

**LAKWOOD PLANNING BOARD
PLAN REVIEW MEETING
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 6, 2007**

I. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Banas called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Mr. Kielt read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings Act:

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the Ocean County Observer and posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood. Advance written Notice has been filed with the Township Clerk for purpose of public inspection and, a copy of this Agenda has been mailed, faxed or delivered to the following newspapers: The Ocean County Observer, or The Tri-Town News at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Akerman, Mr. Klein

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Peters and Mr. Truscott were sworn in.

Mr. Kielt stated the only change to the agenda is **Item #7 SP 1820B – 1161 Route 9**, tabled to the March 6, 2007 meeting. Plans were not received in time.

Motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Akerman, to table the above application until March 6, 2007

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

4. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

- 1. SD# 1576 (NO VARIANCE REQUESTED)**
APPLICANT: MARK PROPERTIES
Location: Albert Avenue, between Salem Street and Oak Street
Block 1159 Lot 65
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots (1 flag lot)

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking a Minor Subdivision Approval to subdivide Block 1159, Lot 65 into two lots. Proposed Lot 65.01 has no new development proposed

at this time, and Proposed Lot 65.02 is a flag lot for a proposed single family dwelling. The property is situated on Albert Avenue, within the R-20 Zoning District. It appears no variances will be required. Ocean County Planning Board and Ocean County Soil Conservation District approval will be required. Evidence of this approval shall be made a condition of final subdivision approval. The zoning table states a minimum of 2.5 parking spaces have been provided per RSIS. Proposed Lot 65.02 has room to park more than three cars. No new construction is proposed at this time on Lot 65.01. The applicant can address parking by adding a note to the plan clearly stating that any proposed residence will provide a minimum of three off street parking spaces. The proposed residence will be serviced with individual septic and well systems. The applicant shall testify to the location of the nearest public utilities. The Board should determine if the applicant will be required to install sidewalk and curb along the property frontage. The architectural plans state that the single family dwelling is for Aaron Developers, LLC. The application states that the applicant is Mark Properties, LLC. This discrepancy shall be resolved. The applicant shall provide landscaping in the buffer between the two proposed lots, as well as along the both sides of the "pole" portion of the flag lot. Access to Lot 65.02 is proposed to be provided by an access easement. The easement is permitted, although, a variance from NJSA Section 35 of MLUL will be required for the lot having no frontage on an improved Right of Way. We recommend that the proposed access easement be made a part of Lot 65.02 in a fee simple arrangement. This would create a variance condition for the lot width of proposed Lot 65.01. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated January 26, 2007. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to create two new tax lots from Block 1159, Lot 65, located on the west side of Albert Avenue. Proposed Lot 65.01 will have frontage along Albert Avenue. The proposed Lot 65.02 is a flag lot located to the rear (west) of Lot 65.01, with access to Albert Avenue provided by an access easement. A proposed two (2) story dwelling is indicated on the submitted plans for new Lot 65.02. The tract is located in the southern portion of the Township, three (3) blocks west of New Hampshire Avenue. Albert Avenue is improved at this location. The tract is located in the R-20 Residential Zone. Single-family residences and flag lots are permitted in the zone. The application seeks no variances. Section 805.G.5 provides the following criteria for creating flag lots: "Flag lots shall be created only in conjunction with an overall development plan of the entire tract of which the flag lot is a part and the applicant shall demonstrate a need, consistent with good planning principles, for the creation of the flag lot and shall further demonstrate that normal subdivision techniques are not practical because of topography, lot or land configurations or other physical characteristics or constraints of the land related to the proposed development concept." The applicant should be prepared to discuss with the Board how this application complies with the above requirements. While in compliance with the Ordinance, an access easement to the rear lot has been discouraged in the past by the Planning Board. The proposed plan does not comply with the requirements of Section 805.G in that the necessary landscaping along the access drive is not provided. Further, an area for temporary storage of solid waste containers must be provided. The plans (submitted as part of this application) for a proposed single-family residence on proposed Flag Lot 65.02 indicate it will contain four (4) bedrooms. Parking for both proposed lots must comply with NJ RSIS standards. Confirm that sufficient area is provided for three (3) vehicles for Lot 65.02. The plans contain a proposed shade tree/utility easement, but do not indicate any proposed sidewalks. Shade trees are also

