

Present: Waterbury, Peterson, Canonico, Betesh, Stambaugh, Fisher, Clark,  
DeSalvo  
Kennedy (Attorney)  
Cranmer (Engineer)

Absent : Walsh

Chairman, Ms. Waterbury, called the meeting to order at, 7:30 p.m.  
All saluted the flag, and the presiding officer's statement was read.

**Minutes:**

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded Ms. Stambaugh to adopt & memorialize the minutes of the October 6, 2010 meeting minutes as submitted. All approved.

**Correspondence:** none

**Planning Board Representative:**

• **Use Variance Checklist:**

Both Mr. Cranmer & Ms. Waterbury gave their view points on the use variance checklist. Mr. Cranmer suggested that some of the following information be included:

- What type of use is proposed
- Surrounding uses
- Taxes are current
- Proofs in advance of the meeting
- Site plan or concept plan
- Residential - height variance

Mr. Cranmer stated that the board should determine what they would like to see on the use variances. We would also need an administrative agent for completeness determination, who does not have the authority to grant waivers, the administrative agent would only place the applicant on the next available agenda.

Ms. Waterbury said that the "D" variances do have a different weight to them than the regular "C" variances. It is important to weigh what the differences will be. The height variance you need the height but the use variance you must weigh the impact that could occur from a non permitted use vs. what would be permitted, to insure that it would be appropriate and fitting to the site. She feels that some type of concept plan would be required. Earlier other checklists were circulated and she is asking the board secretary to recirculate them to members.

Mr. Cranmer explained that the board can approach this two ways:

1. Ask for basic information and rely on the professional to review the application (where the site is, what they want to do, surrounding uses, taxes paid)
2. Ask for everything and grant waivers at the completeness hearing (concept plan, traffic study etc.) and the applicant can ask for submission waivers

Mr. Betesh feels that even though the 2<sup>nd</sup> approach to have a master check list and have the applicant ask for waivers, he feels, that it could result in a tremendous amount of work on the part of the applicant. Board members can discern what is important and what is not. He likes the idea of the check list as a “guide” for the board members as a reminder as to what they would like to see as part of the application or hearing. He feels that there will be a lot of time could be spent on unnecessary details.

Ms. Waterbury feels that there is a middle ground or smaller check list on “D” variance vs. a site plan or subdivision, but enough to understand the impact of the proposed change. The check list gives the board a time frame to act on the application and the check list would give you the basics in order to act on the application.

Mr. Kennedy said that one of the items on the check list is “any thing else that the board deems relevant and necessary” and even if you don’t have a check list and the applicant is looking for a “D” variance he always takes the position that all things are relevant in a use variance application. If the board feels that there is need for a submission we can hold the “relevant and necessary” to protect the boards interest.

- **Definition Building Height** was discussed this will be place on the **12/1/2010** agenda for further discussion. Ms. Waterbury feels that the definition needs to be simple and easy to interpret. Ms. Waterbury asked that board members read the model definitions and be ready to make a recommendation to the Planning Board

**Treasure Island Plaza:**  
Bl 70.01, Lot: 2

**Adoption of Resolution**  
façade enhancements & Parking lot  
Permanent Resolution

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Betesh to adopt & memorialize the resolution of approval to Treasure Island Plaza, for façade & parking lot improvements as submitted.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, Betesh, Fisher, DeSalvo

Negative: None

Ms. Waterbury announced no Executive Session tonight.

Ms. Waterbury stepped down from the Shrewsbury Car Wash and Ms. Peterson took the seat as Chairperson.

**GBD LLC, d/b/a Shrewsbury Car Wash:** Completeness/Amended Minor Site Plan  
Shrewsbury Ave Approval  
Bl: 70.01, Lot: 2

Mr. Kennedy announced that he has reviewed service in this matter and finds it adequate and the board has jurisdiction.

Mr. Kennedy marked the following into evidence:

- **B-1:** Cranmer Engineering - Completeness review dated 9/23/2010
- **B-2:** Cranmer Engineering Review letter dated 11/1/2010
- **B-3:** Resolution adopted by Shrewsbury Board of Adjustment 12/4/2002

Mr. David Haber, Esq. represented the applicant GBD, LLC, Mr. Gary Laurino, Robert Russo, and Dino Nicolette. Mr. Kennedy asked if any board member had a conflict with any of the principle owners? There were no conflicts.

