

1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

A nomination was made by Mr. Akerman to have Mr. Banas sit as the Acting Chairman and seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Ackerman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

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

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the Asbury Park Press 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 the purpose of public inspection and, a copy of this agenda has been mailed, faxed or delivered to the following newspapers: The Asbury Park Press, and The Tri Town News at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Franklin, Mrs. Koutsouris, Mr. Akerman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal, Mr. Schmuckler.

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

4. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTION

#1 # SD-1509B (No varience Requested)
Applicant: Majestic Contracting
Location: Massachusettes Ave., south of Prospect Street
Block 445 Lot 18
Preliminary & Final Subdivision & Site Plan for 17 two family townhouses.

Motion offered by Mr. John Franklin and seconded by Mr. Akerman

Roll Call Mr, Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr, Akerman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, abstain, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes

#2 # SD – 1728 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Maz Properties LLC
Location: Ocean Ave between Linden and North Oakland
Block 189.05 Lots 138-142, 144-146

Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision – 25 single family lots

Motion offered by Mr. John Franklin and seconded by Mr. Schmuckler

Roll Call Mr, Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr, Akerman, abstain, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes

#3 #SD-1729 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Kol Aryeh of Lakewood
Location: Southeast corner of 14th street & Hope Chapel Road
Block 24.01 Lots 10 & 11
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

Motion offered by Mr. John Franklin and seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris

Roll Call Mr, Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr, Akerman, abstain, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, abstain

#4 #SP-1930 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Kol Aryeh of Lakewood
Location: southeast corner of 14th Street & Hope Chapel Road
Block 24.01 Lot 10.01
Minor Site Plan for addition to existing synagogue

Motion offered by Mr. John Franklin and seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris

Roll Call Mr, Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr, Akerman, abstain, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, abstain

#5 #SP-1931 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Gem Ambulance
Location: northeast corner of Cederbridge Ave. & Oberlin Ave. North
Block 1605 Lot 1
Minor Site Plan to expand and reconfigure existing parking lot

Motion offered by Mr. John Franklin and seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris

Roll Call Mr, Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr, Akerman, abstain, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, abstain

5. Plan Review Items

#1 #SP-1735
Applicant: Chiam Greenes (Variance Requested)
Location: 12th Street east of Clifton Avenue
Block 109 Lots 5, 6
Minor Subdivision for three lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide two (2) existing lots totaling 28,650 square feet (0.658 acres) in area known as Lots 5&6 in Block 109 into three (3) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 5.01-5.03 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing one-story dwelling and an existing garage, the dwelling spans the existing lots. Both structures will be removed along with all other existing site improvements. Proposed Lots 5.01-5.03 will become new residential building lots. Public water and sewer is available. The site has double frontage and is situated in the northern portion of the Township between Twelfth Street and Courtney Road, east of Clifton Avenue. Proposed Lots 5.01 and 5.02 will be equal 60' X 150' lots of 9,000 square feet each in area. Proposed Lot 5.03 will be larger, 71' X 150', for an area of 10,650 square feet. Curb exists along both street frontages, but sidewalk does not. Sidewalk is proposed across the Twelfth Street frontage of the proposed lots. The lots are situated within the R-10 Single Family Residential Zone. Variances are required to create this subdivision. We have the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning** (1) The parcels are located in the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. (2) Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: (a) Minimum Lot Area (proposed Lots 5.01 and 5.02, 9,000 SF and 9,000 SF respectively, 10,000 SF required) – proposed conditions. (b) Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lots 5.01, 5.02, and 5.03, 60 feet, 60 feet, and 71 feet respectively, 75 feet required) – proposed conditions. (3) A waiver from constructing sidewalk along the Courtney Road frontage should be requested since sidewalk is not proposed there. It should be noted that part of the Courtney Road right-of-way is steep and constructing sidewalk would require grading that would necessitate the removal of at least two (2) existing large trees. (4) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** (II) **Review Comments** (1) An existing asphalt driveway which services adjoining Lot 2 encroaches onto proposed Lot 5.01. The disposition of this encroachment must be resolved in order to grant the subdivision as proposed. (2) The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for unspecified number of bedroom single-family dwellings. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements indicates that three (3) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each unit. The proposed driveways on the proposed lots have been dimensioned to be large enough to accommodate four (4) spaces. Four (4) off-street parking spaces is the proposed number of spaces to be provided for all the proposed lots according to the Schedule of Bulk Requirements. Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed number of bedrooms in order to determine whether additional off-street parking is required. (3) Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are

