

**TOWNSHIP OF GREENWICH  
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
APRIL 1, 2019**

The regular meeting was called to order by John G. DeSimone, Esquire.

Adequate notice of this meeting was provided in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act by notifying the South Jersey Times on January 21, 2019. And for history everyone there was a Reorganization Meeting done in January and I went back through my notes today and I have them actually here that lists and announces when those meetings are during this year and they are the first Monday in every month with the exception of two months and that was decided at the Reorganization Meeting in January. So adequate notice was provided for tonight's meeting and if I could please, we will take role, conduct our role call.

Those present were: Michael Ivanick; Mayor Reinhart; Anthony Lamanteer, Zoning Officer; David Bostwick; Debbie Bacon; Matthew Pisarski; Michael Henry; and Allan Hedges. Also present was John DeSimone, Solicitor. Absent: Salvatore Mangiafico: Lisa Garrison, Secretary; Penelope Watson, Chairperson; and Neil Reilly.

Flag Salute was led by Mr. DeSimone.

Approval of Minutes - On motion of Mr. Ivanick, seconded to approve the minutes of March 4, 2019, carried and approved.

Approval of Resolution –

Resolution No. 2-2019, - Resolution Granting a Minor Subdivision Lot Line Adjustment for 1073 Ye Greate Street, Anne's House, LLC. By way of history last month an application was presented before the Land Use Board and it was granted the approval for subdivision of approximately 35.83 acres creating two new proposed lots and the plan, survey, minor subdivision prepared by Pennell Surveyors, no variance requests for necessary, hence no publication by the applicant was required. During testimony the applicant Item #13 of the plan survey subdivision sought a request of minimum lot width proposed on Lot 47 which was an existing condition. It was very specific that the minimum side yard setback on proposed Lot 47 was noted and that the variance needed for Block 20, Lot 47 had been previously granted and that the application of subdivision was forwarded to Cumberland County Planning Board and it was acknowledged that they received approval for that. The Board determined that the subdivision met the frontage foot requirements, that was important because under present statute they meet the requirement, so we always think of the future with the development, so it was so noted. The applicant is to present Deeds with property descriptions and proposed lots and blocks. This was memorialized in a form of resolution which is before the Board tonight.

Motion made to accept Resolution No. 2-2019. A motion to approve the Resolution was made and seconded. All in favor. Mr. Reinhart is the applicant, so he cannot vote, and Penelope Watson had to recuse herself during the presentation, so with that said Michael Ivanick, Vice – Chair has the authority to sign the Resolution.

New Application –

Application No. 3-2019 – 884 Ye Greate Street Major Site Plan in side yard and front yard and setback variance having to do with the Cumberland County Historic Society Museum to be at that location. We have Ted Ritter, Esq. representing the Historical Society. Mr. Ritter appeared in September 2018 meeting with a conceptual plan and there are no changes to the conceptual plan. A site plan was provided and witnesses testified. The witnesses were Thomas Tedesco, a Professional Engineer who is licensed in the State of New Jersey, he prepared the site plan and he also did a survey and also did the borings and testing for the site of the septic system which all qualify him as an expert. Other witnesses offered were Robert A. Woodruff, Sr. of Woodruff Energy who is a Co-Trustee of the George Woodruff Native American Artifact Collection presently on display at the Bristol Free Public Library in the basement of that library. It is the applicant's hope, desire and plan that collection will be packed, moved and presented at this facility in one wing and on the other end will be the collection immediately to the rear right now at the Prehistoric Museum. The Alan Ewing Carman Collection most of which are local to our area. Another person whom Ted Ritter, Esq. wanted to call was Joseph C. Deluca, who is our President and may have some comments. And the last person is Richard DeMarco who is our Supervisor of this particular museum which is currently the Prehistoric Museum right next store. And if you could each raise your right hand; I will ask Mr. DeSimone to swear you in. Mr. DeSimone does the swearing in of each of the witnesses.

884 Ye Greate Street was purchased a couple of years ago, the Historic Society had wetland negotiations done and determined that there was enough space on this fairly large tract to construction a building, in addition, to the building that already existed, which we call the front building. Calls witnesses Joe and Rich to the stand. As I explained to the Board at the September meeting, the collections of Native American Artifacts they are on display next store in the Prehistoric Museum which has been open for about 18 years. We have outgrown this space so we began looking at other options. Mr. Woodruff has had several meetings with the Historical Society to go over the particulars of this collection.

Next are the challeges to the site and there are very many, but I think we should hear from the engineer, Tedesco. Calls the engineer to the stand. Reviews the engineer's credentials. Let's talk first about the existing building, which we call the garage building, which has been on the site somewhere around 100 years old; its historic. The plan for that building is for storage. It will be refurbished and will resemble the outside of the construction of the new building, so there will be a connection with the two buildings, in order to give some visual harmony. There are three overhead garage doors in the building and those will be replaced and the outside will receive some outside treatment that will be compatible with the new building. This building as pointed out by the Township engineer, sits only seven tenths of a foot from the property line on the northside, which requires us to come with 8.4 feet of the proposed line with the new building, but we can't do anything about this. Rather than coming in closer to the lot, we are intending to keep it along that line so as to have these buildings line-up. In order for it to look aesthetically pleasing and for the sidewalks to connect between the buildings. As to the parking there is an existing stone driveway that comes off of Ye Greate Street, that driveway will be widened; wherein it presently is 18' to 20' wide and we are going to expand it to 30' wide

coming into the property have 8 spaces for parking, one of them will be handicapped. The handicapped one will be a hard surface. We are proposing to have that parking area to be stoned with the exception of the handicapped space, as stone is permitted under the ordinance. Further the apron coming off of Ye Greate Street will be a hard surface as well. There will also be some screening on the south end of the property. There will be sidewalks from the parking area and connecting both buildings and onto the front of the building, on the south side of the parking lot we will have a stone walkway of pea gravel which will go up to the front door of the proposed building, then sandwiched in between that will be a landscaped yard area, and then were the “blue area” appears on the plans, that will be the storm water system. In summary what I want to do is collect 90% of the water coming off the parking lot, down spouts from the front of the building and in between the walkways, that will be collected to a small stone area and then go back into the ground. If we do get a heavy rainfall I do have a small yard drain set up above the stones by a few inches so what will happen the majority of the rain will go into the ground, but if we get enough rain the water will rise up to the inlet and then discharge to the southeast end of the lot.

As for the sign, we are planning on having a sign identical to the one at the library. I have the current sign 5’ off the right-of-way line, which in accordance with the ordinance the sign should be 10’ off the right-of-way so we will be moving that back 5’ feet so a variance is not required. So that is another change in the plans, we will be setting the sign back 10’ feet.

Next with regard to the septic system, on the east side of the lot the building envelope includes a .9 footprint of disturbance in keeping with the septic as to closeness to the building, we are going to put the proposed septic in the east side of the footprint; more or less in the middle of the lot, cause the lot is 1.6 acres and the footprint was .9 acres. When I did the stormwater system, I did the two holes of the septic system and we had the health department representative out there as well, so we are pretty good. The water table is at 5 or 6 feet, so what we are planning for the septic system, instead of having a 2 ft mounted system, the society has agreed to put a mass treatment unit it, which allow us to reduce the water of infiltration and the water table, so we have an environmental friendly system, where the water will flow all the time. It clears the water up and allows you to get a little bit closer to the water table because it is more or less a mini treatment plant.

Let’s go through the March 21, 2019 report of the engineer Mr. Nardelli. Upon completeness, at the bottom of page 1, Mr. Nardelli notes the names of the adjoining property owners do not appear on the plan. That is not by negligence, that is because the applicant ordered it, but didn’t have it in time to get the plan to the Board and application filed in time, so the 200 foot notice was given separately and at the very bottom of page 1 Mr. Nardelli had no objection to the Board granting a waiver for not having a list on our plan, but rather having on an attachment and I would request that waiver. Going to page 2 of Mr. Nardelli’s report, he notes that we intend to construct a 3,840 sq. ft. building. There is some room for expansion if additional artifacts are put on loan or are donated to the museum. These buildings are built to the maximum that we think we can arguably afford and it will fit on this lot nicely and we will work within the confines of that.

The applicant talked about the side yard setback of 8.4 feet proposed for the new building and the existing condition is 7.0 feet, but we haven't talked yet about the setback of the new building. Tom tell us how we arrived at the setback of 109.8 feet as opposed to the 100 foot that is zoned. With the existing building and the fact that Larry proposed to have a seating area, a little patio outside and the utilities between the two buildings required a certain distance so the building ends up being 109.8 feet from the front right-of-way line. So, we are requesting a variance for that. We do meet the number of parking spaces and talked about the concrete apron, and we are going to add that to our plan. We talked about the size of the sign not requiring any variances and the location of the sign being as shown on the plan. We are going to set back the sign back 10 feet as the ordinance requires from the right-of-way.

Item #5 on page 3 of Mr. Nardi's report, the municipal engineer says: landscaping was already mentioned and it shows some shade trees and buffered plantings as reflected on the plan.

Item #8 since the development serves less than 1 acre and does not contain more than 1 ¼ acre of impervious storm water the state ordinance does not apply, but nevertheless the applicant provided for it for the aesthetics. The applicant will be required to provide an engineer's estimate, and the applicant will do that, for the cost of the site improvements and will post a bond and will post the inspection into our account. The applicant filed with Cumberland County and have not yet received back from them. We will file with the Cumberland County Health Department for the septic and the well. We intend to do a new well, I believe. We have a well on the site and it is not currently in use, and I just not sure about that, but we will comply with the statute.

Mr. Ritter provided to John DeSimone, Esquire, just prior to tonight's meeting the certified newspaper publication that shows that it was properly published in the newspaper in addition to thereto he was also kind enough to produce which the Rule requires, an Affidavit of Service with the attached green cards, that were sent to the list of property owners within 200 feet of the site. This complies with the notice requirements.

Mr. Ritter noted that Lot 18 is currently agricultural use so the side yard setback variance, in my mind, is not a big issue and the front yard setback isn't particularly a big issue given that there is an existing building towards the road, which is just my opinion and that is my feeling on it. You are not asking for any architectural review at this point, this is just variances for site plans. The applicant's goal is to obtain site plan approval and then to launch into a fundraising enterprise to seek pledges from donors to construct the building and then come in with architectural plans for the building, because that can vary the construction estimate on this project, including the site improvements is between \$800,000.00 and \$900,000.00 and Mr. Ritter thinks they can raise that, and they are committed to raise that, but should it go over or under it could have an affect on some of the factors and they are not coming in for the architectural review.

Michael Henry of the Board raised the question for Mr. Tedesco, have you examined the site for the existing museum ends at all? Are you familiar with it? For what aspect? I was just wondering because you comment on the suitability of this site and the fact that

the parking is off the road and the capacity compared to this location. I can probably have Rich testify to that. It might be informative. Rich come on up here. The other question I have for Mr. Tedesco on your site plan you indicated that its outside the 100-year flood plan and the finished floor elevation is proposed at 14.5 which vertical grading is that? Is that 88? Yes. This isn't some that is in our preview, but I think it would be worthwhile to take a hard look at one of the storm surface studies that was done here that is on our website. It was done in 2010. When I look at the FEMA flood map the 500 year the .2% zone comes remarkably close to the developed areas there. Given what we don't know about future risk it might be prudent to take a hard look at the finished floor elevation and see if it is reasonably elevated given the fact that you are dealing with an important cultural collection in a museum use, that is probably one of our highest risks as for as flood water is concerned. It does connect back to a pretty big marsh levy. Richard DeMarco, for the applicant, testified that is not something that we focused on before, we have talked about disaster planning, but they did the floor elevation of this particular building is not something that we conferenced with the engineer or the architect. Not to interpret but the one thing I can tell you at this point is in the interior design of the building, first of all we are talking about rocks, stones, and pottery, the pottery will be up in an elevation where if we had issues it is going to be in a safe zone because of the fact that it is glued back together and its made of clay. Everything else is stone and bone and short of it getting wet, it would be more worried about losing the building that I would be about losing the stones, because they are all going to be there when everything recedes, but I hear what you are saying and I definitely agree that we should look into it. Higher is better and if we can do that would be great. As far as the questions about the other building . . . The question was do you think that site down there is better suited for the museum than this site and why? Well two reason, first of all this site, everybody can look at the building right here, this is the building you are looking at. It maybe a surprise, but it was a two-story building. They took a two-story cinder block building, then cut the roof off of it, took the top story off of it, and put a flat roof on it. I don't know when that building was built, but that the cinders in that place are literally falling around the doors and windows, everything is cracked. I just had the carpenter shop in there, and they replaced 30 feet of floor because when they revamped the building for the museum they put planking on top of concrete and it is now totally infested with termites. So, we are losing floor space even as we speak the sooner we make something happen with this the better off we are all going to be because I have 30 feet of pottery bolted to the wall to make sure that it doesn't go down and it bolted to a cinder block wall that is falling about. So, at this point a shoebox would be a better move than were we are sitting right now. There is no room to expand there whatsoever. We are at max capacity and pretty much on a monthly basis I have donations that come in, some acceptable and some not, but things are increasing not decreasing, so we absolutely have to do something. As far as the space that we are looking at now, personally, no matter where you are at in Greenwich you are in danger of flood, except maybe where I'm at. Everybody else up here if we can one of those 500-year storms that you are talking about everybody's feet is getting wet. I am going to be selling rafts to people on the way out of town. I can say this that since we did the work on the dike, I don't know if anybody else in town has noticed, but there is a lot better drainage than there has every been. There are spots are dry right now that were normally wet all the time, and what we did is working. There is more water up behind me now but there is a lot less water up here in town. That doesn't mean all of the town, but I've done enough walking around here looking and surveying since we did the work and it is definitely has made a difference. If I remember right the level of that is a little bit higher than down here. It is a little higher. That is one of the things

that excited me about making the move is that we are going to a better place. Then lastly can you comment on parking there verses parking here. Actually, I think it will be better parking down there with the access being within the triangle of all the rest of the buildings that we have. We have the Maritime Museum which has no parking lot. It is a tossup, but I think we are actually going to gain more parking with this parking area, there will be room for a bus to get in there and turn run and get in and out and we don't have handicap parking or sidewalks for that matter, we have brick sidewalks, but nothing that is easily assessible. And the other thing and hopefully we are going to continue to utilize this building here as an information center when we have events, but it is actually going to be a public bathroom on either end of town, which right now there is not. Mr. DeMarco's testimony was concluded.

As was previously mentioned at an earlier meeting, the corner property is owned by Cumberland County Board of Freeholders and has been made available to the Cumberland County Historical Society free of charge. They don't any rent, they do all of maintenance, we pay the utilities. So, we have taken advantage of a very generous loan from the County. I don't know, our time frame is probably two to three years out before we would even think about being able to move, which we have told the County Planning Board.

We are ready for a motion. First if we could we should probably do a motion for completeness, where it is deemed complete and then a motion to open it to the public.

Motion for completeness would attest that this presentation is complete with regard to the legal requirements. I will make that motion and I second it. All in favor.

#### Public Comment

Motion to open the floor to public comment specifically regarding Application 3-2019. I make that motion, I second it. The floor is open, anyone?

Mark Werley testified saying he would like to see a plan by the Freeholders as to what is going to happen to their building. We have enough vacant properties, and it is something that the township is working on right now, and we don't need another. So, I would like some sort of plan, maintenance, whatever, from the Freeholders in writing saying this is what is going to happen with that building. Not a solid plan, but some sort of game plan, not just letting that building sit there and rot away. There is obviously a jurisdiction matter there, since the township does not own the building, the township would have to approach the county and ask what their plans would be and that it would be a detriment to Greenwich if it was left vacant. The Historical Society would work diligently with the Board of Freeholders and the County Planning Board to come up with an appropriate use of the building. We have a lot of time to figure this out, but we really want to make this happen, but we still need to obtain commitments for significant dollars and making a plan for that building would be part of that whole process.

The reason why Mr. Werley asked that question is because the township is in the process of collecting data on vacant property within the township; we will be bringing it up at the Township Committee and also at another meeting of the Planning Board so we can address all of

these issues. It is an ongoing concern and thank you Mark for bringing that up, it is an important issue, aside from this project.

I will make a motion to close the public comments, I second it. All in favor. Public comment on this issue is closed.

Given that we have two expert people to deal with regarding land use and that type of thing, and the variances involved here, John DeSimone, Esq. suggested the Board reframe the rest of the motion. I could maybe help with the motion. Mr. Ritter, stop me if I'm wrong, for the most part it sounds like you stipulated to the Township's Engineer's technical and completeness review, in fact, you have actually enhanced it with some additional provisions, am I correct with that understanding? Okay, thank you.

Michael Ivanick motioned to that affect and talk about the particulars and technical information of the presentation. I make a motion that we read the plan as submitted. Mr. Ritter supported the motion and said he believes there were two variances and a couple waivers were in there. As presented in their report and also the motion should be waiving the requirement for the application . . . talking about the waiver of the 200-foot property owner list being actually in the application. The variances are the existing variances for the garage building in its existing condition, the variance for the new building setback from the property line with Jones Farm and the setback 109 feet verse 100 feet across the Ye Greate Street line. So noted. I just want to also clarify that I believe the intent of the front yard setback is to maintain the historic appearance of Ye Greate Street and that the fact the existing building is at the road front, resolves that issue in my mind, and again the description of the design of the new structure to be in alignment with the existing structure is to me satisfactory to grant the side yard setback for the side yard variance. I would add to that maintaining the alignment of the two structures is beneficial, but more importantly it puts the new structure on a higher elevation on that lot which makes a whole lot of sense from the standpoint of protection because the south side of the lot is lower and that is in the drainage way. It is permitted use and there is a need relative, we have got testimony that there is a need relative to the current location. Rich is the Planner, but sense is that when there is something happening at the museum, we have had a lot of congestion here at the corner and this actually distributes some of the cultural activity up and down the street rather than having it here at the library. So it is distributed through the township, so that is a beneficial consequence moving the collection and it will do it justice. Mr. Ivanick asked if there were any further comment on the motion? It is subject of course to all municipal, state, federal rules and regulations, county. Okay.

So I think we are ready for a vote. This should be a roll call, I would think. We never had a second on this. I second it. Okay roll call vote.

Michael Ivanick	Yes
William Reinhart	Yes
Anthony Lamanteer	Yes
David Bostwick	Yes
Debbie Bacon	Yes
Matthew Pisarski	Yes
Mike Henry	Yes

Unanimously carried.

Old Business –

NJ Historic Preservation Office – Certified Local Government Status. I am going to vote that we take this off the table, because essentially we have no information.

New Business -

Vacant Properties in Township. Attempting to put together a solid list of vacant properties in the township. Meanwhile Mayor Reinhart also wanted to work with the Committee to see how we can move according to the ordinance these vacant and abandoned properties. How many do we have? About 15 so far. Of those 15 how many are actively listed for sale? None; they are vacant. If they are listed for sale, they are not considered vacant in accordance with our ordinance. The City of Bridgeton just instituted an ordinance wherein if the house is listed for sale and vacant, after a certain amount of time, they keep increasing the fees. This is difficult because just because the house is on the market, doesn't mean it is going to sell, but they passed the ordinance. I just wanted to bring that to your attention. This is an effective tool, if it is a bank owned property to encourage the bank to proceed with some type of sale. It is very effective in that way and that is something that I was going to suggest that we at least look into. There are model ordinances that we can use and it basically creates a vacancy list and the properties on the vacancy list are charged a fee as long as they remain on that list. It just encourages property owners to sell the property. I think the reason the ordinance was passed is to make sure that the properties are maintained and with our local ordinance the properties are maintained. The banks have been good about maintaining the properties. It is problem and we have to have a meeting of the minds and do something about it. There is a difference between vacant and abandoned and that is the issue.

Public Comment – Motion to open the floor to public comment, seconded, all in favor.

You said that you would get that ordinance for bank owned properties? Sure. I will get it to Lisa and we can put it on the agenda for next month. There are couple of ordinances, it is a whole package that was passed by the State to encourage some type of action on this type of property. It gives the municipality some type of ability. John Carr, the Municipal Solicitor was going to bring us an example. He was, but if Matt has one already, he can bring it before



Planning and Zoning and we can talk about it. This is State issue, this is not just this municipality, so everybody's been working on this to try and clean this up somehow.

Mayor Reinhart recognized we are in the public comment section, but every once and awhile members of the public will say to me have you ever taken the time to add up the assessed value of a property owned by the Cumberland County Historical Society and think about what it cost, pretty much what the township is losing in tax revenue. I haven't done that but I think it is an interesting question. I realize that it is a major asset to the community, so does that offset the tax laws. It is an exercise in futility one way to say how much are they are worth. So, I think the thing to look at might be what do they have that they are not paying taxes on, so the one thing that they have is the Gibbon House which legitimately could be a residence and you could get taxes on that. They have the library, by virtue of the fact that it use to be a bank, and there is no need to have a bank in the township and so as a commercial property it's a failure and it is not going to be a house and it will not be a permitted use in the township. Commercial property is not a permitted use in that location. So, you are not going to make commercial use without jumping through a lot of hoops, so that was sort of the default when they took that building over, then they put a house on the market for taxes. So that leaves us with something that is owned by the county, which the county deposes of, and is not owned by the Historical Society. I don't know what you would do, house wise, with Maritime Museum because that was never a house; at one point it was a church, and leaves us with the one that we just looked at which intended use was quasi-commercial operation by virtue of the fact that we said it was a remote home occupation. So, they occupy two commercial properties in the township and one other property is originally a non-profit use. So I think the answer is that unless we were allowing commercial use down Greate Street two of the buildings would not even be ratables because they would be sitting there waiting to find a use. To me that is the answer. I thought long and hard about it, what is their impact on the tax base. The other part of the tax problem is we have too many houses . . . you have an unpopulated township with vacant buildings our bigger problem is that there is no demand for the buildings, so the value drops. The problem is lack of population not the Historical Society. The lack of demand for what we have got. My bigger point is if you analyze the buildings and what they were originally designed for we don't allow those uses.

Mr. Werley will be asking for the help of the Township Committee because it is a trickle-down effect because we are losing children in high school and elementary school and is jacking the taxes up tremendously and that is why I am asking for any ideas or recommendations.

One of the things Mark said in the past Master Plan re-exam there was a recommendation for accessory dwelling units and that might be something for the Township Committee to look at. That would allow for more than one residency on a parcel. That maybe something that could create income potential for certain properties. Basically, have a single-family home altered. That means renting it out; it could work. Then you have the septic issue.

Motion to close the public session, motion made and seconded. All in favor.

Adjourn – On motion of Mr. Ivanick, seconded to adjourn, unanimously carried.

Respectfully submitted,

John G. DeSimone, Esquire  
Solicitor, Land Use Board