

**LAKWOOD ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
FEBRUARY 5, 2007**

Meeting was called to order at 7:10 P.M.

Meeting properly advertised according to the NJ State Sunshine Law.

Roll call: Attending: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali,
Mr. Lankry, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti
Absent: Mr. Zaks, Mr. Berrios
Also present: Glenn Harrison, Attorney
Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner
Jackie Wahler, Court Stenographer
Fran Siegel, Secretary

Salute to the flag.

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF JANUARY 8, 2007 with a waiver to read – Mr. Gonzalez
Second – Mr. Naftali

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali,
Mr. Lankry, Mr. Sernotti

Secretary read a letter from Ray Shea, attorney for application # **3624, FAIRMONT INVESTMENTS**,
requesting to carry to revise plans.

Motion to carry with re-notice, re-submit and waiver of time – Mr. Gonzalez
Second – Ms. Goralski

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali,
Mr. Lankry, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

APPEAL # 3619 requested that they carry until March 12th.

Motion to carry until March 12th with a waiver of time and no further notice – Mr. Naftali
Second – Mr. Halberstam

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali,
Mr. Lankry, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

APPEAL # 3635 – JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT,
Vermont Avenue, Block 1078 Lot 2, B-5 zone. New electrical substation.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner January 8, 2007

1. The subject property is located on the corner of Vermont Avenue, Stradford Street and Florence Street and is within the B-5 (Highway Development) Zone. The applicant proposes to construct an electrical substation.

2. In accordance with Section 18-903 E. of the Ordinance, electrical substations are not a permitted use in the B-5 Zone. Therefore, a special reasons variance will be required for requesting a use in a district restricted against such use.

The applicant must provide testimony to the Board detailing the special reasons which would allow the Board to grant a variance to depart from the zoning regulations to permit a use in a district restricted against such use (electrical substation).

3. The existing lot does not conform to the current zoning requirements. In accordance with Section 18-903 E. of the Ordinance, bulk variances are required as follows:

	Required	Proposed
Minimum Lot Area	2 ac.	0.57 ac.
Minimum Front Setback	100 ft.	40 ft. (Vermont Ave.) 60 ft. (Stradford St.) 60 ft. (Florence St.)
Rear Yard Setback	50 ft.	24.98 ft.

The applicant must demonstrate to the Board that the requested variances can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and the purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance.

4. The following should be addressed with regards to the drainage, grading and utility plan:
 - a. Vermont Avenue should be improved up to the southern end of the subject property. The pavement width should be 40 feet centered in the right-of-way in accordance with the master plan for Vermont Avenue. Concrete curb and sidewalk shall be installed on the west side of Vermont Avenue to the southern end of the subject property. Pavement section shall conform to N.J.A.C. 5:21 for a major collector road.
 - b. The road profile and cross-section of Vermont Avenue and drainage improvements should be designed in accordance with the master plan for Vermont Avenue.
 - c. The future plan for Vermont Avenue is to connect to Route 70 just south of Stradford Street. This connection will require a new jughandle in the general vicinity of this site. We are requesting that the facility be located closer to Florence Street, set back approximately 15 feet from the right-of-way line.
5. The following should be addressed with regards to the landscaping and lighting plan:
 - a. A tree location plan should be provided to insure the facility is adequately buffered.
 - b. A staggered row of evergreen type plantings should be proposed around the exterior fence line to provide additional buffering.
 - c. A streetlight should be added to the utility pole on Vermont Avenue.
6. Construction details should be provided for all road improvement items.
7. The applicant shall submit to, and appear before, other Local, State and Federal agencies having jurisdiction over this project.
8. Prior to commencement of construction, the applicant shall post a performance guarantee and inspection fund in accordance with the provisions of the Township's Land Use Ordinance and the Municipal Land Use Law.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I have no objection to this application

Grace Bertone, attorney for applicant.

A-1 site plan

James Tobia, sworn. Regional engineer, responsible for the planning of new substations. Factual witness. The capacity of existing substations are being exceeded.

A-2 overview JCP & L electric system.

Mr. Tobia described A-2. They have distribution systems that transmit power.

Mr. Tobia described A-3, which is existing sub stations and which areas they serve.