Ms. Peterson asked Mr. Cranmer if the application is now complete from lasts months hearing?

Mr. Cranmer said that the applicant has satisfied the information needed and he is recommending that the board deem the application complete.

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Betesh to deem the application of G BD, LLC complete.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Peterson, Stambaugh, Betesh, Fisher, Clark, DeSalvo

Negative: None

Abstain: Canonico

**Site Plan Hearing for the canopies:**

Mr. Gary Laurino, Principle, Shrewsbury Car Wash, was sworn

Mr. Jason Fichter, Insite Engineering, Engineer/Planner was sworn

Mr. James Ambrose, Allied Environmental Signage, Project Manager, was sworn

Mr. Fichter gave his educational & professional background in engineering/planning and was accepted as expert witness.

Mr. Kennedy marked the following into evidence:

**1<sup>st</sup> set of photos:**

Photos taken by Mr. Laurino & Mr. Russo 1 week ago

- A-1:** Shrewsbury Car Wash (right hand side)
- A-2:** Precision Marble sign
- A-3:** Monmouth Building Center
- A-4:** Junction Auto Body
- A-5:** car proceeding north on Shrewsbury Ave
- A-6:** blurred car
- A-7:** traffic on road
- A-8:** picture of traffic on road
- A-9:** picture of road w/Homeowners welcome sign
- A-10:** Valley National Bank sign
- A-11:** The Grove sign

**2<sup>nd</sup> set of photos:**

Photos taken by Mr. Laurino & Mr. Russo 1 week ago

- A-12:** photo of Shrewsbury Car Wash
- A-13:** black & red canopy with car
- A-14:** photo of car wash with height dimension
- A-15:** photo of car wash with yellow truck
- A-16:** photo of rear entrance of car wash (full service signs shown)
- A-17:** double post cantilever entry height dimensions (2 pages)
- A-18:** sign detail of Shrewsbury Car Wash, prepared by Allied Sign

Ms. Peterson referred to the Zoning Permit denial letter

- sign set back required 25' where 2' from street line was proposed, which has been revised to 5'
- maximum allowed for sign of 28 sq. ft. on 1 side. The applicant has noticed for 70 sq. ft. where they proposed 42 sq. ft.

Mr. Kennedy stated that the applicant did notice for the more intense set back and square footage of the sign and does not have any concerns. Mr. Cranmer stated that the board did not see what Mr. Donlon's originally reviewed since the plan has been revised.

Mr. Cranmer gave an a brief overview of the previously approved site plan approval for the members that were not here back in 2002, and he explained that jurisdiction for this site was retained at the Zoning Board due to an interpretation that a car was permitted in the LI zone, and not by a use variance. There is still a performance bond on file with the Borough because of an issue with Freehold Soil and the cleaning of a pipe on the site and the applicant is still working things out with Regulatory Agency to work things out, which will not have any impact on the site right now. While still under the Performance Guarantee the applicant has made a decision to apply for the canopies and change the location of the sign which was granted in 2002. The application is for an amended site plan which the board should look at as amended site plan which was previously approved by this board.

Mr. Haber stated even though he was not the attorney for the application in 2002 he is under the understanding that this board determined that the car wash was a permitted use in 2002 by interpretation and retained jurisdiction. The reason why they are before the board for an amendment is based upon the canopy and the bulk variances for the sign.

Mr. Fichter testified that he prepared the site plan for the applicant, and he did review the review letter from Mr. Cranmer dated 11/1/2010.

Mr. Fichter presented a color rendering of the site plan, dated 4/8/2010 revised 10/14/2010 prepared by Insite Engineering, marked as **A-19**.

Mr. Fichter described A-19 as to what currently exists on the site and the new canopies that are proposed. He testified that the canopies will be beneficial for weather for the sun and/or cold weather giving a more presentable look to the carwash. He referred to exhibit A-16 the incoming side of the car wash and a small red canopy which covers the sidewalk, and the area which is to be covered by the new canopy is 2 stacking lanes under the full service signs. The new canopy will match the existing color of the existing canopy. The exiting canopy will be for the same reason as the other, weather for either sun or cold weather.

Mr. Fichter testified that the existing sign will be removed and a new sign will be installed as shown in exhibit A-1. The proposed sign is as close to scale as possible without putting the sign behind the utility pole that currently exists there, the sign will be slightly closer to Shrewsbury Ave.