proposed for the proposed dwellings on proposed Lots 5.01-5.03. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (4) The Minor Subdivision Map has been prepared based on an outbound and topographic survey completed by Charles Surmonte, P.E. & P.L.S.; a copy of the survey along with the project bench mark should be provided. (5) Proposed lot and block numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. (6) General Note 8 notes the architectural dimensions of the proposed structures on the proposed lots is not known at this time. Building boxes of 34' X 55' for proposed Lots 5.01 and 5.02 will provide less than twenty-one percent (21%) lot coverage. A building box of 38' x 55' will provide less than twenty percent (20%) lot coverage for proposed Lot 5.03. The proposed building boxes shown on the Improvement Plan are easily within the allowable coverage of twenty-five percent (25%). (7) The Surveyor's certification on the Minor Subdivision Plan shall be corrected to state "outbound corner markers as shown have been found or are to be set". (8) Proposed dimensions should be added for the proposed two-story dwellings on the proposed lots. (9) The existing gutter grades on both Twelfth Street and Courtney Road cannot properly convey runoff. The curb on Twelfth Street shall be replaced and the gutter constructed at a slope of 0.33% towards Clifton Avenue. Half width road reconstruction will be required and a construction detail shall be designed. The curb on Courtney Road must also be replaced. A high point shall be designed allowing runoff flow to be split in each direction. A half width road reconstruction will also be required and a construction detail shall be designed. (10) The Board should consider restricting access to the proposed lots from the Courtney Road frontage of the project. The applicant is proposing access to all proposed lots from the Twelfth Street frontage. (11) No shade tree and utility easement is proposed for the Courtney Road frontage of the project. A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is proposed for the Twelfth Street frontage of the project. No shade trees are proposed along either of the property's frontage. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (12) The Plan indicates a number of mature trees exist on the site. Some of these trees are unsalvageable if the proposed lots are developed as shown, but many of these trees appear salvageable. The proposed grading should be tightened to better limit the area of disturbance. Compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code (if applicable). Additionally, protective measures around mature trees to remain (e.g., snow fencing or tree wells at drip lines) should be provided. If this subdivision is approved, the final plot plans for proposed Lots 5.01-5.03 submitted for Township review should include tree protective measures to save mature vegetation where practicable. (13) Testimony should be provided on storm water management and the disposition of storm water from roof leaders. (14) Due to no construction of new dwellings on proposed Lots 5.01-5.03 at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of the improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. (15) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. (16) Some minor corrections to the construction details are required and road reconstruction details must be provided. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Ocean County Planning Board; (b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; (c) New Jersey American Water (water & sewer); and (d) All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. John Doyle Esq. for the applicant stated that he reviewed the Engineers Report and by reason of the nature of this application there is an existing home owned by the applicant for which he seeks, if this were to be approved, to raze and build a home for his family on the westerly most lot, being the 71 foot frontage and have two other lots. The variances that are sought are compared to the requirements, we believe are nominal, and use we will save our planning testimony for the public hearing. We have already prepared as the board requested a map of the area showing the numerous existing non-conforming lots either as to area, frontage of both in the neighborhood. With respect to the report we do note the comment about the driveway with the neighbor to the east and we will resolve that with the neighbor in an appropriate way, it is not an issue of traffic conflict it is an issue of ownership and we can resolve that with a license. We will provide sufficient parking in accordance with the RSIS standards. We note the Engineering Report with the building box where the houses will be will show that less land is covered than would be otherwise allowed and we will meet almost everything else. I would like to draw the Boards attention to the fact that this is a double frontage lot meaning that the present home fronts on 12th street and the lot as well as the proposed lots not only front on 12th street, but the rear is on Courtney Road. We would prefer to continue the houses so that they front on 12th street, so that we do not wind up putting our backyards in our neighbors front yard. We would agree with the Board Engineers report #10 "the Board should consider restricting access to the proposed lots from the Courtney Road frontage of the property". We would do that as suggested but also point out that if you look at the topography the lots grading naturally comes from back to front, having viewed the property there is a significant bank along the Courtney Road frontage of approximately 3 feet high. We do not want to touch that or affect the grade, we feel it would be better to leave the natural setting and trees. If we were required to put in sidewalks on our backyard, and none exist on Courtney Road, we would wind up having a combination of changed grading, drainage issues, large trees removed and potentially a bulkhead wall which provides other maintenance and safety issues.

