

Present: Waterbury, Peterson, Stambaugh, Walsh, Anderson  
Kennedy (Attorney)  
Absent: Fisher, Canonico, Betesh

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 Mr. Anderson to adopt & memorialize the minutes of the public portion of the May 4, 2011, 2011 meeting minutes as submitted. All approved.

**Correspondence:** none

**Planning Board Representative:**

Ms. Waterbury reported that the Reexamination Committee will be meeting again and reporting back to the Planning Board

**Unfinished Business:**

A motion was made by Mr. Walsh, seconded by Ms. Stambaugh to go into Closed Session for the purpose of Litigation for the Azgara Bowl. All approved.

-----  
**New Business:**

**Treasure Island Plaza, LLC:**

Broad St & Ave at the Common  
Bl: 70.01, Lot: 2

new sign in Municipal right of way

Mr. Martin McGann, Esq represented the applicant.

Mr. McGann explained that the applicant has been before the board for a new pylon sign on Broad St. which the board approved. During the course of the hearings 2 additional signs in the Municipal Right of Way, one on the corner on Ave at the Common and Broad and the other a directional sign at the entrance to the plaza. They have made an application to Mayor & Counsel and granted the property owner an easement in order to maintain the 2 signs in the right of way, a copy of the recorded easement was submitted and marked into evidence as **A-1**.

Mr. Kennedy marked the following into evidence:

**A-2:** Application for Hearing

**A-3:** Zoning Permit Denial, dated 2/2/11

**A-4:** Sign Location Plan, prepared by Kennedy Consulting dated 11/7/10

Mr. McGann advised the 2 new sign will not be increased in square footage they are just adding the white colonial border to match the Broad Street sign.

Mr. Robert Gorski, architect, was sworn and accepted as an expert witness.

Mr. Gorski described the new signs, as shown in drawings 11/18/10 entitled Road Signs,

- New architectural columns to Ave at the Commons sign to be added matching the Broad St sign 18' x 11' proposed, existing 16.5' x 6', internally illuminated, no change proposed
- New columns on the directional sign, Trader Joes to be added to the sign, proposed 5' x 6', internally illuminated, no change proposed

Ms. Peterson asked if the Ave at the Common sign has been scaled back since the Broad St sign was scaled back as a request of the approval? Mr. Gorski said that these signs were designed after the approval of the Broad Street sign, and these signs have been designed to mimic the portions on all the signs.

Mr. Anderson asked if the brush will be cleaned out in order to put the new sign up? Mr. McGann said currently if you travel north there is a lot of brush but not on the south bound side? There will be no change of grade to the sign it will be placed on the ground and not mounded. The sign will be placed far enough back for driver clearance.

Mr. McGann said that he has had Mr. Don Di Marzio go in there and clean out some of the underbrush. Ms. Waterbury asked if they have jurisdiction to do that since this is wetlands? Mr. McGann said that there is a ruling to allow certain clearing in wetlands or buffer area. Mr. McGann said that if it is permissible they will be cleaning out further, he has advised the Code Enforcement Officer of same.

Mr. Walsh asked if there is any reason why they cannot use the existing post and put some ginger bread around the existing sign? Mr. Gorski said that they can do anything. Mr. Walsh feels that the architecture is beautiful but he feels that sign on the corner is going to be obnoxious. Mr. Walsh feels that the current sign blends into the vegetation and you cannot see the post.

Ms. Stambaugh asked how big are the new posts? Mr. Gorski said 1' - 13" each.

Ms. Waterbury said that with the existing conditions she didn't even notice the sign until the application was submitted. Mr. McGann said that the sign can be see going south, but not going north due to the overgrowth.

Mr. Walsh feels that the re-facing of the sign is enough to include Trader Joes, and he understands that they are trying to include the architectural portion to the sign. Mr. Gorski said that is all they are doing adding the framing and posts. Mr. McGann also stated that they will have Mr. Cranmer check for the site triangle clearance of the Ave at the Common directional sign.

Ms. Peterson asked if the sign on the corner of Broad Street & Ave at the Common is necessary and useful? Mr. McGann said yes.

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

No public in attendance

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

**Board Discussion:**

Mr. Walsh said that the directional sign at the entrance at Ave at the Commons he feels that he could approve that sign, he is having a difficult time with the corner sign. He feels that it is too much at that location, and would not be in favor of that sign as presented. The existing sign blends into what is currently there.

Mr. Anderson agrees that the corner sign is too much, and not necessary, and with regard to the directional sign as long as it doesn't create any site issues.

