



TOWNSHIP OF GALLOWAY  
**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT**  
PLANNING BOARD      ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

**Heather Butler**  
PLANNING / ZONING BOARD  
ADMINISTRATOR

---

300 E. JIMMIE LEEDS ROAD, GALLOWAY, NJ 08205  
(609) 652-3700 EXT. 218    FAX: (609) 652-5259

**MINUTES**  
**ZONING BOARD**  
**NOVEMBER 13, 2014**

The Meeting was called to order at 6:43 by Chairman Sykes.

**Present** Chris Coleman, Anthony DiPietro, Mike Greb, Jerry Hauslet, Ronald Huber,  
Mark Sykes

**Absent** Richard Clute, Robert Mayer, Paul McColgan,

**Approval of Decision & Resolutions:**

#10-2014	Archana Dasondi	(Adopted)
#12-2014	Gerald Bird Development, LLC.	(Adopted)
#13-2014	Richard Long	(Adopted)
#14-2014	Lauren Carney	(Adopted)

**Approval of Minutes:**    September 11, 2014      (Approved)

**Approval of Bill List:**      November 13, 2014      (Approved)

**The following professionals were sworn in**

Chuck Endicott and Tiffany CuvIELlo

**New Appeals:**

**#16-14 Subcarrier Communications, Inc. & New Cingular**

210 Penns Wood Road

B. 951.01 L. 1.03

Zoning District: NR

VariANCES Requested: Minor Site Plan with Use Variance

Proposed: The applicant is requesting a use variance and minor site plan approval to demolish and reconstruct/relocate a telecommunications tower located on Penns Wood Road. The current proposal is to demolish the existing 150-foot high tower and reconstruct a new 165-foot high tower on the same site in a new location.

Exhibit List

A-1 Existing Coverage

A-2 Existing & Proposed Coverage

A-3 Plan Sheet Z-2

A-4 Plan Sheet Z-3

A-5 Plan Sheet Z-4

A-6 Photo Simulations

A-7 Area Map with Setbacks

Mr. Brock Riffel, Mr. Pete Tsoukalas, Mr. Daniel Bloch were all sworn in.

The applicant is represented by Richard DeLucry, Esq. of Cooper Levenson, P.A.

Mr. DeLucry described to the board the existing conditions of the property and what they are proposing.

There was a motion from the board to deem the application complete made by Hauslet and seconded by Huber. All members of the board voted in favor.

Mr. Brock Riffel, P.E., Radio Frequency Engineer was accepted as an expert. He addresses the need for the new tower and explained how the new tower would benefit the area and provide improved 3G and 4G service. The current tower is structurally inept to support the needed upgrades.

Mr. "Pete" Tsoukalas, P.E., Maser Consulting P.A. the project engineer was accepted as an expert. He explained the site plan of the current property and the proposed new tower. It would be cheaper and safer to demolish the existing tower and construct a new one.

Mr. Daniel Bloch, P.P., Maser Consulting P.A was accepted as an expert. He gave testimony as to the distances from the proposed tower to different locations. The D(1) variance is being requested due to the fact that new telecommunication towers are not a permitted use in this zone. Mr. Bloch stated the only potential detriment would be the visual impact, but the tower cannot be viewed from many locations. The proposed tower would be surrounded by existing trees. The site has been used for a TV tower since 1983. It is required for towers to be setback 100% the height of the tower as well as establishing a fall zone equal to the same distance as the setback. Towers shall be setback 1.5 times the height of the structure from a public right-of-way. There is no residential property adjoining this property.

Chuck Endicott read from his report dated November 5, 2014. It was confirmed that the tower will be galvanized; anything remaining from the old tower will be removed from the property and there will be a maintenance vehicle once every 4 to 6 weeks per carrier and will not cause traffic issues.

Tiffany Cuviallo read from her report dated November 4, 2014.

**Board questions:**

Mr. Hauslet asked if the tower would be climbable.

*It is, but the existing tower has been there for many years without incident.*

Mr. DiPietro asked if the existing guide wires would be gone.

*Yes. They will be gone.*

Mr. Greb asked why the existing carriers are not electing to go higher?

*Mr. Riffel stated he could not speak for the other carriers.*

What is the likelihood that the property to the South would be developed?

*Tiffany stated that according to the current zoning it would most likely be commercial.*

Mr. Coleman asked if running cable overground is common.

*Yes. It's the most common practice.*

**No public questions or comments.**

**Finding and Fact:**

Mr. Coleman thinks the applicant provided ample information.

Mr. Dipietro stated he had no questions.

Mr. Hauslet stated that the positive outweighs the negative and is satisfied with the security around it and that it's a good project.

Mr. Greb stated the remote location and limited view from the area really makes the negative impact very minimal and the positive defiantly outweighs the negative.

Mr. Huber stated that the applicants have presented the positive criteria outweighs any negative there is.

Mr. Sykes agrees with the other board member and feels the benefits outweigh the negative.

A motion to approve application #16-14 Subcarrier Communications granting a use variance for construction of a cell tower was made by Coleman and seconded by Dipietro.

Those in favor: Coleman, Dipietro, Hauslet, Huber, Greb, and Sykes.

A motion to approve application #16-14 Subcarrier Communications granting minor site plan approval with (5) variances. As follows:

1. Tower height from the property line - 165 feet are required where 103 are provided.
2. The fall zone - 165 feet are required where 103 feet are provided.
3. The set back from Penns Wood Road – 247 feet is required and 213 feet is provided.
4. Tower Construction– Monopole construction is required where lattice construction is provided.
5. Landscaping – Evergreen Landscaping required where no landscaping is provided.

Was made by Huber and seconded by Coleman.

Those in favor: Coleman, Dipietro, Hauslet, Huber, Greb, and Sykes

Meeting adjourned at 7:46 p.m.

Submitted by Heather Butler, Administrator