

**ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MEETING**  
**June 18, 2025**

The public hearing began at 7:00 P.M.

**Members present were:**

Terry Andrus  
Albert Fisher  
Andrew Groetsch  
Cedric Holmes  
Rudolph Luisi  
Joseph Repice  
Joseph Stefano  
George LoBiondo

**Members absent:** Ryan Flaim, Eric Hernandez

**Others Present were:**

Amanda Mosciello, Zoning Board Solicitor  
Yasmin Perez, Zoning Board Secretary  
Ryan Headley, Zoning Board Engineer/Planner  
Elizabeth Jambor, Assistant Planner  
Rick Crudelli, Assistant Zoning Officer

Ms. Mosciello went over revisions to the agenda.

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the minutes from the May 21, 2025, meeting.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes  
Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

The Chairman entertained a motion to approve the resolutions from the May 21, 2025, meeting.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes  
Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes, Abstain Resolution 2025-41

**SJ GLASS AND DOOR**, 3278 S West Boulevard, Block 7004, Lot 10.1, Resolution #2021-56, extension request for resolution #2023-48.

Mr. Peter Chicanas appeared on behalf of the applicant to request a one-year extension of approval through July 19, 2026, pursuant to Section 52 of the Municipal Land Use Law. He explained that while the applicant remains committed to the project, economic circumstances and other priorities have caused some delay. Despite this, they

anticipate beginning and completing construction within the next year. The applicant's representative, Mr. Matthew McColley, was present in case the Board had questions.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Cedric Holmes: Yes

Rudolph Luisi: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes

Albert Fisher: Yes

Cedric Holmes: Yes

Rudolph Luisi: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes

George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

**ROBERT & DEBORAH DECRESCENZO**, 1710 S. Main Road, Block 6202, Lot 20, Zone R-5, use variance for the conversion of a mixed-use structure (1<sup>st</sup> Floor – Commercial & 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor – Residential) to a two-family dwelling.

Robert DeCrescenzo was sworn in and testified. He explained that he has owned the building since he was younger and operated a photography studio there. The building is already firewalled and set up for conversion into a duplex. He now wishes to retire and formally convert the property into a two-unit residential dwelling.

Mr. Crudelli stated that there are several deficiencies in the application. A current property survey is required to identify and confirm any existing or necessary bulk variances. Only one floor plan was submitted. It's unclear whether it represents the first or second floor. Plans lack clear labeling of units (e.g., Unit A/Unit B or upstairs/downstairs), specific room uses, and full dimensions. These items are essential, as any approval and associated variances will be memorialized and run with the land.

Mr. DeCrescenzo indicated he was previously told that a second floor plan was not required but confirmed he does have one. He agreed to contact the Zoning Office for further guidance.

Due to the incomplete application, the Zoning Office wanted an adjournment to the next month's meeting.

Mr. Crudelli advised the applicant to submit the missing survey and complete floor plans before the next hearing. If those materials are not ready in time, the applicant was encouraged to contact the zoning office in advance to request a further postponement.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Cedric Holmes: Yes  
Rudolph Luisi: Yes  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Cedric Holmes: Yes  
Rudolph Luisi: Yes  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Application continued.

**CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS**, 1100 W. Sherman Avenue, Block 6101, Lot 29, Zone R-5, preliminary & final major site plan approval, in conjunction with “d” use and height variances to construct a 2,500 square foot telecommunications compound with associated site improvements.

Kevin Jones, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant, Cello Partnership, doing business as Verizon Wireless (hereafter referred to as "Verizon"). Verizon is a licensed wireless carrier under the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and is proposing the installation of a communications facility at 1100 W. Sherman Avenue. Mr. Jones explained that Verizon's radio frequency (RF) engineers have identified a gap in service coverage and capacity in this area. The current network cannot meet FCC coverage requirements, prompting the need for a new facility. Site acquisition specialists performed an extensive search in the area and concluded that the proposed location—owned by Cumberland Christian School—is the most suitable and centrally located site to address the gap in coverage. The proposed project is for a 140-foot monopole tower with a 6-foot chain link security fence surrounding it. This facility is designed for future co-location opportunities, allowing other wireless carriers to utilize the tower without increasing its height or footprint. The application is for a use variance, height variance, bulk variances (including side yard setback), and a preliminary and final major site plan approval. Access to the facility will utilize the existing school entrance. The site will be unmanned, remotely monitored 24/7 by Verizon's Network Operations Center. Routine maintenance visits will occur every four to six weeks. Any technician entering the site will first check in with the school and follow all school security protocols. There will be no lighting or signage, except for signage required by the FCC. Additionally, Mr. Jones emphasized that the proposed facility is critical not only for Verizon subscribers but also for City of Vineland first responders (fire, police, EMS), Cumberland County emergency systems, and the City of Vineland's technology department, all of whom rely on the Verizon Wireless network for essential communications.

