OCEANPORT PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
November 26, 2013

Chairman Widdis called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. and gave the Statement of Compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act: "Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by notice to the Asbury Park Press and The Link News on January 17, 2013, and by the posting of same on the municipal bulletin board and Borough Web Site."

Chairman Widdis led the flag salute.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Kahle, Mr. Kleiberg, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Whitson, Mr. Gruskos, Mr. Widdis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. DeSousa, Mr. Fichter, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Savarese,

OFFICIALS PRESENT: Jeanne Smith, Board Secretary, Rick DeNoia, Esq., Board Attorney, and William White, Board Engineer/Planner

Acknowledgment of Councilman Jerry Bertekap present due to resignation of Councilman Johnson on November 1, 2013.

Chairman Widdis advised those of the pubic present to hear the application of Joseph and Beverly Fontanella, 165 Monmouth Blvd., that the notice was deficient and thus would not be heard tonight with new notice required for December 10, 2013 meeting.

BOARD BUSINESS: Chairman Widdis advised that the minutes of September 24, 2013 and October 22, 2013 would be presented at the next meeting. Ms. Smith advised that correspondence had been received from Applicants David & Lisa Ardito requesting that their application be withdrawn without prejudice.

OLD BUSINESS:

1. PB2012-14.1 Village Center LLC **CARRIED FROM OCTOBER 22, 2013**
Block 88, Lot 26.01
Request for Site Plan Amendment with Variances

A-1 Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan, Sheets 1-12, prepared by Hammer Land Engineering dated May 2, 2011, last revised October 28, 2013
A-2 Site Layout Rendering Plan prepared by Hammer Land Engineering dated November 26, 2013
A-3 Correspondence from Joseph D. Hanrahan, PE dated November 25, 2013
A-4 Correspondence from Richard D. Alderiso, AIA dated October 8, 2013
A-5 Mark-O-Lite Sign Co., Inc. Conceptual Sign Drawings, not dated

Peter Falvo, Attorney for Applicant, gave a statement of the application before the Board stating that the Applicant was seeking modification of the site to permit pylon signs to be erected, one at the corner of Port-Au-Peck and East Main Street, the other further east on Port-Au-Peck Avenue where the entrance drive was and one further north on Main Street for the proposed bank. Mr. Falvo continued stating that they also had to modify the rear of the building to accommodate the air conditioning condensers.

William White, Board Engineer and Planner was sworn in.

Mr. Falvo introduced and described several documents which were marked as Exhibits A-1, A-2, A-3, A-4 and A-5. Joseph Hanrahan, Professional Engineer presented his credentials and was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of engineering.

Mr. Falvo asked Mr. Hanrahan to refer to Exhibit A-2 and describe for the Board the changes that to the site and the location of the proposed signs.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they were proposing three free standing signs for the property to enhance the viability of the project and improve safety to allow the customers to identify the project as they're driving down the adjacent roadways. Mr. Hanrahan described the proposed locations – one at the intersection and then one at each end of the development site, and the distance of each sign from the curb.

Chairman Widdis asked questions about which signs were for which tenants and the sizes of the signs.

Mr. Hanrahan answered that they're both about 48 square feet and about 15 feet high and the main sign was 21 feet high and 120 square feet. There was additional discussion on whether the measurements were from the ground and if they included the ornamental tops to the signs.

Chairman Widdis asked what signs were on the original application that was approved. Mr. Hanrahan answered there was no signage approved for the original application. Discussion ensued on what signage was originally approved, the signage permitted in the zone being façade signs on the buildings. Mr. Gruskos commented that he was on the Board for the original application and there was to be a façade sign over each unit, that the area where they're proposing the big pylon, that was supposed to be the calm, sitting area, community area where everybody could gather and there was no big sign to go in the middle of that.

Chairman Widdis asked if the proposed changes would impact that area and was told no.

Mr. Hanrahan continued with testimony concerning the other proposed changes, mainly due to mechanical equipment outside the building, the proposed adjustments to the landscaping for the project. Referring to the displayed exhibit, stated which landscaping was approved, that the yellow trees in front, and to the rear of the building, would be removed due to AC condenser units that were required along the back of the building. There was a total of 15 trees and 23 shrubs that were proposed to be removed as a result of adding mechanical equipment around the building to the rear of the building. Mr. Hanrahan added that they also proposed eliminating the diagonal walks shown highlighted on the plan due to redundancy and to increase the green space on the property and along the frontage proposed to remove the diagonal walks and adjust the landscaping in that area. Mr. Hanrahan stated they were proposing to relocate the trees, the 15 trees staggering them with the proposed trees that are, but on the park property to enhance the buffer between the park and the center itself if amenable to the Board. Mr. Falvo asked Mr. Hanrahan to point out to the Board where the mechanical equipment would be located at the rear of the building.