Ms. Stambaugh likes both signs and the way they tied them into all of the improvements in the center.

Ms. Peterson likes the Broad Street sign; the smaller columns did make a lesser impact and dresses everything up. The directional sign she doesn't have any concerns about, but she does have concerns with the corner sign. She feels that it is competing with the main sign on Broad Street.

Ms. Waterbury agrees with Ms. Peterson. The new freestanding sign on Broad Street looks great, and like the directional sign on Ave at the Common. She feels that the corner sign is confusing, and you cannot see it from one side. Ms. Waterbury stated that the other shopping centers in the area do not have a "warning" on their signs and prefers the existing less bold sign.

Ms. Waterbury asked Mr. McGann if he would like to proceed with a vote or take the comments back to his client? Mr. McGann said to move forward, signs are going to stay; they tried to make them "prettier", so people will like them and some won't.

Mr. Gorski said that the changes to the signs make them look like an edifice or a piece rather than a commercial sign, stuck on a pole, on a corner, which is extremely commercial. The sign on Broad Street fits the building, but this one is on a corner where you cannot take down the trees and brush, the architecture will make them all look the same. Mr. Gorski said that the sign on the black pole makes it look commercial.

Ms. Waterbury said that there might be some other ways to make the sign meet some of their concerns, rather than it's all or nothing. Can you have one pole rather than 2.

Mr. McGann said that he has to confer with his client and come back, he is sure that his client would be inclined to have the smaller sign approved and they will leave the corner sign and if they want to return with another design. Ms. Waterbury said that if they return they would have to show that the sign is significantly different vs. to have the application carried in order to confer with the client. Mr. Kennedy said that if they return it would eliminate the need for 2 separate resolutions.

Mr. McGann doesn't feel that his client would want them to return over a sign frame and have to pay them. The client indicated that if they can make it look better and the board likes the sign that would be fine. Mr. McGann feels that they are making the sign better but the board doesn't seem to like the sign. His client will leave the corner sign and ask that the board approve the directional sign. Mr. McGann indicated that if his client changes his mind they will return at a later time.

Ms. Peterson said that the sign doesn't look better, but 2 signs with those size columns is too much. Does it look better, yes, is it necessary, no.

Mr. McGann said that the whole corner needs to be cleaned up and maintained.  
Mr. Walsh said you will clean it up but no one will maintain it.

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Ms. Stambaugh to approve the side street sign frame on Ave at the Common @ the side entrance to the shopping center, and to deny the 18' corner sign at Broad St & Ave at the Common to Treasure Island LLC as submitted.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Peterson, Walsh, Stambaugh, Anderson

Negative: None

Resolution 7/6/2011.....

**Continuation of Unfinished Business:**

**S Montessori Academy:**

Bl: 34, Lots: 5,6, 7

**Adoption of Resolution**

extension of time 12/31/12

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Anderson to adopt & memorialize the resolution of approval for an extension of time through the Permit Extension Act to 12/31/2011 to S Montessori Academy.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Peterson, Anderson

Negative: None

**Ms. Georgia Blair:**

Bl: 27, Lot: 14

**Adoption of Resolution**

solar panels

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Anderson to adopt & memorialize the resolution of approval for solar panels to Ms. George Blair as amended.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Peterson, Anderson

Negative: None

**Shrewsbury Commons, LLC:**

Bl: 20, Lot: 1

**Adoption of Resolution**

solar panels

A motion was made by Mr. Walsh, seconded by Mr. Anderson to Hold until July 6, 2011 meeting for corrections received and not incorporated into resolution. All approved

**M/M David Ngo:**

Bl: 45, Lot: 23

**Adoption of Resolution**

addition & garage

A motion was made by Mr. Anderson, seconded by Ms. Peterson to adopt & memorialize the resolution of approval for Mr. & Mrs. David Ngo as submitted.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Peterson, Anderson

Negative: None

**M/M Kevin Sullivan:**

Bl: 48, Lot: 22

**Adoption of Resolution**

addition in rear yard

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Anderson to adopt & memorialize the resolution of approval for M/M Kevin Sullivan for a rear yard addition as submitted.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Peterson, Anderson

Negative: None

**M/M David Crawford:**

Bl: 8, Lot: 12

**Adoption of Resolution**

addition in rear yard

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Anderson to adopt & memorialize the resolution of approval to M/M David Crawford for a rear yard addition as submitted.

Roll Call:

Affirmative: Waterbury, Peterson, Anderson

Negative: None

A motion was made by Ms. Peterson, seconded by Mr. Anderson to adjourn the meeting at 9:15 pm. All approved.