

Township of Randolph
Municipal Building
April 3, 2023

The regular meeting of the Township of Randolph Planning Board was called to order at 7:28P.M. by Vice Chairman Sesko. Darren Carney read the opening statement concerning the Open Public Meeting Law and advised that a notice of the meeting was posted on the Municipal bulletin Board and mailed to the Daily Record and the Randolph Reporter according to the resolution adopted by the Board on January 9, 2023.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Commrs. Bowers, Herold, Suchyta, Whiting, Vice Chairman Sesko

ABSENT: Commrs. Elbaum, Ryan-Meyer, Veech, Chairman Lee

ALSO PRESENT: Darren Carney, Assistant Manager/Planning & Zoning Admin., James K. Pryor, Planning Board Attorney

COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

None heard.

COMMENTS OF THE BOARD

None.

MINUTES

March 20, 2023

Commr. Herold suggested on page 4 to add the two parking spaces for each category. Commr. Suchyta noted he was present for the vote on page 2.

Commr. Whiting made a motion to approve, with the corrections, which was seconded by Commr. Suchyta.

The following roll call was taken:

AYES: Commrs. Bowers, Herold, Suchyta, Whiting, Vice Chairman Sesko

NAYS:

ABSTAIN:

Motion carried.

NEW BUSINESS 7:32 pm

MSP 23-01 Emery Capital Partners
B 73 L 66, 1 Emery Avenue Suite 2
Minor Site Plan, C Variance

Susan Rubright, Esq. appeared to represent the applicant. She thanked the Board for accommodating the applicant as the notice was made for a 7:30pm meeting start. She gave a brief history of the property. The applicant is Emery Capital is located at 1 Emery Avenue and the site contains a multi-tenant unit building. There are currently no free-standing signs. The applicant is before the Board with a site plan and variance application for two signs. There is a 5 foot by 10-foot tenant directory street sign proposed and a double-sided sign for the rear unit of the building which currently has a dance studio tenant. The three variances include the monument sign at 1.5 feet from the front yard setback, directional sign at 26 feet from the curb line and variance for two signs where only one sign is allowed.

Mark Thomases, owner Emery Capital Partners was sworn. He noted that he currently has five tenants and has one additional tenant will be coming soon. He noted he has owned the property since 2005. He purchased the property from General Wire and they still remain a tenant in the building. The tenants in the building now sell to consumers and retail uses including medical devices, family/life skill therapy and dance studio.

Ms. Rubright questioned if there are any safety issues since there are currently not any signs.

Mr. Thomases noted that the new tenant is a dance studio and the unit is located in the rear of the property. A sign would be helpful to provide directionally guidance and safety.

Ms. Rubright marked Exhibit A and Exhibits 1-8 and dated April 3, 2023 a collection of photos of the property.

Vice Chairman Sesko about the rear tenants.

Mr. Thomases explained that the two rear tenants were an environmental contractor and dance studio. He explained the photos and the location of the proposed sign locations. He noted that the proposed signage will help the public see 1 Emery Avenue.

Commr. Whiting questioned if the adjacent property was contacted to proposed additional signage.

Mr. Thomases noted that it might create confusion to have signage on a different property. He noted that the proposed signage would be helpful to create branding for 1 Emery Avenue.

Commr. Bowers asked if the sign on the building was visible from Route 10.

Mr. Thomases noted that the current sign is not visible from Route 10. He reviewed Exhibits 1-8 and noted that the proposed light box sign of the rear tenant which is currently the dance studio.

Commr. Suchtya asked if there was any exit out to Route 10 from the parking lot.

Mr. Thomases noted that there is no exit on Route 10.

Christopher Aldrich, Land Surveyor was sworn and accepted by the Board. He explained the proposed sign #1 on the plan should read sign #2. The proposed sign is about 4-5 feet back from the current realtor sign.

Ms. Rubright asked if there was any better location for the proposed signs.

Mr. Aldrich stated that these are the best locations for the proposed signs. He noted that the proposed location on Route 10 has the visibility from Route 10. He showed the directional sign and location of the dance studio door. He noted that the directional sign will help direct the visitors on the site to find the dance studio.