Mr. Fichter reviewed the variances that are being applied for:

- set back of the free standing sign, 25' required, 5' proposed - for better visibility
- sign area: 28 sq. ft. permitted, 45.75 sq ft. proposed
- proposed non conforming digital sign which is not permitted.
- Checklist items have been addressed under t completeness hearing
- No change in the use of the property of a car wash will remain, only change is the installation of the canopies to enhance the use
- No change in the total impervious area on the site
- No change in the traffic, therefore no additional parking will be required, no additional lighting required

Mr. Fichter testified that the sign set back of 25' required, 5' proposed is a "C1" variance which is a hardship due to the unique shape which limits visibility, and presented exhibit **A-20** into evidence, aerial view of the site taken from Google Earth, 4/8/2010, revision #3 10/14/2010, shows the curvature & trees along Shrewsbury Ave, and described exhibit.

Mr. Fichter testified that the car wash is a destination use as opposed to leaving your house and to go to the car wash. Mr. Fichter referred to the following exhibits to indicate the traffic along Shrewsbury Ave A-5, A-6, A-7, A-8, A-9 he described each photo and the inability to see the car wash with respect to the curvature of Shrewsbury Ave., and the car wash is located on the inside of the angle, trees along the stream which they cannot touch, and trees on neighboring properties heading northbound. The situation is unique for this piece of property since most pieces of property are not shaped in the manner that the car wash is shaped. The applicant is trying to maintain as much of the set back as possible while gaining the visibility that they need to achieve for succeeding.

Mr. Fischer testified that the new car wash sign will not be the only sign which is not 25' from the road. Ms. Peterson asked if other locations for the sign were considered? Mr. Fischer indicated yes, and that Mr. Laurino did place a piece of wood in different locations of the property and the proposed location is a balance of giving as much to the Borough yet gaining additional visibility that they feel they need in order to be noticed.

Ms. Stambaugh pointed out that the resolution dated 12/4/2002 indicates that the free standing sign shall be located 25'; she asked if it is 25' or 20'? Mr. Cranmer stated that it scales 20'. Mr. Laurino said that it is closer to 25'.

Mr. Fisher asked if the new sign will be smaller in square footage than the existing sign? Mr. Fischer said that the existing sign is 40+sq. ft. when the 2 signs are added together, the new proposed sign is 45.75 sq. ft. slightly larger, but he discounted the area between the top portion and bottom portion of the existing signs so the existing sign is larger.

Mr. Fischer referred to exhibit A-2 and stated that the Precision Marble sign is 70 sq. ft. vs. their 45.75 sq. ft @ 7'.5 off the back of the sidewalk where they are 8' from the back of the sidewalk as proposed and their sign would be lower. Exhibit A-3 Monmouth Building sign is 58 sq. ft. which is 1' off the sidewalk. Mr. Cranmer feels that the signs were built approximately 20+ years ago. Satellite Storage (A-2) sign is 80 sq. ft., 15' off the back of the sidewalk. Junction Auto Body exhibit A-4 sign is approximately 53 sq. ft., 9' off the face of the curb, where their sign is 15' off the face of the curb.

Mr. Cranmer stated that the woods are the obstruction to the visibility of the existing sign? Mr. Fischer said correct, and the "As Built" shows little trees but now the trees now obstruct the sign. Mr. Fischer referred to A-5 which shows that the canopies of the trees now allow you to see through the trees and it would be better visibility for the lower sign. Mr. Cranmer suggested moving the sign further south for better visibility of the sign.

Mr. Fischer referred to the sign area which he feels is a C2 variance, 45.75 sq. ft requested where 28 sq. ft. is permitted. Referring to A-18, he feels that the sign could be broken down into 2 parts 33.75 sq. ft. for the top portion and 12 sq. ft. for the digital portion for a total of 45.75 sq. ft. Mr. Fischer testified that his client feels that a 28 sq. ft. would not create enough visibility to market their business and succeed, as proven by other signs along Shrewsbury Ave which are larger.

Ms. Peterson asked what the purpose of the 4' square under the sign? Mr. Fischer explained it's the base of the sign and he testified that the applicant would be willing to landscape the base of the sign. Mr. Fischer feels proper landscaping will soften the look of the base.

