

**Mount Laurel Township Zoning Board of Adjustment**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**August 4, 2021**

**Opening**

The seventh Regular Meeting of the Mount Laurel Zoning Board of Adjustment August 4, 2021 was called to order by Chairman Francescone at 7:00 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance and Moment of Silence were observed

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

Roll call was taken

**Board Members in Attendance**

Chairman Francescone, Vice Chairman List, Mrs. Andersen, Mr. Gray, Mr. Killen, Mrs. Liciaga, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Kramer, Mr. Holmes.

**Absent**

**Board Professionals in Attendance**

Joseph Petrongolo, Planner; Matthew Magill, Engineer; Ed Campbell, Board Solicitor

**Announcements and Review of Board Procedures**

**Adopting the Minutes**

Chairman Francescone asked for a motion to adopt the regular meeting minutes of 6/02/2021. Mr. Grey moved the motion, Mr. Sharp seconded, all eligible members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

Chairman Francescone asked for a motion to adopt the Special meeting minutes of 7/08/2021. Mr. Grey moved the motion, Mrs. Andersen seconded, all eligible members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

**Memorialized Resolutions**

1. **R-2021-ZB14** – Mr. Grey made a motion to approve R-2021-ZB14, Mr. Sharp seconded, all eligible members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.
2. **R-2021-ZB15** – Mr. Grey made a motion to approve R-2021-ZB15, Mr. Sharp seconded, all eligible members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.
3. **R-2021-ZB16** – Mr. Grey made a motion to approve R-2021-ZB16, Mr. Sharp seconded, all eligible members voted affirmatively and the motion was carried.

**The Township Professionals were sworn in.**

**Petitions before the board**

1. **Nitin Mehta**, ZB21-C-16, 109 Starboard Way, Block 100.05 Lot 14, R-3 zone. This applicant is seeking a bulk variance from Mount Laurel Township Ordinance 154-64(A)(2) to allow a patio 376 square feet outside the building envelope where 250 square feet is allowed.

**Witnesses Sworn:**

Nitin Mehta

### **Mr. Mehta's Testimony**

**Mr. Mehta** stated, in response to a question from Mrs. Andersen that several of his neighbors have comparable patio's.

**Chairman Francescone** asked Mr. Petrongolo to explain what the building envelope is. Mr. Petrongolo explained the building envelope and stated that the concern is for ground coverage.

**Mr. Mehta** continued that the pavers will be set in stone and they are not sure what the impact of the drainage will be however he stated that the water will drain the same way it does now which is to the right side of his house and to the street.

**Mr. Petrongolo** stated that the dry setting of the patio pavers does allow water to drain through reducing the impact of water runoff.

**Mrs. Andersen** stated a concern for the hill in the rear yard and the effect of the hill on the potential runoff.

**Mr. Mehta** stated he does not believe there will be any impact on drainage

**Mr. Petrongolo** suggested that a grading plan be submitted and reviewed by his office as a condition of any approval to make sure there is no drainage impact on adjacent properties.

**Chairman Francescone** asked Mr. Mehta if he would agree to submit the grading plan and get approval from the board planner as a condition of approval.

**Mr. Mehta** agreed to the condition.

**Mr. Grey** asked Mr. Petrongolo if the additional 126 square feet of patio pavers is going to make a drastic difference in drainage.

**Mr. Petrongolo** replied that it is not a matter of a great deal of water but rather where the water is going.

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

**Chairman Francescone** asked for a motion to approve the variance for application ZB21-C-16 with the condition that the applicant will submit a grading plan for approval. Chairman List moved the motion, Mr. Killen seconded. All present voted affirmatively. Motion carried, approved.

2. **KMC Enterprises**, ZB21-C-13, 3050 Route 38, Block 306 Lot 2, I- zone. This applicant is seeking a bulk variance from section 154-84 of the Mount Laurel Township Ordinance to allow an LED sign where LED signs are defined as changeable copy in 154-83 and therefore prohibited.

### **Witnesses Sworn:**

Jack Clowar, Owner of Prospectors and Michael Sonlin, Effective Sign Works

### **Exhibits Entered:**

A-1 Site Plan and A-2 Sign Plan

**Dino Mantzas Esq.** represented the applicant and summarized the application as an application for variance to allow a changeable copy sign in an Industrial zone. He stated the proposed sign will be ½ square foot less than the existing sign and the pylons will be the same.

