Meeting was called to order at 7:35 P.M.
Meeting properly advertised according to the Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL:
Attending: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Mrs. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam
Also present: Glenn Harrison, Attorney
Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner
Steve McCrystal, Court Stenographer
Fran Siegel, Secretary
Absent: Mr. Zaks, Mr. Sernotti

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES of April 3, 2006 with a waiver to read – Mr. Gonzalez
Second – Mr. Naftali
Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

• APPEAL # 3593 – CONG. SONS OF ISRAEL, 4th Street & Monmouth Ave, Block 127 Lot 4, B-2 zone. Preliminary and Final major subdivision and site plan approval.

Adam Lieberman reclused himself.

Mr. Halberstam announced that there were only 5 members voting and he would need all 5 affirmative votes.

Mr .Penzer agreed to continue.

Secretary read reports.

From: James Priolo, Engineer/Planner - March 8, 2006 – 2nd Revised Review

1. The property in question is located on the corner of Fourth Street and Monmouth Avenue and is within the B-2 (Central Business) Zone. The existing site contains a 2-story masonry building. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the existing lots into six (6) individual lots (5-residential lots, 1-Homeowners Assoc. lot). The residential lots will contain one 3-unit townhouse structure, and one 2-unit structure.
The applicant appeared before the Board in December 2005 and April 2006 and has revised the plans to address several of the Boards comments and concerns.

2. In accordance with Section 903 B.2. of the ordinance, a Special Reasons Variance will be required because the applicant is:
   a. Deviating from a standard pertaining solely to a conditional use. In accordance with Section 1010 A. of the ordinance, townhouses are permitted subject to the following conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Tract Boundary (Setback)</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.5 ft. (4th St.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5 ft. (rear yard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Tract Width</td>
<td>125 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   The zoning table should be revised accordingly.

3. 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. A deviation from a standard pertaining solely to a conditional use.
      Additionally, the applicant must demonstrate to the Board that the requested special reasons 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. Should the Board approve the special reasons variance, the following bulk variances will be required for the proposed subdivision. In accordance with Section 1010 B.1. of the ordinance, bulk variances for the proposed subdivision are required as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Provided</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Setback</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>3.5 ft.</td>
<td>1 ft.</td>
<td>3.5 ft.</td>
<td>3.5 ft. (Mon. Ave.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.5 ft.</td>
<td>18.5 ft.</td>
<td>16.5 ft.</td>
<td>18.5 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Side Setback</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2 ft.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. The following variances will be required:
   a. In accordance with Section 818 A.5., states that all other steps, excluding the landing or the stoop, may project into any front or rear yard setback, whereas the front landing is projecting into the front yard setback for Lot 4.02 (1 ft. from Fourth Street R.O.W.) and Lot 4.05 (1 ft. from Monmouth Avenue R.O.W.).
   b. In accordance with Section 803 E.2., a minimum 15’ wide buffer with dense plantings is required along the parking area adjacent to the existing public library located on adjacent Lot 1, whereas no buffer is provided.

6. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Site Development Plan:
   a. All easements should be shown and should include the dimensions, areas and to whom they are dedicated.
   b. The applicant should address open space and recreational opportunities.
7. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Grading and Drainage Plan and stormwater management:
   a. The triple pipes and oversized structures should be properly dimensioned and shown on the plan.
   b. The lengths of pipe used in the stormwater report should match those shown on the plan.

8. Any approval should include a condition that a Homeowners Association, in accordance with Section 1010B.9 of the ordinance, be established. The applicant shall submit a copy of the Homeowners Association Agreement to the Board Attorney for review.

9. It appears the shaded area depicted as the proposed Homeowners Association lot on the Final Plat includes areas of the individual homeowners lots. The applicant should clarify the area that will be the Homeowners Association lot.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

Since the number of units has been reduced I have no objection to this application. I would like to see the open area fronting on 4th Street to be clearly defined as a grass area recreation or other purpose.

Abe Penzer, represented applicant – they have revised their plans and now have 5 townhouses. They have met all the boards’ requests.

Brian Flannery sworn.

A-1 site plan
A-2 aerial photograph
A-3 new rendering of site layout
A-4 architectural rendering.

Mr. Flannery – This layout provides more light and open air. There is street parking available.

