TOWNSHIP OF EAST HANOVER
LAND USE PLANNING BOARD

411 Ridgedale Avenue
East Hanover, NJ 07936
Phone: (973) 888-6021
Fax: (973) 428-3026

AGENDA FOR THE LAND USE PLANNING BOARD MEETING ON
Monday July 27, 2026, At 7:00 PM
411 Ridgedale Avenue East Hanover NJ
No new matters considered after 10:00 p.m. - No new testimony beyond 9:30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER AT 7:00 P.M

FLAG SALUTE AND INVOCATION: Mbr. Lembo

OPEN PUBLIC MEETING ACT:

ROLL CALL:

Election of Vice Chairman for 2026

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 26, 2026 & June 23, 2026

PUBLIC INPUT:

SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS: Darlene Green & Craig Zimmermann

DISCUSSION:

1. Master Plan Consistency Review - Ordinance No. 15-2026 – Amending Subsection 68.1, Affordable Housing Development Fees

RESOLUTION:

1. Denise & Phil Puzzo. 17 Canfield Road, Block: 89 Lot: 1, Variance for side yard setbacks & building coverage for an addition
2. EH-C1 LLC, 20/40/60 Arena Way, Block: 99 Lot: 12.03 Amended Site Plan to construct outdoor amenities & variance for fence height.

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Hanover Owner LLC, 59 Route 10, Block: 99 Lot: 12.02 Variance for signage Zone SED

2. Christopher Odi, 51 South Ridgedale Avenue, Block: 128 Lot: 8 Variance for floor area for 864 sq ft detached garage.

Any other variances and or waivers that may be required for the above application.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS THAT MAY COME BEFORE THE LAND USE BOARD:

ADJOURNMENT:

Lisa G. Kiss
Land Use Planning Board Secretary

TOWNSHIP OF EAST HANOVER
LAND USE PLANNING BOARD
411 Ridgedale Avenue
East Hanover, NJ 07936
973-888-6021
Fax 973-428-3026

LEGAL NOTICE FOR LAND USE PLANNING BOARD MEETING ACTION TAKEN
PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT the Land Use Planning Board of the Township of East Hanover held a meeting on Monday July 27, 2026, at 7:00 PM in the Townhall, located at 411 Ridgedale Avenue East Hanover, NJ, and the following actions were taken.
Minutes: May 26, 206, approved

RESOLUTIONS:

1. Denise & Phil Puzzo. 17 Canfield Road, Block: 89 Lot: 1, Variance for side yard setbacks & building coverage for an addition - Application Approved
2. EH-C1 LLC – 20/40/60 Arena Way, Block: 99 Lot: 12.03 Amended Site Plan to construct outdoor amenities & variance for fence height. Application Denied

PUBLIC HEARING:

1. Hanover Owner LLC – 59 Route 10, Block: 99 Lot: 12.02 Variance for signage Zone SED Application Approved - Resolution on September 22, 2026
2. Christopher Odi, 51 South Ridgedale Avenue, Block: 128 Lot: 8, Variance for floor area for 864 sq ft detached garage. Application Approved - Resolution on September 22, 2026

This notice is sent in accordance with P.L.2025, Chapter 72 of the Laws of the State of New Jersey

Lisa Kiss
Land Use Planning Board Secretary

Minutes of the Township of East Hanover Land Use Planning Board Meeting held on Monday July 27, 2026, located at East Hanover Township 411 Ridgedale Avenue.

Chairman Elwood called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

Flag Salute and Invocation: Mbr. Lembo

Roll Call:	PRESENT	ABSENT
	Elwood	Lombardi
	Lembo	Cosenzo
	Castano	Marra
	LaSalvia	Jandoli
	Knoll	DeMaio
	Orgel	Forgione

Also Present: William Rush, Esq., Land Use Planning Board Attorney
Austin Bejin PP, Township Planner
Craig Zimermann P.E., Township Engineer
Lisa Kiss, Board Administrator

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: May 26, 2026 & June 23, 2026, Approved

SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS: Austin Bejin, Craig Zimmerman

PUBLIC INPUT: None

DISCUSSION:

The Board Planner reviewed Ordinance No. 15-2026 concerning Section 95-68.1, affordable housing development fees, subsection D-2(c). The ordinance reduces the development fee assessed on additions exceeding 1,000 square feet of livable space from 1.5% to 0.5% of the increased assessed value of the improvements.

Mr. Bejin stated that development fees are not typically addressed in the Master Plan and the ordinance is not inconsistent with the Master Plan. The ordinance also effectuates the Housing Plan previously adopted by the Board.

Mbr. Castano made a motion that Ordinance No. 15-2026 is not inconsistent with the Master Plan. Second Chairman Elwood.
Roll Call: AYES, Castano, Lembo, Knoll, Orgel, LaSalvia, Elwood
NAYS none

RESOLUTION:

Denise & Phil Puzzo. 17 Canfield Road, Block: 89 Lot: 1, Variance for side yard setbacks & building coverage for an addition. Resolution No. 22-2026

Application was previously approved for construction of a one-story addition to the rear of the property, a covered patio, modification of a portion of the existing garage and expansion and repaving of the existing driveway with three bulk variances.

Conditions included installation of six juniper shrubs within the driveway setback area at an initial height of 3 to 4 feet in the locations shown on the approved plans and revisions to the plans consistent with the testimony, subject to approval of the Board Planner and Board Engineer.

Mbr. Lembo made a motion to approve Resolution No. 22-2026. Second Mbr. Knoll.
Roll Call: AYES, Castano, Lembo, Knoll, Elwood
NAYS none

2. **EH-C1 LLC – 20/40/60 Arena Way, Block: 99 Lot: 12.03** - Denied amended site plan amended preliminary and final major site plan approval, C bulk variance, and amended major soil moving permit. SED Special Economic Development Zone District. For outdoor amenities & variances for fence height.

The prior application involved approved improvements including a 7,500 square-foot utility building, modifications to internal roadways, new surface parking, pedestrian open spaces, sidewalks, pathways, shade structures, two pickleball courts, bocce court, landscaping, lighting and signage.

Applicants sought to increase the pickleball courts from two to four, add four padel courts and relocate the bocce court.

The application had been denied by a vote of six to two. Reasons for denial included failure to demonstrate a reliable relationship between the number of courts and the reasonably anticipated office population, failure to establish definite terms and limits on guest attendance and access, and failure to establish that the recreational and event facilities would remain subordinate and incidental to the principal office use.

Mbr. Castano made a motion to approve Resolution No. 23-2026. Second Mbr. Lembo.
Roll Call: AYES, Castano, Lembo, Knoll, Elwood
NAYS none

Resolutions Approved

PUBLIC HEARING:

Hanover Owner LLC, 59 Route 10 Block: 99 Lot: 12.02 – Variances for signage on Route 10 and Ridgedale Avenue

Present:
Attorney: Katharine Coffey
Sign Vendor: Bruce Fish
Planner: Brian McPeak, PP, AICP

Exhibits:

A-1: Sign Photos 10 Pages

A-2: Sign Photos before & now 20 Pages

Transcripts attached page 1 to 68

Applicant appeared for continued consideration of a signage application for the property located at 59 Route 10, a portion of the former Novartis campus.

The applicant revised the signage proposal following comments made by the Board at the April 28, 2026, meeting. Two wall signs were eliminated. One wall sign was relocated closer to Route 10 and away from the residential properties on Ridgedale Avenue. A monument sign previously proposed along Ridgedale Avenue was relocated closer to Route 10.

Applicant proposed four freestanding signs along Route 10 consisting of two monument signs and two directional signs. Seven wall signs were proposed, with two located internally on the site and not visible from the road.

Bruce Fish testified regarding the signage design, materials, lighting and visibility. The wall signs will consist of aluminum, opaque, halo-illuminated letters. The lighting will reflect against the building and will not shine directly toward the roadway.

The two monument signs will have ground-mounted lighting directed toward the signs. The two directional signs will not be illuminated and will use reflective lettering.

The directional signs are intended to notify motorists and truck drivers that the site entrance is ahead and allow sufficient time for vehicles to move into the appropriate lane on Route 10.

The monument sign near Route 10 and Ridgedale Avenue was relocated in an effort to prevent trucks from proceeding down Ridgedale Avenue. The sign will contain directional language and an arrow indicating the Route 10 entrance.

The Board discussed the size of the proposed monument sign in relation to the existing "Welcome to East Hanover" sign. Applicants agreed to voluntarily coordinate with the Township regarding a possible replacement Township sign of a comparable scale. The Board Attorney clarified that this was voluntary and was not a condition of the application.

Hanover Owner LLC, 59 Route 10 Block: 99 Lot: 12.02 – Variances for signage on Route 10 and Ridgedale Avenue

The Board discussed possible directional signage near Littell Road to discourage tractor trailers from entering Ridgedale Avenue. Applicant agreed to contact and cooperate with the County if County approval is available.

Applicant confirmed that NJDOT approval is not required for the proposed signage.

Lighting for the signs will operate from dusk to dawn.

Open to the public: none

Brian McPeak, PP, AICP was sworn and accepted by the Board as a professional planner.

Mr. McPeak testified that variances were required for the number and setbacks of the freestanding signs and for the size, aggregate area and height of certain wall signs.

Freestanding signage is limited to one sign per frontage. Four signs are proposed along Route 10. Mr. McPeak stated the additional signs were intended to provide site identification and directional guidance and to avoid placing additional signage along Ridgedale Avenue.

Certain setback variances were required because placement of the signs at the required setback would place them behind existing trees and landscaping and make them difficult to see.

Wall signs also required variances for individual area, aggregate area and height. Certain wall signs are proposed at approximately 281.25 square feet where 200 square feet is permitted. The signs are also located above the 15-foot height limitation because lower signs would be obstructed by landscaping and vegetation.

Mr. McPeak testified that the requested variances could be granted pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70(c)(2), as the benefits of the deviations substantially outweigh any detriments.

He stated that the signage promotes safe vehicle travel and provides drivers sufficient notice to access the property safely.

The Board discussed directing truck traffic toward Routes 280 and 287 and away from residential roadways. Applicant agreed to coordinate regarding internal directional information and to instruct tenants to advise drivers of the preferred routes.

Open to the public: None

Applicants will comply w/Planners report dated July 14, 2026 & Engineering report dated April 8, 2026

Mbr. Castano made a motion to approve the application. Second Mbr. Lembo.
Roll Call: AYES, Castano, Lembo, Knoll, Orgel, LaSalvia, Elwood
NAYS none

Christopher Odi – 51 South Ridgedale Avenue, Block: 128 Lot: 8 – Variance for floor area for 864 sq ft detached garage.

Applicant: Christopher Odi

Exhibits: none

Applicant proposes to construct a 24 x 36-foot detached accessory garage, approximately 864 square feet, for personal vehicle storage and residential storage. No commercial use is proposed.

A variance is required for the size of the detached garage. The ordinance permits a detached garage to be 30% of the ground floor area of the principal building or 1,000 square feet, whichever is less.

The residence contains approximately 1,300 square feet, which would permit a detached garage of approximately 400 square feet. Applicant proposes an 864 square-foot garage.

Applicant testified that the garage will be located 10 feet from and parallel to the side property line.

The Board Engineer questioned the location of the tree line. Applicant testified that no trees will be removed.

The garage will be approximately 14.5 feet in height.

Garage roof leaders and drainage shall be directed so that runoff does not adversely affect neighboring properties.

Applicant will prepare the required grading and engineering plans after approval. The plans will be subject to Board Engineer and Building Department review.

Open to the public: none

The Board Planner also identified existing nonconforming conditions relating to front yard impervious coverage, driveway separation and the existing front yard setback. These conditions are not being changed by the application.

Applicants shall provide calculations showing existing and proposed impervious coverage and shall show the stone area adjacent to the deck on the revised survey.

Applicant agreed that the garage door will comply with ordinance requirements regarding windows or panels.

Applicant agreed to comply with the comments contained in the June 18, 2026, engineering review letter and June 16, 2026, planning review letter.

The garage will be used only for personal vehicles, a lawnmower and residential storage.

Open to the public: none

Transcripts page 69 to 88

Mbr. Castano made a motion to approve the application. Second Mbr. Lembo
Roll Call: AYES: Castano, Lembo, Knoll, Orgel, La Salvia, Chairman Elwood
NAYS: None

Mbr. Lembo made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Second Mbr. Castano
Roll Call: All Ayes

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Lisa G. Kiss
Land Use Planning Board Secretary

TOWNSHIP OF EAST HANOVER
LAND USE PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
EAST HANOVER MUNICIPAL BUILDING
415 Ridgedale Avenue
East Hanover, New Jersey 07936
Monday, July 27, 2026
Commencing at 7:00 p.m.

STENOGRAPHIC
TRANSCRIPT OF
PROCEEDINGS

- -

BEFORE THE EAST HANOVER LAND USE PLANNING BOARD
THERE BEING PRESENT:

ALAN ELWOOD, CHAIRMAN
COUNCILMAN FRANK DEMAIO (Absent.)
COUNCILWOMAN CAROLYN JANDOLI (Absent.)
GARY LOMBARDI (Absent.)
SIGI LEMBO
FREDERICK MARRA (Absent.)
MAURO CASTANO
STEPHEN COSENZO (Absent.)
LINDA KNOLL, Alternate #1
JUSTIN ORGEL, Alternate #2
MATHEW LASALVIA, Alternate #3
CARLO FORGIONE, Alternate #4

A L S O P R E S E N T

AUSTIN BEJIN, P.P., AICP, Board Planner
CRAIG ZIMMERMANN, P.E., Board Engineer
LISA KISS, Board Administrator

TRANSCRIBED BY AND BEFORE:
Patricia A. Pucciarello, Professional Court Reporter,
and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey

SENTRY COURT REPORTING
&
LITIGATION SERVICES

100 Hanover Avenue, Suite 202
Cedar Knolls, New Jersey 07927
(973) 998-8685

APPEARANCES:

WILLIAM RUSH, ESQUIRE
Counsel to the Board

DAY PITNEY LLP
BY: KATHERINE COFFEY, ESQ.
8 Sylvan Way
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054
973-966-6300
Counsel for the Applicant

INDEX

WITNESSES	SWORN	PAGE
Hanover Owner, LLC 59 Route 10 Block 99, Lot 12.02		
BRUCE FISH	15	
Direct Examination by Ms. Coffey		16
Questions from the Board/Professionals		38
BRIAN MCPEAK, PP, AICP	53	
Voir Dire Examination by Ms. Coffey		53
Direct Examination by Ms. Coffey		54
Questions from the Board/Professionals		62
Christopher Odi 51 South Ridgedale Avenue Block 128, Lot 8		
CHRISTOPHER ODI	68	
Testimony	69	
Questions from the Board/Professionals		71

EXHIBITS

NO.	DESCRIPTION	ID	EVD
A-2	Signal Sign Co. Package 20 pages	16	

(Exhibits retained by counsel.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Call the meeting to order. All rise for the flag salute, please.

(All rise for a recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Please remain standing.

MR. LEMBO: Dear Lord, bless the individuals who volunteer their time to evaluate, deliberate and vote on the wishes of the community. Give them the wisdom and fortitude to make the proper decisions for the township of East Hanover. Amen.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Adequate notice of this meeting held on July 27th, 2026, was provided by posting this resolution to the township website and the Hanover Eagle, which are circulated in East Hanover, New Jersey, and by filing a copy to all applicable parties, authorities and agencies.

This meeting is being held and conducted in accordance with PL 2025, Chapter 72 of the laws of New Jersey.

Can I have a roll call, please.

MS. KISS: Chairman Elwood.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Here.

MS. KISS: Members Castano.

MR. CASTANO: Here.

MS. KISS: Lembo.

MR. LEMBO: Here.

MS. KISS: Knoll.

MS. KNOLL: Here.

MS. KISS: Orgel.

MR. ORGEL: Here.

MS. KISS: LaSalvia.

MR. LASALVIA: Here.

MS. KISS: Also present is Mr. Rush, our attorney; Mr. Zimmermann, our engineer; and our planner tonight is Austin Bejin. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I need an approval of the minutes for May 26th.

MR. LEMBO: I'll approve the minutes from May 26th.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I have an approval. I need a second.

MR. LASALVIA: Second.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?

I'm sorry, you want to roll call?

MS. KISS: No, you can do all in favor.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous Aye.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Any opposed?

Okay. Next will be the minutes of June 23rd. Same thing, I need approval for the minutes.

MR. CASTANO: I make a motion to approve the minutes of June 23rd.

MR. LEMBO: Second.

MS. KISS: All in favor?

(Unanimous Aye.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Any opposed?

Okay, good. Moving right along.

At this time we'll do the public input. If anyone has anything that they would like to discuss that is not on the agenda tonight, please step forward to the mike, state your name and address.

Seeing no one, I need a motion to close public input.

MR. CASTANO: I make a motion to close public.

MS. KNOLL: Second.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous Aye.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. We need to swear in our professionals.

MR. RUSH: Can you both raise your

right hand? Do you swear or affirm all the testimony you shall give the Board tonight shall be the truth and the entire truth?

MR. ZIMMERMANN: I do.

MR. BEJIN: I do.

MR. RUSH: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Moving right along. Master plan consistency review.

Austin, you want to take this?

MR. BEJIN: Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Tonight we're looking at Ordinance Number 15-2026 for master plan consistency. It's actually really just one change to Section 95-68.1 that affordable housing development fees and subsection D-2(c). And what this would do is reduce the development fee that's assessed onto I guess any additions that exceed 1,000-square foot of livable space.

The current value is 1.5 percent of the increased assessed value of the improvements and what's changing here is going to reduce it to 0.5. And so we took a look at the master plan and specifically, fees aren't typically handled in the master plan. So this ordinance would be not

inconsistent with the master plan.

However as part of the housing plan, it would be effectuating the housing plan that was previously adopted by the Board.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. So basically we need an approval to say that it's not inconsistent with our master plan, correct?

MR. BEJIN: Correct.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Anyone? I need an approval to make it not inconsistent with the master plan.

MR. CASTANO: I approve that it's not inconsistent with our master plan.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I'd go ahead and second that.

Roll call.

MS. KISS: Chairman Elwood.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Yes.

MS. KISS: Member Castano.

MR. CASTANO: Yes.

MS. KISS: Member Lembo.

MR. LEMBO: Yes.

MS. KISS: Member Knoll.

MS. KNOLL: Yes.

MS. KISS: Member Orgel.

MR. ORGEL: Yes.

MS. KISS: And Member LaSalvia.

MR. LASALVIA: Yes.

MS. KISS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All right. Moving right along, Resolution 22-2026, I'm sorry, is Phil and Denise Puzzo.

MR. RUSH: Correct, for 17 Canfield Road. It was an application -- the applicant was looking to construct a one-story addition to the rear of the property on the southerly side, construct a covered patio, modify a portion of the existing garage and slightly expand and repave the existing driveway.

They were looking for three bulk variances. The Board unanimously approved the application with standard conditions. And the conditions specific to this application were the plan -- the applicants will install six juniper shrubs with the driveway setback area at an initial height of 3 to 4 feet and in the space shown on the approved plans and modifications have to be approved by the Board planner. And they need to modify the plans pursuant to testimony at the meeting and obviously, those need to be approved by the Board

planner and Board engineer.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. We need a motion to approve the resolution.
MR. LEMBO: I'll make a motion to approve Resolution 22-2026.
MS. KNOLL: I'll second.
MR. CASTANO: Second.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. I have an approval and a second.
Roll call.
MS. KISS: Member Castano.
MR. CASTANO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Lembo.
MR. LEMBO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Knoll.
MS. KNOLL: Yes.
MS. KISS: And Chairman Elwood.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Yes.
Okay. This is EH-C1 LLC, Resolution 23 -- is that correct? Oh, yeah, 23-2026.
MR. RUSH: Okay. This was an application for improvements that were previously approved for the property including -- and there's a 7,500-square foot utility building, modifications to internal roadways and new surface parking area,

pedestrian open spaces, sidewalks, pathways, shade structures, two pickleball courts, a bocce court, landscaping, lighting, signage, et cetera.
As you know, the applicant was looking to expand primarily the pickleball area. They were looking to go from two pickleball courts to four pickleball courts and also add four padel courts, which I still don't know what that is, really, but it's relatively popular, and they wanted to relocate the bocce court.
This application was denied by a vote of six to two and the basis for the denial was the applicant did not demonstrate a reliable relationship between number of courts and the actual reasonably anticipated office population.
The applicant failed to establish definite terms and limits on guest attendance and access, and most importantly, the applicant failed to establish that the proposed recreational and event facilities would remain subordinate and incidental to the principal office use.
There were some other reasons why it was not as well that I included, but those were the three main ones.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. So even with

this denial, we're just doing an approval of --
MR. RUSH: You're just approving the resolution tonight, you're not revoting on the application.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So I need a motion to approve the resolution.
MR. CASTANO: I'll make a motion to approve Resolution 23-2026.
MR. LEMBO: Second.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Roll call.
MS. KISS: Member Castano.
MR. CASTANO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Lembo.
MR. LEMBO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Knoll.
MS. KNOLL: Yes.
MS. KISS: And Chairman Elwood.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Yes.
MS. KISS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All right. Public hearing, Hanover Owner, LLC, 59 Route 10.
Welcome, Ms. Coffey.
MS. COFFEY: Thank you. Can everyone hear me okay? Good. Great.
Nice to see everybody. I'm Kate

Coffey from Day Pitney and I'm here on behalf of Hanover Owner, LLC. The property is located at 59 Route 10 and South Ridgedale Avenue. It's now known as Block 99, Lot 12.02, which is a portion of the Novartis campus. The screen just went to the beach.
So we're in the SED special economic development industrial district. We were last here, you may recall, on April 28th before the Board. We had some feedback from the Board particularly around the intensity of the signs that we proposed particularly with regard to sensitivity to the homes on Ridgedale Avenue.
So we have trimmed down our proposal significantly. We've eliminated two of the wall signs that were previously proposed as part of the application. And you may recall, we also relocated one of the wall signs on Ridgedale to be closer to Route 10, which should be out of the sight line of the residences on Ridgedale, it's still visible from Route 10. And we also relocated a monument sign that had proposed to be on Ridgedale, so now it's in the route -- it's a Route 10 sign and that's meant to direct traffic so they know that their entrance is on Route 10 rather than being confused and thinking that they should be turning on Ridgedale, which is not

where we want them to go.

We also added verbiage to that sign. You guys will recall that we had talked about adding verbiage to make sure that people knew our entrance was on Route 10.

So the proposal currently is four freestanding signs all along Route 10. Two of those are monument signs, two of those are directional signs, and seven wall signs total. You'll recall two of those wall signs are interior to the site, they're based within the former Novartis campus, so they're not visible from roads, they're meant for internal circulation.

We have three wall signs proposed on Route 10 and two proposed on Ridgedale. We are seeking the variance relief that was outlined in the Colliers July 14th, 2026, planning report.

And with that, I think I'll ask Mr. Fish to come and join me to get into more of the details about what's proposed. While he's coming up, I'll remind everybody Mr. Fish is the applicant's sign expert and he was sworn when we were last here.

Do we need him resworn?

MR. RUSH: Let's reswear him in because it's been awhile.

THE WITNESS: Swear away.

MR. RUSH: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you should give the Board shall be the truth and the entire truth?

THE WITNESS: I do.

MR. RUSH: And can you state and spell your name for the record, please.

THE WITNESS: Bruce Fish, F-I-S-H.

MR. RUSH: Thank you.

MS. COFFEY: And then before we get rolling, so we have exhibits up on the screen that also match what's on the board.

Do we want to mark these page by page as we go, Mr. Rush, is that helpful? Or do you want us to say -- I think it's a total of 20 pages. So we could also just say 20 pages.

MR. RUSH: I guess let's go one by one.

MS. COFFEY: All right. We'll go one by one.

So starting our with our first page, if we could mark that h this as A-1.

MS. KISS: A-2.

MS. COFFEY: We're up to A-2. Forgive me. Thank you, Ms. Kiss.

THE WITNESS: Anywhere in particular?

MS. COFFEY: We were here before, so --

MS. KISS: It was 10 pages of signs.

MS. COFFEY: So A-2.

THE WITNESS: Anywhere in particular?

MS. COFFEY: Probably just in the corner, top right-hand corner. There you go. Today is 27th, yup.

(Exhibit A-2, Signal Sign Co. Package, 20 pages, is marked as Applicant's Exhibit 2 for identification.)

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. And before we get into the substance that's here, can you just briefly describe what we're looking at for purposes of giving the page a name?

A. Sure. So this is just some images of what was previously at the site, I'm not sure if other people remember these things, an old Novartis building that had two sets of letters that were up on the top of the building. There was a freestanding sign along Route 10 that had Novartis, which was an illuminated sign, and there is actually existing -- we're going to replace this like for like, but there

is an existing sign also along Route 10 for directional purposes.

Q. Okay. And then if you could turn to the next page, please, and remind the Board of what the applicant had previously proposed and what's being proposed this evening if you could go to the next --

A. Am I marking each one of these?

MR. RUSH: You know what, actually, let's just call it A-1 and how many pages?

MS. COFFEY: So it's a total of 20 pages.

MR. RUSH: A-2.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. A-2, page 2 for the record. And if you could please walk us through what the applicant had proposed back in April and how that's been updated.

A. So this was our original plan here.

Q. On the left of the --

A. On the left-hand side with the prior proposal showing where the freestanding sign was and also, I've highlighted in yellow four of the pieces that have been changed from the last meeting to this meeting.

MS. COFFEY: I have smaller sizes of these. Would that be helpful?

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Sure.

MS. COFFEY: Okay. Hang on. I'm seeing everybody --

MS. KISS: The small ones are your packet.

MS. COFFEY: I have them right here. I have it all in order.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: We all had that first page, but I don't think we had --

MS. COFFEY: Well, this way no one has to search.

Ms. Kiss, do you have enough there? All right. Cool.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. Okay.

A. So the four -- I've marked up these fours location with large yellow arrows. First of all, Sign Number 25 on our new plan has been eliminated. We reduced one of signs along Route 10. I'm just working my way around, Chairman, clockwise.

Sign C is the monument sign which we relocated closer to Route 10, which we'll talk about further.

Sign number 31, which was previously located approximately halfway in the middle of the tenant space over here, we've slid this all the way down nearly to the edge of the building at the edge of their tenant space, also closer to Route 10 away from the residential properties.

And finally, the last sign which is Sign Number 30 which was facing the residential properties, we've eliminated completely.

Q. Thank you. Can you turn to the next page, please.

A. So this is literally the same drawing just on a full-size basis showing our new proposed plan eliminating the sign that was here, sliding the sign all the way down, sliding the monument sign down and eliminating Sign 25.

Q. Thank you. We could probably go to the next page, please. Okay. And I'm going to do these kind of in two categories in going through the signs.

So we're going to start with the monument signs. So we're proposing a total of four monument signs. Can you talk about what -- actually, I'm just looking at what we've got here.

A. This has all counts but --

Q. So let's start with the wall signs. So can you please tell us about the locations of the wall signs and the materials that they're going to be comprised of?

A. Certainly. So as we previously stated, there are total of seven -- two, three, four, five, six -- seven wall signs, two of which are internal to the site mainly intended for people who are visiting, trucks and whatnot and visitors, so -- and these two being internal don't require any variances, but we wanted them on the plan for everybody to see the totality of the signage for the project.

The remaining signs are closer to the roof of the building, the taller signs. There's a lot of foliage down for this property, so anything that would have been at the 15-foot maximum height would have been totally obscured by the foliage, so that is one of the variances that is being requested for all these signs because they're all above the 15-foot mark, which is part of your code.

The other piece of the puzzle is the size of the sign. The code requires -- has a maximum of either 15 percent or 200 square feet on the sign. We are not even close to the 15 percent. In total

we're just about one percent of the building, but the signs themselves calculate out to just over what was allowed here. So these are 281 square feet, which is above the 200 square feet, so that is another variance that we're looking for for the signs.

The number of signs is not a variance issue, that's not an issue with the code. And again, the overall size of the signs as a percentage is well, well, well, below what the code allows for.

These are going to be backlit, halo-lit illuminated signs. I can show you some pictures of exactly what that looks like later on. These are alluminum signs, they basically hold up to the weather forever. They are -- there's no light that actually emanates directly out of these. There's no plastic faces where the light comes out of.

The signs are aluminum, opaque with an open back. The back bounces off the back of the building or the background and then that creates the light, which is why it's called a halo illumination, because it glows around the perimeter of the letters or shapes and size.

Q. Thank you, Mr. Fish. Can we go to the next page, please, to talk about the proposed

monument signs.

A. And these are just basic details of those wall signs.

Q. So just for -- just hang on before you get going. So you're saying at the top of the page are the details of proposed wall signs, correct?

A. Correct, so we have RealCold, which is a known tenant in the building. We have identified the rest of the building as Unit-A tenant because there's not a specific tenant known there right now. And if by chance this ever became two more tenants, they would not have any additional signs. We would just have a Unit A and a Unit B. So this is the entirety of the signage that's being requested for this building.

Q. Okay. Now we'll go to monument signs.

A. Monument signs, all right. So we have four proposed monument signs. The ordinance calls anything freestanding a freestanding sign that comes under the ordinance. I'll take the two simple ones first. These are signs D and E, which are directional signs indicating how far it is to the entrance. As you approach from Route 10, along Route 10, there's an entrance. The one entrance is off of Route 10 and these are specifically to tell

drivers, most specifically truck drivers, because this is going to have some amount of truck traffic, to slow down to get over to the right lane where the entrance is. So this one is roughly a thousand feet and this one roughly 500 feet, so that would get them to slow down.

The sign at the corner -- this is the one that we had a lot of discussion about at the last meeting and that is the one that we pulled much closer to Route 10 and we added the language with an arrow "111 Route 10 entrance." The issues there which we're sensitive to are specifically you may have a truck that's making a U-turn coming around from the westbound to the eastbound.

We didn't want them to continue on down Ridgedale and disturb any of the residents over there, so we pulled this closer to the road with the intent that they will hopefully see that and with the arrow, will tell them to continue back on the Route 10.

And then further down along Route 10 is another -- a second identification sign for the site prior to -- again, prior to the entrance, but closer to the entrance to the property. These signs are size-wise in compliance. We have setback issues

because of the way that the property is -- it's close to the road. Because of where the foliage is, if we set the signs back to the 20-foot setback, you wouldn't see the signs because they'd be behind trees and foliage, so we do require variances for the location of these signs.

And than lastly we require a variance for the number of signs along Route 10 because there's a maximum.

Q. Mr. Fish, can you go to your next sheet just to show folks what the monument sign along Route 10 are going to look like?

A. So this is the Sign A which is closer to the entrance which is just about right there.

Q. For the record, the right there we're talking about is the top left corner of the image, correct?

A. Just about the top left corner of that image. So this is very close to the final entrance along Route 10 prior to entering this entrance.

Q. Go on to the next page, please.

A. Before I pass this one here, we didn't talk about lighting for these signs here. So this sign and the one on the corner, these are going to be lit with ground-mounted fixtures. There's no

lighting coming from the signs themselves, these are ground-mounted fixtures. The other two signs have no lighting whatsoever, they'll have reflective lighting that just picks up the lighting from headlights.

Q. I'm going to pause you. So you're saying it's ground-mounted lighting, that means that the light is shining away from the road and onto the sign?

A. Nothing goes towards the road. You'll have two fixtures that will face the sign itself and it doesn't impact anything for drivers, roadway, any impact anywhere else except to see the sign.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: And that's single sided, correct?

THE WITNESS: And these are single sided. All four of the freestanding signs are single sided.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. And just before you get rolling, do you have a series of images used from Route 10. So sit tight with us because we're going to see it from a few different vantage points.

Okay. Go ahead.

A. So again, we previously had this. This is Sign C, this is the main entrance sign along

Route 10. This is the one that we moved from further down here. Again, it does create an additional variance. This is now four signs along Route 10 as opposed to three signs with one along Ridgedale, so it creates a variance, but it makes for a much safer situation for truckers and for cars to make that U-turn for people to see it as you're approaching it coming down Route 10. So we hopefully, don't get anybody going down Ridgedale accidentally. We're trying to make that --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Is that to scale?

THE WITNESS: This is to scale.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So what happens when the mayor says to me how can you allow them to put that giant sign and look at the "Welcome to East Hanover" sign in front of it?

MS. COFFEY: So the size of the sign is permitted by your ordinance.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Not where it is, though.

MS. COFFEY: No. Well, right, you'll recall we originally proposed it to be further away from the "Welcome to East Hanover" sign and the Board's feeling was that that would get confusing, frankly, for drivers for traffic onto Ridgedale,

which we didn't want to have.

THE WITNESS: This sign, this exact sign if we had placed it over here where it originally was, we would not need a variance for it. So we moved it, which does incur a variance, but it actually improves traffic flow to the site and keeps people away from the residential road.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: We'll get back to this one.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. Keep going.

A. And these are the two -- and again, these two are not illuminated signs, directional telling people, you know, slow down, it's a thousand feet away, 500 feet away before the entrance is. Reflective lettering, single faced, no lighting.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: I got a question on this one, if you don't mind.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: These are two different signs?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: One, there's a sign out there today which is going to be removed and replaced, one of these signs?

THE WITNESS: Correct, this one right here.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Right. So you're removing and replacing one in kind, let's say, and then adding one of these two?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Thank you.

MS. COFFEY: Exactly.

THE WITNESS: It was requested by the Board of us the last time we were here to repeat or show again the building with the signs on this that originally came before the planning board when we have different -- so this was -- I was not part of the original application for the building itself. This was a -- this was one of the three views that were shown to the planning board of the building and the signs on the building.

There are none to show here. There's a line here that goes into nowhere because there is no sign to be seen.

MS. COFFEY: So we had been asked when we were here in April just to use the views that have been taken as far as the original warehouse application, so we did that and then we have additional imagery also because you can't see much.

Just for context, if you flip in your booklets to page 2 of your booklets, you'll see there's a number of three on kind of the bottom left-hand corner of the revised proposal. This is the view from View 3, which is sort of the back left-hand corner of the property which has proximity to the Ridgedale single-family homes. And as you can see from the exhibit, there's no view of any of the signs from that corner of those signs. All right.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. This view just to correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Fish, this is for View Number 6?

A. Six, yes.

Q. Again, this is using the imagery from the prior warehouse application, just to remind everybody kind of where it came from, and we're further up Ridgedale closer to Route 10. And, again, if you look at that second page, you'll see where the View 6 came from.

Okay. Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Can I ask a question?

MS. COFFEY: Go ahead.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So basically on View 3, the proposed and then basically where you're

taking a photo, what is the point of that sign then?
MS. COFFEY: There is no sign.
THE WITNESS: There is no sign.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: You eliminated it?
MS. COFFEY: We got rid of it.
THE WITNESS: That's the one I eliminated, yeah. We were just asked to repeat those three views that were previously shown on the Board.
MS. COFFEY: We didn't want you think we were holding out on you.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay.
BY MS. COFFEY:
Q. Okay.
A. And then this is View 16, which is along Route 10, and this is where you can see some of the new signs that are proposed along Route 10.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I think you skipped a page or two.
MS. COFFEY: I think you're in a different order maybe.
THE WITNESS: Oh, that's right because you put this at the very end that's right. We'll come back to that one.
MS. COFFEY: So sticking with Ridgedale Ave., we took three views for those of you

who are familiar, closer to the corner is the LIVIA assisted living facility on Ridgedale and we took three views from, for lack of a better term, bridge.
So we took some views from the bridge so that you could understand what would be visible from along Ridgedale particularly closer to Route 10 and in particular from that bridge at LIVIA.
Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So this is -- and I've numbered these, they're 1, 2, and 3. So this is Number 1, so is the closest to Route 10. I'm working my way, again, away from Route 10. So this is standing on that bridge with a view behind and the building is behind all of this foliage right now. You can't see the building at all, but you can see the very -- at the very right-hand in the center, you could see a piece of the building. There's no signs over there.
BY MS. COFFEY:
Q. And Sign 31 is --
A. Sign 31 is behind the trees. Again, working our way down a little bit away from Route 10 along Ridgedale, you see more of the building. This was previously where we had Sign 31 and we slid the sign further to the north. So again, it is behind

all the foliage here.
You get all the way down to the edge of the LIVIA property, this is the first time you can see any signs of Sign Number 31. So this is where it's been moved to and looking at it from the bridge back towards the building, that's the first time you see that sign.
Q. And then next I want to go to the views from Route 10 because there may be -- people may be wondering what's the point of Sign 31 then. So let's do that.
And we took a number of views going back a ways on Route 10, so if you could walk us through each of those.
A. All right. So originally I was asked to take some views from a thousand feet and 1500 feet away. The first one is thousand feet noted here approximately where that is on the map. And you can see the corner of the building which would have Tenant A, but pretty much the rest of building is obstructed by all sort of foliage and the LIVIA property there.
Q. And -- hold on. Don't go.
But what we can see, right, is we can see Sign 23 and you can also see Sign C, correct?

A. You can also see, right, Sign C, so we've noted that here. This is the first time you'll be able to see the monument sign as you approach the building of a thousand, like I said, about a thousand feet away.
Q. Thank you.
A. Which is right by the -- I think this is the Anchor development.
Loop back 1500 feet and once again, you're catching pieces of the building, but you're not seeing Sign 31 at this point in time. You will see the building on the corner and a sign on the corner and you can barely see the monument sign at the corner.
Q. Okay. Thank you. And then we received a memorandum from Colliers saying so what's the point of the sign?
A. Right.
Q. So we did some -- we went back out to see well, what is the point of Sign 31?
We have some additional views for you as well.
Go ahead.
A. So we went back 2500 feet and that 2500 feet, the elevations change significantly. And

so this is literally where you can really see where the Sign 31 is. So you're about a half a mile away, just under a half a mile away, and that's where you'll see that one sign of the building for the tenant that we know of RealCold. And we did another one 3,000 feet away and also that's the Sign 31.

So as you approach this building from, you know, say three quarters of a mile, half a mile away, you will see the building. You can see the building significantly, but you will see that sign, that Sign 31, which is the purpose of why we're asking for a variance for that sign and the size of the sign.

Q. Thank you. All right. Now I'm going back to view of the wall signs from Route 10, please so we can walk through that sure.

MS. COFFEY: And Al, it's just the next one for you. Don't drive yourself crazy.

THE WITNESS: They changed the order on these.

So this is -- so this is the view from Route 10. Again, this image was from the original application for the building, View 16, and we just added the signs along View 16 that you could see from Route 10.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. And now we're traveling westbound?

A. This is traveling westbound.

MS. COFFEY: On Route 10 whereas the imagery that we had on the prior sheets was traveling eastbound on Route 10, just to orient everybody.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Do you have any images of those further away? If it's right here, you don't see anything.

THE WITNESS: You do see these, actually. And what happens here is so we do this all the time, when people complain, you know, they say oh, there's a telephone pole or something like that in front of my sign, I've got a picture of it. And for a moment in time, that telephone pole might be right smack dab in the middle of sign, but this is a moving image here.

So what happens is that pole, like these trees, are going to slide across the image of the sign. So you will read the sign, but I would have to have 20 images up here to give you a little ticker-tape parade of that sign, but these signs are visible along Route 10. They're at an elevation that gets them, you know, above or at the treeline and in between the trees. Not a hundred percent ideal, but

yes, you'll see these signs as you're traveling along Route 10.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. And Mr. Fish, that's part of why it was important to have them as proposed, correct? Because if they were lower, then they would be obstructed by the vegetation?

A. Absolutely. You can't even see anything down at the 15-foot level here or any part of the building.

Q. And then next I just want to give everybody some examples of illumination with respect to the signs. I think it's your last two sheets here.

MS. COFFEY: And Al, you just keep moving forward.

So this first image is of the current signage on Ridgedale Avenue that Novartis has, and we wanted to share this with the Board because it is not what the applicant is proposing.

We know there is concern about sensitivity to particularly single-family homes around illumination from the signs and we wanted to remind everybody what's been approved for Novartis on Ridgedale and then we're going to show you what the

halo lights look like next just to give you a sense of making sure everyone understands what's being proposed.

THE WITNESS: Just to explain, this was the old sign that Novartis had. So the face itself lights up, which we're not having the face light up on our monument sign.

And again, these Novartis letters here that are on the building the face of the letters is translucent and acrylic. When the light comes through them, we're not having that, but we wanted to show this as an example.

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. And then let's show an example of what we are having?

A. So these are three different versions, three different locations of halo illumination. So they're metal letters, they're opaque, as you can see. What you see around is the glow, the halo around the letter. The light goes back towards the building and all you see is the reflection off of the building. Same thing here in Brach Eichler, also in Roseland, same idea, metal letter, the light displays off the back of the building.

Q. Thank you.

MS. COFFEY: Okay. Happy to answer any questions. We did, I should just mention, receive an updated memorandum from Colliers, the planning memorandum. The only questions in there were with regard to the sign materials which Mr. Fish discussed and then also, again, can anyone ever seen Sign 31, which we discussed already.

Happy to answer any questions and then we also have our planner when we're done with Mr. Fish.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Before we go to our professionals, anyone up here?

Mr. Lembo.

MR. LEMBO: The sign that's going to come down Ridgedale to make a left on Route 10.

MS. COFFEY: Come down Ridgedale?

MR. LEMBO: The one we were talking about where --

MS. COFFEY: The monument sign?

MR. LEMBO: The monument sign.

MS. COFFEY: Yeah, yeah, at the corner.

MR. LEMBO: Now, is that going to be split with another tenant if another tenant gets in there?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we have an area there.

MS. COFFEY: So while he's turning, so the sign is always going to stay the same size. And if you look at the detail that's there, right now it says, "RealCold, Tenant A." And then idea would be when we know the tenant name, their name would go into the --

THE WITNESS: The sign won't get any bigger, but the letters may get bigger.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: When R&O was approved, this is a maximum of what, three tenants?

MS. COFFEY: Yes, and the package that we are presenting to you was the plan that had a maximum of -- well, if you got a third, they would take some of the Tenant A signage. So we don't expect that we have to come back and say oh, now we need more signs. We're trying to do it all at once and give everyone the complete picture.

MR. CASTANO: So the size won't change, they'll just have three names?

MS. COFFEY: The size won't change.

THE WITNESS: They're never going to actually say "Tenant A." So whatever the name is, if we have a tenant that takes the entire rest of the

building, we'll put their name there if we get half a building then.

MS. COFFEY: Right.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Was anything done in regards to last time we spoke if you were headed westbound on Route 10 and took the exit down Littell Road and got to the bottom about doing any type of signage there to make sure that tractor trailers are not going to be making right-hand turns onto Ridgedale Avenue?

MS. COFFEY: So the challenge with that is it's not our property over there, so it's something that we can --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Is there something possibly with the -- I don't know how it all works as far as the, you know, but I know there's signs that say, like, Mondelez or Lurker Park and Novartis and there's arrows, you know, it's not going to be like a logo, but it's, you know, identifying where and being that you may have up to three tenants, it might just have to be the address.

MS. COFFEY: Right. So I would say I think the applicant would be happy to have that signage, but it's going to have to coordinate either the town or with the county, I'm not sure who

controls that.

MR. RUSH: That's a county road.

MS. COFFEY: That's county, so --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: It's definitely not us, but I'm just asking --

MS. COFFEY: Yeah, we'd be certainly happy to ask --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I want to make sure tractor trailers are not making a right onto Ridgedale Avenue.

THE WITNESS: One of the main reasons why, you know, we felt that, you know, we agreed with the Board last time to try and move that monument sign closer to regular dale and add the arrowing, do everything we can to get them not to --

MS. COFFEY: Mr. Chairman, if the county -- we're happy to ask the county and if they approve it, we'd be happy to cooperate with them.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: It would be a county application.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Mr. Zimmermann, you want to go first?

MR. ZIMMERMANN: My standing review is still from April 8th because a new revision essentially was just a slide of the one monument

sign, I'll just say about 40 feet or so maybe 30 feet or so. And this -- there's not a lot of traditional engineering involved in this application, it's just a signs that they're asking for and I'm deferring to the planner for the wall signs.

You can see on the one exhibit the two signs, 23 and 31, I think behind the monument sign. I don't know if you want to just show it so the Board can inspect it, I think that's the one that shows the monument on the corner of Ridgedale and Route 10. It's one of the first ones you showed when you showed the monument.

MS. COFFEY: I think it's --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: The top corner of the --

MS. COFFEY: Yeah. You're thinking of this one?

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Yes. If you don't mind, I just want to defer to that one real quick. That one.

So you can see the two signs -- I'm just pointing this out for pattern difference. You can see the monument sign on the corner in front of the East Hanover or in back of the East Hanover sign, you can see the two wall signs that are referred to,

23 and 31, I believe, sir?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Up there on the right and the left, you know, up here. You see that sign? I just got to do it just because it's a Bob Barker thing or something.

MS. COFFEY: Thank you, Mr. Zimmermann.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: It's a lot of power. Thank you for indulging me.

I had a question in regards to -- and the Chairman asked this. He said you can have up to three tenants here, one is RealCold storage and two tenants, but you're only showing a reserved area just for one tenant under RealCold storage, you don't really show three. How would that happen then?

THE WITNESS: We would have to split -- so we would take this area, Tenant A, and split it up into two, into half.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So technically if you could split that, obviously their names would be much smaller. Why does the sign need to be so large? Because again, you know, it's dwarfing the East Hanover sign there.

THE WITNESS: It does dwarf the East

Hanover sign, no question about that. I think the East Hanover sign is way too small.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: That's going to be a problem.

THE WITNESS: The reason is that these -- again, these letters need to be large enough to be legible. This is Route 10 and yes, it's a 50-mile-an-hour road by speed limit, but I challenge you on a day that's not very much traffic to see if everybody is going 50 miles per hour.

So these people are moving along at a pretty good clip and, you know, the theory might be that well, if I saw this sign for RealCold and as I approach to it, I might want to make a right turn, but we don't want them to make a right turn there obviously. And you see this building but you don't know at this point in time where the entrance is.

So this sign here I think is very important, place the sign here that's legible that's got their logos on, whatever the other tenant names might be, and have that additional information with the arrow and the address to keep people going on Route 10. And then once you pass that, you've seen the 1,000-foot sign and then once you pass that, you've seen the 500-foot sign.

And so they're all really there for the idea of getting people A, who are zipping along the left-hand lane to move them over from the left-hand lane to the middle lane and then finally to the right-hand lane to get to the entrance to the site.

It's really a matter of the speed that people go along there and getting them safely to that right-hand side and not having to make, you know, a violent lane change.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So we don't have to dwarf the East Hanover sign, would the applicant be open to replacing the East Hanover sign to make it comparable?

MS. COFFEY: Yeah, the applicant would be. It's actually something we had looked at. We weren't sure if the town would want it to have a sister sign on the opposite corner by Wawa, but if the town would like it, the applicant would certainly be willing to do one of the same size.

MR. RUSH: Let's make it clear this application is not contingent upon the applicant --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: It's not contingent.

MR. RUSH: If the applicant chooses to --

MS. COFFEY: It's something that we, frankly --
THE WITNESS: We actually definitely spoke --
MS. COFFEY: We spent some time obsessing over this.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: It looks ridiculous.
MR. RUSH: It would be voluntary on the part of the applicant.
MS. COFFEY: We would be happy to voluntarily do -- I would assume, and we could coordinate with the township, it would be the same style of signs that would match the one at the Wawa corner.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I'm sure between yourselves and Ms. Green, you guys will work it out just fine.
MS. COFFEY: We'd be happy to do that. And that was part of what had informed the originally proposed position of the sign is we didn't want to have conflict.
So I mean, we've been trying to be sensitive to it in figuring out a solution that would work well.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: That's a solution.

Thank you.
Austin, any comments?
MR. ZIMMERMANN: I have just one more. My letter did say that I think the applicant needs to confirm that this needs to go to DOT for any type of approval for the signage, it's just something that all of you guys --
THE WITNESS: We did.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Okay.
MS. COFFEY: We did check and the answer is it does not need to go to DOT.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Oh, that's the answer?
MS. COFFEY: That's the answer.
THE WITNESS: The answer is we don't need to go to DOT.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Understood. Thank you.
MS. COFFEY: Yes, that was a yes but no answer.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Okay. Understood.
From the 3,000 mark beyond, you're almost in Hanover at that point, I would think. That's fair to say, right?
Can I see the 3,000 exhibit? I just

wanted to get something straight in my head I think.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I believe these are the ones where you enter Golf --
MR. ZIMMERMANN: You're absolutely right. I'm thinking about it now. You're right.
There's a sign that you can see from 3,000 and at nighttime, you would have a soft halo glow around the sign.
THE WITNESS: This here, yes.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: How bright is that? Can you speculate what the general --
THE WITNESS: You'll see a glow of light, not by any means anything like a street light or a traffic light. And as you approach it, you'll probably eventually read RealCold at night and there's lettering underneath it that you won't read until you get very close to it, but it's not as if -- there is no light that's coming at you, it's all reflective.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: No, I understand. There's no glare anywhere as part of this application, at least from what I can discern, including the signs on Route 10 where they are focusing the light onto the face of the wall signs and there's no glare coming out -- I understand that

there's no, like, inside box of light that's coming out, everything is directed in except that glow of the halo.
The idea that you can see someone strike the match from, I think they say two miles away on a mountainside. It's not distracting light, but you could see it, that's why foot-candles come in too. The foot-candles that I take a look at sometimes based on the general volume of light that you can see coming off of that. In that flare, imagine like a nova and then it was just like, you know, affect your size obviously. A little flare like this, I would think that wouldn't make that much of a difference, but you could still see the light, just not irritating because you're not going beyond a certain foot-candle in a moment.
I think I'm done. I'm going to reserve -- I just want to take one more look through my review, but I think I'm good.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Austin?
MR. BEJIN: Yeah, so like Ms. Coffey said, our last two comments were addressed in the materials and I think there was one other comment.
MS. COFFEY: It was the visibility of Sign 31.

MR. BEJIN: Visibility of 31, yeah, which is what we have now, but I actually did have one question about the two monument signs and their materials, as you were talking, I had thought of it.

So it's going to be illuminated with up-lights facing towards the sign. So I guess the letters for RealCold and then eventually Tenant A as well as the address, is that, like, vinyl letters?

THE WITNESS: Those are probably raised letters. We have an aluminum structure kind of frame inside, it's got some size to it. It's going to be concrete footing in the ground.

Both this and the other smaller Sign A have concrete footing for them, there's depth, there's structure engine and then on that structure, are raised letters that sit on top of the face. Everything aluminum finished and then the lights display up to the -- towards the building, towards the sign.

MS. COFFEY: Okay. And the raised letters wouldn't be similar to halo letters where they're off of the sign?

THE WITNESS: No, there's no -- yeah, there's no lighting in the sign whatsoever.

MR. BEJIN: Okay. I just wanted to

make sure.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: I do have one last thing. The lights are dawn to disk, that's --

THE WITNESS: No. Oh, dawn to dusk, yeah.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Per my Comment 14, the applicant should also provide --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: No, no, the other way around, dusk to dawn. Dawn to dusk.

(Crosstalk.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Then the foot-candles really aren't going to matter.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: My bad.

MS. COFFEY: The lighting is supposed to be, I'm just going to say it on the record, dusk to dawn.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Thank you. I just had it reversed. That's my bad, I apologize.

The answer is yes then?

THE WITNESS: Yes, dusk to dawn.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Very good. Thank you. Nothing further.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Anyone else up here?

MR. ZIMMERMANN: I can go all day if you want me to.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: At this time, I'm going to ask for a motion to open to the public.

MR. CASTANO: I make a motion to open to the public.

MR. LASALVIA: I second.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous Aye.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: At this time, I'd like to open to the public. Anyone from the public that has anything based on the testimony given by Mr. Fish, please step up to the mike, state your name.

Seeing nobody, I need a motion to close public input.

MR. LEMBO: Motion to close public input.

MR. ORGEL: Second.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous Aye.)

MS. COFFEY: Thank you. Our next witness is Brian McPeak who is our planner who is going to be talking about the justification for the variances that the applicant is seeing.

So Mr. McPeak did testify on the original warehouse application, but he has not yet

testified in connection with this application, so first we need him to be sworn.

MR. RUSH: Can you raise your right hand, sir?

Do you swear or affirm the testimony you should give the Board shall be the truth and the entire truth?

THE WITNESS: I do.

MR. RUSH: Thank you. Can you state and spell your name for the record, please?

THE WITNESS: Sure. It's Brian with an I, B-R-I-A-N, McPeak, M-C, capital P-E-A-K.

MR. RUSH: Thank you.

THE WITNESS: And I think to perhaps correct the record, I think the way the warehouse application itself proceeded --

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Hold on. We need to qualify him.

MS. COFFEY: Yes.

VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. So Mr. McPeak, I need you to introduce yourself to the Board and the public and tell them about your experience and credentials, please.

A. Absolutely. My apologies.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: No worries.

THE WITNESS: Brian McPeak, I am a licensed professional planner in the state of New Jersey. My license is in good standing. I've appeared before dozens of boards throughout the state including this board on prior applications.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: We'll accept your qualifications.

THE WITNESS: And I believe I actually never had testified for the application for the warehouse.

MS. COFFEY: You just got to watch it.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MS. COFFEY:

Q. Okay. Well, either way, so why don't you tell us about the relief that's being requested this evening and the justification for it, please.

A. Absolutely. I did testify in a subdivision and a fence application and Novartis was the applicant.

So obviously I've spent my fair share of time with reviewing the application, listening to the Board's comments. I'm also familiar with the setting, familiar with the surroundings. PS&S, the company I work for, has done numerous work on this

site and the adjacent property.

With regard to this application, as we've discussed, there are four freestanding signs proposed for site identification and directional guidance, five wall-mounted signs for tenant identification.

Materials I've reviewed include the zoning ordinance, zoning map, the 2005 master plan and the 2022 master plan development regulations re-examination, and the Board's professional reports, most notably the April 8th report as well as I reviewed the July 14th report.

Mr. Fish already testified as to the outreach from PS&S to DOT. Our understanding based on that outreach is that no submittal is required in the situation because DOT does not exert jurisdiction over signage on this particular roadway.

As the Board is familiar with, the site is located in the SED, special economic development industrial district and that sets the framework for the overall situation.

Mr. Fish walked through the signs themselves. I'm going to start with the freestanding signs. We have a couple of variances, or a couple categories of variances, I should say.

One, the number of signs per frontage is limited to one and we obviously have four, Sign C, D, E and A which are all along Route 10, that's an intentional element of the application. The Board made it clear that signage along Ridgedale was problematic for a variety of good reasons, so we redirected the signage onto Route 10 to get those directional issue settled out of Route 10.

In my opinion, these are modest signs, they don't overwhelm the landscaping. They do however, accomplish the purpose, which is to orient the drivers and get them to the facility and let them know how to access it, and that's something the Board has had questions and been sensitive to every single time this site has been before the Board.

So I think there's been a lot of listening on, frankly, both sides and the freestanding signs have gotten into a from my perspective as a planner, a good place.

The other class of variances we need are setback variances with the exception of Sign C right at the intersection on the Route 10 frontage, that has a 20-foot setback which is the ordinance requirement. The other three signs A, B and D have 10-foot setbacks as shown on Mr. Fish's figure here,

and we need a variance for those locations.

The location in this case is driven by the landscape and the other conditions along the frontage. It really -- these signs need to be in this location or they would -- the purpose of the signage would be defeated as Mr. Fish indicated, and I as a planner would agree with that.

Turning to wall-mounted signs, again, we have in this case really three classes of variance; sign area on an individual basis, sign area on an aggregate basis, and then the height of the signs on the wall.

On an individual basis, Sign 27 complies with the ordinance requirement limitation of 250 square feet -- excuse me -- 200 square feet. And the other signs are proposed at 281.25 feet square feet, so nominally larger than the ordinance requires. And then in the aggregate, and this is the one that really becomes meaningful from the standpoint of the restrictions the ordinance places on the signs, is it's limited to the lesser of 15 percent of the wall area or 250 square feet total. If that 250 feet total limitation were to be adhered to, the signs would be tiny and they're already small and they would be tiny.

If we were to evaluate the facade at 15 percent of the western facade, which is Signs 23 and 31, the facade is 82,000-plus square feet, we could have more than 12,000 square feet of signs under a 15-percent sign.

We don't want to do that, but the ordinance -- that's the difference between the 250-square foot limitation and the 15 percent of wall area restriction.

On the northern facade, the facade is a little smaller. There it's a 30,000-plus square-foot facade, so the total 15 percent of that comes out to about 4500 square feet. Again, we're dramatically below those numbers, but we do trip over the 250 aggregate limitation.

In my opinion, the size of the signs is warranted because they would be lost on the facade if they were to comply with the 250-square foot limitation.

The sign height briefly alluded to in the ordinance limits height from the ground elevation at that base of the building to 15 feet. In this case due to the elevation of the site, as well as the landscaping and other materials around the building, were we to comply with 15-foot height limitation,

none of the signs would be visible and again, that defeats the purposes.

From my standpoint as a planner, the Board -- we're here tonight requesting that the Board grant variances under Municipal Land Use Law 40:55-70(c)(2) as granting these variances would advance the purposes of planning and the benefits and deviations substantially outweigh any detriments.

I've sprinkled my testimony with my opinion regarding the signs and these variances, but I haven't yet spoken to the purposes under the Municipal Land Use Law of these variance.

From my perspective, Municipal Land Use Law Purposes A and G are applicable here. A is the sort of I'll say traditional that planning should guide municipal action to yield the result or the appropriate use of land, use or development of land in a state and a manner which will promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare.

In this case, I think the safety aspect of it is what appeals to me most as a planner. The safe movement of vehicles to and from this site is encouraged by this site pattern.

And Purpose G is to provide sufficient space and appropriate locations for a variety of uses

and open spaces, both public and private, according to the respective environmental requirement in order to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens.

In my opinion, granting the request for variances will clearly result in a better result because that action will promote safe vehicle travel. And in configuration of the signs in terms of the number, location and size of the signs is reasonably necessary to adequately inform drivers that they are approaching the site and that they need to get into a position to gain access to the site entrance. So that's the positive criteria from my perspective.

Relative to the negative criteria, again, I've stated this, I don't want to repeat it too much, but the size and location of the proposed signage is modest in my opinion and will not result in visually disruptive conditions. Moreover, the number of proposed signs is also modest and the sign package as a whole does not result, in my opinion, in the -- I knew I was going to struggle -- proliferation of signage along the road.

I don't think these signs will be distracting drivers. Indeed, I anticipate the signs will guide them to timely and useful information so that they can safely make necessary speed adjustments

in relation.

Relative to the master plan and the zoning ordinance, I've reviewed those and in my opinion, these variances would not have an adverse impact on the zone plan and the zone ordinance.

The master plan meets design criteria for Route 10, that speaks to the architecture of pedestrians space and green spaces being focal points of development and not parking lots and signs.

Those design criteria also speak to freestanding signs that should be consolidated in strategic locations, compliment the architectural style of the development, avoid cluttered appearance, and have limited contact -- or excuse me -- content.

Facade signs should compliment and not interfere with or be out of proportion or cover over the building's architectural details. In my opinion, this package does all of those things the guidelines seek to have happen.

Freestanding signage is not cluttering the roadway and the sign package as a whole is modest and really just focused on what it needs to be.

Q. Thank you, Mr. McPeak.

MS. COFFEY: Happy for Mr. McPeak to field any questions the Board or its professionals

may have.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Does anybody have questions up here?
MR. LEMBO: I mean, I have a question, I don't know if you could answer it or not.
I mean, you mentioned the safety factor, and I totally agree with you. And I remember when we came in for the actual building for R & O, there was a lot of people here and they were very concerned about all the truck traffic.
I mean, if this was to be approved, is there any way we could get, like, some signs on the inside just encouraging trucks to try and take 280 and 287?
MS. COFFEY: Well, interior to the site, you mean, for directional purposes?
MR. LEMBO: Correct.
MR. RUSH: That would trigger additional variances.
MS. COFFEY: What I would suggest is if it may be a good solution and assuming you're willing is we can coordinate with Ms. Green and to the extent that it's something we could work out with her, I think the applicant would be happy to have internal directional signage pointing people to the

right.
MR. LEMBO: I mean, I know you can't force them to go that way, but --
MS. COFFEY: Yeah, give me one second.
MR. RUSH: I don't think --
MS. COFFEY: You're talking about internal to the site along the kind of internal circulation, right, is what I think you're saying, right, Mr. Lembo?
MR. LEMBO: Yeah, just to nudge them along and --
MS. COFFEY: Yeah, so I think that we -- that the intention is to have some of that directional signage already, but we're happy to coordinate with Ms. Green and Mr. Bejin to make sure you have it in the right place.
MR. LEMBO: See, that was the biggest concern.
MS. COFFEY: Right, to send them out to the --
MR. RUSH: What I think Mr. Lembo was talking about, though, is he's talking about he wants signs that are directing the truck drivers to take certain routes, not maneuver internally.
MS. COFFEY: Yeah, right. You're

envisioning the, you know, bear right for 280 kind of signs that --
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Like when you're exiting, it will show, like, almost, like, a map of go to the jughandle, turn around, and 287 is that way.
MS. COFFEY: So what I'm being told is it's more of an operational instruction to the drivers. And so the plan, at least at minimum, is to make sure that the tenants are informing the drivers of the route that we expect them to take, so -- which may have a better enforcement.
MR. LEMBO: Or even if you had some interior signs. They don't necessarily have to be outside.
MS. COFFEY: Oh, within the building, you mean? Yeah.
MR. LEMBO: I don't know if the truckers go inside, but --
MS. COFFEY: Yeah, so I think we have the --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Handouts.
MS. COFFEY: Yeah, the truckers do typically go inside and my recollection is that often there's, like, a break area for them to, you know, be

off the road, have a sandwich, that kind of thing. So we could certainly put something up there and have handouts.
And also, again, the intention is to inform our tenants to inform their drivers of the routes that they should be taking along Ridgedale, et cetera, the quickest way to get to the highways, that kind of thing.
MR. LEMBO: In all due respect to the town residents.
MS. COFFEY: Understood.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Anyone else?
Mr. Zimmermann?
MR. ZIMMERMANN: No thanks.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Austin?
MR. BEJIN: I do not have any questions.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: At this time I'll open to the public.
If there's anyone from the public that has any questions for Mr. McPeak, step forward.
Seeing no one, I need a motion to close public input.
MR. ORGEL: Motion to close.
MS. KNOLL: Second.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?
(Unanimous Aye.)
MS. COFFEY: I'll just say a quick thank you. I think everyone is aware of what the proposal is now.
I just want to say, as always, the Board and its professionals in particular are just a pleasure to work with and we really appreciate the thoughtfulness and the intention that we've received all along this process. So thank you very much.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Thank you for also listening to what the Board has said and coming back with, you know, basically solving a lot of our concerns. Obviously traffic-wise we still do have some concerns, which we'll see what happens in the end, but, you know.
So all right. At this point, I need a motion to approve or deny.
Or actually, hold on. One more time I need to open up in case anyone has anything from the public to say about anything in regards to this application.
Seeing no one, I need a motion to close.
MR. LASALVIA: Motion to close.

MR. ORGEL: Second.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?
(Unanimous Aye.)
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. I need a motion to approve or deny the application.
MR. CASTANO: I make a motion to approve the application.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Motion by Member Castano.
Is there a second?
MR. LEMBO: I'll second it.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Mr. Lembo second.
Roll call.
MS. KISS: Member Castano.
MR. CASTANO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Lembo.
MR. LEMBO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Knoll.
MS. KNOLL: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Orgel.
MR. ORGEL: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member LaSalvia.
MR. LASALVIA: Yes.
MS. KISS: And Chairman Elwood.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Yes.

MS. COFFEY: Thanks very much. We really appreciate it.
MS. KISS: Just on the record, we don't have a meeting next month. So this resolution will be in September.
MS. COFFEY: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate it.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All right. Is Mr. Marucci coming or --
MR. ODI: No, I think it's just me.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. So come on up, state your name, spell your last name. I'm going to give you the quick one, two, three on this because you're a new face here.
So basically we're going to swear you in, you tell us what you want to do and we'll have a discussion.
MR. RUSH: Okay. So you're the homeowner and you're here alone, correct?
MR. ODI: Yes.
MR. RUSH: Okay. If you could raise your right hand.
Do you or swear or affirm the testimony you should give the Board shall be the truth and the entire truth?

THE WITNESS: I do.
MR. RUSH: Okay. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.
THE WITNESS: Christopher Odi, O-D-I.
MR. RUSH: Okay. And Mr. Odi, where do you live?
THE WITNESS: I live at 51 South Ridgedale Ave.
MR. RUSH: Okay. And you're the owner and the applicant tonight, correct?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RUSH: As the Chairman said, tell the Board what you want to do.
THE WITNESS: So the purpose of this is to construct a 24-by-36 foot accessory garage for vehicle storage and residential storage. No commercial use. And I need a variance because of the size of it.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. So in your drawings, it shows that it's going to be 10 feet off the property line and the way it's drawn, it looks like it's skewed from the property line.
So is it 10 feet to the front corner and 10 feet to the back corner or is one of those numbers incorrect?

THE WITNESS: It's going to be 10 feet from that, parallel to the neighbor.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Parallel to the property line?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Even though it's not going to necessarily follow the driveway line?
THE WITNESS: It's going to be whatever 10 feet from the property line.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. It's a pretty simple application. I'm just looking for -- anything else you want to put into it or discussion-wise?
THE WITNESS: No. I mean, everything is in the paperwork.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All right. So let's just go right ahead and you are in receipt of the June 18th engineering review letter from Colliers and Mr. Zimmermann?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So we have some comments.
Craig, you want to take this?
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Yeah, sure.
I wanted to know what trees -- your sketch does not show any trees. I don't know if you

have any trees that are coming down this iteration of this property or of the garage.
THE WITNESS: There are no trees being cut down.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: No trees coming down.
How close is the tree line to the back of the garage?
THE WITNESS: I want to build it right in front of the tree I have there, so I guess a couple feet.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: The closest tree is?
THE WITNESS: It's going to be right behind the garage.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Right behind the garage?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Is that tree line?
THE WITNESS: Uh.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Do you have, like, a wooded area in your backyard?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I have a bunch of trees in the back.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Right. Where are they in relation to this survey that you show in approximation?

THE WITNESS: I have a picture.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: I think the point is we would like to see a tree line so we have a general idea of where the --
THE WITNESS: Is that going to be marked on the survey?
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Well, I'm requesting it.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I'll have that marked on the survey.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: All right.
MR. RUSH: Let me ask a question. Is this the picture you're referring to?
THE WITNESS: The next one. The last one I think is in my packet.
MR. RUSH: So where exactly would the garage be?
THE WITNESS: So this is the picture. The garage would be on the left side over here. Then we go previous picture right where these two cars are.
MR. RUSH: Okay. So you're basically putting the cars where they are currently. So you're not cutting any of these trees down?
THE WITNESS: I'm not cutting any

trees down.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: You're not cutting any trees down as part of this application?
THE WITNESS: I'm not.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So basically the area that's part of your asphalt currently will be --
THE WITNESS: Taken away.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: -- part of the garage?
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I think that's where the confusion is.
THE WITNESS: Yeah. I noted somewhere that certain square footage of the driveway will go away and be replaced by the garage.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So basically 11 feet back from the house itself, or I'm sorry, from the deck is where the garage is going to start?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, about 41 feet from the back of the deck.
MR. BEJIN: Back of the house.
THE WITNESS: Yes, back of the house.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Oh, that says 41?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Oh. There's no way

he's going back 41 feet from there and he's not getting to the trees at all.

MR. LEMBO: I don't think so either.

THE WITNESS: In the picture there's a mark here, this is where the front is of the garage will be. I mapped it out. And then back here in this corner right in front of these trees, that's where the garage will start.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: But the depth of the garage is 36 feet?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Austin, you want to maybe pull up Google Earth?

MR. BEJIN: I have a picture in our letter on page 2 aerial, it should be from April, but that 41-foot dimension appears to be from the back of the house to the front of the garage.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Yeah, so based on the photo that you have there on the aerial, assuming let's just say a car is 20 feet deep and you're basically two-and-a-half cars to the rear of the asphalt, correct?

MR. BEJIN: From the back of the house, it would be like -- it would be 33 and a half.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: He's basically even

saying he needs another 11 feet from the deck which would kind of get you to the middle of that rear car.

MR. BEJIN: It's hard to tell on this.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I'm just using the car as a scale.

MR. BEJIN: Yeah, I don't have the Wi-Fi.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: I'm looking at it right now, it looks like he just is going to make it to the back. I'm going 77 feet back from the face of your rear house, I'm going 41 feet to the front of the garage, and then an additional 36, so that's a total of 77 feet. And I just scaled it on Google Earth and it looks like the back of the garage is just going to clear the tree line, it's just going to be right up to it. It's going to be close.

But if the applicant is saying that he is stipulating that there's going to be no tree removal, then there's going to be no tree removal so you don't have to address it.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. And that's your testimony, no trees to be removed?

THE WITNESS: Yes, no trees to be removed.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Got it. Do we know

the height or the proposed height of this garage? I didn't see that in anything. Do you have an idea? Do you have anything for the vendor to suggest what the height is?

THE WITNESS: It's 14-and-a-half feet to the top of the A.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: I think it's somewhere in the drawing.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: That's fine. I just need to know because anything above 15 feet would require a variance. The applicant is saying everything is below that, so he's fine with 14 and a half. That address another one of my concerns.

Excuse me. I'm on page 3 of my letter. Can we talk about -- can you talk about garage drains and leaders, they shall be directed away from your neighboring property. So any type of leaders as part of the garage need to come back onto your site and be captured.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: You can't have any spillage or drainage going over to the property line. You're 10 feet away, I get it, but you can't have that water going to the south, essentially.

THE WITNESS: It won't go to the south. And the neighbor living next to me is higher ground, so I understand.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Right. The point being is the drainage cannot affect your neighbors --

THE WITNESS: It's going to drain to the south.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: -- on any property.

THE WITNESS: Yes, it's not going to affect.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Is there an engineering plan going with this? I mean, just because your paperworks shows that Mr. Marucci was the engineer here, but we don't have any engineering stuff.

THE WITNESS: So I was talking to Anthony and he's pushing me to have everything, all the plans and all the topological surveys and whatnot, whatever survey needed will be done upon approval because I don't want to spend all this money and get rejected.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Yeah, yeah. Okay.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: He's saying that he just wants the approval and when we gets the approval, he will do grading permitting review.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. No worries.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, whatever you guys need.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Okay. There's no environmental concerns here that I was able to detect. You have a stream corridor in your way backyard.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: You're well out of the riparian zone. And we addressed my issue 12, my Comment 12, "Any such approved garage will be subject to the building department's review for any required permitting."
So if you're inclined to approve the garage, then it will move to grading review.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: At the building department. I think that was it.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: What about the footings?
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Oh, thank you. Yes, you will have to make sure that you have a geological soil sample done to rate the soils for the foundation of the garage.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Write that down and

tell Mr. Marucci that.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: You're putting foundations in as part of this garage; is that correct?
THE WITNESS: Yeah, the way the garage bay, it's a pole barn style. So there should be a bunch of poles going into three -- it's in the drawing, but three, four feet down, and then the concrete will tie everything all together. It should be very strong.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: It's something that you will go back to your applicant's engineer and address to make sure that you have the structure integrity of the existing soils to bear the garage via the foundation system that you're using.
THE WITNESS: Okay. What is this called? Just to --
MR. ZIMMERMANN: You need a geo- -- it's not a geological report. You need a soil analysis.
THE WITNESS: Soil analysis.
MR. ZIMMERMAN: Right, and he'll know. He should know what to do.
THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: The soil characteristics that you have locally inform what type of foundation you can put in. So I know you have details of it, et cetera, but if you had spoil or poor soil, you would have to go deeper, for instance, whatever the design is. You can make design assumptions, which you've done, but you'd still need the soil capacity to bear the weight of your garage.
THE WITNESS: To confirm, yes.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Safely for you.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: You don't want next year to have the leaning tower of garage on your --
MR. RUSH: Also just because you didn't do any engineering plans, the Board is approving this based upon this survey depiction that you're giving. So this is where the garage has to go. When you start on your engineering plans, you can't have a different design.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. RUSH: The garage is approved, you know, in this location.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Our office will be

reviewing the grading plan that you do and submit to the building department. So we'll refer back to this to make sure that it's consistent with what.
MR. RUSH: Right. Obviously this is what the Board is approving, so this is where -- you're limited to this location.
THE WITNESS: Yeah, I've marked it off. Okay.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Very good.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All done, Mr. Zimmermann?
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. I believe Member Knoll has a question.
MS. KNOLL: I do.
The second-to-last picture in your packet, the one with the cars in it and the riding mower.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. KNOLL: You stated that you won't be taking any trees down. Can you explain why there's a picture of a tree that's cut up?
THE WITNESS: Oh, the power company came a couple months ago and cut down a tree in front of my house. And they asked if I wanted the wood, so

I told them I wanted it and I chopped it with an axe for a workout.

MS. KNOLL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All right. So now, let's see. Well, let's first open to does our Board engineer or Austin, do you have anything on engineering?

MR. BEJIN: Yeah, I have a few comments. And just for the record, this specific variance that's being requested is for the ordinance requirement that limits garages to 30 percent of the floor area of the principal building or a thousand square feet.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Hold on a second, there, Austin. I want to finish with engineering first.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: I'm finished.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Right, but I want to open to the public.

MR. ZIMMERMANN: Oh, my bad.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So at this point, I'd like to open to the public.

Anyone that has anything in regards -- any questions in regards to what the applicant has stated, please step forward, state your name.

Seeing no one, motion to close public input.

MR. ORGEL: Motion to close.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous Aye.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Now let's do some planning.

Austin, the floor is yours.

MR. BEJIN: All right. Thank you.

So the specific variance that's required is for the size of the garage. The ordinance allows a garage -- a detached garage to be 30 percent of the ground floor of the building or a thousand square feet, whichever is less.

And the information the applicant provided notes that the floor area of the home is roughly 1300 square feet, which would allow a garage of almost 400 square feet.

So the applicant is requesting an 864 square-foot garage and that would be 65 percent plus or minus of the building. So that's the specific variance that's required.

There's also a couple of preexisting conditions that we have found, one for the impervious coverage in the front yard, it looks like there's

circular driveway that has a lot of pavement that exceeds the 40 percent that's allowed. This is similar with the circular driveway, the separation points appear to be closer than the 50 feet that was required and also the house has a front yard setback that's less than 50 feet at about 37 feet.

None of those conditions are changing with this application specific to the addition of a detached garage.

We spoke about my question with the setback to the side because it does look a little skewed. It was the applicant's testimony that this garage would be parallel to the property line so the entire side would be set back 10 feet.

I did have two comments related to the impervious coverage of the site, which I believe could be handled as conditions of approval to calculate the existing and the proposed impervious coverage to show currently what's there on the site and then coverage after the garage is constructed if approved, as well as what appear to be stone area adjacent to the deck, that wasn't on the survey, so just the additional of that.

So you could tell Mr. Marucci as he's drafting the survey to include those things on the

survey, that would address those.

And then the last comment I had was about there's an ordinance requirement for the garage door design. I don't know if you saw it in our letter, it's the last one.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

MR. BEJIN: So do you have like a design of that door that would meet this requirement just to make sure?

THE WITNESS: I don't have one today. I just -- I'll just tell whoever's putting my garage door it to make sure to follow this.

MR. BEJIN: Okay. So that would have windows or panels?

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR. BEJIN: Okay. Then I have no further questions.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. So basically you're stating that you would comply and let Mr. Marucci know that his plans all need to address all the comments of the June 18th and the June 16th engineering and planning letters respectively, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes. Yes.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Anybody have

any planning questions up here? Anyone?
MR. CASTANO: You said the garage is only for personal use?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. LEMBO: Just to put cars in?
THE WITNESS: And a lawnmower.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Lawnmower.
MR. LEMBO: What are you going to do, back all the way up to the circle to turn around?
THE WITNESS: What do you mean?
MR. LEMBO: You're going try and make a K turn there? How would you get out?
THE WITNESS: Oh, to put the cars in?
MR. LEMBO: Yeah.
THE WITNESS: I do that now.
MR. LEMBO: Oh, do you?
THE WITNESS: I go in one way and then I back in.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: So you basically go into the driveway on the right side, swing around and you back all the way up?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. So you're basically coming straight out.
THE WITNESS: Yup.

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: It certainly needs it. I went by and checked it and it's very tight to try and drive it through there. It's very tight.
Okay. Anyone else up here? No?
All right. I'd like to open to the public if anybody has any questions regarding the testimony given by this witness.
Seeing nobody, I need a motion to close.
MR. LEMBO: Motion to close.
MR. ORGEL: Motion to close.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?
(Unanimous Aye.)
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Anybody have any -- anyone from the public anything in regards to this application overall?
Or do you want to do a summary first? I figured you're pretty good where you are. Yeah.
Anyone from the public have any questions or comments regarding this application?
Seeing no one, I need a motion to close public input.
MR. LEMBO: Motion to close.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: All in favor?
(Unanimous Aye.)

CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Like you said, it's a very cut-and-dry application. We need a motion to approve or deny.
MR. LASALVIA: Motion to approve.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: I have a motion to approve. I need a second.
MR. CASTANO: Second.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: We have a second. Roll call.
MS. KISS: Member Castano.
MR. CASTANO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Lembo.
MR. LEMBO: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Knoll.
MS. KNOLL: Yes.
MS. KISS: Member Orgel.
MR. ORGEL: Yes.
MS. KISS: LaSalvia?
MR. LASALVIA: Yes.
MS. KISS: And Chairman Elwood.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Yes.
MS. KISS: Okay. You got it.
MR. RUSH: Congratulations, you're approved.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: You're approved.

Let Mr. Marucci know.
MS. KISS: Just so you know, the resolution will not come out till September 22nd. So Mr. Marucci can do the work, but won't be able to accept it until the resolution comes out. So you're not really building yet until, like, you know, October.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Because we don't have an August meeting.
MS. KISS: We don't have an August meeting.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. RUSH: Why don't we have an August meeting?
MS. KISS: We don't have an August meeting.
MR. RUSH: Why?
MS. KISS: Because I never have quorums in the last five years.
THE WITNESS: So my next step is just to talk to Anthony and let him know it's approved and --
MS. KISS: Yes, start with the plans, yup.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: You may want to --

I'm sorry.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: But you probably don't want to tell him that he's got extra time, that there's a month. You can tell him to go ahead and start his stuff.
MS. KISS: Call me tomorrow.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: He could start it now with the idea you can't submit it until you have the resolution in September.
THE WITNESS: I have people building my garage. Can I tell them I'm approved?
MS. KISS: You cannot --
THE WITNESS: I can't build anything.
MS. KISS: You can't build anything until most likely September 22nd is our meeting, so then they'll have to review it. So you're looking at October, maybe end of October.
THE WITNESS: They told me they have a nine week --
MR. ZIMMERMANN: Lead time?
THE WITNESS: Lead time.
MR. ZIMMERMANN: He wants to get the vendor to start fabrication of the garage. That's at risk, but --

THE WITNESS: What's the risk?
CHAIRMAN SALEMME: You should speak to Mr. Marucci first. It's certainly at your risk. I don't foresee any issues, but you never know. So we're not going to tell you green light, go ahead and do everything because if something does come up, you know, but that's on you.
MR. RUSH: And legally they can't tell you what you need to do going forward. They can't give you legal advice.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. RUSH: And that's where they're kind of stepping into now with legal advice with respect to appeals and things like that.
Just talk to Mr. Marucci and tell him what happened at the meeting and I think he'll guide you appropriately.
THE WITNESS: Okay. Cool. Thank you. Have a good night.
MS. KISS: Motion to adjourn.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Okay. Motion to adjourn?
MR. LEMBO: Motion to adjourn.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Anyone second to adjourn?

MR. ORGEL: Second.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: There's our second. All in favor?
(Unanimous Aye.)
MS. KISS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN ELWOOD: Goodnight.
(Matter adjourned at 8:31 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE

I, PATRICIA A. PUCCIARELLO, a shorthand reporter and Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth, to the best of my ability.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that I am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially interested in this action.

Notary Public of the State of New Jersey
My commission expires April 7, 2029
License No. 2383485