

- 5. SP 1957A Beth Medrash Govoha of America**
Forest Ave & Carey Street Block 63, Lots 1 & 4
Extension of Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a school campus

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 6. SP 2214 Torah Temimah of Lakewood Inc**
Lanes Mill Road Block 187.15, Lot 14
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a school and gym

Mrs. Morris recommends they hold off on this resolution as there are still emails going back and forth between the applicants attorney and objecting attorney.

- 7. SP 2222AA Saul Gray**
Pawnee Road Block 2, Lot 52
Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to convert existing house to a school

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 8. SP 2150A Wawa Lakewood LLC**
Route 9 and Prospect Street Block 420; 420.01, Lots 16; 12, 14, & 23
Amended Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan and Minor Subdivision for a convenience store and gas station

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 9. SD 2181 Cedarwood Hills Homeowners Association**
Flannery Avenue & Quick Chek Drive Block 1603.01, Lot 21
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 2 lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 10. SD 2187 Mural Holdings, LLC, c/o Jacob Muller**
Turin Avenue Block 1043, Lots 5 & 7
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 11. SD 2192 Claire Drive LLC**
Claire Drive Block 430, Lots 13-16
Denial of a Minor Subdivision to create six lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

5. ORDINANCES FOR DISCUSSION & CORRESPONDENCE

- **Transportation Improvement District, Impact Fees**

Mrs. Morris said transportation improvement districts one and two have been created some time ago, however, the Committee had never formerly adopted what those fees would be. This is simply the fee schedule proposed to go along with those two improvement districts. There is detailed information regarding trip costs and what those fees per unit will be. She trusts the Committee has reviewed this in depth. It has been prepared by T&M Associates who created the transportation improvement district ordinance.

Mr. Herzl asked if these are the actual costs the Township feels they should contribute.

Mr. Vogt said they are not involved with this. As he understands it, the purpose of the impact fees are to go towards long term improvements. When someone comes in and their application is going to contribute toward future traffic, then there would be a mechanism which allows the Township to collect those fees as part of the approval.

Mr. Herzl said these are not actual costs. It is just a percentage the applicant would have to contribute.

Mr. Vogt said these are the capital fees. The applicant would be responsible for a percentage based upon the impact.

Mr. Flanbaum asked who would calculate these fees.

Mrs. Morris said this ordinance is structured to be in Chapter 18 so she would imagine the same way the board engineer calculates the stormwater maintenance fees which are including in resolution compliance review, he would calculate these impact fees as well.

Mr. Herzl said the application would not be deemed complete until these fees are collected.

Mr. Vogt said the applicant would go through the application process. If the board acts favorably, during the compliance phase, prior to them signing off and the applicant starting construction they would have the fees calculated.

Mr. Flanbaum asked who would calculate the number of trips.

Mr. Vogt said he hasn't had a chance to review this but he would imagine they would get information from the applicant's consultants. They would review and either accept as is or modify the calculations. There are probably formulas they would use based upon the data and costs of improvements needed.

Mr. Herzl said they would not have an exact amount what it would cost.

Mr. Vogt said it is not going to be an exact science.

Mrs. Morris said if you look at the last page, it indicates what the trip per unit/cost per trip calculation is going to be. For a single family detached home, it would be .77 per unit so then you would cross reference that with the area they are in on the cost share analysis page where it has cost per trip. For example, in the Cross/Prospect Street core, it is \$665 per trip. So all of that has been calculated by T&M based off of the anticipated infrastructure and

improvements needed and then balanced against the number of anticipated units and then turned into a calculation to spread that among the number of anticipated units.

Mr. Vogt said he is not positive, but he believes Maser Consulting was also involved in the preparation of this ordinance.

Mr. Flancbaum said it depends on what development area the application is in which is going to determine what the cost per trip is.

Mrs. Morris said it is separated that way because the traffic improvements are split up depending on the needs of that area including traffic lights, road widening, etc. so it is based off of specific anticipated improvements.

Mr. Herzl asked how they know how many trips would take place in a day.

Mrs. Morris said T&M did calculations based off of, she assumes, the current zoning and the anticipated development coming to that area.

Mr. Follman said then the fee would be about \$500 for a single family home which is a joke. It's not nearly what it needs to be.

Mr. Flancbaum said it depends on what development area you're in. For example, if the project is within the Vine Street extension area, the cost per trip is going to be more than \$500.

Mr. Herzl said the highest is near Route 9.

Mr. Follman said the original impact fees discussed a few years ago were \$15,000 to \$20,000 per unit.

Mr. Franklin said this seems fairer. It sounds like they are putting the budget together for the improvements.

Mr. Flancbaum thinks this is good because the fees collected for certain areas will go towards that area as opposed to collecting a flat fee for every unit around town and not knowing where the money is going to go.

Mr. Vogt said that is his understanding.

Mr. Herzl said the cost of improvements are going to be much greater than these fees being collected.

Mr. Flancbaum can only assume that T&M Associates did their due diligence in preparing this ordinance.

Mr. Herzl doesn't know if it is enough but it is defiantly a good start.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mr. Moshe Klein asked why a representative from T&M Associates did not come to help explain this ordinance to the board.

Mrs. Morris said they can certainly carry this to the May 23rd meeting if the board wants an additional presentation from T&M. It looks like the Committee is anticipating to act for second reading on June 8th so May 23rd would still be in advance of that meeting unless the board is comfortable with this as is.

The board was in general agreement that this ordinance be carried to the May 23, 2017 meeting.

- **SP 2221AA Congregation Bais Yesocher Tiferes Aryeh** – request to permit temporary trailers on the site

Mrs. Morris said there was an original restriction in the resolution against permitting temporary trailers. The applicant is here before the board to request to lift that restriction and she believes there is also correspondence from the Brick MUA specifically regarding this correspondence request.

Mr. Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. This is a school on Ridge Avenue and at time of approval, the Rabbi said he had no intention of proposing trailers which was made a condition in the resolution. He doesn't necessarily think the board was against trailers but they happened to ask and the Rabbi gave an answer without having a total understanding of what he was saying. At this point, it certainly makes more sense as this would help them build up for the next school year and provide additional classroom space for these students.

