

**LAKWOOD PLANNING BOARD  
MINUTES  
MARCH 27, 2007**

**I. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE**

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

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the Asbury Park Press and 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 Asbury Park Press, 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. Banas, Mrs. Wise, Mr. Klein, Mr. Gatton, Mr. Percal

**3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS**

Mr. Peters and Mr. Truscott were sworn in.

Mr. Kielt said there was a change to the agenda- **Item #4 – SP 1863 Mountainview Investments** - waiting on revised plans, re-scheduled for the Plan Review Meeting of June 5th 2007, 6 p.m.

**Motion was made by Mrs. Wise, seconded by Mr. Klein, to table to June 5th 2007**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mrs. Wise; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes,

**4. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS**

**1. SD # 1561 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: DAVID HERZOG**

Location: East 4th Street, west side of Negba Street between E.4th & E.5th Sts.  
Block 241 Lot 9

Minor Subdivision and Preliminary & Final Site Plan- 2 lots and 1 two story duplex  
1 three story multi family with basement - total of 6 apartments

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Minor Subdivision Approval to subdivide one multi-zone lot into two lots. Lot 9.01 proposes a 2 two story Duplexes are proposed on a 10,000 sq. ft. portion of the existing lot containing the entire R-7.5 zoned portion and a small amount of the B-2 zone. Lot 9.02 proposes a three story Multi-Family housing building containing six apartments and a partially below grade basement is proposed on a 13,363 sq. ft. portion of the existing lot zoned B-2. The subject property, known as Block 241, Lot 9, stretches from East Fourth Street to East Fifth Street along Negba Street within the R-7.5 and B-2 zones. The property is currently vacant. A variance will be required for the following: Lot 9.02 Side yard setback – A 12.75 foot setback is proposed where 20 feet are required. Lot 9.02 Lot Coverage – 44% lot coverage is proposed where 40% coverage is the maximum. The applicant will be required to obtain an outside agency approval from the Ocean County Planning Board and the Ocean County Soil Conservation District. The multifamily building will contain two (2) six (6) bedroom apartments, and four (4) four bedroom apartments. The RSIS tops out at 2.1 parking spaces per unit for a three bedroom unit. The applicant has provided 14 parking spaces for the multifamily building in accordance with 2.1 parking spaces per unit. The board should determine if the parking provided will be sufficient. The duplex building will contain two (2) five (5) bedroom units. The RSIS tops out at 2.4 parking spaces per unit for a three bedroom townhouse. The applicant has provided 10 parking spaces for the duplex building. The subject property is located along Negba Street which currently has a substandard width based on RSIS Standards. The existing Right of Way (ROW) is twenty (20) feet with a cartway of 19.6 feet. The standard width for a neighborhood street is a fifty (50) foot wide ROW with a thirty foot wide cartway allowing for a sixteen foot wide two way, traveled way, and two seven foot wide parking areas. The applicant has proposed a seven foot wide roadway easement dedicated to Lakewood Township to contain the proposed sidewalk. To bring the roadway up to standard would require the applicant to dedicate 15 feet of lot depth to the Township for ROW and provide a five (5) foot road widening. The Board may wish to accept the applicant's proposal or pursue some middle ground such as accepting the proposed roadway width and making this block of Negba Street one way with parking on one side. Any limitation on parking or direction of travel would require action by the Township Committee. As per section 18-814 of the UDO, continuous open driveways in excess of the permitted maximum width as specified in Section 18-807 shall be prohibited. The maximum width of specified in Section 18-807 is thirty feet, a waiver will be required to allow for the 135 foot continuous open driveway. We have safety concerns regarding the narrow street with a row of pull-in parking spaces which will require a large number of cars to back into the street. The applicant should call out the existing sidewalk on the plans along East Fifth Street. A hatched area is shown on the Site Plan, but it isn't labeled. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated February 6, 2007. The applicant is seeking the following: Minor subdivision approval to subdivide existing Lot 9 (located within Block 241) into two (2) separate tax lots. Lot 9 is currently vacant. Preliminary/final major site plan approval to construct: A two (2) family dwelling (duplex) on proposed Lot 9.01, and a six (6) unit multi-family apartment building on proposed Lot 9.02. Off-street parking and stormwater management facilities for the proposed development. Lot 9 is a corner lot from East 4th to East 5th Street, with Negba Street running along its eastern edge. Lot 9 currently is located in two (2) separate zoning districts, the R-7.5 and B-2 Zones. The surrounding properties are improved, with single-family dwellings. Proposed Lot 9.01 will have depressed curb cuts along both East 5th and Negba Streets, and will lie entirely in