Mr. Hanrahan indicated where all the mechanical equipment would be located adjacent to the building itself in the form of AC condensers, transformers, refrigeration units along the back of the building and that one of the reasons the trees were proposed to be removed was that they couldn't be put on the transformers.

Chairman Widdis asked what was the alternative. Mr. Hanrahan answered that they were just two and a half foot high air conditioning units.

Mr. Kleiberg commented that everybody was parking in the back and now you're going to see condenser units that are five to six years old start to fade and questioned why they were not proposing lattice in front of them or something like that? Mr. Hanrahan answered that they were not proposing any screening in front of the units. There was additional discussion on the original location of the sidewalk which had to be moved so that the condensers could be put in along the building and due to the overhang on the building it was within four feet of the curb line so there would be no sun or rain for those areas.

Mr. Kleiberg further commented that he had quite a few issues and stated that when this application came before the Board, one of the key issues was how aesthetically pleasing it would be from the parking lot and how all the greenery would be buffering the building and now they were eliminating it to put air conditioning units. Mr. Kleiberg continued stating that the signage was brought up at those meetings and the Board was told because we had a Jockey Club going across the street that there would be little signs on the front and that criteria with the lighting would be met. There's so many differences all getting hit at one time.

Mr. Gruskos commented that his first issue was that he did not understand the planning - there's greenery behind the building. There's a lot of engineering going into the project. Now, all of a sudden to get AC units, condensers, it's being eliminated and where were the condensers proposed for the original application. A lengthy discussion ensued concerning what was planned for originally, how the original plan did not address items that were encountered when implementing the plan and why the location of the air conditioner condensers was selected,

Mr. Gruskos stated he agreed with Mr. Kleiberg's remark that the condensers were going to look horrible very quick and that a buffer be added. Mr. Hanrahan responded that nothing was proposed but they were certainly open to proposing a small fence lattice work in front to screen them.

Chairman Widdis stated he thought they all agreed with Mr. Gruskos but asked Mr. White for his ideas.

Mr. Gruskos asked additional questions about the main pylon sign, the traffic studies and whether there would be a site line issue with the intersection. Mr. Hanrahan responded that it was a signalized intersection and the project was outside of any site triangles, of the site lines so it's a safe sign. There was additional discussion on the minimum distance required for site lines.

Mr. Gruskos asked if the 7-Eleven would have a sign on the front of the building and was told yes. Mr. Gruskos asked for the square footage of the facade signs and was advised that it would comply with the ordinance which was based upon a percentage of the square footage. There was additional discussion on the façade signs and that it would depend on the number of tenants how many signs and the size.

Mr. White interjected and summarized for the Board what was allowable for wall signage on the first floor: “Shall not exceed two square feet for each linear foot of building frontage should that particular business or businesses and for a hundred square feet, whichever is less”. So if you have one business take the entire first floor of a building he would be allowed 100 square feet of wall signage per frontage basically. So instead of seeing a bunch of small signs, you would see one big sign. So the understanding was that each individual store had a wall sign. Mr. White added that they're also allowed to have an awning and the awning was signable area as well.

Mr. Gruskos asked would there be signs on the front and the back, right, on the building. Mr. White stated signs would only appear on street frontage.

Mr. Kleiberg stated he understood the problem with the condenser units but being that people were going to be parking in the back, and you want to attract people to come to the businesses that are in the front, and condenser units sitting out there is would not be presentable and that the design should be better than a chain link fence with slats through it, something that's good and substantial and would keep the riff raff from ripping off the cooper.

Mr. Hanrahan stated they would come up with a good buffer, decorative low fence and they'll screen the condensers.

Mr. Kleiberg stated he thought the signs were way too big, 48 square feet and the two small ones and 144 square feet on the larger one and that's just the sign, not the pylon holding them up.

Mr. Kahle asked about which side would be the front end of the stores and was told the street. Mr. Kahle asked about the access from the back but the front was on the street and commented about the number of potential tenants and wasn't sure the signage proposed would support that demand and they'd come back for additional signage.

