

Mount Laurel Township Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
March 3, 2021

**Opening**

The Third Regular Meeting of the Mount Laurel Zoning Board of Adjustment March 3, 2021 was called to order by Chairman Francescone at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance and Moment of Silence were observed

The Open Public notice was read by Suzanna O'Hagan, Board Secretary

Roll call was taken

**Announcements and Review of Board Procedures**

The Board Chairman announced that Legal Landscaping, ZB20-D-14 is carried to the April 7, 2021 Zoning Board meeting. No further notice will be given.

**Adopting the Minutes**

Chairman Francescone asked for a motion to adopt the Reorganization minutes of 2/03/2021. Mr. Killen moved the motion, Mrs. Andersen seconded, all present voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

Chairman Francescone asked for a motion to adopt the Regular meeting minutes of 2/03/2021. Mrs. Andersen moved the motion, Mrs. Liciaga seconded. All present voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

**Memorialized Resolutions**

1. **R-2021-ZB05** – Mr. Killen made a motion to approve R-2021-ZB05, Mrs. Andersen seconded, all present voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.
2. **R-2021-ZB06** – Mr. Grey made a motion to approve R-2021-ZB06, Mr. Killen seconded, all present voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.
3. **R-2021-ZB07** – Mr. Killen made a motion to approve R-2021-ZB07, Mrs. Liciaga seconded, all present voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

**Oaths of office**

New Zoning Board member Charles Holmes and the four-year appointment of Brian Sharp.

**Resolution of Appreciation**

Read by Chairman Francescone for Former Zoning Board members Michael Kiernan, Marilyn Jones, Joseph Green and Jeffrey Bailey.

**The Professionals were sworn in.**

**Temporary Use Permit**

**Carlo Capuano, ZB#21-73-01**, 876 Centerton Road, Block 100.11 Lot 5 R-3 zone. The applicant is requesting a temporary use permit one office trailer 9.8' x 32' and one storage trailer 8' x 19.8' to remain on site for 12 months.

Mr. Capuano was sworn in.

**Mr. Capuano's Testimony**

The storage trailer will be used to store renovation equipment during construction and the second trailer will be used as an office trailer.

**Mr. Kramer** asked if the basin area will be cleaned up as part of the renovation.

**Mr. Capuano** responded that the clean-up of the basin is in progress.

Chairman Francescone asked for a motion to approve 21-73-01. Mr. List moved the motion, Mr. Sharp seconded. All In Favor Vote. All present voted Aye and the motion was carried.

### **Petitions before the board**

**1. MiPro Homes, LLC, ZB#20-C-22**, 1 Grace Ct., Block 1004.01 Lot 16.01, R1-D zone. These Bulk variances are being sought from ordinance 154-16 to allow a front yard setback of 23.7 feet where 30 feet is required and a rear yard setback of 30.9 feet where 35 feet is required.

Jeffrey Baron Esquire, of Baron & Brennan, PA represented the applicant.

#### **Witnesses Sworn:**

James Miller, Planner and Michael Procacci, Principal

#### **Exhibits entered:**

A-1 Variance Plan, 1 Grace Court

**Mr. Baron** summarize the application stating that the curved lot makes the variance necessary and the purpose is to make the home consistent with the others in the subdivision.

#### **James Millers Testimony**

Mr. Miller shared Exhibit A-1 and said he believes the application meets the C1 and C2 variance criteria and that without the variance the house could not be build there. The lot is otherwise oversized for the zone. The C1 criteria is satisfied in that the condition of the home being on a corner creates two front yards per the Mount Laurel ordinance. It is because of this condition that the variance is necessary. If the road did not curve the variance would not be necessary, however the planning board made the curved road a condition of approval for the Subdivision. The C2 criteria is satisfied by advancing purposes C, to provide adequate light air an open space and M, to encourage coordination of various public and private procedures and activities shaping land development with a view of lessening the cost of such development and to the more efficient use of land. The design allows the home to have an appropriate garage and to have a scale consistent with the other homes in the development. Mr. Miller does not believe there is any negative impact on neighboring properties or the intent or purpose of the zone plan. He believes this is a better zoning alternative and that the positives of the application outweigh the negative.

**Mr. Kramer** asked why not build a smaller house.

**Mr. Baron** replied the home is consistent with the other homes and that it is not a custom home.

**Mrs. Andersen** asked if the house is offset from the others.

Mr. Baron replied that it is.

**Mr. Gray** asked what the setback is left of the driveway

**Mr. Miller** replied it is 40 feet.

**Chairman Francescone** opened the public portion at 7:51, seeing no one wishing to comment closed the public portion.

**Mr. Baron** summarized the application stating that the request is minor and the home is a model so it cannot be easily changed. The Planning Board requested the curve in the road.

**Mr. Kramer** asked what the wall is near the property.

**Mr. Baron** replied that the wall is not on this property and belongs to the neighbor and he wishes to keep it.

**Chairman Francescone** asked for a motion to approve application ZB20-C-22. Mr. Killen moved the motion, Mrs. Andersen seconded. Roll Call Vote. All present voted Aye and the motion was carried.

**2. JP Morgan Chase Bank, ZB#21-C-01**, 3047 Route 38, Block 302.15 Lot 12.04, I zone. This Bulk variance is sought from section 154-92.7(B) and 154-92.6(B) to allow a second façade sign.

Gianni Corleone with Chiesa Shahinian & Giantomasi PC., represented the applicant.

#### **Witnesses Sworn**

Gregory Feeley, Philadelphia Sign Company

## **Exhibits**

A-1 Sign Façade drawing #B80025, A-2 sign detail #B803467 sheet 4, A-3 sign detail #B83467 sheet 5, A-4 sign detail #B83467 sheet 6, A-5 rendering of West Elevation #80025 sheet 8, A-6 west elevation night photo, A-7 East elevation existing conditions and P-1 previously approved sign plan sheet C16 PBP1937

**Ms. Corleone** summarized the application as a request for one additional façade sign on the east elevation of the Chase Bank with a total sign area of 36.9 square feet to make the property identifiable from Route 38. The preliminary and final site plan with variance relief for signage was approved by the planning board in February 2019, R-2019-05. The previous approval was for three façade signs. Changes to the entrance of the building meant that the previously approved transom sign would no longer fit. The applicant would now like to install a wall sign instead. The Chase Private Client sign was installed incorrectly and will be removed.

## **Gregory Feeley's Testimony**

Mr. Feeley is project manager for Chase Bank new build operations and installs. The proposal is for 14' 1½" long 31" high sign with 24" letter set and Chase logo over the entranceway of the east elevation. The sign will be exactly the same as the one on the West elevation. Exhibit A-1 was shared by Ms. Corleone. Mr. Feeley described the construction and installation of the proposed illuminated sign using Exhibits A-1, A-3, A-3, A-4, A-5, A-6 and A-7 East elevation photograph.

**Chairman Francescone** asked what exact variances are being requested and why they should be granted.

**Mrs. Andersen** asked if the board is bound by the variances granted by the Planning Board.

**Mr. Petrongolo** responded that the applicant was previously granted numerous signs including three façade signs and one monument sign. The applicant does not need a new variance for a second façade as they were already granted the variance to allow three, they only need a variance for the size of the second sign. The proposed sign creates a combined sign square footage of 73.8 square feet. The applicant has eliminated the third sign.

**Mr. Feeley** clarified that the "Chase Private Client" sign was installed in error and will be removed. That program no longer exists.

**Mr. Petrongolo** shared the previously approved sign plan.

After some discussion Ms. Corleone clarified that the request is to increase the size of the previously approved sign from 5.2 square feet to 36.9 square feet.

**Mr. Feeley** continued. The Chase standard is to have a branded sign on the entrance of the building. This building only has a branding sign on the rear of the building. The original approval was for a vinyl sign on glass above the front door. That approved sign is unable to be installed because of structural changes to the entranceway. The proposed facade sign will match the West elevation sign and be visible from Route 38.

**Jay Petrongolo** reviewed his report of January 22, 2021. The applicant is requesting a variance to allow a previously approved sign to be increased in size to 36.9 from 5.2 square feet. The total combined square footage of the two signs will be 73.8 square feet (36.9 SF x 2 signs) where a total sign square footage of 40 square feet is allowed per ordinance section 154-92.7.B.2.

**Mr. Campbell** clarified that the approved 5.2 square foot transom sign will not be installed and instead they are asking to install a sign to match the sign on the Western elevation at 36.9 square feet and that any relief granted will supersede previously granted variances of PB1837. Ms. Corleone concurred.

**Mr. Sharp** asked if it is correct that the previously approved sign was not illuminated and the proposed sign is illuminated.

**Mr. Petrongolo** replied that is correct.

**Chairman Francescone** opened the meeting to the public for question or comment, seeing none, closed the public portion.

Chairman Francescone asked Ms. Corleone what the justification is for the sign variance.

**Ms. Corleone** reiterated the requested variances are required to make the sign on the East side of the building match the sign on the West side of the building and to aid in identifying the property from Route 38.

**Mr. Petrongolo** stated that he does not believe he has heard testimony regarding the positive and negative criteria as is the applicants burden.

**Mr. Feeley** testified that there is no branding on the East elevation and it is necessary to guide customers. Chase prefers to have branding on the front entranceway of the building. The rear of the parking lot is woods and the pylon sign for the Shop Rite obstruct the view of the Chase Bank.

**Chairman Francescone** asked why the sign cannot be designed to fit the previously approved space.

**Ms. Corleone** responded the proposed sign is designed to be consistent with the other sign and be illuminated to identify the Chase Bank from Route 38.

**Mrs. Andersen** commented that she does not believe the proposed sign aids in identifying the Chase Bank because you would see the monument sign before you would see the proposed façade sign.

**Mr. Petrongolo**, in response to a question by Mr. Gray, stated that in the past the Planning Board has considered allowing one larger façade sign on the opposite side of the building and a second smaller façade sign for example Jimmy Johns and other projects along Route 38.

**Mr. Gray** suggested amending the request to allow a smaller second façade sign similar to others in the township.

Chairman Francescone called for a recess to allow Ms. Corleone to confer with her clients at 8:47, the meeting was called back to order at 8:54.

**Ms. Corleone** amended the application to request a similar letter set facade sign with a total square footage of 20.7 square feet.

**Mr. Feeley** clarified the amended request is for a façade sign in the same style with the same lettering and in the same location as the previously proposed. The overall length will be 10' 6 3/8" and overall height will be 1' 11 5/8".

**Mr. Gray** made a motion to approve a variance from 154-92.7.B(2) to allow a 20.7 square foot sign with the condition that the Private Client sign will be removed.

**Mr. Petrongolo** clarified that with the amended sign proposal the total square footage of the two façade signs combined is 57.4 square feet.

**Mrs. Liciaga** seconded the motion. Roll Call Vote. Mrs. Andersen voted Nay stating that she does not believe the sign will help identify the building and she believes the existing signs are sufficient, all remaining Board members voted Aye and the motion was carried.

### **Adjournment:**

Chairman Francescone asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. List moved he motion, all present voted Aye and the motion was carried.

Adopted on: April 7, 2021

---

Suzanna O'Hagan, Secretary  
Zoning Board of Adjustment