not indicated. A performance guarantee should be posted for any improvements in the public right-of-way. An individual septic system and potable well is proposed to serve the residential dwelling on Lot 65.02. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Ray Shea, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant, with Brian Flannery as engineer. Mr. Flannery said they will give the justification at the public hearing with respect to the flag lot. He agreed to make the flag portion fee simple and also agreed to sidewalks and shade tree easements and the remaining comments.

Mr. Klein asked about the buffering around the whole flag lot and Mr. Flannery said they would comply. Mr. Banas asked to see the surrounding neighbors are. The affordable housing is near and they have the property to the west of that.

Motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Klein, to advance this application to the meeting of April 24, 2007

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

2. SD # 1577 (NO VARIANCE REQUESTED)

APPLICANT: YOSEF & ESTHER TESLER

Location: Lakeview Drive, west of Myrtle Place
Block 12.06 Lots 5.01, 44

Minor Subdivision for 2 lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Minor Subdivision Approval to move the lot line separating existing Lots 5.01 & 44 to provide Lot 5.01 with an additional area of approximately 3,090 square feet. The applicant also proposes changing the lot numbers to 5.02 & 44.01. The property is situated on Lakeview Drive, within the R-12 Zoning District. It appears no variances will be required. The proposed lot line runs through the driveway of New Lot 5.02. We recommend moving the proposed lot line to run between the two driveways, despite the fact that this would create a variance condition for the side yard setback of New Lot 44.01. If the applicant chooses to not move the lot line, an access easement will be required. A 6' shade tree easement has been provided. The area of the easement should be shown on the plans. Concrete curb exists along the frontage of both properties. Sidewalk only exists along the frontage of lot 44.01. The Board should determine if sidewalk will be required along the frontage of lot 5.02. The zoning table states 2 off-street parking spaces are required and provided for each lot. For an unknown number of bedrooms, each lot requires 2.5 parking spaces. The driveway on Lot 44.01 is long enough for stacked two cars parking but not wide enough for a third parking spot. The board should determine if an additional parking space will be required. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated January 26, 2007. The applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to relocate the lot line between the subject lots. Single-family dwellings are located on each existing lot, which will remain. The parcel totals 30,253 square feet in area and is located on the north side of Lakeview Drive near Myrtle Place. The site is located in the R-12 Residential Zone. Single-family homes are a permitted

use in the zone. No variances are requested. The new lot line will locate a portion of an existing paved driveway currently on old Lot 44 into new Lot 5.02. Use of the driveway should be clarified. Shade trees are not shown on the plans. A six-foot shade tree easement is identified. The Board Engineer and Attorney should review the easement and survey description. There is no existing sidewalk along the majority of the frontage of Lot 5.02. Off-street parking for three (3) vehicles is required for the NJRSIS. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

The applicant or the applicant's attorney (Mr. Penzer) were not present. Mr. Banas suggested moving on with item #3 and then come back to this one. Mr. Penzer was reached by phone, and said he would not be coming tonight. Mr. Banas requested tabling this item until March 6, 2007

Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Herzl, to table this application until March 6, 2007.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

3. SD # 1578 (NO VARIANCE REQUESTED)

APPLICANT: RACHEL ROSENFELD

Location: 257 East 4th Street, east of Sampson Avenue
Block 243 Lot 28

Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots (1 flag lot)