Mr. Fischer referred to the digital portion of the sign as a C2 variance, the size is 12 sq. ft. 8' x 1' ½"). The applicant feels that the sign will significantly increase the visibility of the site and attract more business. There are other businesses in the Borough that currently have digital signs, and they feel that since they already exists in the Borough they also can utilize the same advantage. Mr. Cranmer read section 94. 8.34A-7 into the record clarifying that the base is not included in the area of the sign only if it is being used for sign advertisement.

Mr. Fischer feels that the "message" portion of the sign would also be attracting business for any specials or that they are open on Sundays.

There was a lengthy discussion on the l.e.d. sign and the interchanging of the sign and that the board did not approve the sign on the original site plan approval. Mr. Fischer referred to exhibits A-10 (Valley National Bank) & A-11 (Grove) which show other l.e.d. signs throughout the Borough.

Mr. Fischer stated that the proposed signs would not rise to the level of substantial detriment to the public good or impair the intent and purpose of the Zone Plan and it is his opinion that the positive benefits outweigh the negative benefits of the application and the board could approve the requested relief.

Mr. Fischer summarized:

- C1 variance for the sign setback, 20' required proposing 5'
- C2 variance for the sign area 28 sq. ft. permitted, 45.75 being proposed
- C2 variance for the digital sign (not permitted in any zone)

Ms. Peterson referred to A-18 Option 1 & Option 2; she asked which is being proposed? Mr. Ambrose said that they are both the same size, they are choosing Option 2. The top portion is not changeable only the lower portion will be a red digital sign, which are controlled by a computer for changing of the signs. The sign would not flash or scroll. They may have an alternate default message i.e. time & temperature. The hours of digital would be the same as the site lighting; the sign would not be on all night. These types of signs are becoming more and more prevalent in the area. The placement of this sign would be better for all drivers going north and south.

Mr. Kennedy asked the applicant if he will be selling advertising rights or this strictly for his use? Mr. Laurino said this is just for the car wash.

Mr. Kennedy asked if the Police Department should review this? Mr. Cranmer explained that the plan is routed to them for their review, but no response has been received.

Break 9:20 pm to 9:27 pm All present at roll call.

**Review of Engineer Review letter dated 11/1/2010:**

**Site Plan layout and Traffic Control:**

**2.1:** Testimony given on the use of the canopy at the entrance will be used for protection from the elements for the employees and will enhance the look of the car wash and take away the look of an “erector” set. The vacuums will now be hidden under the canopy and they will not act as support members they will have their own support members. The new nylon canopy will match the existing canopy, it will be left up year round even though it is not rated for snow load but this canopy is used throughout the country, it will have a peak of about 12’-13’ with the edge of 9’, the supports will be powder coated steel, maintenance will be as needed or what is suggested by the manufacturer, their life expectancy is at least 10 years+. Mr. Laurino testified that no detailing will be done under the canopies.

**2.6:** Mr. Fischer testified that the minimum clear dimension between the n.e. corner of the canopy and existing curbing is 12’ is sufficient for any type of vehicle to pass.

**2.7:** Mr. Fischer testified that the vertical support and footings have not been determined. Mr. Laurino testified that they will be between the lanes and will not obstruct traffic; they will not be behind the curb line as referred to A-16, Mr. Fischer testified that these vertical supports will be taken out and replaced with the proposed canopy. Mr. Laurino stated that the new canopy will be secured in the blacktop. Mr. Cranmer stated that the construction of the canopy will be deferred to the Construction Official.

Ms. Peterson asked if there will be any verbiage on the canopy i.e. full service etc?  
Mr. Laurino stated that he will be keeping the full service signs hanging off the canopy no messages will be on the canopy itself.

Mr. Fisher asked if the canopy in the rear will be visible from Shrewsbury Ave, will it be higher than the building? Mr. Laurino said not at all. Mr. Fisher asked what was the purpose of the canopy in the front of the building? Mr. Laurino said that his thought was that under certain conditions it would supply shade to the cars, and in the winter it would be for perception than reality, but it also helps to have a cover and have the cars closer to the doors and to help to keep the employees a little warmer and for freezing, there would be some esthetics involved but mostly more functional.

A motion was made by Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mr. Fisher to open the meeting to the public. All approved.

No public.

A motion was made by Ms. Canonico, seconded by Mr. Fisher to close the meeting to the public. All approved.