the R-7.5 Zone. Proposed Lot 9.02 will have depressed curb cuts along both East 4th and Negba Streets, and will lie entirely within the B-2 Zone. The applicant has submitted revised plans and a minor subdivision plat subsequent to the December 5, 2006 Plan Review meeting. Lot 9.01 will be entirely located in the R-7.5 Zone; two-family and duplex housing is a permitted use. The applicant has requested the following bulk variance: Minimum lot area: 10,000 SF required, 9,555 SF proposed). Lot 9.02 will be entirely located in the B-2 Zone; multi-family housing is a permitted use. The applicant has requested the following bulk variances; Side yard setback: 20 feet required, 12.74 feet proposed. Maximum Building Lot coverage: 40% required, 44% proposed. The positive and negative criteria for the requested variances should be addressed. The Bulk Charts on the site plans and plat have discrepancies. The applicant should clarify and correct the following: Lot 9.01 Maximum Building Coverage – plat states 27 % provided, the site plans are blank. Lot 9.02 Maximum Lot Coverage – plat states 27.8%, site plans = 44 % (variance required). Side yard setback – plat states 12.75 feet, site plan = 12.74 feet. In addition, the comment “each” for side yard should be removed, as 9.02 is a corner lot. If the maximum lot coverage for Lot 9.02 is 27.8%, the applicant does not require a variance for this item. Architectural drawings have been submitted for Board review. The duplex units will have each had 5 bedrooms, two (2) in-swing entrance doors, and unfinished basements. The multi-family structure is proposed to have six (6) units. Two (2) of the multi-family units will have six (6) bedrooms each, and four (4) of the units will have 4 bedrooms each (Page A2 Unit B Master Bedroom and Bedroom 2 are not identified). The parking calculations on the Site Development Plan and subdivision plat are incorrect and require revisions: Lot 9.01: the 5-bedroom duplex units require a minimum of 3 off-street parking spaces, not 2.5. Total spaces required = 6; total provided = 10. Lot 9.02: the RSIS requirements for Garden Apartments should be utilized. A 3- bedroom garden apartment requires 0.1 additional parking spaces over a 2-bedroom unit. Applying this standard to the proposed multi-family structure (containing two (2) six bedroom units, and four (4) five bedroom units), a total of 14 spaces are required for the multi-family apartment building; total spaces provided = 14. The applicant should clarify on the Minor Subdivision and the Site Plan that Lot 9.01 will only contain two (2) dwelling units to be consistent with the architectural plans. The applicant is actually providing four (4) more parking spaces than required for Lot 9.01, and this proposed parking arrangement limits the location of street trees on Negba Street. We suggest the parking spaces be reduced to the required amount (6), and the layout redesigned, so more landscaping can be added along Negba Street. The new landscape plan should be designed to ensure a diversity of species in the screening vegetation. Shade tree easements or lighting plans are not indicated on the site plans. The plans indicate that a Homeowners Association (HOA) will be established for Lot 9.01 for maintenance and ownership of the underground stormwater management recharge system. The proper documents should be filed with the NJDCA, establishing the HOA and they should be reviewed by the Board Attorney, prior to filing. The submitted Site Development Plan notes that waivers have been requested for the following: Existing topography and contours within 200 feet of the site. Environmental Impact Statement, and Tree Protection Management Plan. Performance guarantees should be posted for all improvements in the right-of-way. Sidewalks and site triangle/roadway easements are indicated on the plans. The proposed lot numbers must be approved by the Lakewood Tax Assessor. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. The required outside agency approvals may include, but are not limited to: Ocean County Planning Board; Soil Conservation District; Sewer and water utilities; and, all other required Outside Agency approvals.

Dennis Kelly, Esq. from Levin Shea & Pfeffer appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Flannery is the engineer for the applicant. Mr. Flannery said they are trying to subdivide one lot into two, one lot in the R-7.5 and the other lot would be B-2. They were before the board at a previous technical meeting and agreed to make some changes and come back. There was an issue of width of Negba Street, which as it exists is 20 ft. wide, and more in the configuration of an alley than a street. He marked 2 exhibits A-1 (rendered version of site plan) and A-2 (aerial that shows the site in yellow) All except for one home, the lots have fronts on E.4th Street and E.5th Street and these two lots would have frontage on those two streets. If Negba was classified as an alley, the width would be 22 ft. according to RSIS with 18 ft. of pavement. Mr. Flannery is suggesting utilizing it as a one way street in a southerly direction. The other problem is the northerly extension of Negba Street is offset such that the westerly line of the northerly extension lines up with the westerly line of Negba Street as it exists. They are proposing a 7 ft. roadway easement indicated on the plans and they have a letter from Glenn Lines, former township engineer that indicates that in his opinion a 7 ft. right of way dedication would be the appropriate thing. Mr. Flannery understands the letter has no weight, it is the planning board who decides if what they are proposing makes sense. If you go with Max's suggestion of a 50 ft. wide street, half of their lot is 60 ft. wide and if they were to give 15 ft. they would lose 25% of the lot in that area. If they give the 7 ft. and make it a one way, there will be adequate right of way for one way and they could angle the parking spaces so that rather than backing straight out, they will be in a one way configuration and an easier move in and out. They would also have to shrink the size of the buildings to accommodate the sidewalks. He is hoping the planning board will agree with their compromise and they would come back to another tech meeting and they understand the Township Committee would be the ones to make the street one way and they would make that request to the Township Committee then come back to this board and move forward. In regards to the lot coverage, Mr. Peters copied the mistake that his office made. The 44% is the lot coverage (impervious) and the requirement is for building coverage which is 27+ %. The board did not get copies of Mr. Truscott's letter. Mr. Flannery read the part of the planners' report that had to do with the lot coverage.

Mr. Banas said if the board did not grant the 15 ft. that is being discussed, how large of a lot would the applicant have and Mr. Flannery said the lot on East 4th Street would be 45 ft. wide and it requires a 25 ft. front setback and a 15 ft. rear setback and leave them with a 5ft. wide buildable strip. Mr. Flannery said most of the comments in the professional's reports are technical and they would comply with them but there are 2 issues that need concurrence from the board on, 1 is the right of way dedication, and the other is the number of parking spaces, the applicant proposed 14 for the multi family building and 10 for the duplex building (treating the duplex as 2 townhouses) If the board tells them the number of parking spaces and the suggestion to angle the parking space with the one way street, they would revise the plans accordingly. Mr. Banas asked the professionals their opinion on going to a 7 ft. dedication rather than 15 ft. Mr. Peters said the ultimate decision is up to the board but he feels that is a good middle ground, making it one way, they would not have to worry about 2 way traffic which would cut down the required width of the roadway. The angled parking saves some depth along the front. Mr. Truscott deferred to Max on this subject but would agree the one way street and angled parking is a better solution.

