

CHATHAM BOROUGH PLANNING BOARD
February 2, 2011 7:30 p.m.

Chairman Richard Crater called the Chatham Borough Planning Board meeting of February 2, 2011 to order at 7:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Chatham Municipal Building. Mr. Crater announced that all legal notices have been posted for this meeting.

Members Present:

Mayor V. Nelson Vaughan*, Councilman Bruce Harris, Chairman Richard Crater, Donna Cali-Charles, John Bitar**, Vincent DeNave ***, H.H. Montague, Susan Favate, James Mitchell.

*arrived at 7:35 p.m.

**arrived at 7:38 p.m.

***arrived at 8:50 p.m.

Anne Marie Rizzuto, Esq., attorney for the Board, was present.

Members Absent:

Joseph Mikulewicz, Matthew Wagner

Open to the Public

No one came forward.

Adoption of Minutes

The second draft of the January 5, 2011 minutes were approved as amended.

Applications

There were none.

Pending Business

Sign Ordinance – Revised ordinance from Board attorney (incorporating portable board signs, etc.)

Mr. Crater noted that Ms. Rizzuto has prepared this revised ordinance for the Board's review tonight. Ms. Rizzuto reported that she has incorporated the changes that Board members had recommended at their last meeting.

Ms. Rizzuto referred the Board to the Definitions section in the ordinance. Ms. Rizzuto reviewed the definition for portable signs. She felt this particular definition was very encompassing as it stands. It didn't need any changes. Mr. Montague disapproved of most of the signs listed in this ordinance. These were not the signs he had agreed upon at the last meeting. Mr. Montague pointed out that a definition for a sandwich board sign was still needed.

Ms. Rizzuto referred the Board to Section E: Portable Signs. She believed the changes being discussed need to be made in this particular section. She recalled the Board had

earlier agreed to allow for easel boards and sandwich boards. Mr. Montague felt the easel board sign should have a definition. He explained that the height restriction, as it is currently written, does not allow easel signs.

Ms. Rizzuto felt that easel signs and sandwich boards do not need to be separately defined. These signs should be defined in the portable sign definition.

Mrs. Favate and Councilman Harris suggested that the Board, in the ordinance, eliminate the signs they don't want included.

After further discussion, Ms. Rizzuto confirmed with the Board that easel/sandwich signs measuring 5 feet high and 3 feet wide would be allowed. Ms. Rizzuto will redefine the term "portable sign" as limited to sandwich and easel board signs. She reviewed the language she will revise in Section F.

Mr. Montague made a motion to approve this draft ordinance with tonight's revisions and forward it to the Mayor and Council for their consideration. Mrs. Favate seconded the motion. A voice vote was taken. The motion was unanimously approved.

Checklists for Application – under review – ordinance changes and revised Checklists A, B, C, D and E.

Ms. Rizzuto noted that the draft ordinance had repetitive language. This repetitiveness would make it difficult for an architect or engineer trying to file plans. She explained how she has divided checklist requirements into sections. Ms. Rizzuto's goal is to have everything that a person needs to complete the checklist in one or two sections of Article 20. She has tried to make the checklists follow what the MLUL provides. State statutes will be followed.

Ms. Rizzuto discussed with the Board whether notices to the public be made for A Request for Interpretation or An Appeal of the Zoning Officer's Decision. Mr. Crater had the impression that the Board wanted notices to be made for these situations. Mr. Montague didn't feel that way. Sending out notices would be a financial burden on applicants. Mr. Crater pointed out that residents often want to be made aware of certain applications close to their homes. Mrs. Favate didn't feel A Request for Interpretation hearing should require notices.

Ms. Rizzuto discussed Section 165-161: General filing requirements for Applications for Development. She recommended that the Board specify to an applicant, if he/she does not provide the submissions listed in this section, the application will be rejected. The applicant will then have to re-file.

Ms. Rizzuto reviewed the re-wording she had done for surveys. Mr. DeNave gave his views on surveys and site plans.

Ms. Rizzuto noted that the following documents should be provided by the applicant:

- 16 copies of the completed application

- 16 copies of the checklist
- 16 copies of the pertinent plans, maps, surveys, photos
- 4 copies of covenants and deeds
- If a traffic study is needed, copies should be made for each Board member & Board Attorney
- If an environmental study is needed, copies should be made for Board members & Board attorney
- Site photographs should be submitted with applications submitted to Board members

Ms. Rizzuto said Board members will receive the revised draft ordinance on Friday, February 11th, to be discussed at the next Board meeting (Feb. 16).

RFP for Planner

Mr. DeNave reported that the subcommittee has received 10 proposals from planners. The committee interviewed six of these ten planners. The committee then selected three top candidates for the Board to interview. Two of these planners have experience from adjacent towns. Mr. DeNave gave the names of the three candidates. Mr. DeNave asked if he should go ahead and invite these candidates for an interview at a regular Board meeting.

Mr. Crater felt that one candidate could be heard at the next meeting. Because fees and expenses will be discussed, these interviews should be held in Closed Session. Mr. Crater noted that the Borough Council still has to appropriate the money for the planner decided on by the Board. Ms. Rizzuto suggested that the escrow ordinance be looked at to see if an increase should be made for the planner.

Mr. Crater thanked the Board members who served on the search committee: Mr. DeNave, Mr. Wagner, Mrs. Favate, and Mr. Montague.

New Business

Councilman Harris asked Board members to think about creating a distinct definition between “small retail” and “large retail”. Currently, the definitions for permitted uses are on the broad side.

At 8:55 p.m. the Board went into Closed Session to discuss Cougar Field and Contract Negotiations/Personnel.

At 9:33 p.m. the Board returned to Open Session and adjourned for the evening.

The next Planning Board meeting will be on Wednesday, February 16, 2011, 7:30 p.m., Chatham Municipal Building.

Respectfully submitted:

Elizabeth Holler
Recording Secretary