1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Neiman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Ally Morris read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings Act:

"The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the *Asbury Park Press* and posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood. Advance written Notice has been filed with the Township Clerk for purpose of public inspection and, a copy of this Agenda has been mailed, faxed or delivered to the following newspapers: *The Asbury Park Press, and The Tri-Town News* at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act."

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

4. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

1. SD 1908 (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Reuven Kanarek & Stephan Fischer
Location: Bruce Street
Block 249 Lot 2 & 3
Minor Subdivision to create four fee-simple duplex units

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert
Abstained: Mr. Banas

2. SD 1909 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Bais Rivka Rochel
Location: High Street and River Avenue
Block 782 Lot 7 & 24
Minor Subdivision to create four fee-simple duplex units and one lot for the existing school

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert
Abstained: Mr. Banas

3. SD 1913 (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: S&M Investors LLC
Location: Cedar Bridge Avenue

Block 1603 Lot 1.02
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert
Abstained: Mr. Banas

4. SP 2041 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Quick Chek Corporation
Location: New Hampshire Ave & Cedarbridge Ave
Block 1603 Lot 1.02
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a proposed service station

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert
Abstained: Mr. Banas

5. SD 1692A (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Mordechai Yaakov & Chaya Taub
Location: Leonard Street & Park Avenue
Block 228 Lots 2.01 & 2.02
Amended Minor Subdivision to add building coverage variance to prior approval

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert
Abstained: Mr. Banas

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. SD 1917 (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Appolo Homes, LLC
Location: Appolo Road
Block 104 Lot 53.16 & 60
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 8 lots

Project Description
The applicant is seeking a Major Subdivision approval. The applicant proposes the subdivision of two (2) existing lots to create eight (8) proposed single family residential lots. The existing two (2) lots of approximately five (5) acres known as Lots 53.16 and 60 in Block 104 are proposed to be subdivided into proposed Lots 57.01 – 57.08 on the Major Subdivision Plan. The subdivision would create a cul-de-sac for the project, upon which all residential lots would front. The subject property is located on the northerly side of Apollo Road, in the north central portion of the Township, west of Squankum Road. Apollo Road has recently been partially improved. To date, base course pavement, belgian block curb, street lights, and utilities have been constructed across the frontage of the site. Sidewalk has yet to be constructed along this portion of Apollo Road. The existing right-of-way width of Apollo Road is fifty feet (50'), and a thirty-two foot (32') pavement width has been proposed. The site is currently vacant and mostly

cleared. Only the northern swath of the tract is wooded. The property contains piles of fill and wood chips. All existing wood chips must be removed to make way for the proposed residential subdivision. The land slopes from south to north. The northern edge of the tract contains freshwater wetlands from the North Branch of the Metedeconk River. The river is hundreds of feet from the northern property boundary. Even though the surface water body is classified as a Category One Waterway by the NJDEP and is subject to a three hundred foot (300') riparian buffer, the limits would be mapped beyond the Subdivision Plan. A Letter of Interpretation has been obtained for the project, and a fifty foot (50') transition area is associated with the freshwater wetlands. Transition area averaging is proposed for the development. Proposed storm water management facilities and utilities are associated with this project. The project site discharges runoff to a Special Water Resource Protection Area. Accordingly, a proposed Water Quality Structure will provide water quality for runoff from pavement surfaces. An underground recharge system is proposed for the cul-de-sac, individual underground recharge systems for some of the proposed lots, as well as retention of an existing recharge system to address water quantity. Overflows from these systems will be conveyed to bubbler inlets on the eastern side of the site. Proposed sanitary sewer will connect to an existing system in Apollo Road. Proposed potable water for the subdivision will connect to an existing main in Apollo Road. Four (4) off-street parking spaces are proposed for each residential dwelling. The number of bedrooms for the units is not specified on the subdivision plans. The project is also proposing curb and sidewalk throughout. The subject site is located within the R-12 Single Family Residential Zone District. Single-family residences are a permitted use in the zone district. The site is situated within a predominantly residential area. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 11/12/13 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated November 4, 2013: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. B1 – Topography of the site. 2. B2 – Topography within 200' thereof. 3. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 4. C14 - Tree Protection Management Plan. A partial waiver is requested from the "Site Features" requirements since no disturbance is proposed within the wetlands. We recommend the granting of this waiver provided other aspects of the Outbound and Topographic Survey are corrected. The Board shall take action on the partial topography waivers. Submission of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the project in conjunction with the Letter of Interpretation approval will suffice for this application. The submittal of the Environmental Impact Statement is required prior to the Public Hearing. A copy of the Letter of Interpretation Application package has been submitted. The Board shall take action on the waiver request from submission of an Environmental Impact Statement. The Tree Protection Management Plan waiver can be granted for completeness purposes. Based on the survey submitted, only some of the proposed northern lots will require tree removal. A Tree Protection Management Plan should be required prior to any construction. Requiring a Tree Protection Management Plan shall be made a condition of any approval. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-12, Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family residences are a permitted use in the zone district. Statements of fact. 2. No variances have been requested. Statement of fact. 3. A design waiver is required for proposed side lot lines that are not perpendicular to straight streets and radial to curved streets. We can support this design waiver because the proposed side lot lines in question would all be parallel to the existing Apollo Road boundary line. The Board shall take action on the design waiver to permit side lot lines that are not perpendicular to straight streets, as well as non-radial side lot lines. III. Review Comments A. General 1. An Outbound and Topographic Survey for the property has been provided. At a minimum, the following revisions are required: a. Relevant information with respect to filed map K3849 must be added

to the plan. Lot 56.16 in the Map Reference shall be corrected to Lot 53.16 with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. b. Existing bearings, distances, and areas shall be provided for Lots 53.16 and 60. Existing bearings and distances have been provided. Individual Lot areas shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. c. Existing contours require corrections based on the existing spot elevations shown. The existing contours on Apollo Road must be completed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. d. Survey data must be provided for all existing easements, the freshwater wetlands and waters boundary line, and the transition area line. The freshwater wetlands call out shall correct "finel" to "file". Some survey data has been provided. Survey data for the transition area line and the ten foot (10') shade tree and utility easement along Apollo Road must be provided for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. e. An existing drainage pipe is shown to be flat. However, the inverts do not agree by a foot (1'). The information can be corrected for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. f. A chain link fence encroachment from neighboring Lot 66 on the east side of the project must be addressed. Testimony on addressing the encroachment shall be provided. 2. Off-street parking: According to the plans provided, a typical dwelling will have a basement and no garage. The applicant is proposing four (4) off-street parking spaces per unit which is enough to be in compliance with the RSIS standards of three (3) off-street parking spaces for unspecified number of bedroom units. Up to six (6) bedrooms per unit will be permitted for this project to also comply with parking ordinance 2010-62. Proposed off-street parking shall be to the satisfaction of the Board. 3. Curb and sidewalk is proposed throughout the development. New belgian block curb exists along Apollo Road, some of which would be removed for the proposed street intersection. Unless five foot (5') wide sidewalk is proposed, pedestrian bypass areas will have to be designed. Proposed curb ramps must be corrected at the new intersection. Pedestrian bypass areas have been added for the cul-de-sac. Pedestrian bypass areas and corrections to the curb ramps shall be provided along Apollo Road with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. It is anticipated that trash and recyclable collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood. Confirming testimony should be provided. 5. A new road name for the cul-de-sac has yet to be proposed for the project. The new road name can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. The applicant's professionals indicate the proposed lot numbers have been approved by the Tax Assessor. The Final Plat shall be signed by the Lakewood Tax Assessor prior to filing. A signature box shall be provided on the Final Plat for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 7. The requirements in 18-815 indicate a one-time maintenance fee shall be provided for detention facilities to be owned and maintained by the Township. A fee of six thousand dollars ($6,000.00) is required based on eight (8) proposed single family detached dwellings at seven hundred fifty dollars ($750.00) per unit. Statements of fact. 8. The requirements in 18-821 (Building Uniformity in Residential Developments) must be addressed. A minimum of four (4) basic house designs are required for developments consisting of between seven (7) and fifteen (15) homes. Statements of fact. B. Plan Review 1. The General Notes require minor editing. The applicant's engineer should review the General Notes with our office prior to submitting for resolution compliance should approval be granted. 2. Sight Triangle Easements have been proposed at the intersection of the cul-de-sac with Apollo Road. The basis for the sight triangle easements requirements shall be addressed. The applicant's engineer indicates that the sight triangles have been designed using distances of fifty feet (50') and one hundred feet (100') along the centerlines from the intersection of the cul-de-sac with Apollo Road. 3. The existing and proposed drainage easements indicate the ownership of the entire storm water management system is intended to