Mr. Penzer – By eliminating the one townhouse the open space recreation lot has increased from 2,400 square feet to 4,500 square feet and decreased the lot coverage from 35% to 28.9% eliminating the variance for lot coverage.

Mr. Flannery reviewed Mr. Priolo’s report.

Mr. Flannery – Townhouses are a conditional use. They do not meet the conditions. This project fits in well with the neighborhood. This is the downtown area and will be consistent with the area.

Mr. Penzer - The synagogue is using the money to have the chapel next to the cemetery and is inherently beneficial.
Mr. Halberstam – would prefer a 6 foot white vinyl fence where it abuts the library and 4 feet the first 25 feet.

Applicant agreed.

Open to Public. Closed to Public.

**Motion to approve** with a 6 & 4 foot fence – Mr. Naftali
Second – Mr. Gonzalez

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

- **APPEAL # 3614 - ALEX KURTEEV**, Tower Street, Block 855.04 Lot 26, R-20 zone. To construct a single family home – requesting lot width variance 100 feet required 82 feet proposed.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner March 29, 2006

1. The subject property is located on Towers Street and is within the R-20 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The existing site is vacant. The applicant proposes to construct a 2-story single-family dwelling.

2. In accordance with Section 902 C. of the Ordinance, bulk variances will be required for the construction of the proposed single-family dwelling as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Lot Width</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>87.5 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   | Minimum Side Setback (Combined) | 25 ft. | 23 ft. |

   It should be noted that the side setback should be measured from the staircase on the east side of the dwelling.

   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.

3. Any approval should include a condition that curb and sidewalk shall be installed along the entire roadway frontage.

4. The applicant should provide testimony on the proposed use of the basement level. The drawings indicate a separate outside entrance to the basement level. Any approval should include a condition that the maximum elevation difference between finished floor and outside grade is 30 inches.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I have no objection to this application.

Abraham Penzer represented applicant.
Frederick Voss, 272 Lanes Mill Road, Engineer, sworn.

Board accepted credentials

Mr. Penzer – lot width existing. Will change the steps from the side to the rear to eliminate side setback variance.

Ray Shea requested that Appeal # 3612, Somerset Development be carried since there was many objectors in the audience and they would like to meet with them to try and work out their concerns.

Jerome Gertner, attorney for Leisure Village Association agreed to meet to try and resolve their concerns.

Motion to carry to Special Meeting of June 12 – Ms. Goralski
Second – Mr. Naftali
Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

No further notice and a waiver of time.

Mr. Penzer – the lot width is existing and that is the only variance requested. They will install sidewalk and curb along the frontage.

Mr. Voss – the basement is for storage and mechanical. The finished floor will be 30 inches to grade.

Open to Public.

Jess Hyman, 1414 Tower Street, sworn. Asked where the driveway will be.

Mr. Voss – the driveway will be on the right side in the front of the house.

Closed to Public.

Motion to approve – Mr. Lieberman
Second- Mr. Gelley
Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

• APPEAL #3558A – ROUTE 88 PROPERTIES, R-20 zone Dr. Szold Way, Preliminary & Final major subdivision and site plan.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner – March 31, 2006

1. The subject property is located on Dr. Szold Way and is within the R-20 (Single-Family
Residential Zone. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the proposed multi-family units into 25 individual lots (24-residential lots, 1-Homeowners Assoc. lot).

On November 7, 2005, under Appeal No. 3558, the Applicant received use variance and site plan approval for the proposed multi-family units which are not a permitted use in the R-20 Zone. It should be noted that Resolution Compliance approval has not yet been granted, due to some outstanding issues.

The Applicant has now returned before the Board for Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision approval. The site design has remained the same as the approved Site Plan.

2. This report is being offered with respect to the final subdivision only.

3. The preliminary subdivision plans should show the proposed subdivision lines, to insure they match the proposed subdivision lines on the final plat.

4. Basement floor elevations are shown for three of the four building structures on the grading plan. The architectural plans do not indicate proposed basements, and the original approval did not include basements. The Applicant should discuss this discrepancy.