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Minor Subdivision Approval to subdivide Block 243, Lot 28 into two lots. Proposed Lot 28.01 contains an existing two family dwelling that will remain, and Proposed Lot 28.02 is a flag lot for a proposed two story dwelling. The property is situated on East Fourth Street, within the R-7.5 Zoning District. It appears no variances will be required. Ocean County Planning Board and Ocean County Soil Conservation District approval will be required. Evidence of these approvals shall be made a condition of final subdivision approval. Three (3) off-street parking spaces have been provided for each dwelling. Both proposed lots will be serviced by public water and sewer. The pavement width of East Fourth Street at the subject property should be shown on the plans. It appears that the existing dirt drive will be removed, but it has not been marked for removal. Construction details shall be included for proposed improvements and plantings. Shade tree easements are typically required along all property frontages. The plans shall be revised to include a six foot (6') wide shade tree easement along the property frontage. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated January 29, 2007. The applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to subdivide existing Lot 28 into two lots, one of which is a flag lot. A 2-story residential structure is located on the current lot, which will remain. The parcel totals 28,566 square feet in area and is located on East Fourth Street, between Manetta Avenue and School Garden Street. The lot abuts a Board of Education parcel. The site is located in the R-7.5 Residential Zone. Single-family homes are a permitted use in the zone. No variances are requested. §805G5 of the Lakewood Unified Development Ordinance reads "Flag lots shall be created only in conjunction with an overall development

plan of the entire tract of which the flag lot is a part and the applicant shall demonstrate a need, consistent with good planning principals (sic) for the creation of the flag lot and shall further demonstrate that normal subdivision techniques are not practical because of topography, lot, or land configurations or other physical characteristics or constraints of the land related to the proposed development concept.” The applicant should provide testimony to satisfy these requirements. §805G6c of the UDO requires “applications for a flag lot subdivision shall submit architectural plans for the proposed dwelling to be constructed on the flag lot.” The applicant should submit architectural plans in accordance with this requirement or request a waiver. Additional landscaping detail of the buffer plantings should be provided on the plans. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Off-street parking shall comply with the NJ RSIS. A note should be provided on the plan. Shade trees are proposed via a note on the plan. We would recommend that the shade trees be shown. The map should show the location of other residential dwellings located on the adjoining lot as to new Lot 28.02. Performance guarantees should be posted for any improvements in the right-of-way. The garage on new Lot 28.01 shown “to be removed” must be removed prior to the filing of the Map. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Kenneth Pape, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant with Ray Carpenter as the engineer. They will comply with the comments in the professionals’ reports and will testify at the public hearing the reason for a flag lot. Mr. Banas requested Mr. Carpenter show the surrounding lots. Mr. Pape wanted to know about the buffering next to a neighbor which is a school (old #5 school) and asked what would be the best for it. Mr. Banas said they would answer that question at the public hearing.

Mr. Herzl asked if the applicant received the copy for the Lakewood Fire Commission and the width of the driveway being too narrow and Mr. Carpenter said flag lots were required to have 20ft wide driveways, 12 ft. for the driveways, and 4 ft. buffers for each side, and that is what the ordinance requires. Mr. Pape said he would make inquiries to the Fire Commissioner.

Motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Herzl, to advance this application to the meeting of April 24, 2007

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

4. SD # 1579 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)

APPLICANT: DANIEL GROSS

Location: 516 East 5th Street, east of Manetta Avenue
Block 243 Lot 4

Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Minor Subdivision approval to subdivide Block 243, Lot 4 into two lots. New Lot 4.01 contains an existing single family dwelling. The applicant proposes construction of a new single family dwelling new Lot 4.02. The property is situated on East Fifth Street, within the R-7.5 Zoning District. A variance will be required for the front yard setback of new Lot 4.01, 17 feet is proposed where 25 feet is required. This is an existing condition. Ocean County Planning Board and Ocean County Soil

