



approval prior to construction. Sidewalks are not recommended at this time. The existing monument sign located behind the fence will be removed.

Mr. Schatzman discussed Ms. Wasilauski's memo dated September 27, 2019. The applicant will work with Mr. Bartolone with regard to tree planting and landscaping. Kestrel boxes will be installed.

Mr. Schatzman said the Environmental Commission and Board of Health had no objections.

Mr. Schatzman discussed Sgt. Andrew Perry's memo dated October 11, 2019. The gated access will be opened by security. Mr. Stires testified the East Mountain Road entrance gate nearest the intersection will be open from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m. for the school buses.

Mr. Stires further testified that there are no negative criteria. The fence is setback so that it doesn't run into any obstructions and avoids the existing landscaping along the road frontage. Mr. Schatzman read from the Clarke Caton Hintz memo regarding the positive and negative criteria.

Vice Chairman Roberts opened the meeting to the public.

Shilo Frampton, 475 East Mountain Road, stated Carrier has been a wonderful neighbor for a long time. He asked if there is anything Carrier is doing to bring security of the facility up to date to match the fence. He asked if there were more abled people that can handle security or if camera installation proposed. Carrier should look at their overall security.

Mr. Schatzman said there are security people within the facility and the fence is additional security. Carrier is enhancing the existing security with the installation of the fence.

Mayor Jaffer said she has spoken to Carrier about having a public meeting with the neighbors to talk about their security programing. She will follow up with Mr. Frampton and Carrier.

Sharon Morgan, 469 East Mountain Road, said she is concerned with the actual security on the site. Her house was broken into about 10 years ago by a Carrier patient. She is curious about the actual effectiveness of the fence. There are openings in the fence with some being gated and some not. She does not feel that the fence is providing anything. Patients could still climb over the fence. She wondered if Carrier has spoken with security experts or Montgomery Police.

Mr. Stires testified that the standard chain link is 2 x 2 holes and they are using 1 x 1 which will make it more difficult to climb. Comments at the last meeting were that it shouldn't look like a penitentiary. The proposed fence allows a level of security and a level of aesthetics. The interior fence also provides another level of security.

Mr. Schatzman said the gates will be opened and closed by security staff. Mr. Stires said right now there is 8,000 linear feet of escapability which is being narrowed down to 50 feet.

There being no further public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Mr. DeRochi asked if there will be visual monitoring of the gated areas and suggested Carrier install cameras at these locations. Mr. Schatzman said it is too onerous at this time. There will be staff stationed at the gates when they are open. However, if there are more problems in the future they will consider it.

Mr. DeRochi said the design of the fence is an enormous improvement over what was shown at the last meeting. The fence will create a visual screen for the campus and will make it look much nicer.

Mr. Matthews asked if security cameras are used within the facility. Mr. Schatzman said there are. Mr. Matthews said it doesn't seem like it would be that difficult to add cameras if there is already a monitoring station.

Mr. Conry asked how a patient would get out if they were in a building inside the complex. Mr. Stires testified there is a proposed fence in the interior of the campus that they would have to get over first. Mr. Conry asked if the patients are all funneled through the courtyard or if there are back entrances.

Mr. Hausmann, Vice President of Engineering & Support Services, remains under oath. Mr. Hausmann testified that all of the units are locked and access is gained by using a card. If there is an elopement, security will go directly to the two openings and the Crisis Intervention Service staff will get to the patient. If a camera is installed it will not stop the person from leaving. Carrier meets regularly with the Police. The Police are aware of the proposed fence, but Carrier did not go over the design with them.

Vice Chairman Roberts asked if the proposed additional landscaping could include street trees in the gaps along Route 601 and East Mountain. She asked why sidewalks weren't recommended.

Mr. Schatzman said Carrier will work with Mr. Bartolone regarding the street trees. With regard to the sidewalks there is no rational nexus between building a fence and installing sidewalk and there are no sidewalks in the area.

Mr. Linnus summarized that the application is for submission waiver and amended final major site plan with bulk variance approval to install a fence. The motion would be to approve with conditions. The applicant has agreed to comply with all the conditions set forth in Mr. Sullivan's report and testimony on the record with the other professional and Board staff reports. The resolution would also contain the usual standard conditions plus a recommendation of landscaping and street trees by Mr. Bartolone.

A motion to approve with the conditions was made by Mr. Mani and seconded by Mr. DeRochi. The motion carried on the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Bell, DeRochi, Jaffer, Mani, Matthews, Roberts and Conry

Nays: None

Mr. Wilson returned to the dais.

**Case PB-11-19**

**Applicant: Grove at Montgomery, LLC**

Block 6001 Lot 1 – 21 Belle Mead-Griggstown Road

Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with Bulk Variances

Expiration Date - 2/28/20

Affidavit of Notification and Publication Required

Notice was in order. Ronald Shimanowitz, Esquire represented the applicant.

Mr. Shimanowitz explained that the application is for amended preliminary and final site plan and bulk variance approval for wall mounted signage. The 6,402 square foot multi-use structure has retail/office on the first floor and 28 apartments on the second. This application is for façade signage that is comparable to what was approved at Montgomery Place. Variances for the size of the signs are being sought.

Bruce Fish, 105 Dorsa Avenue, and Art Bernard, 77 North Union Street, were sworn in.

Mr. Fish gave the Board his qualifications and was accepted as a signage expert. Mr. Fish testified that in 2016 he had designed signage for the project. The intent was to have a series of architectural panels that run across the tenant bays. Since they were not sure how many tenants there would be they created a series of panels where the lettering and/or logos for each tenant would be placed. The panels are proposed to be a maximum 33 inches by 18 feet or 49.5 square feet which is the maximum permitted. However, the Code also limits sign size to 1/2 of 1 square foot for each lineal foot of tenant space. For a typical 22 lineal foot storefront the permitted sign would be 10 square feet. The proposal is to contain the lettering within the 50 square feet and propose a maximum of 80% of the storefront width. This will maintain the balance between the tenants so that no two signs are too close to each other. These signs are not internally illuminated and will be illuminated with gooseneck lighting. Corner tenants or tenants that take a larger space will be permitted a secondary sign that will be no greater than 35 square feet with 18 inch high lettering.

Mr. Sullivan noted that the rendering submitted to the Board does not reflect what was constructed. Mr. Fish clarified that the plans submitted with this application are the same that was submitted in 2016 with a revision date through 5/28/19. The bays have been squared off so there is more space between the windows on the second floor and the opening on the first floor. Mr. Fish referenced Page 3 of the sign package which is a photograph with superimposed rendered panels to scale. The lettering will be a maximum height of 24 inches. There is no change proposed for the lighting. The larger signs and lettering are needed for legibility and safety from the parking lot and for the traveling public.

Vice Chairman Roberts opened the meeting to the public to question Mr. Fish. There were no questions from the public.

Art Bernard gave the Board his qualifications and was accepted as an expert in planning. The applicant is seeking variance relief because they are concerned about the ability of the customers to read the compliant sign. The relief can be granted based on the C2 criteria. The proposal advances various purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law and the benefits outweigh the detriments. The proposed signs make it easier to locate the appropriate stores. There is no substantial detriment to the public good. The larger signs will have no impact on any of the surrounding properties. The signs will be attractive and will make it easier to navigate the shopping center. There is no negative impact to the zone plan.

Mr. Shimanowitz discussed the Clarke Caton Hintz review letter. The lighting is a 10 inch gooseneck with a 25 watt LED and has already been installed. The applicant will comply with the ordinance and lights will be turned off at 11:00 p.m.

Vice Chairman Roberts opened the meeting to the public. There was no public comment.

Mr. DeRochi said the signage reads as a big band. He suggested the signage should be shorter in width for the storefronts that don't require it to give it some variety. Mr. Fish replied that the columns separate the signs. If there is a smaller bay there would be a shorter space. Mr. DeRochi said he would like to see more space between the signs. The maximum is 80% but it should be done in 70% if possible.

Mr. Sullivan agreed with Mr. DeRochi. The signs are shown to come all the way to the column which makes it feel like they are overlapping. Mr. Matthews agrees there should be more space between the signs.

Vice Chairman Roberts asked if the lettering will all be the same color. Mr. Fish testified the lettering and logos will be different for each tenant but the panels are designed to be the same color. The applicant amended the application to request a variance to permit different colors and fonts on the signs.

Mr. Sullivan said the panel seems like a consistent length band going across the building. It would be better if the panels were removed and the letters applied to the façade of the building. The panels are not integrated with the building.

Mr. Fish said the panels are needed because of the architecture of the building. The intent is to make it consistent and look like it is part of the building.

Mr. Sullivan suggested the panel be raised from the edge of the building. Mr. Fish agreed and said it could be raised 4 to 6 inches above the edge.

Mr. DeRochi said the lengths of the signs should be limited to what is needed to get the message across up to a maximum of 50 square feet. In the bays that have articulated masonry columns the sign should not overlap the interior edge of the column.

Mr. Conry said when looking at the rendering, if the signs are shortened they might not match up with the existing lighting. There could be lights that point at nothing and only some of the lights pointing to the message.

Mr. Shimanowitz said raising the sign and bringing it within the column edges is no problem. The idea of designing the sign length to the message is not a good standard. The applicant would like to stick with a maximum of 80% of the bay length.

Mr. Fish testified the sign border will go right to the wall and the panel will project 1.5 inches from the wall.

After further discussion, Mr. DeRochi agreed not to vary the length other than between the two columns.

Mr. Linnus summarized the motion which would be to approve amended preliminary and final major site plan with bulk variances as submitted by the applicant. The approval would include normal conditions and compliance with Mr. Sullivan's report. Special conditions include revising the plans to be consistent with the testimony as presented by the applicant, the Board and the Board's professionals. The application was amended to include a variance for the color and style. The revised plans are subject to Mr. Sullivan's approval.

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

Ayes: Bell, DeRochi, Jaffer, Mani, Matthews, Roberts, Wilson and Conry

Nays: None

**V. MINUTES**

**November 4, 2019 – Regular Meeting**

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Mr. DeRochi and seconded by Mr. Mani. The motion carried on the following:

Ayes: Bell, DeRochi, Jaffer, Mani, Matthews, Roberts, Wilson, and Conry

Nays: None

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.