Chairman Widdis asked questions about where the garbage would go and was told that hasn't changed with one on the north end and one on the south end. Chairman Widdis asked what would go around it and was told modular block walls with gates as shown on the plans.

Mr. Whitson asked if the signs would be lit and was told internally lit, yes. Mr. Whitson asked how the signs were a safety issue and was told it was project identification so when you're driving, you know if a store was coming up and you enter into that location. There was discussion on how much time someone needed to see in advance to make a safe decision to turn in.

Mr. Whitson stated that they've gone from no separation or lattice with anything in the back to something in the back, but they were vague as to what exactly would go in the back. Mr. Hanrahan stated he agreed and would speak with the architect and owner and bring something back to the Board.

Mr. Sullivan asked what direction the main sign at the intersection would face and was told it was facing in an east, west direction so perpendicular to Port-Au-Peck. Mr. Sullivan commented then people coming north on Main Street wouldn't necessarily be able to read it. Mr. Hanrahan answered if they're coming north, if they're making a left turn from Port-Au-Peck onto East Main Street, they'll see that sign, sure, coming up Port-Au-Peck. But if they're running south, driving south on East Main Street, they won't really see the sign until they come to the intersection. Additional discussion ensued on how the sign would appear from different approaches, the necessity for the size, the need of the tenant/business, the lumens of the sign.

Mr. White asked questions about the sidewalk and distance from the curb and was told six feet.
There was discussion on the distance remaining for the condensers, the area needed for the overhang, the proposed changes in the materials to be used on the walkway and its appearance, the intent to improve the durability and the maintenance as it would be used for a service walk to the units themselves.

Chairman Widdis stated that he was concerned how it was going to look which was critical in the discussion on the original application. Mr. Hanrahan commented to keep in mind that the 11 trees that were in that area would not provide any screening to the bottom area. Those are trees that are going to be clear to the bottom so the actual view to the area other than seeing the tree trunk wouldn't change much. Mr. Falvo commented respectfully that no matter how much was put in the back to make it attractive, it was still the service side of the building and that they were trying to keep it aesthetically appealing and would come up with a plan that would do that.

Mr. Gruskos interjected that he spends a lot of time on the West Coast and facilities just like this where the back was where you pull in, was very aesthetically pleasing and can't tell that you're pulling in the back and there were no big signs. There was lengthy discussion on how the back of the building should look, what was originally approved, what was being removed and how it would impact the views. Mr. Kleiberg added that he didn’t have a problem with the trees moving but had a problem with seeing the condenser units.

Chairman Widdis redirected the discussion back to the trees and where proposed to relocate them, what would be put around the transformer, the number of trees, the shrubbery that would remain, how would the mechanical equipment be screened and be aesthetically pleasing, what type of trees and their size.

Mr. Hanrahan answered that the diagonal sidewalks that were originally approved along East Main Street, we're being remove as there were already sidewalks perpendicular from East Main Street to the front of the building and were opening up the green space.

Chairman Widdis asked what was going to be put in its place? Mr. Hanrahan answered just grasses they were going to move the shrubs around to enhance the plan and the view from East Main Street. Chairman Widdis asked about the steps to several sidewalk areas along the frontage. Mr. Hanrahan answered that the actual roadway, East Main Street was built about nine inches lower than the design plans called for so to make up for those nine inches, they had to add some steps for a couple of the sidewalks. There was additional discussion on the access to the sidewalks in front for ADA accessibility from the corners.

Chairman Widdis asked about the two steps in the rear door of the south building to transition grade and the relocation of two handicap parking stalls and that they had to move those hanidcap stalls up to this area here and allow ADA access to the building.

Mr. Whitson asked why it wasn’t mentioned that the rear sidewalk would no longer be pavers but would be concrete. Mr. Hanrahan answered that they failed to add it to the letter. Mr. Whitson stated then the testimony here was different than what was given on November 25th. Mr. Hanrahan responded that it was in addition to the letter.

Mr. Whitson commented that he had concerns about the fact there were last minute changes. Mr. White advised Mr. Whitson that it was sent at his request because after going through the plan he thought it best that the Board have a list to work off of.

Mr. Whitson commented that he understood that but the letter says one thing and he's saying something else in addition. Mr. Hanrahan responded that the plan didn't change and that they just hadn't include that.

