



**BOROUGH OF FOLSOM
PLANNING/ZONING
BOARD OF ADJUSTMENTS
MINUTES
March 20, 2024**

CALL MEETING TO ORDER: 6:37 PM

SALUTE TO THE FLAG:

CERTIFICATION: Adequate notice of this meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meeting Act pursuant to Public Law 1975, Chapter 231. Said notice has been advertised in the Hammonton Gazette and is posted on the bulletin board showing the time and place for the meeting.

ROLL CALL: Chairwoman Kristin-Gummoe Lubrano, Vice Chairman Michael Veneziani, Mayor Glenn Smith, Dave Cappuccio, Michael Sutts, Jim Hoffman, Leslie Roberson, Catherine DeYoung, John Thomas, Chris Hadulias

Members Absent:

Others Present:	Solicitor:	Carol N. Goloff, Esquire; Goloff Law
	Solicitor:	Rachael Goloff Esquire; Goloff Law
	Board Engineer:	Jen Heller PE, PP; Polistina & Associates
	Board Secretary:	Susan Carroll

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion was made by Mr. Hoffman and seconded Ms. DeYoung to approve the minutes of February 21, 2024. There was a roll call vote with eight Ayes, two Abstentions, Nays none.

Kristin Gummoe-Lubrano	Abstain
Mike Veneziani	Yes
Glenn Smith	Abstain
Dave Cappuccio	Yes
Mike Sutts	Yes
Jim Hoffman	Yes
Leslie Roberson	Yes
Catherine DeYoung	Yes
John Thomas	Yes
Chris Hadulias	Yes

March 20, 2024

APPLICATION: Gary LoSasso seeking C Variance(s) for addition to accessory structure at 3014 8th Street – Block 3301 – Lot 2 – located in the Forest 20 Zoning District.

Solicitor Rachael Goloff swore in Gary LoSasso, 3014 8th Street. He was seeking to add 32 feet onto his pole barn. He needed more room. He wanted to remove two dilapidated sheds and to store the boat and backhoe. He planned to add onto the back of the pole barn.

Board Secretary confirmed all mailings were mailed in a timely manner and legal advertising was placed in the Atlantic City Press and the Hammonton Gazette.

Ms. Heller PE, PP requested and updated plan/survey showing the current structures on the site because the plan submitted with the application was outdated. There were a lot of sheds on the property. The submitted plan showed a 40 foot container and sheds labeled Shed A, Shed B, and Shed C. Mr. LoSasso proposed to keep Shed A. It was the one closest to the house and it was in good shape. He proposed to remove Sheds B and C. Those sheds were near the existing pole barn. There were containers all the way out back which he proposed to keep. Ms. Heller noted the driveway was re-configured from what the proposed plan showed and what the aerial map showed. Mr. LoSasso reached out to ARH for an updated survey and they will be sending somebody out next week. Mrs. Heller recommended an updated survey be submitted to the Board indicating which sheds will be removed as a Condition of the Approval and requested the updated survey be submitted prior to the next Board Meeting in April. Mr. LoSasso was in agreement and noted the Board needed it and he needed it.

Ms. Heller addressed the Waiver requests. The request for a waiver from Item 1: The scale of the survey would not be needed since an updated survey would be submitted as a Condition of Approval.

There was a request for a waiver for Item 18 for contours. A Topographic Survey would show contours or a Limited Topographic Survey would show contours only in the areas of disturbance. Three trees were removed and were indicated on the submitted plan. A topographic survey of the woods would not be needed since there would not be any clearing of additional land for the addition to the pole barn.

A request for a waiver from Item 24: Location of existing structures and their setbacks would not be needed since as a Condition of Approval a new/updated plan that shows the other structures on the site would be submitted.

Item 26: Location of existing railroads. There were no existing railroads or bridges. A waiver from Item 29: Utility layouts was requested. There was already electric in the existing pole barn. The Applicant proposed to extend lighting to the proposed addition. Item 30: A Waiver from the monument(s).

Based on the information provided on the plans submitted was sufficient for making a determination whether or not the Board should grant the Variances.

A Variance for 3.3% impervious coverage was requested. Ms. Heller suggested to request a Variance of 3 ½% impervious coverage. The requested 3.3% Variance for impervious coverage might not be enough. The Board can grant a Variance for 3 ½% impervious coverage, but in the event the impervious coverage goes over 3 ½ % with the new proposed addition, the Applicant would have to come back to the Board. The requested 3.3 % impervious coverage did not include the sheds that would be removed and the Variance request for 3.3% impervious coverage would be sufficient for 20 acres. The Applicant thought the driveway put the impervious coverage over the maximum. The Applicant requested to go with 3 ½ % impervious coverage to be safe.

Variances for height and area of building were requested. The Applicant proposed a total area of 3,680 sq. ft. where a maximum of 900 sq. ft. was allowed; and proposed a height of 18 ½ ft. where 15 ft. was allowed; and a side yard setback. The side yard setback on the existing pole barn was 20 ft. The addition will be put on the back of the existing and not further the non-conformity, but still need to request the Variance because 75 ft. were required. The Applicant had a neighbor on the side where the addition would be placed. Michael Porretta who was on Block 3301 – Lot 1. Mr. Jeffrey Glosson recently brought Block 3301 - Lot 10. The existing pole barn had been on the property since 2005.