be the Township of Lakewood. Approval will be required from the Department of Public Works. The revised plans indicate the proposed drywells will be owned and maintained by the individual lot owners. The revised plans also indicate the owner of proposed Lot 57.07 shall be responsible for the maintenance of the yard inlet and the fifteen inch (15") pipe connected to inlet #3. The rest of the proposed storm water management system is intended to be owned and maintained by the Township of Lakewood. A meeting with the Department of Public Works is recommended prior to resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. Horizontal and Vertical Datum shall be addressed; a benchmark has been indicated on the Survey. The information provided on the survey must be included on the construction plans with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. Proposed off-street parking spaces shall be provided with minimum dimensions. Proposed dimensions for each scenario can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. A Freshwater Wetlands Line with a fifty foot (50') transition area is shown along the northern side of the property. The plan shows that Freshwater Wetlands and Buffer are based upon LOI File # 1514-08-0007.1, FWW 080001. A copy of the Letter of Interpretation has been provided. The approved plan should be submitted. The approved plan can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 7. The proposed subdivision is relying on Transition Area Averaging for approval of the current configuration. NJDEP approval shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted. 8. Proposed dimensioning shall be completed. Proposed dimensioning can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. C. Grading 1. Detailed grading is provided on an Improvement Plan which is Sheet 3 of 10. A storm sewer collection system is proposed to collect runoff and recharge it within the proposed right-of-way of the cul-de-sac. An existing drainage easement with recharge piping along the east side of the project will remain. The revised plans provide additional storm sewer collection and recharge. Final grading will be reviewed with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. Walkout basements are proposed for new Lots 57.04 and 57.05. Proposed retaining walls have been designed in conjunction with the transition area averaging. Transition area averaging is proposed for Lots 57.03 through 57.06. Statements of fact. 3. A profile has been provided for the proposed cul-de-sac. The following revisions are required: a. Proposed horizontal control points should be added. Proposed horizontal control points can be finalized and provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. b. Proposed station 2+62.79 = 6+03.89. The profile should note proposed top of curb grades between these stations rather than centerline. The proposed cul-de-sac bulb shall be designed such that equal slopes and/or vertical curves enter and exit the bulb. Final design can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. c. The existing drainage pipe crossing shall be added such that proposed design conflicts are avoided. The existing drainage pipe crossing has been added and the sanitary sewer redesigned. It will not be possible to service the proposed basements by gravity. 4. Off road profiles are provided for the proposed storm drainage easements. Off road profiles will be reviewed after revision are provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. A detailed review of the grading can be completed during compliance submission; if/when this subdivision is approved. Statement of fact. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm sewer collection system has been designed to convey storm water runoff into a proposed recharge system. The proposed collection system discharges into a hydrodynamic vortex separator prior to reaching infiltration facilities. The hydrodynamic vortex separator provides the water quality measures necessary for a Special Water Resource Protection Area. The proposed recharge system is located under the site access road. Outlets from the proposed recharge system and the existing system

already installed on the site will be piped to a new bubbler inlet near the east side of the property. It is our understanding the ownership of the entire storm water management system will be the Township. Therefore, we recommend the applicant's engineer meet with the Department of Public Works to review the project. Some revisions have been made to the proposed storm water management. However, we recommend the applicant's engineer meet with the Department of Public Works prior to resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. Our cursory review of the Storm Water Management notes that the proposed reduction rate for the 100 year storm is not being met. The proposed grading can easily be revised to direct additional runoff to the storm water collection and recharge systems, thereby reducing the bypass areas. The Post Development Drainage Areas can be corrected accordingly. As a result, areas shown for collection will require additional storage volume and less discharge from the site would take place. Some revisions have been made to the proposed storm water management. The following corrections shall be made to the Report for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted: a. "Storm Water Quality" shall reference Appendix B. b. The 10 year storm event values for the Post-Construction Total Peak and Pre-Construction Peak must be transposed. 3. For those lots where rear yard runoff cannot be conveyed to the street, drywells are proposed to capture runoff from the rear portion of those dwelling roofs. Roof recharge beds are proposed for most of the lots to allow recharge of runoff from roof leaders. Testimony should also be provided confirming the roof recharge beds will be owned and maintained by the individual lot owners. The revised plans indicate the drywells will be owned and maintained by the individual lot owners. 4. The Storm Water Management Report and Design will be reviewed in detail after revisions to the design are made. The final Report and Design will be reviewed in detail with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. A Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual must be submitted per the NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township Code. The Manual should be submitted after final approval of the design. E. Landscaping 1. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations from the Shade Tree Commission as practicable. Per our site inspection of the property, the portion of the site to be developed has been cleared. The Shade Tree Commission recommended the following additional landscaping: a. There should be foundation plantings. b. On the east side of the property, plant Arborvitae, White Pine, Norway Spruce, Leyland Cypress fifteen feet (15') on center, 6-8' high. The additional landscaping can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. Thirty (30) Green Vase Zelkova shade trees have been proposed for landscaping. Some revisions are required to eliminate conflicts with existing and proposed improvements. The Shade Tree Commission recommended keeping the proposed shade trees on Apollo Road as is, and alternating Willow Oak and White Oak for the proposed shade trees on the cul-de-sac. The landscaping revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should subdivision approval be granted. Statement of fact. F. Lighting 1. Proposed lighting has been provided for the cul-de-sac area. The Plan indicates six (6) pole mounted town and country fixtures are proposed. Confirmation on the proposed height of the fixtures should be provided. According to the Lighting Fixture Detail, the pole height will be thirteen feet (13') and the overall height will be fifteen feet (15'). Testimony should be provided on the proposed height of the fixtures. 2. A point to point diagram has been provided to verify the adequacy of the proposed lighting. The proposed lighting meets the 0.2 minimum foot-candle, 0.5 average foot-candle, and 12:1 uniformity ration requirements. Statements of fact. 3. Testimony should be provided regarding street lighting ownership. There is no indication a Homeowners Association is proposed. Testimony should be provided

on street lighting ownership. 4. The proposed lighting locations shall be superimposed on the Improvement Plan to insure there are no conflicts. The superimposed lighting locations do not match the point to point diagram. Corrections shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. Lighting shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should subdivision approval be granted. Statement of fact. G. Utilities 1. Potable water and sanitary sewer service will be provided by the New Jersey American Water Company. The project is within the franchise area of the New Jersey American Water Company. Statements of fact. H. Signage 1. Proposed regulatory signage has not been shown on the plans and should be added. Regulatory sign details shall be added. Proposed regulatory signage shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. I. Environmental 1. Environmental Impact Statement The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the NJDEP Letter of Interpretation shall be submitted prior to the Public Hearing. A copy of the NJDEP Letter of Interpretation application has been submitted. Freshwater Wetlands have been mapped for the site. A copy of the Letter of Interpretation has been provided. A copy of the approved plan from NJDEP is required for subdivision approval. Transition Area Averaging is proposed to create this subdivision. Statements of fact. 2. Tree Management A Tree Protection Plan has not been submitted. The submission of a plan should be a condition of any approval. Statements of fact. J. Construction Details 1. Review of construction details will take place during compliance review, if/when this project is approved by the Board. Statement of fact. K. Final Plat (Major Subdivision) 1. Survey data needs to be provided for the proposed Transition Area Compensation/Reduction Line. The proposed line also needs to be tied to the project boundary. The information has been provided. 2. The General Notes require editing. The applicant's engineer should review the General Notes with our office prior to resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Capped pins shall be proposed for all changes in direction of the Transition Area Compensation/Reduction Line, as well as the Line's intersections with property lines. A missing capped pin to be set can be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. Dedications for the proposed shade tree and utility easements within the cul-de-sac should be added. Proposed dimensions and areas shall be provided on an individual lot basis. Proposed dimensions must be completed for skewed lines such that areas can be checked. Final corrections can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. A 6.05 foot skew dimension is shown for an existing ten foot (10') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easement. A corrected dimension can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. An easement is required on proposed Lot 57.06 to allow the chain link fence encroachment to remain from adjoining Lot 66. The easement can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 7. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 8. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after design revisions are undertaken for the project. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after resolution compliance submission is made should approval be granted. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. NJDEP Transition Area Averaging; and f. All other required outside agency approvals. The General Notes indicate an Ocean County Soil Conservation District Certification has been obtained. However, a copy of the certification has not been provided and the project is likely to undergo revisions which would at a minimum require a recertification. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities.

Mr. Vogt stated that no variances are needed. The Board should take action on the partial topography waiver if not done so already. If the Board approves the project they will work with the applicant to get whatever topo they need.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler and seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve the waivers.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. stated that this is an eight lot fully conforming subdivision.

Mr. Charles Surmonte, P.E. was sworn in.

Mr. Doyle said an encroachment was pointed out in the review letter which will be resolved. The trash will be picked up by the Township. They have met with Public Works concerning the stormwater and drainage system which resulted in changes to the plans.

Mr. Surmonte said the drainage is being handled via an underground system within the roadway with an overflow provision between lots 57.06 and 57.05. The easement will be provided and the property owner will bear that burden.

Mr. Neiman asked if a wetlands LOI was obtained for this project.

Mr. Doyle said yes.

Mr. Vogt said there are wetlands in the rear of the property. The applicant has agreed to provide proof from the State that the wetlands line shown on the plans is accurate and that they are outside of any buffers.

Mr. Surmonte said they would have to go to the DEP to modify the transition areas throughout to reduce some areas and expand in others.

Mr. Vogt said they will seek approval from the DEP to have encroachments which are allowed by law but you would have to go through the process.

Mr. Doyle said there were concerns about the height of the lights. Those fixtures will be changed to whatever is typical. The lights will be owned by JCP&L. There will be no need to form an HOA.

Mr. Surmonte said there is existing water and sewer on Appolo Road which they will be extending.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if the street will be public.

