

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323
September 28, 2010

The regular meeting of the Florence Township Zoning Board of Adjustment was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Chairman Zekas called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag.

Secretary Montgomery then read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provision of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided to the official newspapers and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

Brett Buddenbaum	Ray Montgomery
Keith Crowell	Candida Taylor
John Fratinardo	B. Michael Zekas
John Groze	Rebecca Borucki (LATE)

ABSENT: Robert Adams (excused)
Planner Robert Perry (excused)

ALSO PRESENT: Solicitor David Frank
Engineer Dante Guzzi

Chairman Zekas announce for the public that the application for Joseph LaRocca request for Use variance and waiver of site plan for 312 Summer Street has been continued at the request of the applicant until October 26, 2010.

Chairman Zekas called for Application ZB#2010-11 for Craig Sklowdowski. Applicant is requesting bulk variances for side yard setback and lot coverage to permit construction of a single family home on property located at 301 East Second Street, Florence, NJ. Block 74, Lot 8.

Member Borucki arrived at 7:35 p.m.

After being sworn in by Solicitor Frank Mr. Sklowdowski related that he would like to build a single story residence on a vacant lot located at 301 East Second Street in Florence. He stated that there is an existing garage on the property that will remain. The house, driveway and ramp will exceed the permitted impervious coverage for the RA zone.

Chairman Zekas stated that Mr. Sklowdowski had indicated that the required variance was for lot coverage. He asked Engineer Guzzi if any other variances were required. Engineer Guzzi stated that there are 2 variances required – the lot coverage and variance for rear yard setback. He stated that the plan that was provided indicated the rear yard

78.

setback to the house not to the deck at the rear and additionally it was measured from the centerline of the alley not from the property line. The proposed dwelling will require a variance from maximum impervious coverage 47.5% where 25% is allowed and the minimum rear yard setback 35' is required and 19.5' is proposed.

Engineer Guzzi stated that there is also an existing garage which has several non-conforming conditions including alley setback of ½ foot where 10' is required and since this is a corner lot it is located in the Walnut Street frontage approximately 1 ¼' from Walnut Street and garages aren't permitted in the front yard. The garage is an existing non-conforming condition.

Chairman Zekas asked about the proposed height of the garage. Engineer Guzzi said that the height of the existing garage was not listed on the plan; Mr. Sklowdowski stated that it was less than 20' high.

Engineer Guzzi referred the Board to page 2 of his August 16, 2010 review letter. Item 1 regarding the incorrectly calculated rear yard setback has already been addressed.

Engineer Guzzi stated that Item 2 regarding the driveway was really his main concern regarding this application. The driveway is located very close to the intersection of Walnut and East Second Street. NJDOT requires that driveways be located 12' from the intersection. The proposal is to locate it approximately 6' from the intersection. The issue here is that you don't want vehicles backing out onto the intersection as it creates a safety concern. He addressed two recommendations in his review letter, either shifting the end of the driveway away from Walnut Street to provide the minimum 12' or the second alternative would be to flip the driveway and garage to the other side of the property.

Mr. Sklowdowski said that the garage is going to be rehabbed as the foundation is crumbling.

Engineer Guzzi said that if the applicant determines that it is feasible to flip the garage, there might be a couple other variances that are triggered but it would resolve this safety issue.

Continuing with his review letter Engineer Guzzi stated that Item 3 is a housekeeping issue with respect to the grading. A grading plan will be submitted as a condition of approval. Item 4 regarding the height of the garage was already addressed.

Engineer Guzzi stated that the big issue is the location of the driveway and how that will be resolved. Mr. Sklowdowski said that the driveway is designed to be wide enough for his van.

Solicitor Frank asked if Engineer Guzzi was suggesting that the driveway be moved away from the Walnut Street side of the property and moved over to adjoin Lot 11? Engineer

Guzzi said if this was possible it would alleviate his concern, but it would trigger additional variances as this property is a corner lot and has two front yard setbacks. He stated that if you maintain that front yard setback from Walnut Street there would not be enough room on the opposite side for the driveway and to allow you to get out and maneuver into the house. In order to provide that room the house may have to be pushed a little closer to Walnut Street. The alternative to relocating the driveway completely would be to pull the driveway a little bit closer to the house itself even if you had to curve it just to get away from the intersection.

Mr. Sklowdowski stated that he didn't have a problem with pulling the driveway over a few feet.