Mr. Banas asked the board for their opinion and Mr. Gatton said he would follow the advice of the professionals. Mr. Klein asked what the RSIS standard was for one way streets and Mr. Flannery said they do not have a standard for one way street, they have standards for alleys, one way and two way alleys; a 2 way alley is 22 ft. Mrs. Wise said the other side that would have to give 7 ft. who owns that property and Mr. Flannery said there are 3 separate owners, and there are older dwellings on them. If they come to the board at a later date, they could contribute to this condition. Mrs. Wise wanted to make sure this was all contingent on the Township Committee approving a one way street. Mr. Akerman asked if the suggestion right now was to make it a one way and Mr. Flannery said the suggestion is to ask the Township Committee to make it a one way, even though as it is it is a 2 way alley. Mr. Akerman asked Mr. Flannery to show him the traffic flow again.

Mr. Banas asked for a show of hands to see if they would go for the suggestion of recommending a one way for Negba St. Mr. Gatton said they are in existing single family dwellings in the neighborhood. Mr. Flannery said they would provide 14 parking spaces. Mr. Flannery said they would show variations in the parking spaces.

Mr. Truscott said the other thing about the one way street is that the new plans be distributed to the fire department for comments on the new arrangement. Mr. Kielt said his office would do that.

**Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Gatton, to move this application to the June 5th Plan Review Meeting.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mrs. Wise; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

**2. SD # 1581 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: MEIR KOHEN**

Location: Albert Avenue, between Oak Street and South Street  
Block 855.06 Lot 15

Minor Subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking a minor subdivision of Block 855.06 Lots 15. Two single family lots are proposed. A dwelling building is proposed on each of the new lots. The existing lot is currently used for single family dwelling that will be removed. The site is located along Albert Avenue and between South Street and Oak Street in the R-20 Zoning District. A variance is requested for lot area. Each of the proposed lots has an area of 19,270 S.F, where 20,000 S.F are required. Outside agency approvals will be required from the Ocean County Planning Board and the Ocean County Soil Conservation District. Evidence of both approvals should be made a condition of final subdivision approval. The applicant proposes to dedicate a 6 ft. wide shade tree easement to the Township of Lakewood along the property frontages on South Street. The applicant proposes that the future dwellings will be served by individual septic and well. The applicant shall provide testimony on the nearest location of public water and sewer. An

error has been made in the zoning schedule. The minimum lot width required by the Lakewood UDO shall be 100 ft instead of the 90 ft. which is shown on the plan. The applicant should revise the plan to show 100 ft minimum lot width is required. Concrete curb exists along the Oak Street frontage; there is no existing sidewalk on-site. The applicant has proposed curb and sidewalk along all the property frontages. The zoning table states three (3) off-street parking spaces have been provided for each lot. The driveways as proposed can only contain two parked cars. The driveways shall be enlarged to handle the parking of three cars. The two proposed dwellings are located at the corner between two streets. The applicant should show two front yard setbacks for each of the dwellings. The yards between the two proposed dwellings should become rear yards, and the rear yard setbacks of 20 ft. shall be labeled on the plan. The existing dwelling shall be removed prior to signature of the final plat or a bond posted to ensure its prompt removal after the subdivision is completed. Both proposed lots are labeled new lot 15.01 on the plan. This discrepancy should be corrected. The applicant shall provide on the plan a detail of driveway apron. A handicapped ramp details shall be included on the plans, the ramps shall detail a detectable warning surface with truncated domes. The applicant should show the location of the existing well and septic on the plans. Notes shall be added to the plan stating the existing septic system shall be abandoned in accordance with NJAC 7:9A-12.8 and well shall be sealed by a New Jersey licensed well driller in accordance with NJAC 7:9D-3. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated March 21, 2007. The applicants seek minor subdivision approval to subdivide existing Lot 15 into two (2) new corner lots, located within Block 855.06. Lot 15 currently contains an existing bi-level frame dwelling which will be removed as part of this project. The existing lot is 38,540 square feet in area. The tract is located in the southern part of the Township. The tract and contiguous properties are located in the R-20 (Residential) zone. The surrounding land uses are residential in nature. Single-family detached housing is a permitted uses in the R-20 Zone. The applicant has requested the following variances: Minimum Lot Area: 20,000 square feet required, 19,270 square feet proposed for both lots. The positive and negative criteria for the requested bulk variances should be addressed. Corner lots are defined in the Lakewood UDO as requiring two (2) front yards, one (1) rear yard and a minimum of one (1) side yard. The applicant should revise the Zoning Requirements table on the subdivision plat to include one (1) rear yard and one (1) side yard; the two (2) front yard setbacks should remain unchanged. The combined side yard setback requirement should be indicated as not applicable. The zoning setback lines on the plat should also be revised. The applicant should correct the subdivision plat, which indicates the identical lot number (15.01) for both lots. A key map should be added to the subdivision plans. In addition we note that the orientation of the plat is southwest, while the area map is oriented north. The area map should be revised to be consistent with the plan sheet. The key map should also be oriented to be consistent with the plans. The plat indicates the subdivision line for the proposed lots is on the same plane as contiguous Lots 17 and 21 to the southeast of the site and, therefore, consistent with the block. Parking for all proposed lots must comply with NJ RSIS standards. Confirm that sufficient area is provided for three (3) vehicles for all proposed lots. Proposed septic tanks, disposal fields and wells are indicated on the subdivision plan. Existing well(s) and septic should be clearly delineated on the plans. Proposed sidewalks with details are indicated on the submitted subdivision plans, along with shade tree easements containing ten (10) proposed street trees of the

same type. The plat indicates an existing dwelling on Lot 15. The dwelling and existing improvements (including the existing septic system, if applicable) must be removed or a bond posted for such removal prior to the signature of the plat by the Planning Board. Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. The signature block for the surveyor and fee owners of the property are unsigned on the reviewed subdivision plans. The subdivision plans have been signed in a signature block by the Lakewood Township Tax Assessor confirming that the proposed lot numbers have been approved. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Penzer, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated every single comment in both reports can be met, they are all minor in nature. They have added sidewalks and shade tree easements to the plans. Mr. Banas asked how many lots are constructed out there with variances and Mr. Penzer said he was not familiar with that and he did not have an answer and asked Mr. Carpenter to provide a map for the public hearing showing that.