Mr. Gruskos asked about the area of meeting area which was pitched and the changes would block that area. Mr. Hanrahan answered that the access was still the same and nothing would be blocked. He continued that they didn't change any sidewalks in that area. And the paver area was still the same, they just moved three trees from one quadrant to the other. There's no impact to the meeting area.

Mr. White asked if the meeting area was on one end, what was in the other end. Mr. Hanrahan answered that there was no change to the area down at the other end, that it was a plaza area with a proposed fountain in the area.

Chairman Widdis then opened the meeting to questions from the public.

PUBLIC:

Henry Schultz, 40 Iselin Lane, Oceanport and the secretary of the Jockey Club HOA asked if the storefront signage would be illuminated signage that was going to go on each storefront and asked if the rear parking lot was going to be the main access would there be signage the same in the back as the front by square footage and would that be illuminated and was advised that question would best answer that when he testifies. Mr. Falvo stated that to facilitate the discussion, wall mounted signs - facade signs over the various businesses would be illuminated.

Mr. Schultz commented that he thought was a bit of overkill for the neighborhood with these proposed pylon signs and he thought they were massive, with the building height.

Chairman Widdis stated that there would be an opportunity for opinions later on in the presentation. As there was no one else from the public to question the Engineer, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Falvo called for the project's architect to present. Mr. Alderiso presented his qualifications and was accepted by the Board as an expert in the field of architecture.

Mr. Alderiso provided testimony concerning the condensing units at the back side of the building. The units are nested close to the building outside of each of the storefronts on both the north and south building. Each unit was about 30 by 30 by about three foot tall and were covered by the overhang that was always part of the project. The project was mixed commercial residential use and in lieu of putting a large chiller somewhere on the site they felt that this was the most unobtrusive way to handle the units in lieu of curbing the roofs or carving the roofs out or trying to stuff as many of the units over the back side of the roof as possible. Mr. Alderiso stated he thought the proposed location change would be least visible and that as for landscape fencing for screening they needed to be careful about the spacing of the units and that the units' ability to still get fresh air because they are condensers requiring outside air.

Mr. Alderiso then provided testimony concerning the tree removal and the issue with the trees was their size and that they would have grown into the canopy, probably shielded the canopy and the signage which can go on the back side of the canopies. Mr. Alderiso continued that as for the signs, they were making provisions for the signs that go on the fascia of the canopies to be lit and that they would not know the number of them until the spaces were populated with tenants.

Mr. Falvo asked Mr. Alderiso to address questions about the elevations of the building and any changes. Mr. Alderiso testified that there were no changes to the elevations themselves of the building and that the only changes were the adding of several steps and removing several of the walks. Mr. Alderiso stated that as far as the pavers in the back, he was the biggest proponent of pavers but the material change was actually his idea with the sidewalks knowing how difficult the maintenance of pavers can be and that there would be service occurring back there with hand trucks or even pallet jacks. He thought it would make sense and not be too much of a distraction from the rest of the building and the elevation to have this was just a nice, clean white concrete sidewalk appropriately jointed that meets a curb.

Mr. Falvo asked Mr. Alderiso about the sign ordinance and that it requires signs to match with or be compatible with the material to be used on the building and submitted Exhibit A-4 which reflects the color of the material that will be used on the building. And it's proposed by the owner that whatever signs are erected will draw the color from that so that the signs match the building. Mr. Alderiso answered correct.

Mr. Falvo asked Mr. Alderiso questions about the materials and colors being used on the building and the proposed pylon signs which would have matching natural stone on the facade with a cast stone coping above the natural stone. And then growing out of the podium would be the signage and the proposal would be to integrate the three colors into the signage.

Chairman Widdis asked for him to describe the size of the pylon signs. Mr. Alderiso stated that the larger signage, the pylon signs, the standalones would integrate the colors.

Mr. Kleiberg commented what about logos.

Mr. Falvo answered yes, the frames of the sign, the dividers in the sign would blend and the actual sign face would probably be a white and the the lettering of the business or its logo. Mr. Alderiso added that the permanent, the structural members and the permanent components of the sign would have a take on these colors. Mr. Alderiso answered additional questions about the colors of the pylon signs and the landscaping at the bases.

Mr. Gruskos asked about the rendering of the façade signs. Mr. Alderiso stated that it was what was submitted originally along the fascia, so the fascia was about three foot tall and then length would depend on how many tenants occupy the space.