Conservation District approvals will be required. Evidence of these approvals shall be made a condition of final subdivision approval. Concrete curb and sidewalk exist along the property frontage. The limit of the existing depressed curb shall be shown on the plan. The zoning table states that three (3) off street parking spaces have been provided for each lot. It appears that the proposed driveway for new Lot 4.02 is not large enough for three parking spaces. The applicant shall clarify this discrepancy. The pavement width of East Fifth Street at the subject property should be shown on the plans. The footprint of the frame garage on Lot 4.01 needs clarification. The setbacks to the existing garage shall be identified. Construction details shall be included for proposed improvements. The applicant has provided a six (6') foot shade tree easement along the property frontage. The area of this easement shall be shown on the plan. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated January 26, 2007. The applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to subdivide Lot 4 into two lots. A single-family dwelling is located on the property, which will remain. The parcel totals 15,000 square feet in area and is located on the south side of East Fifth Street. The surrounding land use is generally residential. The site is located in the R-7.5 Residential Zone. Single-family homes are a permitted use in the zone. Sidewalks and shade trees are shown on the plans. An area of stone primarily on new Lot 4.02 is shown to be removed. The stone should be removed or a bond should be posted prior to the filing of the map. A shade tree easement is proposed. The easement document and survey description should be reviewed by the Board Engineer and Attorney if the subdivision is perfected by deed. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Pape Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant with Mr. Carpenter as the engineer. Mr. Carpenter agreed to comply with all the comments from the professionals' reports

Motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Herzl, to advance this application to the meeting of April 24, 2007

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

5. SP # 1860 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)
APPLICANT: CONGREGATION AVREICHIM
Location: 10th Street @ northeast intersection of Clifton Avenue
Block 112 Lot 11.02
Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan for addition to existing building

Mr. Penzer was reached by phone, and said he would not be coming tonight. Mr. Banas requested tabling this item until March 6, 2007

Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Herzl, to table this application until March 6, 2007.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

6. SP # 1861 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)

APPLICANT: MALKIEL SVEI

Location: Chestnut Street, behind BP gas station
Block 1070 Lot 3

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan to construct an office building

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Preliminary & Final Site Plan Approval for Block 1070, Lot 3. The site currently contains a single family residence which will be removed. The project consists of a two story office building with a basement, stormwater management measures, and parking facilities. The site is located on Chestnut Street, in the HD-7 Zoning District. Variances are required for the following: Minimum Lot Area: 0.34 acres is proposed where 1.0 acre is required. This is an existing condition. Lot Frontage: 100 feet is proposed where 150 feet is required. This is an existing condition. Front Yard Setback: 25 feet is proposed where 50 feet is required. The applicant has requested a ten foot (10') rear yard setback variance. The lot has a double frontage on both Chestnut Street and Chestnut Street Extension. The plans and application should be revised to request a second front yard setback variance. The ten foot (10') dimension is to the side yard, the dimension from the proposed building to Chestnut Street Extension shall be shown on the plans. Although not requested, the application will require a side yard variance, ten feet (10') is proposed where 30' is required. The combined side yard shall be shown in the zoning table, and the side yard dimension on the west side of the building shall be shown on the plans. Ocean County Soil Conservation District and Ocean County Planning Board approvals will be required. Proof of approval shall be made a condition of final approval. The applicant requests a wavier from section 18-803.E.2.a of the UDO which requires a 25 foot buffer. The applicant has proposed sight triangle easements on both sides of the proposed parking lot entrance, to be dedicated to Ocean County. The board should determine if a shade tree easement will be required along both frontages. The Board should determine if the applicant is to install sidewalk along the property frontages. The application states that 48 parking spaces are required. The parking calculations on the plan state that 17 spaces are required. At minimum, one space is required for every 300 feet of office space. The applicant shall provide testimony to the use of the offices as this affects the parking calculations. The applicant shall also clarify and resolve the discrepancy between the application and the plans. Furthermore, the building area used for the parking calculations does not match the area shown on the architectural plans. 9. The lot is a thru lot requiring a five foot (5') landscaped buffer along chestnut street extension. The applicant has not marked any of the existing structures to be removed on the plans. The plans shall be revised to indicate which structures will be removed. The reference source of the north arrow shall be shown on the plans. A detail for the concrete dumpster pad and dumpster enclosure with gate shall be added to the plans. The applicant shall provide testimony as to how trash pickup will be handled in order to allow safe ingress and egress of trash collection vehicles. Parking spaces may need to be eliminated to allow for a K-turn area. The roof leader system does not indicate the size and type of pipe used. Furthermore, the applicant has not proposed grades or invert elevations where it ties into the catch basins. The applicant has not included a detail for the style of handicap ramp included in the plans. The applicant shall include a detail and location for detectable surface to be installed on the handicapped ramps. The applicant shall include any proposed signage on the plans. The plans include both an Ocean County