Mr. Klein said he looked at the area map and that looked like what Mr. Banas was asking about and Mr. Penzer said that was correct and there will be testimony at the public hearing.

**Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Klein, to advance to the meeting of June 19, 2007**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

**3. SD # 1582 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: YAAKOV SINGER**

Location: White Road, east of Cross Street  
Block 251 Lot 9.02

Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking a minor subdivision of Block 251 Lots 9.02. Two residential lots are proposed. A new dwelling will be constructed on each of the proposed Lots 9.04 and 9.05. The site is located on White Street in the R-40 Zoning District. The applicant is requesting a variance for lot width for both of the proposed lots. Proposed Lots 9.04 and 9.05 have widths of 125 ft, where a lot width of 150 ft is required. Outside agency approvals will be required from the Ocean County Planning Board and Ocean County Soil Conservation. Evidence of both approvals should be made a condition of final subdivision approval. The applicant proposes to dedicate a 6 ft wide shade tree & utility easement to the Township of Lakewood along the White Street frontage of the property. The applicant proposes that the future dwellings will be served by individual septic and wells. The applicant shall provide testimony on the nearest location of public water and sewer. There is no curb or sidewalk existing along the property frontage the Board should determine if curb and sidewalk will be required. The applicant shall revise the zoning table to show the required and proposed number of parking spaces. Each driveway can accommodate more than four parked cars. The remaining comments pertain to the map filing law.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated March 26, 2007. The applicants seek minor subdivision and variance approvals to subdivide existing Lot 9.02 into two (2) new lots, located within Block 251. Lot 9.02 is a wooded, unimproved lot. The tract is located in the southwestern part of the Township, near the border with Jackson Township. The tract and surrounding properties are located in the R-40 (Residential) Zone. In general, the surrounding land uses are low in density, with individual lots either residentially developed or wooded and unimproved. Lots 9.03 and 9.01, which adjoin the property to the east and west, respectively, contain residences. Single-family detached housing is a permitted use in the R-40 Zone. The applicant has requested the following variances for both of the proposed lots: Minimum Lot width: 150 feet required, 125 feet proposed. The positive and negative criteria for the requested bulk variances should be addressed. Applicant should discuss the dimensions of the proposed lots and the contemplated land use(s) in comparison with current lot sizes and uses in the surrounding area. Any attempts to purchase additional property to mitigate the variances should be noted.

Parking for all proposed lots must comply with NJ RSIS standards. Confirm that sufficient area is provided for three (3) vehicles for all proposed lots, and indicate as such on the subdivision plans. A shade tree and utility easement indicating three (3) trees to be planted for each proposed lot is shown on the subdivision plan. Sidewalks are not proposed along White Street. Proposed septic tanks, disposal fields (partially in the front yard setbacks) and wells are indicated on the subdivision plan. Lots requiring septic systems shall be of sufficient size to achieve required separation distances in accordance with New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection septic design regulations, and shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the State enforced by the County Board of Health. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Penzer, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He has no problem meeting all the items except one, which will cause a great deal of grief and that is the sidewalks on White Road. The neighbors are against it and he does not know what to do about it. They will have to abide by the board's decision. Mr. Banas feels strongly that sidewalks are important. Mr. Penzer said the remaining comments can be done.

Mr. Gatton asked why the sidewalks would be a concern and Mr. Penzer said the people out there feel it is rural and one acre zoning, and they don't really want people walking around, it is more of a palatial estate type of effect and he has heard other arguments from the back. Mr. Banas stated the public could not speak at this meeting, they would have the opportunity to speak at the public hearing.

**Motion was made by Mr. Gatton, seconded by Mr. Percal, to advance to the meeting of June 19, 2007**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes



**4. SP # 1863 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: MOUNTAINVIEW INVESTMENTS LLC**

Location: Kennedy Boulevard, former Shop-Rite  
Block 104 Lot 38

Minor Site Plan to construct canopy on existing building and reconfigure parking lot

Tabled until June 5th 2007.

**5. SD # 1584 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: SOMERSET DEVELOPMENT LLC**

Location: 975 East County Line Road, west of Lucerne Drive  
Block 174.04 Lots 24 & 63

Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision for 9 lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision Approval to subdivide 2 lots and created 9 new lots. The existing Lot 63 is current occupied by a single family dwelling and Lot 24 is open field. The property is located between Kennedy Boulevard East and County Line Road East within the R-15 zone. A variance is requested for lot width for Lot 24.05, 90.8 ft are proposed where 100 ft is required. The applicant should include the required minimum number of off street parking spaces and the proposed off street parking spaces for proposed lots in the zoning schedule. When numbers of bedroom are not certain, 3.5 off street parking spaces are required for each dwelling. The applicant shows on the plan a 20' x 30' driveway for each dwelling, each driveway is large enough to provide 2 off street parking spaces, the applicant shall address this issue to the Planning Board. The applicant will be required to obtain outside agency approvals from Ocean County Planning Board, Ocean County Soil Conservation District, and NJDEP approvals for Water Main Extension and Treatment Works approval. The lots 24.04 and 24.05 are thru lots and should be deed restricted, so no access will be allowed from, lots 24.04 and 24.05 to County Line Road East. Lots 24.01 and 24.09 shall be restricted in a similar matter. The board should determine if shade tree easements will be required. Six (6) foot wide shade tree and utility easements are generally required to be dedicated to Lakewood Township along new and existing property frontages. The applicant should provide testimony on whether the proposed roadway and drainage system will be public or private. The Township may not want to assume ownership of the stormwater management system due to the number of pipe runs located in easements through residential side yards. If private ownership is proposed a homeowners association will be required. The applicant's engineer shall provide a stormwater basin maintenance plan for review by the Planning Board Engineer. The maintenance plan shall be provided to the party responsible for the maintenance of the system after construction. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated March 26, 2007. The applicant seeks preliminary/final major subdivision and variance approvals to subdivide existing Lots 24 and 63 located within Block 174.04. The property has frontage on East County Line Road and northern

