

MANOS LAW FIRM, LLC

2408 New Road, Suite 2
Northfield, New Jersey 08225
T: (609) 335-1873
F: (609) 257-6075

Elias T. Manos, Esq.

leo@manoslawfirm.com

- Member of NJ & PA Bars

March 19, 2025

Via Hand Delivery

Robin Atlas, Board Secretary
City of Northfield Planning Board
1600 Shore Road
Northfield, NJ 08225

**RE: Application of Jackpot Properties LLC
Block 16.01, Lot 60
250 Tilton Road
Northfield, NJ
Site Plan Waiver and Elimination of Prior Condition of Approval**

Dear Ms. Atlas:

This firm represents Jackpot Properties LLC ("Applicant") in connection with the above referenced application to the City of Northfield Planning Board seeking a site plan waiver to construct an accessory pergola structure to the existing furniture store building on the above referenced property. Supplementing our application on file, enclosed please find three (3) copies of a Resolution and Findings of Facts and Decision adopted by the Board on September 4, 2014 (the "Resolution") that granted "c" variances pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c to the Applicant for signage for the operation of a furniture store on property. The Applicant is hereby amending its application to also seek elimination of the condition of the Resolution stating that the Applicant was required to return to the Board for site plan approval within six (6) months. The building on the property has existed for many years and the site is underdeveloped and functions property. The plans submitted are also rather detailed and thus the Applicant submits that formal site plan approval should not be required given the minimal changes to the site over the years.

I understand that you will provide this supplement to the application to the Planning Board Members. Further, a pdf version of the above is being provided.

I will of course provide the required public notice and publication for the hearing date on April 3, 2025 at 7:00 p.m.

MANOS LAW FIRM, LLC

March 19, 2025

Page 2

Thank you very much for your kind attention to this matter. In the event you have any questions, comments or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

MANOS LAW FIRM, LLC

By: 

ELIAS T. MANOS

leo@manoslawfirm.com

Encl.

Cc. Client (via email) (w/encl.)
Arthur Ponzio, PP (via email) (w/encl.)
Peter C. Weiss, RA (via email) (w/encl.)

C:\Users\EManos\Documents\Client Directory\Schwartz, David\Atlas, Robin filing Application supplemental.doc

**PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF NORTHFIELD
COMBINED RESOLUTION OF MEMORIALIZATION
AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION**

APPLICANT: **JACKPOT PROPERTIES, LLC**
APPLICATION: "C" Variance relief in order to upgrade signage at property
BLOCK AND LOT: Block 16.01, Lot 60
PREMISES: 250-254 Tilton Road
HEARING DATE: July 10, 2014
ACTION TAKEN: **GRANTED**

BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the City of Northfield that the annexed written decision and findings and conclusions resulting from this Board's action at its regular meeting with respect to the above-captioned matter be and are hereby adopted as Official.

AND BE IT FURTHER resolved that the Planning Board hereunto been adopted by a vote of a majority of the members of this Board who voted for such action previously taken and that no other members voted hereon.

THE FOREGOING is a true copy of a Resolution of Memorialization adopted by the Planning Board of the City of Northfield at its regular meeting of September 4, 2014.



ROBIN ATLAS
Planning Board Secretary

RESOLUTION AND FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECISION

APPLICANT: **JACKPOT PROPERTIES, LLC**
APPLICATION: "C" Variance relief in order to upgrade signage at property
BLOCK AND LOT: Block 16.01, Lot 60
PREMISES: 250-254 Tilton Road
HEARING DATE: July 10, 2014
ACTION TAKEN: **GRANTED**

THIS BOARD, carefully considered the evidence presented by the Applicant through the legal argument of Brian Callaghan, Esquire of the law firm of Callaghan, Thompson & Thompson of Atlantic City, as well as the sworn testimony of Craig Dothe, registered New Jersey Architect and registered Professional Planner, as well as Christine Schwartz, a principal of the Applicant. The Applicant was seeking "C" variance relief pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2) in order to upgrade signage at the subject property.

The bulk of the testimony was presented by Craig Dothe and the following exhibits were marked as follows: A-1: Front Elevation; A-2: Floor Plan of the building; A-3: The Site Plan; A-4: Existing and Proposed Frontage of the property. Mr. Dothe's testimony indicated that the property had been three individual stores. The Applicant had purchased the building and intends to sell high end furniture from it. Mr. Dothe went into detail describing a proposed interior, referring to Exhibit A-2. He also went into great detail in his testimony referring to Exhibit A-4 describing the signage that is currently on the property. There are four signs on the roof of the building. All four signs aggregate 213 sq. ft. and are non-conforming. Further, referring to Exhibit A-4, he showed how a proposed wall sign conforms to the Zoning Ordinance and will be located above the mansard. The signage aggregates 205 sq. ft. The sign project was designed to eliminate non-conformities. The Applicant in essence was proposing to remove the existing roof

mounted and facade signs and to install a new roof sign of 198.75 sq. ft. and a facade sign of 44.48 sq. ft. This was a total of 243.23 sq. ft. significantly in excess of that which is allowed. The Application, therefore, involved the following variances: First, with regard to the roof signs, a variance was needed as signs are not permitted to be constructed above the roof line. Secondly, only 50 ft of the facade signage is allowed while 243.23 sq. ft. was proposed, of which, 198.84 sq. ft. would be above the roof line and 44.48 sq. ft. would be wall mounted as described in Exhibit A-4.

Mr. Dothe dealt with the existing free standing sign. It is not internally lit and there is no intention to modify or change it in any way. The Applicant understands that to do so they would have to present an Application to this Board for a variance.

With regard to the variance relief, Mr. Dothe stressed how the existing property will be upgraded by the Applicant both esthetically and physically. Such upgrade advances purposes of zoning, namely creating a pleasing and appropriate visual environment, as well as the proper utilization of real property within the State of New Jersey. This being in a RC Zone, he could see no detriment flowing to any adjoining property or to the Zone Plan and Zoning Ordinance of the City of Northfield.

Further discussion indicated that there would be no moving or blinking signs on the property and that the sign to the right of the property would be probably a carved sign with no illumination. There would be no banners or temporary signs.

John Scott Abbott, Esquire, a member of the public, spoke in favor of the Application indicating that he represented 332 Tilton Road, LLC, a contiguous neighbor. All of the concerns that had been raised privately by that entity had been addressed and indicated that he supports a

six month time frame for the Applicant to come back to seek site plan approval.

Adio Santori of 104 S. Iroquois Avenue, Margate, New Jersey had an inquiry about a site plan issue which was answered to his satisfaction.

It was specifically determined that whatever relief was granted herein would be contingent upon the Applicant coming back for site plan approval to this Board within six months of the date of the hearing. Nevertheless, the Applicant would be entitled and able to obtain a Certificate of Occupancy in the interim so that the Applicant could open the business as quickly as possible.

After hearing all of the testimony and the input of the public, the Board determined that the Applicant had satisfied its burden of proof and therefore voted unanimously to grant variances associated with the signs pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the City of Northfield that the Application by Applicant be approved strictly subject to the following conditions:

(1) The recommendations contained in the Planning Board Engineer's letter regarding this Application are incorporated herein by reference as if set forth at length and shall be additional conditions of approval except to the extent inconsistent herewith.

(2) All findings and conclusions herein above set forth are incorporated herein by reference as conditions of approval as if specifically set forth at length.

(3) The terms and conditions contained herein shall be binding upon all successors, assignees, personal representatives, heirs, and all and every other person or entity taking possession or title of the premises in question.

(4) Review and approval of all other agencies exercising jurisdiction in this matter, by either affirmative action by any such agency, or by the required passage of time in lieu thereof.

(5) Additional conditions of approval contained in the foregoing findings are incorporated herein.

(6) All of the representations and statements made by the Applicant as well as the Applicant's representatives and witnesses shall be considered and deemed to be relied upon by this Board in rendering this decision and to be an express condition of this Board's action in approving the subject Application. This Planning Board resolution of approval shall be strictly applied and shall only grant approval for Applicant's written proposal.