Mr. Doyle said yes.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public, seeing no one come forward, he closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler and seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the application.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

2. SP 2040 (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Woodhaven Lumber & Millwork
Location: 200 James Street
Block 345 Lot 11
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a proposed 1,800 square foot storage building

Project Description
The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval to construct an 8,100 SF steel framed storage building at the above-referenced location. As depicted on the Site Plans, the storage building is proposed within 64 feet of the easterly property line, and set back approximately 330 feet from the property's James Street frontage. The storage building will be located immediately north of an existing storage building on-site, and within an area that is previously disturbed. At the July 21, 2009 Planning Board Meeting, the application received preliminary and final site plan approval to construct an 8,100 SF service garage at this property, and additional parking spaces, subject to the conditions set forth per Planning Board Resolution SP# 1778A, dated August 18, 2009. As part of the approval, supplemental buffer including 16 pine trees and 8 viburnum were required to provide buffer for a utility extension through the existing wooded buffer along the site's James Street frontage. The existing tract covers 34.6 acres, containing an existing 10,083 SF one story masonry office building with seventy-six (76) delineated spaces attached, a one story masonry garage of 2,417 SF, a one story masonry warehouse of 173,919 SF, a one story masonry garage of 9,596 SF and the recently approved fueling facility. The tract also includes undelineated gravel parking areas throughout, an aboveground fuel tank, several stockpiles of building materials, and a side track for delivery of building materials by rail. The property is located in the western portion of the Township bordered by James Street to the north, and the New Jersey Southern Branch Main Line to the south. The area directly across James Street to the north is a residential zone, containing primarily residential uses. The uses to the east, south, and west of the site are industrial uses and/or zoned industrial. We have the following comments and recommendations per review of the current application, and applicable comments from our initial review letter dated November 1, 2013: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 2. C14 - Tree Protection Management Plan. 3. C17 – Drainage calculations A waiver has been requested from the submissions of an Environmental Impact Statement and Tree Protection Management Plan since the site has been developed and/or disturbed. We support these waivers. Said waivers were granted at the workshop hearing. II. Zoning • The site is situated within the M-1, Industrial Zone. The existing uses (lumber yard, office building, and garages) and the proposed storage building are all permitted within the M-1 zone as part of this facility. Fact. • No variances or design waivers are requested (nor appear necessary). Fact. II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. No circulation information is provided regarding vehicular access to and from the proposed storage facility. At a minimum, testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to how the proposed storage building will be accessed (from within the site). Fact. 2. The Site Plans should be revised to depict the proposed concrete aprons and bay doors as illustrated on the Architectural plans. The applicant agrees to this requirement as a condition of approval, if

granted. 3. No new parking is proposed, nor appears necessary per the UDO in support of the proposed storage building. Fact. 4. The applicant shall provide testimony as to whether the proposed garage area is meant to be accessed by the public, such as outside contractors. If public access is proposed, a dedicated circulation plan should be provided. Testimony will be provided at the public hearing. 5. The applicant shall provide testimony as to the storage of any potential hazardous materials associated with the new storage building. Testimony will be provided at the public hearing. B. Architectural 1. We defer to the Fire Official in regards to the adequacy of emergency access and fire suppression capability for the proposed storage building. This issue can be addressed during compliance, if/when approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this requirement as a condition of approval, if granted. C. Grading 1. As depicted on the Site Plans, minimal new proposed grading would result for installation of the proposed storage building. The proposed grading appears sufficient to accomplish positive drainage of the site. Fact. D. Stormwater Management 1. As stated previously, we recommend summary drainage calculations be provided during compliance (if approval is granted) to address the proposed increase in stormwater runoff from the proposed building. If necessary, on-site measures (e.g., dry wells, other) will be implemented. Stormwater calculations were provided, indicating that a negligible stormwater increase will result from this building. This item has been addressed. 2. The proposed roof gutter downspouts as depicted on the Architectural Plans should be included on the Site Plans, as well as addressing how the proposed discharges will be handled (e.g., individual discharges onto splash blocks, manifold pipes, etc). The applicant agrees to this requirement as a condition of approval, if granted. E. Landscaping 1. No new landscaping is proposed for the proposed storage building. We note that the adjacent property east of the property is wooded and undeveloped. Fact. 2. Landscaping (if any) shall be provided as requested by the Board. Fact. F. Lighting 1. No lighting data for the existing or proposed condition has been provided. Testimony should be provided as to whether new lighting is proposed. Fact. 2. Non-security building lighting (if any) should be put on timers. The applicant agrees to this requirement as a condition of approval, if granted. G. Signage 1. No signage information is provided. Any signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application shall comply with Township ordinance requirements. Per FWH's 11/27/13 cover letter, no new signage is proposed with this application. H. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography and a previous site inspection of the property, the site and surrounding areas are predominantly developed with the exception of wooded portions in the northwestern corner of the property, as well as wooded buffer areas along the northern and southern property lines. Fact. 2. Environmental Impact Statement 3. As indicated above, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has not been submitted for review. To assess the site for environmental concerns, a natural resources search of the property and surroundings was completed using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. No significant impacts were noted per review of NJDEP-GIS mapping. Fact. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details must be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this requirement as a condition of approval, if granted. III. Outside Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Ocean County Planning Board; b. Water and Sewer service (NJAW), if proposed; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d. Developer's Agreement (at the discretion of the Township); e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. on behalf of the applicant said they are here tonight to seek construction of a 90x90 steel frame storage building on a 35 acre property. This is a fully conforming application. The facility is going to be used to store sheet rock.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He said this is a conforming application.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public, seeing no one come forward, he closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

3. SP 1838B (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: NJ Hand
Location: Towers Street & Vine Avenue
Blocks 815, 815.01, 818, 819, 831, 832
Lots 1, 1, 1, 1, 3 & 5, 3
Site Plan for Phase III of the Lakewood Commons for 62 Affordable units

Project Description
The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for Phase 3 of the Lakewood Commons property. This site plan proposes construction of sixty-two (62) affordable units. The proposed unit distribution will be among three (3) – six (6) unit apartment buildings, three (3) - ten (10) unit apartment buildings, one (1) – six (6) unit townhouse building, and one (1) – eight (8) unit townhouse building. The development will also propose the extension of Coles Way, with associated parking lots, and the extension of sanitary sewer to Funston Avenue. Phase 3 of the project is located at the northeast portion of the overall site, directly adjacent to the Phase 2 improvements. Per the July 11, 2006 Resolution of Approval, the applicant received Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval for Phase I of the project. The Phase 1 portion of the development included seventy-two (72) units, on-site parking, a storm water management basin, and recreation building. Phase 1 also included an extension of Towers Street, east of Vine Avenue. Phase 2 received Lakewood Township Planning Board approval on December 19, 2009. The approval was for the construction of fifty-nine (59) units, associated parking lots, the extension of Coles Way, an extension of Washington Avenue to the community, and an infiltration basin (Basin 2). The improvements constructed as a part of Phase 2 are located at the northwest portion of the overall site. Construction of this phase was completed this past year. The conceptually approved overall development is a multi-stage, one hundred percent (100%) affordable housing development. The total project consists of four hundred thirty-nine (439) multifamily and townhouse units on common property, a recreation building, and related drainage, utilities, parking, and roadway improvements. Extensive lighting and landscaping, as well as a pedestrian circulation system were also proposed. We have the following comments per review of the revised submission and applicable comments from our initial review letter dated November 4, 2013: I. Zoning 1. The site is located in the R-40/20 Cluster Zone. Planned Affordable Residential Development is a permitted use in the R-40/20 Cluster Zone in accordance with the bulk standards and requirements of paragraph 18-902B.7 of the UDO. Fact. 2. No variances are requested for the application. The Schedule of General Regulations accounts for what was actually constructed in Phases 1 and 2, what is proposed for Phase 3,

and the totals provided after construction of the first three (3) phases of the project. Our review notes the Overall Site Plan indicates four hundred thirty-nine (439) units were conceptually approved. Fact. 3. According to the Schedule of General Regulations four hundred thirty-five (435) off-street parking spaces are required and four hundred forty-one (441) off-street parking spaces are proposed. The schedule attempts to improve the parking impact by counting forty-seven (47) additional on-street parking spaces and seventeen (17) land banked spaces to bring the total parking space count to five hundred five (505). Fact. II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. The listing of the Landscape and Lighting Plans, as well as the Architectural Plans, is on the Cover Sheet of the Civil Engineering Plans. Fact. 2. The Overall Site Plan indicates eight (8) proposed buildings being added to three (3) new parking lots in Phase 3. Detailed site plan information for this proposal is on the civil engineering drawings. Fact. 3. The extension of Coles Way is proposed for improvement beyond Phase 2 of the project site. The proposed pavement width is thirty feet (30') with parking only on one (1) side. The proposed parking lots will have drive aisles of twenty-four feet (24') in width. Fact. 4. A temporary cul-de-sac is proposed at the phase limit of Coles Way. Fact. 5. Vehicular circulation is consistent with previous phases regarding accessibility for parking spaces, delivery, emergency, and trash pickup vehicles that will need to access the site. Fact. 6. The Existing Conditions Plan shows portions three (3) streets, Caryl Avenue, Kinsey Avenue, and Read Street, to be vacated as part of the Phase 3 project. Testimony shall be provided on the status of vacating the interior paper streets and reconfiguring the various blocks and lots of the development. Per VNHA's 12/2/13 response letter, testimony will be provided at the Public Hearing. 7. The documents for a Homeowners Association may require updating for this Phase 3 application (for the proposed increase in units) and should be submitted for review. The applicant agrees to providing revised information as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. 8. Handicap parking spaces are proposed in front of each of the buildings. Information on the proposed number of handicap parking spaces has been provided in the Schedule of General Regulations and shows a surplus of spaces. Fact. 9. It should be noted that the proposed Phase 2 access extension of Washington Avenue between Coles Way and Spruce Street was constructed. Fact. B. Architectural 1. Architectural Plans were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the six (6) unit and ten (10) unit apartment buildings will be forty-two feet five inches (42'-5") in height. The six (6) unit and eight (8) unit townhouse buildings will be thirty-three feet three inches (33'-3") in height. Fact. 2. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the previous building façade and treatments are proposed. We recommend renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing. Fact. 3. HVAC equipment for the apartment and townhouse buildings is shown on the Landscape Plans. Fact. 4. Handicapped access to the proposed buildings should be addressed. Per VNHA's 12/2/13 response letter, all ground floor units of the 6-unit and 10-unit apartment buildings are accessible at the entrance and adaptable throughout the dwelling as per NJ UCC and ANSI regulations. Additionally, proposed townhouse units have an adaptable feature that allows a bedroom and bathroom to be on the ground floor should it be required for a disabled or physically-challenged resident. Therefore, this item has been addressed. C. Grading 1. A detailed Grading Plan is provided on Sheet CE-7. The proposed grading ties into the existing conditions and has been designed to direct runoff to proposed storm sewer systems associated with the infiltration basin constructed in Phase 2. Fact. 3. The grading proposes two (2) future pad locations which will be in future Phase 4. Fact. 3. Proposed spot grades are required at the corners of the dumpster enclosures. Spot grades have been provided as requested. 4. Large lengths of retaining wall are proposed for the north and east side of the project. The maximum proposed height of the wall nears eighteen feet (18'). We anticipate design and construction