Chairman Widdis asked where the pylon sign would stand in reference to the building and what the height would be which Mr. Alderiso referring to the exhibit indicated where it would fall.

Chairman Widdis then opened the meeting to questions from the public on that witness only.

PUBLIC:

Mr. Schultz appeared again and asked about the signage was it going to be illuminated in the front and the back.

As there was no one else from the public to question the Architect, the public portion was closed.

Christine Cofone, Professional Planner for the Applicant presented her qualifications and having been before the Board previously was accepted as an expert in Planning and was sworn in.

Ms. Cofone testified that she was the Planner that testified for the reconfiguration application of the apartments, that she had performed an evaluation of what was proposed from a planning point of view to see if it's compatible with and satisfies the negative and positive criteria. Mrs. Cofone summarized the results of her evaluation including a review of the VC zone allowed uses, the relief being sought to allow standalone signs, made a comparison to the Grove in Shrewbury which had free standing signage - ground mounted signage out in front. Ms. Cofone further testified to the Criteria I of the land use law and would it be advanced by the granting of the variances that were being requested in conjunction with this application. Ms. Cofone reviewed the types of bulk variances (C) and that the criteria that would be involved was the C-2 criteria which required that they demonstrate that one or more purposes of the land use law would be advanced by the granting of the application. Ms. Cofone opined that the Criteria I, desirable visual environment would be met but also that Criteria A of the land use law which talks about promoting the general welfare would be advanced. The VC zone talks specifically about enhancing the downtown and creating an image with a mixed and vitality. It talks about having mixed uses and vitality. And she believed that the project was a linear sensor and they want the commercial areas to be successful. And one of the things that commercial areas thrive on or need to be successful was signage. She continued that it was her opinion that Criteria A, promoting the general welfare would be advanced by the granting of this application because it was a linear shopping center that's at the corner of Port-Au-Peck and Main Street and that there was a need to have the signage and they actually placed it in really appropriate locations at the entrances and then as well as the main focal point of the corner of the center.

Ms. Cofone then discussed incorporating elements of the main building into the signage to make it all flow together and as to Board members concern, the VC ordinance talks about adding charm of the street scape and public spaces and that she saw absolutely nothing to be taken away from these spaces by having the signs in the proposed locations and they can anchor the center. They can tie the architecture in together. And she saw no detriment to the Borough zone plan if in fact the variances were granted to allow the sign here.

Ms. Cofone discussed the negative criteria for the grant of a C-2 variance, and that the land use law holds that the Board has to find that there's no substantial detriment to be granted, or no substantial detriment to rise from the variance for the benefit of the grant of the variance would outweigh any detriment. I think here we have a situation where these signs will contribute to the downtown, contribute to the vibrancy of the downtown. They will contribute to the vibrancy of the center which is exactly what the zone plan calls for. So from a planning point of view, I see no substantial detriment to the Borough zone plan or the public good if in fact these variances are granted. And certainly the larger sign, which was at the corner of Port-Au-Peck and Main Street was directly across from the racetrack. It is diagonally across an ancillary parking lot for the racetrack and she saw no substantial detriments to the public good to the area that surrounds the development.

Chairman Widdis asked about reducing the size of the sign. Ms. Cofone saw no physical reason that it couldn't. Chairman Widdis asked if she thought the size of the sign appropriate in comparison with the size of the building? There was discussion about the gross size of the main sign, its width, the nearness to the building, that the architecture of the sign mimics the rhythm of the peaked roof of the building, whether reducing the proportions of the sign would be out of proportion to the size of the building.

Ms. Cofone also addressed the questions about the lighting and potential spillover of lighting at the property line at the corner and that from a planning point of view, she thought it important and did recommend that the Board set as a condition of approval the limits of the lighting lumens.

Mr. Falvo addressed the members of the Board and said if the size of the sign was a concern, they could go back to the sign fabricator and ask him if it may be reduced at the top or put a different capping on the top so that you still have Oceanport Village Center but perhaps not the peak so it doesn't go up almost five feet.

There was discussion on the best features of the sign, reducing the height by removing the pylon portion on all 3 signs and what reduction in the heights would not create site triangle issues.

Mr. Falvo stated they understand that the Board wants to see the screening of the condensers and they would go back to the sign manufacturer and see if the sign heights could be dropped a bit in order to maintain the concept and make them less imposing and get the information on the lumens of the sign.

