

**MONTGOMERY TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MONTGOMERY TOWNSHIP, SOMERSET COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
REGULAR MEETING
MARCH 21, 2016**

MINUTES

Vice Chairman Matthews called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and read the opening statement that adequate notice of the meeting had been posted and sent to the officially designated newspapers.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Cheskis (arrived 7:37 p.m.); Vice Chairman Matthews; Ms. Davis; Mr. DeRochi; Mayor Graham; Mr. Mani

ALSO PRESENT: Francis P. Linnus, Board Attorney; Michael Sullivan, Board Planner; Lori Savron, Planning Director

I. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation.

III. RESOLUTION

Case PB-16-15 Applicant: Country Club Meadows, LLC
Block 5023 Lots 2 & 3 and Block 5016 Lots 1 & 3
Submission Waivers Associated with a Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision and Site Plan

Mr. Linnus noted that subsequent to the hearing the applicant withdrew the application for final approval, therefore, the submission waivers for final are rendered moot. What is before the Board is regarding the applicant's request for submission waivers on preliminary only.

A motion to memorialize the resolution was made by Mr. DeRochi and seconded by Mr. Mani. This carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Davis, DeRochi, Graham, Mani and Matthews
Nays: None

IV. APPLICATION CONTINUATION

Case PB-14-15 Applicant: Steven and Margaret Davis
Block 15001 Lot 49
Submission Waiver and Minor Subdivision with Variances
Expiration Date – 120 Days from Completeness
Affidavit of Notification and Publication Required

Case PB-15-15 Applicant: Gurdon and Heather Hornor
Block 7013 Lot 22
Submission Waiver and Minor Subdivision with Variances
Expiration Date – 120 Days from Completeness
Affidavit of Notification and Publication Required

Mr. Linnus explained that the applicant's submitted notice and they were in proper order. The notice was published but a couple notices to the neighbors were missed. The applications are now scheduled for the April 4, 2016 Planning Board meeting. No new notice will be provided other than the required notice to the neighbors who were not originally noticed.

V. APPLICATION

Case PB-11-15 Applicant: Village Shopper III, LLC
Block 28005 Lot 65
Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Variances
Expiration Date – 7/2/16
Affidavit of Notification and Publication Required

Richard Schatzman, Esquire, Brett Pugliese and Robert Korkuch, PE represented the applicant. Notice was in order.

Mr. Schatzman explained the application is for approval for the addition of two signs; a second monument sign and a directory sign.

Robert Korkuch, 1 Washington Boulevard, was sworn in. Brett Pugliese, 219 Nassau Street, was sworn in.

Mr. Pugliese explained the proposed signs. The monument sign will be 22 square feet and will display up to six second floor office tenants. It will not be internally illuminated but will have landscape lighting at ground level. The sign will be landscaped with low shrubbery. Mr. Bartolone has reviewed the landscape plan and finds it satisfactory. The sign is needed to give the second floor offices representation on the road. The monument sign is located within 2.5' of the side property line of Village Shopper II to allow for clear visibility to the driving public. Village Shopper III is currently under contract to purchase Village Shopper I and II so the infringement is on property the applicant will eventually own.

Mr. Korkuch gave the Board his qualifications and was accepted as an expert.

Mr. Schatzman testified that there will be separate ownerships of Village Shopper I and II and the property will not be merged with Village Shopper III so the variance is necessary.

Mr. Korkuch referenced the site plan and described the monument sign location. The directory sign is located directly against the property line at the main entrance into the center. A variance for the size of the sign is needed to allow enough room to advertise the location of all the tenants. Both the monument sign and directory sign are located where they are for safety reasons. This situation is unique because you have to go through Village Shopper II to get to Village Shopper III. The applicant will exercise due care to protect the existing infrastructure. Foundation details will be provided at the time of building permit. The survey monument that is within close proximity to the proposed monument sign will be protected and if damage will be replaced at the applicant's expense.

Mr. Pugliese said the electric for the lighting of the proposed monument sign will be tied into the existing monument sign and will be on the same clock. They turn on around sundown and go off one hour after the closing of the latest business which is usually around 11:00 p.m. or 12:00 a.m. No more than 25% of the sign area will be logos and/or pictures.

Mr. DeRochi asked if the existing monument sign is maxed out in terms of the allowable square foot of signage. Mr. Schatzman confirmed it is.

Board members asked if the print on the existing sign could be made smaller. Mr. Pugliese testified that if up to 6 more tenants were added it would decrease the readability of the tenants, especially to passing cars. Mr. Sullivan agreed there needs to be a minimum letter size to safely read the sign.

Mr. DeRochi asked if this could be made a temporary sign until a comprehensive sign package can be designed for the whole center.

Vincent Pugliese, 16 Carriage Trail, was sworn in. The building is mixed use with commercial and retail. The need and demand for the commercial tenant signage came after the project was approved which is why a sign was not proposed at the time of approval. The sign for Village II would not be located in the vicinity of this new sign; it will be located on the other side of the driveway/loop road. He is concerned about making it a temporary sign since he doesn't know at this time what will happen at Village Shopper I and II.

Mr. Linnus said if the ownership of Village Shopper II is not the same as Village Shopper III, then the placement of a sign on Village Shopper II to serve Village Shopper III would be considered a billboard which is not permitted. Mr. Schatzman replied there could be an easement. Mr. Linnus was not satisfied that even if it is in an easement it would not be considered a billboard and reserved judgement on the issue. Theoretically the lot line between the two properties could be adjusted.

The Board expressed concerns over the amount of signage that could be requested when Village Shopper I and II are developed.

In response to Mr. Linnus, Mr. Schatzman gave the status of the right-of-way acquisition from the Township.

Chairman Cheskis opened the meeting to the public. There being no public comment, a motion to close the public hearing was made by Mr. DeRochi and seconded by Ms. Davis.

Mr. DeRochi said the purpose of the sign is good and he just questioned whether it was in the best location long term.

A motion to approve the application subject to conditions was made by Mayor Graham and seconded by Mr. Mani. This carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Cheskis, Davis, DeRochi, Graham, Mani and Matthews

Nays: None

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.