Curb Detail with a four inch (4") asphalt base course shown and a Curb and Pavement Restoration Detail with a two inch (2") asphalt base course shown. It appears all pavement restoration will be within the county right of way, this discrepancy shall be resolved. The Curb and Pavement Restoration detail should be called on-site pavement detail if this is the intent. The County Route Number for Chestnut Street shall be added to the plans. The Existing Conditions Plan contains a tree list, but the trees on the plan have not been numbered to correspond to the list. The plans shall be revised to include the limit of pavement milling on the site plan for clarity. The plans shall be revised to show required setback lines on the site plan. The maintenance schedule for the stormwater management system shall be added to the plans. The grading and drainage and profile plans include Type "N", Type "A", and Type "E" inlets. Details have been given for Type "A", Type "E", and "Lakewood Storm" Inlets. The applicant shall clarify this discrepancy and make it clear which inlets will include pretreatment filters. As per section 9.5 B of the New Jersey BMP manual, the design permeability rate shall be 1/2 of the tested permeability rate. The calculations based on permeability rate shall be revised. This project is not considered a "major development" project and is not required to comply with the requirements for stormwater quantity reductions, water quality, or groundwater recharge. The stormwater management system has been designed so there is no increase in runoff due to the proposed development of the site. It appears the site has sufficient grade to direct stormwater runoff to the scour hole by overland swales. We recommend an above ground basin be designed in the open area north of the building rather than a series of infiltration pipes. The description and assessment of the site and regional hydrogeology was not adequately discussed in the EIS. At a minimum, existing groundwater aquifers' water quality shall be described, and an assessment of the impact of the stormwater management on the groundwater quality shall be included. Procedures to mitigate groundwater quality impacts should be provided by the applicant in a Maintenance and Cleaning Plan for the site stormwater management system, including site basins. The applicant shall add a note to the plans stating that wells if found will be abandoned by a licensed driller and tanks and septic will be removed in accordance with NJDEP standards. A note shall be added to the plans stating that if fill is to be imported, the source shall be documented and the soil shall be tested.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated January 30, 2007. The applicant is seeking preliminary/final major site plan and variance approvals to construct a two (2) story office building and associated parking, drainage facilities and utilities on Block 1070, Lot 3. The proposed building (basement, 1st & 2nd floors) contains 7,243 square feet of interior space. Lot 3 is 0.3329 acres in size and currently contains an existing two-story dwelling. The tract is located in the southern part of the Township, east of Route 9. The tract's eastern lot line abuts the portion of the right-of-way dedicated to Chestnut Street and the Chestnut Street Extension, which is currently a triangular grassy lot, the three sides of which are bordered by the Chestnut Street Extension (northeast), Chestnut Street (south), and the tract (west). The properties surrounding the tract to the north, south and west are used for commercial purposes. The lot directly east of the tract is part of the R-12 Residential Zone and contains a residence. Lot 3 is located in the HD-7 (Highway Development) Zone. Various types of commercial and retail uses are permitted uses. The following variances are required (Note: In our opinion, the lot has three (3) front yards and one side yard): Front yard setback: 50 feet required; 25 feet proposed on Chestnut Street, 33.5 feet on Chestnut Street Extension, and 10 feet on the west frontage. Lot Area: 1 acre

required; 0.34 acres proposed. Lot width: 150 feet required; 100 feet proposed. The positive and negative criteria for the requested bulk variances should be addressed. A waiver from the 25-foot wide landscape buffer requirements has been requested. The current use (residential) is not a permitted use in the HD-7 Zone. Revise the Schedule of Bulk Requirements on the site plan to reflect the three front yards and required variances, per Item B.2. We recommend that the site plan be revised to identify all building setback lines. The lot currently provides a visual transition from the R-12 Residential Zone to the east of the tract and HD-7 and Route 9 to the west. We are concerned that, due to the small size of the tract (1/3 the size currently required for the HD-7 Zone), the buffer waiver requested will only exacerbate the negative visual impact due to the intensified use contemplated by the proposal. The Planning Board should discuss alternative methods of mitigating the requested variances. We note that off-street parking requirements noted on the plans (1 space per 300 SF) is based on an office use. If medical or dental offices are contemplated, additional parking is required. The use should be stipulated and additional Board approval required if the proposed use varies from that approved. Reconcile the parking computation with the architectural drawing in terms of floor area. Floor area is defined in the UDO to include basement area, but excludes stairwells. The application and plans should be revised to provide the floor area figure per the Ordinance definition and the parking requirements should be recalculated. Street trees should be provided on the north frontage. The landscaping on the north side of the lot is insufficient. Foundation plantings should be increased. Shade tree/utility easements or proposed sidewalks are not shown on the plans. The Site Plan includes a grading, drainage and utility plan, landscape and lighting plan, soil erosion and sediment control plan and parking/traffic sign details. The recycling and trash enclosure areas should be in a less visible location. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been submitted for Planning Board Review. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

John Doyle Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He is prepared to testify about the variances at the public hearing. They agree to comply with the sidewalks, and they testify the parking count is correct as they are not having any medical units and the basement does not compute in the parking. Mr. Flannery is the engineer for the applicant and said because this property has fronts on 3 streets and the buffering from the property to the gas station would not make this property feasible and the existing residence is not allowed in the HD-7 zone. Mr. Banas said with all the variances they have, even though it is a peculiar shape and in a peculiar area, it seems the building is too large for the size of the lot. Mr. Flannery said they will testify the reason to the board at the public hearing and that what they are proposing is appropriate. Mr. Flannery asked for direction on the trash receptacle from Mr. Franklin. Mr. Franklin said that is the only place to put it and it would be a commercial pick up and there would be a wall around it.

Mr. Peters questioned the grades and the underground pipes and Mr. Flannery said he saw the comments and would try to work out a solution by the time the plans are due back. Mr. Flannery said they feel they have sufficient parking.

Mr. Klein said the dumpster area looks to pose an issue to the car parked in the adjacent parking spot and Mr. Flannery said it would be picked up in the early morning before the cars arrive. Mr. Flannery stated there would be sidewalks on Chestnut Street, but not on the Chestnut Street Extension. Mr. Banas said he would like to see sidewalks along all of it.

Motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Akerman, to advance this application to the meeting of April 24, 2007.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

7. SP # 1820B (VARIANCE REQUESTED)

APPLICANT: 1161 ROUTE 9

Location: Route 9, between Chestnut Street and Yale Drive
Block 1064 Lot 4

Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan for addition to existing building

Tabled until March 6, 2007.

8. DISCUSSION – Amendment to UDO-Plot Plan and As-Built Survey

Mr. Kielt stated this was in the works for a while and the Township Committee had already done a first reading on this.

Mr. Franklin said it looks like everything is in order and this is a safety precaution for the town and Lakewood is the only town that does not have one. It doesn't cost the homeowner any more money and it protects the builder and the neighbors.

Motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Herzl, to approve and pass on to the committee that it meets the requirements and there are no consistencies with the master plan.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

5. CORRESPONDENCE

6. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes from January 16, 2007 Special Meeting

Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Franklin, to approve

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes

- Minutes from January 23, 2007 Public Meeting

Motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Franklin, to approve

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; abstain,
Mr. Klein; yes

7. APPROVAL OF BILLS

Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Klein, to approve

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes,
Mr. Klein; yes

Mr. Banas had a question about the minutes from the OCPB minutes about Malkiel Svei and there were a lot of comments from the county about it. Mr. Banas was disturbed by the second paragraph and asked that this be redistributed for the next meeting on March 6 for the applicant so it can be discussed.

8. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Chris Johnson
Planning Board Recording Secretary