Mr. Kleiberg redirected the discussion back to the screening and referred to the ordinance which says under the VC zone development criteria, under A-4, that all mechanicals must be screened and that no merchandise products, waste equipment or similar material or objects shall be displayed outside.

Mr. Falvo responded that they were not displaying any product outside. Mr. Kleiberg stated and no product storage and was told correct – storage would be inside.

Mr. Fichter stated that the Jockey Club Estates had a concern with the signs and their view towards the center and asked if there was any thought to position the signs as much as possible to a) maximize, retract a few of the signs, but also turn them so you minimize the view from the Jockey Club.

Mr. Falvo answered that they believe there was screening along the jockey club property as it presently existed along East Main Street but offered a lights out provision on the signs.

There was additional discussion on how to rotate the sign positions so Jockey Club would see the edge of the sign, not the front so their view was not affected, how that would impact the traffic's view,

PUBLIC:
Chairman Widdis asked if there were any questions from the public for the Planner only and as there were none that portion of the hearing was closed.

Chairman Widdis stated that at this point, the Board was not going to take a vote because they want to see and confirm the items of concern including the lumens, the landscaping plan, et cetera that were mentioned and asked them to come back to another meeting.

Ms. Smith stated the next available meeting was December 10th.

Chairman Widdis asked if there was sufficient time for the professionals to prepare the requested items.

There was discussion on the available meetings.

Mr. Falvo stated that there was a concern with holding up the construction if there was no decision made and then recounted what the Board had requested be provided, conferred with the Professionals on how soon the information could be gathered.

Mr. Kleiberg commented that the signs were not going to hold up construction.

Mr. Falvo answered, true, but what was done with the condensers would. Discussion ensued on the importance of addressing the condensers issue so as not to delay construction and the other issue of the concrete sidewalk.

Mr. Alderiso added that one of the issues was that the gas company would not make the gas line connection to the buildings until all of the excavation in the back was completed in the proximity of the gas line understandably as they don't want anyone working in the area where the gas line was being placed. In order to heat the units so that finishes could be made over the winter, they need the gas line.

Mr. Falvo asked if the Board would make a decision on the proposed sidewalk change.

There was discussion on the pavers and the push out of the sidewalk to the curb for the service area.
Mr. Hanrahan explained that the previous approval had the sidewalk along the building and green area between the sidewalk and the curb. Now, we're flopping them, except the green area was going to become stone for the AC units so that the sidewalk was moving out to the curb line where as before the sidewalk was up against the building.

Discussion ensued and it was decided that the areas to have pavers – around the condensers and the actual sidewalk would be colored concrete that complimented the building façade.

PUBLIC:

Chairman Widdis asked if there was anyone from the public that wished to comment and as no one from the public wished to be heard Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

Ms. Smith asked if there was a motion?

Mr. Kleiberg made a motion to allow the propose sidewalk changes with colored concrete which was seconded by Mr. Kahle and received the following roll call:

AYES:	Mr. Whitson, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Kahle, Mr. Kleibeg, Mr. Gruskos, Mr. Widdis
NAYES:	None
ABSTAIN:	None
ABSENT:	Mr. McCarthy, Councilman Johnson, Mr. Savarese, Mr. Fichter, Ms. DeSousa
INELIGIBLE:	None

Ms. Smith stated the motion carried.

Chairman Widdis cautioned Mr. Falvo that the Board's response indicates that they need to reduce the size of the pylon of the sign one particular sign.

The Board provided additional comments for guidance that the pylon signs should be reduced.

Chairman Widdis announced for the public that the hearing for this application would be continued at the December 10, 2013 meeting with no additional notice required.

2. PB2013-07 – Rescinio, Susan & Michael
32 Morris Place
Block 61, Lot 10
Request for Use and Bulk Variances

Mr. Menna, Attorney for the Applicant, presented the details of the application's purpose for an expansion of a non-conforming use, that service in order as confirmed with Mr. DeNoia and asked the Board for a moment to confer with his client as there were only 4 eligible members available for the use variance which was granted by the Board. Afterwards, Mr. Menna requested that the Board adjourn the hearing for his Applicant to a future meeting and that no additional notice be requested which was granted by the Board.

PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC: Chairman Widdis opened the meeting to Petitions from the Public and as no one from the public wished to be heard, Chairman Widdis closed that portion of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: As there was no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m. on a motion by Mr. Gruskos which was seconded by Mr. Kahle and approved by the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

JEANNE SMITH
Secretary