

BOROUGH OF FAIR HAVEN PLANNING BOARD

Regular Meeting Minutes

April 27, 2017

1. The meeting was called to order at 7:35 by Mr. Banahan, Vice-Chair, with a reading of the Open Public Meetings Act statement, followed by the pledge to the flag.

2. ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Banahan, Mrs. Dale, Mr. Ingle, Mr. Lehder, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Marchese, Mr. Rice

Absent: Mrs. Flanagan, Mr. Folker, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Rue

Also Present: Mr. Kovats, Board Attorney, Mr. Gardella, Board Engineer, Ms. Lelie, Board Planner

Mr. Banahan and Mr. Rice listened to the tapes of the April 18, 2017 meeting and are able to vote on the agenda items at this meeting.

3. ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

MOTION Dale, second Rice, to approve the minutes of the April 18, 2017 meeting as presented.

In Favor: Banahan, Dale, Ingle, Lehder, Lucas, Marchese, Rice

Opposed: None

4. OLD BUSINESS

Fair Haven Retail, LLC. – 560 River Rd., Block 32, Lot 2, B-1 zone – Request for preliminary and final site plan approval – variances required for lot coverage, signage

Mr. Bruno, appearing on behalf of the applicant, noted that the Board had voted to approve the application at the last meeting but deferred on the matter of the sign, which was carried to tonight's meeting. The applicant has submitted 3 options for the Board to consider. The sign has been raised in response to concerns about the sight triangle. Mr. Bruno said the Board could act on the resolution first and then consider the sign and amend the resolution.

Mr. Kovats reviewed the resolution and provided corrections. He noted that the formula for the signs was incorporated into the resolution but not the monument sign.

A MOTION to approve the resolution was made by Mr. Lucas, second by Mr. Ingle, and discussion on the motion followed. Mrs. Dale noted the wording regarding the signs seems consistent. Mr. Lehder asked if there was a schematic to go with the formula and was told there was not; it is not based on specific stores. Mr. Bruno referred to the exhibits submitted for this meeting.

Ex. A-19. Mr. Marchese recommended that the design criteria be attached to the leases. Mr. Bruno said he had no problem with that. Mr. Lehder questioned why this was necessary since the applicant is already given a variance for sign area. Mr. McGillin, previously sworn, spoke to the question of sign size and the question of how to measure the tails. He stated that wouldn't count much for the smaller stores but it gives the larger stores flexibility and opportunity to be

creative. There is a limit of 25%. Mr. Lehder reviewed Ex. A7-A. Mr. Bruno, referring to A-19, said the scale isn't overwhelming.

Mr. Banahan asked how the Board could tie things together. Mr. McGillin explained the difference between the example of the Good Karma Café on Ex. 7A and what they are asking for. The criteria sets things so that they are proportionate. Based on the Board's comments the applicant tried to come up with a formula. Using the formula, the Café sign on 7A would be larger and might not get to 30" letters. The formula allows stores to go to both upper and lower case. The box is a limiting factor, not necessarily filling the box.

Mr. Kovats stated that the Board could address the sign area configuration and attach it to the resolution as an exhibit, with a requirement that it be made available to tenants. This would be added to the resolution as #8 under the Tenant Façade Sign Criteria.

Modified MOTION by Lucas, second Rice to approve the resolution consistent with the Board Attorney's recommendations and the Board's agreement.

In regard to the logo, the maximum height will be set at 30" as well, included in the overall measurement area no great than 20% of the total sign area.

Modified MOTION by Lucas, second by Rice

In Favor: Banahan, Ingle, Lehder, Lucas, Marchese, Rice

Opposed: None

Not Voting: Dale

Discussion followed on the monument sign. **Ex. A-20** and **A-21**. Mr. McGillin discussed the three options that were presented in response to the sight line and mass of the sign. He stated that option #3 reflects his description at the previous meeting, then added options 1 and 2 to reduce the mass. Option 1 best meets the criteria. Ownership is agreeable to any of the three. In response to a question he stated that the panels are not illuminated, the individual letters are.

Mr. Marchese commended the applicant for coming up with the designs.

Mr. Lehder said he was happy with the design of all 3.

Mr. Banahan likes the additional masonry in option 1.

Mr. Lucas and Mr. Lehder liked option with the sign attached to the building.

Ms. Lelie said option 1 pulls the same material.

Mr. Marchese and Mr. Rice said they preferred option 1.

Public Comment

Jeff Christopher, River Rd, identified himself as the dentist in the building next door to the shopping center. He presented a picture of how the sign would look from his building, noting it cuts off the view from his waiting room. He presented **Ex. C-1** – 3 pages of photos using a blue tarp he hung to represent the sign.

Ms. Lelie said variances were needed for sign area, height and setback.

Mr. Bruno said the sign will enhance the dentist's property and thought his comments were shortsighted. He repeated that the applicant has discussed the importance of the sign.

Gerry Celenick – representing the Wash House, stated that they desperately needed to be seen. She thought the sign would be in keeping.

Sandy Zilacoba, 560 River Rd – stated she owns the Yoga Studio and she agrees that more visibility is needed.

Ruth Blaser, River Rd, stated she wants the sign moved over to the gas station side. She was reminded that the applicant had testified that it was not feasible.

There were no further comments from the public.

MOTION Rice, second Ingle, to approve the monument sign as illustrated in option #1.

In Favor: Banahan, Ingle, Lehder, Lucas, Marchese, Rice

Opposed: Dale

Mrs. Dale stated she believed the sign was in the wrong location and that there should not be illuminated signs in Fair Haven.

Mrs. Fuller announced that there will be a meeting on May 9 to discuss administrative matters that have time limitations.

MOTION to adjourn made, second and passed unanimously by voice vote.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy Fuller, Secretary