details similar to Phase 2. An Allan Block Typical Section is shown which notes the wall manufacturer shall submit design calculations signed and sealed by a New Jersey Professional Engineer. Railing is proposed on top of the retaining wall. Fact. Said information will be provided during compliance review, if/when approved. The applicant agrees to this condition. 5. The proposed grading of the temporary cul-de-sac shall be flatter. Regrading of the cul de sac is provided on the revised site plans. 6. Horizontal control points (intersections, curb returns, points of curvature and tangency) should be added to the profiles to provide proposed spot elevations for the grading. Said information has been provided on the revised plans. 7. The future vertical curves on Towers-Funston shall be lengthened to at least twenty-five feet (25') for every percent change in grade. Said information has been provided on the revised plans. 8. A final review of the grading design will occur during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm water management system has been designed for the site. Post development runoff for Phase 3 will be handled by a proposed drainage system consisting of inlets and pipes that will convey flow to an infiltration basin constructed in Phase 2 located near the northern border of the site. Fact. 2. The basin was constructed with 5:1 side slopes as shown on the grading of the basin. The bottom elevation was constructed at elevation 76.00, the top of berm at elevation 84.00. Fact. 3. The Engineering Report indicates the full build out of the drainage area required for the Phase 2 infiltration basin includes Phase 2 (constructed), Phase 3 (subject of this application), and a portion of Phase 4 (future phase). Fact. 4. The Storm Water Management Report submitted for Phase 2 should be updated for the proposed storm water management system of Phase 3 (and future Phase 4). We need to confirm the required reduction for the various storm events will be met. The applicant agrees to providing revised information as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. 5. The design of the infiltration basin constructed in Phase 2 and to be used for Phase 3 storm water management meets the water quality requirements. Fact. 6. Storm sewer profiles which are not part of the road profiles have been provided on Sheet CE-12. These will be reviewed in detail after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. Fact. 7. Proposed underground perforated pipe has been designed for portions of the proposed buildings. Connections to the proposed storm sewer system are shown. Fact. 8. A storm water management maintenance plan manual was provided with the previous Phase 2 approval in accordance with NJ Stormwater Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township standards. The manual was very comprehensive. An updated manual should be supplied to address the latest construction phase. An updated manual has been provided. 9. A final review of the stormwater management design will occur during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. E. Landscaping 1. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board. A comprehensive landscape design has been provided. Fact. 2. Proposed shade trees are located in the landscape strip between the curb and sidewalk. Normally we would recommend shade trees be relocated behind the sidewalk area. However, the shade trees already planted in previous Phases are located in the landscape strip between the curb and sidewalk. Fact. 3. Sight triangles must be corrected on the plan. In this manner proposed landscaping can be designed to not impede vehicular visibility. Corrections were made to the civil/site plans, and revisions to the landscape plan. 4. The Landscape Plan shows a CAFRA Tree Save Area outside the project limits. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, approval information will be included on the revised plans. Said information was provided on revised Landscape Sheet L 1.0. 5. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should approval be granted. Fact. The applicant agrees to this condition. F. Lighting 1. A detailed lighting design has been provided. The comprehensive lighting plan for Phase 3 must be clarified to indicate

the proposed number of sixteen foot (16') high pole mounted town and country fixtures and thirty foot (30') high pole mounted cobra head fixtures. The proposed number of fixtures is in conflict between sheets. Fixture count revisions have been made to the revised plans. 2. A point to point diagram has been provided to review the illumination. Fact. 3. Lighting shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted. Fact. The applicant agrees to this condition. G. Utilities 1. The project is located in the New Jersey American Water Company franchise area. Public water and sewer service will be constructed by NJAWC. Fact. 2. Fire hydrants are being proposed for the project. Hydrants are proposed for the three (3) Phase 3 parking areas. Fact. 3. Proposed sanitary sewer is being connected to an off-site manhole to be constructed by others at the intersection of Bellinger Street and Funston Avenue (with costs shared by the applicant). The proposed sanitary sewer line will be constructed within the future limits of Coles Way and Funston Avenue. Fact. 4. Water, gas, electric, telephone, and cable service to the proposed Phase 3 section will be provided as an extension from the Phase 2 side of the project. Fact. H. Signage 1. Proposed signage and street signs associated with the Phase 3 portion of the project has been shown on the plans. Signage details will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. Fact. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with the Township Ordinance. Fact. I. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site investigation of the property, the project site is heavily wooded with both deciduous and coniferous trees. Aerial photography indicates that the original existing right-of-ways were once cleared in a grid pattern throughout the site. Topographic information provided indicates that there is a ridge that runs along the northern section of the site. Elevations along this ridge range from approximately +120 feet in the northeast corner of the site to +100 feet in the northwest corner of the site. The site generally slopes toward the south with the ground surface elevations in the southern portion of the site extending to as low as about elevation +80. The Phase 1 and 2 portions of the development have been constructed including access roads, on-site parking, storm water management, utilities, landscaping, lighting, and a recreation building. Fact. 2. Environmental Impact Statement The applicant has submitted the Environmental Impact Statement for the Overall Preliminary and Phase 1 Final Site Plan Application of Lakewood Commons. The document has been prepared by Van Note-Harvey Associates, P.C., to comply with Section 18-820 of the UDO. The report was revised May 11, 2006. Fact. To assess the site for environmental concerns, natural resources search of the property and surroundings was completed using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. The following highlights some of the documents and field inventories which were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property: • Known Contaminated sites (including deed notices of contaminated areas); • Wood Turtle and Urban Peregrine habitat areas; and • NJDEP Landscape Project areas, including known forested wetlands, emergent wetlands, forest, and grassland habitat areas. The author of the Environmental Impact Statement concludes that no significant environmental limitations exist on the site that would prevent the proposed project. By adhering to sound planning techniques, employing Best Management Practice's during and after construction for storm water management, utilizing approved Soil Erosion and Sediment Control practices, preserving trees, and providing a comprehensive landscape plan; minimization of impacts to the environment can be achieved. Our office agrees with the author's findings. Fact. 3. Tree Management Plan A Tree Management Plan was previously approved. A copy of the previously approved Tree Management Plan shall be

submitted to determine whether any alterations are necessary. A copy of the plan was provided. J. Traffic 1. A Traffic Impact Study has not been submitted for review. A Traffic Impact Study should be submitted for review prior to the Public Hearing. Traffic testimony should be provided. A Traffic Impact Study report has been provided, including recent traffic counts at the Vine Avenue/Towers Street and Spruce Street/Washington Avenue intersections. Projected Levels of Service are provided for each intersection on Page 4 of the report. 2. As indicated in the report, testimony regarding the findings of the report will be provided at the public hearing. K. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; if/when this application is approved. Fact. 2.Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements. Fact. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Ocean County Planning Board; b. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; c. NJDEP CAFRA Modification; d. All other required outside agency approvals. An NJDEP Letter of Interpretation: Presence/Absence Determination, Overall Site was obtained May 3, 2006. An NJDEP Letter of Interpretation: Footprint of Disturbance Determination, Lincoln Avenue right-of-way was obtained May 3, 2007. An NJDEP CAFRA Permit was obtained August 7, 2008. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for the construction of sanitary sewer and potable water service for the proposed project. New Jersey American Water Company will need to obtain a Treatment Works Approval and a Bureau of Safe Drinking Water Permit from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. The applicant agrees to obtaining all outside agency approvals as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming.

Mr. Rennert stepped down for this application.

Mr. Vogt said there are no variances required.

Mr. Abraham Penzer, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. He stated this is phase 3 of a multiple phased project. This project is 100% affordable housing. This phase will look exactly like the previous phases. There are no basements and each house is on one floor. He explained that he made every effort to reach out to the neighbors.

Mr. Neiman asked what the issues are with the neighbors.

Mr. Penzer said an issue was open space which is planned in phase 4. He is prepared to speak about that issue. They have no issues with the engineer's review letter and can meet all of the comments.

Mr. Ralph A. Petrella, P.E. was sworn in. He entered a concept plan for phase 3 & 4 as exhibit A-1. He showed the different phases to the Board members including the phases that have already been constructed.

Mr. Jackson entered sheet CE-5 as exhibit A-2 which shows all of the phases of the project. He asked how many units are currently constructed.

Mr. Petrella said 130 units in phases 1 and 2. Phase 1 was approved as well as a conceptual approval totaling 6 phases. Phase 3 will consist of 62 units.

Mr. Jackson asked about the open space.

Mr. Penzer said they would like to approve that in this phase as opposed to phase 4.

The Board members would like to know the size of that space.

Mr. Tom Sterns, AIA, PP, was sworn in. He said it's roughly 370 ft x 130 ft. The area is generally flat.

Mr. Jackson asked how this is going to be used by the residents.

Mr. Penzer said it would be used as open space, ball field, play fields, etc.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if at least 25% of that space could be active recreation. The other 75% would be passive recreation.

Mr. Penzer said it would be governed by the Homeowner's Assocation. That is why they had the meetings with the neighbors.

Mr. Schmuckler asked about the clubhouse.

Mr. Penzer said it is approximately 3,500 sf per floor.

Mr. Ingber said he walked the property and saw that the max occupancy of the clubhouse is 258.

Mr. Penzer said the bottom floor is not being actively used as a meeting hall.

A discussion ensued concerning the basin size.

Mr. Neiman asked where the current recreational area is.

Mr. Petrella showed the Board members on the plan.

Mr. Neiman asked if there was any open space in phase 1 or phase 2.

Mr. Penzer said not as much as they are proposing now. He said there is no requirement in affordable housing to give any recreational space. This project does have it even though they are not required to.

Mr. Schmuckler asked about the existing recreational building.

Mr. Penzer said there is a basement with two stories.

Mr. Neiman asked about an additional community center.

Mr. Penzer said there will be one in phase 4. There is not room in phase 3.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if this building will have capacity for at least 500 people.