Mr. Banas inquired if there would be more of a safety issue if the sidewalks were put in?

Mr. Doyle stated that the removal of trees and the building of a bulkhead wall three feet high to put in the sidewalks on Courtney Road only three feet from traffic may propose greater safety issues than just using access from 12th Street. He asked that the Board consider this before the application goes to a public hearing and he is fully aware that the burden to prove this rests fully with the applicant as the Board will make their own decision.

Mr. Schmuckler asked why with lot 5.03 there was a 10 foot space going to your neighbor but 15 feet on the inside between houses. Why wouldn't you put 15 feet between the neighbor and ten feet between the houses.

Mr. Doyle started that he would check with the applicant, who was not present, what the reasoning might be for this footage.

Mr. Schmuckler then stated that he felt the applicant should reach out to the neighbors prior to the public hearing to see if they had any special concerns that could be addressed.

Mr. Doyle stated that he would relay this concern to his client.

Mr. Kielt stated that this application would be moved to the July 27th meeting for the public hearing.

Mr. Akerman made a motion to advance this application to the July 27th meeting for public hearing. Mr Schmuckler seconded the motion

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Akerman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

MR. Jackson Esq. stated let the public be aware that #1735 Chiam Greens has been moved to the July 27th public hearing in this room at 6pm. No further notice is required. Revised plans by July 1st.

6. New Business

#1 SD#1727 Yeshoshua Frenkel

Application is tabled to the August 17th meeting in this room at 6pm.

A motion was made by Mr. Akerman and seconded by Mr. Schmuckler

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Akerman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

#2 #SD-1730
Applicant: Michael Herzog (Variance Requested)
Location: Attaya Road west of Miller Road
Block 11.04 Lot 7
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing property totaling 48,089 square feet (1.104 acres) in area known as Lot 7 in Block 11.04 into two (2) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 7.01 and 7.02 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing one-story frame dwelling which will be removed. Public water and sewer is not available. Therefore, private individual septic disposal systems and potable wells will be required. No construction is proposed under this application. The site is situated in the western portion of the Township on

the south side of Attaya Road, west of the intersection with Miller Road. The property has over three hundred feet (300') of depth. The Map indicates that Freshwater Wetlands exist on the southerly part of the land. A fifty foot (50') buffer and associated conservation easement accompany the Freshwater Wetlands. In the worst case, the buffer extends no more than one hundred fifty feet (150') into the lot, leaving the majority of the site as uplands. The subdivision proposes to create two (2) equal size lots with proposed areas of 24,044 square feet (0.552 acres). Proposed Lot 7.01 will have more uplands area than proposed Lot 7.02. Curb and sidewalk does not exist along the street frontage. The proposed lots are situated within the R-12, Single Family Residential Zone. The site is surrounded by other residential lands. Lot width variances are required to create this subdivision. ***We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 5/4/10 Planning Board workshop hearing, and comments from our initial review letter dated April 29, 2010:*** (I) **Zoning** (1) The parcels are located in the R-12 Single Family Residential Zone. Single family detached housing is a permitted use in the zone. **Statements of fact.** (2) Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are requested: Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lots 7.01 & 7.02, 75 feet; 90 feet required) – proposed condition. **The Board shall take action on the proposed lot width variances requested for proposed Lots 7.01 & 7.02.** (3) A waiver from constructing curb and sidewalk along the property frontage is necessary (if approved by the Board). **Proposed curb and sidewalk has been added to the project. A waiver is no longer required.** (4) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances and waivers. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** (II) **Review Comments** (1) The existing property has substantial varied relief and generally slopes away from Attaya Road. Since no units are depicted at this time, testimony is required to address proposed grading and drainage. Furthermore, we recommend that a resubmission of the plan be made prior to the Public Hearing using a conforming building box to delineate proposed layout, grading, and drainage schemes. **An Improvement and Conceptual Grading Plan has been submitted for review. The following information and corrections should be provided:** (a) **Proposed dimensions for the building boxes and driveways.** (b) **Proposed curb grades since the road widening will be affected by the proposed grades.** (c) **Information to support the proposed basement floor elevations.** (d) **The locations of proposed potable wells and septic systems since the grading will be impacted.** (e) **Revisions to the proposed grading on the west side of proposed Lot 7.01. Currently runoff will be trapped in the side yards of proposed Lot 7.01 and existing Lot 20 instead of draining to the wetlands in the rear of the properties.** (2) The General Notes indicate the outbound information was obtained from the survey provided for the project. However, the source of the topography must be provided. Also, no individual trees are shown on the survey and subdivision and we observed large individual trees outside the wooded areas during our site investigation. **General Note #3 should be modified to state "Topographic and Wetland information".** (3) The General Notes also state that wetlands information was obtained from a plan