Mr. Tobia described A-4 existing sub station service areas Lakewood South recent and proposed development added. Since last summer there has been a lot of new development in the area.

Mr. Tobia described A-5 proposed Vermont Avenue sub station service.

Bernard Chernisky, Reading, Pa. professional engineer, sworn.
Board accepted credentials

Mr. Chernisky designed substation.

A-6 site plan.

Mr. Chernisky – the building is 80' x 60' with an access drive. The site is wooded. It will be an unmanned facility. It is visited once a month for maintenance. The actual construction is about 6 weeks and their goal is to have it in service by the summer.

Michael McKenna, licenced professional engineer, sworn.
Board accepted credentials.

Mr. McKenna – sub station is located in the center of the lot. There are 3 roads surrounding the lot. The lot is 200 feet wide. The sub station is a 60 x 80 rectangle. The site is flat and will be fenced in for safety. The proposal is to put down loose stone. There are two lights mounted on the switch gear. The fence will be 7 feet high with chain link and 1 foot of barbed wire. There is an identification sign with numbers for emergencies. There are danger high voltage signs on the fencing.

Mr. Halberstam – if the area is developed will it be safe for children? Is there any health hazards?

Mr. McKenna – the area is fenced. There is an area on Chestnut Street proposed for development.

Mr. Priolo – this is generally surrounded by a business zone - there is nothing residential pending in the area that we know of.

Mr. Chernisky – It is very rare that there is an equipment failure. It is very unlikely. The transformers are noiseless. There are no emissions from the sub station. There are no health hazards identified with sub stations. There is no hazards to wells in the area. They will have vegetative type screening.

Kevin O'Brien – professional planner, sworn.
Board accepted credentials.

A-7 photographs of site.

Mr. O'Brien – This use is not allowed in the B-5 zone, they are asking for a use variance. There is very little electric left to service Lakewood. Electric use has gone up 30% since 1990. The population of Lakewood has gone up 65%. For every person you add on electrical usage. Housing units increased. There is no negative impact. The public need is overwhelming and this is an inherently beneficial use.

Mr. Tovia – chose this location because it is geographically central to the other surrounding substations.

Mr. McKenna reviewed Mr. Priolo's report. A street light on Vermont will be installed. Just proposing access to the site with a stone road. Requested by the town to provide improvements of Vermont and Florence and Stafford – they would prefer to bond the improvements.

Mr. Priolo – no objection to bonding – they have to pay the Township for the improvements or build the road themselves.

Mr. McKenna - Agreed to additional landscaping.

Open to Public

William Hovday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, sworn. Not permitted in zone. Area is starting to be developed with residential dwellings. They should try to acquire additional land from the Township.

Closed to Public.

Ms. Bertone – this site was chosen because of the availability. Have studied this site and sub stations should be as close to the load as possible. B-5 is a commercial zone. Very few zones permit the utility use.

A copy of a letter from Ms. Bertone was given to Mr. Harrison; re: J CP & L proposing to purchase adjoining lots from the Township.

Motion by Mr. Gelley to approve use variance and site plan subject to improvements in greenery fencing and Mr. Priolo's report.

Second – Mr. Halberstam

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lankry, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

Recess.

APPEAL # 3630 - FLAM & BLOCH

East Harvard Street, Block 225 Lots 1, 3, 4, 5 & 6,
Block 228 Lots 141, 142, 151, 181 & 183, R10 zone. Use and density
variance for age restricted dwellings in the R-10 zone.

Mr. Sernotti stepped down due to a possible conflict.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner October 27, 2006

1. The subject property is approximately 2.34 acres in size and is located along the intersection of East Harvard Street and East End Street and is within the R-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The proposed site is comprised of several properties split by Township right-of-way and contains approximately five existing dwellings. The applicant is proposing an age restricted development consisting of 36 multi-family residential units within six (6) buildings and associated parking facilities. All existing structures will be removed.
2. Special reasons variances are required for this project because the applicant is:
 - a. Requesting a use not permitted in this zone. In accordance with Section 902 F. of the ordinance, age restricted developments are not permitted in the R-10 Zone, and therefore a use variance is required for the proposed age restricted development.
 - b. Requesting an increase in the maximum permitted density. Based on the minimum lot area in the R-10 Zone, the maximum permitted density is 4.3 units/acre, whereas 15.4 units/acre is proposed, and therefore a density variance is required.