Ms. Rubright questioned the sign setback.

Mr. Aldrich stated that the sign is 1.5 feet from the property line.

Vice Chairman Sesko asked if the size of the sign requires a variance.

Mr. Carney stated that no variance is required for the size of the sign.

Commr. Suchtya asked if the sign on the building was illuminated.

Mr. Aldrich stated there is no illumination on the sign on the building.

Commr. Whiting asked if the NJDOT location was considered.

Mr. Thomases stated that they considered it but though it would be difficult to get NJDOT approval of a sign for another property owner.

Commr. Herold asked if sign # 2 was cantered would it have better visibility.

Mr. Aldrich noted that might be a better option.

Mr. Thomases noted that would was a good suggestion.

Commr. Herold asked if sign # 1 on Route 10 and it could be cantered towards the west bound Route 10.

Mr. Thomases noted if they moved 6" - 12" that it would be helpful.

Mr. Carney noted that the variance would be for granted for the distance from Route 10. That would allow for a field change to be done if within the distance granted. Commr. Whiting asked about the stop sign and if it would impede the proposed sign on Route 10.

Vice Chairman Sesko noted her concern about the second sign for the rear tenant as the sign remains permanent.

Mr. Thomases noted that the unit has been there for many years and felt that there will always be a rear tenant.

Mr. Pryor noted that the variance is for the location not what is on the sign.

Commr. Herold questioned if the back tenant only access from rear.

Mr. Thomases stated yes.

Vice Chairman opened the meeting up to the public to Mr. Thomases' testimony. None heard.

Vice Chairman opened the meeting up to the public to Mr. Aldrich's testimony. None heard.

Ms. Rubright called the sign representative.

James Hoehn, sign contractor was sworn and accepted by the Board.

Ms. Rubright questioned the sign, size, materials, location and lighting.

Mr. Hoehn explained the sign #1 is illuminated with LED lighting and will have a brick layer base with a changeable tenant panel. The sign will only be illuminated at night. The letters are between 3"-4" tall and the sign is 13" x 5 feet. The sign # 2 is double sided with a Lexan base and panels can be easily changed.

Ms. Rubright asked what kind of lighting is proposed.

Mr. Hoehn noted that it will be LED lighting.

Ms. Rubright questioned if there is any lighting glow.

Mr. Hoehn noted that the LED lighting has no light spillage.

Vice Chairman Sesko questioned if the Board has any questions.

Commr. Herold asked about the colors.

Mr. Thomases explained the color is black.

Commr. Suchyta asked about the timing of the lights.

Mr. Hoehn noted that the sign lights timing is able to be changed by the owner.

Mr. Carney noted that the ordinance states that the sign lighting needs to be off by 10:00pm.

Mr. Thomases agreed to have the sign lighting turned off by 9:00pm.

Vice Chairman Sesko opened the meeting up to the public. None heard.

Ms. Rubright summarized the case and noted that the applicant is seeking three variances under the C1 and C2 Flexible C variance. The parking areas and the topographic areas do not permit the signs to be in complying locations. The directional sign in a conforming location would not be beneficial. The need for two signs would be under the C1 variance the need for safety of the directions will be helpful to visitors to the site. She noted that under the negative criteria other property owners in the zone have similar signs. She requested the variances and noted that safety and visibility would be advanced. She agreed the field fit of the signs if the Board was in favor of granting the variances.

Vice Chairman Sesko opened the meeting up to the public. None heard.

Commr. Whiting made a motion with all the conditions that were discussed and Commr. Suchyta seconded the motion.

The following roll call was taken:

AYES: Commrs. Bowers, Herold, Suchyta, Whiting, Vice Chairman Sesko

NAYS:

ABSTAIN:

Motion carried.

COMMENTS OF THE PUBLIC

The Board discussed the correspondences that were in the packet.

Mr. Carney noted that the BOA annual report is submitted to the Planning Board annually for informational purposes.

COMMENTS OF THE BOARD

April 3, 2023

6

There was a motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:38pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kimberly A. Coward, Recording Secretary