

MANCHESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2021  
1 COLONIAL DRIVE, MANCHESTER, NEW JERSEY

The Regular Meeting of the Manchester Township Planning Board was called to order by Chairperson Barron at 6:00 P.M. on Monday, November 1, 2021.

A Salute to the Flag and Pledge of Allegiance was repeated.

This meeting has been advertised as required by enactment of the Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL:

William Barron	Chairperson	Present
Felicia Finn	Vice Chairperson	Present
Rory Wells	Mayor's Designee	Present
James Vaccaro	Councilman	Present
Bill Foor	Member	Absent
James Teague	Member	Present
Frank Stavallo	1 <sup>st</sup> , Alternate	Present
Vacant	2 <sup>nd</sup> . Alternate	Absent

Gregory Hock	Board Attorney Present
Robert Mullin	Board Engineer Present

APPOINTMENTS:

Appointment of Amanda Kisty as Secretary to the Planning Board

Motion made to appoint Amanda Kisty as Secretary to the Planning Board by, Vice Chairperson-Felicia Finn, seconded by James Vaccaro

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Mr. Vaccaro-Yes  
Messrs. Foor-Absent, Teague-Yes, Wells-Yes, Stavallo-Yes

MEMORIALIZATIONS:

Memorialization of a resolution approving a Minor Site Plan with Bulk Variances for a Loading Dock Block 72.01 Lot 14.03 2400 Ridgeway Rd.

Applicant: Cihera Properties, LLC, Martinez

Attorney: Marc S. Galella, Esq. for Robert C. Shea, Esq.

Case #2021-00268

Approved: October 4, 2021

Mr. Hock: The Applicant's minor site plan approval with bulk variances as set forth in the Board Engineer review letter dated August 16, 2021, last revised August 20, 2021, prepared by Robert Mullen, PE, CME, PP, with the following conditions: Variance granted for maximum sign area of 24 SF where 20 SF is permitted, the applicant agreed to the relocation of the entry sign out of the front setback area to a conforming location, the applicant agreed to relocate the two storage containers situated in the north of the garage/warehouse to a conforming location, applicant agreed to submit revised plans depicting the relocation of the sign and the two storage containers for review and approval by the Board engineer, the applicant agreed to comply with all other normal conditions of approval set forth by the Board and with

all conditions and technical requirements set forth in the Board Engineers report unless modified by Resolution.

Motion made to approve by, Vice Chairperson-Felicia Finn, seconded by James Vaccaro

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Mr. Vaccaro-Yes

Messrs. Foor-Absent, Teague-Yes, Wells-Yes, Stavalo-Yes

#### APPLICATIONS:

Minor Site Plan Approval/Variance Sign

Block 100 Lot 23 36 Lacey Road

Applicant: KC Sign Co. Steve Clark/Greg Feld (Community Reformed Church)

Attorney: Nick Carlson, Esq.

Case #2021-00269

Carried from October 4, 2021 meeting with notice required

Nick Carlson, Attorney for the Applicant, began by asserting that the applicant needed 2 variances.

Mr. Carlson introduced Reverend Pointer from the church who would be available for questions if needed and Mr. Stephen Clark, from Casey Sign and Awnings as his expert witness.

He said the Applicant requires two variances:

1. A size variance because the proposed sign is larger than what is allowed.
2. LED Sign with dimmer where LED signs are not permitted; The sign will be brighter during the day and will dim at night.

Mr. Hock: Swore Mr. Clark in.

Mr. Clark provided his credentials as a LED sign designer and installer for Casey Signs & Awnings. He then submitted a Packet of photos and plans, 8 pages in length.

Mr. Hock: Accepted the 8-page packet of photos and plans and marked the same as Exhibit A-1.

Mr. Clark: Introduced page 1 of Exhibit A-1 as the art work and design layout for the project. It is a basic set up that you see all over the place. He explained that the top of the sign has the name of the Church and has LED lights inside. The bottom of the sign is the digital portion and can be changed remotely.

He introduced page 2 as a depiction of the existing conditions on the site. The current sign is a digital sign.

Page 3 & 4 was explained as their survey of the proposed work to be installed on the existing conditions. The existing cabinet is 71" in height by 101 1/2" in width. There is a 3' by 8' leader board that needs to be repaired or replaced.

