MONTGOMERY TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MONTGOMERY TOWNSHIP, SOMERSET COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
MARCH 9, 2026 - REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES

Arun Mani, Vice Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. and read the opening statement - Under the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act, notice of the time and place of this meeting has been posted and sent to the officially designated newspapers.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Arun Mani, Vice Chair; Al Battle, Paul Blodgett; Ibad Khan; Sarah Roberts; Marvin Schuldiner; Mayor Neena Singh; Anthony Glockler, Alternate No. 1

ALSO PRESENT: Karen L. Cayci, Esquire, Board Attorney; Wendy Rubinstein Quiroga, Township Attorney; Michael Sullivan, Board Planner; Rakesh Darji, Board Engineer; Lori Savron, Township Administrator/Planning Director; Chery Chrusz, Assistant Planning Director

I. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

II. APPLICATION CONTINUATION

Case PB-01-26 Applicant: Princeton Orthopaedics
Block 28006 Lot 43
Amended Minor Site Plan with bulk variances for signage only

Vice Chair Mani announced that the application will be heard at the March 23, 2026 Planning Board meeting. No further notice will be provided.

III. MASTER PLAN PUBLIC HEARING AND ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

Lori Savron, Planning Director and Township Administrator, explained that the evening's agenda included the official public hearing on the amended Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan, which form part of the Township's Master Plan. L. Savron reminded attendees that an informational session on the amendment had previously been held on February 9 and that the amended plan had been available online for public review since February 13.

L. Savron explained that the amended Housing Plan Element includes demographic and statistical information, while the Fair Share Plan outlines how the Township will meet its fourth-round state-mandated affordable housing obligations. L. Savron noted that the Township's previous third-round housing plan was originally adopted in 2008 and later amended in 2010, 2018, and 2020. The current amendment to the fourth-round plan reflects changed circumstances since its adoption in June 2025, particularly the opportunity to extend affordability controls on additional existing housing units. This amendment removes previously proposed inclusionary developments and instead prioritizes the preservation of existing affordable units through extended deed restrictions.

Michael Sullivan presented details of the amended housing plan. M. Sullivan explained that several existing developments with expiring affordability controls between 2032 and 2033 would have those controls extended rather than replaced with newly constructed units. These sites include Pike Run, Montgomery Glen, McKinley Commons, and McKinley Court. M. Sullivan described how extending affordability controls allows the Township to maintain housing for low- and moderate-income households while also receiving credit bonuses permitted under the Fair Housing Act. The plan incorporates third-round surplus credits and extensions of affordability controls across multiple sites, resulting in 210 preserved units and 65 bonus credits, for a total of 275 credits. This total exceeds the Township's obligation by 15 credits, creating a small surplus that may be carried into a future housing round or serve as a buffer if one mechanism does not produce expected results.

M. Sullivan emphasized that the amended approach represents sound planning because it relies on preserving existing units rather than constructing new developments. M. Sullivan noted that this approach supports sustainability goals, reduces pressure on sewer and water capacity, and avoids expanding development into undeveloped land. M. Sullivan also explained that the opportunity to extend affordability controls at Pike Run was not available during the preparation of the June 2025 plan, as the property owner had not previously expressed interest. Subsequent discussions after the adoption of the earlier plan made the amendment possible.

Board members asked questions about the timing of submission and the legal context. Township representatives explained that the amended plan would be submitted to the state within 48 hours of adoption and no later than March 16. Township representatives also clarified that the original plan had been adopted under time constraints due to potential builder's remedy litigation. Although the Township remains under pressure to maintain a compliant plan, a recent court order extended the Township's immunity during the amendment process. The plan will ultimately require approval by the Superior Court, as is standard for municipalities in New Jersey.

Board members also discussed whether the amendment prevents future inclusionary development. It was clarified that the Township may still pursue inclusionary zoning opportunities outside the plan if appropriate proposals arise, but such development is not required to meet the Township's current fourth-round obligation.

The public comment period was opened, but no members of the public spoke. The Board voted to close public comment.