Mr. Franklin asked if they will have a paved parking area.

Mr. Flannery said there is some paved parking area now but this is just temporary. They would at least be paving the handicapped spot.

Mr. Franklin thinks they should pave the entire parking area.

Mr. Flannery said it is an expense to the school.

Mr. Franklin understands but why then do they have an ordinance that says the parking area should be paved. There is a reason for it.

Mr. Herzl asked how many parking spaces are required for this school.

Mr. Flannery said the ordinance requires one space per classroom and one per office. There will be three classrooms and an office so the required spaces would be four which will be paved. They respectfully request then rather doing a full depth pavement, they would do just a base coat knowing that it is something that only has to last three years.

Mr. Follman thought the applicant asked for two years.

Mr. Flannery said the Rabbi is not familiar with the building process. He requests the approval be for three years but if the board want them to come back after two, they would do that.

Mr. Herzl asked if he read the letter from Brick MUA.

Mr. Flannery confirmed, this applicant just like every other applicant in Lakewood would be required to obtain whatever permits necessary. He doesn't necessary think they need one but if it is required they would do that.

Mr. Vogt asked if the applicant would obtain whatever permits necessary before any work is done. He is asking because the letter raises the issue of the potential of a Category One wetlands area and Mr. Franklin had recommended paving. He asked if they would get the State to sign off that this is not C1 waters.

Mr. Flannery said with a C1, if there is already an existing driveway then they are allowed to pave. They would get a professional who would look at the regulations and provide a letter listing why this would be exempt.

Mr. Herzl said they are only paving in the front.

Mr. Flannery said they are paving the area where there is already a driveway. They are not disturbing the riparian buffer.

Mr. Vogt said they would comply with the C1 standards.

Mr. Flannery confirmed.

Mr. Herzl asked if these trailers would be a detriment to the watershed.

Mr. Flannery said absolutely not.

Mr. Follman asked if the board can somehow limit the time extensions for the temporary trailers.

Mrs. Morris thinks the zoning officer issues a three year permit and then two one year extensions.

Mr. Follman said they keep coming back for extensions.

Mr. Herzl said the zoning officer has been very strict about it.

Mr. Follman said the applicant is planning to remove these trailers and build a proper school in the future.

Mr. Flannery confirmed.

Mr. Flancbaum questioned the use of the house.

Mr. Flannery said the portion usable would be an office.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mr. Shlomo Klein was sworn in. He said the original approval was for a change of use and the architectural plans showed bedrooms so he assumed they would want to put in trailers. The Rabbi did give testimony that there would be no trailers. He asked that applicants be truthful to the board.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

A motion was made and seconded to approve temporary trailers on the site with a three year time limit. All were in favor.

- **SD 1939, SD 1967, SD 1978, SD 1979, SD 1997, SD 1998 (Prospect Square)** – request for landscaping revisions

Mrs. Morris said this is a request for landscaping revisions in the backyards between the properties. She feels this is a proper administrative approval request. She does not believe there are any variances associated with these changes but the Township engineer was not comfortable moving landscaping without the board's input.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. The landscaping plan showed trees in the back in between units to give people privacy but the homeowner's prefers to remove the trees to give them more of a backyard and just do normal landscaping around the foundations of the house.

Mr. Herzl asked who the neighbors behind these trees are.

Mr. Flannery said it is all part of this development.

Mr. Follman asked if these houses are built.

Mr. Flannery confirmed, the houses are up and they are getting ready to close.

Mr. Herzl asked if this was noticed.

Mr. Flannery said no, this is an administrative matter. The Township engineer could actually do this on his own because there is no violation in changing this. The builder started putting the trees in and the buyers saw them and complained. If any buyers prefer to keep the trees, they would plant them as it is part of the contract.

Mr. Follman asked if the duplexes back up to each other.

Mr. Flannery said yes, it is duplex to duplex and there are probably six trees behind each house.

Mr. Follman asked how wide the trees are.

Mr. Flannery said the trees would ultimately grow to be 10 ft wide.

Mr. Vogt asked if they still comply with the tree protection ordinance.

Mr. Flannery said they would make sure when they submit revised plans that they still comply. If they need to plant more trees, they would find other places to do that.

Mr. Shlomo Klein was sworn in said there should be something in writing from the buyers stating they do not want the trees.

Mr. Aharon Mansour, 709 Park Avenue, was sworn in. Mr. Mansour is also a builder in Lakewood and believes he is taking down the trees to avoid an even bigger headache with the homeowners.

Mr. Moshe Rittrin was sworn in. He is prospective buyer and this is something a lot of the buyers do not need and do not want as it takes away from the backyard.

Mr. Shlomo Zolden was sworn in. He is also a prospective buyer and would prefer to remove the trees as they make the property much smaller. The trees are not along the property line as there is drainage along there.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mr. Herzl does not want to deceive any potential buyers with the assumption they would have these trees. That is why he asked if this was noticed.

Mrs. Morris said all of the properties are still owned by the developer, the potential buyers would not be noticed.

Mr. Follman said the engineer confirmed the trees are part of the contract if any buyer prefers to have them.

Mr. Flancbaum doubts the trees are specifically mentioned in the contract.

Mr. Flannery said all of the contracts are based on the plans and the plans show the trees so anybody who wants trees can have them.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the landscaping change conditioned upon compliance with the Tree Protection Ordinance.

All were in favor.

- **SP 2163 The TTY Foundation** – clarification on variances previously granted

Mrs. Morris said this is a clarification on variances previously granted. It is her understanding that the plans approved by the Board were signed off and the site was constructed as such. However, the verbal testimony given at the meeting was in contrast to what was shown on the plans so the resolution is not specific as to what variances were granted. A neighbor had brought up a question as to whether a front setback variance was granted and looking back at the testimony, they have discovered that clarification was needed. This is also the intersection where there was that question about the curb being in the wrong spot and is too far within the right-of-way.

Mr. Vogt said this is the other side of the Cross Street/Biltmore Avenue area.