**Board comments:**

Ms. Canonico stated that she was present in 2004 and there was a lot of testimony on the application, and she feels that the applicant has done a great job on the site. The sign was discussed with regard to the physical size and when she does drive by the applicant makes a good point that the sign is difficult to see now where it wasn't 5 years ago. She feels that the applicant has proved a good point that there are other signs on the street that are close to the road. Ms. Canonico stated that she would be in favor of the sign location. The canopies she has no problem with, they are needed and they will create a balance on the building, and a canopy is needed in the front. Option #2 on the color of the sign would be her choice. Ms. Canonico stated that the negative would be the l.e.d. portion of the sign, especially with a changing message. If he could incorporate the message part in the main portion of the sign, but she would not be in favor of the l.e.d. portion. She feels that the base is a little "chunky" and may cause an obstruction, she would like to see the base changed but it would not change her vote.

Mr. Laurino asked if the "changing portion" of the sign was changed weekly or monthly would she have a problem? Ms. Canonico feels that it is hard to control, and she feels that moving the sign closer to the road will achieve what the applicant is looking for.

Mr. Laurino asked if the l.e.d. only had time & temperature? Ms. Canonico said that she may not have any issue with that.

Mr. Betesh asked if there are other l.e.d. lights that could be used other than the obtrusive ones that used, i.e. white background with black letters? Mr. Ambrose explained the technology that is used with the dots forming the letters, which he feels is "cheesy". There are smaller lights clustered together which would give a few more options which would make you think differently when you see the message. Mr. Betesh feels that the red l.e.d. technology is very obtrusive and they may want to put up a sign which could be black and white which makes it look like a sign.

Ms. Stambaugh stated that she doesn't have any issue with the canopies as long as they meet all of the codes. She has a problem with the sign, the base of the sign and feels that there may be traffic issues exiting the car wash since the sign is lower and closer to the road. The sign is too close to the road, the sign will be moved from 20' to 5' which is too close to the road. She doesn't like the sign, and l.e.d. portion is not necessary and it is a diversion to drivers and could pose a traffic problem.

Mr. DeSalvo stated that he has no issues with the canopies. He has similar issues with the sign, it is close to the road, which he feels that the sign should be closer but he is not sure of the distance. He would not approve the l.e.d. portion of the sign.

Ms. Clark she has no concerns with the canopies as proposed, the site is one of the nicest businesses in Shrewsbury, and they will add to the site. She did visit the site and would like to make sure that the sight distance would not be an issue. There is a sight problem with the existing sign and does not like the digital sign since Shrewsbury is a historic town and we have lost the perspective of that throughout the town and would not like to see flashing lights all over. Ms. Clark does feel that the Shrewsbury Car Wash is one of the better maintained businesses in town but she is not in favor of the l.e.d. portion

Mr. Fisher said that he is in favor of everything except the digital portion of the sign. The sign that is proposed is smaller than the existing, and is in a better location and is one of the better signs along Shrewsbury Ave. He doesn't like poles but the board is not here to dictate how he mounts the sign.

Mr. Betesh stated that he likes the solid base to the sign, makes the sign look more substantial, he does have concerns with the site lines, but if it isn't a problem landscaping would make the base look much better. He agrees with Ms. Clark that the site is well maintained. The existing location for the sign is a problem. If the board does approve the digital and allow the message to be changed he hopes that it would be a full color and restricted to black and white and still achieve what he needs for the business, he doesn't like the red l.e.d. and he agrees that it is not in character with the town. The canopies will improve the appearance of the car wash, but the digital sign is main concern. He doesn't have any concerns with the proposed placement of the new sign.

Mr. Fisher feels that if the sign is placed where it is shown on the exhibit A-1 he doesn't think that there will be a site line issue, as you exit the driveway you are past the proposed sign and again in A-5 the angle of the turn shows the sign behind the site line. Mr. Cranmer agrees, that the sign will just hit the 5' set back, he suggested that the sign be pushed back to the 10' set back line.

Ms. Peterson stated that she does not have any problem with the canopies they will serve a function and enhance the site. Because of the unique shape of the property and the location on the curve of Shrewsbury Ave the sign does need to be moved closer to the street. She feels that it needs to be out of the site triangle and doesn't obstruct the view. The design of the new sign is fine with her but she cannot agree to the digital portion of the sign. She feels that most of the signs in Shrewsbury need to be taken down and reconstructed. This sign is important to the success of the business and needs to be closer to the road. The entrance to Shrewsbury on Broad Street has been ruined by the construction of the digital sign at the Library. She cannot support the digital aspect of the sign. The base is fine and the sign is needed by people who are driving by the business for the first time.