The applicant must demonstrate that the requested use variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and the purpose of the zone plan and the zoning ordinance. The applicant should address the Board regarding the visual impacts the proposed dwellings will have on the surrounding properties.

The applicant must provide testimony to the Board detailing the special reasons which would allow the Board to grant a variance to depart from the zoning regulations to permit a use in a district restricted against such use (age restricted use) and to allow an increase in the maximum permitted density. In order to achieve this, the applicant should explain why the age-restricted use with the requested density is a better planning and zoning alternative than the traditional single-family detached residential concept.

3. Should the use variances be approved by the Board, the following bulk variances may be required in accordance with the age restricted section of the ordinance (18-1011 Age Restricted Multi-Family Housing) and/or the R-10 Zone requirements:

	Required Age Restricted Communities	Required R-10 Zone	Proposed
Minimum Tract Area	15 acres	10,000 s.f.	2.34 acres
Maximum Density	10 units/acre	4.34 units/ acre	15.4 units/ acre
Min. Perimeter Setback	100 ft.	N/A	4 ft.
Min. Setback (Internal Road)	35 ft.	N/A	4 ft.
Min. Distance between Bldgs.	50 ft.	N/A	25 ft.
Max. Principal Bldg. Length	150 ft.	N/A	162 ft.
Minimum Lot Depth	500 ft.	N/A	50 ft.
Minimum Lot Width	500 ft.	75 ft.	150 ft.
Minimum Lot Frontage	500 ft.	N/A	450 ft.
Front Yard Setback	N/A	30 ft.	4 ft.
Rear Yard Setback	N/A	20 ft.	10 ft.
Side Yard Setback	N/A	10/25 ft.	1 ft.
Max. Building Coverage	25%	25%	33%
Max. Impervious Coverage	30%	N/A	64.8%

It should be noted that the lot coverage should include the decks.

4. In accordance with Section 803 E., a minimum 30-foot wide buffer is required along the north, south and west property lines of Block 208 and the north and south property lines of Block 225.
5. In accordance with Section 18-1011 (Age Restricted Multi-Family Housing), the following is required:
 - a. Private elevators shall be provided in all multi-story buildings.
 - b. Clubhouse, community center and/or recreational facilities are required. Sufficient resident/guest parking should be provided.
 - c. Occupancy of the housing shall be age restricted to those 55 and older.
6. There are no recreational buildings or uses proposed in this development. The applicant should discuss how the recreational needs of this development will be met.
7. The applicant should discuss vehicular circulation within the site including turnarounds, trucks, deliveries, etc. The sizes and types of trucks accessing this site should be provided and turning movements should be verified.
8. It appears that the applicant is conceptually proposing to subdivide adjacent residential Lot 151, Block 208 to create a lot for parking. The rear yard of this residential dwelling will now be utilized as a parking lot.
9. East Harvard Street is undersized in right-of-way width and dedications (5 feet each side) will be required during the site plan phase. These dedications will impact the building layout.
10. The applicant should discuss how stormwater management will be addressed during the site plan phase of this project.
11. Any use variance approval shall be subject to Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Subdivision approval.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I think that the unconventional design of these age restricted houses points to the fact that this density is too great.

Abe Penzer, attorney for applicant.

Mr. Halberstam announced that only 6 members were present and they need 5 affirmative votes for use.

Mr. Penzer agreed to continue with application.

Mr. Penzer – asking for a use variance and density variance. These units are one and two bedrooms. People that are older want their independence but to live near their children. They have to show that their special reasons meet the general purpose of zoning. Senior citizen housing is inherently beneficial. Out of 139 lots only 11 are conforming to the R-10 zone.

A-1 – copy of tax map showing the area, 72 multi-family lots, 38 conforming to the R-7.5 zone, 11 non residential, 15 conforming to the R-10 zone and 3 lots less than 6,000 square feet.