5. In accordance with Section 902 C., the following bulk variances will be required along with the subdivision:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Area</td>
<td>20,000 s.f.</td>
<td>1,193 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>20 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback (One)</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback (Combined)</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>0 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Building Coverage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. The Applicant must submit a copy of the Homeowners Association agreement, which shall include the following:
   a. It appears the shaded area depicted as the proposed Homeowners Association lot includes areas of the individual homeowners lots. The applicant should clarify the area that will be the Homeowners Association lot.
   b. A copy of the proposed blanket easement to be dedicated to the respective utility companies for the installation and maintenance of storm, sanitary, electric, phone, CATV and any other necessary utilities not covered under an individual easement should be provided.
   c. It should be noted that the responsibility of maintaining the stormwater system should be the Homeowners Association and not the Township of Lakewood.

7. The final plat should be amended to include the following:
   a. Descriptions of all easements should be provided for review prior to filing in the Office of the Ocean County Clerk.
   b. The error of closure of the tract boundary should be provided.
   c. The correct zoning schedule for the R-20 Zone.

8. Ocean County Planning Board approval must be indicated on the plan.
9. 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

Since the number of units has not changed the only areas that need to be clarified are, the affect of the basements and the management of common areas. These issues could affect the amount of parking places and other site plan issues.

Louis Felicetta, attorney for applicant. This project received use variance and site plan approval. They are here now for subdivision of 24 lots.

Brian Flannery – need subdivision only – the units will have basements when the original application did not. They want to create fee simple lots whereas the site plan approval did not have basements. There will be 20 inches to outside grade. The only access to the basement is from the inside. There will be no outside entrance to the basements. The units are 2 story, 20 x 30.

Mr. Flannery reviewed Mr. Priolo’s report.

Mr. Halberstam – not changing anything other than basements and fee simple lots.

Mr. Flannery – there will be 24 single family lots and one homeowners association.

Open to Public. Closed to Public.

**Motion to approve** – Mr. Lieberman
Second – Mr. Naftali

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

**• APPEAL # 3604 – ARYEH WEINSTEIN**, 730 River Avenue, Block 423 a lot 13, HD-7 zone.

Use variance to construct a duplex and a minor subdivision into two lots.

Chairman announced that this is a use variance and 5 affirmative votes were needed.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner January 23, 2006

1. The property in question is located on River Avenue (Route 9) with double frontage on Rena Lane and is within the HD-7 (Highway Development) Zone. The lot contains an existing dwelling and sheds. The applicant proposes to construct a 2-family townhouse structure on the lot and subdivide the lot to create two fee simple lots. The existing dwelling and sheds will be removed.

2. In accordance with Section 903 H.2. of the ordinance, a Special Reasons Variance will
be required because the applicant is:

1. Deviating from a standard pertaining solely to a conditional use. In accordance with Section 1010 A. of the ordinance, townhouses are permitted subject to the following conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Tract Area</td>
<td>43,560 s.f.</td>
<td>10,516 s.f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Tract Width</td>
<td>125 feet</td>
<td>70.11 feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Tract Boundary (Rt. 9)</td>
<td>100 ft.</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:

2. Deviating from a standard pertaining solely to a conditional use. Additionally, the applicant must demonstrate to the Board that the requested special reasons 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.

3. Should the Board approve the special reasons variance, the following bulk variances will be required for the proposed subdivision. In accordance with Section 1010 B.1. of the ordinance, bulk variances for the proposed subdivision are required as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Provided Lot 13.01</th>
<th>Provided Lot 13.02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Side Yard Setback</td>
<td>12 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft.</td>
<td>9 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In accordance with Section 805 F., thru-lots shall provide a landscaped buffer along the secondary frontage (River Avenue). The width and depth of buffer shall be determined by the Board, but in no case shall be less than five feet (5’). No buffer is provided along River Avenue.

5. The applicant should address the Board regarding the visual impacts which the proposed development will have on the surrounding properties.

6. In accordance with Section 1010 B.6., each unit shall have an area designated for the storage of trash and recycling containers. The applicant should discuss the method of trash collection for the townhouse units.

7. Any approval should include a condition that curb and sidewalk shall be required along Rena Lane and Route 9.

8. Ocean County Planning Board approval should be indicated on the plan.

9. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Minor Subdivision Plan and Map Filing Law:

   a. All certification blocks should reference the Lakewood Township Zoning Board.
   b. A monument must be indicated at the intersection of the proposed lot line and the existing right-of-way line.
   c. A note must be added to the plan indicating that the lot, block, and street addresses have been assigned by the Lakewood Township Tax Assessor’s office.
   d. The Certification for the Record Holder should indicate the printed name beneath
From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I see no advantage of creating two small residential lots on a state highway with this degree of non-conformity.