A motion to approve the 2026 Amended Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan was made by Paul Blodgett and seconded by Mayor Singh. The motion carried on the following roll call vote:
Ayes: Battle, Blodgett, Khan, Mani, Roberts, Schuldiner, Singh, and Glockler
Nays: None

Resolution Adopting The 20265 Fourth Round Housing Element And & Fair Share Plan

The Board then reviewed and adopted a resolution memorializing the approval of the Amended Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. The resolution affirmed that the amendment is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Master Plan and supports access to affordable housing.

A motion was made by Paul Blodgett and seconded by Marvin Schuldiner to memorialize the resolution adopting the Amended Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. The motion passed on the following roll call vote:
Ayes: Battle, Blodget, Khan, Mani, Roberts, Schuldiner, Singh, and Glockler
Nays: None

IV. APPLICATION

Case PB-06-25 Applicant: Princeton Promenade, LLC
Amended Final Major Site Plan for Signage and Model Home
Block 34001/46.01, 56, 57, 77, 78 & 79
Expiration Date: 3-29-26
Affidavit of Notification and Publication Required and Previously Found to Be In Order

Eric Goldstein, Esq., appeared on behalf of the applicant. This application is an amended final application and major site plan request for Princeton Promenade, LLC concerning signage and the establishment of a model home. E. Goldstein explained that the request is related to the size and number of signs, as well as a variance associated with the configuration of parking serving the model home.

E. Goldstein introduced two exhibits which were marked Exhibit A-1 and Exhibit A-2. Exhibit A-1 is Site plan A, prepared by Bohler Engineering with overlay of signage prepared by NVR, Inc., consisting of six pages and A-2 is a commercial sign package, prepared by SJC Ventures, consisting of 13 pages.

Ken Mills, Land Development Manager for NVR in Central Jersey, was sworn in and testified regarding the company's role in the project and the proposed arrangement. K. Mills explained that the model home would be constructed on a designated residential lot while a temporary visitor parking area would be located on an adjacent lot. He stated that the intent of the off-street parking arrangement was to improve safety and organization by keeping visitor vehicles off the street and providing controlled access to the model home.

K. Mills advised that visits to the model home would occur strictly by appointment rather than through open public access. K. Mills explained that prospective buyers typically schedule appointments online or through a QR code displayed on site, and that only one appointment would occur at a time. This process minimizes traffic and prevents the type of large crowds commonly associated with traditional model home centers.

The Board discussed accessibility and ADA considerations. K. Mills testified that the design includes a level concrete pad near the garage entrance to facilitate access for individuals using wheelchairs or mobility devices. The pad would be constructed with minimal slope and would connect to a pathway leading to the parking area, allowing accessible entry to the model home. He stated that while the interior of the model home would not initially be constructed as a fully accessible dwelling, accessibility modifications could be incorporated if requested by a purchaser.

K. Mills acknowledged that the proposed plan requires a variance under the Township's ordinance because the temporary parking area would be located on a separate lot rather than on the same lot as the model home.

Board members asked questions regarding operational details, including whether sales personnel would also park in the lot and how the temporary arrangement would transition once home sales progressed. K. Mills confirmed that one or two sales staff members might use the lot but may also park on the street. He further explained that the model home would eventually be converted into a standard residential property. At that time, the sales office functions would be removed, the garage restored to residential use, and the temporary parking area eliminated so that the adjacent lot could be developed with a home.

Additional discussion addressed lighting, grading, drainage, and construction timing. The applicant confirmed that no additional lighting beyond typical residential fixtures and previously approved street lighting was proposed. The lighting associated with the home would consist of standard residential fixtures such as those located near entryways and garages, and the sales operations would generally conclude before evening hours. The applicant also indicated that a bond would be posted to ensure that the temporary parking lot could be removed and the

property restored in accordance with Township requirements. Testimony further indicated that the grading of the parking lot would remain generally consistent with the previously approved grading plan and that drainage would continue to comply with residential site improvement standards.
K. Mills testified regarding the requested residential marketing signage. He acknowledged that variance relief is required because the sign type is not permitted under the Montgomery land use ordinances. In response to Board concerns, he agreed that all signs identified as #8 signs on Exhibit A-1 will not be allowed. The signage will be removed 120 days from issuance of the sign permit. K. Mills confirmed that NVR would comply with all comments in Mr. Darji's review memo, dated March 6, 2026, and that no signs will be illuminated.