Mr. Penzer does not know.

Mr. Ingber said it should accommodate the community.

Mr. Penzer said they will meet all fire codes.

Mr. Neiman said they are making sure that the people in affordable housing have the quality of life they deserve.

Mr. Shmuel Lefkowitz was sworn in. He is the president of NJ Hand. He stated at the present time only one floor is being used in the recreation building. There are currently 130 units and are adding 62 units in phase and the bottom floor will be opened up. They will make sure that there are enough amenities for everyone. It is very hard now as affordable housing is not a priority anymore in this state.

Mr. Neiman asked if they plan on building another community center in a future phase.

Mr. Lefkowitz said yes.

Mr. Schmuckler said a few of the designs can be changed to make things a little more private for people. There is a pathway which he believes can be removed and replace it with some bushes.

Mr. Lefkowitz said that is not a problem. Privacy is very important to them.

Mr. Petrella said under the original application the Board felt that people would be walking in between units and they felt with all the foot traffic on grass it would end being muddy or hard to maintain.

Mr. Schmuckler asked they put some landscaping there to keep people from walking there.

Mr. Neiman said if this gets approved tonight he would like to make sure a few things get on the resolution including the exact delineation of the open space is drawn on the plans.

Mr. Vogt suggesting having an exhibit attached to the resolution.

Mr. Penzer agrees with that.

Mr. Neiman said an adequate community center will need to be provided in phase 4 of this project. That will be in the resolution in phase 3. The next issue is the accessibility to Lakewood Commons. Currently there are two means of ingress and egress to this project. As this project grows there is going to be a need for more open roadway. This is already a congested area. He understands that with phase 3 there are not going to be any new openings. He thinks the

Township Committee has to be on board with this application and the whole area as part of the Smart Growth Plan, instead of vacating current paper streets and putting more housing, to make more roadways there. Charity Tull is supposed to be constructed in the future and there should be roads opened up to Charity Tull to help alleviate congestion.

Mr. Schmuckler would like to see the applicant open up a road in this phase as it was done in the first two phases.

Mr. Lefkowitz said the openings they have previously made were on their site. They were in control of those openings. They have no control over anything else. Mr. Neiman made a good suggestion to communicate to the Township Committee.

Mr. Penzer recommended a meeting be held with the Township Committee, Planning Board, owners in the area to make roads work uniformly.

Mr. Scott Kennel, traffic expert, was sworn in.

Mr. Neiman asked how the residents of phase 3 are coming in and out of the project.

Mr. Kennel said they would have access to both Washington and Towers Street. The two access points they have comply with RSIS requirements. They have done additional studies beyond that. He had done a traffic study in 2009 and 2013 and the volume of traffic actually reduced on Vine and Spruce by approximately 25%. A lot of that is contributed to the fact that Oak Street was opened up out towards New Hampshire Avenue.

Mr. Kennel went into further detail concerning the traffic studies performed.

Mr. Schmuckler asked that based on his calculations when would it reach it's tipping point where it's no longer adequate.

Mr. Kennel said hey are at approximately 50% of the capacity. There is a possibility it could accommodate phase 4 and phase 5 but they would have to see. The traffic volume on Spruce is approximately 25% to 30% less than it was in 2009.

Mr. Schmuckler does not agree with that as he drives down Spruce everyday. He wants the assurance that there will be more access opened up in the future.

Mr. Neiman said they have to see roadwork in place in this area.

Mr. Lefkowitz stated they opened up Washington Avenue without being required to. This is the first time he has heard that the Planning Board is concerned about these streets and it will be addressed.

Mr. Neiman said in the last few years there has been a lot of development in the Albert Street area. They have heard from a lot of concerned residents in that area and it is a very congested area.

Mr. Penzer said it is their testimony that they are not making an impact. He reiterated that this is an affordable housing project.

Mr. Lefkowitz said they are just looking for phase 3 approval now and will do anything possible to support and do what is right.

Mr. Schmuckler asked that the applicant provide an additional access point by phase 4 to the east or the south excluding Spruce Street.

Mr. Neiman would like that a condition of approval.

Mr. Penzer and the applicant agrees with that.

Mr. Ingber commented on one of the roads being dangerous as people are parking on both sides.

Mr. Kennel said it is a typical road where there is full parking activity taking place on the access aisle. People are not backing into the intersection. The parking spaces are offset far enough from Coles Way where you wouldn't have parking maneuvers on to Coles Way.

Mr. Ingber said it is a curved road with cars backing in and out. He believes it is dangerous. He asked if it is possible to remove a few spots to make more room for turning.

Mr. Petrella said there is currently enough room for turning movements.

Mr. Vogt said to perhaps provide a detailed circulation plan.

Mr. Schmuckler said he will not approve this if there is parking on the street.

Mr. Petrella said this design has been approved in previous phases. They are just continuing with that theme. The typical roadway is 24 ft wide. This road is 30 ft.

Mr. Schmuckler would rather have a narrower road and no parking on the street. He is concerned about the safety of the children.

Mr. Kennel said one suggestion is they would have designated cross walks. They would create speed tables which would create slower speeds.

Mr. Penzer said he has no problem eliminating the spaces in phase 3 but not in the first two phases and people are currently using those spots.

Mr. Schmuckler said since you are bringing the traffic from phase 3 through phases 1 and 2 therefore you need to clear these roads.

Mr. Penzer said they agree to eliminate parking in phases 1 through 3 on Coles Way but they can not control Towers Street.

Mr. Vogt said you may need to add a parking variance as a result.

Mr. Penzer said they have 70 extra spaces now. Even if they eliminated the parking spots on Coles Way they would still have enough parking.

Mr. Petrella said currently 435 parking spaces are required. They are currently providing for the 3 phases 505 spaces.

Mr. Schmuckler asked that they put up no parking signs along Coles Way.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public.

Mr. Avroham Zaks, 540 Spruce Street, was sworn in. He lives nearby and he is requesting that when they do build phase 3 that the existing trees will be behind the future houses are not taken down. He would like at least 25 ft of trees for a buffer.

Mr. Petrella said the trees along the northern border are not going to be removed. The site is going to be cleared up to the retaining wall shown on the plans.

Mr. Neiman would like the trees flagged which will not be removed.

Mr. Petrella said a soil erosion plan is including in the plans and shows tree protection.

Mr. Vogt asked that prior to site clearing if the applicant is proposing some sort of barrier along the limit of proposed site clearing to make sure they don't go over.

Mr. Zaks would like a fence be put up on top of the retaining wall for safety.

Mr. Petrella said at the highest point of the retaining wall it could be 18 ft high.

Mr. Zaks also commented that he did not agree with the traffic engineer's reports.

Mr. Menacham Siegal was sworn in. He has lived in Lakewood Commons the past five years. He thanked NJ Hand for all they have done. He believes the community center is adequate and there is already enough open space.

Seeing no one further Mr. Neiman closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the application with the following conditions:
Provide an exhibit in the resolution that delineates the extent of the recreation open space in phase 3 and phase 4.
Twenty five percent of the open space will be restricted for active recreation while the rest can be passive.
The bottom floor of the community center will be opened up.
Phase 4 must propose a new community center.
An additional access point to the east or the south must be including in phase 4.
A detailed circulation plan shall be provided.
The parking on Coles Way for phases 1, 2 & 3 will be removed.

No parking signs shall be added along Coles Way.
The walkway between homes in phase 1 and phase 2 will be removed and there will be some sort of landscaping to make sure there is no foot traffic.
At the north end of the site beyond the retaining wall, 75 ft of trees for a buffer shall remain and a snow fence shall be installed to help facilitate that.
A fence shall be installed at the top of the retaining wall.
Provide an exhibit with the resolution that is consistent with the motion made.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman

Discussion ensued concerning the size of the open space area. Approximately 230 ft will be cleared in phase 3 and the rest will be cleared in phase 4.

4. SP 2042 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: 210 Ocean Ave, LLC
Location: 208 Ocean Avenue
Block 536 Lot 12
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a proposed office building

Project Description
The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval in order to construct a two-story, 5,688-square foot office building with associated parking. The proposed building will be located on a 0.343 acre property on the south side of Ocean Avenue (Route 88). There is an existing two and a half-story dwelling on the property which will be removed as part of this plan. The applicant has proposed a total of nineteen (19) off-street parking spaces for the proposed use. Based on the architectural plans we calculate the first floor area will be 2,610 square feet and the second floor area will be 3,078 square feet. One (1) off-street parking space is required for every three hundred square feet (300 SF) of floor area. Therefore, a total of nineteen (19) off-street parking spaces are required. The tract is located in the north central portion of the Township on the south side of Ocean Avenue (Route 88) west of Congress Street. Route 88 is a State Highway with a fifty foot (50') right-of-way. An Access Permit will be required for the proposed parking lot driveway. Developed lots border the site. The subject site is located within a developed area with a mix of uses. There is existing curbing and sidewalk in good condition along the property frontage. Most of the curb and sidewalk would be replaced with the construction of the site access driveway. Overhead electric exists on the north side of the highway. Potable water is located under the north side of the street. Sanitary sewer runs under the centerline of the road. The land generally slopes gently southward. There are small trees on the site which have been located on the survey. There are also encroachments on the property which need to be dealt with. The parcel is located in the B-4 Wholesale Service Zone District. Professional office uses are permitted in the B-4 Zone. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 11/12/13 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting, and comments from our initial review letter dated November 6, 2013: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. B2 -- Topography within 200 feet thereof. 2. B4 -- Contours of the area within 200 feet of the site boundaries. 3. B10 -- Man-made features within 200 feet thereof. 4. C13 – Environmental Impact Statement. 5. C14 – Tree Protection Management Plan. We support the entire above referenced waiver requests except for C14. The Board granted the submission waivers. A Tree Protection Management Plan can be waived for completeness purposes only. The applicant will