Mrs. Morris said there is a letter from Mr. Krupnick who is the owner of the property on the other side. He recommends that since the applicant is here requesting clarification on that variance, perhaps the board can do something concerning the curb being too far out into the right-of-way.

Mr. Follman asked if the Township is responsible to move the curb.

Mr. Vogt said it is still going back and forth. The applicant's engineer is dealing with Ocean County as to the final approvals on the road. That was a result of the minor subdivision on the opposite side of the road. The variance in question is a secondary front yard setback. It was identified on the plans and in their review letter. The testimony was not consistent with the plans and the letter and that is why the applicant is here.

Mr. Grunberger arrived.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein Esq. explained that both the plans as well as the notice actually contained reference that the applicant was seeking a variance for front yard setback of 22 ft where 30 ft is required. For some reason, there was some testimony that seemed to say that the front yard setback was 30 ft rather than 22 ft. Therefore, when the resolution was passed, there was no mention of the granting of the variance but it was shown on the plans, it was referenced in the board engineer's letter and her legal notice. What was built matches exactly what was shown on the plans. The only thing that doesn't match is the resolution which the neighbor pointed out that variance was not granted. They are asking that the resolution be amended to include that variance.

Mrs. Morris did go back and listen to the recording and she thinks it was just a clear mistake in the testimony that was provided.

Mr. Vogt said this was a secondary frontage so there may have been confusion at the hearing talking about the 30 ft being the primary.

Mrs. Weinstein believes the professional who provided the testimony must have been somewhat confused because there were the two front yard setbacks and that's why it happened. It was clearly a mistake and the testimony did not match what was shown on the plans.

Mr. Herzl questioned the curb within the right-of-way.

Mr. Abe Auerbach was sworn in. That street has been there for the past 15 years or so when the last development was built. They did not touch Biltmore, they did not add any curb. The only curb they touched was to repair a curb that cracked by the apron. The sidewalk was always there and again, they did no improvements on Biltmore. He spoke to the Township engineer and pulled it up on Google Earth and went back to see everything was there years ago. This school is not fronting or touching Biltmore.

Mr. Shlomo Klein was sworn in. The attorney gave testimony that the 22 ft front yard setback variance was listed in the notice but as somebody pointed out, it might be 50 ft required.

Mr. Vogt said that was pointed out in their letter.

Mr. Klein said therefore the notice was wrong.

Mrs. Weinstein disagreed, the notice was correct. It is within the HD-7 zone where 50 ft is required. There were two front yard setbacks, one was 30 ft and the other was 22 ft. The legal notice provided for tonight does state the applicant is seeking a variance of 22 ft whereas 30 ft is required but it should be 50 ft.

Mr. Klein said currently on Biltmore there is sidewalk and the property is extended to the middle of the road. The Township ordinance requires developers to repair any infrastructure on the properties frontage and within the right-of-way no matter how bad it was before. The proper proceeding should have been that the applicant come before the board and ask for the variance as well as a waiver for not completing the road. The applicant is claiming they are not required to do it but they are. The board didn't require them to request a waiver and therefore the engineering department gets stuck with the problem. The applicant should be required to ask for the waiver just like every other applicant even if it is a Yeshiva.

Mr. Moshe Zeines, 112 Elmhurst Boulevard, was sworn. He lives down the block from the Yeshiva. He witnessed the applicant put in the sidewalk as he frequents that road. The applicant is coming in and telling the board they didn't touch Biltmore which is not true. They ripped up the existing sidewalk and installed new sidewalk in the same incorrect spot. The applicant should have put the sidewalk in the correct place but they didn't do that as the boys would have less room to play. The engineering department didn't catch on to this but the applicant's engineer should have caught it and done it right. It is very difficult for buses to make the turn from Biltmore onto Cross. They have to drive onto part of the pavement across the street in order to turn.

Mr. Vogt said this is a clarification of the setback for the dormitory.

Mr. Herzl asked what is being done about the sidewalk.

Mr. Vogt said the applicant for the subdivision on the other side of the street, per the approval, is dealing with Ocean County engineering and they are trying to develop a mutual acceptable road improvement at the intersection. They will probably have a meeting with the applicant, the Township and County sometime in the future.

Mr. Herzl said the County will probably ask them to remove the sidewalk.

Mrs. Morris said any CAFRA applications are sent to the Township clerk who gives them to the engineering department. Any violations from the soils district or CAFRA comes to the engineering so that they can issue stop work orders. She has not seen anything from CAFRA regarding any sort of violation for this property.

Mr. Klein said there was testimony that this property was not restricted by CAFRA. As he recalls, the reason why these properties were restricted to CAFRA is because of the sewer system and this property was part of that neighborhood regardless if they attach to sewer or not.

Mr. Flannery said this area needed a CAFRA permit because when NJAW extended their water main through to Oak Street, the engineer did that prepared the permit listed all the blocks that would have a secondary impact on this lot was excluded. The lot has an existing house on it which is already tied into public sewer. You get into CAFRA if you have a sewer extension over 1,200 ft, if you have shared infrastructure or if you have more than 74 units. This project is exempt from CAFRA, it is always going to be exempt from CAFRA and it does not need a permit. If there was a CAFRA violation, the Township engineer and applicant would be aware of it. He has no knowledge of any violation and would assume it would be available if there was.

Mr. Klein said there are a lot of problems going on concerning the basements and attics within the Oak Street Core. They were not allowed to question it before because they were administrative minors and were given special treatment of getting it approved but now they have an obligation to address this problem. As these units are being sold, they are being advertised with two rentable basements plus a rentable attic.

Mr. Follman said they should make sure there is no staircase outside going upstairs into the attic.

Mr. Klein said there are thousands of apartments that have illegal basements. The builders are not putting in sprinkler systems and there is not enough parking when these apartments are being rented out.

Mr. Herzl asked what the requirements are for parking.

Mr. Vogt said per the UDO standard, the number of parking depends on the number of bedrooms. It starts with 4 and can go to 5 up to a 9th bedroom.