The Board inquired about the anticipated construction schedule. Mr. Mills stated that the model home could typically be completed within approximately ninety days, and he anticipated that its construction would occur concurrently with the completion of other infrastructure improvements within the Princeton Promenade development area. A restoration bond for the removal of the parking lot and related site improvements will be posted.

Board Professionals Michael Sullivan and Rakesh Darji were sworn in.

Rakesh Darji, Board Engineer testified regarding his memo of March 5, 2026. The Applicant agreed to comply with all comments and recommendations set forth in the review memo. Darji advised that he agrees that a temporary off-site parking area will be safer for visitors to the model home than on-street parking. Darji responded to Board questions and confirmed with the Applicant the information provided in their application.

Michael Sullivan, Board Planner testified regarding his review memo of March 5, 2026, and responded to Board questions regarding his review. Sullivan advised that Exhibit A-2 had been provided by the Applicant the morning of the hearing. Based on the revisions to the proposed signage, the review memo is no longer accurate and provided verbal comments regarding the required sign variances.

Jessica Moore, Chief Operating Officer of SJC Ventures was sworn in on behalf of the applicant. J. Moore testified regarding the commercial sign package (Exhibit A-2) and responded to Board questions regarding all proposed signage and noted that the sign lettering would be back-lit.

M. Sullivan summarized the required variances:

- Variance for Height of Secondary Campus Entrance Monument Signs. The ordinance permits a maximum height of eight feet. The applicant is proposing a height 8'-8"
- Variance for Sign Area of Secondary Campus Entrance Monument Signs. The ordinance permits a maximum sign area of 65 square feet. The applicant is proposing a sign area of 69.33 square feet.
- Variance for Number of Directional Signs. The ordinance permits up to seven directional signs. The applicant is proposing 31 directional signs as follows:
    - Six one-sided pedestrian directional signs
    - Eight pickup and delivery signs (Whole Foods)
    - Five short term parking signs (Panera Bread)
    - Five vehicular directional signs (Panera)
    - One drive-thru clearance bar (Panera Bread)
    - Two drive-thru menu boards (Panera Bread and Dunkin)
    - One canopy sign (Panera Bread)
    - One Drive-thru sign (Dunkin)
    - One pick-up sign (Chipotle)
    - One drive-thru clearance bar (Chipotle)
- Variances for Directional Sign Height. The ordinance permits a maximum height of eight feet. The following signs require variance relief for height:
    - Drive-thru clearance bar (Panera Bread): 9.5 feet. Canopy sign (Panera Bread): 10 feet.
    - Drive-thru sign (Dunkin): 8.5 feet.
    - Drive-thru clearance bar (Panera Bread): 9.5 feet.
- Variances for Directional Sign Design. The ordinance requires all directional signs to be ground-mounted, monument style. None of the directional signs conform.
- Variances for Directional Sign Content. The ordinance requires all directional signs to identify the complex. None of the directional signs conform.
- Variance for Wayfinding Sign Content. The ordinance requires each wayfinding sign to identify the complex with a map and directory. The proposed way-finding signs do not contain a map or directory
- Variance for Number of Attached Signs on Supermarket (Whole Foods) Building. The ordinance permits up to two individual signs: one on the front of the building and one on the side or rear of the building. The applicant is proposing three signs for the proposed Whole Foods supermarket: two signs on the front of the building and one sign on the left (west) side of the building.
- Variance for Sign Letter Height on Supermarket (Whole Foods) Building. The ordinance permits a maximum letter height of four feet. The primary sign has a letter height of 6.5 feet.
- Variance for Sign Area on Supermarket (Whole Foods) Building. The ordinance permits a maximum sign area of 300 square feet or one square foot of sign area per one linear foot of building façade, whichever is less. The applicant is proposing a primary sign area of 397.31 square feet