Mr. Flannery described A-1 with proposed lots and the zone boundary lines. Not asking for site plan only use. They do not conform with the R-10 zone. Planning Board is currently undergoing a re-examination of the Master Plan and will be looking at changing this zone to R-7.5 zone. Asking for use and density because they do not conform to the R-10 zoning. Age restricted use is a beneficial use. There will be no outside entrance to the basement. First floor units are all handicap accessible. Age restricted residential makes sense on this site. When they come back with site plan they will review the parking. This makes sense because of the proximity of the commercial center across County Line Road, 2 synagogues in the immediate area, and a doctor's office on County Line Road. There is a need in this community for age restricted housing.

A-4 aerial

Mr. Flannery – there are 2 synagogues on the area. Reviewed Mr. Priolo's report. They will drop one of the units and make it a community building. Stormwater management will be done with underground recharge pipe. They need to come back for preliminary and final site plan.

Michelle Taylor, Vice President, Taylor Design Group, sworn. Licensed professional planner.

Board accepted credentials.

A-5 exhibit shows existing conditions on site and the surrounding area.

Ms. Taylor described A-5. There are 64 vehicles proposed for this site. There is no impact to the residential properties.

P.G. Waxman, Waxman Realty, 1600 Forest Avenue, affirmed. There is a very strong compelling need for this type of project. There are many seniors that want to be near their children. There is a demand for this type of development and it is very close to shopping and to all facilities. The impact of this project would be negligible compared to larger structures and more people. This would enhance the values of the properties in the neighborhood.

Mr. Priolo – concerned that they have the recreational facilities but the testimony shows that they are nearby and local to the area and essentially providing them.

James Monteforte, 708 Route 35, Neptune, sworn. Architect. There will be 15 – one bedroom and 21- 2 bedroom units. There will be no outside access to the basement. He described floor plans of units.

A-8 floor plans

Mr. Monteforte –these type of units is not required to have elevators. They will provide plans for an optional elevator within the townhomes and within the second floor units.

Open to Public.

William Hovday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, sworn. like the idea – in favor of the project.

Carol Suckno 59 Foxwood Road, sworn. If the synagogue is the recreational building what happens to those that do not use the synagogue.

Mr. Penzer – The intent is for one entire unit to be for recreation. There are two synagogues in the area. If necessary one floor will be a synagogue and one floor will be for recreation. There will be a homeowners association.

Isaac Choen, 1120 Somerset Avenue, affirmed. In favor of application.

Nosson Lowinger, 947 Park Terrace, affirmed. Concerned about traffic. The parking lot will be in his backyard for kids and traffic.

Mr. Penzer – 8 duplexes would be more traffic.

Chaim Rubin, 2 Malka Way, affirmed. In favor of application

Samuel Kunda, Brooklyn, affirmed. In favor of this application.

Avraham Pollack, 936 Park Terrace, affirmed. Lot 149. In favor of senior development but concerned about traffic and density.

Ann Altusky – 5411 12th Avenue, Brooklyn, New York, affirmed. In favor of application. Having a unit near shopping would be very good.

Dovid Baddouch, 944 Park Terrace, affirmed. Support this plan to bring in seniors which are our role models and our children should look up to.

Closed to Public.

Mr. Penzer – 57 notices were sent out – it is a very crowded, dense area. The recreation will be the 36th unit. The intent is not to have a synagogue on their property.

Mr. Flannery - There is no plan to show that 10 duplexes would fit on this property.

Mr. Gonzalez – Understand the need for this proposal, but not in favor in this neighborhood.

Mr. Gelley – there will be no school buses, there is a need for senior housing, density is an issue which will be discussed at site plan.

Mr. Lankry – agree with Mr. Gelley – only voting for the use.

Mr. Naftali – they should consider one or two units could be a ranch, some buffers around the parking lot area, try to save some green areas.

Motion to approve the use only – Mr. Naftali

Second – Mr. Gelley

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lankry,
Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

Nayes: Mr. Gonzalez

Mr. Halberstam made a motion to table Appeal # 3634, Aaron Peker until 3/12/07 with a waiver of time and no further notice.