### **Mr. Clowar's Testimony**

Using exhibit A-2, Mr. Clowar explained that only the 36"x98" changeable copy portion of the existing sign will change to a 36"x96" LED sign, the rest of the sign will remain the same and in the same location.

He stated that it currently requires 2 employees to go out and change the sign on a daily basis, it takes 20-30 minutes and is difficult in inclement weather. He further stated that, like so many businesses right now, he is experiencing a shortage of employees.

He testified that he believes the digital sign will increase foot traffic. The current sign is illuminated from dusk to 4:00am. It is on until 4:00am because it is tied into the parking lot lighting and the lights need to remain on for employees leaving late at night/early morning. The proposed sign will be lit approximately 9:00am to midnight because the sign will be controlled separately from the parking lot lights.

### **Mr. Sonlin's Testimony**

Mr. Sonlin stated he is and has been a sales representative for Effective Sign Works for thirteen years. The proposed sign will be as previously stated. The manual reader board will be replaced with the electronic LED reader board and will be approximately ½ square foot smaller than the existing. The brightness will automatically dim down depending on the surrounding ambient light. The daytime brightness is brighter than nighttime. This sign will be a little less bright than the existing. He stated that the Federal Highway Administration has done a study that shows the Changeable LED sign is safe for traveling public if the sign changes no quicker than every 8 seconds. This sign will change once per hour.

**Mr. Petrongolo** reviewed his report dated 6-25-2021. He asked if the sign will have motion or only text and if Mr. Clowar is willing to reduce the lighting if requested by the township.

**Mr. Clowar** responded that the sign has the capability of motion but will be text only and he will reduce the lighting if requested.

**Mrs. Andersen** asked why LED signs are viewed differently.

**Mr. Petrongolo** replied that our ordinance does not permit it. The concern is to avoid a Las Vegas type situation with excessive lights along the roadways. The LED signs are much like a television with the capability of video and graphics.

**Mr. Kramer** asked what type of information will be on the sign.

**Mr. Clowar** responded it would be for messaging such as the daily special or "line dancing tonight" for people traveling east on Route 38. He stated his main concern is for his employees having to go out there and change the letters.

**Mr. Sharp** asked what colors the sign will be.

**Mr. Clowar** responded that the coloring will change day to day.

**Mr. Mantzas** summarized the application stating that the project would clean up an existing condition and the sign will be far better situation for the business. He stated that the applicant will cooperate with the township if any problems arise.

**Mr. Campbell** state the conditions of approval as the following:

- 1.) Text will change no more than once per hour
- 2.) The applicant will work with the township regarding lighting if necessary
- 3.) No motion or video, text only
- 4.) Sign will be off between approximately 2:00am and 8:00am and on between 8:00am and no later than 2:00am.

**Chairman Francescone** asked for a motion to approve the variance for application ZB21-D-13 with the enumerated conditions. Mr. Gray moved the motion, Mrs. Andersen seconded. All present voted affirmatively. Motion carried, approved.

3. **150 Mount Laurel Medical**, ZB21-C-18, 150 Century Parkway, Block 1311 Lot 1.06, I- zone. This applicant is seeking a bulk sign variance from section 154-92.7(f) to allow a fourth façade sign where three façade signs are allowed.

**Witnesses Sworn:**

David Cohen, President of Needleman Management Co.; Tiffany Morrissey, Professional Planner and Kirk Ryan, Sign Pro's

**Exhibits Entered**

A-1 Site plan; A-2, 2 existing signs; A-3 existing Dermatology sign and A-4 Sign plan for proposed Global Neurosciences Institute sign.

**Ronda Feld Esq.** represented the applicant and summarized the application as a variance to allow a fourth façade sign where three are allowed and to allow three lines where two lines are allowed.

**Mr. Cohen's Testimony**

Mr. Cohen presented exhibits A-1, A-2, A-3 and A-4. He testified to the location and orientation of the building. Mr. Cohen stated that the building is fully occupied and the current signs have been there since 2001 or 2002. The façade has been updated to make the building more modern. Mr. Cohen further testified to the sizes of the existing signs. He showed, using A-3 and A-4, the proposed location of the Global Neurosciences sign as being to the left of the LabCorp sign. Mr. Cohen explained that the sign reflects the tenants branding with the color and logo. He testified that the Global Neurosciences Institute is a medical practice catering to patients with cognitive impairments. He believes if patients come to the building for the new tenant they will be confused if there is no sign. The total square footage of the sign is 27.5.