Member Taylor asked if the applicant had considered flipping the whole house? Engineer Guzzi stated that if this were done a variance would be required. The house would need to be closer to Walnut Street so a variance for secondary front yard setback would be required. Member Taylor said that it might be better to grant the front yard setback variance in order to solve the driveway safety issue.

Mr. Sklowdowski asked how far the house was from the corner. Engineer Guzzi stated that the proposal currently has the house setback 25'8" from Walnut Street. From the other side the setback is only 15' and this is where the concern is. 15' may not give the necessary room for the maneuvering in the driveway.

Mr. Sklowdowski stated that he had been advised that he could move the driveway over 6'. Engineer Guzzi asked if Mr. Sklowdowski would be interested in flipping the house if the Board would grant the front yard setback for the house so that instead of being 25' from Walnut Street the house would be 20' and this would give enough room for the driveway and the driveway could be relocated to the right hand side of the lot. Mr. Sklowdowski said that he would accept this. Solicitor Frank stated that Mr. Sklowdowski had some advisors in attendance and asked if he would like to consult with any of them or if any of them would like to testify?

Craig Masterson was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mr. Masterson stated that he was the architect for the applicant. He stated that he was a licensed architect in the state of New Jersey and had previously testified before Boards. Mr. Masterson was accepted as an expert in the field of architecture.

Mr. Masterson asked what exactly the Board was proposing? Engineer Guzzi responded that the Board is asking what the feasibility of flipping the house would be, with the understanding that the Board would consider granting a variance from the Walnut Street frontage to allow adequate room on the east side of the property to have the driveway and the detached garage. The driveway would be pulled all the way to the east side of the property away from the intersection, which creates a much safer environment. The applicant has to tell the Board what an appropriate front yard setback would be and then the Board would consider the variance.

Mr. Masterson said that if the Board would grant the 15' setback on the Walnut Street side with the understanding that the existing garage would be relocated on the site.

Solicitor Frank asked what the setback for the garage and the driveway would be on the east side of the property. Mr. Masterson said that to play it safe without having the luxury to layout the plan properly they would have to be given the opportunity to take exactly the setback that is currently existing on Walnut Street and apply it to the neighbors yard (Lot 11) on the opposite side. If this were granted they would then work with Mr. Guzzi to provide the plan that gave them the optimum setback – as much as they possible could – but still be allowed to get to that minimum setback if they have to.

Vice Chairman Fratinardo asked if the applicant was asking for a 15' front yard? Mr. Masterson said yes for the building. Vice Chairman Fratinardo asked if the applicant had any idea what they were looking for on the garage? Engineer Guzzi stated that the requirement is 5' from the side yard and 10' from the alley. He asked the applicant how this would work with the layout if they flipped the house? Mr. Masterson said this would not work. He stated that they would want the 1.22' side yard for the garage and approximately ½ foot from the rear yard to the alley. He stated that they would then work backwards and try to allow for greater setbacks if possible. Engineer Guzzi stated that the Board couldn't really offer flexible variances.

Mr. Masterson stated that they were asking for the 1.22" side yard and ½ foot alley setback.

Engineer Guzzi stated that in the zone for any accessory use (garden shed) would be 2' from the side yard and 2' from the alley. He stated that the Board would want to maintain the 2' from the side yard and 2' from the alley.

Chairman Zekas said that if the applicant would like to have a brief meeting then the Board would adjourn the application and move on to a second application and then open the hearing back up later in this meeting. Mr. Masterson stated that this would be a good idea.

Sophie Sklowdowski was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mrs. Sklowdowski said that she would prefer to keep the layout as proposed and move the driveway to come in at an angle. She stated that they had looked at flipping the house and it won't leave sufficient room for the ramp. It was very difficult to get the ramp setback on the lot. Mrs. Sklowdowski stated that flipping the driveway will not work it will not leave enough room for maneuvering.

Motion of Montgomery, seconded by Fratinardo to adjourn this application to be re-opened later during this meeting. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Chairman Zekas called for Application ZB#2010-12 for Lawrence Gyenge, Sr. Applicant is requesting bulk variances for setback and impervious surface coverage to allow continued use of an above ground swimming pool that was installed too close to

81.

the property line on property located at 1006 West Third Street, Florence, NJ. Block 3, Lot 3.

After being sworn in by Solicitor Frank, Lawrence Gyenge Sr. testified that he had put a pool up but didn't know how far he should install it from the fence. He said that he was one foot off. The ordinance calls for 6' setback for pools and Mr. Gyenge installed his pool 5' from the fence.

Mr. Gyenge said that he had a pool before but took it down about 3 years ago because his children were all grown up. He decided to install this pool for his granddaughter to use because he was afraid that she would swim in the river.

Engineer Guzzi said that apparently Mr. Gyenge got a permit for the pool, but when the pool was installed it was too close to the property line. A variance is required for 5' setback where 6' is required and a variance is also required for impervious lot coverage 68.7% where 33% is required.

Solicitor Frank asked if Mr. Gyenge got a permit for this pool? Mr. Gyenge answered that his daughter got the permit. Engineer Guzzi asked how long the pool was there? Mr. Gyenge said that he just installed this pool this summer but he always had a pool. This pool is only a 12' round pool and the old pool was about 20' long and 15' wide. This was taken down 4 or 5 years ago.

Engineer Guzzi asked if there were any drainage problems or complaints from the neighbors since he installed the pool. Mr. Gyenge answered that there had not been.

Engineer Guzzi said that Mr. Gyenge had addressed the one comment in his September 2, 2010 review letter regarding the location of the pool. Engineer Guzzi stated that there are a number of existing non-conforming conditions including minimum lot size, minimum lot width, lot coverage, front yard, side yard, side yard total and there is an existing garage in the back which is also non-conforming.

Chairman Zekas opened the hearing to the public.

Ed Gyenge, 215 Woodlawn Avenue stated that he was here to support his brother's request and recommends that the Board grant the requested variances.

Motion of Fratinardo, seconded by Taylor to close the public hearing.

Solicitor Frank stated that the usual conditions apply and there will be no regrading of the property resulting in stormwater being displaced onto adjoining properties.

Motion of Fratinardo, seconded by Taylor to approve Application ZB#2010-12. Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Buddenbaum, Crowell, Fratinardo, Groze, Montgomery, Taylor, Zekas

NOES: None
ABSENT: Adams

Chairman Zekas called for Application ZB#2010-13 for Richard and Sylvia Bocci. Applicant is requesting bulk variances for side yard setback, lot width, lot size and impervious surface coverage to permit construction of a single family home on property located on East Sixth Street, Florence. Block 66, Lot 18.

Candace Bocci, daughter of the applicants, was sworn in by Solicitor Frank.

Ms. Bocci stated that her parents own a vacant non-conforming lot. There is no other land around the lot that they could purchase to make it conforming. Variances would have to be granted in order to allow any improvements to the property.

Ms. Bocci stated that their application was for variances to permit the construction of a single-family home on the lot. She stated that she had received a review letter from Engineer Guzzi, which listed some suggestions regarding the setbacks and positioning of the home on the lot. She stated that she had her site planner reposition the house on the lot and brought a revised plan, which she submitted to the Board as Exhibit A1. This plan relocates the house so that the front and the rear setbacks are now conforming and the side yard setbacks are non-conforming – 10'6" requested on each side.

Solicitor Frank said that Ms. Bocci had testified that there is no other land that could be joined with this lot and asked if that was due to the fact that the adjoining parcels are developed. Ms. Bocci answered that the lots on both sides have existing houses and neither of the adjoining property owners wish to buy the lot.

Engineer Guzzi said that the repositioning of the house basically corrects the setbacks so that they measure to the edge of the house. The front yard setback is 26.5' so this is now conforming and a variance is no longer required. The required side yard setback is 15' and the applicant is asking for 10.5' on each side. The house would be centered on the lot. The rear yard remains conforming at 35'. The variances that are required now are minimum lot size and lot width, which are pre-existing non-conforming conditions of the lot. The maximum lot coverage, which is 24.7% where 20% is required, and then the 2 side yards at 10.5' where 15' is required.

Chairman Zekas said that on the plan that was supplied to the Board the side yard setback was listed as 12.5' on each side, but now the applicant indicated that the side yard setback is going down to 10.5'. Engineer Guzzi stated that the side yard setback had not been measured correctly on the original submittal. The applicant did not take into account the kitchen bump out. The house has now been shifted so that it would be centered on the lot.

Chairman Zekas said that the plan that was submitted shows the home, but doesn't show any walkways that would count against the impervious coverage. Engineer Guzzi stated that this would be Item No. 5 in his review letter requesting that the applicant show all

service walks and driveways on the property so that they could calculate the impervious coverage. Engineer Guzzi asked Ms. Bocci if there would be a sidewalk from the house to the street or if a driveway was planned. Ms. Bocci asked if sidewalks counted to the impervious coverage. Engineer Guzzi stated that it does count. The only exception is if the applicant were to install a walk made of concrete pavers set in sand. He informed Ms. Bocci that she should let the Board know now if a sidewalk or driveway is planned and then that could be added to the calculations. Ms. Bocci stated that there would be no driveway, but they would like to have a sidewalk from the front porch to the street.

Engineer Guzzi stated that 27% impervious coverage would allow for a 6' wide sidewalk from the steps to the street. Ms. Bocci amended her application to 27% impervious coverage.

Engineer Guzzi referring to his September 3, 2010 review letter stated that Item 1 is the requirement for a grading plan. This does not have to be submitted for the Board's review but it should be a condition of approval and will be required in order to get a building permit.

Item No. 2 the front yard setback has been addressed by Exhibit A1. Solicitor Frank stated that Exhibit A2 was submitted also which is the dimensional information including the height of the proposed house.

Item No. 3 referred the side yard setback issue that has been addressed.

Item No. 4 sidewalks are required for this application. The applicant will be required to install sidewalks along the front of the property and they should match the existing sidewalks.

Item No. 5 refers to the service walk. The applicant has proposed a concrete service walk in the front and no driveway.

Item No. 6 regarding the height of the dwelling. Exhibit A2 shows the height of the proposed dwelling and this will not exceed the maximum permitted height.

Item No. 7 as a condition of approval the location of the water and sewer utilities should be shown on the grading plan.

Chairman Zekas asked about the other homes in the neighborhood. Ms. Bocci stated that she had taken pictures of homes that are facing the subject property. She said that the photographs show homes with side yard setbacks that are considerably less than the 15' required and the lot size of these homes are undersized. Solicitor Frank stated that the photographs would be labeled as exhibits A3, A4 and A5. He stated that the photographs show that the proposal by the applicant is consistent with what exists in the neighborhood.

Chairman Zekas opened the meeting to public comment. Seeing no one wished to testify motion was made by Fratinardo, seconded by Crowell to close the public hearing. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Engineer Guzzi stated that this application requires variances for existing non-conforming conditions of the lot, which include lot size of 6,500 sq. ft. where 10,000 sq. ft. is required and lot width 65' where 100' is required. The proposed development will require a variance from maximum lot coverage of 27% where 20% is permitted and 2 side yard setbacks of 10.5' where 15' is required.

Solicitor Frank stated that conditions would be compliance with the sidewalk ordinance requiring sidewalks along the frontage and submission of a grading plan, which includes the location of all water and sewer utilities, at the time of application for construction permit.

Motion of Fratinardo, seconded by Taylor to approve Application ZB#2010-13 with the variances and conditions as stated previously.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Zekas, Taylor, Montgomery, Groze, Fratinardo, Crowell, Buddenbaum

NOES: None

ABSENT: Adams

The secretary read the time limit for appeal statement to the applicant.

Chairman Zekas called to re-open Application ZB#2010-11 for Craig Sklowdowski.

Mr. Sklowdowski said that after consulting with his advisors they had determined that it would be difficult to flip the plan. He asked Engineer Guzzi what he had proposed for the setback for the garage. Engineer Guzzi stated that he had recommended to the Board they maintain a minimum of 2' from the side yard and the alley because that is the minimum requirement for any accessory building. Currently the garage is 1.5' setback. Mr. Sklowdowski asked if this was 2' from the centerline of the alley? Engineer Guzzi stated that this would be measured 2' from the side property line and 2' from the property line with the alley. He stated that this is the property line even though the deed is written to the centerline of the alley.

Mr. Masterson that they would like to keep the alley setback as close to the 1.5' as possible. The 2' from the side yard from the neighbor makes perfect sense. Vice Chairman Fratinardo asked if the alleys were used. Mr. Sklowdowski stated that there is no alley on this block. Engineer Guzzi asked if he was driving on Walnut Street and wanted to turn onto the alley is there a depressed curb in that location? Mr. Sklowdowski stated that his brother's driveway for his home on Front Street is there. He stated that the water and sewer are in this alley, but the neighbors on the street have their fences on the centerline of the alley. Engineer Guzzi stated that this is not an open alley and basically

exists because it contains the utility easements. Engineer Guzzi stated that this is a 20' wide alley.

Chairman Zekas asked for an explanation as to why it would be difficult to maintain the 2' setback to the rear. Mr. Masterson stated that because of the way the garage is positioned in relation to the house. The garage is clipped on the angle there that allows for room to get around. He stated that if he pulls it forward it would close the gap and make it difficult to maneuver Mr. Sklowdowski's wheelchair.

Member Taylor asked for the dimensions of the garage. Engineer Guzzi stated that it is approximately 20' x 22'. Mr. Masterson said that he can play with the width but the depth has to be sufficient for a van to get inside. Engineer Guzzi stated that there is a little bit less concern with the alley setback since it is not used for trash pick-up. He stated that flipping the house and getting the driveway away from the intersection is going to result in a much safer condition for the applicant as well as people driving up and down the street.

Mr. Masterson stated that they are amending the application to have a 2' side yard setback and a .5' rear yard setback to the garage building. Engineer Guzzi stated that since the garage is going to be roughly the same size there would still be a maximum lot coverage if 47.5% where 25% is permitted. There will be a rear yard setback of 19.5' where 35' is permitted. There will be an accessory structure (garage), which will be 2' from the side property line where 5' is required and .5' from the alley where 10' is required. There will be an additional front yard setback variance from Walnut Street (the secondary frontage) of 15' where 25' is required.

Solicitor Frank said that a key consideration here is to construct a home that is an entirely accessible dwelling on one floor. This requires a different type of architecture that what is typically found. Everything must be contained on the one level. This results in an increase in lot coverage and pushes the house out toward the edges of the property. Mr. Masterson stated that the proposed house is still a modest 3 bedroom home.

Solicitor Frank stated that while personal hardship is not what the Board is typically asked to consider, in our society we also recognize that providing accessible dwelling units and all types of other facilities is considered to be socially beneficial and is one of the purposes of zoning.

Member Taylor asked if the ADA legislation addressed private dwellings as well. Solicitor Frank stated that it does not.

Engineer Guzzi stated that the grading plan is required as a condition of approval.

Chairman Zekas asked for verification that the .5' setback for the re-located garage is measure from the alley edge not the centerline. Engineer Guzzi stated that it was from the alley edge and the garage will be positioned similarly to its current location but just flipped to the other side of the property.

Solicitor Frank stated that Mr. Sklowdowski's deed says that he owns to the center of the alley. The township has a right of way, which is in the nature of an easement.

Chairman Zekas opened the hearing to public comment. Seeing no one wishing to comment motion was made by Fratinardo, seconded by Crowell to close the public hearing. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Engineer Guzzi stated that this application is for the construction of a new residence at 301 East Second Street. The applicant has requested variances for maximum lot coverage of 47.5% where 25% is required, a minimum front yard setback from Walnut Street of 15' where 25' is required, a minimum rear yard of 19.5' where 35' is required and the construction of a garage which will be located 2' from the side yard where 5' is required and ½ foot from the alley where 10' is required.

Solicitor Frank said that the only conditions he has is that the house and garage will comply with the maximum height requirements. There would be a revised grading plan submitted prior to receiving a construction permit.

Motion of Fratinardo, seconded by Crowell to approve Application ZB#2010-11.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Buddenbaum, Crowell, Fratinardo, Groze, Montgomery, Taylor, Zekas
NOES: None
ABSENT: Adams

The secretary read the time limit for appeal statement to the applicant.

Chairman Zekas called for Application ZB#2010-15 for Elizabeth A. Gensel. Applicant is requesting a bulk variance for impervious coverage to permit construction of an 8' x 8' storage shed on property located at 217 Woodlawn Avenue, Florence, NJ. Block 156.04, Lot 5.

Elizabeth Gensel was sworn in by Solicitor Frank.

Ms. Gensel stated that she had applied for a bulk variance for impervious coverage in order to allow installation of a shed in her back yard. She indicated that she had received Engineer Guzzi's September 20, 2010 letter and addressed the comments as follows: the lot will not be re-graded and the alley setback will exceed the 2' minimum.

Ms. Gensel stated that the most impact would be to her neighbor Ed Gyenge.

Engineer Guzzi stated that as outlined in his September 20, 2010 report the subject property is an undersized lot with a number of existing non-conforming conditions. The shed will only require a variance for impervious coverage. He stated that on the sketch

87.

that was submitted it appeared that the driveway actually extended further. Ms. Gensel stated that when she purchased the property the driveway extended all the way up to the back of the house and there was concrete up to the step and along the backside of the house. She stated that she had removed about 25' of concrete and black top. Now those areas are just grass. She stated that she also took out an area of 15' x 4' of concrete along the front of the house that is now a garden.

Engineer Guzzi stated that it is safe to say that Ms. Gensel removed more impervious coverage than the 8' x 8' proposed shed will cover. Chairman Zekas stated that there was a note in the application that Ms. Gensel had removed approximately 396 sq. ft. of concrete and he complimented her on this. Ms. Gensel said she would rather have grass and yard than asphalt and concrete.

Chairman Zekas asked Ms. Gensel to point out the placement of the shed on the plan. Ms. Gensel stated that it would be 2' off of her neighbor's fence and approximately 14' from the alley. There is a fence midway up the back of the yard and the shed will be next to this fence.

Secretary Montgomery asked if part of this shed would be sitting on the pavement? Ms. Gensel stated that the shed would either be sitting on blocks or stones. The existing driveway is 9' wide of blacktop and then there is 2' of stone on either side. The shed would be covering some of that stone. It may cover approximately a foot of the driveway.

Chairman Zekas opened the hearing to public comment.

Ed Gyenge, 215 Woodlawn Avenue, was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Mr. Gyenge stated that his property was next door to Ms. Gensel and the shed would be located adjacent to his property. He stated that he had no problem with the application and does not anticipate any negative impact.

Patrice Gensel, 229 East Second Street, was sworn in by Solicitor Frank. Ms. Gensel said that she was here to support her sister and stated that Ms. (Elizabeth) Gensel did take up a considerable amount of concrete that was in the yard when she purchased the property.

Seeing no one else wishing to comment, motion was made by Montgomery, seconded by Fratinardo to close the public hearing. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Engineer Guzzi stated that the application is for a lot coverage variance of 40% where 33% is required.

Solicitor Frank stated that there is a condition that the lot not be re-graded in such a way to direct stormwater onto adjoining properties.

88.

Motion of Fratinardo, seconded by Taylor to approve Application ZB#2010-15. Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Zekas, Taylor, Montgomery, Groze, Fratinardo, Crowell, Buddenbaum
NOES: None
ABSENT: Adams

Chairman Zekas called for Application ZB#2010-14 for Joseph LaRocca. Applicant is requesting a Use variance and site plan waiver to permit conversion of a warehouse with one apartment into four apartments on property located at 312 Summer Street, Florence, NJ. Block 43, Lot 8.

Solicitor Frank stated that the Board is not taking jurisdiction of this application for any purpose other than carrying it. No finding is being made with regard to the completeness of the application.

Motion of Taylor, seconded by Crowell to accept the applicant's request for continuance. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

MINUTES

Motion of Montgomery, seconded by Buddenbaum to approve the Minutes of the June 22, 2010 meeting as submitted. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

RESOLUTIONS

Resolution ZB-2010-15

Granting the application of Whitesell Construction Co., Inc. for Use variance and preliminary major site plan approval to permit parking as a primary use in support of a proposed building to be constructed at 600 Richards Run, Burlington Township, NJ. Block 158, Lot 4.

Motion of Groze, seconded by Crowell to approve Resolution ZB-2010-15. Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Crowell, Fratinardo, Groze, Montgomery, Taylor, Zekas
NOES: None
ABSENT: Adams

CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Ordinance No. 2010-14. An ordinance of the Township of Florence amending Chapter 91 of the Florence Township Code and specifically amending Section 91-74 to require sidewalks as a condition of land use approval and providing for payments into a dedicated Sidewalk Trust Fund as an alternative under certain circumstances.

89.

- B. Letter from Patrick McAndrew, Esq., dated August 12, 2010 regarding deed approval for Block 16, Lots 6 & 7, located on Alden Avenue and Norman Avenue for Salt & Light Company, Inc.
- C. Letter from Engineer Guzzi dated August 27, 2010 regarding deed of subdivision for Salt & Light Company, Inc.
- D. Letter from Solicitor Frank dated August 31, 2010 regarding deed of subdivision for Salt & Light Company, Inc.

Solicitor Frank stated Correspondence A regarding Ordinance No. 2010 for the requirement of sidewalks. He stated that there had been discussion between the Council and the Planning Board regarding the waiving of the sidewalk requirement as part of the land use approval process. This ordinance is the result of those discussions and basically states that applicants, where applicable, must either provide sidewalks or make a payment into the Sidewalk Trust Fund as an alternative.

Motion was made and seconded to receive and file Correspondence A through D. Motion unanimously approved by all members present.

Motion of Fratinardo, seconded by Buddenbaum to adjourn at 8:57 p.m.

Ray Montgomery, Secretary

RM/ne