Mrs. Morris said the Township parking requirements are in excess of RSIS. That was changed a number of years ago given the anticipation of basement rentals. Any basement, regardless of whether it is finished, counts as two bedrooms. Any room over 70 sf with a window and a closet is considered a bedroom, regardless of how it is labeled on the architectural plans. When the Township engineer reviews a building permit, he counts up all the bedrooms, potential bedrooms, basement and then there is a direct calculation for how many parking spaces are required based off of that.

Mr. Herzl asked if the maximum number of spaces required is 5.

Mrs. Morris said once you hit 9 bedrooms for the entire unit then 5 spaces are required.

Mr. Vogt wants the board to keep in mind what the engineering department is looking at is when the house is first built. If someone wants to come back and renovate the basement, they would not see that. They see it when it is first constructed only.

Mrs. Morris said the Township engineer essentially disregards what the Planning Board is granting with respect to parking unless a variance is granted. There may be testimony given that four parking spaces are being provided but the engineer may determine additional parking is required at time of plot plan review.

Mr. Vogt said 4 spaces may turn into 5, it would not turn into 3.

Mr. Herzl questioned the sprinkler system.

Mrs. Morris said the building department completely governs that.

Mr. Vogt said it is a building code issue. The board should not be delving into that.

Mr. Herzl said the board is not approving or disapproving, if it is needed then the Township would require them to put it in.

Mr. Vogt said any residential or non-residential structure is going to be subject to building code review.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mr. Flannery said the applicant would follow the law which is one rentable basement. When people converted to that, they need to get a building department so they put in the sprinklers, fire separation, parking and have the appropriate living spaces. There probably are illegal basements in Lakewood but that is not the board's job to stop that. The board's job is to look at the ordinance and this application complies completely with the ordinance.

Mr. Grunberger said the basement should be considered an additional unit, not just an additional bedroom so it should require more parking.

Mrs. Morris said it is her understanding that the building department has technical classifications for building type with respect to building code which may differ from the typical definitions they use for their ordinance. She believes that actually when there is a rentable basement, the building department calls it a two family home because that is the way the code is classified. Per ordinance, the basement is counted as two bedrooms regardless of how it is inhabited and how it is split up.

Mr. Herzl said the board is always requiring 4 spaces. If there are more than 9 bedrooms then the applicant agrees to go to 5.

Mr. Flannery confirmed and if you put in 6 bedrooms in the basement and 12 bedrooms upstairs then you should have more parking than that. The Lakewood ordinance exceeds RSIS. The RSIS is the maximum that you are allowed to require by a municipality. He hasn't heard any complaints that the Township standards requires more because it makes sense just like the 32 ft wide roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

3. SD 2207 Spring 48, LLC

Sims Avenue

Blocks 803 & 804, Lots 1 & 2

Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 10 lots

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 12, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mrs. Morris received correspondence at about 5:30 today. Apparently this subdivision is proposing to utilize the neighboring pump station which is a private pump station on private property. That neighbor has written a letter to

the board requesting they table the application until the neighbor has had time to figure out what this applicant intends to do. It was her understanding from Mr. Lines office that this applicant was willing to table.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esq. was advised of the letter when he walked into the meeting. The applicant is on his way and requested that this be heard later in the evening.

Mr. Vogt said submission waivers include topography, contours and made-made features within 200 ft as well as an environmental impact statement. Waivers are recommended, provided topography is added and submitted for the adjoining right-of-ways of lot 2 in block 804. EIS can only be waived based on their review of NJDEP GIS mapping. The applicant will need to comply with the tree protection ordinance.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waiver as recommended by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Vogt said variances are required including minimum lot depth, side yard setback, proposed radial right-of-way dedications. Potential design waivers from improving Towers Street with pavement, curb, sidewalk, street lighting and street trees, from providing shade tree and utility easement along all project frontages, from providing sidewalk along the Bellinger Street and South Bell Avenue project frontages and from planting street trees along the Bellinger Street and South Bell Avenue project frontages.

Mr. Pfeffer said they disagree on the side yard setback being required but they would provide testimony on that. The one real variance they have is for lot 1.01 for lot depth.

Mr. Vogt asked if all of the design waivers are still being sought.

Mr. Pfeffer confirmed. This is an application for 10 townhouse units in 3 separate buildings along Sims Avenue.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. A minimum lot depth variance is requested for lot 1.01 which is a triangular lot. The lot depth required by ordinance is 80 ft which they have behind the building. It is because the lot is a triangle and when you average it out it comes to less than 80 ft. In his testimony they comply with the intent of the ordinance and it is a very large beautiful lot. It is a C1 variance as the triangle shape of the property creates that hardship. A minimum side yard setback of the end units is required. The ordinance permits 12 ft between buildings which is what's there.

Mr. Herzl asked if a lot area variance is being requested on the smaller lot.

Mr. Flannery said no lot area or density variances are being requested. The ordinance does allow 12 ft between the townhouse units which is what was provided and have provided more than the 12 ft side yard setback on the ends. The other thing to point out is they are doing this in 3 buildings but could have done this in 2 buildings which wouldn't have looked as nice and would have had a big space in the middle. The radial right-of-way dedications would be worked out during resolution compliance. Most of the design waivers requested are for the future vacant lot. This is a property where there is a right-of-way vacation and in order for that vacation to be included in this lot normally it would be subdivided down the middle but the adjoining applicant is part of the application and have shown their lot on the plans and those are the frontages they don't want to improve because they are not doing anything there now. At some point in the future, someone would come to the board to get approval and at that point all of those improvements would be put in. They are agreeing along their frontages to do the shade trees, curbs, sidewalks and everything else required. All other items would be addressed during resolution compliance.

Mr. Herzl asked if these units have basements.

Mr. Flannery said yes.

Mr. Herzl asked how many parking spaces are being provided.

Mr. Flannery said 4 stacked parking spaces.

Mr. Franklin asked if Towers is going to go through in the future.

Mr. Flannery does not expect it to be. If you look at the development pattern in the area, he does not expect it to be cut through.