Brian Flannery, engineer. There is an existing home that is 70 feet back from Route 9. This unit is consistent with the units approved by this Board on Rena Court. If they make the units one foot narrower would give them 10 feet on each side and for parking. The lot is 150 foot deep. They could face the units on Rena Lane. They would propose patios and not decks. They are asking for the rear to be 70 feet from Route 9. They will have buffering to Route 9 which will improve the visual impact. The units would be 25 x 40 feet.

Mr. Mack – The Governing body would like to keep the 100 foot setback from Route 9.

Mr. Flannery - Currently there is a building set back 70 feet from Route 9. They cannot comply with the 100 foot setback.

Aryeh Weinstein, 120 Caranetta Drive, affirmed. He owns the property many years. They will match the development.

Mr. Flannery – the state is saying that they would take 22 feet – which would leave 48 feet from the back of the house.

Mr. Priolo - They would have a 48 foot backyard.

Applicant requested to come back with new plan.

Motion to carry until June 5 – Mr. Lieberman
Second – Mr. Gelley
Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

No further notice and a waiver of time.

Recess.

RAY SHEA REQUESTED THAT APPEAL # 3608, BEN RABINOWITZ, be carried to the June 5th meeting. This application is for a use variance and there were only 6 members.

Motion to carry until June 5th – Mr. Gelley
Second – Mr. Lieberman
Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

No further notice and a waiver of time.
From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner April 4, 2006

1. The subject property is located along Hope Chapel Road and is within the R-12 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The applicant proposes to convert the existing single-family dwelling into offices for the adjacent synagogue and construct new parking facilities.

2. A special reasons variance will be required as follows:
   a. To permit a use in a district restricted against such use. In accordance with Section 902 E. of the Ordinance, the proposed office use is not a permitted use within the R-12 Zone. The only permitted use in this Zone is single-family detached. 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 (office use). In order to achieve this, the applicant should explain why the office use is a better planning and zoning alternative than the traditional single-family residential concept.

3. If use variance approval is granted, the following variances will be required during the site plan phase:
   a. In accordance with Section 902 E., bulk variances will be required as follows:
      
      | Minimum Side Setback (One) | Required | Provided |
      |---------------------------|----------|----------|
      | Minimum Side Setback (Accessory) | 10 ft. | 7.6 ft. |
      | Minimum Rear Setback (Accessory) | 10 ft. | 0 ft.   |
      | Minimum Rear Setback (Accessory) | 10 ft. | 3 ft.   |
   b. In accordance with Section 803.E.2., a 50-foot vegetated buffer is required along the rear and south side property lines. A landscaping plan should be submitted for review providing adequate buffers between the proposed office and existing residential uses.

4. The following items should be corrected on the plan:
   a. The plan should not be titled, “Preliminary & Final Plat Major Site Plan”, it should be titled a variance plan/map.
   b. The wrong lot is highlighted on the location and zoning map.
   c. The accessory side yard setbacks should be shown on the zoning schedule.

5. It appears only 5 parking spaces are required, whereas 28 spaces are proposed. The applicant should discuss the need for this excessive amount of parking. It appears the excess parking will be used for the adjacent synagogue.

6. The applicant should discuss the proposed use of the existing garage and small building.
7. The applicant should consider connecting the proposed parking lot and the existing synagogue parking lot to eliminate one driveway during the site plan phase of this project.

8. The applicant should discuss the proposed office use, occupancy and hours of operation.

9. The applicant should discuss vehicular circulation within the site including turn arounds, trash removal, etc. It appears that the eight (8) southern most spaces provide no room for backing movements. A minimum 5-foot radius should be provided between the spaces.

10. The applicant should discuss how stormwater management will be addressed during site plan review.

11. Any use variance approval should be subject to Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

The need for this parking lot has been well documented by the use of this lot and the amount of parking on this and surrounding streets. I think that the lot needs to be buffered very thoroughly to protect the other houses in the neighborhood.