frontage along (unimproved) Kennedy Boulevard. Nine (9) lots fronting Champlain Court, a proposed cul de sac, will be created, with two (2) lots being corner lots and two (2) lots being thru lots. The 3.55-acre tract has been the location of Casey's Market and Greenhouse in an R-15 Zone in the northern part of the Township, and contains a one (1) story frame dwelling, a barn and a metal framed farm stand. All of the current improvements are oriented toward East County Line Road. County Line Road forms the border with the R-12 Zone to the south; contiguous zoning for the rest of the properties is R-15. The surrounding land uses are residential in nature. Single-family detached housing is a permitted uses in the R-15 Zone. The applicant has requested the following variance: Minimum lot width: 100 feet required, 90.8 feet proposed (Lot 24.05) The positive and negative criteria for the required bulk variances should be addressed. As noted, access to proposed Champlain Court is via Kennedy Boulevard, which is indicated as unimproved on the subdivision plat. Applicant should address the timing and status of Kennedy Boulevard improvements. As per Section 18-908 of the Lakewood UDO, through-lots 24.04 and 24.05 require a landscaped buffer along the secondary frontage bordering East County Line Road. The width and depth of the buffer shall be determined by the Board based upon the characteristics of the existing neighborhood, but in no case shall the buffer be less than five (5) feet wide. Applicant should revise the plans to identify at least a 5-foot wide buffer area. A sight triangle for Champlain Court and Kennedy Boulevard should be added to the plans. The applicant should discuss how the sight triangle areas will be incorporated into the landscape plan. We recommend that the proposed plantings and placements be modified in the vicinity of the triangle to ensure clear sight lines. A proposed five (5) foot wide sidewalk easement along East County Line Road is indicated on the subdivision plan and the subdivision plat. As proposed sidewalks are indicated in a separate note to be installed along Champlain Court, it should be ascertained if the applicant intends to install sidewalks along East County Line Road. Parking for all proposed lots must comply with NJ RSIS standards. The applicant should generally indicate what type of permitted residential buildings are contemplated and confirm that sufficient off-street parking area is provided for each proposed lot. The appropriate RSIS requirements should be added to the plans. A proposed 5.25-foot roadway dedication to Ocean County along East County Line Road is indicated on the plans; shade tree/utility easements are not. The plans indicate the existing structures are to be removed. All structures must be removed or a bond posted for such removal prior to the signature of the plat by the Planning Board. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Moshe Klein, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Greg Ulman from Menlo Engineering is the engineer for the applicant who stated they would comply with 95% of the comments. He asked for clarification about the sidewalks on County Line Road, and said the applicant in not planning on installing sidewalks, that is a recommendation from the county and they are merely dedicating it to the county and providing a 5 ft. easement for a future sidewalk that will be constructed by the county. Mr. Jackson asked what the problem with doing the sidewalks now and Mr. Klein said the county was going to do them as part of their plans. Mr. Jackson said they needed a time table when the county would be doing them, whether it be in a month or if it is in a few years. Mr. Klein said they would get a letter. Mr. Ulman said they would comply with the remainder of the comments and recommendations and will work with Mr. Peters on the design specification for the stormwater management system. They stated most of the drainage system is located in the right of way and needed Mr. Peters recommendation for the system located in the

adjacent property. Mr. Peters said he did not recall but would check the files to get back to the applicant's engineer.

Mr. Klein asked if it was not yet determined if the road would be private or public and was told by the applicant it would be a public road and Mr. Banas said they would wait and see where the drains are located. Mr. Peters said the catch basins are within the roadway, but there is a number of storm pipes that go into easements between the houses and that is generally something that Mr. Franklin gives input in at the public hearing.

**Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Percal, to advance to the meeting of June 19, 2007**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