be required to comply with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance as a condition of Board approval (if/when granted). A Tree Protection Management Plan has been provided with the revised submission. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the B-4, Wholesale Service Zone. Professional offices are permitted uses in this zone. Statements of fact. 2. The following bulk variances are required for the proposed project: • Minimum Lot Area – Twenty thousand square feet (20,000 SF) required, 14,935 square feet provided – existing condition. • Minimum Side Yard Setback – Ten feet (10') required, eight feet (8') provided – proposed condition. The revised plans propose a minimum side yard setback of 7.57 feet. • Minimum Aggregate Side Yard Setback - Twenty feet (20') required, 16.1 feet provided – proposed condition. The revised plans propose a minimum aggregate side yard setback of 15.57 feet. • Minimum Rear Yard Setback – Thirty feet (30') required, eight feet (8') provided – proposed condition. It should be noted that the bulk requirements as currently presented in the application are based on the UDO Schedule of Regulations (Appendix A), which is considerably more conservative than the bulk requirements in Section 18-903D of the Zoning Section of the UDO. The Board shall take action on the bulk variances required. 3. A waiver is required from Ordinance Section 18-803 E.2.a., which states: "Except as otherwise stated in this chapter, non-residential development shall provide a minimum twenty-five foot (25') wide buffer area as measured from the property line toward the proposed use. Except as otherwise stated in this chapter, the buffer shall be increased to fifty feet (50') wide where the non-residential development is adjacent to an existing single-family residential development or an area zoned for residential land uses." Per the revised plans, some buffer landscaping has been added. The Board shall take action on the required waiver. 4. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A tie distance of 282.70 feet from Congress Street shall be added to the Survey. The tie distance can be added to the Outbound Survey and the Site Plan for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. The Survey shows the existing driveway from adjoining Lot 11 to the west encroaching onto the property. The Survey also shows an existing chain link fence crossing the side line between Lots 12 and 13. These encroachments must be addressed, particularly the driveway encroachment. Removal of the neighboring driveway would effectively eliminate off-street parking from adjoining Lot 11. The applicant's engineer indicates the driveway encroachment to be worked out with the neighbor. Testimony shall be provided on the encroachments. 3. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements requires corrections. The applicant's engineer indicates the Schedule of Bulk Requirements is based on Appendix "A". Revisions should be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. The General Notes should be revised to separately reference the Survey of Property and Topographic Survey since they are two (2) individual documents. The General Notes have been revised. Final editing can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. Building Setback Lines shall be revised in accordance with the B-4 Zoning requirements. The applicant's engineer indicates the building setback lines are shown as per Appendix "A". Revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. A nineteen (19) space proposed parking area will access Ocean Avenue (Route 88) on the north side of the site. An NJDOT Access Permit will be required for the project. The proposed access aisle for the parking area will be a minimum of twenty-six feet (26') wide. One (1) van accessible handicap parking space is proposed. The parking calculations can be revised with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 7. The proposed building must be revised to show all

entry foyers, overhangs, protrusions, and the correct proposed square footage listed by floor. The proposed building has been revised to match the preliminary architectural drawings. The correct square footage listed by floor can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 8. Testimony should be provided on site operations, including deliveries, and circulation for trucks and emergency vehicles. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony will be provided. 9. A dumpster area is proposed at the end of a handicap accessible aisle with a roll out dumpster. Construction details with dimensions have been provided. Testimony is required regarding the adequacy of the refuse area and whether collection will be private. This information should be added to the plans. The refuse area should be designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E., of the UDO. No screening has been proposed. The proposed dumpster area has been eliminated from the revised plans. Testimony must be provided on trash collection and recycling. 10. New Jersey Department of Transportation will dictate the need for sight triangles at the access driveway. Statement of fact. 11. The dashed line across the frontage of the site must be labeled. The dashed line has been labeled NJDOT Desired Typical Section. A shade tree and utility easement has been added and a description has been provided. The description must be corrected and a deed of easement must be submitted with resolution compliance for review by the Board Attorney and Engineer should approval be granted. 12. The Sheet Index on the Title Sheet and the respective sheets shall indicate the latest revision dates. B. Architectural 1. A preliminary architectural plan was submitted for review. The floor plans at the building access points do not match the site plan. The site plans have been coordinated with the preliminary architectural plans. Final architectural plans shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. The proposed floor area for the second floor should be corrected to 3,078 square feet. The proposed second floor protrudes by two feet (2') in the rear of the structure and overhangs the sidewalk between the entry foyers in the front of the structure (as permitted by Section 18-818 of the UDO). The proposed floor area has been corrected. Final architectural plans shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. The preliminary architectural plans indicate the proposed building to be twenty-six feet (26') high. The building height complies with the allowable height of forty-five feet (45'). Statements of fact. 4. Information should be provided for utility connections. Location of HVAC equipment should be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. Information for utility connections and HVAC equipment shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. Testimony should be provided on ADA accessibility. According to the preliminary architectural plan, only the first floor is ADA accessible. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony will be provided. 6. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the proposed building facade, and treatments. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. Testimony and renderings should be provided. C. Grading 1. A detailed grading plan is provided on Sheet 4. Except for the proposed six inch (6") curb face in front of the building, the rest of the parking lot curb would have four inch (4") curb face. The proposed length of the curb with six inch (6") face should be corrected to sixty-six feet (66') with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2 The following additional information is required for review of the grading plan: a. The elimination of overwrites. The "graying" of existing base map information is the only way to improve plan legibility. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. Final grading will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. In order to mitigate the additional runoff created by the increase in impervious area due to the proposed development, an underground recharge system is proposed to infiltrate the roof runoff from the building and the

runoff from the parking area. Statement of fact. 2. Per our review of the proposed improvements as described in the report, less than 0.25 acres of additional impervious coverage is proposed and less than one (1) acre of disturbance will occur. This exempts the project from being "major development" as defined in the Township Code and in the NJ Storm Water Rule. Statements of fact. 3. Soil test pits have been provided to demonstrate that a two foot (2') vertical separation between the proposed bottom of the storm water management recharge system and the seasonal high water table is maintained. Statement of fact. 4. Permeability test results have been provided to justify the recharge calculations used for the project. Statement of fact. 5. The calculations listed in the Report should be adjusted for concurrence with the additional building area. A revised storm water management report which increases the proposed system volume can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. Information such as cleanouts and inverts regarding the proposed roof leaders and their discharge(s) into the storm water collection system must be provided. The applicant's engineer indicates that this information will be designed in conjunction with the final architectural plans and provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 7. Since the project is not classified as major development, a Storm Water Management Operations & Maintenance Manual is not required. Testimony should be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony will be provided on the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system. E. Landscaping 1. The applicant has provided a landscape plan as part of this submission. Review of landscaping will take place after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. Only two (2) October Glory Red Maples are proposed in front of the site for landscaping. Additional landscaping should be provided. Provided a sight triangle is not violated, the shade trees should be moved forward on the site to be within the proposed shade tree and utility easement. Additional landscaping has been added to the plans in accordance with recommendations from the Shade Tree Commission. 3 The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. F. Lighting 1. Site lighting is being provided by two (2) proposed pole mounted fixtures. The proposed lights would be two hundred fifty watt (250W) high pressure sodium fixtures with a mounting height of sixteen feet (16'). The site lighting has been revised to provide two (2) pole mounted fixtures and a wall mounted fixture on the building. All of the proposed lights would be two hundred fifty watt (250W) high pressure sodium fixtures with a mounting height of twenty feet (20'). 2. A point to point diagram is required to verify the adequacy of the proposed lighting. A point to point diagram has been provided which verifies that the proposed lighting complies with ordinance requirements. 3. The overall lighting design is subject to review and approval by the Board. The Board should provide lighting recommendations, if any. Final site lighting will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. G. Utilities 1. Testimony should be provided as to whether a separate fire service line is being proposed for the building. Adequacy of fire service will be determined by the Township Fire official. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony will be provided on fire service. H. Signage 1. No signage information is provided on the Site Plan other than some regulatory signage. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) should be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. The applicant's engineer indicates that all future signage will conform to the Ordinance requirements. Final review of signage will be conducted after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. I. Environmental 1. Tree Management Plan The Tree Protection Plan must be submitted prior to

construction. The applicant must comply with the requirements for tree protection and removal as applicable on the site in accordance with the Township's Tree Ordinance. A Tree Management Plan has been added to the set of plans. We will conduct a review of the Tree Management Plan after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 8 and 9 of the plans. Construction details are provided on Sheets 8 and 10 of the revised plans. 2. All proposed construction details must be revised to comply with applicable Township or NJDOT standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance submission; if/when this application is approved. The applicant's engineer indicates that details have been added and revised to comply with NJDOT standards. We will conduct a final review of construction details after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. New Jersey Department of Transportation (Access Permit); f. Water and sewer utilities, prior to occupancy permits; and g. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Rennert stepped down for this application.

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are requested for minimum lot area, side yard setback, aggregate side yard setback and rear yard setback.

Mr. Brian Flannery. P.E., P.P. was sworn in. The application proposes an office building on Ocean Avenue and Route 88 in the B-4 zone. There is an existing non-conforming house. Various variances are being requested as Mr. Vogt stated. The parking requirements will be met as well as all of the comments in the engineer's review letter.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if there will be a fence near the school area.