Mrs. Morris said there is a portion of Towers which was vacated right at the intersection so it physically can't go through.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct.

Mr. Franklin asked how they would get out of Towers Street on the other end if it doesn't go all the way through.

Mr. Flannery said they would have to go down Bellinger Street.

Mr. Franklin asked how the traffic would work without Towers cutting through.

Mr. Flannery said they would all go out to Sims and then to Bellinger. Charity Tull was vacated along with pieces of Towers Street and they did that because the people on Albert Avenue did not want traffic from this area coming through. It didn't make sense from a planning perspective and it was done to satisfy a few neighbors on Albert Avenue.

Mr. Follman asked if they could unvacate a road.

Mrs. Morris doesn't believe so. She is sure there is some mechanism for eminent domain.

Mr. Flannery said it is the current governing body who vacated it.

Mrs. Morris asked if the applicant has come to some sort of agreement concerning the easements on the adjoining property.

Mr. Pfeffer said they are not asking for any easements on their property.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said this street was vacated a few months ago by the Township Committee. He questioned why this was being done and their response was to help out a Yeshiva. He later found out the intent was to be able to build more townhouses. He asked why the applicant is asking for waivers if it connects to South Bell. He asked the board to require additional parking for basement apartments.

Mr. Flannery said there is a school to the north of this property. There is no purpose to improve the street as the school takes up the whole lot and there is no access.

Mr. Klein said the Township Committee instructed the board to stop giving waivers because in the end the tax payers are getting stuck with it.

Mr. Eisenberger was sworn in. He is the dean of the school next to this property. He attempted to resolve a number of issues with the applicant but they did not get back to him. He requested additional time so they could hire an attorney in order to get the proper representation.

Mr. Pfeffer does not recall receiving the message. A letter was shown to him as he walked into the meeting indicated there are concerns. The application has only one small variance for lot depth, otherwise they have a fully conforming application.

Mr. Eisenberger said there is a concern the units are very close to their pool which creates a privacy concern. The plans they have also show easements on their property and that they would be using their sewer pump station. In addition, there is only one road into Sims Avenue, which they paved in order to get the school and they are concerned they would not have any access for their students to get to school. There could be additional concerns but he would like the opportunity to hire a lawyer.

Mr. Herzl asked how far away the units are from the pool.

Mr. Pfeffer said approximately 80 ft. They are not asking for any side or rear yard variances to their property.

Mr. Joseph Kociuba, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. The pool is located to the north of their property across the Towers Street frontage. Their pool is actually in a front yard. They provided a front yard setback on Towers Street which is required and conforming. He would have to look at the survey but he would estimate the pool is probably 30 or 40 ft away from their property. It is on the other side of the Towers Street paper street. If you add that all together, the pool itself is probably about 100 ft away.

Mr. Flancbaum asked if that part of Towers is vacated.

Mr. Kociuba said no, it is a buffer between their lots.

Mr. Pfeffer said there is an easement shown but they are not asking for it.

Mr. Flancbaum asked what easement they are referring to.

Mr. Kociuba said there was a utility easement for sewer connection. They can realign the sewer connection at a different location.

Mr. Herzl asked if the lot depth variance is near the school.

Mr. Pfeffer said it is on the other side of Towers Street. It is the last house being built away from the school.

Mr. Herzl said there are no variances necessary next to the school.

Mr. Pfeffer confirmed.

Mr. Flancbaum said the applicant also has concerns about access during construction.

Mrs. Morris said the school lot was actually created as part of the Somerset subdivision to the north. Her understanding is the school lot was originally designed to have access to the north and this portion of Sims Avenue, which the neighbor is concerned would be blocked off, was actually a fringe benefit for them that they have been able to access because that northern portion of Sims hasn't been constructed yet. She is not even sure who should be benefiting from that portion of Sims. She thinks it was built by a different developer and the school has been able to take advantage of that.

Mr. Flannery said people build houses on streets all the time and don't block the streets. There is no reason why they would be blocking the street.

Mr. Follman asked if there is any on-street parking available.

Mr. Kociuba said there is no construction on the opposite side of the street so there is on-street parking for the entire length of Sims.

Mr. Follman said someone will build there eventually. He asked if there is any available on-street parking on their side of the street.

Mr. Kociuba said the driveways take up the majority of the road with the exception of the wide lot.

Mr. Follman said it is a shame to lose all of that on-street parking due to the driveways.

Mr. Pfeffer said because lot 1.01 is oversized, they probably could get in some additional parking spaces.

Mr. Herzl asked about trash pickup.

Mr. Kociuba said trash pickup would be at the street just like any other home.

Mr. Herzl asked if they have sufficient room to put out trash cans with all the driveways.

Mr. Kociuba said yes, these lots are deep so there would be plenty of room between the driveway and unit.

Mr. Herzl is concerned that the cans would be blocking driveways.

Mr. Kociuba said the lots are 25 ft wide, the driveways are 18 ft wide so there is 7 ft on each lot.

Mr. Franklin said it will be tight but they will work it out.

Mr. Eisenberger is concerned about the grading of the property. Their property looks to be significantly higher and he is concerned about privacy.

Mr. Herzl said the pool is across the street.

Mr. Pfeffer said it is a minimum of 80 ft away. It depends on how far their pool is from the property line.

Mr. Follman said there really isn't anything they can do with that.

Mr. Eisenberger again requested to be given more time to hire an attorney.

Mr. Flancbaum said this is an application with virtually no variances besides the lot depth variance which is hundreds of feet away from their school. The pool is over 100 ft away and the easement/pump station issue has also gone away.

Mr. Herzl said the applicant noticed 10 days ago. He doesn't think it is fair to the applicant to carry this.

Mr. Pfeffer pointed out they were here two weeks ago but there was not a quorum.

Mr. Flannery said the notice was given 10 days before that meeting.

Mr. Eisenberger said he just got the notice a week ago because it went to Somerset Pines.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Hibberson, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Follman, Ms. Zografos

No: Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Franklin

4. SP 2230 Summit Court Shul

Summit Court

Block 423, Lot 38

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a synagogue

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 17, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Vogt said submission waivers are required including topography, contours and man-made features within 200 ft, an environmental impact statement and a tree protection management plan. The waivers are supported, a tree protection management plan shall be provided as a condition of approval.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waiver as recommended by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Vogt said variances include minimum lot area, width, rear yard setback, maximum building coverage, perimeter buffer relief and a potential issue with the proposed ADA space being within 5 ft of the adjoining property.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. said this shul would be constructed at the bulb of the cul-de-sac of Summit Court which would have a basement apartment to house the Rabbi. This is a pretty isolated neighborhood so there is a need for a shul in this area. The people that live in this neighborhood do not want their children to cross Prospect Street so they decided to build a shul and it is really meant to be a small neighborhood shul. There will be no Simcha hall, it was initially shown on the plans but was since eliminated. There are some variances requested, most notably because the lot itself does not conform to the requirements of the R-12 zone in which it is located. The lot is 9,221 sf so it is undersized and it has a lot width of 80.5 ft where 90 ft is requested so those are obviously existing conditions. There is also a variance for lot coverage which is again necessitated by the fact that the lot is undersized. As for the variance for the ADA ramp in the rear of the property which is 6 ft from the rear yard setback, they actually believe this one is a grey area whether or not in fact it is a variance but in an abundance of caution since the board engineer identified it as a variance they have noticed it as such. The handicap ramp is rather high and the reason for that is because there is an apartment in the basement where the Rabbi is going to be living and wanted to be able to get sunlight into the apartment.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. As indicated in the board engineer's report, a lot area variance is required. The lot is 9,221 sf whereas the ordinance requires 12,000 sf. This is an existing condition and as the board

can see on the map, there are houses on each side of it. There is a house on this lot which the Rabbi currently lives in which he is proposing to knock down so he can provide this shul and a residence as well. A minimum lot variance of 80.5 ft whereas 90 ft is required is an existing condition as well. The minimum rear yard setback, the board engineer's office indicates the ramp violates that. He would argue that the ordinance allows handicap ramps within 3 ft of the property line but even if the board does decide a variance is needed, certainly the benefits outweigh the detriments as it is providing handicap access to the shul on the first floor. A maximum building coverage variance of 27.2% is requested whereas 25% is required. The reason for that is the Rabbi has to have his residence on one floor and provide a shul.

Mr. Herzl asked how many parking spaces are required.

Mr. Flannery said 7 spaces are provided. The sanctuary space is 962 sf which would require 2 spaces and the house would require 3 spaces.

Mr. Herzl thought the parking requirements for shuls were changed.

Mrs. Morris said the board has made recommendations but nothing has been officially adopted by the Committee yet.

Mr. Flannery explained that even if the ordinance said more is required, this is a neighborhood shul. All of these people live in close proximity and it is not bringing people from other areas to pray. This is a man that is knocking his house down and building a shul so that the residents in the area can pray without crossing busy roads.

Mr. Herzl asked if there is on-street parking.

Mr. Flannery said there is limited on-street parking. It certainly would be his testimony that people are going to be attending this shul live in the area and it would be a very short walk. At present time, the ordinance requires 5 spaces and they are providing 7 spaces.

Mr. Herzl said that is not sufficient parking for a shul.

Mrs. Weinstein said it is a small shul.

Mr. Follman said 10 people are required for a minyan so they are short 3 spots.

Mr. Herzl asked how far away the hospital is from this property.

Mr. Flannery said the hospital is a block or two away.

Mr. Herzl asked if it is possible to get any more parking spaces on the property.

Mr. Flannery said no, this is the maximum. In order to accommodate the Rabbi's family and have the shul for the neighborhood then this is the most they can fit.

Mr. Herzl said they agree to no outside Simchas/parties and they are providing sidewalks.

Mr. Flannery confirmed. Perimeter buffer relief is required. If the neighbor wants a fence on the property line, the applicant would agree to it. In the rear, there are trees and an open space between the townhouses and the High Point apartments.

Mr. Vogt thinks the site plan shows fencing around the perimeter.

Mr. Flannery said the report indicates the ADA ramp is 5 ft within adjoining lot 37. He thinks if you look at the plan, it is not part of the ramp when it's in that close proximity. The ramp starts a little further away so it is his testimony this variance is not required, but if the board feels it is then the benefits certainly outweigh the detriments.

Mr. Vogt said the area of the ramp closest to lot 37 would virtually be at grade.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct, it would not be elevated.

Mr. Vogt said a 4 ft high vinyl fence up to the setback and a 6 ft past that is proposed. Practically speaking, the owners of lot 37 are not going to see that part of the ramp.

Mr. Flannery confirmed.

Mr. Herzl asked about the refuge enclosure.

Mr. Flannery said the cans would be rolled out to the curb and they would go behind the building. There is an area shown on the side toward the back.

Mr. Herzl asked if he agrees to the rest of the comments in the report.

Mr. Flannery agreed.

Mr. Herzl asked how many prayer services will be taking place during the day.

Mrs. Weinstein said it is only going to be used on the Sabbath. There are not going to be weekday services but to be safe, she does not want that to be made a condition of the resolution because the board members as well as herself knows what happens a few years down the road the neighbors want to use it during the week as well.

Mr. Herzl asked if they could limit it to one minyan in the morning and one at night.

Mrs. Weinstein agrees.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mr. Shlomo Klein was sworn in. He questioned the number of parking spaces on the architectural plans.

Mr. Flannery said those plans do not show the handicapped space. The parking proposed is in accordance with the plan which includes 3 stacked parking spaces which are for the residents.

Mr. Klein said the Planning Board sent recommendations to the Township Committee concerning parking for the shuls and they have ignored them which he finds unacceptable. He thinks stacked parking does not work. There is not a mechanism in Lakewood to enforce restrictions of when people can pray at shuls.

Mr. Follman said the board can only do so much.

Mr. Herzl said they are not the enforcing agency. They can condition the approval but do not enforce those conditions.