Joseph Odenheimer from Mazer Consulting, licensed professional engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant. Access to the proposed facility would utilize the existing entrance to Cumberland Christian School from W. Sherman Avenue. An existing maintenance drive located at the rear of the property will be enhanced and extended to the tower. The access road is proposed to be a 12-foot-wide gravel driveway, deemed sufficient

given the limited frequency of site visits (every 4–6 weeks for maintenance). The monopole structure is proposed to be 135 feet tall with antennas mounted at 130 feet. A 5-foot lightning rod is installed on top of the pole, bringing the total height to 140 feet. The tower is located within a 50' x 50' fenced compound, secured by a 6-foot chain link fence with a locking gate and topped with barbed wire. The site will have a backup diesel generator (approximately 200 gallons capacity), electrical and wireless communication equipment cabinets. The generator is standby-only, activated only during power outages or emergencies, and is required by the FCC. This facility will not generate noise, glare, or odor. All electric and fiber connections will run underground from the existing infrastructure on school property. A 30-foot easement has been secured from the school for access and utilities.

Mr. Headley raised concerns about the use of a gravel driveway, particularly during winter months, citing the potential for mud, slush, and debris being tracked onto Sherman Avenue. While the applicant initially proposed gravel due to limited use, the board expressed preference for a more durable surface. This condition was accepted by the applicant as a reasonable compromise.

Mr. Odenheimer confirmed that he reviewed the engineering letter prepared by Mr. Headley and agrees with its contents, with the exception of some waivers. Item 7A, waiver from paving the driveway (discussed above; stone will be used instead). Items 12F, G, I, K, M, O, P: Waivers related to sight triangles, driveway access to public road (unchanged), circulation patterns (minimal traffic), full lighting plan (manual light on timer within compound only), finished floor elevations of existing buildings (unaffected), and centerline elevations of adjacent streets (no street work proposed). Mr. Headley indicated that he had no objections to the requested waivers.

Andrew Peterson, expert in radio frequency engineering and electromagnetic emissions, testified on behalf of the applicant. He analyzed the existing wireless infrastructure in the area, assessed the objectives of the proposed facility, and authored a radio frequency design analysis report, which had been submitted to the board in advance. Mr. Petersohn also prepared several exhibits to support his testimony. He explained that Verizon Wireless identified a significant gap in reliable service in the area through several standard industry methods, including the review of network performance statistics, third-party drive testing, propagation modeling using specialized software, and customer complaints. All methods consistently indicated a lack of reliable in-building and in-vehicle coverage in the vicinity of the proposed site, particularly along Route 55, Delsea Drive, and Sherman Avenue. Mr. Petersohn presented two primary exhibits. The first was a map showing existing Verizon Wireless coverage in the area, which included green shading for in-building coverage and yellow for in-vehicle coverage. This exhibit illustrated a gap in reliable service surrounding the proposed location. The second exhibit showed the projected coverage if the proposed facility were approved and constructed, with strong in-building and vehicular coverage added throughout the previously underserved areas. He noted that the proposed facility would fit well into the surrounding Verizon network and substantially improve both coverage and service reliability. In addition to addressing coverage concerns, Mr. Petersohn testified that the proposed site would also alleviate capacity issues. He explained that in order for wireless service to be effective, sufficient signal strength (coverage) and available bandwidth (capacity) are both required. The existing Verizon site to the south, known as the Clayville facility, is currently experiencing capacity strain—particularly from increased demand along Route 55 during the summer months. The new facility would offload demand from the Clayville site, thereby improving overall network performance in the area. He also addressed electromagnetic emissions, noting that the proposed facility is located on school property and in proximity to residential neighborhoods. He conducted an electromagnetic exposure analysis using the methodology outlined in the FCC's Office of Engineering and Technology Bulletin 65. Based on the specific equipment and antenna configuration proposed for this site, his analysis determined that the maximum radio frequency emissions would be less than 4.3% of the FCC's allowable limit at any publicly accessible location. He emphasized that this figure is based on a theoretical worst-case scenario with highly conservative assumptions. In actual field measurements of similar sites, emissions are typically a small fraction—often ten times lower—than the theoretical maximum. The proposed facility would comply fully with all applicable federal and state regulations related to electromagnetic emissions.

Brian Seidel, professional planner, testified on behalf of the applicant. He reviewed applicable land use regulations, the City's Master Plan and reexamination report, the zoning ordinance, the site location, and the full set of application documents. He also coordinated with the project team in evaluating the proposed site and its suitability for the intended use. Mr. Seidel explained that the application requires three forms of relief: a use variance (D(1)), a height variance (D(6)), and a bulk variance. He clarified that the D(1) use variance is necessary because wireless communication towers are not permitted in any zone within the City of Vineland. The D(6) height variance is needed because the proposed tower exceeds the maximum height permitted in the R-5 residential district. The C variance (bulk) relates to a pre-existing nonconforming setback condition associated with a school building on the site, not with the proposed tower. He emphasized that the parcel is unique due to its size—approximately 27 acres—and its existing character. While zoned residential, the site is surrounded by commercial zoning along Sherman Avenue and Delsea Drive. The site includes substantial existing mature vegetation, particularly around the tower location, which helps buffer and screen the structure. Mr. Seidel stated that the site provides generous setbacks from surrounding properties—approximately seven times greater than what is required by code. This, combined with the existing vegetation and the monopole tower design, minimizes visual impact. The tower will resemble nearby transmission structures and is not expected to generate noise, dust, odor, or vibration. It will be a passive use with no employees on site aside from occasional maintenance visits. Regarding the statutory criteria for granting a use variance, Mr. Seidel testified that the site is particularly well-suited for this use, citing its location near high-demand users such as hospitals, medical centers, and the local college. He stated that the FCC license held by Verizon Wireless has been recognized by the courts as satisfying the positive criteria for a use variance. He further concluded that the variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good or impairment to the zone plan. In reviewing the Master Plan, he noted that while the plan references wireless facilities in the public rights-of-way, it does not specifically address tower structures. However, it does emphasize public safety on key roadways—specifically Sherman Avenue and Delsea Drive, which have high accident rates—and recommends support for technological infrastructure and business development. He testified that the proposed facility will directly support these goals by improving service reliability in the area. Mr. Seidel stated that the application addresses a documented gap in wireless coverage, uses the least intrusive means to fill that gap, and meets both the positive and negative criteria required for variance relief. The approval of the application is warranted.

Mr. Matthew Christopher McCauley, residing at 2570 Coronado Drive, appeared before the Board and provided public comment in opposition to the proposed wireless communications tower. He stated that his residence is located directly behind the proposed tower site, approximately 300 feet away. He introduced himself as a U.S. Navy veteran who recently retired after 20 years of service. He and his family chose their current home specifically for its wooded surroundings and the privacy it offers from the adjacent school property. Mr. McCauley expressed concern over the visual impact of the proposed 120-foot monopole tower, which he indicated would rise significantly above the existing tree line, which he estimated at approximately 50 to 70 feet. He stated that the tower would be highly visible from his home and the surrounding neighborhood, specifically citing that approximately 80 homes in Garrison Estates and additional homes in nearby subdivisions would be affected. He questioned why the tower must be located in a residential area and raised concerns that Verizon may have chosen a school property. He acknowledged that Verizon may have encountered difficulties in securing other locations but felt the burden of that decision should not fall on nearby homeowners. He also raised objections regarding potential impacts to property values, stating that he expects the presence of the tower will negatively affect surrounding real estate, with no corresponding tax relief or compensation. Mr. McCauley also voiced concern about the inclusion of a diesel generator at the site, noting his experience with such equipment during his military career. He stated that diesel generators are not quiet and could be disruptive, particularly if activated during nighttime hours. He also noted that his dogs would likely be disturbed by the noise.

Joseph Lang of 2552 Coronado Drive in Garrison Estates, lives directly adjacent to the proposed wireless tower site. He stated that his property shares a boundary with the proposed location and that the tower, if approved, would be situated directly behind the homes he and his neighbor built. He expressed concern that one of the primary reasons he and his family chose to build on that lot was due to the wooded area and the presence of the Christian school behind their home, which they believed would remain undeveloped. He further stated that they paid a premium price for the lot because of those natural buffers. He explained that his property value had dropped shortly after purchasing the home and has only recently begun to recover. He fears that the placement of a 120-foot communications tower so close to his property will cause a significant decline in his home's value once again. In addition to the potential loss in property value, He voiced concern about the likely presence of a light on top of the tower. He noted that medical helicopters frequently fly overhead en route to the nearby hospital and expressed the belief that the tower would require some form of beacon or flashing light to ensure visibility and safety for air traffic. He stated that the presence of such a light would further diminish the quality of life and character of the neighborhood.

Member of the public was sworn in and identified herself as a resident of 2575 Coronado Drive, whose property is among the closest to the proposed tower site. She began by noting that no residents are pleased with the idea of a 100+ foot tower being constructed in their backyard, particularly those whose homes back directly up to the wooded buffer where the tower would be installed. She emphasized the emotional and personal impact of the proposal, acknowledging that while she could focus on how the project made her feel, there were also substantial economic concerns that warranted attention. Referring to property value studies, she cited data showing that homes closest to cell towers can experience value losses ranging from 2.46% to 9.78%, and in some cases as high as 18%. She noted that with approximately 80 homes in the affected neighborhood, the total loss in property value could range from hundreds of thousands to several million dollars, depending on market conditions and eventual resale timing. She also raised concerns regarding land stability and environmental impact, pointing out that the proposed tower site is located in a sloped wooded area that backs into similarly sloped residential lots. She questioned whether any geotechnical or environmental assessments had been completed to examine potential destabilization or underground effects. The applicant confirmed that such evaluations were conducted and that the project's engineer was available to provide further information, if requested. She also expressed concern over the permanence of tower infrastructure once installed. Citing U.S. Code Section 6409(a), she asserted that federal law allows wireless carriers to increase the height of an existing tower by up to 20 feet without additional public input. Although the applicant clarified that municipal review is still generally required, she expressed discomfort with the idea that the community would have little to no control over future changes once the initial structure is approved. While acknowledging that she is not a technical expert, she questioned whether sufficient effort was made to pursue alternatives with other landlords or to verify whether additional infrastructure was truly needed.

