

**MEDFORD TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT**

**20 April 2022**

**7:00 p.m.**

**Public Safety Bldg.-91 Union Street**

Attorney Patrick Varga called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. and read the Statement of Conformance with the Open Public Meetings Act and the Municipal Land Use Law.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Cocivera, Hamilton, Meehan, Pullman, Rickards, Simmers, Wolf, Stefanoni, Morrison  
Absent: None  
Professional Staff: Attorney Patrick Varga, Engineer Christopher Noll, Planner Michelle Taylor, Secretary Beth Portocalis

**CORRESPONDENCE:** None

**MINUTES:**

March 16, 2022 Regular Meeting – Mr. Pullman made a motion to approve the March 16, 2022 Zoning Board Meeting Minutes. Mr. Simmers seconded the motion. A unanimous voice vote in favor carried the motion.

**REPORTS:** None

**RESOLUTIONS TO BE MEMORIALIZED:**

**Peter Kimani, 1 Blue Heron Ct., Block 5507.06//Lot 38, ZVE-1094, Resolution #2022-13**  
Granting Bulk Variance approval retroactively to permit a 217sf shed whereby accessory structures are permitted not exceeding 168 square feet. **Zone: RGD-2**

Recorded Vote

Ayes: Hamilton, Meehan, Pullman, Rickards (M), Simmers, Stefanoni, Wolf (2)  
Nays: None  
Abst.: None  
Motion carried: 7 - 0 - 0

---

**Christopher Hawkins, 492 Tuckerton Road. Block 5301.14//Lot 2, ZVE-1111, Resolution #2022-14**

Granting Bulk Variance approval to permit a 200sf shed whereby accessory structures are permitted not to exceed 168 square feet. **Zone: RGD-1**

Recorded Vote

Ayes: Hamilton (M), Meehan, Pullman, Rickards, Simmers (2), Stefanoni, Wolf  
Nays: None  
Abst.: None  
Motion carried: 7 - 0 - 0

---

**Brian Bonelli, 6 Carol Joy Road, Block 4801.02//Lot 3, ZVE-1105, Resolution #2022-15**

Granting Bulk Variance approvals for an existing 387sf paver patio on the rear of the dwelling that required lot coverage relief where 28.89% was existing, 48.65% was proposed, and 30% is permitted; building coverage relief where 19.64% was existing, 26.96% was proposed, and 20% is permitted; rear yard setback relief where 30' is required and 7.86% is existing/proposed; and side yard setback relief where 25' is required and 13.6' is existing/proposed. Approval was also granted for an existing 80sf shed that required side yard setback relief where .3' setback is existing and 5' is required. **Zone: GD**

Recorded Vote

Ayes: Hamilton (2), Meehan, Pullman (M), Rickards, Simmers, Stefanoni, Wolf  
Nays: None  
Abst.: None  
Motion carried: 7 - 0 - 0

---

**Joseph Orlando, 144 & 148 Old Marlton Pike, Block 906.02//Lot 21 & 22, SPR-5757  
Resolution #2022-16**

Bifurcated application granting d (2) Use Variance approval for expansion of a non-permitted use on Lot 22 to add an 1,895 sf wood and metal pole barn addition to the existing 1,325 sf concrete and masonry Goodwill Industries building. **Zone: GMS**

Recorded Vote

Ayes: Hamilton (M), Meehan, Pullman, Rickards, Simmers, Stefanoni, Wolf (2)  
Nays: None  
Abst.: None  
Motion carried: 7 - 0 - 0

---

**APPLICATIONS/OFFICIAL:**

**Randy & Cynthia Senkle, 112 Hickory Lane, Block 906.05//Lot 1, ZVE-1110**

Seeking Bulk Variance approvals to construct a 10'wide, 325sf asphalt driveway extension adjacent to the existing attached garage and driveway of the residence and a 10'wide, 360sf concrete/stone parking pad alongside the garage continuing from the proposed asphalt driveway to park a recreational vehicle. The proposed requires a side yard setback relief whereby 10' is required and 1.5' is proposed; lot coverage relief is required whereby 30% is permitted, 29.74% is existing, and 34.66% is proposed. Also, a waiver is required per section 520 I from the Land Development Ordinance, for the driveway and parking area to be located less than 10' from the side property line. **Zone: GMS**

**SWORN:** Randy Senkle, Owner  
Patrick McAndrew, Esq., Attorney

Mr. McAndrew opened the testimony by explaining that the Senkle's are seeking approvals in order to park an RV in their driveway. The expanded driveway is to be located alongside the dwelling in the yard behind the gated fence. It is proposed to be located 1 ½ feet to the side yard property line. The lot coverage will be exceeded due to an existing large deck and patio area.

Mr. Senkle was next to testify. He explained that the existing driveway is used to park the family's two vehicles, and they will be adding another one in a couple of years. Their RV is 22 feet long and 8 feet wide. There are no doors on the side of the dwelling where the new driveway is proposed, as it's the garage side. Their existing fence is 1 foot off the property line, and it already has a 10' wide gate. The neighbor has landscaping on their side which will help block the view of the RV while it is parked. The driveway is slightly behind the fence to leave room for the trash & recycling containers.

Mr. Senkle also discussed his deck, which is 570sf. It is elevated, so groundwater does perk on the lot. That being said, he is agreeable to submitting a grading plan for Mr. Noll's review to insure the additional impervious surfacing will not have an adverse effect on the adjoining property.

Board members asked about the turning radius, and Mr. Senkle responded that he is confident that he will be able to navigate the RV to the added driveway as proposed.

**PUBLIC: Mr. Hamilton made a motion to open the public portion. Mr. Simmers seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.**

Joseph Gyrzynski – 110 Hickory Lane. He is the next door neighbor to the Senkle's and has no objections to the application as proposed.

Michael Santoro – 201 Balsam Court. He resides across the street from the Senkle's and has no objection to the proposed driveway and an RV being parked.

**Mr. Hamilton made a motion to close the public portion. Mr. Pullman seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.**

Mr. Noll referenced his March 11, 2022 review letter. He noted a design waiver per Section 520(I) is required since the driveway will not be located 10' from the property line. He also noted his concern with the driveway being located so close to the dwelling.

Mr. McAndrew stated that the Senkle's agree to comply with the comments in Mr. Noll's review letter, and if minor adjustments are made, they may not exceed the overall square footage coverage allowances.

**MOTION: Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve the application as submitted, with the conditions to (1) grading plan approval from Mr. Noll; and (2) comply with the other comments in Mr. Noll's review letter. Mr. Meehan seconded.**

**Recorded Vote:**

Ayes: Hamilton, Meehan, Pullman, Simmers, Wolf , Rickards, Cocivera  
Nays: None  
Abst.: None  
Motion carried: 7 - 0 - 0

---

**Christine Suchecki, 21 Shadow Oak Drive, Block: 3202.14//Lot 7, ZVE-1115**

Seeking Bulk Variance approvals required for proposed two additions and an attached garage addition (3 total additions) to principal dwelling; with one addition totally 320.5sf to one side of dwelling; proposed front attached garage addition of 276 sf, and proposed rear addition of 110sf. Building Coverage relief required 9.7% existing, 13.8% proposed and 12% permitted; front yard principal building setback 43.48' existing, 28' proposed and 50' required; side yard principal building setback 35.5' is existing, 15.5' is proposed and 30' is required. **Zone: GD**

**SWORN:** Christine & Christopher Suchecki, Owners

Mrs. Suchecki opened the testimony by detailing how they have lived in the home for 28 years. They raised their children there, and now need additional space for their aging parents, who will be living with them, and space for when their adult children visit.

The garage will be expanded to accommodate two vehicles. It is currently a one-car garage that is being used as a "man-cave." The addition onto the rear of the dwelling will be utilized as a family room. The other addition will include a front door, as the current access to the dwelling is thru a door located in the garage.

Mrs. Taylor did not prepare a review letter, as the application was self explanatory. The addition which includes a front door will eliminate the need to open and close the garage door every time the house is entered. Mrs. Taylor did ask if a sidewalk will be needed; to which the Sechecki's responded yes.

Chairman Cocivera asked if the additions will match the current color scheme, and the Sechecki's replied in the affirmative.

**PUBLIC:** Mr. Pullman made a motion to open the public portion. Mr. Wolf seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

No one from the public spoke.

**Mr. Wolf made a motion to close the public portion. Mr. Pullman seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.**

**MOTION:** Mr. Simmers made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Wolf seconded.

**Recorded Vote:**

Ayes: Hamilton, Meehan, Pullman, Simmers, Wolf, Rickards, Cocivera  
Nays: None  
Abst.: None  
Motion carried: 7 - 0 - 0

---

**Jennifer A. Lynch, 39 Union Street, Block: 1601//Lot 11, ZVE-1112**

Seeking Use Variance approvals to revert a residential dwelling that was most recently utilized as a commercial property (as a permitted use in the Restricted Commercial (RC) Zone District) back to residential use where residential use is not a principal permitted use in the RC Zone. **Zone: RC**

**SWORN:** Jennifer Lynch, Applicant  
Robert Kingsbury, Esq., Attorney

Mr. Kingsbury opened the testimony by describing the dwelling was built in 1800 in the historic Medford Village downtown area. The building has maintained its historic character and most elements of a dwelling, even while being used commercially as office space.

As to the positive and negative criteria, Mr. Kingsbury offered that Ms. Lynch purchased the property after it had been listed commercially for over one year and as a residential dwelling for another six months. She is a long-time Medford resident, formally living in a lakefront property. She was motivated to “rescue” the dwelling and intends to restore it to its original grandeur as an 1800 Victorian with original woodwork and other period architectural elements.

Mr. Kingsbury continued by explaining that Ms. Lynch will clean up the trash and other refuse in the rear yard, and also intends to take up some of the asphalt driveway and parking area and replant grass.

He concluded that while there are no imminent plans, should Ms. Lynch plan to expand the dwelling in any way, she understands she will need to return to the Board for approvals since the zoning is Restricted Commercial where residential use is not currently permitted.

Mrs. Taylor referred to her April 13, 2022 review letter, this property is important to Medford’s history which started in the Village area, and is appropriate to preserve as a residential dwelling. The current Zoning was put in place in the 1980s and has not been updated, however there has been discussion to permit both residential and commercial uses in the Village, especially for buildings that were originally built as homes.

**PUBLIC: Mr. Wolf made a motion to open the public portion. Mr. Pullman seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.**

No one from the public spoke.

**Mr. Hamilton made a motion to close the public portion. Mr. Pullman seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.**

**MOTION:** Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve the use variance application as submitted.  
Mr. Wolf seconded.

**Recorded Vote:**

Ayes:	Hamilton, Meehan, Pullman, Simmers, Wolf, Rickards, Cocivera
Nays:	None
Abst.:	None
Motion carried:	7 - 0 - 0

---

**Robert & Susan Grant, 103 East Lake Blvd., Block: 3601/Lot: 2, ZVE-1113**

Seeking Bulk Variance approvals for both existing and proposed unpermitted conditions (three decks, stairs, landings, brick and concrete walks/paths); and a proposed patio area and retaining wall totaling 500 sf, exceeding building coverage 30% previously approved, 33% now existing, 12% permitted; exceeding lot coverage 30% existing, 74% proposed, 20% permitted; one side yard principal building setback 12' existing, 11' proposed, 15' required, other side yard principal building setback 8' existing, 0' proposed, 15' required; front yard principal building setback 24.2' existing, 50' required; rear yard principal building setback 38' existing, 26' proposed, 50' required. (Prior Bulk Variance approvals granted in 1990 permitted 30% lot coverage) A portion of existing wood fence along the south side property line is located on an adjoining property. The existing conditions also require wetland buffer relief due to existing encroachment. **Zone: GD**

**SWORN:** Robert Grant, Applicant  
Adam Grant, Land Surveyor (and son of owners)  
Jay Sims, PP & PP

Adam Grant opened the testimony by describing his parents had made an application to remove and replace older elements of existing paver patio areas and a retaining wall. Based upon a survey done in 1974, the lot had 33% coverage on an undersized, non-conforming lot. In 1990 his parents applied for a variance for a deck, and the Zoning Board approved expanded lot coverage of 30%, which was an obvious error in calculations. By his new survey and calculations, the proposed net increase in coverage is 168 square feet; or 3 percent. The increase was due to the change from loose stone areas to permeable pavers. The grading confirmed that any runoff will go towards the lake, and not have any adverse effect on adjoining properties.

Mr. Grant continued that the Lake Pine Colony Club has approved and accepted all improvements, and the neighbors have no objections. He then distributed nine photos, marked as Exhibit A-15, which were aerial photos marked up to show the property lines and the new areas where the new and replacement paver patio areas are proposed.

Mr. Sims was next to testify. He described the particular difficulties, being the property never conformed to the zoning criteria. The lot size is uniquely small and significantly under the requirements, being only 40% of what is required. He continued that even though the impervious coverage is very high, the increased runoff is only .01CFS. He concluded that as shown in the

photos provided by Adam Grant, the proposed improvements are consistent with other improvements made on lakefront properties.

Mrs. Taylor acknowledged the 1990 ZBA Resolution errors. She noted the one side yard will have a 0% setback, but there is a fence.

Mr. Noll commented that he had conducted a site visit, and has no concerns with the stormwater run-off, as per the testimony it will drain to the lake. He also noted the Grants will be using permeable pavers, which will also help with drainage.

**PUBLIC:** Mr. Wolf made a motion to open the public portion. Mr. Pullman seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

No one from the public spoke.

**Mr. Pullman made a motion to close the public portion. Mr. Simmers seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.**

**MOTION:** Mr. Wolf made a motion to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Hamilton seconded.

**Recorded Vote:**

Ayes:	Hamilton, Meehan, Pullman, Simmers, Wolf , Rickards, Cocivera
Nays:	None
Abst.:	None
Motion carried:	7 - 0 - 0

---

*The Board took a brief recess from 8:20-8:37 pm.*

**Fieldstone Associates, 196-198 Old Marlton Pike, Block 905//Lot 10.01, 10.02 & 11, SPR-5758** – Preliminary and Final Site Plan approvals required for proposed 3-story self-storage facility. A d(1) Use Variance is required to permit the self-storage facility. A d(4) Floor Area Ratio Use Variance is required .25 allowed and .60 proposed. Bulk Variances required for building square footage whereby 35,000 sf is permitted and a 41,217 sf footprint is proposed with a total overall 119,151 sf total square footage is proposed. The building height permitted is 2.5 stories with a maximum 35’ height; whereby 3 stories and 35’ height is proposed. A loading zone of 10’ x 40’ is required and whereby 10’ x 30’ is proposed. Variance for off-street loading is proposed in front yard where only side and rear yard is permitted. Waivers are required per Section 506 to permit less than the required landscape buffer materials, fencing and berms; per Section 520 F. to permit loading in the front yard. **Zone: HM**

**SWORN:** Art Corsini, Real Estate Developer  
Patrick McAndrew, Esq., Attorney  
Ahmed Tamous, PE, Bohler Engineering  
James Dankovich, Architect, BWD Architects

Andrew Ferranda, Traffic Engineer  
Tiffany Morrissey, PP, Planner

Mr. Corsini was the first to testify. He offered that he has 44 years of experience with large developments, including apartment complexes, shopping centers, warehousing, and two other self storage facilities. He developed the Barclay apartments on Route 70 just over the Evesham border, and coupled with the new apartments, townhouses and single family dwellings being built in Medford also along Route 70, market studies determined the need for a self storage facility in this immediate area. The existing storage facilities in Medford are already at or near capacity.

In order to make the project work, Mr. Corsini explained that 95,000sf of the building will be rental space, which is needed to make the project work financially. The rest of the area will be dedicated to elevators, hallways and HVAC and mechanical equipment. The units will vary in size. All units will be climate controlled, which is expected today at self-storage facilities. Neither of the other self storage facilities in Medford is climate controlled.

No outdoor storage of RVs, boats, cars, etc. is proposed, however one 20 foot box truck will be parked on site for tenants to use as needed for move in and move out. No property manager is proposed to be on site, but there will be an office area where moving and storage supplies will be sold. The application included a list of items that will be prohibited to be stored.

Two full-time and one part-time employee are projected to staff the office. Office hours are projected to be 10:00 am - 6:00 pm weekdays, and 9:00 am – 3:00 pm on weekends. Tenant access will be provided from 6:00 am to 10:00 pm. Property maintenance will be provided via local sub-contractors.

Mr. Corsini concluded his comments that the application seeks relief from trash enclosure requirement, as the operational plan calls for tenants to take all trash off-site. The only trash generated will be from the office, and the plan is have that contracted out to a private contractor.

Mr. Dankovich was next to testify. He confirmed that the entire building will have a fire suppression sprinkler system. The office area is 1200sf. The complex will be fenced and gated; and tenants will be issued codes to gain entry via a keypad at the gate. No vehicles over 35 feet in length are expected. Sidewalks will be added around the perimeter of the site.

Exhibit A-23 was distributed and also mounted to a display board showing the first floor and second floor layout plans. 972 units will be provided of various sizes, with an average size of 91 square feet. Security will be provided via a 24-hour security monitoring system with multiple cameras. The roof conceals the proposed 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, as it is proposed as a sloped metal mansard steep pitched roof designed to disguise the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, which has a smaller footprint. The HVAC units will be roof mounted, and are a system of twelve residential sized units. The location of the units will be hidden from view.



The façade is 300 feet long and is a mix of brick masonry piers and glass windows. The office area will have a canopy to define it. Loading will take place through glass sliding doors. The building exterior has staggered “steps” to break up the length.

Mr. Dankovich concluded his comments by stating the building as proposed meets the 35 foot height requirement, but a variance is needed for the 3-story commercial building whereby 2 ½ stories is the maximum permitted.

Mr. Tamous was the next to testify. He offered a detailed property description. He described the elevation difference of 3’, so that is where the basin is to be located; determining the overall site layout. He then reviewed the bulk standards compared to the prior approvals.

He continued that the objective was to maintain as much green space as possible between the facility and the neighboring homes; which is 100’ from the property line. There is 75’ of existing vegetation between the facility and the closest dwelling.

Mr. Tamous stated that the facility will be serviced by municipal water and sewer. There will be only one point of access (ingress and egress), and it is located as far away from the bend intersection as possible.

He confirmed that the applicant agrees to Mrs. Taylor’s review letter comments regarding berming with additional landscaping for added buffering. He also noted Mrs. Taylor’s lighting comments and is proposing ten (10) LED lights with 4000kelvin, but none will be behind the building by the houses. Parking and loading will take place at the front of the building which faces the roadway, with none close to the homes. Mr. Tamous concluded that the applicant has no objections to the comments in Mr. Noll’s review letter.

Discussion amongst Board members, professionals and the applicant’s professionals ensued about the 2.5 stories vs. 3 stories, the impact on heights, and the visual impacts from all vantage points.

Mr. Ferranda was next to testify on the traffic impacts. He explained that the peak hours in the afternoon were 4:00-6:00 pm weekdays; and Saturdays from 11:00 am – 2:00 pm. The analysis utilized projected build-out data into 2023 from the new housing currently under various stages of construction. Daily during weekdays 9 trips are projected in and 10 are projected out. On Saturdays, 13 trips are projected incoming and 8 outgoing. Overall self storage units are very low traffic generators, with very low intensity use. The intersection is currently rated for a level of service “B” (A is the best) This proposed facility will not change the service level. The driveway is 500 feet from the intersection, which Mr. Ferranda opined was good spacing. The access was reviewed and approved by the Fire Department.

Mr. Ferranda concluded his testimony by offering comparison trip generation statistics for permitted uses in the HM Zone, which include fast food restaurants, day care facilities, and office buildings. A day care would generate 56 trips during the PM weekday peak and 9 on Saturdays; a fast food restaurant would generate 66 weekday trips and 101 on Saturdays; and an office building

would generate 44 weekday trips and 11 Saturday trips—much higher than the proposed self storage building.

Ms. Morrissey was next to testify. She discussed the positive and negative criteria in relation to the requested d(1) use variance and d(4) Floor Area Ratio (FAR) variance, since the facility will exceed the maximum permitted 35,000 square feet and the 2 ½ story zone requirements. She offered that the use is consistent with the 2004 approvals granted by the Zoning Board for self storage buildings, with the primary differences being that this facility has been condensed into one state of the art building with a single controlled access entry.

She continued that the site is particularly well suited for this type of facility, being uniquely situated. This use is permitted on Route 70 but being on Old Marlton Pike, it will not be as visible. If an assisted living facility were being proposed, that building could be 45' in height. Self storage use is a low intensive use and provides a service; with 80% of the usage/tenants expected from the local area. There is an increasing demand with over 1400 new housing units being built within a 3-mile radius. The other permitted uses require much more parking, more spread, and much higher intensity.

Ms. Morrissey continued by referencing the draft Route 70 Master Plan, which recommends self storage facilities as permitted in the HM Zone, and as proposed meets three conditions of the use: no outdoor storage, one resident caretaker with none proposed, and truck rentals are limited to one. In regards to the FAR, the intent is to control building massing and intensity of use. This building was designed to more resemble more of an office building, and as per earlier testimony, is a very low intensive use. The visual impacts will be enhanced as the applicant has accepted the Planner's recommendation for added berming and landscape buffering. There will be no back of house operations such as trash enclosures. The architecture incorporates brick with breaks and a roof designed to disguise the third floor.

Mrs. Taylor referred to her April 13, 2022 letter, and confirmed the applicant has addressed most of her concerns via the testimony. She suggested that the red brick doesn't necessarily convey "Medford" and could as easily be found in Marlton or Mount Laurel. The lighting should not draw attention to the building, and should be reduced to 3000 Kelvin. She acknowledged and appreciated that the applicant has agreed to the buffering requirements, especially since the loading and garage doors are along the front of the building. She also noted the monument sign must be relocated outside of the Right-of-Way.

Chairman Cocivera asked if the windows have interior lighting, would that be distracting to neighboring residents and passers-by, to which Mrs. Taylor responded it could be.

Mr. Noll referred to his April 14, 2022 letter. He confirmed that no submission waivers were requested. He concurs with the traffic testimony and is satisfied that the stormwater management plan meets the current requirements. He also confirmed that the applicant has agreed to his comments. He also stated that prior environmental issues have been resolved. Lastly, the applicant will be required to make a \$12,500 Fair Share contribution.

**PUBLIC:** Mr. Hamilton made a motion to open the public portion. Mr. Wolf seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

Dawn Augustino – 202 Old Marlton Pike. Opposed to the application because of the “massive” size of the building which the landscaping will take years to screen. The number of variances needed indicate the proposed project does not fit on the property.

Timothy Strauss – 9 Bellwether Court. Opposed to the application due to proximity to his house and back yard. The “massive” building and the lighting will impact his property. Medford already has three self storage facilities; two of which he stated do have capacity. Marlton has double the population of Medford but only two self storage facilities. As a member of the Muirfield HOA, he stated more neighborhood residents would have attended tonight’s meeting, but are away on spring break vacations.

Donald Augustino – 202 Old Marlton Pike. Is opposed to the application because the real impact will be on the property owners who live around it. He is also concerned about the lighting and the visual impact of a 3-story building of such size. Hours until 10pm could generate noise for neighboring property owners; he asked Board members if they would want this built in their backyards. He also questioned if this will benefit more Marlton and Mt. Laurel residents than Medford residents.

Joseph Cudemo – 200 Old Marlton Pike. Is opposed to the application, as his property and dwelling is the closest one to the property and building. He questioned why the buffer is 50’ surround most of the property except where his property adjoins, which is only 25 feet, which leaves one edge of the building approx. 40-50 feet from his property line. He also expressed concern that at least 100 loads of fill was brought in by the prior owners in piles 12-15 feet high, and was not clean fill as it was full of concrete and other unknown matter. Pipes had been brought in at least 12” in diameter. He also had issues with the lighting, as wall packs emit more light than down lit poles. He also stated the intersection is “all messed up,” and that those leaving the facility will not be able to make lefts to access Route 70, so those vehicles will need to make rights onto Old Marlton Pike and lefts onto Hartford Road, an already failing intersection, to reach Route 70.

Mark Pettine – 212 Old Marlton Pike. Is opposed to the application. He resides next to Mr. Cudemo and shares the same driveway. He expressed concern that 18-wheelers will be accessing the facility. He is also concerned about a 3 story building being located at the gateway to Medford.

Donna Lombardo – 210 Old Marlton Pike. Is opposed to the application as it is 100’ from her bedroom window and she will have an open view of the building since her house is closer to the roadway. She also expressed unease with reported illegal activities in other self storage facilities.

David Faulker – 5 Muirfield Court. Is opposed to the application. As a 28 year resident in Muirfield, he was drawn by the historic nature and natural surroundings. At the gateway intersection entering Medford, the building is too large. He also suggested that traffic exiting onto Old Marlton Pike is already driving too fast, and those slowing to turn into the facility may cause accidents.

David Cleeland – 210 Old Marlton Pike. Is opposed to the application as there is insufficient buffer to reduce the noise from trucks beeping while backing in to offload. He also does not understand why the Board would consider the higher elevation, as when he applied to build five years ago, he was told to lower the roof due to the mass.

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to close the public portion. Mr. Simmers seconded. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

Mr. McAndrew asked the Board to continue the application to allow the Applicant and their team to address the concerns expressed by the Board members and the public/residents. Upon questioning from Mr. Varga, Mr. McAndrew said that revised plans and renderings could be submitted by June 1<sup>st</sup>, thus continuing the application to the June meeting.

**MOTION:** Vice Chairman Rickards made a motion continue the application to the June 15, 2022 Zoning Board meeting without the need to re-notice; contingent upon the submission of revised plans by June 1<sup>st</sup>. Mr. Hamilton seconded.

*(On behalf of the applicant, Mr. McAndrew consented to an extension of time to hear the application)*

**Recorded Vote:**

Ayes:	Hamilton, Meehan, Pullman, Simmers, Wolf, Rickards, Cocivera
Nays:	None
Abst.:	None
Motion carried:	7 - 0 - 0

---

**GENERAL PUBLIC:**

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to open the general public portion of the meeting. Mr. Pullman seconded the motion. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

No one was present or on Zoom.

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to close the general public portion of the meeting. Mr. Meehan seconded the motion. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.

**EXECUTIVE SESSION:** None

Medford Township Zoning Board  
20 April 2022  
13

**ADDITIONAL ACTIONS BY BOARD:** None

**MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to adjourn the April 2022 Zoning Board of Adjustment meeting at 11:05 pm. Mr. Simmers seconded the motion. The voice vote was unanimous in favor.



---

Beth Portocalis, Zoning Board Secretary & Recording Secretary