Mr. Klein said the usage of the property is not an enforceable condition. The board cannot enforce how many minyans take place.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mrs. Weinstein said the stacked parking spaces are really for the Rabbi and his wife. They're the ones who are going to be willing to get blocked in.

Mr. Herzl said in the future, schools and shuls need to provide as much parking as possible. They did recommend to the Committee it should be 1 space per 100 sf.

Mrs. Weinstein said in this particular instance it is impossible. You are talking about a neighborhood where there is no land to acquire to put a shul so the Rabbi is giving up his house and property. If there were more room, they would have definitely provided additional parking but they will keep that in mind in the future.

Mr. Herzl understands it is not enforceable but the shul would agree to keep it to one minyan as there is no parking.

Mrs. Weinstein agreed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Follman, Ms. Zografos

No: Mr. Hibberson

5. SD 2208 Prospect St. Holdings, LLC

Blanche Street

Block 445, Lots 9 & 19

Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 9 lots

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 17, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mrs. Morris said there were recent changes to the plans. They were requesting four duplex buildings but have reduced it to three and have increased the size of the proposed parking lot based off meetings with neighbors in the area. She anticipates they will have an exhibit to show the board which explains those changes. Hopefully their attorney can indicate whether or not the notice provided is still adequate as well.

Mr. Vogt said their review letter was based on four duplex units. The proposal which the board does not have in front of them is for three units which in theory is a good thing but the board does not have the plans. The setbacks and variances conditions are going to change with that reduction as well.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esq. said this was originally a proposal for four duplex buildings with one remaining lot for a synagogue. After meeting with the neighbors, they have decided to take one duplex out and are now coming before the board with three duplexes and a synagogue and would be increasing parking by 30 spaces for that synagogue.

Mr. Herzl said they are removing one duplex to add parking in order to appease the neighbors.

Mr. Follman asked if the other units are staying in the same spot. They are removing one of the duplexes and adding parking in that area.

Mr. Pfeffer said that is correct. They are actually reducing the number of variances and are able to make this a better application. This is probably something the board would want to see if they had come in with four duplexes.

Mr. Vogt said he is looking at the originally filed plans as well as the new plans. He asked if the three units remaining are along Amsterdam Avenue.

Mr. Pfeffer said that is correct.

Mr. Vogt said they are removing one duplex unit and the playground in order to provide more parking. It looks like the unit on the corner of Amsterdam Avenue and Blanche Street is moved further back from Amsterdam.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. said that is correct. In addition, the duplex lots have been increased. The initial application had 8,500 sf lot and the revised plans show 9,000 and 10,000 sf lots.

Mr. Herzl asked why they are increasing the lot sizes.

Mr. Flannery said in order to satisfy the neighbors and to provide the area needed for parking. In order to get more parking and accommodate the shul the neighbors wanted they had to lose a lot.

Mrs. Morris said it looks like they had a conforming front yard setback to Columbus Avenue before but now they are asking for a 5 ft setback variance.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed they are asking for a 5.5 ft front yard setback from Columbus Avenue where on the original application it was closer to 10 ft.

Mrs. Morris pointed out they are also asking for a 22.5 ft setback from Blanche Street.

Mr. Flannery said it was shown in the table on the original plans but it does not show the dimensions.

Mr. Vogt asked if their advertisement is still valid.

Mr. Pfeffer said yes. They are presenting the original application but have agreed with the neighbors to take out a duplex and increase the parking. Any other variance created should be covered under the catch-all statement. He understands it would be at the applicant's risk to move forward but he does feel that based upon the notice provided and the application is only improving. He would understand if they were increasing the number of units but they are actually making this a better application and believe they can go forward.

Mr. Vogt asked if they are exasperating any variances or waivers which were identified in the previous review of the original design.

Mr. Flannery said the only variance he sees is the 5.5 ft front setback to the shul.

Mrs. Morris said there is also a side setback for the shul lot of 5 ft where 7 ft is required.

Mr. Vogt said submission waivers are required including an environmental impact statement and a tree protection management plan. The waivers are supported as the site contains no environmental constraints. A tree protection management plan may be waived for completeness purposes but will be required during resolution compliance, if approved.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waiver as recommended by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Vogt asked the applicant to clarify which variances are being requested.

Mr. Flannery said the report prepared indicated a variance is required for minimum lot area. They now have two lots which are 10,000 sf and the other lots are over 9,000 sf which is an improvement over the previous design. A minimum front yard setback of 22.5 ft from Blanche Street is still being requested. The variances for the synagogue would be dealt with under the site plan application. One additional design waiver is being requested at this time. Since the parking is coming off Blanche Street, they now have the shul facing Blanche so that changes the fronts, sides and the rear. Now the property line to the north would be the rear setback where 15 ft is required. The front setback to Columbus they are asking for 5.5 ft where 15 ft is required. They are also asking for a design waiver to not construct Columbus because they are not doing any development along Columbus. They would develop Blanche and would put radius turns so there would be a provision for turnaround and to extend that road in the future.

Mr. Herzl asked if Columbus is a paper street.

Mr. Flannery confirmed. It proceeds to the north. There are townhouses which front on Prospect Street and there is a 10 ft retaining wall so that street is never going to be a through street. The synagogue would need a 5.5 ft setback variance to the paper street and a 5 ft side setback to the new proposed lot. No setback variances are being requested from the adjacent existing townhouse development.

Mr. Pfeffer said the applicant agrees to the rest of the comments in the engineer's report.

Mr. Flannery said this zone allows townhouses so they could build 9 townhouses by right with 3 triplexes but the applicant is only proposing 3 duplexes. It is his testimony that this is a better zoning alternative as well as the shul benefiting the neighborhood.

Mrs. Morris said there is a panhandle portion of the synagogue lot that goes along lot 9.01. She asked if there is a reason for that. If they incorporated that area in lot 9.01 and lot 9.02 then they could eliminate the lot area variance.

Mr. Flannery said that is an area for sewer and water. If they were in the MUA area then they could do an easement but they are unable to do that with NJAW.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mr. Shlomo Klein was sworn in. He is concerned the public did not have a chance to look at the revised plans. He said the plans must be submitted to the board 10 days prior to the meeting for the public to come look at. He noted there are many objectors in the audience.

