

VOORHEES ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING MINUTES AUGUST 14, 2014

The Vice Chairman (Mr. Neal Cupersmith) called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the "Open Public Meetings Act" and has been duly published by law.

ROLL CALL:

PRESENT: Mr. Weil, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Willard, Mr. Quarishi, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Doug Rohymeyer from CME, and Mrs. Cherylynn Walters from Marrazzo and Platt, law firm

ABSENT: Mr. Kerr and Mr. Senges

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

June 12, 2014:

Motion made by Mr. Weil; Seconded by Mr. Willard, Abstention: Mr. Cupersmith. The remaining voice vote is in favor

June 26, 2014:

Motion was made by Mr. Weil: Seconded by Mr. Cohen; Abstention:

July 10, 2014:

Motion was made by Mr. Weil; Seconded by Mr. Willard; Abstention: Mr. Leoncio

APPROVAL OF RESOLUTIONS:NONE

CORRESPONDENCE: NONE

.....

NEW BUSINESS:

PETER J. GALLO

43 Lafayette Avenue

Block 295, Lot 1

The applicant is seeking relief from Section 154.015© (2) of the ULDO to permit the construction of a 3 ft high vinyl split rail-fence in the front-yard area and with a front yard setback of 0 feet where no fencing is permitted in the front yard area and minimum front yard setback is 50 feet. Seeking all other variances as required by the zoning board of adjustment.

Mr. Peter Gallo and Patricia Capasso were sworn in for testimony by the board solicitor

Mr. Gallo stated that he has been there for 20 years and has had a split rail. With age of the fence, he wanted to replace the fence and put in the exact same spot and due to having to comply with the current zoning regulations now, he was not permitted to put in that location. The fence sits off the street and there is no one around him and wanted to go before the zoning board to ask for relief to allow this fence in the same position.

Mr. Gallo stated that it is 8 ft off Lafayette Avenue and 13 ft from the property line of Centre Road, which is a dirt road-paper street. There is a house behind him but they are very hidden and sit far off the street. The fence will stop at their driveway. The front of Lafayette is hard to see.

Mr. Quarishi asked if they have a swimming pool and the answer was yes and they have fencing and the answer was yes-the fencing is around the pool; that is separate from this.

Cherylyn stated that there are pins in the ground –that are telling the property owner where their property lines are located-they are replacing the fence in the same location where it was located. Cherylyn stated that the board does not have jurisdiction to allow you permission for you to build or erect a structure or fence within a County right of way or any right of way. The board can give him

approve to reconstruct as long as it is on your property and not within the right of way-he understood this rule.

A motion was made by Mr. Weil to approve the fence(3 ft vinyl split rail fence in front yard area with a front yard setback of 8 ft where no fencing allowing, also 13 ft on Centre Road (per Cherylyn) is the location the applicant applied for; Seconded by Mr. Cohen.

ROLL CALL:

AYES:Mr. Cohen, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Quarishi and Mr. Cupersmith

NAYS: NONE

CELLCO

16 S Burnt Mill Road

Block 20, Lot 18

The applicant is seeking a use variance for relief from Sections 152.012 and Bulk Variance relief from 152.015(D) (2) and (3) of the Voorhees Ordinance, together with a site plan approval to permit the installation of a wireless communications facility. The applicant is also requesting all such other relief, including height variance, other variances or waivers/exceptions from design standards and /or performance standards, as may be required to develop the premises in the manner indicated in the application materials.

The professionals were all sworn in for testimony this evening. The attorney was present this evening, Mr. Hambro along with David Karlebach from Community Planning, the planner, Andrew Petersohn, from dBmEngineering, P.C. the engineer and Ronald Igneri, from Stantec.

The Applicant's facility will consist of twelve (12) wireless telecommunication antenna mounted at height of approximately 88'above ground level (and extending to approximately 92') on the existing 120' tall monopole style communication tower as well as the installation of an associated equipment shelter within an approximately 16.5 ' by 10' expansion of the existing fenced compound enclosing the monopole.

Mr. Petersohn the applicant's radio frequency engineer testified on behalf of the applicant. He introduced exhibit A-1 which was a map of the Verizon wireless existing server coverage in the area surrounding the cell tower on Burnt Mill road. A-2 was another exhibit which was a map of the proposed server coverage. He stated that there is such a demand of data service with all the grow with the servers have in their cars, home, iPhone, pads, etc. that there is service interruption that occurs and they have to keep up on all of this . They can't let there be a decrease in service so they need to keep current and have the services with the 9-1-1- because the system can't tell the difference from on-emergency to emergency needs for voice or data requests. This would be a harm to customers and the public safety. If they obtain the addition 12 antennae on the existing monopole it will result in improved voice and data service in the immediate area. There are no other existing tall structures within the area. It is a very low power facility and indicated exposure concerns are well within the FCC standards even in the worst case scenario.

Ronald Igneri, the engineer stated that the 40 ft by 40 ft and that the monopole located towards the rear of the compound instead of in the middle of the compound which is common. The new compound would be designed to deal with data usage and would be an improvement of what is existing out there now. The new compound would also have a generator for emergency power supply in the event that a traditional commercial power supply is lost for any reason. The generator would be powered by diesel fuel. The running time would be weekdays only from the hours of 9:00-5:00pm. The compound would be increased in size by 512 ft so it will now be a 16 ft by 32 ft. The applicant agreed to replant any vegetation and or landscaping along the rear of the property line to offset the removal of trees and do proper grading around the new compound as well. The applicant agreed that they will go over with our board engineer, Doug Rohymeyer from CME regarding the type, number, size and location of the trees to make everyone is in agreement, if not the applicant will return back to the board. The board was concerned with the noise level of the generator and agreed as a condition that they will limit routine testing and or running of the generator to weekdays only, Monday through Friday between hours of 9:00am to 5:00pm for no more than 20 minutes at a time .

The applicant agreed to comply with the previous approvals to the board in 2005 and 2009 when they received approvals then for the cell tower.

Mr. David Karlebach, the applicant's planner testified. He stated that in the Voorhees code it is not permitted. He stated that it is a suitable use; there is a need and it is for the safety of the citizens. This is unmanned, there is no traffic impact, no smoke, glare, and the land use for this site is very benign. The positive outweighs the negative. There were no questions by the board. He believed this is a good project. One of the board members asked who Cellco was and Mr. Hambro stated that it is for Verizon- it is their corporate name.

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC; SEEING NONE THE PUBLIC PORTION WAS CLOSED

Cherylynn wanted to do separate votes for this application so the D1 variance variance:

A motion was made to approve this application by Mr. Willard; Seconded by Mr. Weil.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, and Mr. Cupersmith

NAYS: None

A motion was made for the D6 variance for the height (centerline 88')

Motion was made by Mr. Willard; Seconded by Mr. Weil

AYES:Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Cupersmith

NAYS: None

Motion was made for the site plan with the following conditions:

Comply with the previous approvals, CME review letter , the generator and the operating instructions; replanting vegetation.

Motion was made by Mr Willard; Seconded by Mr. Weil

AYES:Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio and Mr. Cupersmith

NAYS: None

Motion was made to adjourn the meeting.

Respectfully submitted:

Valerie S. Marchitto, Board Secretary