

**Borough of Clementon**

**Planning/Zoning Board**

**March 8, 2018 Meeting Minutes**

The March 8, 2018, meeting of the Clementon Planning/Zoning Board was called to Order by Chairman Feldman. It was announced that the meeting has been properly advertised and posted Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, The Open Public Meetings Act. The meeting was then opened with a salute to the flag and called to order by Chairman Feldman.

Roll Call: Chairman Feldman, V.C. Kinkel, Secretary McKelvey, Mayor Weaver, Member Armbruster, Member Lofland, Member Saunders, Member Naurath, Solicitor Rhodes, Churchill Engineer William Fleming were all present.

Absent: Member Kuns.

Chairman Feldman: Motion to approve February 8, 2018 minutes with the correction of Member Saunders comment on bottom page one.

V.C. Kunkel made first motion, second motion Member Armbruster.

Roll Call: Chairman Feldman, V.C. Kunkel, Secretary McKelvey, Member Armbruster, Member Lofland, Member Saunders, Member Naurath all approved. Mayor Weaver abstained.

Chairman Feldman: Called on DeDulca Law firm to discuss the variance application request for Santander Bank.

Laura Delesandro, Esquire introduced herself as the representing attorney for the Law firm of Del Duca Lewis and Santander Bank variance application. Witness Tom Gianni, Vice president of operations Image One Industries who prepared the signed plans for the signs. Location of Santander Bank is at 100 Berlin Road and Mill Creek Rd just before you get to Clementon Lake Park. Exhibits A1 (Aerial View of location) and Exhibit A2 (view of back where proposing sign will be added) were handed out to board members for referencing. She went on to explain that the variance will be the addition to the sign if facing the bank would be located on the right side of the building. Coming from West heading East on Berlin Rd. the sign will measure 55.48 sq. ft.

Chairman Feldman: How big is the sign now?

Mr. Gianni sworn in by Solicitor Rhodes gave overview of the sign that they are proposing and the existing sign on the property. There is a sign located on the front entrance. There is a Pylon sign at the left portion of the parking lot that exists. The sign that we are proposing is slightly larger in size on the front entrance which is 40 sq. feet. It is 55.48 sq. feet. The right side elevation of the building is a long approach and the entrance to the parking lot is far down the street from the building itself. That whole side of the building looks like it could be a Doctor's office. It is totally unidentifiable from that direction.

It is crying out for a sign. The sign we are proposing is a LED design no building alterations are needed. People will recognize the building as a bank.

Chairman Feldman: I am looking at the picture with the sign. Frankly that size looks sufficient. What makes you think that the size would not be sufficient for the proposed new sign?

Mr. Gianni: I do think the size is sufficient for the sign. It fits perfectly on the building and the building looks like it was made for that sign.

Solicitor Rhodes: I think what the chairman was asking was why 56 instead of 40 square feet.

V.C. Kunkel: Is the front sign 40 square feet?

Mr. Gianni: The front sign is 3 foot 4X12, so I would put it about 40 square feet.

Attorney Delessandro: Would you agree that the larger size would contribute to getting more patrons to come to the bank when coming up Berlin Road the distance they have to make that safe turn into the parking lot then entrance on the other side?

Mr. Gianni: Absolutely. The sign over the front entrance just identifies the entrance of the site. It has no real approach or recognized ability from a motorist's point of view. Where the side sign will have clear identification of what the building is. Coming from the opposite direction you will have the pylon sign which will also contribute to the direction. The trees that you can see from the picture A2 you can't identify the site by the pylon from that direction. The building will benefit greatly from the sign on the building.

Chairman Feldman: Wasn't there some mention of the pylon sign on the original application?

Attorney Delessandro: Was it re-facing a directional sign? Now we are not asking for a variance for that we are just going to reface the sign.

Chairman Feldman: Are there any other questions or comments? Mr. Fleming? Solicitor Rhodes any questions?

Bill Fleming: Yes I am ok with this.

Solicitor Rhodes: Just a review for the board. The applicant is applying for two variances. The first has to do with the ordinance allowing only one façade sign per business structure building. The second has to do with the size permitting only 40 square feet for a façade sign. The applicant is asking for a 56 square foot sign. The justification for that is that the entrance way to the parking lot precedes the building making it difficult for a passing motorist to see it and have time to turn into the driveway. A larger sign will enhance the ability to the traveling motorist. The sign also fits the architectural confines of the building as indicated on exhibit A2.

Chairman Feldman: That just about sums it up.

V.C. Kunkel: Is that sign going to be lit the same time as the other one is?

Mr. Gianni: Yes it will.

Chairman Feldman: May I have a motion to approve?

V.C. Kunkel made first motion to approve. Second motion made by secretary McKelvey.

Roll Call: Chairman Feldman, V.C. Kunkel, Secretary McKelvey, Mayor Weaver, Member Lofland, Member Saunders, Member Naurath all voted to approve. Member Armbruster Abstained.

Chairman Feldman: Are there any other comments?

Member Armbruster: The Mayor has meet with a gentleman proposing a new use for the extension building on Ohio Ave. He would like to purchase it from the county and turn it into 55 and older apartments. Possibly putting in a second floor and creating 16 units. My thought it is not zoned for that use. It will have to come before this board. Currently it is designated for re development single family homes. That would allow up to 6 homes on that property. Anything other than that, they would have to come before this board for approval. It would put the property back on the tax roles as it is not currently on the tax roles in county or building. The question is how would the residents feel about apartments? What would be the effect on the values of their home? Over all is that a good use for that area? I asked the proposed buyer if he had done any other buildings like this in a residential area or not. He said no he has done them on main streets mostly. He has done one similar in Merchantville. I am just making the board aware as the county is looking for feedback. The extension service has been out of this building for about 10 years. The county is eager to sell the property. I approached them when I was Mayor and they were asking close to \$400,000. In November I approached Dominick Vesper. This building has issues as far as EPA. In 5 to 10 years this building has to be vacated and we would have to rehouse the Borough. I asked what the sale price for the extension building would be if we were to relocate and the price was \$100,000.

Member Saunders: Did you talk to the builder at length about that? Is it something they were going to go up high rise with?

Member Armbruster: He just said he would like to put a second story on the building.

Member Saunders: Will they extend the size of the building?

Member Armbruster refers to pictures of current buildings he has done in other towns. He added that they were only going to extend the building to two stories.

Member Saunders: Same footprint. That goes back to Silver Lake Drive.

Member Armbruster: Yes, it is a fairly large piece of property irregular shaped.

V.C. Kunkel: Would they have enough parking for that?

Member Armbruster: They have more parking than they would need. The building has been remediated already. I just wanted to make this board aware and see if they could assist the governing body as to whether it will be a good use or not so we could get back to the county.

Member Armbruster also had a brief discussion about turning 2 plots the Borough owns already into a Borough Park that connects to Bottoms Lake. By using "open Space Money" to purchase the house between both properties @ \$60,000. They could have a nice bridge/landing for fishing and boating. Various members commented about the idea referencing insurance issues and questioning the need to purchase the property between the two parcels of land. (The cd had a communication error prior to this discussion and that is why this is summarized.)

Solicitor Rhodes read resolution #2018-01 Referencing Oak Leaf Financial and their extension request. The resolution was then voted on.

Roll Call: Chairman Feldman, V.C Kunkel, Secretary McKelvey, Mayor Weaver, Member Armbruster, Member Lofland, Member Saunders, Member Naurath all approved Resolution.

Motion made by Secretary McKelvey to adjourn meeting Second motion made by Member Lofland.

Meeting adjourned.