Second – Mr. Gonzalez

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali,
Mr. Lankry, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

APPEAL # 3570A – SOMERSET DEVELOPMENT

436 & 444 Cross Street, Block 524, 7, 8.01, 8.02, 10-17, 129-131, R-40,
M-1 zone. Site plan

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner - January 29, 2007

1. The subject property is approximately 29.84 acres in size and is located along Cross Street. The property is within the M-1 (Industrial) Zone and the R-40 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The applicant is proposing an adult community development consisting of 93 single-family residential units and 2 open space lots. All of the development is proposed within the M-1 Zone.
2. The adult community is a non-permitted use in the M-1 Zone. The applicant previously received approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustments under Appeal No. 3570 (Adopted February 6, 2006) for the proposed use only. The applicant is back before the Board for Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision approval.

The Resolution contained the following express conditions:

- a. Applicant must submit a recreational plan along with this Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision. No recreation plan has been submitted.
 - b. Open space for the development must be addressed. It appears that a large portion of the open space on the site will be used for stormwater management.
 - c. The total unit count will be decided upon review of the site plan.
3. Variances are required as follows:
- a. In accordance with Section 1001 Adult Communities:

	Required	Proposed
Minimum Tract Area	100 Acres	29.84 Acres
Minimum Open Space	50% Gross Area	9.1%
Recreation Building	1,395 s.f.	None
Swimming Pool	2,800 s.f.	None
Parking for Recreation	28 spaces	None

- b. In accordance with Section 903M (M-1 Zone):

	Required	Proposed
Minimum Front Yard Setback	100 ft.	70 ft. (Cross Street)

4. The applicant may present this application as an expansion of the existing Fairways at Lake Ridge Development and may try to utilize the existing recreational and parking facilities towards the requirements of this project. In accordance with Section 18-1001 of the Ordinance, the recreational and parking requirements for the existing development (1,031 units) and the combined developments are as follows:

		Required (Existing)	Required (Expansion)	Required (Total)	Provided (Existing)
Recreation Bldg.	15 s.f./unit	15,465 s.f.	1,395 s.f.	16,860 s.f.	15,145 s.f.
Swimming Pool	2,800 s.f. + 5 s.f./unit over 500 units	5,455 s.f.	465 s.f.	5,920 s.f.	3,325 s.f. (outdoor) 800 s.f. (indoor) 4,125 s.f. (total)
Parking	1 space/50 s.f. of Rec. Bldg.	310 spaces	28 spaces	338 spaces	184 spaces

The applicant should show how the deficiencies in the amenities and parking will be accommodated to provide for the additional 93 units. Any expansion to the existing clubhouse and parking area should be shown on a plan and made a condition of any approval.

5. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Site Development Plan:
- a. Setback dimensions should be shown for the proposed residential lots.
 - b. The Board Approval block should reference the Lakewood Township Zoning Board.

6. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Grading and Drainage Plan and stormwater management:
 - a. A factor of safety should be provided for the infiltration rate utilized in the calculations, reducing it to approximately 10 inches/hour.
 - b. The stormwater report indicated that reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) will be used through the drainage system, whereas HDPE is also shown throughout the system on the plans.
 - c. It appears that the area that drains through FES-58 does not enter into the infiltration basin, but in fact enters the drainage ditch/swale north of Eagle Ridge Lane that runs offsite. The stormwater report analyzes the basin with this area entering the basin. Also the impervious and pervious areas used in the calculations for FES-58 do not match what is shown on the plans. These discrepancies must be addressed.
 - d. The fence should include a gate at the maintenance entrance of the stormwater basin.
 - e. Water quality and groundwater infiltration calculations should be provided.
 - f. A stormwater maintenance manual should be provided.
 - g. The applicant should consider connecting the inlets CB-47, 49, 50, 51 along Cross Street into inlets CB-7, 5, 4, and 3 located behind the berm.
 - h. Drainage swales along side yards and rear yards should have a minimum slope of 2%. A cross-sectional swale detail should be included and show a well draining soil material under the sod layer.
 - i. Note 1 indicates that all basement walls and floors shall be waterproofed. This condition should be re-stated in any Resolution of Approval and the waterproofing material should be specified.
 - j. The six inch (6") PVC collection system for each basement should be shown on the plan with a positive discharge point. Additionally, roof runoff should be collected in the same system.
 - k. Concrete sidewalks and handicap ramps should be shown on the plans. Sidewalks should also be proposed on Cross Street.
 - l. Sheet 5 shows grading and disturbance on the adjacent open space property of the Fairways (Block 524.01, Lot 1). A temporary grading easement should be shown.
 - m. The site has been graded without the benefit of overland flow relief. In the event of a drainage system back up, stormwater will pool in various low points throughout the property.
7. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Landscape and Lighting Plan:
 - a. There appear to be some discrepancies between the planting schedule and plan.
8. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Construction Details:
 - a. A detail for the two-rail paddock fence and gate should be provided.
9. Construction of site entrance (Eagle Ridge Lane) is proposed upon an area delineated as a stream by the developer of the Fairways at Lake Ridge. A stream encroachment permit will be required for the construction of an in-line detention basin from the NJDEP-LURP.
10. The sharing of infrastructure (sewer, water roads, etc.) with the Fairways at Lake Ridge will require an amendment to their CAFRA approval.
11. Ocean County Planning Board approval should be indicated on the preliminary and final major subdivision plans and final plat.

12. The applicant shall submit to, and appear before, other Local, State and Federal agencies having jurisdiction over this project.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I would like to see how the lack of open space and recreational facilities will be addressed.

Moshe Klein, attorney for applicant.

Brian Flannery – There will be 93 single family units.

A-1 grading plan

A-2 aerial of site and existing Fairways development

A-3 site plan

A-4 list of bulk requirements

A-5 rendered version of existing recreation facilities at Fairways

Mr. Flannery reviewed Mr. Priolo's report. This developer is making a contribution of \$1,270,527.00 to add a 1,400 square foot addition to their clubhouse and 28 additional parking spaces will be added to the facility. There are agreements between the applicant and the Homeowners Association. The existing pool is sufficient. Will comply and satisfy Mr. Priolo's comments. Asking for a waiver of sidewalks along Cross Street.

Nicholas Graviano, sworn. The Kokes Organization has agreed to construct the clubhouse addition.

A-6

Mr. Sernotti - When the day the last house closes the addition will be finished?

Michael Jacobus, 1463 Massachusetts Avenue, Kokes Organization. They are the contract purchasers of this property and have agreed to construct the addition. Clubhouse will be complete when 47 or 48 units are complete.

Open to Public.

Closed to Public.

Mr. Priolo – we require sidewalks on all streets.

Mr. Jacobus – there are no sidewalks on Cross Street or Massachusetts Avenue.

Mr. Priolo – they are going to widen Cross Street because of this project and they should just be required to put in the sidewalks.

Mr. Mack – we have never waived one yet.

Motion to approve including sidewalks – Mr. Halberstam

Second – Mr. Gonzalez

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lankry, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

RESOLUTIONS

APPEAL # 3618 – TUXEDO PROPERTY PARTNERS, Forest Drive, Block 12 Lot 206, R-12 zone, Resolution to approve the construction of a single family home on an undersized lot.

Motion to approve – Ms. Goralski

Second – Mr. Naftali

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Halberstam

APPEAL # 3632 – KURDEN VENTURES (DUNKIN DONUTS) 1650 Route 70, Block 1248 Lot 20, B-5 Zone. Resolution to approve a use variance for a 620 square foot addition to an existing service station for a proposed Dunkin Donuts with a drive through.

Motion to approve – Mr. Halberstam

Second – Mr. Gonzalez

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

APPEAL #3597 – SMITH FARGO, Ocean & Clover Street Block 538 Lots 1, 2, 17 & 18, Block 539 Lots 17 & 18, R-7.5 zone. Resolution to deny a use variance to construct town homes in the R-7.5 zone on less than 5 acres.

Motion to approve – Mr. Goralski

Second – Mr. Gonzalez

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Sernotti

RESOLUTION TO AWARD CONTRACT TO JOHN RUSSO FOR LITIGATION in the matter of Omni Point vs. Township of Lakewood – Appeal # 3587

Motion to approve – Mr. Halberstam

Second – Mr. Gonzalez

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lankry, Mr. Halberstam, Mr. Sernotti

MOTION TO PAY BILLS

All in favor.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Fran Siegel, Secretary