Mr. Fisher addressed the applicant and said that if he moves the sign back to alleviate some of the traffic concerns and take the l.e.d. portion of the sign he feels that the application will be approved.

Mr. Laurino said that he will move the sign back. Mr. Cranmer suggested 10' to the right of way line, where 5' is proposed. Mr. Laurino agreed. Mr. Laurino asked the board to consider an amber time and temperature to the sign. All board members agreed no digital time & temperature. The board feels that the 2 digital signs that currently exist are here and that adding a 3<sup>rd</sup> is setting a precedent for many others.

Mr. Haiber said that the precedent already exists and this would be an amber sign and will not flash and will not change. He doesn't understand what it is that is obtrusive of this sign, which is already in Shrewsbury but cannot be on Shrewsbury Ave. Mr. Fisher stated that this sign cannot be regulated to just doing time & temperature. Mr. Haiber said that his client will agree to do just that. Ms. Peterson said that this type of sign adds a different feel to what Shrewsbury is, and that is the reason why it is in the Ordinance as not an approved sign. Mr. Haiber said that he has noticed 3 towns for this application, on this County road, and this board is trying to legislate one side of the road, and he feels that it is unfair to the commercial establishments in your community to have this standard which is different from across the street. Mr. Cranmer disagreed with Mr. Haiber and stated that there is no provision of "setting precedent" in Municipal Land Use Law. You cannot rely on another sign in another zone in another part of town and state that a precedent has been set.

Mr. Fisher said that the applicant has proven that there are challenges associated with the set back issue of where the sign is located. They have not proven that they need to have a digital sign, which would warrant this board to grant a variance for the sign. The sign needs to be in the set back area and the applicant has proven the need.

Mr. Kennedy said in respect to the sign at the Library it was done on a Capital Review only not for an approval, when they did go to the Planning Board they indicated that they did not like it, but it was done anyway. Ms. Peterson stated that the sign at the Library stands out like a "sore thumb".

Ms. Clark stated that there was a lot of discussion on that sign and the board was not happy that the digital was going up and they did not have anything to say about it, and it was voiced by the Planning Board that they were not happy on the "look" of the sign. The County did paint the sign to bring it more into what the town was trying to do.

Mr. Haiber said that the board could approve the sign with the condition that only time & temperature. Mr. Betesh said that we could also deny the entire application since the sign was not in compliance with our regulations. Your point about having a different standard from adjacent towns that is what gives Shrewsbury its character and no one likes the existing digital signs that are in our town and if the board could they would all be removed. The fact that they are there doesn't give the board justification to add more.

Mr. Cranmer suggested that the applicant return next month with the changes as discussed by the board, i.e. what the sign will look like, location of the sign etc. The board should give Mr. Kennedy direction to draft a resolution.

Mr. Haiber said that he would agree to amend the application to seek the variance for an amended site plan with the proposed canopy, and to place the 45.7 sq. ft. sign without the digital component within the 7-10' set back.

Ms. Peterson asked if the sign without the digital component 33.75 sq. ft. or are you asking for the full 45.7 sq. ft. which includes the digital sq ft. area. She suggested that the applicant present next month where the sign will be located and what the sign will look like.

Mr. Kennedy agreed that if this application were to be approved tonight, next month the resolution would be adopted and the 45 days appeal would start, the board is suggesting that the application be continued until next with the final detail, eliminating the digital element, and he will bring a draft resolution. If the board likes the amended drawings then the board will vote on the application to approve and then vote to adopt the resolution as well.

Mr. Haiber suggested that the applicant talk to Mr. Cranmer to determine if the set back should be 7' or 10'. Mr. Cranmer said that he would suggest 10' but he will work with Mr. Fischer on the verbiage that will appear on the sign, the landscaping and the location of the sign.

Mr. Kennedy asked Mr. Haiber if he will grant an extension of time through 12/1/2010. Mr. Haiber agreed.

Mr. Kennedy announced that the application for Shrewsbury Car Wash will be **carried to the 12/1/2010 meeting** without further notice.

**Draft Resolution 12/1/2010** will be prepared by Mr. Kennedy.

Ms. Peterson asked Mr. Kennedy what is the procedure for not accepting the qualifications on an expert witness on an application. Mr. Kennedy said that he will look into the proper procedure.

A motion was made by Mr. Betesh, seconded by Ms. Canonico to adjourn the meeting at 10:45 pm. All approved.