Bottom portion is where the variance is the most crucial for. The LED right now is 38" tall by 85" wide so that comes to 23 SF. It is not an outrageous size.

Mr. Hock: Asked for clarification.

Mr. Clark: The ID Header Sign will be 24" in height, 85" in width and 23" in depth. The overall height from grade to top of cabinet would be 112"

Mr. Clark: Page 5 & 6 are examples of the sign they designed and constructed for another church in the Borough of Lakehurst. It is the same as what is being asked for. 38" x 85"

Page 7&8 the design layout of the sign on the corner here (meaning the Township municipal building) and we (meaning KC Signs) actually did that. Then there is a new LED that they didn't do that is a 3 x 8. He has done 76 variances for these signs.

One of the reasons that they are asking for a variance is because the maximum area of 12 square feet per side is too restrictive because of the way the module is set up. It would be too hard to program and too hard to read. The 12 SF makes it more dangerous because the text is too small.

At 22 square feet drivers will see bigger letters which makes it easier to read.

He continued that some problems with changeable letters are that with a 3 ft. high box, you have to know messages in advance, there is no flexibility in letter size, you often end up with extra lines you don't need or not enough space for the entire message, and there is often a problem with visibility because the entire board has to be lit up. Whereas with the LED, the only thing emitting light is the text. The LED sign has an automatic brightness sensor so that throughout the day it gets brighter as needed and at night it gets darker and the brightness goes down.

You can set the sign sensor for 15 minute increments and 10,000 NITS is the highest it can go. 7,000 NITS is the standard for daytime and 3,000 NITS is standard for night.

Casey Signs & Awnings provides 7 yrs. of parts and labor service and they will replace the parts and maintain the sign as needed. All the signs that we construct and maintain are repaired immediately.

Another benefit to this sign is that the Church can set up to PALS alert system and provide silver alerts, amber alerts, etc.

Mr. Carlson: Had a few follow up couple of question:

Professional qualifications?

Mr. Clark: 14 years at Casey Signs.

Mr. Carlson: Have you done any other work in the area?

Mr. Clark: We did the Manchester Township sign and the Lakehurst Church sign

Mr. Carlson: Are these sign larger or smaller than the proposed sign?

Mr. Clark: The Township sign is bigger.

Mr. Carlson: Is there a higher density where the Township sign is?

Mr. Clark: Yes, the area where the Township sign is denser.

Mr. Carlson: How close is the proposed sign to a residential area?

Mr. Clark: Not close enough to impact it negatively.

Mr. Carlson: Have there been any complaints about the Township sign?

Mr. Clark: No.

Mr. Carlson: Asked what 3,000 NITS at night comparable to.

Mr. Clark: Said it would be similar to the standard shopping plaza and standard code. Not as harsh brightness.

Standard traffic lights are 3,500 NITS.

Mr. Carlson: What are the benefits to the church?

Mr. Clark: It would help them with community organizations, trying to get community events together, fundraisers, and getting alerts such as amber and silver alerts out there to the public.

Mr. Carlson: What are the negative results of not allowing the sign?

Mr. Clark: Casey signs was not involved in the construction of the sign that was there so they can only fix the existing sign but cannot control the brightness. It is also very old technology.

Mr. Carlson: Is the LED sign negative for drivers because it does not conform?

Mr. Clark: People will not drive by and see multiple messages. They will likely see a new message every time they drive by. When you have an LED that is too small, the message gets crammed and it is hard to read or the full message cannot get out.

Mr. Carlson: Will the sign have the same footing as the existing sign?

Mr. Clark: Yes. It is structurally sound.

Mr. Mullin: What is a NIT?

Mr. Clark: A NIT is a measurement of brightness just like lumens. Lumens are used for florescent lighting and NITS are used for LED. The intensity of the brightness.

Mr. Mullin: Asked if the correct measurements were 38" x 85.5".

Mr. Clark: Asserted that the head board is 24".

Mullin: 36.48 SF (Total SF of the sign)

Clark: 48" is the existing sign.

Mr. Mullin: Is there a reduction in size by 25%?

Mr. Clark: Yes.

Mr. Mullin: Asked if it was possible to do 38" letters.

Mr. Clark: Said that it could be done but that the letters would never get that big and would usually remain 10-12" letters with 2-3 lines of text.

Mr. Mullin: Asked Mr. Clark about the brightness controls.