Sam Brown, attorney for applicant. This application is to provide much needed parking for the adjacent synagogue. The synagogue is heavily utilized and causing overflow parking for the neighborhood. The subject lot is owned by Moses Schwartz and he agreed that he would create a parking facility for the overflow of parking. Also asking for offices for the synagogue. The building now is a single family home and it would not be practical to continue that use. Whatever offices are not used by the synagogue they would rent out.

Glen Lines, Engineer, sworn. Reviewed Mr. Priolo’s report. The shed will be used for storage. They have to go to the County Planning Board also because Hope Chapel is a County Road. The offices will be compatible with the synagogue offices. They will come back for site plan approval. They will not demolish existing house or the existing garage. Office use on a County road is not uncommon. This is a good use for the lot and will help with the parking problem for the synagogue. The house is about 144 square feet. They will provide a buffer along the rear property line. Proposing a 9 foot vinyl stockade fence along the southern property line as a buffer. It will be 6 feet plus a 3 foot lattice. There is a 5 foot easement and move it in one foot to allow for the 9 foot fence. There are 23 excess spaces to be used by the adjacent synagogue.

Mr. Brown - This use will provide a benefit to the neighborhood.

Mr. Priolo - They are also asking for other offices other than offices for the synagogue.

Mr. Brown – they will create a restriction where the change of use will only last as long as this is used as an accessory use to the synagogue.
Mr. Harrison – it can be deed restricted.

Mr. Brown – will work out the details with Mr. Harrison. The house is one floor about 1,400 square feet. About 600 square feet is needed for the synagogue.

Mr. Mack – there is also leased space available too. Concerned about the outside offices.

Open to Public.

Barbara Alpert, 540 Seton Circle, sworn. The parking lot to the synagogue is filled as well as the proposed lot. Concerned about the outside offices using the parking spaces for the congregants.

Egon Birnbaum, affirmed. Live in the back of the synagogue and the existing house. Asked that there will not be a second story on the existing house and that there be signs posted for “no horn blowing”. Also would like a 9 foot fence between their property and his so that this use does not affect his property.

Maryann Englesbe, 595 Seton Circle, sworn – not opposed to the additional parking. Opposed to outside offices other than the offices for the synagogue. Suggested that the buildings be removed and the entire property be used as parking for the synagogue. Outside offices will benefit no one other than the owner of the property.

Cathy Stilwell, 950 Brook Road, sworn.

Margaret Chase Miller, 515 Hope Chapel Road, sworn.

Mrs. Stilwell – met with the applicant. The agreed to the 9 foot fence 6 feet from the property line to allow for the 5 foot easement. They also agreed to overlay her driveway. Agreed to landscaping. They are concerned about the outside offices.

Bob Soden, 1474 14th Street, affirmed. There is a need for the additional parking. Sees no problem with the office space.

Eli Teichman, 1436, 14th Street, affirmed. The services and the benefit the applicant is providing to the neighborhood is tremendous.

Closed to Public.

Glenn Lines – now the parking is disorganized and paving the grass area will provide more parking. No objection to fencing the rear of the property. Will put in some evergreens to help with the noise. There will only be one-story on the existing footprint, they have no plans to expand the building. Only office use, not business. Proposing a 6 foot fence with lattice and will overlay her driveway. There will be no signs on Hope Chapel Road. They will provide a proper lighting plan.
Mr. Lines - There is one office in the existing synagogue about 10 x 11 feet.

**Motion to approve use only for parking lot and offices for synagogue and other offices, with a deed restriction** – Mr. Lieberman  
Second – Mr. Gelley  
**Roll call vote:** affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

**RESOLUTIONS**

- **Appeal # 3546A Tamarind Developers**, Joe Parker Road, Block 189.03 Lots 184 & 186, R-20 zone. Site plan  
  
  **Motion to approve** – Mr. Naftali  
  Second – Mr. Gonzalez  
  **Roll call vote:** affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

- **Appeal # 3499A – Somerset Mam, LLC**, 911 East County Line Road, Block 761 Lots 1-3 B-3 zone. Revised to provide six handicapped parking spaces – four in the back and two in the front.  
  
  **Motion to approve** – Mr. Naftali  
  Second – Mr. Gelley  
  **Roll call vote:** affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Gonzalez, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Halberstam

**MOTION TO PAY BILLS.**  
All in favor.

**MOTION TO ADJOURN.**  
All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15 P.M.  
Respectfully submitted,  
Fran Siegel, Secretary