Mr. Herzl said perhaps they should wait for a revised review letter before proceeding as there are objectors.

Mr. Pfeffer said he would like to hear from the objectors before the board makes a decision.

Mr. Klein said the previous application showed Columbus improved with sidewalks. He questioned how people are supposed to walk to the shul when there are no sidewalks.

Mr. Shlomo Slomovitz, 70 Capital Lane, was sworn in. He lives directly across the street in Prospect Park. He first heard this developer was building a shul on a one acre lot. Now they are coming in and building a shul along with duplexes. This lot was supposed to be completely used for a shul with parking. The applicant was required to build a synagogue per the resolution from a previous approval.

Mrs. Morris said there was a condition that was attached to one or two of the Prospect Square applications that the applicant provide a community building. This application, in her opinion, stands on its own. Whether or not it comes to meet the requirements for those other subdivisions has yet to be determined. The board still needs to act on this application individually even if this shul is not meeting those requirements. Then the developer will be out of luck and must build a shul which does meet those requirements or he won't get CO's for those other units but the board can't deny this simply based off the fact that it does not meet the requirements for another application.

Mr. Slomovitz opposes any variances requested as it imposes on their privacy.

Mr. Zev Stern, 3 Capital Lane, was sworn in. He also lives in Prospect Park and strongly opposes the application as it will only benefit the developer. The proposed parking is insufficient for the hundreds of families which are going to be praying daily at this synagogue.

Mr. Moshe Wagner, 30 Capital Lane, was sworn in. He is a member of the HOA of Prospect Park and is against this application.

Mr. Herzl asked if this lot was designated for a shul.

Mrs. Morris said it was not designated for anything. It is a lot that the developer has decided to put a shul on and is hoping it would fill his requirement which has yet to be determined. It is not the board's obligation to ensure the applicant meets that requirement.

Mr. Grunberger asked who would ensure the shul conforms.

Mr. Morris imagines that when the developer applies for CO's, the Township engineer would have to confirm they are meeting all of the requirements of the resolution and one of those requirements was a specific condition that the developer offer a community within a certain distance and size.

Mr. Pfeffer said this is an independent application. They have no objection tabling the subdivision for the moment and going to the site plan for the synagogue in order to provide testimony and proofs before going back to the subdivision.

Mr. Herzl asked that the applicant come back as there is a lot of opposition and the board does not have a clear picture.

Mr. Vogt said they need revised plans which must be reviewed and then the applicant can come back.

Mr. Pfeffer does not think there is anything they can do to make the objectors happy. The applicant understands the variances requested, copies of the revised plans have been provided and they would re-notice for the next meeting.

Mr. Vogt said the concept has changed. The board is leaning towards not hearing this application tonight. He asked what would change in two weeks. They need time to review the revised plans.

Mr. Pfeffer said the plans have already been revised.

Mr. Franklin said if the plans aren't changing then there is no need to come back, the board should vote on it now as they are not approving a 5 ft front yard setback.

- 10. SP 2228 Brooks Developers, LLC c/o Noach Schon**
East County Line Road Block 208.01, Lots 33, 75.01, & 75.02
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Minor Subdivision for a retail building

Mrs. Morris announced the applicant has requested to carry this project until further notice.

- 11. SP 2229 Adil Homes, LLC**
East County Line Road Block 190, Lots 73.25-73.27
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a retail and office building

Mrs. Morris announced the applicant has requested to carry this project until further notice.

- 12. SP 2233 Zichron Chaim Inc.**
New Hampshire Avenue Block 1159.03, Lot 13
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a school

Mrs. Morris announced the applicant has requested to carry this project until further notice.

7. OAK STREET CORE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SUBDIVISIONS

- **SD 2228AO Mark Properties, LLC**, Block 1048, Lots 1 & 5

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated March 28, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2237AO SGKL, LLC**, Block 1045, Lot 3

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 4, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2238AO SGKL, LLC**, Block 1026, Lot 8

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 4, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2239AO SGKL, LLC**, Block 1037, Lot 7

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 4, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2240AO Oak Street 2B, LLC**, Block 1042, Lots 4 & 5

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 4, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2241AO Yosef Rabinowitz**, Block 1027, Lot 7

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 13, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2244AO Richard Krupnick**, Block 1025, Lot 3

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 13, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2245AO Richard Krupnick**, Block 1026, Lot 6

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 13, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2246AO Richard Krupnick**, Block 1036, Lot 6

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 13, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2247AO Mark Properties, LLC**, Block 1036, Lot 3

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 18, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2248AO Mark Properties, LLC**, Block 1035 ,Lots 1, 3, & 7

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 18, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2249AO Whiting Pines Realty Corp**, Block 1049, Lot 6

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 18, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2250AO Suburban Agency, Inc**, Block 1025, Lot 5

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 18, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2251AO Chateau Land 1, LLC**, Block 1042, Lot 1

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 26, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2256AO Barbara Flannery**, Block 1025, Lot 2

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated April 26, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- **SD 2257AO SCS Property Group**, Block 1038, Lot 1

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated May 1, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

All were in favor.

- **SD 2258AO Oak Vine Development, LLC**, Block 1035, Lots 4 & 5

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated May 1, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

All were in favor.

- **SD 2259AO Oak Vine Development, LLC**, Block 1027, Lot 8

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated May 1, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

All were in favor.

- **SD 2260AO Shvat II, LLC**, Block 1035, Lot 6

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated May 1, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Herzl confirmed no variances are being requested and sidewalks are being provided.

Mr. Vogt said on the property frontages, yes.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He confirmed these are conforming applications and all of the improvements are being installed per the ordinance.

Mr. Shlomo Klein said the Planning Board is approving 80 duplexes plus basements and attics. Some of these applications are missing sidewalks and roads.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.
All were in favor.

- 8. PUBLIC PORTION**
- 9. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
- 10. APPROVAL OF BILLS**
- 11. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary