

**READINGTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES**

**September 14, 2009**

**A. Chairman called the meeting to order at 7:35 p.m. announcing that all laws governing the Open Public Meetings Act had been met and that the meeting had been duly advertised.**

**B. Attendance:**

<b>Mrs. Allen</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mr. Cook</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mrs. Duffy</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mr. Shamey</b>	<b>absent</b>
<b>Mr. Klotz</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mr. Monaco</b>	<b>present</b>
<b>Mr. Smith</b>	<b>absent</b>
<b>Madam Chair</b>	<b>present</b>

**Michael Sullivan, Clark – Caton & Hintz  
Britt Simon, Esq.  
John Hansen, Ferriero Engineering**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

**1. August 24, 2009 – Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the minutes. Mrs. Allen seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded*.**

**D. CORRESPONDENCE:**

**Mrs. Filler informed the board that the Environmental Commission prepared a memorandum to the Township Committee regarding the decorative edging plantings at the ball fields. Unfortunately the plants that were planted were non-native species.**

**Mrs. Filler made a motion to authorize Michael Sullivan to prepare an ordinance to prohibit the use and plantings of invasive species in the township for land development applications. Mrs. Allen seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call:**

<b>Mrs. Allen</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Cook</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>aye</b>

Mr. Klotz                aye  
Mr. Monaco            aye  
Madam Chair          aye

**Mrs. Filler made a comment about receipt of correspondence involving COAH. Mr. Sullivan answered that there is litigation linked to this matter so no discussion can take place during open session.**

**E. RESOLUTIONS:**

- 1. Professional Services Agreement - Alternate Planning Board Solicitors  
Donald Moore, Esq.,  
Britt Simon, Esq.**

**Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the resolution. Mrs. Allen seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call:**

Mrs. Allen              aye  
Mrs. Filler              aye  
Mr. Monaco              aye  
Madam Chair            aye

- 2. Serra – Whitehouse Prep.  
Final Site Plan  
B. 36, L. 96**

**The resolution is carried to the next meeting.**

**F. TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE:**

**None**

**G OTHER BUSINESS:**

- 1. Voucher approval – Mr. Klotz made a motion to approve the vouchers. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion. *Motion* was carried with a vote of *Ayes all, Nays none recorded.***

**H. NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. Request for extension to approval  
Block 40, Lot 1 (Solberg)**

The record showed that Mrs. Allen and Mr. Monaco recused themselves from this application and left the dais.

Suzanne Solberg Nagle was sworn and testified that she is one of the general partners of Solberg Aviation Company. She stated that they received preliminary subdivision approval for this property, but due to the hard economic times, she requested a two year extension to that approval.

Mr. Sullivan recommended that the COAH obligation for this development be carried and updated to reflect what the current contribution requirements are in effect.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to grant a 2 year extension of approval subject to whatever affordable housing requirements that is in effect at the time this subdivision comes before the board for final approval. Mr. Duffy seconded the motion.

**Roll call:**

Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Madam Chair	aye

**I. PUBLIC HEARING:**

1. Investors Savings Bank  
Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan  
B. 89, Lot 1

Lloyd Tubman, Esq., of Archer & Greiner, stated that she is the attorney for the applicant. She stated that the property is located at River Road, Broad Street and Route 202 in Three Bridges. It is an existing bank. The building was vacant for a period of time, and is now in operation. The client's consultant came into Mr. Barczyk applied for a permit for a smaller pylon sign. The sign is installed. Unfortunately the applicant was not aware that the ordinance states that if you take down a pre-existing non-conforming sign and go to a lesser size, you must come to the board with a conforming size sign. The applicant is requesting a variance to legalize the smaller pylon sign. There are other sign variances as well that the applicant will be seeking.

This site plan is the first of two site plans that will be submitted. The first was submitted by the bank for the opening because they needed signage immediately. The second site plan that will be submitted will eliminate one or two of the existing

four driveways and completely renovate the parking lot. Ms. Tubman stated that the applicant will bond for the repairs that John Hansen is requesting in his letter dated September 9, 2009.

Ms. Tubman informed the board that the applicant's landscape architect could not be present for this hearing. So when they received Clark, Caton & Hintz's critique of the landscaping plan, the architect was informed to work with Michael Sullivan and Brent Krasner and as a result has submitted to the professionals a revised landscape plan that does substitute and adds 10 trees.

Attorney Simon swore in William Jackson, of NW Sign Industries and Peter Korzen, of Korzen Engineering, Michael Sullivan and John Hansen.

Peter Korzen stated that he is a licensed professional engineer and land surveyor in the State of New Jersey with 25 years experience. He stated that he has a Bachelor of Science Degree in Civil Engineering.

Mr. Korzen addressed the existing conditions of the site to the board. The parking lot contains 29 parking spaces. There are four driveways. The easterly portion of the site is undeveloped.

Regarding the proposed conditions, the applicant requests variances for signs and landscaping. Mr. Korzen identified all of the proposed signs as follows:

- Sign number one – free standing sign located at the north side of the building
- Sign number two – wall mounted sign located on the northeast side of the building
- Sign number three – entrance sign located at the northerly driveway on Board Street
- Sign number four – directional exit sign on the southerly driveway on River Ave.
- Sign number five – directional entrance sign with a direction to the ATM that is located on the southerly driveway on Board Street.
- Sign number six – exit sign on that same driveway
- Sign number seven – directional sign with a left arrow leading cars to the ATM and drive-thru.
- Sign number eight – directional sign above the door on the west side of the building
- Sign number nine – hours of the bank
- Sign number ten – overhead clearance sign located at the canopy
- Sign number eleven – building mounted clearance sign
- Sign number twelve – ATM sign
- Sign number thirteen – Do not enter sign located on the north side of the drive-thru.

There are three non-conforming existing condition variances that are required. One is a minimum side yard set back from the building to the residential zone. It is required to be 75 feet. The actual dimension is 74.3 feet. The second non-conforming existing condition is a buffer to a local street. The requirement is 50 feet. The existing condition is 0.4 feet to River Ave. The third non-conforming pre-

existing variance is a buffer from a parking lot or driveway to a residential zone. The requirement is 50 feet; they are 16.7 feet from the southerly corner.

There are no variances required for parking; however there are several pre-existing non-conforming conditions. One is minimum distance from a right-of-way to a parking lot. It is required to be 20 feet and the existing condition is 0.4 feet located on River Ave. The minimum distance from the center line of a driveway to an intersection of a road, it is required to be 102.4 feet and with the existing condition it is 43 feet. Likewise the driveway close to Route 202 on River Ave. is required to be 198.2 feet and it is 50 feet. There are several variances required on the sign chart. Bank sign number two is the large façade sign located on the northeast side of the building. The ordinance allows for only one façade sign. They are proposing a façade sign and one above the door. Also the size requires a variance. The maximum area has an area of 50 square feet and they are proposing 67.5 square feet for the larger sign. They are proposing 10 directional signs when only 4 are allowed by ordinance. The maximum area for directional sign is exceeded. Two and one-half feet is allowed and they are proposing 6.6 feet for the directional signs. The maximum height allowed is 3.5 feet and they are proposing 4 feet high for the ground mounted directional signs and 8 feet high for the building mounted signs at the canopy. A variance is required for the minimum setback from the property line. It is required to be 10 feet. The closest sign to the property line is 3 feet which is located at the right-of-way line of River Avenue. The last variance is for signs in the site triangles. They are proposing to install signs in the site triangles and landscaping. The township requirement height is one foot.

Madam Chair complimented the applicant regarding the renovation of the building, but was disappointed with the amount of the branded signs.

William Jackson employed by M.W. Sign for three years. Regarding the directional signs, these are typically the size that use and place at these locations. The applicant is concerned that the patrons will stop short on Route 202.

Madam Chair stated that no one is speeding by this site because cars must take the jug handle to get to the site.

Mrs. Duffy felt that there would be more confusion with people trying to read all of those signs.

Mr. Hansen agreed that technically the directional signs need relief because they are in the site triangle. If the applicant reduced the height of those signs, they would be closer to conformance of the design standard.

Mr. Jackson testified that the proposed wall sign is halo lit. The light is on the back of the sign.

Regarding sign number one which is the double sided, illuminated pylon sign the board placed their opinions on the record. Mr. Cook stated that the sign looked like a billboard. Mr. Monaco was concerned about the size of this sign versus the prior sign. Mr. Klotz wanted to know if it would be illuminated at night. Mr. Jackson answered yes. Mrs. Filler preferred that the size of the sign be closer to the conforming size. Mrs. Allen recommended that the light should be turned off at the time the bank closes. Mrs. Duffy stated that the color of the sign makes a difference. Even though the Bank of America sign was larger, it was far less intrusive. Mr. Monaco stated that it is a trade off, since the ordinance allows for two signs. He agreed that the color is offensive. Madam Chair stated that the applicant knew in March that the signs were not conforming and went ahead and installed the signs. She did not hear a valid reason for the illuminated signs. The township does not allow this type of sign. She felt that if this sign was approved, she would ask that it not be illuminated. Ms. Tubman testified that the applicant received a permit to erect this sign.

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to approve sign number one with the restriction that it cannot be illuminated past nine o'clock p.m. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion.

**Roll Call:**

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Madam Chair	nay

Regarding sign number two which is the façade sign on the northeast side of the building.

Mrs. Duffy made a motion to deny this sign. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion.

**Roll Call:**

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Duffy	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Madam Chair	aye

Ms. Tubman stated that the applicant can erect a façade sign, but it must conform to the ordinance. Madam Chair answered that that was correct.

**Mrs. Duffy made a motion to deny the variance to allow the oversized and over numbered directional signs which include numbers, three, four five, six, seven and fifteen. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call:**

<b>Mrs. Allen</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Cook</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Duffy</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Klotz</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Monaco</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Madam Chair</b>	<b>aye</b>

**Mrs. Duffy made a motion to approve signs numbered eight and nine. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call:**

<b>Mrs. Allen</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Cook</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Duffy</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Klotz</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Monaco</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Madam Chair</b>	<b>aye</b>

**Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve signs numbered ten, eleven, twelve and thirteen. Mrs. Duffy seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call:**

<b>Mrs. Allen</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Cook</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Duffy</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mrs. Filler</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Klotz</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Mr. Monaco</b>	<b>aye</b>
<b>Madam Chair</b>	<b>aye</b>

**Mr. Monaco made a motion to approve the ATM sign, identified as number 14. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion.**

**Roll Call:**

Mrs. Allen            aye  
Mr. Cook             aye  
Mrs. Duffy           aye  
Mrs. Filler           aye  
Mr. Klotz             aye  
Mr. Monaco           aye  
Madam Chair         aye

**Exhibit A-1 Copy of email from Deborah H. Cerbone, P.P., C.L.A. to Lloyd Tubman along with attached letter to Brent Krasner, dated September 11, 2009.**

**Ms. Tubman stated that there were twelve trees added to the plan. Mr. Hansen stated that he reviewed the plans and felt that the site distance was sufficient. Mr. Sullivan stated that he was satisfied with the changes and identified the changes for the board.**

**Mrs. Filler made a motion to approve the variance for the height of the shrubs in the site triangle to conform with the county's requirements, not the township's requirement. Mr. Monaco seconded the motion.**

**(Mrs. Duffy left the meeting @9:00 p.m.)**

**Roll Call:**

Mrs. Allen            aye  
Mr. Cook             aye  
Mrs. Filler           aye  
Mr. Klotz             aye  
Mr. Monaco           aye  
Madam Chair         aye

**Ms. Tubman stated that there is one more item that arises out of Mr. Hansen's review letter. It was suggested that the cracks in the asphalt be sealed in the parking lot and the area of the cement driveway off to the River Road side be repaired. The applicant proposes in the alternative to mill and repave the entire parking lot and re-stripe it. In order to guarantee that the repairs will be made, the applicant will post a performance bond for the repairs that Mr. Hansen is recommending. At that time, they are proposes to eliminate one or perhaps two driveways.**

**Mr. Hansen stated that that would be acceptable. There are other items in his report. The sidewalk and the dumpster area have to be addressed. Mr. Hansen stated that there is a sidewalk that runs along the pavement edge that should be replaced. There is a two yard dumpster that is now sitting in a parking stall. The applicant should inform the board what they intend to do with that. The last issue is**

the sidewalks that extend from the parking lot out to Old York Road. If the sidewalk is not used and it is overgrown and isn't functioning it is extra impervious coverage. Ms. Tubman answered that the applicant will repair the sidewalk that is pedestrian accessible. Mr. Hansen informed the board that all of these improvements are site items and are relatively low cost enhancements if the board wants to review this more, then this could be incorporated into the performance bond. The board agreed. Mr. Hansen stated that the correct resolution would be that a performance bond will be posted that meets the improvements that are outlined in his letter September 9, 2009.

Ms. Tubman informed the board that when the applicant returns to the board, they will address the dumpster issue.

Mrs. Filler made a motion to require the applicant to post a performance bond that meets the improvements that are outlined in John Hansen's letter dated September 9, 2009. Mr. Klotz seconded the motion.

**Roll Call:**

Mrs. Allen	aye
Mr. Cook	aye
Mrs. Filler	aye
Mr. Klotz	aye
Mr. Monaco	aye
Madam Chair	aye

**J. ADJOURNMENT**

Mr. Monaco made a motion to adjourn at 9:20 p.m. Mrs. Filler seconded the motion. Motion was carried with a vote of Ayes all, Nays none recorded.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda A. Jacukowicz