

**LAKWOOD ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
MINUTES
JUNE 6, 2006**

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

ROLL CALL:

Attending: Mr. Gelley, Mrs. Goralski, Mr. Naftali,
Mr. Zaks, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Sernotti

Absent: Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Halberstam

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 MAY 1, 2006 with a waiver to read – Mr. Naftali
Second – Ms. Goralski

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

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF MAY 22, 2006 with a waiver to read – Mr. Lieberman
Second – Mr. Naftali

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

Mark Williams, attorney representing Appeal # 3618 & Appeal #3619 on Forest Drive requested to carry until July 10th.

MOTION TO CARRY APPEAL # 3618 TO JULY 10TH – Mr. Gelley

Second - Mr. Naftali

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Zaks,
Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Sernotti

No further notice and a waiver of time.

MOTION TO CARRY APPEAL # 3619 TO JULY 10TH – Mr. Lieberman

Second - Mr. Naftali

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Zaks,
Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Sernotti

No further notice and a waiver of time.

Brian Flannery asked that Appeal #3604, Aryeh Weinstein, be carried. Chairman announced that he would have to renote.

APPEAL # 3608 – BEN RABINOWITZ, 952 A East County Line Road, Block 208.01 Lot 73, R-12 zone. Use variance to construct 2 office buildings in the R-12 zone.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer /Planner March 13, 2006

1. The subject property is located along East County Line Road and is within the R-12 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The applicant proposes to demolish the existing single-family dwelling and construct two 2-story office buildings.
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. Based on the plan submitted, variances will be required during the site plan phase of this application as follows:
 - a. In accordance with Section 803.E.2., a 50-foot vegetated buffer is required along the side property lines. There appears to be no space to provide adequate buffers between the proposed offices and existing residential uses.
4. The applicant should discuss the proposed office use, occupancy and hours of operation. In addition, the applicant should discuss the use of the proposed units on the basement level.
5. The applicant should discuss vehicular circulation within the site including turnarounds, trucks, deliveries, trash removal, etc.
6. A County right-of-way dedication may be required along East County Line Road during the site plan phase. This would require further setback of the building.
7. A copy of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Letter of Interpretation must be submitted for review. Any wetlands present on the site should be delineated.
8. Additional information on the Cabinfield Branch and any environmental constraints associated with the C-1 waterway should be shown in more detail during site plan review.
9. The applicant should discuss how stormwater management will be addressed during site plan review.
10. Any use variance approval should be subject to Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

It is very obvious that County Line Road continues to change from residential to commercial in an easterly direction. This particular parcel is still a fair distance from this development and is located in a traditional residential area. I feel the board should be very aware of the impact this application will have on neighboring properties.

Ray Shea represented applicant.

Brian Flannery, sworn.

A-1 aerial exhibit

A-2 color rendering of variance sketch

Mr. Shea – asking for use only to build commercial structures and not residential.

Chairman announced that there were only 6 members available.

Mr. Shea agreed to proceed.

Mr. Flannery – The property is located on the south side of County Line Road. Asking for two 2 story office buildings. A small office building in the front and a small office building in the rear. The size of the buildings are approximately the same size as the residential homes in the area. There will be only one driveway for entering and exiting. Reviewed Mr. Priolo's report. County Line Road is heavily traveled. Property is very narrow and very deep. The lot is 116 feet wide x 752 feet deep. The rear of the lot is impacted by the stream corridor buffer. They will be providing the need for office space. It will be general office use, 9 – 5. When they come back for site they will know how many offices and the type of offices. The only other permitted use for this property would be a flag lot and the office use would be a better use.

Open to Public.

Ilana Wittels, 951 East County Line Road, affirmed. Lives across from this property and would like not to see the office use.

Joel Wittels, 951 East County Line Road, affirmed. The traffic on County Line Road is very heavy and this use would add to the traffic. Objected to the office use.

William Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, sworn. Objected to use.

Kathy Stillwell, 950 Brook Road, sworn. This area is totally residential and should be kept residential according to the Master Plan. Objected to use variance.

Closed to Public.

Mr. Shea – applicant is the owner of the property.

Motion to deny – Mr. Zaks

Second – Mr. Gelley

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Zaks, Mr. Sernotti
nays: Mr. Lieberman

Application denied.

APPEAL # 3592 – AJ SKORA, Henry & Birch St, Block 417 Lot 16, R-10 zone. To construct a single family home

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner - April 3, 2006

1. The subject property is located on Birch Street and is within the R-10 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The existing lot contains a storage shed. The applicant proposes to construct a new single-family dwelling. The existing lot does not conform to the current zoning requirements. In accordance with Section 902.F. of the ordinance, bulk variances will be required for the construction of the proposed dwelling as follows:

	Required	Existing	Proposed
Minimum Lot Frontage	75 ft.	50 ft.	50 ft.
Minimum Side Setback (Combined)	25 ft.	-	20 ft.
Maximum Lot Coverage	25%	4%	26.3%
Accessory Side Setback	10 ft.	1.7 ft.	1.7 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.

The applicant should address the Board regarding the visual impacts which the new larger structure will have on the surrounding properties.

2. In accordance with Section 805 F., thru-lots shall provide a landscaped buffer along the secondary frontage (Henry Street). 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.
3. In accordance with RSIS, a minimum of three (3) parking spaces should be provided for this dwelling.
4. Any approval should include a condition that all curb shall be replaced as directed by the Township Engineer. A note should also be added to the plan. Sidewalk should be proposed along the entire frontage.
5. The architectural plans provided show an outside entrance to the basement level. The applicant should discuss the intended use of this level. The architectural drawings show future plans for bathrooms on the basement level.
6. Any approval should include a condition that the maximum elevation difference between finished floor and outside grade is 30 inches. The elevations provided indicate a 60-inch difference.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I have no objections to this application other than to suggest that the accessory structure be moved.

Ray Shea represented applicant. Would like to preserve shed. Agreed to no access to Henry Street. Asking for variance of combined side yard setback of 20 feet where 25 feet is required. They will be RSIS compliant.

Open to Public. Closed to Public.

Motion to approve as to stipulations of Mr. Priolo's report – Mr. Zaks

Second – Mr. Naftali

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Zaks, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Sernotti

APPEAL # 3613 – MARTIN LEWIN, 430 3rd Street, Block 72 Lot 11, R-OP zone. Subdivide Lot 11 into 2 non-conforming lots.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Enginner/Planner May 3, 2006

1. The subject property is located along the southern side of Third Street between Madison and Forest Avenues and is within the ROP (Residential Office Park) Zone. The application proposes to subdivide the lot into two new lots consisting of 3,750 s.f. (Lot 11.01) and 3,750 s.f. (Lot 11.02). A 2-1/2-story duplex currently exists on this property. The subdivision will split the building.
2. A use variance and associated bulk variances for the proposed duplex structure were approved by the Board of Adjustment under a prior Resolution of Approval (Appeal No. 3519 – Adopted December 6, 2004). The applicant is now back before the Board to subdivide the lot.
3. In accordance with Section 903.I. of the ordinance, variances for the proposed subdivision are required as follows:

	Required	Existing Lot 11	Proposed Lot 11.01	Proposed Lot 11.02
Minimum Lot Area	10,000 s.f.	7,500 s.f.	3,750 s.f.	3,750 s.f.
Minimum Lot Width	75 ft.	75 ft.	37.5 ft.	37.5 ft.
Front Yard Setback	25 ft.	23 ft.	23 ft.	23 ft.
Side Yard Setback (One)	12 ft.	12.5 ft.	0 ft	0 ft.
Side Yard Setback (Combined)	25 ft.	25 ft.	12.5 ft.	12.5 ft.
Maximum Building Coverage	25%	33.3%	35.6%	35.6%

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.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I see no reason to subdivide this property to even smaller lots since the Board has already granted relief for the undersized property.

John Miri represented applicant. Making this application to correct situations that developed regarding this property. A use variance for a two-unit structure was granted and the intent was to create two fee simple lots. Mr. Lewin purchased the property with the intention to sell two separate lots. The property was constructed and listed for sale. At closing they were advised that the structure was on one lot. Consulted with the tax assessor and the township attorney. Alternative in order to facilitate the closing they created a two unit condo association. The contract purchasers were upset with the arrangement. Reviewed Mr. Priolo's report.

A-1 current zoning map

A-2 current tax map

Mr. Miri – there are many townhouses in the area. The size of the lots would be very similar to the area. The granting of this application would not be detrimental to the zone plan or the ordinance. This was an honest confusion of events. They thought they had purchased fee simple lots. They created the condo association so that the two units could be sold separately.

David Klein, 1495 Pine Park Avenue, attorney for purchaser. Mr. Switzer obtained the variance for a duplex unit. He then sold the property to M & S Enterprises, Mr. Lewin. His client then contracted to purchase the units, father and daughter. The mistake was discovered shortly before closing. There are monies that are escrowed. The daughter purchase property A and the father purchased property B. Insurance is very difficult to get for a two unit condo.

Mr. Sernotti - Mr. Switzer knew that he was getting a duplex on one undersized lot. The solution does not sit here.

Mr. Priolo – basement entrance was constructed in the front and the resolution says that it should be in the rear. Concerned about the subdivision.

Mr. Sernotti – does not think that it is up to this board to correct these mistakes.

Raizy Folger, 430 3rd Street, affirmed. They had to close. They had no choice. Her father in-law came up with the escrow agreement.

Martin Lewin, 1425 Cedarview Avenue, affirmed. There was a chain of errors and ask the board for understanding.

Open to Public.

David Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane. The board should not grant this subdivision.

Closed to Public.

Mr. Zaks – are there anybody living in the basement units?

Mr. Sernotti read a letter from the Township Tax Assessor, Linda Solakian.

Mr. Lewin – he built two single family houses with finished basements.

Motion to approve – Mr. Gelley

Second – Mr. Lieberman

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Mr. Zaks, Mr. Lieberman
nays: Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Sernotti

Motion denied.

Recess.

APPEAL # 3425A – DAVID NAHUM, 604 James Street, Block 385 Lot 4 – M-1 zone. Amended site plan.

Secretary read reports.

From: James Priolo, Engineer/Planner

1. The subject property is located on James Street and is within the M-1 (Industrial) Zone. The lot contains a single-story residential dwelling (1,440 s.f.) and a one-story masonry building (6,255 s.f.) used as an auto body shop. The applicant proposes to maintain the residential dwelling and auto body shop and construct 3 one-story masonry buildings (16,563 s.f. total) to be used as warehouses for contractors.
2. The residential and auto body shop uses are non-permitted uses in the M-1 Zone. The applicant previously received use variance and site plan approval from the Zoning Board of Adjustment under Appeal No. 3425 (adopted 9/12/05) to permit and construct the proposed uses with bulk variances. The approval was subject to the vacation of the unimproved fifty-foot right-of-way of Wakefield Avenue. The Township did not approve the right-of-way vacation of Wakefield Avenue and therefore the original approvals are no longer valid. The applicant is back before the Board to seek new approvals for use and bulk variances and preliminary and final site plan.
3. The residential and auto body shop uses are not permitted in the M-1 Zone. In accordance with Section 18-15 of the ordinance, a mixed-use variance approval is required from the Board of Adjustment for the existing residential and auto body shop uses and the proposed warehouse use on one lot. The applicant must provide testimony to the Board detailing the special reasons, which would allow the Board to grant a mixed-use variance to depart from the zoning regulations to permit uses in a district restricted against such uses. The applicant must demonstrate to the Board 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.

4. In accordance with Section 903 M., the following bulk variances are being requested as follows:

	Required	Existing	Proposed
Minimum Lot Area	3 acres	2.35 acres	2.35 acres
Minimum Lot Width	300 ft.	194.37 ft.	194.37 ft.
Front Yard Setback (James Street)	100 ft.	35.37 ft. (dwelling)	35.37 ft. (dwelling) 60 ft. (warehouse-new)
Front Yard Setback (Wakefield Ave.)	100 ft.	41.40 ft. (dwelling) 25.89 ft. (existing bldg.)	41.40 ft. (dwelling) 25.89 ft. (existing bldg.) 16.16 ft. (warehouse-new)

The applicant must demonstrate to the Board that the requested bulk 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.

5. The Board should review the feasibility of the proposed warehouses adjacent to Wakefield Avenue. Since this right-of-way was not vacated, the rear of the building is now extremely close to the street right-of-way.
6. The applicant shall provide testimony regarding the proposed hours of operation, the type of material and equipment to be stored in the warehouses and the number of employees operating and managing the warehouses. Additionally, the applicant shall provide testimony regarding the proposed hours of operation and the number of employees at the auto body shop.
7. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the site plan:
- The applicant should discuss vehicular circulation within the site including turn arounds, trucks, deliveries, trash removal, etc. It appears that the parking lot, if full, will leave very little space for turning around and truck circulation. In accordance with the express conditions of the original approval a turn around must be provided.
 - Concrete curbs and sidewalks should be proposed along James Street for the entire frontage of the property.
 - It appears the applicant currently utilizes the unimproved Wakefield Avenue to access the rear of the existing one-story masonry building. The proposed plan shows no parking in front of this building and the applicant should discuss how they intend to provide access to this building. The paper street should be screened with fencing, landscaping or other measures.
 - Driveway access to the single-family dwelling should be shown.
8. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Grading, Drainage and Utility Plan and stormwater management:
- The pipe length used in the recharge calculations for the 24" recharge trench is incorrect. Any subsequent calculations should be revised.
 - Stormwater infiltration as required under N.J.A.C. Section 7:8-5.4 shall be addressed. It appears the required reductions for the 100-year storm have not been met; the maximum permitted runoff is 80% of the pre-development runoff; the maximum would be 8.17 cfs, whereas 9.29 cfs is proposed.
 - Roof leaders should be connected directly into the drainage system.
 - An alternative to the grading and drainage around the building at the southeast corner of the site should be considered. This area should be designed so that if Wakefield Avenue is ever improved, there will not be improvement conflicts with drainage and grading.

- e. The applicant should provide additional information downstream of the bubbler.
- 9. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the architectural drawings:
 - a. Dimensions should be provided on the plan as the plan does not appear to match the architectural drawings.
 - b. The plan shows garage doors with a parking space in front. The applicant should discuss if the garage doors are for vehicle access.
 - c. The facade should be discussed as the rear of the existing building and one proposed building will now face Wakefield Avenue.
 - d. Although a septic field is proposed, the architectural drawings do not indicate any plumbing, floor drains or restroom facilities. No sewer laterals are depicted on the plans. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the need for the septic system. It is likely that the floors of the warehouses will have floor drains to allow for periodic washing and to collect spills. Any chemical materials shall not be discharged into the septic system.
- 10. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Landscape & Lighting Plan:
 - a. Landscaping should be provided around the trash enclosure.
 - b. Berming and additional landscaping should be provided along James Street.
 - c. It appears no existing trees will remain as a result of this application.
- 11. The following comments should be addressed with regards to the Construction Details:
 - a. A detail for a single 36" recharge trench should be provided as opposed to the detail for the double 36" recharge trench.
 - b. A detail of a van accessible parking stall and signage shall be provided.
- 12. Ocean County Planning Board approval shall be indicated on the plans.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I think that the elimination of one of the rear buildings and a repositioning of the remaining buildings would make this a more desirable application.

Mr. Flannery – proposing three buildings for contractors warehouses and keeping the existing residence and the existing building which is an auto body shop. The approval was based on the vacation of Wakefield Avenue. The Township was unwilling to vacate Wakefield Avenue. They need a use variance for the existing home and the existing auto body shop. The contractors warehouses are a permitted use. Reviewed Mr. Priolo's report. They will be providing landscaping and enhancing the area. There will be curbing in designated areas. The site is flat until the railroad tracks.

Mr. Priolo - Share the concerns with Mr. Mack about the over utilization of the site. There is really no turn-around. The existing building has no parking in front of it.

Open to Public. Closed to public.

Motion to approve use only – Mr. Zaks

Second – Mr. Naftali

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Zaks,
Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Sernotti

APPEAL # 3615 – CHARLES SEMAH, 604 5th Street, Block 49 Lot 6, R-12 zone. Addition on an undersized lot.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner – April 13, 2006

1. The subject property is located on Fifth Street and is within the R-12 (Single-Family Residential) Zone. The applicant proposes to construct a 1-story front and 2-story rear addition to the existing 2-story single-family dwelling on the existing undersized lot.
2. In accordance with Section 902 E. of the Ordinance, bulk variances will be required for the construction of the proposed single-family addition as follows:

	Required	Existing	Proposed
Minimum Lot Area	12,000 s.f.	5,992.8 s.f.	5,992.8 s.f.
Minimum Lot Width	90 ft.	40 ft.	40 ft.
Minimum Front Setback	30 ft.	26.7 ft.	19.7 ft.
Minimum Side Setback (One)	10 ft.	3.4 ft.	3.4 ft.
Minimum Side Setback (Both)	25 ft.	11.3 ft.	11.3 ft.
Minimum Side Setback (Accessory)	10 ft.	2 ft.	2 ft.
Maximum Lot Coverage	25%	28.4%	38.7%

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. The applicant should provide testimony on the proposed use of the basement level. The drawings indicate a new separate outside entrance to the basement level.
4. Any approval should include a condition that all curb and sidewalk shall be replaced as directed by the Township Engineer. Additionally, a minimum 2-car driveway and concrete apron should be provided.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

Although I have no major objections to this application I see no reason why the basement stairs cannot be moved from this very narrow side line to the rear of the property. This could be accomplished by making the deck smaller or changing the configuration.

Charles Semah, 604 5th Street, affirmed. Would like to put a new kitchen area in the back and renovate the front entrance of the house. The plan does show that there is a back stairway instead of the side. The house got too small for them.

Mr. Priolo – the front setback is consistent with the neighborhood

Lawrence Shreiber, 922 E. County Line Road, affirmed. They will relocate the basement door to the rear and take out a section of the deck.

Open to Public. Closed to Public.

Motion to approve – Mr. Naftali

Second – Mr. Zaks

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Zaks, Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Sernotti

APPEAL #3605 – CONG. BAIS YISROEL, 325 7th Street, Block 96 Lot 8, R-OP zone. Minor subdivision – one lot for a school and the other for multi-family use.

Secretary read reports.

From: Jim Priolo, Engineer/Planner - January 16, 2006

1. The subject property is located on the corner of Seventh Street and River Avenue (Route 9) and is within the ROP (Residential Office Park) Zone. The existing site contains a 3-story building (Capital Hotel). The applicant proposes to demolish a portion of the existing building and renovate the remaining into a school building. The applicant also proposes to construct two, 3-story multi-family buildings. Along with this, the applicant is proposing a conceptual 2-lot subdivision, one lot will contain the school and the other the multi-family buildings.
2. Special Reasons Variances are required as follows:
 - a. Requesting a use in a district restricted against such use. In accordance with Section 903.I.1 of the Ordinance, multi-family homes are not a permitted use in the ROP Zone.
 - b. Requesting an increase in the maximum permitted density. The maximum permitted density in the ROP Zone based on single-family use and lot area is 4.3 units/acre, whereas the applicant is proposing 15 units/acres. It appears the site can yield 5 conforming lots, whereas the applicant is requesting 18 units (multi-family). 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 use in a district restricted against such use.
 - b. An increase in the maximum permitted density.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.
3. Schools are a permitted use in the ROP Zone subject to being in compliance with Section 906 of the Ordinance. During the subdivision/site plan phase of this application, variances will be required as follows:
 - a. A minimum 20 ft. landscaped buffer is required from the residential use, whereas no buffer is proposed.
 - b. Parking has not been addressed for the dormitory rooms. The architectural indicate that 22 dorm rooms will be located within the school building. The applicant should provide parking calculations for each use on site to insure that parking requirements have been met.
4. Should the Board approve the special reasons variances, bulk variances will be required during the subdivision/site plan phases as follows:

	Required ROP	Provided Lot 8.01	Provided Lot 8.02
Front Yard Setback	25 ft. (7th St.)	24.4 ft.	—
Side Yard Setback	12 ft.	5 ft.	—
Rear Yard Setback	15 ft.	7.5 ft.	12 ft.
Maximum Lot Coverage	25%	31.4%	31.2%

5. The proposed units do not provide any storage area for such things as gardening/yard equipment, bicycles and children's outdoor toys. The applicant should discuss storage of these items.
6. The applicant should discuss the method of trash collection for the school. It appears the proposed trash enclosure is for the residential use.
7. The applicant should discuss how stormwater management will be addressed during the site plan phase of this project.
8. Approval of this application is subject to Preliminary and Final Subdivision/Site Plan approval.

From: Ed Mack, Zoning Officer

I think that the two proposed uses of the property will be better than the existing hotel which appears to be in a period of decline. I am disappointed that the new use of the remaining building as a school does not appear to change the floor existing plan, but appears to use the building as is with many small rooms.

I am not opposed to the school use although the first floor plan at least needs to be revised and I would like to get more explanation of the roof top gym.

I would also think that the parking needs to be increased or the amount of residential units needs to be reduced.

Charles P. Tivenan, attorney, represented applicant.

A-1 photos of current state of Capital Hotel

A-2 architectural rendering of the front elevation of the residential structure

Mr. Chairman announced that there were only 6 members present

Mr. Flannery - The Township Committee is in the process of changing the ordinance to allow multi-family use in this zone. Proposing 15 units per acre, 18 multi-family units. This type of housing is needed. It is located in the downtown area.

Mr. Flannery reviewed Mr. Priolo's report. Here for use only will come back for site plan and subdivision approval. There will be an underground recharge system. The school trash also gets picked up by the Township. Dumpsters will be provided with the approval of Public Works. There is an area for the dumpsters. Asking for multi-family use and density.

Mr. Harrison - The school is permitted –only for use for multi-family in the R-OP zone.

Mr. Flannery - On the use variance plan – there will be three multi family buildings.

It was determined that the plans that the board members had were not correct.

Detective Steve Wexler, 231 3rd Street, sworn. Spoke as to the character of Shlomo Meyer and the rehab that he has done in this town. In every project he was cooperative with the Police Department.

Motion to table to July 10th – Mr. Gelley

Second – Mr. Zaks

Roll call vote: affirmative: Mr. Gelley, Ms. Goralski, Mr. Naftali, Mr. Zaks,
Mr. Lieberman, Mr. Sernotti

No further notice and a waiver of time.

RESOLUTIONS

APPEAL # 3593 – CONG. SONS OF ISRAEL, 4th Street & Monmouth Ave, Block 127 Lot 4, B-2 zone. Resolution to approve subdivision and site plan approval to construct 5 townhouses.

Motion to approve – Mr. Naftali

Second – Mr. Gelley

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

APPEAL # 3614 - ALEX KURTEEV, Tower Street, Block 855.04 Lot 26, R-20 zone. Resolution to approve the construction of a single family home – requesting lot width variance 100 feet required 82 feet approved.

Motion to approve – Mr. Lieberman

Second – Mr. Naftali

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

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

Motion to approve – Mr. Lieberman

Second – Mr. Gelley

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

APPEAL # 3611 – MOSES SCHWARTZ, 517 Hope Chapel Road, Block 24.04 Lot 3, R-12 zone. Resolution to approve a use variance for the conversion of a single family dwelling into office space and parking for adjacent congregation and other offices.

Motion to approve – Mr. Lieberman

Second – Mr. Naftali

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

MOTION TO PAY BILLS.

All in favor.

MOTION TO ADJOURN.

All in favor.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,
Fran Siegel, Secretary