Stacy Zeiger, of 21 Holly Way, Bridgeton, NJ, was sworn in and identified herself as the Head of School at the Christian School on which the proposed Verizon Wireless tower would be located. Ms. Zeiger offered public comment in support of the application, speaking on behalf of the school community. Ms. Zeiger explained that the tower is planned for a remote, wooded area of the school's property—an area that students do not access, either during class or extracurricular activities. She emphasized that the location was chosen with care, and that the tower would be visually buffered by existing trees throughout the year, including during the winter months when leaves are off the trees. She stated that while the upper portion of the tower may be visible due to its height, the broader base and majority of the structure would remain obscured by surrounding vegetation. She also stated that Verizon has complied with all safety protocols requested by the school throughout the application process. This included ensuring that surveyors and personnel followed school safety and security procedures during their visits to the site. She confirmed that the school has not received any objections from parents or students regarding the proposed facility.

Mr. Odenheimer referenced page two of the submitted Radio Frequency Design Report, which outlines the four existing Verizon Wireless tower sites surrounding the proposed location. These are also illustrated on the submitted coverage maps. He noted that the closest existing Verizon tower is approximately 1.25 to 1.5 miles

away, and even at that distance, coverage remains inadequate, particularly for in-building service and reliable in-vehicle coverage. He explained that while such distances may seem relatively short, they are insufficient to meet the performance standards expected by Verizon Wireless customers, particularly when factoring in capacity demands. In areas with moderate to high user activity—such as along Route 55, where traffic congestion is common—existing towers become overburdened, diminishing coverage reliability. The Clayville site, located south of the proposed location, was cited as an example of a facility experiencing sector overloading, especially in summer months. The proposed tower would offload traffic from that facility and reinforce coverage in an underserved segment of the network.

A member of the public stepped forward again to pose further questions. He asked whether Verizon's design was tied to particular coverage levels such as 4G or 5G, and whether the location adjacent to residential neighborhoods was truly the best option. He also noted the sparsity of large buildings in the area and questioned whether other, more commercially-zoned areas along Route 55 would have been more appropriate and less intrusive.

Mr. Odenheimer responded that the primary capacity concern is along Route 55, which runs adjacent to the proposed site. The heavy data use by commuters and local traffic contributes to a burden on the nearby Clayville site. The new tower would directly relieve that capacity strain. He also reiterated that Verizon always seeks to co-locate on existing towers or tall structures first, and that the placement of new towers in residential zones is generally a last resort—only pursued after other locations are deemed unavailable or unsuitable. He also explained that tower lighting requirements are regulated by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). According to FAA standards, any tower exceeding 200 feet in height is automatically required to have lighting. Towers below 200 feet, such as the one proposed in this application at approximately 130 feet, are subject to individual FAA review. The FAA assesses each structure on a case-by-case basis, considering factors such as proximity to airports, heliports, and common flight paths. They conducted its assessment and determined that lighting was not required for the proposed tower. As a result, the tower is being designed and submitted without lighting. He presented photo simulations marked as Exhibit A-3, titled "Photo Simulations Depicting Existing and Proposed Conditions." The images were prepared to illustrate the visual impact of the proposed 130-foot monopole from various surrounding locations. The monopole is visible from in front of the school on Sherman Avenue (Photo 1) and faintly visible above the tree line from Delmar Avenue (Photo 7). It is not visible from Delsea Drive (Photo 2), farther west on Sherman Avenue (Photo 3), Orchard Avenue (Photo 4), Coronado Drive (Photos 5 and 6), primarily due to tree coverage and distance.

Marco Paredes, Site Acquisition Expert, testified regarding the alternative site analysis and the process that led to selecting the proposed monopole location. Verizon Wireless identified a coverage deficiency in the area and tasked Mr. Paredes with locating suitable sites within a designated search ring. His responsibilities included reviewing zoning ordinances and evaluating existing structures or properties that could accommodate the required tower height (minimum 120–130 feet). From 2020 onward, over ten alternate sites were investigated and ultimately deemed unsuitable for various reasons, including lack of interest from property owners, insufficient height of existing structures, and zoning or access constraints. Verizon determined the school site met the technical requirements and, following discussions, entered a lease agreement with the school district in August 2024. Exhibit A-4, Site Acquisition Summary.

Harold Seepersad of 2588 Coronado Drive expressed concern about the cumulative RF emissions from the proposed monopole, asking whether the reported 4.2% of FCC limits applies only to Verizon and how additional carriers might impact that total. It was clarified that each future carrier would be required to demonstrate compliance with FCC regulations and that Verizon, as the primary tenant, would occupy the top position on the monopole. He also voiced general concern about the tower's location near a school and residential neighborhood.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Cedric Holmes: Yes  
Rudolph Luisi: No  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the use variance.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Cedric Holmes: Yes  
Rudolph Luisi: No  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the height variance.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Cedric Holmes: Yes  
Rudolph Luisi: No  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the site plan.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Cedric Holmes: Yes  
Rudolph Luisi: No  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Application granted.

**PINE GROVE FARM, LLC**, 768 E. Garden Road, Block 904, Lots 1, 34, 36.1, 37, 47, 47.1 & 48, Zones A-5/MHP, use variance for the expansion of an existing mobile home park.

Keith Davis, Esq., of Nehmad Davis & Goldstein, appeared on behalf of the applicant, Pine Grove Farm, LLC and its principal, Mr. Philo Chapman. He explained that the application seeks a use variance and density variance to expand the existing manufactured home community by 161 new units, bringing the total to 327 residential units. The expansion would also include new recreational amenities to benefit both current and future residents. The proposed use is not permitted in the A5 zoning district, although it is permitted in the adjacent MHP zone



where some of the amenities would be located. Mr. Davis stated that the application promotes housing affordability by providing lower-cost homeownership options for first-time buyers and downsizing seniors amid rising housing costs and interest rates. He noted that if the requested relief is granted, the applicant would return at a later date for full site plan approval. The current hearing is limited to the requested use and density variances. The witnesses that will testify are: Mr. Chapman (applicant), Mr. Joseph Odenheimer (civil engineer), Mr. Alex Zukowski (traffic consultant), and Mr. Steve Hawk (professional planner).

Philo Chapman, majority owner of Pine Grove Farm, LLC, testified on his own behalf. He described the property's deep family roots, noting his family's ownership since 1912 and their stewardship through six generations. He emphasized that the proposal is not for traditional "trailer park" housing, but rather high-quality, code-compliant manufactured homes built to 2018 HUD standards. These homes would be two-bedroom, two-bath units with modern features such as drywall interiors, shingled roofs, granite countertops, and tiled bathrooms. He explained that the total cost to homeowners, including lot rent and mortgage payments, would be below current fair market rents in Vineland. Mr. Chapman described the proposal as "housing that's affordable" rather than government-subsidized "affordable housing," arguing it meets a critical need for seniors and young families priced out of the conventional home market. Mr. Chapman noted that the expansion includes extensive recreational amenities—such as two community centers, walking trails, gazebos, sports courts, grilling areas, and pollinator gardens—serving both existing and future residents. He testified that his plan incorporates open space, stormwater management, and upgrades to the existing community. He also discussed his long-standing efforts to bring public utilities to the site, securing city water access and working toward extending public sewer, which would be supported by a new on-site pump station and 1.5-mile force main. He expressed willingness to allow neighboring properties to connect to the system without recapture fees. He clarified that the subject land is not actively farmed and does not carry a farmland assessment. Mr. Chapman concluded by urging the board to consider the application as a responsible approach to affordable homeownership and community development, built upon decades of personal investment in Vineland.

Joseph Odenheimer, a licensed professional engineer, testified on behalf of the applicant, Pine Grove Farm, LLC, regarding the proposed expansion of the existing manufactured home park. Mr. Odenheimer prepared the use variance and density concept plan submitted as part of the application. He described the site layout, which includes 161 new residential manufactured home units—154 units on the western portion of the site and 7 units on the eastern side near the recreation area—resulting in a total of 327 homes across the existing and proposed phases. The internal roadway network will be privately maintained and constructed to RSIS standards, with 30-foot cartways, curb, and sidewalk, but not dedicated to the City. Two access points are proposed—one from Garden Road and another from E Avenue—with community centers located near both entrances in repurposed residential structures. Mr. Odenheimer reviewed the recreation and open space amenities proposed, noting that the plan meets the open space and active recreation requirements of the MHP (Manufactured Home Park) zone, which was used as a benchmark. Proposed improvements include pickleball and basketball courts, pollinator and community gardens, walking trails, open play fields, a playground-style mound with slides, a maintenance barn, and RV/boat storage areas. He confirmed that the expansion would be served by a new sanitary sewer system, replacing the current septic systems. A force main and private pump station will be constructed, subject to NJDEP approval of the wastewater management plan amendment application currently under review. Stormwater will be managed through distributed basins designed in compliance with NJDEP regulations. He acknowledged that final engineering details, including lighting, landscaping, and drainage, would be addressed during a future site plan application, should the use and density variances be granted. Mr. Odenheimer noted that the project has been designed to comply with the City's zoning standards to the extent applicable, with the only variances sought being for use and density. Additional buffering or landscaping could be incorporated into the final plan based on board feedback during site plan review.

Alex Zukowski, a licensed professional engineer, was sworn in and testified as the traffic consultant for the applicant. He prepared and submitted a traffic impact study for the proposed expansion of the Pine Grove Farm manufactured home community. The study evaluated site access, traffic generation, and operational impacts at

nearby intersections, specifically the intersection of Garden Road and East Avenue. The analysis utilized the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Manual and applied standard traffic engineering methodologies. Mr. Zukowski testified that the site's design, which consolidates multiple single-family home driveways into fewer access points and provides two points of ingress and egress on Garden Road and East Avenue, improves safety by reducing conflict points and dispersing traffic flow. Existing traffic conditions at the key intersection currently operate at a Level of Service (LOS) "A," indicative of minimal delay, and are projected to continue at LOS "A" after development, with only a negligible increase in delay (approximately half a second). Similarly, the driveway access points are expected to maintain LOS "A" operations. The proposed development will not create any substantial negative traffic impacts to the surrounding neighborhood or public good, supporting the variance relief sought by the applicant.

Stephen Hawk, licensed professional planner, testified as the applicant's planning expert. He confirmed his familiarity with the City of Vineland zoning ordinance, master plan, and planning procedures.

Mr. Hawk testified that the application seeks two principal variances: a "D1" use variance to permit a mobile home park use not permitted in the A5 zoning district, and a "D5" density variance for the proposed expansion which includes single-family homes within a mobile home park setting at a density exceeding the permitted density in the A5 zone. He explained the standard of review for granting such variances involves a balancing test of positive and negative criteria, and the enhanced burden of the "Medici" standard, requiring justification for the continued exclusion of this use from the zone. Mr. Hawk explained that the proposed expansion substantially advances multiple purposes of zoning, particularly: Purpose A (General Welfare): Addressing the severe housing shortage and crisis by adding over 160 new affordable residential units, helping increase housing supply in Vineland. He cited recent studies and data showing regional housing deficits and the challenges of permitting new units. Purpose A (Public Safety): Improved emergency access with dual access points on Garden Road and East Avenue. Purpose I (Aesthetic Environment): Enhanced landscaping, buffering, and improved visual character with new architectural styles and screening of service areas. Purpose H (Traffic and Transportation): Consolidation of nine existing driveways to three, reducing traffic conflict points and improving road safety along the busy county road. Purpose J (Environmental Improvements): Significant new plantings (~1,200 trees and shrubs), higher energy efficiency standards for new homes, and new stormwater management systems addressing existing deficiencies. Elimination of Septic Systems: Replacement of approximately 161 septic systems with public sewer service, improving water quality and public health. He provided a historical perspective on mobile home parks in Vineland, noting many were developed prior to modern zoning standards and continue to operate with legacy nonconformities. This application uniquely addresses and improves these deficiencies by bringing much of the park up to current zoning and design standards. Mr. Hawk described the project as a planned residential development incorporating best practices in site design, landscaping, stormwater management, and community amenities, including two converted brick buildings as community centers. Regarding site suitability, it adjoins an existing mobile home community under common ownership. It is situated in an area with several other mobile home parks, establishing a compatible neighborhood character. The site has no environmental constraints (no wetlands or flood zones). It is accessible to major routes (Route 55 and Route 555). The site is not adjacent to sensitive uses such as active farmland, avoiding land use conflicts common in other expansions. He also discussed comparable developments in Vineland demonstrating the proposed density (3.5 units per acre overall) is consistent with or lower than densities in similar areas and far below densities allowed in some active adult neighborhoods. On negative criteria, Mr. Hawk stated there is no substantial detriment to the public good or zoning plan, noting that traffic impacts are minimal and intersection operations will remain at a high level of service. Adjacent properties will benefit from safer, consolidated access points, enhanced landscaping, and reduced environmental impacts such as improved stormwater and elimination of septic systems. The expansion is not out of character with the area, which already features several mobile home parks with similar or higher densities. He highlighted the reduction of existing nonconformities. Decreasing density from over 5 units per acre to approximately 3.5 overall. Increasing open space from zero to over 15%, with nearly triple the required recreation area. Enhancing lot frontage and depth well beyond minimum standards. He contrasted the proposal with typical A5 zoning development, noting that the surrounding A5 lots generally have large frontages and lower density, making the mobile home park expansion a more efficient and

appropriate land use. The substantial positive criteria, including housing benefits, public sewer connection, and environmental improvements, far outweigh any limited negative impacts. He expressed that in his 36 years of planning experience; it is rare to see an application improve existing grandfathered conditions while providing substantial new benefits. He recommended the variances be granted.

Mr. Headey, board planner and engineer, raised several pointed concerns regarding the applicant's request for a use and density variance to expand an existing mobile home park. He noted that recreational facilities are currently not evident at the existing park and confirmed that the property remains on septic, which is still operational. A concern was expressed that promised upgrades, such as sewer extension and recreational improvements, are being presented as conditional upon the approval of the proposed expansion. This approach was viewed as problematic, because existing residents would only benefit from upgrades if the board grants significant variances. It was stated that without the expansion, there would be no viable path to fund necessary upgrades to sewer and recreational infrastructure. Mr. Headley acknowledged that mobile home parks may have been allowed conditionally decades ago, but noted the current A5 zoning was established in 1999. Emphasis was placed on the fact that the site is now within a zone that does not permit mobile home parks, and that the variance requested is significant. The 2018 Master Plan Reexamination, focused on promoting traditional active adult communities (55+) with fee simple ownership and smaller lots in targeted areas, including the rezoning of Rudy's Airport and portions of East Landis Avenue. It was noted that while there are several mobile home parks nearby, the broader area consists mostly of large-lot single-family homes, many over two acres, generally consistent with the A5 district's intent. Mr. Headly challenged the relevance of several zoning purposes cited by the applicant's planner. Purpose I (Visual Environment): The proposed homes are dense and close to the sidewalk, which does not represent a desirable visual environment, though it may be seen differently by the applicant. Purpose H (Transportation): Although curb cuts are being reduced, the substantial traffic increase—from an estimated 90 trips with 9 driveways to over 1,600 trips with 161 units. Purpose J (Environmental Protection): The project could be seen as urban sprawl or improper land use, inconsistent with preserving rural character as per the zoning ordinance and State Planning goals. The property is located in Planning Area 4 (PA4 – Rural) per the NJ State Development and Redevelopment Plan. This area is meant to maintain agricultural uses and low density, aligning with the A5 zone. Granting a use variance for a higher-density mobile home expansion contradicts these planning goals.

Nicole Docherty, 1024 E. Garden Road, owns property directly adjacent to the eastern portion of the applicant's land, where the proposed recreational area would be located. She opposed the proposed expansion. She stated that all trees have been removed from the applicant's property, eliminating a vital wind barrier. As a result, Ms. Docherty has experienced significant storm-related property damage. Approximately 19–20 existing mobile homes currently back up to her property, and there are ongoing issues with trash, yard waste, and plant debris being dumped onto her land by neighboring residents. There are also individuals with flashlights in her woods at 3:00 a.m. that are illegally hunting or loitering. She expressed serious concerns that any additional units (proposed 161) would amplify existing problems, making her property unlivable. Ms. Docherty also raised concerns about increased flooding, traffic, and stormwater impacts from additional development.

Timothy DeJesus, 1024 E. Garden Road, lives adjacent to the proposed expansion area (East side, next to proposed residential area). He opposed the proposed expansion. He expressed concern that increasing the number of affordable homes in this area would bring higher density, which is contrary to the area's current rural and quiet character. He also questioned the necessity of recreational facilities (such as a park or basketball court) if, as the applicant claimed, 75% of the residents are 55 years old or older. Mr. DeJesus objected to a park being built adjacent to their home, stating it would negatively impact their privacy and quality of life. He also expressed doubt about the applicant's implication that public sewer/water improvements could not happen without the proposed expansion.

Ryan Miller, 601 E. Garden Road, opposed to the proposed expansion. He emphasized that the proposed development is incompatible with the rural and quiet lifestyle he and his family intentionally chose when

purchasing their property. Mr. Miller also expressed concern that approval would lead to further deforestation and loss of natural habitat. He urged the board to preserve existing wildlife areas and farmland, consistent with the current zoning.

Ronald J. Gorgo, 911 E. Garden Road, strongly opposed the proposed expansion of the trailer park. He lives directly across from the proposed recreation area. He emphasized that the property is zoned A5 and that allowing this development would set a precedent by granting a significant variance from zoning regulations. Mr. Gorgo advocated for preserving country living and simpler, low-density development, which he and his neighbors value. He also stated that there are existing draining issues tied to the trailer park. Homes are being flooded and pump water out regularly. The applicant clear cut the forested areas across from his home with no subsequent farming as originally intended. He stressed that while he could continue listing issues, his core concerns are with drainage, traffic, zoning noncompliance, and the failure to uphold conservation goals. Mr. Gorgo requested the board deny the application and prioritize road repair and sustainable planning.

Richard Squires, 2771 NE Avenue, neighboring property owner directly impacted by proposed expansion; expects 7 new units to border his side yard. He opposed the proposed expansion of the trailer park. He described existing flooding problems along East Avenue near Forest Grove due to clay-heavy soil, poor natural drainage, and high groundwater. Ineffective existing drainage infrastructure (drains “don’t work”). During heavy rains, water floods across the entire roadway—about a foot deep. He expressed skepticism about proposed engineered solutions (e.g., retention basins). Engineers have already worked on East Avenue with unsatisfactory results. He believes additional impervious surfaces and grading from the development will worsen flooding. Mr. Squires clarified that he does not oppose responsible development, but strongly objects to the proposed density, which he described as "super dense for that area."

Elizabeth Barber, 2565 NE Avenue, long-term adjacent property owner; her property is bordered on two sides by Pine Grove Farms. She opposed the proposed expansion of the mobile home park. Her home has been flooded multiple times, and she and her family have rebuilt the lower level twice. Eventually they invested in professional waterproofing, installed sump pumps with a backup generator system due to frequent power outages in North Vineland. She noted that the worst flooding occurred after Pine Grove Farms cleared nearby woods and believes the deforestation has exacerbated flooding on NE Avenue and surrounding properties. The plan shows a walking path directly along her property line, with no planting or buffer proposed. The proposed path would allow pedestrians direct sightlines into her yard and home, destroying privacy. She urged the board to vote down the proposal to preserve the rural lifestyle, protect against further flooding, and maintain the area’s open space.

Jennifer Meehan, 650 E. Forest Grove Road, nearby resident; lifelong resident of North Vineland. She opposed the proposed expansion of the mobile home park. She expressed skepticism about the applicant’s claims that the proposal would improve the neighborhood and increase open space. Doubling the number of units does not equate to preserving open space. She urged the zoning board to uphold the zoning code and master plan. The property owners knew the zoning restrictions when the land was purchased and should be held to them.

Derek Ferrer, 949 E. Garden Road, adjacent neighbor; property directly affected by prior tree clearing. He opposed the proposed expansion of the mobile home park. Has lived at his property for 24 years without prior issues until recent changes by the applicant. Mr. Chapman has never made contact or approached him directly as testified. In 2018, approximately 10 acres in front of his house were cleared without prior notice. Since that clearing, he has experienced flooding issues, including water running across the road and into his backyard and dog kennels—a problem that did not exist prior to the clearing. He opposes the expansion of the mobile home park due to the negative impact on flooding, visual aesthetics, privacy, and rural character of the area.

Anita Gorgo, 911 E. Garden Road, lives directly across the street from the proposed expansion area. She opposed the proposed mobile home park expansion. Her home is directly across the street from the proposed pickleball courts, RV and boat storage, and recreational facilities. She strongly objects to the RV and boat storage. There

are existing storage facilities already exist on the opposite side of the development. She also expressed concerns about lighting and visual impact from proposed development. After the clear-cutting of 10 acres, stormwater runoff now floods their yard and surrounding homes. Ms. Gorgo urged the board to deny the expansion based on environmental, zoning, and quality-of-life concerns.

Donna Richards, 2533 N East Avenue, lives directly next to Ms. Barber, near East Avenue. She is opposed to the proposed mobile home park expansion. She confirmed that all the trees were removed from the area as far back as 1990, and that the property is now completely open with no visual buffer. There is a serious concern about the proposed new access point on East Avenue. She opposes the expansion on the basis that it benefits the applicant at the expense of long-time residents' property values, safety, and neighborhood quality.

Kevin Meehan, 650 E. Forest Grove Road, opposed the proposed mobile home park expansion. He is opposed due to anticipated light pollution from new street lights associated with the internal road network of the proposed development. The increase in traffic volume from the added homes with existing speeding issues on that road. There is existing drainage issues and increased runoff from new impervious surfaces (e.g., roads, homes) could worsen flooding, especially given the high water table on E Avenue.

Judith Marcacci, 1027 E. Garden Road, opposed the proposed mobile home park expansion. There is a strong concern about increased traffic volume resulting from the proposed 189-unit expansion. Garden Road already experiences high traffic throughout the day, including frequent tractor-trailer traffic from the nearby industrial park to Main Road. Additional units would worsen congestion and safety.

Andrew Stolar, 1101 E. Garden Road, opposed the proposed mobile home park expansion. He expressed general opposition aligned with the concerns already raised by other residents. He has a strong objection to the argument that expansion is necessary to correct issues that were created by the applicant, particularly the removal of wooded areas, which he says led to newly emerged drainage and water problems.

Thomas E. Fenimore, 525 E. Forest Grove Road, opposed the proposed mobile home park expansion. He lives at the corner of East Avenue and Forest Grove Road, a known dangerous intersection. He expressed concern over the traffic engineer's conclusion that the additional 161 units would have no impact. The intersection lacks a four-way stop and has frequent accidents, with vehicles often misjudging right-of-way due to poor signage and design. Adding traffic volume at this intersection will further increase risk to public safety. He purchased lot from Mr. Chapman 20 years ago and has experienced chronic water problems since construction.

Joe Marcacci, 1060 E. Garden Road, opposed the proposed mobile home park expansion. He feels that the current development maintains a peaceful rural character, but further expansion will disrupt that. Traffic conditions are also a major concern.

Todd Ippolito, 819 E. Garden Road, supports the application and the proposed expansion. He noted that he has witnessed over 40 years of careful, meticulous maintenance of Chapman Country Living. Mr. Ippolito personally participated in the construction of two of Mr. Chapman's other business ventures and attested that they are still well-maintained.

Chairman made a motion to close the public hearing.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes

Andrew Groetsch: Yes

Cedric Holmes: Yes

Rudolph Luisi: Yes

Joseph Repice: Yes

Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Mr. Stefano made a motion to approve the application.

Roll call:

Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Cedric Holmes: Yes  
Rudolph Luisi: No  
Joseph Repice: No  
Joseph Stefano: No  
George LoBiondo: No

Application denied.

Meeting adjourned at 11:32 PM

Roll call:

Terry Andrus: Yes  
Albert Fisher: Yes  
Andrew Groetsch: Yes  
Joseph Repice: Yes  
Joseph Stefano: Yes  
George LoBiondo: Yes

Yasmin Perez, Secretary  
**Zoning Board of Adjustment**