**6. SD # 1585 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: ARBORETUM PROPERTIES LLC**

Location: Arboretum Parkway and County Line Road West  
Block 25.07 Lots 54 & 60

Minor Subdivision for 3 lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Minor Subdivision Approval to subdivide two residential lots into three residential lots. The property contains two existing dwellings, which will be removed. Three new single family homes are proposed. The property is located at corner of Arboretum Parkway and County Line Road West, within the R-12 zone. The applicant is requesting variances on lot areas. Each of the proposed lots has an area less than 12,000 S.F which is required by the Lakewood UDO. Proposed lot sizes range from 10,623 S.F to 11,000 S.F. The applicant proposes to dedicate a 6 ft wide shade tree and utility easement to the Township of Lakewood along Arboretum Parkway and County Line Road West. The applicant proposes to dedicate a 1,609 S.F sight triangle easement to Ocean County. Outside agency approvals will be required from the Ocean County Planning Board and the Ocean County Soil Conservation District. Evidence of both approvals should be made a condition of final subdivision approval. The water and sewer services will be provided by New Jersey American Water Company. The applicant should show on the plans existing and proposed curbs, sidewalks, and handicapped ramps along the property frontage. The existing edge of pavement shall be shown if curbing does not exist. The existing dwelling shall be removed prior to signature of the final plat or a bond posted to ensure its prompt removal after the subdivision is completed. Per RSIS three (3) parking spaces are required for each lot. The zoning table state 3.5 parking spaces have been provided for lot 60.01, the driveway does not meet the minimum length of 36 ft for stacked parking and will only accommodate two cars. The zoning table states three (3) parking spaces have been provided for lot 60.02, the southern parking spot is only 16 feet deep from the property line, and this lot will only contain two parked cars. Lot 60.03 has sufficient room to accommodate three parked cars as stated in the zoning table. The parking layout on lots 60.01 and 60.02 shall be revised, in addition the proposed number of parking spaces shall be shown in whole numbers as half spaces can not be physically construed. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated March 26, 2007. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide existing Lots 54 and 60 into three (3) non-conforming new lots, located within Block 25.07. Both lots currently contain existing one (1) story frame dwellings. Approximate lot sizes for the existing lots are as follows: Lot 54-0.3826 acres, Lot 60-0.3644 acres. The total size of the tract is 32,539 square feet in area (0.7470 acres). The property is located in an R-12 Zone in the northern part of the Township, just north of Georgian Court University. Zoning for the tract and surrounding properties is R-12 (Residential). The surrounding land uses are residential in nature. Part of the tract borders County Line Road West, which in this portion of the township is bordered by residential uses. Single-family detached housing is a permitted uses in the R-12 Zone. The applicant has requested the following variances: Minimum Lot Area: 12,000 square feet required: 11,000 square feet proposed (Lot 60.01); 10,916 square feet proposed (Lot 60.02); and 10,623 square feet proposed (Lot 60.03) The applicant did not request variances for minimum lot width, which is 90 feet in the R-12 Zone. A review of the subdivision plat indicates that the mean lot widths of all proposed lots are less than 90 feet. As the mean lot width is not permitted to be less than the required lot width, variances may be required. The applicant should review the mean lot widths to confirm compliance with the Ordinance. The positive and negative criteria for the required bulk variances should be addressed. The applicant should explain why it is not practical to have the new side lot lines at right angles to Arboretum Parkway. The current lot line between Lot 54 and Lot 60 is at an approximate right angle to Arboretum Parkway, which, though it curves slightly at the intersection with County Line Road, is on a relatively flat plane with most of the frontage for the tract. If deemed impractical to orient the side lot lines at right angles, or radial to the street line, the applicant will have to request a waiver and should note as such on the subdivision plat. The minimum height listed in the zoning bulk chart (30 feet) is incorrect for the R-12 Zone. The applicant must revise the chart to reflect the correct minimum height of 35 feet. The applicant should discuss the dimensions of the proposed lots and the contemplated land use(s) in comparison with current lot sizes and uses in the surrounding area. The submitted architectural plans are for a five (5) bedroom house (Lot 60.01) and two (2) six bedroom homes (Lots 60.02 & 60.03). Parking for all proposed lots must comply with NJ RSIS standards. Confirm that sufficient area is provided for three (3) vehicles, and revise the zoning bulk charts on the plat to reflect three (3) provided spaces for Lot 60.03. Proposed sidewalks and street trees are not indicated on the subdivision plat or proposed improvement plan. Shade tree/utility and sight triangle easements are indicated on the plat and plans. We note a 3-foot wide alley bordering the rear yard of 60.02 and 60.03, and a notation for Lot 63. The applicant should discuss the discrepancy between the filed maps to confirm that there is no adverse impact on the subject lots. We will defer to the Board Engineer's determination on this issue. The plat indicates existing dwellings on Lot 54 and Lot 60. The dwelling and existing improvements must be removed or a bond posted for such removal prior to the signature of the plat by the Planning Board. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Penzer, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant who agreed to all the items except for one item of Max's report with regards to parking and one item in Mr. Truscott. There will be sidewalks. Mr. Flannery said they need 3 parking spaces and Mr. Peters stated the ½ parking spaces not be used, but Mr. Flannery said according to the RSIS, with a 2 car garage and a double wide driveway, you count that as 3 ½ spaces, which is actually 4, they have parking for 4 (2 in the garage and a double wide 30 ft. driveway). Mr. Banas said he thought for 5 and 6 bedroom they had an understanding of more spaces and

Mr. Flannery said 4 spaces have been sufficient in the past. Mr. Banas asked Mr. Flannery to reflect it as 4 parking spaces, not 3 ½. In Marty's report the mean lot widths are less than 90 and Mr. Flannery will speak to him because there is no definition of mean lot widths and they will measure them again. Mr. Truscott wanted to address them now, and said he spoke to Mr. Mack the zoning officer and he said his practice was to take the front lot line and back lot line and average between the two. Mr. Flannery agreed. There was discussion about if the curb would get measured. They would discuss the request for the C1 waiver at the public hearing.

Mr. Klein questioned the depth of the garage and if it was sufficient for one car and was told yes. Mr. Gatton commented on the minimum lot area of 12,000 ft. is required and said they are asking for anywhere from 8% to an 18% variance and Mr. Flannery said Mr. Penzer's statement of 11% was accurate. Mr. Flannery said at the public hearing they would provide the justification for the variances. Mr. Percal asked if at the public hearing they would have an aerial map showing the surrounding area and if there are also undersized lots there. Mr. Penzer said that Mr. Rube Silver was representing an objector and was told he could not speak at this hearing and could speak at the public hearing. Mr. Banas said he was allowed to speak at this hearing.

Mr. Rube Silver, Esq. appeared on behalf of an objector. He said he was concerned the board was approving variances without hearing from the public and Mr. Banas said this was only a technical meeting and nothing was being decided at this meeting. Mr. Silver said this way required anyone who was interested in having to come to 2 meetings and it is more of an imposition on the public than the applicant. Mr. Jackson recommended not participating in a dialogue about the boards procedures, and saving that for any appeal if it is made. Mr. Silver also requested this not be forwarded to June 19th because it is his 53rd anniversary and he usually spends it with his wife rather than the people at this planning board. Mr. Banas asked if Mr. Penzer if there was any other dates they could use and there was discussion on other dates to no avail. The date remained the 19th of June.

**Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Gatton, to advance to the meeting of June 19, 2007.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

**7. SD # 1587 (NO VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: ELANA SHAIN**

Location: Gudz Road, north of Central Avenue  
Block 11.10 Lots 72.01 & 72.02

Minor Subdivision from 2 lots to 3 lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking Minor Subdivision Approval to subdivide two residential lots into three residential lots; one will be a flag lot. The property contains two existing dwelling, the existing dwelling on the proposed lot 72.05 will be removed; the existing dwelling on the proposed lot 72.3 will remain. One new single family home is proposed, on the flag lot. No new construction is proposed on lot 72.05 at this time. The property is located along Gudz Road within the R-12 zone. No bulk variance is required.

The applicant will be required to obtain outside agency approvals from the Ocean County Planning Board, and Ocean County Soil Conservation District. Both approvals should be made a condition of final subdivision approval. Access to the flag lot 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 a public Right of Way. The board may wish to consider requesting the applicant make the flag pole portion of the rear lot a part of the lot in a fee simple arrangement. This will require variances for lot width, side yard setback, and minimum lot area for Lot 72.3. The applicant will dedicate a 6 ft wide shade tree and utility easement to the Township of Lakewood along the property frontage. The development will be serviced by public water and sewer. Concrete curb exists along the property frontage but sidewalk does not. The board should determine if concrete sidewalk will be required, if so details will be required for the sidewalk and driveway apron. Depressed curb details shall also be provided. The limits of the driveway are difficult to determine based on the location of the two building setback dimension lines. The dimension lines shall be relocated (one can be removed) and the limit of the driveway clarified. The existing dwelling on proposed lot 72.05 is noted as to be removed. The dwelling shall be removed prior to completion of the subdivision or a bond posted to ensure its removal after completion of the subdivision. No new construction is proposed on lot 72.05 at this time. A note shall be added to the plan clearly stating any new home constructed on lot 72.05 will provided a minimum of three off street parking spaces. In regards to the proposed flag lot, the applicant shall address the following requirements: An area shall be provided proximate to the street frontage for solid waste and recyclable pick up on designated collection days. No continual storage of trash and recyclables shall be permitted in this area. Buffering shall be provided between the access strip and the property lines along the pole of the flag lot. A minimum ten (10) foot wide buffer area shall be provided along the property line adjoining the lot immediately to the front of the flag portion of the flag lot. The remaining comments deal with the map filing law.

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated March 26, 2007. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to create three (3) tax lots from Block 11.10, Lots 72.01 and 72.02, located on the north side of Gudz Road. The majority of proposed Lot 72.03 and proposed flag lot 72.04 will be comprised of land from existing Lot 72.02. The majority of existing Lot 72.01 comprises proposed Lot 72.05. The stem of the flag lot provides easement access, and located between proposed Lots 72.03 and 72.05. Two (2) dwellings are on the respective existing lots; the one (1) story frame dwelling on Lot 72.01 is to be removed. The tract is located in an R-12 Zoning District in the northwestern part of Lakewood Township near the border with Jackson Township. Contiguous zoning is R-15 to the northwest; all other areas are R-12. The surrounding land uses are residential in nature. The size of the tract is 1.3774 acres (60,000 square feet); current Lot 72.01 is 0.842 acres, and Lot 72.02 is 0.5372 acres. Tract frontage is 200 feet along Gudz Road; Lot 72.02 is currently 75 feet wide, and Lot 72.05 is 125 feet wide. Required lot width in the R-12 zone is 90 feet. Single-family detached housing is a permitted uses in the R-12 Zone. The applicant has not requested any variances. The proposed subdivision will eliminate the lot width non-conformity of Lot 72.02 (required: 90 feet, existing 75 feet). Section 18-805.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. Applicant should discuss the dimensions of the proposed lots and the contemplated land use(s) in comparison with current lot sizes and uses in the surrounding area. We note that many of the lots on this segment of Gudz Road are also deep lots and the applicant should distinguish the need for a flag lot configuration for this parcel. Lot widths of proposed Lots 72.03 and 72.05 are 90 feet and 110 feet respectively; 90 feet is the minimum requirement for the R-12 Zone. We note that the proposed lot line be moved to the east (reducing the 110 foot width of Lot 72.05) and the additional land could provide a fee simple “pole” for (flag) Lot 72.04, thereby eliminating the proposed easement access to the flag lot over Lot 72.03. 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 landscaping plan should be prepared with consideration of existing vegetation to remain after future site plan disturbances. A sufficient visual screen between the newly created lots as well as those lots bordering the rear lot line of the tract should be provided. Architectural plans have been submitted as required of all application for flag lots. To avoid any confusion, the spelling of Gudz Road should be corrected. A shade tree and utility easement is indicated on the subdivision plat and proposed improvement plan. Proposed sidewalks are not indicated on the plans. The plat and subdivision plans indicate existing structures of various types to be removed from the tract. The improvements must be removed or a bond posted for such removal prior to the signature of the plat by the Planning Board. The applicant should verify if any septic systems will be removed that will require Board of Health approval. Parking for all proposed lots must comply with NJ RSIS standards. Confirm that sufficient area is provided for three (3) vehicles for Lot 72.04 (flag lot.), and verify the existing and required parking for the existing dwelling on proposed Lot 72.03. The applicant should generally indicate what type of permitted residential buildings are contemplated for proposed lot 72.05, confirm that that sufficient off – street parking area will be available, and verify that the appropriate RSIS requirements are indicated on the plans. The remaining comments are technical in nature..

Mr. Penzer, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated there will be sidewalks. There is only one item on both reports that they have a problem with and Mr. Flannery will address. Mr. Flannery said they relate to the flag pole being in an easement and they agree to make the pole portion fee simple and revise the plans accordingly, but that will create a variance for lot width. In the planners report, he suggests they slide the lot line over and accommodate that easement but the purpose of this application is that the applicant wishes to remain in the existing home and build their dream home on the adjacent lot so they do not want to slide the lot line over. They will provide testimony at the public hearing.