entitled "Wetlands Location Plan, Lots 6 & 7 in Block 11.04". The plan was prepared by FWH Associates, P.A., and dated 9/06/05. A copy of this plan should be submitted along with any NJDEP Letter of Interpretation obtained. **A copy of the Wetlands Location Plan has been provided. An NJDEP Letter of Interpretation is required.** (4) The General Notes state all existing buildings and improvements are to be removed. The status of the meandering wire fence should be addressed since it meanders on existing Lots 6 & 7. **The applicant's professionals indicate that testimony will be provided at the public hearing.** (5) No site improvements are proposed along the frontage of the project. Attaya Road is a paved road generally having an existing pavement width of about twenty-four feet (24'). There are existing catch basins in front of the property and the road briefly widens to thirty feet (30') at the cross drains. Should the Board require curb for the project, the proposed curb should be set in line with the existing inlet and the road widened to the proper half width. A large tree adjacent the existing edge of pavement will need to be removed for the road widening and curb construction. **A design for the road widening to a fifteen foot (15') half width is required. Proposed grades are required in order to determine the limit of work. A simple extension from the existing pavement to the proposed curb as shown is not acceptable because the irregular joint proposed will lead to road failure.** (6) No construction or dwelling units are proposed at this time. However, the plan indicates the single-family detached dwelling units will have four (4) bedrooms. The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for four (4) bedroom single-family dwellings. The plans indicated that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each lot. **The Improvement and Conceptual Grading Plan show driveways large enough to accommodate at least four (4) vehicles.** (7) Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed for the future dwellings on proposed Lots 7.01 & 7.02. Based on the four (4) spaces being provided, it appears basements are contemplated. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. **Basement floor elevations have been indicated on the Improvement and Conceptual Grading Plan. Soils information justifying the proposed basement floor elevations is required.** (8) The proposed lot numbers have been assigned by the Tax Assessor and the plat signed by the Tax Assessor. **The Tax Assessor's signature appears to have been taken from another document as evidenced by the signature date and background on the copy. An original signature is required.** (9) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. **The three (3) front monuments shall be indicated as "to be set".** (10) The front monuments shown as set are not in place. The plat must be corrected, but the monuments must be in place prior to the Map being filed. **The front monuments shall be labeled as "to be set".** (11) A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is depicted on the plan along the property frontage. The easement should be dedicated to the Township and the easement areas provided on a per lot basis. **The shade tree and utility easements have been dedicated to the Township, areas shall be provided on a per lot basis.** (12) No shade trees are proposed for the project. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. **The Board should take action on whether to require shade trees for the proposed project.** (13) The Plan does not indicate any existing trees on the site. Testimony should be provided regarding whether there are any specimen trees located on the property.

Compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code (if applicable). Additionally, protective measures around mature trees to remain (e.g., snow fencing or tree wells at drip lines) should be provided. If this subdivision is approved, the final plot plans submitted for Township review should include tree protection measures to save mature vegetation where practicable. ***The applicant's professionals indicate they will provide testimony on the existing trees at the public hearing.*** (14) Due to no construction of new dwellings at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of the improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. ***Statement of fact.*** (15) Unless the Board waives the construction of curb and sidewalk, construction details are required for improvements required by the Board. ***Construction details have been included on the Improvement and Conceptual Grading Plan. The following additional details and/or corrections are necessary:*** (a) ***Road Widening Details.*** (b) ***Depressed Curb.*** (c) ***Concrete Driveway.*** (d) ***Note #2 on the Curb Detail shall be corrected to state "AASHTO".*** (16) Public sewer and water are not available at this time. The future dwellings are to be serviced by individual septic systems and potable wells. Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for the Minor Subdivision. ***Ocean County Board of Health approval is required.*** (17) Testimony should be provided on existing utilities. It is believed that existing utilities would not be impacted by the Minor Subdivision. ***The applicant's professionals have indicated that testimony will be provided on existing utilities. (III) Regulatory Agency Approvals*** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Ocean County Planning Board; (b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); (c) Ocean County Board of Health (well & septic); (d) NJDEP Letter of Interpretation (Freshwater Wetlands); and (e) All other required outside agency approvals. ***All outside agency approvals shall be obtained as a condition of approval.***

Mr. Brian Flannery P.E. for the applicant, as indicated it is a 48,000 sq. ft. lot we are subdividing it down the middle to two 24,000 sq. ft. lots in an R12 Zone. The only variance we are requesting is lot width, 90 feet is required and 75 feet is provided. The other comments in the report are minor in nature and we will satisfy your engineer on each and every one.

Mr. Percal inquires if there was a tax map of the area.

Mr. Flannery replied that there was not a map required at the tech meeting but that he knows the area and they are asking for a lot width variance not a lot area variance.

Mr. Kiert stated that in his notes to the P.E. he doesn't request a tax map for the lot width variance only a lot area variance.

Mr. Percal noted that in the future he would like to see a tax map for any variance request to see how a variance request would effect the neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson stated that Mr. Percal had every right to request a tax map.

Mr. Banas opened the microphone to the public.

Seeing no one coming forth he closed this portion to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler to approve the application with the variance. Seconded by Mr. Akerman.

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Akerman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

#1 SP#1877 K Land Corp

Proposed WaWa and furniture store. Applicant request to discuss prior approval for the inclusion of certain Phase I improvements in Phase II.

Mr. John Franklin recused himself.

Mr. Bret Kaplan Esq. for the applicant. As I stated at the last meeting, this property received two approvals one from this Board for a furniture store and one from the Zoning Board of Adjustments for a WaWa convenience store. Originally the furniture store was Phase I and the WaWa convenience store was phase II, at this time the WaWa is moving forward as Phase I and the furniture store at a yet to be determined date will move forward as phase II. Mr. Vogt asked in his notes that based on this new sequence that we bond for some of the improvements that were related to the furniture store as they relate to the WaWa construction. We have gone ahead with this request. Mr. Vogt asked that we post a plan and submit it to the Board and we post the necessary bonds that would include the WaWA improvements as well as those additional improvements requested by Mr. Vogt. We have done that and are waiting to get the bond from Assurity, they want to see a resolution from the Board approving that, so it is kind of a catch twenty two. This is the reason I am back before this Board to answer any questions. We are looking forward to moving ahead with the WaWa.

Mr. Vogt explained that the only real changes at this time is to incorporate the plans for the parking, drainage and retaining wall that were approved for the furniture store phase to the WaWa phase since the order of the phases have now changed. The only changes to the WaWa that were approved by the Zoning Board is to lessen the size of the WaWa and the number of gas pumps being built.

Mr Banas expressed his concern that the Zoning Board could appeal whatever the Planning Board approves.

Mr. Vogt explained that he is the engineer for both Boards and everything would be alright.

Mr. Schmuckler made a motion to approve the changes to the resolution as it is written in the report and as it is in the phasing plan. Mr. Follman seconded the motion.

Roll Call Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Akerman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

8. PUBLIC PORTION

Seeing no one this portion of the meeting was closed.

9. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Minutes from May 25, Planning Board Meeting.

Motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, and seconded by Mr. Akerman to approve.

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Akerman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

10. APPROVAL OF BILLS

Motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, and seconded by Mr. Percal to approve.

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Akerman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Banas announced that this was the last meeting for Mr. Franklin and congratulated him on his upcoming retirement. Mr. Franklin thanked the Board for their sentiment and said that he was glad that he was able to serve on a wonderful Board that has grown so much over the years.

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Margaret Stazko
Planning Board Recording Secretary