**Mrs. Morrissey's Testimony**

Mrs. Morrissey described the size of the existing signs. She stated that the total square footage of all the signs, including the proposed, is 68.65 square feet. Mrs. Morrissey believes the sign promotes purpose (a) and purpose (h) of the positive criteria in the Municipal Land Use Law. She noted that the signs do not face Fellowship Road, they face the internal driveway and are for directional purposes so visitors of the building find the entrances for each of the four tenants safely. She testified that currently patients for Global Neuroscience are going into the wrong offices asking where their doctors office is. Mrs. Morrissey believes the sign makes sense on the property because each sign is less than allowed in each area and the total signage is less than allowed in the entire area. Her professional opinion is that there is no substantial impairment of our zoning ordinance or zone plan. She believes that this would provide appropriate identification of the businesses without cluttering up the area. Additionally, the signage does not impact any nearby properties, it is internal to the site and provides a benefit and no negative impact to the public good. Therefore, she believes the benefits substantially outweigh the detriments.

**Mr. Petrongolo** reviewed his report dated 7/20/2021. He stated that he does not disagree with Mrs. Morrissey's position although he disagrees with her statement that the allowable 50 square feet is for each individual sign. He stated that the allowable 50 square footage is for the total allowable signage. Mr. Petrongolo said he believes there are some benefits to having the proposed sign.

**Chairman Francescone** opened the public portion for questions or comments. Seeing none closed the public portion.

**Ms. Feld** closed by saying that she believes the sign is tasteful, aesthetically attractive, up to date and it will balance out the look of the façade facing Century Parkway.

**Mr. Grey** asked if the proposed sign is illuminated.

**Mr. Cohen** responded that it is not.

**Chairman Francescone** asked if each of the 4 tenants have separate entrances.

**Mr. Cohen** responded that they do have separate entrances.

**Chairman Francescone** asked for a motion to approve the variance for application ZB21-D-18. Mr. Gray moved the motion, Mrs. Liciaga seconded. All present voted affirmatively. Motion carried, approved.

3. **Security Vault Works**, ZB21-D-04, 4011-4351 Dearborn Circle, Block 512 Lot 1.06, Ind. zone. This applicant is seeking Minor Site Plan approval and Use variance from section 154-56.A to allow a standalone drive-through ATM along with various associated bulk variances including sign variances.

**Witnesses Sworn:**

Ahmad Tamous, P.E.; Tiffany Morrissey CuvIELLO, PP, AICP; Mike Robertson, Security Vault Works, Inc.; Ryan Carnall, Metro Commercial; Jeremy Byrne, Barings; Jim Gabrieli, Jones Lang LaSalle

**Exhibits Entered:**

A-1, Curriculum Vitae for Ahmad Tamous, PE; A2, Curriculum Vitae for Tiffany Morrissey CuvIELLO; A-3, Aerial Photograph of Property depicting the proposed location; A-4, Site Plan date 6/28/2021; A-5 Existing site conditions; A-6 Existing Shopping Center Conditions Photographs; A-7 Photographs of other ATM's Constructed by Security Vault Works, Inc.; A-8 Queuing Study; A-9 Aerial photograph and A-10, color site plan highlighting landscaping 1 page.

**Matthew McHugh Esq.** Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg LLP. represented the applicant and summarized the application as an application for Site Plan approval, Use and Bulk variances to allow a chase bank free standing drive through ATM.

**Mr. Tamous's Testimony**

Mr. Tamous shared Exhibits A-9 and A-10. He explained the proposed location of the ATM being on the South side of the parking lot. He described the Site Plan labeled A-10 including the lighting detail, drive isle detail and landscape detail. Mr. Tamous testified that as a result of meetings with the Township professionals, modifications were made to the curbing and landscaping including the concrete island shown on A-10. He further testified that a parking variance was granted for the site in 2004, R-2005-27, allowing a reduction of parking resulting in 265 parking spaces. The ordinance has since been revised and Mr. Tamous believes the location now requires 201 parking spaces based on the uses currently in the shopping center. The applicant is proposing 257 spaces. Mr. Tamous testified that all ATM's in NJ are required to provide a higher level lighting. The required minimum foot-candles of a stand-alone ATM is two foot-candles within 50 feet. To meet those standards, you will see a much higher intensity than you are accustomed to seeing in a parking lot. As a result, there are "hot spots" under the light itself and they will dissipate as you move away.

Mr. Tamous testified that there will be no trash enclosure or receptacle.

He further testified that a queuing study was done for this Chase ATM and similar ATM's in the area. Based on this study the anticipated transaction time is 80 seconds. The plan allows for one car to be at the ATM with one car behind. He testified that in his professional opinion this is sufficient queuing.

**Mr. McHugh** asked Mr. Tamous to identify Exhibits A-1 through A-8 and he did identify them as described above.

**Mrs. Morrissey's Testimony**

Mrs. Morrissey described the application as being for an accessory use in a front yard and an accessory use without a principle use. Mrs. Morrissey state that she is not disagreeing with the interpretation of the ATM as an accessory use but will provide background of other location to show why it is a principle use in relation to the master plan and the Medici standard and to show why this is a unique for the proposed property.

Mrs. Morrissey testified that the Mt. Laurel ordinance calls for a front yard setback of 50' and the proposed plan is for an 83' setback. She believes the proposed projects advance purpose (a) of the Municipal Land Use Law because the site and the use work well together due to the unique features of the use and the site, purpose (g) and purpose (h). Mrs. Morrissey compared the project to the old school photo booth developing locations as they were stand alone and not associated with the shopping centers. She further testified that the stand alone ATM's have been approved as a permitted principle use in various locations such as Medford, Brooklawn, Woodbury Heights and Galloway Township. She stated that this is a principal use because of the changing way we bank as society. She no longer goes to the bank rather she banks on her phone or if she needs cash she goes to the ATM. This is an important way of supporting the shopping center. The ATM being within the shopping center, removed from the building but accessible through the parking area, provides an opportunity to complement the existing users in the shopping center and cuts down on the necessity of extra trips on the road to go to the bank before shopping. She noted that the ordinance does allow banks with drive in facilities in the zone and this use is a different kind of drive in as it is not manned but completely automated. She believes because of the stated circumstances, this location is particularly suited for this use and may attract people to use the retail stores that would not have otherwise. She noted that the parking lot is very large and while the applicant would remove eight parking spaces the ATM is removed from the main parking area and would not impact parking or circulation on the property. She testified that even with the removal of the parking spaces the parking is compliant with the current ordinance. The applicant agrees to screen the area as requested.

Mrs. Morrissey further testified that in her opinion the site and use are particularly suited to one another and would therefore promote the general welfare. She also believes the proposal provides sufficient space and appropriate location for the use to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens. Additionally, she believes the use and location encourage the design and transportation routes which will promote the free flow of traffic.

In terms of negative criteria Mrs. Morrissey noted that while the structure is technically in the front yard it is not within the required 50' setback but rather it is setback 83'. The applicant is proposing three façade signs where 1 is allowed however, they are very small signs equaling 10.16 square feet where a total of 24 square feet is permitted and visible only in the shopping center when the motorist is approaching. The small sign above the card insert is to assure the customer they are at a Chase ATM and the column sign is necessary to orient the customer to the entrance of the ATM the third is roof mounted logo.

Referencing Mt. Laurel Ordinance 154-78, Mrs. Morrissey believes the application satisfies the conditions and standards listed. She noted the goals and objectives in the 2017 Master Plan re-exam that she believes are met with this application.

Mrs. Morrissey stated that for the reasons above she believes the benefits of the application substantially outweigh any potential detriments or impairments to the zone plan or master plans or to the public good.

### **Mr. Gabrieli's Testimony**

Mr. Gabrieli testified that this area is part of a new market development business plan noting there is a new branch about five miles up the road another in Marlton and another in Cinnaminson. The goal is to provide the convenience of numerous access point for customers and to get into the shopping centers to attract new business to the bank and shopping center. He stated that the ATM will provide a full service banking experience except that you cannot open an account. When asked by Mr.

McHugh to explain why a trash receptacle is not required for this ATM, Mr. Gabrieli stated that there is personal information on an ATM receipt ie. The last four digits of a social security number and when you make a transaction you have the option of having the transaction record emailed to you. He stated that there is a service that will maintain the facility on a bi-weekly basis. His experience is that the trash located at the ATM is not from the ATM because people don't want to dispose of their receipt and leave that information behind. Mr. Gabrieli describes the signage proposed as being consistent with Chase branding.

### **Mr. Carnall's Testimony**

Mr. Carnall is with Metro Commercial Management Services and they are the management company for the whole property. He stated that the benefits of the ATM are numerous. He stated that the ATM will allow the customers to get cash to pay the tenants who can then offer a discount or something similar. He believes this would provide a benefit to the tenants and incentivize customers to visit the shopping center. He said he has spoken to most of the tenants and they are all in favor of the ATM. He testified that the proposed ATM is part of a marketing approach to include the expansion of RCBC and the residential development along Marne Highway. He does not believe there will be any detrimental impact on the site. He further stated that in addition to the applicants bi-weekly site service, Metro Management has the site swept three days a week.

**Mr. Petrongolo** reviewed his report dated 7/20/2021. Mr. Petrongolo reviewed for the board, the requirements for granting a use variance. He questioned whether or not the site is suited to the use noting that there are branches not far from this site, as testified to by the applicant, that have the ATM service. He stated that the allowance of other towns is irrelevant, that we have to evaluate by our ordinance and our town where it is not permitted. Mr. Petrongolo believes that there is an impact on our zone plan and ordinance in that we specifically do not permit this use when not associated with a bank and then putting it in a front yard addresses the impact on the zone plan, zone ordinance and site suitability. Mr. Petrongolo disagrees that this use addresses purpose (g) and (h). Purpose (g), to provide sufficient space for a variety of agricultural, residential, recreation, commercial, industrial uses and open spaces both public and private. He stated that our ordinance does that, we have specific and appropriate zones for specific and appropriate uses and he does not know what is unique about this site to allow this use. Purpose (h), to encourage location, design and transportation routes which promote free flow of traffic etc., again Mr. Petrongolo believes our zoning ordinance and zone plan does that. He reminded the board that the applicant has the right to go to council and ask if council would like to amend the ordinance to allow the ATM as a permitted use. Mr. Petrongolo reminded the board that per Ordinance 154-78.A, the board needs to assure itself that the proposed change is consistent with the spirit, purpose and intent of the zoning ordinance. He stated that he believes there are other locations associated with branches that the ATM can go.

Regarding the Site Plan Mr. Petrongolo agrees that a parking variance is not required. In reference to site suitability he notes lighting and landscaping. State law requires 10 foot-candles at the ATM and the applicant is proposing an average of 23 foot-candles and at the ATM they are proposing 40 foot-candles, four times the required. This will create a very bright hot spot of light off of the highway and in the middle of the center which makes it stand out and excessive. He believes the lighting can be dropped by four times and still meet the state standards. He has asked for additional landscaping and striped areas to be curbed, the applicant has agreed to the curbing. He believes adding landscaping and reducing the lighting goes to mitigate the impact of the variance. Mr. Petrongolo stated that our

ordinance specifically prohibits roof signs and the applicant is asking for a prohibited roof sign on a prohibited use, this again goes to site suitability, he stated he cannot support a variance for prohibited signs however, he would not object to the other two signs.

Mr. Petrongolo asked the applicant if there will be a construction trailer or any kind of lay down area.

**Mr. Tamous** replied there will not be. The unit is refabricated unit that will be shipped from a nearby facility. Once the curb and island are constructed the unit will be placed there.

**Mr. Tamous** replied to Mr. Petrongolo's testimony. He shared the lighting plan as submitted as part of A-4. He explained that the State requires the 10 foot-candles at the ATM as Mr. Petrongolo stated but they also require 2 foot-candles around the 60' radius. With the proposed 20 and 40 foot-candle lights at the ATM, the applicant is barely meeting the 60' requirement.

**Mr. Petrongolo** responded that that problem could be remedied by adding another light pole and reducing the intensity. He questioned the impact of the lighting currently in the parking lot and does that not assist with the minimums.

**Mr. Tamous** responded that the existing lighting will help with the interior parking lot lighting but not by the highway. He agreed that they could add light poles but said they would interfere with the existing light poles in other areas.

**Mr. Petrongolo** stated if Mr. Tamous added a light pole to each of the proposed islands he could significantly reduce the intensity of the light by dropping the 40 foot-candles to 15. Mr. Petrongolo state again that this goes to the suitability of the use.

**Mr. Tamous** agreed to take another look at the lighting. He will work with the Planners office to address concern regarding the lighting.

**Mr. Petrongolo** asked if the applicant will also work with the Planners office regarding landscaping.

**Mr. Tamous** responded that the front of the site along Rt. 38 has a high berm and is heavily landscaped. He will defer to Jim Gabrieli regarding landscaping in the island.

**Mr. Petrongolo** said the purpose of trees in the island is that they are a safety feature as well as an aesthetic feature and he believes they need to be there. Mr. Petrongolo further stated that a major issue is the signage.

**Mr. Gabrieli** told Mr. Tamous to remove the rooftop sign, Mr. Tamous agreed. Mr. Gabrieli agreed to one six foot high tree on either side of the green space in addition to the landscaping proposed but he cannot agree to exceed six feet although the trees will grow over time. He also noted for the board that the two closest branches, Mt. Laurel and Marlton, do not have a drive up ATM.

**Mr. Petrongolo** said that our ordinance requires a 2 ½ foot caliper tree. A six foot shade tree is a wimp and would not be appropriate in the location.

**Mr. Gabrieli** responded that the client would view that as a security problem.

**Mr. Petrongolo** responded that a six foot tree would be ornamental and would be branched to the ground and would screen more than a shade tree would. A shade tree would provide more visibility because the branches are elevated.

**Mr. Gabrieli** said upon approval he can ask his client (Chase) for an exception to allow a 2 ½ inch caliper tree.

**Mr. Petrongolo** stated that this goes to site suitability. If the board were to grant the use variance with the condition that the trees be provided that would be a strong tool to convince the client that they are needed.

**Chairman Francescone** asked Mr. Petrongolo to explain the trees or shrubs currently proposed.

**Mr. Petrongolo** responded that the shrubs shown on the plan are two to three foot shrubs along Rt. 38. He is fine with that and is asking for additional shade trees in the island. Our ordinance requires shade trees in parking lots, additionally, the trees delineate the island and makes it safer for traffic.

**Mr. McHugh** stated that at this time he does not have authority from Chase to authorize the additional trees but they are committed to working with the staff to address suitable landscaping in the island.

**Mr. Gabrieli** stated that he has now heard from the client and can agree to provide two 2½" caliper trees on the island. He confirmed that a 2½" caliper tree will be 12 -14 feet tall when planted.

**Mr. Tamous** stated that those shade trees will also help with the intensity of the light.

**Chairman Francescone** called for a short break. The meeting reconvened at 10:00pm.

**Mr. Magill** reviewed Mike Angelastro's traffic and engineering report dated July 22, 2021. Mr. Magill said the applicant has responded to most of the questions and concerns in the report. He agreed that the queuing study shows that the stacking and queuing would be contained in the storage the applicant is providing and that 99½% of the time it would not exceed the allowable space. He agrees that traffic is not an issue at the site. He stated that the lighting, as proposed, could create some glare and reducing the lighting would help with that.

**Mr. Kramer** questioned the stand alone ATM's susceptibility to scamming and tampering and has the secluded location been taken into consideration in terms of security. He also asked what is preventing a pedestrian from walking up to the ATM.

**Mr. Gabrieli** responded that there is a 24 hour 7 day a week camera overhead, monitored by Chase as well as a 24 hour 7 day a week transaction camera. These would deter vandalism and theft. There is nothing preventing a pedestrian from walking up to the ATM. Through an earlier study, Chase has determined that Mount Laurel is not a security risk and a gate is not required. Upon approval Mr. Gabrieli can provide data regarding scams and card readers.

**Mr. Grey** stated that the Chase Bank recently built a few miles up the road was built without a drive up ATM and questioned why they didn't put one there.

**Mr. Gabrieli** replied this is part of Chase's marketing plan to make it convenient for customers. He further stated that the new Chase bank is not easily accessed.

**Mr. Kramer** asked couldn't the applicant remove a drive up teller and install an ATM at the Chase location on Rt. 38 and Larchmont.

**Chairman Francescone** asked if the applicant would like to address any of the professional's comments or board questions. He stated that it is the intention to end this meeting in 2 minutes due to the 1½ hour time limit and time of night.

**Mr. McHugh** responded that he would rather regroup with his team and provide rebuttal at the next board meeting.

**Mr. Petrongolo** stated that the applicant may want to confer with his office before the next meeting and that they had several meetings regarding this application before this meeting.

**Chairman Francescone** asked for a motion to adjourn the hearing for Security Vault Works, ZB21-D-04 until September 1, 2021. Mr. Grey moved the motion Mr. List seconded. All members voted affirmatively, the motion was carried.

**Mr. Petrongolo** stated if any revised plans are submitted before the next meeting they would need to be submitted a minimum of 10 days before the meeting.

Discussion took place regarding returning to live meetings. It was decided by board consensus that meetings would continue electronically through October 2021, the board would readdress the issue then.

**Adjournment:**

Chairman Francescone asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Grey moved the motion. All present voted affirmatively. Meeting adjourned 10:17 P.M.

Adopted on: September 1, 2021

---

Suzanna O'Hagan, Secretary  
Zoning Board of Adjustment