**Motion was made by Mr. Klein, seconded by Mr. Akerman, to advance to the meeting of June 19, 2007.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; abstain

**8. 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 one of the driveway of New Lot 5.02. The plan has been revised to show an easement for the portion of the driveway on the neighboring lot. The easement wording shall be submitted to the Planning Board Solicitor for review. The easement agreement shall be finalized prior to signature of the Final Plat. We have reviewed the legal description and find it to be acceptable. A 6' shade tree easement has been provided. The applicant should call out all proposed site work such as installations of concrete curbs, sidewalks, and driveways on the plan. Details of concrete sidewalk and apron shall be shown on the plan, if applicable. The applicant is required to provide 3 off street parking spaces for each lot. The existing driveways on Lot 5.02 can provide 6 parking spaces together. The two car garage and driveway on lot 44.01 can accommodate a total of 4 cars. The zoning schedule should be revised according to the changes that have been made from previous plan. The board should determine if the driveway and garage combination will be sufficient. The plan has been prepared in accordance with the New Jersey map Filling Law

Mr. Truscott read from a letter dated March 22, 2007. The applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to relocate the lot line between the subject lots, with an access easement indicated on new Lot 44.01. A single-family dwelling is currently located on Lot 44, which will remain. A new two (2) story dwelling is currently being constructed on Lot 5.01. The parcel totals 30,253 square feet in area and is located on the north side of Lakeview Drive near Myrtle Place, one (1) block south of Lake Carasaljo. The tract and surrounding properties are located in the R-12 (Residential) Zone in the northwestern part of the Township. Surrounding land uses are primarily residential. As noted, 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 subdivision plat identifies an existing two (2) story dwelling on Lot 5.02; a field inspection indicates that this structure is under construction (almost complete). The surveyor's certification should be revised as to the date of the survey to be consistent with the plan data. The subdivision plat indicates that new Lot 5.02 will have a concrete driveway with direct access to Lakeview Drive. A concrete walkway leads to the house indicated on the plat. The new lot line will locate a portion of an existing paved driveway currently on old Lot 44 into new Lot 5.02. The portion of the driveway remaining on proposed lot 44.01 is approximately twenty two (22) feet wide, with a five (5) foot wide access easement indicated. We note that both lots have apparent direct access to Lakeview Drive via a proposed driveway (Lot 5.02) and the remainder of the driveway located on proposed Lot 44.01. Use of the driveway and the purpose of the proposed ingress and egress easement should be clarified. A six-foot shade tree easement is identified, but shade trees are not shown on the plans. A sidewalk is now indicated along



the entire frontage of the tract. The Board Engineer and Attorney should review the easement and survey description prior to filing in the Ocean County Clerk's office. Parking for all proposed lots must comply with NJ RSIS standards. Confirm that sufficient area is provided for three (3) vehicles for all proposed lots, and indicate as such on the subdivision plans. The remaining comments are technical in nature.

Mr. Liston, Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He stated they agree to all the comments in the professionals' reports

**Motion was made by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Akerman, to advance to the meeting of June 19, 2007.**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

**5. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. Jackson stated there was a revision to Kelli Darlymple, which was typographical and also in Mr. Brown's resolution for South Lake Park. Mr. Brown said the changes refers to the homeowners' association, the board requested they create for the stormwater management. The draft also stated roadways dedicated to the township, and they are eliminating that.

**1. SD # 1537 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: NJ HAND**

Location: corner of Spruce Street & Sherman Avenue (south of Pine Street)  
Block 834 Lot 1

Extension of previously approved Minor Subdivision

**Motion was made by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Klein, to approve**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; abstain, Mr. Percal; yes

**2. SD # 1538 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**

**APPLICANT: NJ HAND**

Location: corner of Read Street & Funston Avenue (south of Pine Street)  
Block 833 Lot 2

Extension of previously approved Minor Subdivision

**Motion was made by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Klein, to approve**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; abstain, Mr. Percal; yes

- 3. SD # 1567 (VARIANCE REQUESTED)**  
**APPLICANT: KELLI DALRYMPLE**  
Location: Whitesville Road and Lafayette Boulevard  
Block 252 Lot 4.02  
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

**Motion was made by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Klein, to approve**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

- 4. SD # 1551A (NO VARIANCE REQUESTED)**  
**APPLICANT: SOUTH LAKE PARK C/O SAM BROWN**  
Location: Hope Chapel Road, Buchanan Street, Adams Street,  
Hope Hill Lane and Oliver Street  
Block 5 Lots 5 & 1.01  
Block 11 Lots 5, 16, 21, 22, 35, 97, 101  
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision

**Motion was made by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Klein, to approve**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; abstain, Mr. Percal; yes

- 5. SD # 1430C**  
**APPLICANT: SOMERSET DEVELOPMENT – PINE RIVER VILLAGE**  
Location: Pine Street, across from Cedar Bridge Corporate Campus  
Block 830, 844-852 Lot all  
Amended Final Subdivision to realign lot line

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

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; abstain, Mr. Percal; yes

**6. CORRESPONDENCE**

Mr. Banas received a letter in his packet that he shared with the members. It is in reference to the Calgo Gardens matter. The main thrust is that the writer was at the technical meeting and her was concerned with the way the procedure went and he is going to appear the pubic hearing and create a template. Mr. Banas requested a copy of the letter be made and send it with the next mailing to the members.

## **7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes from March 13, 2007 Master Plan Meeting

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

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

## **8. APPROVAL OF BILLS**

**Motion was made by Mr. Gatton, seconded by Mr. Akerman, to approve**

**ROLL CALL:**

Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Klein; yes, Mr. Gatton; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

**The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.**

Respectfully submitted  
Chris Johnson  
Planning Board Recording Secretary