- Variances for Number of Attached Signs on Pad Site Buildings. The ordinance permits a maximum of two business identification signs per tenant. The following buildings require variances for the number of wall signs:
    - Building 500 (Chipotle): three signs
    - Building 900 (Tenant 1): four signs
    - Building 1000 (Robinson Ale House): three signs
- Variance for Primary Sign Location on Building 1000 (Pad Site). The ordinance requires the primary sign to be located directly above the storefronts on the front façade. The applicant is proposing a second primary sign for Building 1000 which is not located directly above the storefront on the front façade.
- Variances for Secondary Sign Location on Pad Site Buildings. The ordinance permits a secondary sign on either the side or rear façade. The applicant is proposing secondary signs on both the side and rear façades of Buildings 500, 900, and 1000:
    - Building 500: Chipotle
    - Building 900: Tenant 1
    - Building 1000: Robinson's Ale House
- Variance for Attached Sign Height on Building 1000 (Pad Site). The ordinance permits a maximum height of 22 feet. Robinson's Ale House (sign A1) has a height of 23'-6".
- Variance for Attached Sign Area on Building 1000 (Pad Site). The ordinance permits a maximum sign area of 1.5 sf/lineal feet of tenant façade or 50 feet, whichever is less. The maximum permitted sign area on this building is 50 sf. Robinson's Ale House sign A1 has a sign area of 80 sf and sign A2 has an area of 60 sf.
- Variance for Attached Sign Area on Building 900 (Pad Site). The ordinance permits a maximum sign area of 1.5 sf/lineal feet of tenant façade or 50 feet, whichever is less. The maximum permitted area on this building is 50 sf. The signs have a sign area of 80 sf on building elevations 1 and 3 and a sign area of 60 sf on building elevations 2 and 4.
- Variances for Number of Attached Signs on Non-Pad Site Buildings. The ordinance permits a maximum of two attached business identification signs per tenant. The following summary identifies tenant spaces requiring variances for having more than two attached signs per tenant:

    - Ulta - 11
    - Panera - 3
    - Urgent Care - 3
    - Dunkin' - 3
    - dor L dor - 3
    - Woof Gang - 3
    - Turning Point - 4
    - Alloy - 3
    - Arya Nail Lounge - 3
- Variances for Secondary Attached Sign Location on Non-Pad Site Buildings. The ordinance permits a secondary sign on either the side or rear facades. The applicant is proposing secondary signs on both the side and rear façades for the following tenants:
    - Building 400: Panera and Urgent Care
    - Building 700: Dunkin' and dor L dor
    - Building 1200-1300: Woof Gang and Turning Point
- Variances for Maximum Permitted Mounting Height of Attached Signs on Non-Pad Site Buildings. The ordinance permits a maximum mounting height of 22 feet. The following signs exceed the allowable mounting height:

Building Number	Elevation Number	Tenant	Mounting Height
700	1	Dunkin'	23'-9"
	1	dor L dor	23'-9"
	2	Dunkin'	23'-9"
	3	dor L dor	22'-6"
	3	Buffalo Wild Wings	22'-8"
	3	Dunkin'	23'
	4	dor L dor	24'-6"
1100	1	Woof Gang	23'
	1	Tenant 1	23'-6"
	1	Love & Honey	22'-6"
	1	Turning Point	23'-9"
	2	Woof Gang	23'
	3	Turning Point	22'-6"
	3	Tenant 1	23'-6"
1200-1300	1	Alloy	23'-9"
	1	Toastique	23'-10"
	2	Alloy	23'-10"
	3	Toastique	23'
	3	Alloy	23'

- Variances for Maximum Permitted Attached Sign Area on Non-Pad Site Buildings . The ordinance permits a maximum sign area of 50 square feet or two square feet of sign area per one linear foot of building tenant façade, whichever is less. The following variances are required:

Building Number	Elevation Number	Tenant	Sign Area (SF)
400	3	Panera	52.69
700	1	European Wax Center	40
	1	Camglow	46.67
1100	1	Woof Gang	50
	1	Love & Honey	50
	3	Woof Gang	50
1200-1300	1	Alloy	50
	1	Toastique	50
	1	Hair Cuttery	45
	1	Tenant 1	50
	3	Alloy	50
	3	Toastique	50
	3	Hair Cuttery	45
	3	Tenant 1	45

- Variance for Off-Street Parking for Model Home. The ordinance permits models only on streets where on-street parking is permitted. No off-street, temporary parking shall be permitted. The applicant is proposing a temporary paved parking area to serve the model home sales office on Lot 5.
- Variance for Temporary Residential Signs. The ordinance permits detached dwelling units to have one customary and typical street number designation and nameplate sign, provided that such sign does not exceed one square foot. The applicant is proposing a total of 44 temporary advertising signs for the approved residential units, which are not permitted signs for the residential portion of the development.
- Variance for Number of Temporary Signs. The ordinance permits one temporary noncommercial or commercial sign, either freestanding or attached, to be erected on a lot at any one time. The applicant is proposing more than one temporary sign on Lots 4 and 5 where the proposed model home/sales center and temporary parking area are proposed.
- Variance for Time of Temporary Signs. The ordinance requires all temporary signs to be removed within 30 days from the date of their installation. The applicant is proposing temporary signs for 120 days from installation, which will be the date of the issuance of sign permits.
- Variance for Temporary Noncommercial Sign Area. The ordinance permits a temporary noncommercial sign not exceeding 20 square feet. The proposed #1 – "4' x 8' Community Sign is 32 square feet.
- Variance for Temporary Noncommercial Sign Mounting Height. The ordinance permits a temporary noncommercial sign five feet in mounting height. Proposed signs #1, 2, 4, 7 and 9 exceed the permitted mounting height.

S. Roberts asked about the sign lighting and requested it be reduced and that yellow rather than white lights or colored lights be used. The applicant agreed to work with the tenants to make the lights as environmentally friendly as possible but can't limit the sign colors. The parking lot lighting will be dimmed down and remain on for safety and security.

The Board discussed the variances and requested the proposed signage plans be revised so that the "Tenant" signage on Building 100 on the front (south) elevation and the left (west) elevation be increased up to 25.6 feet in height to allow lettering to be placed on the wall and the sign area of the "Tenant" sign on Building 900 on the left (west) elevation be reduced to 50 feet to eliminate a variance. All temporary signs shall be setback at least 10 feet from all driveways, street right-of-way and other property lines.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Jeremiah Obert, 943 Route 518, asked that the Applicant provide better communication with him and those adjacent neighbors who have agreements with the Applicant regarding installation of improvements for sewer, water, fencing and sidewalks.

Joe Laureni, 935 Route 518, supports the project but also requested better communication with the Applicant regarding compliance with its agreement with him for installation of improvements.

Amparo Spielholz, 961 Route 518, advised she has had no communication with the Applicant regarding compliance with its agreement with her for installation of improvements. She also advised that the fencing was installed improperly on her property.

Ravi Raina, 955 Route 518 supported the prior comments made by his neighbors.

Erin Norris, Route 518, supports her neighbors' comments.

There being no further public comments, the public comment portion of the meeting was unanimously closed. Board Attorney Cayci summarized the conditions.

A motion to approve the application with conditions was made by Paul Blodgett and seconded by Marvin Schuldiner The motion passed on the following roll call vote:
Ayes: Battle, Blodget, Khan, Mani, Schuldiner, Singh, and Glockler
Nays: Roberts

V. MINUTES

February 9, 2026 - Regular Meeting

A motion to approve the February 9, 2026 minutes was made by A. Mani and seconded by A. Battle. The motion carried on the following roll call vote:
Ayes: Blodgett, Khan, Mani, Roberts, Schuldiner, Singh and Glockler
Nays: None

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:13 p.m.