Mr. Flannery said yes.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public, seeing no one come forward, he closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Banas to approve the application.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman

5. SP 2045 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Gedolah Bais Yisroel
Location: Ridge Avenue
Block 175 Lots 11 & 82
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for proposed school

Project Description
The applicant is requesting Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval to construct a two-story, 11,520 sf School and Yeshiva on the referenced property. The existing property is vacant, with a Jersey Central Power & Lighting (JCP&L) right-of-way within the southern edge of

the property and the north branch of the Metedeconk River with associated wetlands forming the northern property line, as well as the Township boundary. Per review of the Architectural Plan, the facility will include a 1,583 sf Bais Medrash area, two (2) classrooms, two (2) offices, a lobby, and eleven (11) dorm rooms. Several single-family residences exist east of the property. Property north of the school and adjacent properties is undeveloped, and will likely remain undeveloped due to existing wetlands and category one buffers. In addition to proposed site improvements that will support the School/Yeshiva, road widening improvements are proposed along the property's Ridge Avenue frontage as depicted on the site plans, and as designed on the 4-Sheet road design plan set. At the July 11, 2011 Zoning Board Meeting, a previous application for a three-story, 23,745 sf school and synagogue (and basement) on this property received preliminary and final major site plan approval, together with use and bulk variances, subject to the conditions set forth per Zoning Board Resolution #3776, dated July 25, 2011. The property is located in the R-15 Zone District. Schools are permitted uses. I. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-15 Single-Family Residential District. Schools are permitted in the zone, subject to the provisions of Section 18-905. 2. Per review of the site plans, a front yard setback variance is necessary (15 feet is proposed, 30 feet is required). 3. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the required variance. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. 4. Additionally, disturbance within the 20 foot residential buffer adjoining residential Lot 84 is proposed for construction of an infiltration basin. Per Note #2 on Site Plan Sheet #2, the applicant is requesting relief from this requirement, and proposes to install a 6-foot high screen as stipulated per UDO (Subsection 18-906A3). 5. No submission waivers appear necessary for this application. 6. A (partial) design waiver is required for sidewalk along the improved road frontage. Sidewalk is proposed east of the entrance drive, but not to the west. 7. Similarly, a (partial) design waiver appears necessary for on-site curbing in the area between the paved access drive and bioretention swale, intended to promote sheet flow of stormwater into the swale. We support the waiver; however, the applicant may wish to consider end treatment at the edge of paving where vertical curbing is not proposed (to minimize future maintenance). II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Testimony should be provided by the applicant for the Board summarizing the proposed use of the school, including but not limited to the following: a. How many students are proposed at the school. b. Will any students (or parents) drive and park at the school. c. How many buses (if any) are proposed. d. Will any students will be dropped off and picked up (by car). 2. As indicated previously, Per review of the Architectural Plan, the facility will include a 1,583 sf Bais Medrash area, two (2) classrooms, two (2) offices, a lobby, and eleven (11) dorm rooms. Per UDO requirements, Subsection 18-906C, we estimate that up to six (6) off-street parking spaces are required (including the lobby area, and one space for the Bais Medrash area). Spaces for dorm rooms are not required per the UDO. 3. As depicted on the plan, twelve (12) off-street parking spaces are proposed, in excess of UDO requirements. 4. Testimony will be provided by the applicant's engineer regarding the adequacy of the access drive alignment to accommodate the largest vehicles (buses, DPW vehicles, other) intended to access the site. Per communications with the applicant's engineer, a circulation plan will be provided during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. 5. As depicted on the Site Plans and on the Ridge Avenue improvement plans, full-depth pavement widening is proposed along the entire property frontage, including what appears to be acceleration and deceleration pavement tapers. Said design is well-prepared, and will be reviewed in detail during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. 6. As indicated previously, a (partial) design waiver is

required for sidewalk along the improved road frontage. Sidewalk is proposed east of the entrance drive, but not to the west. Final sidewalk design, including handicap accessible ramps will be reviewed in detail during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. 7. As depicted on the Site Plans, a refuse enclosure is proposed at the westerly end of the proposed access drive. Per General Note #10, trash and recyclables pickup will be performed by the Township DPW. DPW approval of the proposed design is necessary. The applicant agrees to this requirement. 8. The currently-depicted traffic signage and marking information on the site plans is generally well-prepared. Said information will be reviewed in further detail during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this requirement. 9. A sight triangle easement is depicted for the proposed access drive's intersection with (improved) Ridge Avenue. Survey data and testimony shall be provided for sight triangle easements. The applicant agrees to this requirement (as a condition of Board approval, if granted). 10. Proposed six foot (6') wide utility easements shall be added to the site plan and labeled along with providing bearings, distances, and areas. The applicant agrees to this requirement (as a condition of Board approval, if granted). B. Architectural 1. As depicted on the architectural plan, the front façade is proposed to be brick face for both stories. We recommend that architectural rendering be provided at the forthcoming public hearing, including building treatments for all elevations. 2. As depicted on the architectural plans, no basement is proposed. 3. Per review of the plans and communications with the applicant's professionals, the building and site improvements are designed to be handicap accessible, and will be in conformance with Building Code requirements. 4. Per review of the plans and communications with the applicant's professionals, the building design will be code-compliant with respect to fire suppression. 5. Testimony should be required as to location of proposed HVAC equipment (roof-mounted, ground, other). Adequate buffer and/or screening of said units will be necessary. The applicant agrees to this requirement as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. 6. The site plans depict a detailed roof leader collection system, connecting proposed building gutter systems to proposed on-site stormwater management facilities. Said design is well-prepared, and will be coordinated with final architectural plans during compliance (if/when Board approval is granted). C. Grading 1. Per review of the proposed grading, the overall design is well-prepared. As depicted, final grades will be shallow, and consistent with existing grades with the exception of two (2) areas – along the interior sidewalk and building entrance, and around the proposed infiltration basin immediately east of the school building. Shallow retaining wall systems are proposed in both of these areas. 2. Similarly, proposed elevations are provided for the proposed Ridge Avenue improvements, and are generally well-prepared. 3. Final review of the grading design, including retaining all systems and road improvements will be addressed during compliance review should approval be granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. D. Storm Water Management 1. Per review of the submitted stormwater management design, it is generally well-prepared, and designed to comply with the requirements of the NJ Stormwater Rule (NJAC 7:8) as applicable to the project. The design includes a subsurface recharge system and bioretention swale to attenuate runoff from the proposed parking area and access drive, and a (surficial) infiltration basin with sand filter to attenuate runoff from the school building. 2. We recommend additional inlets and piping near the proposed drive entrance (or equivalent measures) to collect and convey pavement runoff to the proposed recharge system. This issue can be reviewed with the applicant's engineer during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees with this condition. 3. Soil data and borings locations are provided on Site Plan Sheet #3. A copy of the geotechnical report (and accompanying soil logs and percolation data) referenced on the plan summary should be provided to our office for final review of the proposed design (including seasonal high

water table and percolation rates observed throughout the site). The applicant agrees to this condition. 4. As indicated in the Stormwater Management report, the applicant will be responsible for operation and maintenance of the proposed systems. A stormwater maintenance report will be provided during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees with this condition. 5. Final review of the stormwater management system, and proposed maintenance will occur during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. E. Landscaping and Lighting 1. A dedicated Landscaping Plan is provided on Sheet 5 of the plans. As depicted, street trees are provided along Ridge Avenue (outside of the site triangle), as well as around the access drive and parking areas. Buffer and foundation plantings are depicted within the proposed bioretention swale. 2. A six foot (6') high privacy fence between the infiltration basin and Lot 84 is necessary to buffer the project for compliance with Section 18-906 of the UDO. As indicated previously, the applicant agrees to this condition. 3. A detailed Tree Location and Tree Save Plan is provided on Sheet 6 of the site plans, and is well-prepared. The final design will be reviewed to document compliance with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance. The applicant agrees to this condition. 4. A dedicated Lighting Plan is provided on Site Plan Sheet #7 of the submission, and is well-prepared. Light sources, illumination intensities and cut sheets for the various fixtures are provided. 5. We recommend that non-security lighting (i.e., other than proposed building-mounted lighting) be placed on timers for when the school is not in operation. 6. A final review of the lighting design will occur during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. F. Utilities 1. As depicted on the Utility Plan (Site Plan Sheet #4), public water and sewer service are proposed via connections to existing public systems present within Ridge Avenue. As indicated per General Utility Note #24, proposed water and sewer main extensions and connections will be owned and operated by the Lakewood Township MUA (LTMUA). As a result, LTMUA approval of the design is required. The applicant agrees to this condition. 2. A final review of utilities, for site compliance purposes will occur as a condition of Board approval, if granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. G. Signage 1. No signage information is provided. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs, if any (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. H. Environmental 1. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) report was provided for the project, and is generally well-prepared. Additionally, limits of freshwater wetlands, wetland buffers, and the local Category One development buffer are depicted on the site plan documents. Existing mature vegetation is also depicted on the Tree Management/Protection plan, as well as compliance with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance standards 2. As depicted on the site plans, no new development or disturbance within wetlands or buffers is proposed. I. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete @ 4,500 psi. 2. Construction details are provided with the current design submission. We will review the construction details during compliance should site plan approval be granted. 3. Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Ocean County Planning Board; b. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; c. Lakewood Township MUA; d. NJDEP (sewer extension permit); e. Developer's Agreement (at the discretion of the Township); and f. All other required outside agency approvals. A revised

submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.

Mr. Rennert stepped down for this application.

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are requested for front yard setback as well as a 20 ft residential buffer.

Mr. Graham MacFarlane, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. One variance is requested for front yard setback along Ridge Avenue. The site has some unique constraints in both its shape and topography. There are also environmental constraints that leave only a very small portion of this site developable. A design waiver is also requested for a buffer along the eastern property line. The detention basin encroaches into a small portion of the buffer. They will provide a fence along the boundary of the basin and the property line to the point where it does not encroach into the category one buffer. No busing is proposed with this application. There are eleven dorm rooms intended for post high school boys.

Mr. Banas asked about the detention basin.

Mr. MacFarlane said the basin is about 3 feet deep.

Mr. Banas is concerned about the boys going near the basin.

Mr. MacFarlane said the parking area is available and a portion of the site to the south of the building. The overall tract is about 10 acres. There will be a fence around the basin.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public, seeing no one come forward, he closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Ingber to approve the application.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman

6. SP 2046 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Kehillas Hearthstone
Location: Hearthstone Drive & Jenna Court
Block 428.01 Lots 1 & 2
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for proposed addition to existing synagogue

Project Description
The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of an addition to the existing synagogue along with site improvements, on the subject premises. The project would merge existing Lots 1 and 2 in Block 428.01, which also contains the rabbi's residence. The project site consists of Lots 1 and 2 in Block 428.01, situated in the R-12 Zone. The site is in the southwestern portion of the Township, on the northeast corner of Hearthstone Drive and Jenna Court. Both streets are improved municipal roadways in fair condition with fifty foot (50') right-of-ways. Curb and sidewalk in fair condition exist along both project frontages. Sanitary sewer and potable water are available and currently serve the existing lots. According to the site plan and our site investigation, the property is within a residential subdivision. Lot 1 is the corner property and contains the synagogue for which an addition is proposed on the east

side. The adjacent property to the east is Lot 2 and contains the rabbi's residence. Lots 1 and 2 are proposed to be consolidated as the proposed improvements associated with the synagogue addition would cross the existing property line. Per the topographic survey and site investigation, the land gently slopes generally downward toward the existing roadways. There are some existing trees on the site which have not been located on the survey. Site access to the synagogue is proposed via two (2) access driveways and parking areas, one (1) from each street. These proposed driveways and parking areas will service seven (7) off-street parking spaces, where one (1) of the proposed off-street parking spaces would be van accessible handicap. An existing driveway on Jenna Court services the rabbi's residence. Proposed storm water management facilities have not been included in the Site Plan. A retaining wall is proposed around the synagogue addition for grading purposes. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Waivers A. The following submission waivers have been requested: 1. B2 - Topography within 200 feet thereof. 2. B4 - Contours within 200 feet of the site boundaries. 3. B10 - Man-made features within 200 feet of the site. 4. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 5. C14 - Tree Protection Management Plan. 6. C15 - Landscaping Plan. 7. C17 - Design calculations for drainage facilities. We support the B-Site Features waivers as there is enough information provided for design. We support the waiving of an Environmental Impact Statement due to the developed nature of the site. The applicant will be required to comply with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance as a conditional of Board approval (if/when granted). The submission waiver for landscaping should only be from a completeness standpoint and should be required prior to the public hearing. The submission waiver from design calculations for drainage facilities should only be from a completeness standpoint. Drainage facilities should be proposed to eliminate the increase in runoff by the development. Identify proposed drainage prior to the public hearing. II. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-12 Zone. Single Family Detached Housing and places of worship are a permitted uses in this zone. Places of worship are subject to the provisions of Section 18-905 of the UDO. 2. A variance is required for Minimum Front Yard Setback. The existing synagogue, for which the addition is proposed, is located 25.7 feet from the Hearthstone Drive right-of-way, whereas thirty feet (30') is required. This is an existing nonconforming condition. 3. A variance is required for Minimum Rear Yard Setback. The proposed consolidation of the properties will turn the easterly existing side yard of Lot 2 into a rear yard. Therefore, the 10.2 foot dimension from the existing residence to the property line will require a minimum rear yard setback variance since twenty feet (20') would be necessary. 4. A variance is requested for Maximum Building Coverage. The proposed building coverage is shown to be thirty percent (30%) and the maximum allowable coverage is twenty-five percent (25%). However, we cannot confirm whether the proposed coverage is correct since there are discrepancies in the preliminary architectural plans, no dimensions for the existing residence, and no information on the future status of the existing sheds. 5. Depending on the future status of the existing sheds, setback variances may be required for accessory structures. 6. Section 18-905A., of the UDO must be addressed to determine whether any variances or waivers are required from the Parking Regulations. 7. Section 18-905B., of the UDO must be addressed to determine whether any waivers are required from the Buffer Requirements. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A topographic survey has been submitted. A revised survey is required which shall include the following: a. An outbound survey with individual areas for existing Lots 1 and 2. This will enable us to confirm the lot area provided. b. A horizontal datum and a vertical bench mark. c. Individual tree locations. d. The existing curb ramps at the intersection. e. The existing mailbox along the Hearthstone Drive frontage. f. The new fence on adjoining Lot 16 which connects to the fence on Lot 1. 2. Seven (7) off-street parking spaces are proposed for the synagogue,

including one (1) van accessible handicap space. The existing split level rabbi's residence contains a driveway capable of parking two (2) vehicles. The number of parking spaces being proposed and the number of required spaces must be included on the plans. This should be included under the "Zoning Data for the R-12 Zone". 3. A General Note shall be added addressing horizontal datum. 4. A vertical bench mark must be provided. 5. General Note #10 indicates that Lots 1 and 2 will be consolidated through deed. A description and deed of easement shall be provided to the board attorney and engineer for review. 6. The provided minimum lot width shall be revised to one hundred feet (100') since it will be measured across the Hearthstone Drive frontage. 7. Revision dates must be corrected in the plan set. 8. The plan must be revised clarifying existing improvements to remain and to be removed. 9. Proposed setback lines shall be added to the site plan. 10. The existing synagogue is incorrectly shown as a two-story house and does not match the survey in configuration and location. The base map needs to be corrected since proposed site improvements will be impacted. 11. As noted previously, synagogue site access is proposed via driveways that intersect Hearthstone Drive and Jenna Court. The proposed curb locations for the parking areas must be dimensioned from the right-of-way lines. Proposed dimensioning should be completed throughout the site. 12. As depicted on the site plan, sidewalk is to be replaced in the vicinity of the proposed driveway crossings. Proposed sidewalk is also shown connecting the parking areas to the building. 13. The proposed handicap accessible space, not the aisle, must be provided with appropriate signage. Curb ramps have been proposed onsite where necessary. The existing curb ramps at the intersection shall be shown. Detectable warning surface must be proposed for these existing curb ramps at the intersection. 14. The General Notes indicate that solid waste and recycling to be collected by the Township. A proposed refuse area is shown on the side of the synagogue. The refuse/recyclable storage area detail provided does not match the plan. 15. Curbing shall be proposed along Hearthstone Drive and Jenna Court where new driveways are to be constructed and existing driveways are to be removed. Curbing has also been proposed for the interior of the parking areas. 16. A proposed Sight Triangle Easement has been depicted at the intersection. Sight Triangle Easements shall be added to the access driveways. All of these easements will be dedicated to the Township. Descriptions and deeds of easement shall be provided to the board attorney and engineer for review. 17. A Shade Tree and Utility Easement has been proposed for the future lot consolidation. A description and deed of easement shall be provided to the board attorney and engineer for review. B. Architectural 1. The proposed building addition is approximately eighteen feet (18') high consisting of a one-story structure with a basement. The proposed first floor is at grade. The proposed building addition does not exceed the allowable height of thirty-five feet (35'). 2. The existing and proposed building layout and square footage must be checked and coordinated with the site plan, especially since variances are necessary. 3. ADA accessibility will be provided to the first floor. 4. Testimony should be provided as to whether the synagogue has a sprinkler system. The proposed addition will require new sanitary sewer and potable water services. 5. Testimony should be provided as to where HVAC equipment is proposed for the building and how the equipment will be adequately screened. 6. The roof drainage of the existing and proposed building must be coordinated with the site plan. 7. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use at the public hearing, consistent with the building footprint as depicted on the site plans. C. Grading 1. A dedicated grading plan has been provided and is feasible. 2. The soil log provided justifies the proposed basement depth. The proposed basement floor elevation shall be added to the plans. 3. A review of the final grading plan will be performed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. As indicated previously, no proposed storm water management facilities have been provided.

2. We recommend the installation of storm water management facilities to handle the increase in runoff from the site. 3. Storm water management can be provided as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. E. Landscaping 1. No landscaping has been provided with the submission. 2. The final landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Shade Tree Commission as practicable. 3. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. F. Lighting 1. No site lighting information has been provided with the submission. 2. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 3. The final lighting design shall be reviewed during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. G. Utilities 1. The existing site is served by public water and sewer from New Jersey American Water Company since the project is within their franchise area. Based on the preliminary Architectural Plans additional sewer and water services will need to be provided for the addition. H. Signage 1. No signage has been proposed. We recommend that final signage and markings be provided as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. I. Environmental 1. Site Description To assess the site for environmental concerns, a natural resources search of the property and surroundings was completed using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issue associated with development of this property. Testimony should be provided on any known areas of environmental concern that exist within the property. 2. Environmental Impact Statement A waiver has been requested from an Environmental Impact Statement since the site has been previously developed. 3. Tree Management Plan As indicated previously, a Tree Management Plan must be provided. The applicant must comply with the Tree Protection ordinance requirements as a condition of Board approval (if/when granted). J. Construction Details 1. Construction details have been provided. 2. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township or NJDOT standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. 3. Final review of construction details will take place during compliance (if/when approval is granted). IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement (if required, at the discretion of the Township); b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are required for front yard setback, rear yard setback and maximum building coverage.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. This is for the expansion of an existing synagogue and for consolidation of the two lots. The second of which will house the rabbi's residence. This is an existing shul that has outgrown its quarters. The intent is not to bring additional traffic to the shul but to accommodate the existing members. The front yard setback is an existing non-conforming condition. Because they are combining the two lots, the side yard setback now becomes a rear yard setback.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. They currently have two parking spaces which will be increased to seven. The building coverage requested is 30%. None of the lots in the area conform to R-12 standards.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public, seeing no one come forward, he closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the application.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman

6. CORRESPONDENCE

- **SP 2033 –** Zev & Chaya Hess – Discussion on coverage percentage

Mr. Penzer, Esq. said they had reduced the coverage to 33% by removing the roof over the porch but it does not work.

The board has no problem increasing the building coverage percentage by only adding the roof.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to amend the resolution
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman
Abstained: Mr. Banas

- **SP 1901 –** 16 South Clifton, LLC – Discussion regarding parking agreement with neighboring property

Mr. Penzer said they have received an agreement from St. Mary's for the use of the parking lot.

The Board is satisfied with the agreement.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the agreement.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Ingber, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman

7. PUBLIC PORTION

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. APPROVAL OF BILLS

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary