached deck to the existing one story in-law suite.
3. The grant of the bulk variances as sought by this application will provide benefits to the Township and the Zone Plan which will outweigh any detriment, if any, to the Zoning scheme of the Zoning Ordinances of Washington Township

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Washington Township Zoning Board of Adjustment, that the application for a variance to allow for a twelve (12) foot second driveway and a 10' x 16' attached deck to the one story in-law suite is **GRANTED.**

3. This application is further conditioned p9on the Applicant obtaining any and all permits which are required by any other agencies of the Township, Cunty, State or Federal government, including the Gloucester County Planning Board, if necessary.
4. This application is further conditioned upon the Applicant bringing current any and all escrow payment or other fees owned to the Township, County or State for professional review of the application.
5. The Applicant is GRANTED a variance to allow for a twelve (12) foot second driveway on Plumtree Drive and a variance for total maximum impervious coverage of 27% as testified to at the hearing on May 12, 2025.
6. The Applicant is to provide additional landscaping to address the second driveway.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Applicant publish a notice of this decision in the official newspaper of the Washington Township zoning Board of Adjustment and will provide proof of publication to the Board's secretary and pay for the cost of said publication.

WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD

JOSPEH BENNIS, Chairperson

ATTEST:

Jeanette Naylor
Jeanette Naylor, Secretary

The Resolution is adopted by the
Washington Township Zoning Board of Adjustment
On the 9th day of June and memorialized the decision of the
Board made at a hearing on May 12, 2025.

THOSE VOTING IN FAVOR: 7
THOSE OPPOSED; 0
THOSE ABSTAINING: 0

ATTEST:

Jeanette Naylor

Jeanette Naylor, Secretary

This Memorialization of the Resolution
Setting forth the decision of the Board
was adopted thereafter on the 9th day
of June by a vote of 5 in favor
and 0 opposed 0 abstained.

L:\WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP ZBA\Rogale, Elizabeth\052325 Resolution for Bulk Variance.doc