The Applicant testified that there will be no one living in the pole barn. The pole barn was currently used for storage for his Jeeps, a side by side, a quad, a welder, a saw. If Approved, the Applicant will have to apply for permits with the Construction office for the addition.

The meeting was opened to the Public for public comment. Seeing no one from the public portion was closed.

The meeting was opened to the Board. Mr. Thomas asked if the addition will be the same height and width as the existing. Yes, the Applicant was matching what was there. Mr. Sutts questioned if there would be garage doors on the back and if a driveway would be needed to get around. The Applicant answered there would be one garage door on the back and he had an open area there. Ms. DeYoung asked if Lot 1 was vacant land. The Applicant explained that Lots 1 and 10 next to him were vacant. Mr. Hoffman questioned if Lots 1 & 10 were rear yards. Mr. LoSasso explained Lot 1 yes and Lot 10 came in off of 8th (Street) so it would be the rear of Lot 10.

There were no other questions from the Board.

Solicitor Rachael Goloff summarized the application. The Applicant was requesting an addition to his pole barn. The Applicant provided testimony about what he wanted to do with it and what was existing. The Board Members asked questions and it seemed like a very straight forward application. She requested a Motion in the affirmative and politely requested discussion to put in the Resolution.

Chairwoman Gummoe-Lubrano began the discussion. She thought the Application should be Approved based on the Conditions provided and noted by the Board Engineer to submit an

updated survey before the next meeting indicating what was going to be removed. Then also, the impervious coverage Variance change to 3.5 % if the Applicant so chose. The Applicant indicated this was an addition to an existing structure that will conform to the existing building design just extending it out 20 feet. It was noted on the record it was not a residential building and no one will be residing in it. It was just for storage. There was no issue with any one from the public. It was beneficial because it allowed the Applicant to keep a more organized yard and a better looking area and keep his vehicles organized and out of the weather. She didn't see any negatives with no one from the public.

A Motion was made by Ms. DeYoung and seconded by Mr. Thomas. There was a roll call vote with ayes all and nays none

Kristin Gummoe-Lubrano	Yes - For the reasons previously set forth on the record.
Mike Veneziani	Yes
Glenn Smith	Yes
Dave Cappuccio	Yes
Mike Sutts	Yes
Jim Hoffman	Yes
Leslie Roberson	Yes
Catherine DeYoung	Yes - Provided the updated survey is received within 4 weeks
John Thomas	Yes
Chris Hadulias	Yes

The meeting was open to the public for public comment. Seeing no one from the public present the public portion was closed.

There was no other business for the Board.

NEXT SCHEDULED MEETING: April 17, 2024 at 6:30 pm

Solicitor Carol Goloff complimented the Board as currently her top performing Board. She offered procedural tips for the Motions. Although Roberts Rules are not mentioned, we are supposed to govern ourselves by Roberts Rules. She explained how to make a Motion and what the progression was. Going forward, first a Motion needs to be made. Then it needs to be seconded and then there is discussion. The discussion shouldn't come before the Motion. A lot of discussion happens with questions from the Board when talking to an Applicant and getting ideas out for discussion. Technically, once a Motion is made, it can't be added to. There is a process for doing that. Going forward, somebody will make a Motion. Either you can decide as a Board that somebody is going to make a Motion, or Rachael and I can form the Motion that will include Variances, Waivers, Conditions, and Comments the from the Engineer's Report.

A Motion can be made for, or see the Motion from the Solicitor's description. The Motion will be seconded. If there is no second, it dies. A Motion can be made if there is very heated issue. A no vote can be made, but if the motion fails, another motion can be made that will include everything in the first motion, but include additional request not in the first motion.

Ms. DeYoung expressed difficulty for Board Members to need to say something when they vote, but yet tonight there were limited issues to bring up. Solicitor Goloff explained the Findings of Facts were necessary when people/public were in attendance and if there is a heated issue or fighting. We need a strong Record. The Record was simple tonight, but it wouldn't have been if a neighbor was in attendance whose backyard abuts to where the pole barn is, and was angry because they didn't want a barn within 20 feet of the backyard because he had a pool and was trying to make it look pretty. The neighbor might have argued the pole building will go up 18 feet only 15 feet is permitted and doesn't want the pole barn there. The Board needs to have a really strong record as to why you are permitting or not permitting. What prompted you? We know as a Board that this gentleman should have proven the positive criteria, all the reasons why this is necessary and good, and all the negative criteria if any or if it really doesn't substantially hurt the zone. Jen will always tell you in the Engineer's Report what if it's approved. If it's a really hard application, Rachael or I will be eliciting the testimony.

For tonight's Application this gentleman was a layman. Jen asked the Applicant the Engineering questions. It's touchy to do that. It needed to be recorded on the record how the Board voted on an application and the reasons why. For example: you don't believe it is a detriment to the Zone and putting the barn there was good for the zone otherwise he would have to take down 27 trees with greater than 6 inch diameter. You don't want to take down trees. There are positive and negative (criteria) for adding on to the barn where it's been since 2006. We will help you get that language. Even if you just said: "For the positive and negative criteria reasons either Jen, the Applicant, or the Attorney's placed on the record". Even saying that is fine, but we will prompt you. We need to know that there are Roberts Rules of Order and going forward we are going to keep to the script of, after everything is done its going to be Motion. Second, Discussion.

A Motion was made by Mr. Veneziani and seconded by Mr. Cappuccio to adjourn the meeting. All were in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 7:02

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Carroll
Board Secretary