Mr. Clark: You can change the sensor as frequently as you need it.

Mr. Mullin: Asked what the time frame was for changes in messages.

Mr. Clark: Said that it would be every 8 seconds or more.

Mr. Mullin: Concluded his questions.

Mr. Barron: Asked what the total height of the sign was off the ground.

Mr. Clark: Base (brick stone) 3 feet

38" + 2 ft. (sign)

8'3" altogether

Roughly 8-12" farther down than the existing sign

Mr. Barron: Asked if there would be no scrolling letters just a message than a new message.

Mr. Clark: Confirmed no scrolling letters because the sign would be big enough to display a complete message.

Mr. Barron: Concluded his questions.

Mr. Hock: Asked Mr. Clark to confirm and agree to no scrolling letters, no blinking messages/letters, no animation, and no less than 8 seconds between a change in message.

Mr. Clark: Agreed.

#### PUBLIC PORTION OPEN:

Hearing none

#### PUBLIC PORTION CLOSED:

Motion made to approve by, Felicia Finn, seconded by James Vaccaro

ROLL CALL: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Mr. Vaccaro-Yes

Messrs. Foor-Absent, Teague-Yes, Wells-Yes, Stavallo-Yes

#### APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

October 4, 2021 Regular meeting minutes

Motion to approve by James Vaccaro, seconded by Rory Wells

Roll Call: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Mr. Vaccaro-Yes

Messrs. Foor-Absent, Teague-Yes, Wells-Yes, Stavallo-Yes

#### PAYMENT OF BILLS:

Amanda Kisty read in Bills as follows:

We are in receipt of fourteen invoices from Collier Engineering and Design total of 75 hours and an amount of \$12,009.64.

We are in receipt of four invoices from Mr. Hock, ESQ for 7.75 hours and \$760.50. The total of the invoices is \$12,770.14. The services are in support of:

#### **Project No.**

MCP001

MCP024

#### **Project**

General Planning Board Services (three invoices)

Riverside at Manchester

MCP037	Brentwood Estates – Major Site Plan
MCP068	United Church of Toms River
MCP074	Preliminary and Final Site Plan for 2132 Route 37 LLC (three invoices)
MCP078	Minor Subdivision _B1.355, L16,23 4 24 (Jeffery Jerman)
MCP079	Minor Subdivision – B1.355, L9,15,20 (Jeffery Jerman)
MCP080	Minor Subdivision – B1.65, L6&8 (Jeffery Jerman)
MCP0081	Minor Site Plan – Cipher Properties LLC (two invoices)
MCP0083	Amended Site Plan – Community Reform Church (two invoices)
MCP0084	Minor Subdivision – Ronald Raisin

The services are in support Correspondence; Application, Exhibit, Storm water Management Report, Traffic Report and Landscaping Review; Reforestation Bond; Easement Status; Resolution Preparation and Compliance; Preparation of Consent Order and Preparation for Attendance at Planning Board Meetings.

Motion made to pay bills by, James Vaccaro, seconded by Frank Stavalo

Roll Call: Chairperson Barron-Yes, Ms. Finn-Yes, Mr. Vaccaro-Yes

Messrs. Foor-Absent, Teague-Yes, Wells-Yes, Stavalo-Yes

PROFESSIONAL REPORTS: None

Mr. Wells: Thanked Bill Foor for taking the time to review all of the billing invoices and provide a report even when he is not present at the meeting.

OPEN PUBLIC PORTION:

John PagenKopf- Came to address two items:

1<sup>st</sup> item: When will there be an update to the Master Plan?

Mr. Barron- Asked Mr. Mullin to comment on this inquiry.

Mr. Mullin- The next review by the Master Plan review committee will most likely occur sometime in early 2022.

2<sup>nd</sup> item: Congratulated Marianne on her retirement from the Township and more specifically as Planning Board Secretary. He explained to Amanda Kisty that she had “big shoes to fill.”

Mr. Wells: Reiterated that the Master Plan review should be revisited in a month or two after the election tomorrow. He said he was on the committee but is no longer and is interested about that information as well.

CLOSE PUBLIC PORTION: Mr. Barron

MOTION TO ADJOURN: by James Vaccaro, seconded by Felicia Finn

ALL IN FAVOR

NONE OPPOSED

ADJOURNMENT: 6:43 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

Amanda Kisty  
Secretary to the Board