

****NOTE: THERE IS A LOUD BUZZING SOUND THROUGHOUT THE RECORDING OF THIS MEETING. PLEASE EXCUSE ANY ERRORS OR OMISSIONS. A COPY OF THE TRANSCRIPT MAY BE PURCHASED FROM THE COURT REPORTER IF NEEDED.**

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 at least 48 hours in advance. The public has the right to attend this meeting, and minutes of this meeting will be available for public inspection. This meeting meets the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Magno was sworn in.

4. APPROVAL OF 2015 MEETING SCHEDULE

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

5. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

- 1. SD 1988** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: White Street Developers, LLC
Location: White Street & Olive Court
Block 251 Lots 1.22 & 1.23
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

Mrs. Morris said this was pushed off in order to reach out to the committee to see if the Board could get any clarification on the transportation improvement district ordinance. No response was received.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esq. (inaudible).

Mr. Neiman said this is a small project. They need to have some type of plan in place in order to improve the infrastructure in that area before the Board will approve any future projects in that area. These roads were built for an R-40 zone. If they want to change the zoning, the roads must be upgraded.

Mr. Pfeffer wanted to clarify if the builder will be able to get a CO before White Street is widened.

Mr. Neiman believes the applicant will be widening only the frontage of this project and any impact fees will be provided once the ordinance is adopted.

Mr. Pfeffer said that is correct.

Mr. Sussman (inaudible).

Mrs. Morris said the issue is the Board doesn't have the authority until the committee adopts an ordinance. The Board can make recommendations but the Committee has to act on those.

Mr. Franklin said they do not have to approve a project if they know the transportation to that project won't work.

Mr. Rennert said White Street and Drake Road are built right now for R-40. That is the way he looks at it until there is a plan in place.

Mr. Sussman said if they keep approving small projects then eventually this will be built up on roads that are designed for R-40.

Mr. Rennert said a lot still needs to happen and the township needs to be committed to a certain direction. If not, this is an R-40 zone.

Mr. Mark Kitrick said they are only speaking about this resolution right now. There was a resolution confirming the adoption or the granting of the application. The applicant is asking for an amendment to the proposed resolution.

Mr. Pfeffer said no CO will be issued until they comply with that.

Mr. Rennert said the problem is the original approval was granted on the basis that White Street will be widened.

Mr. Schmuckler said maybe the Board would feel more comfortable leaving the resolution the way it is and then having the applicant come back to amend the site plan. If the applicant were to come back before the board, they would say it is a very minor change.

Mr. Neiman said it was changed. The infrastructure is R-40 but the Township did change the zone.

Mr. Rennert understands but if they approve it now the project will be built without the infrastructure.

Mr. Schmuckler agrees that this is still R-40. If you want to get the more dense zoning, the applicant needs to follow certain conditions including water and sewer, road widening, etc.

Mr. Neiman said the water and sewer was already brought in. The question is the roadways. The Board would like some sort of affirmation.

Mrs. Morris said she did speak with Stan Slachetka today as T&M prepared the study that came up with the figures that were on the ordinance. There is an entire study detailing where improvements should be happening and accounting those costs into it. Realistically, to come up with an actual design plan on how wide White Street and what portions are going to be widened, it would take time and the Township Committee would have to decide to spend the town's money on that.

Mr. Schmuckler said that overall the Board should not give approvals in this area because it is a hazard. The roads can't handle the high density until the roads are upgraded.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the amended resolution.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Rennert

Abstain: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler

- 2. SD 1564A** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Harvard Partners LLC
Location: Lanes Mill Road & Hidden Lane
Block 187.15 Lot 9

Amended Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 15 lots

Mrs. Morris stated that this resolution was prepared at the request of Ray Shea. It was regarding the Harvard Partners application on Lanes Mill Road where the County would not let them have new access on Lanes Mill Road. Apparently the County has rescinded that and they are going to let the applicant have that opening as originally approved. This is just a resolution to officially withdraw the amended resolution.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Franklin to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler

Abstain: Mr. Rennert

6. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

- 1. SP 2095** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Excel VII, LLC
Location: 1790 Swarthmore Avenue
Block 1603 Lot 2

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a building addition

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval to propose additional off-street parking for a previously approved Phase 2 building expansion of the existing industrial building, located at the corner of Swarthmore Avenue and Kenyon Drive within the M-1 Zone of the Lakewood Industrial Park. The existing industrial structure is a 200' X 243.5' rectangular building with an area of forty-eight thousand seven hundred square feet (48,700 SF). The previously approved 160' X 200', thirty-two thousand square foot (32,000 SF) future addition would bring the total building area to eighty-thousand seven hundred square feet (80,700 SF). The proposed off-street parking would be added around the future building addition on the southerly side of the lot. According to the site plan, the proposed off-street parking will be three ninety-three (93) spaces. Three (3) of the proposed spaces will be handicapped. Proposed parking spaces will be a minimum of 9' X 20'. The handicapped spaces are shown as 12' X 20'. Proposed aisle widths would be a minimum of twenty-four feet (24') wide. Access to the site will be provided from the existing two (2) driveways intersecting Kenyon Drive and the one (1) driveway intersecting Swarthmore Avenue. The tract consists of an almost rectangular property which is listed as 4.7 acres in area. The lot where this facility is located is generally bounded by other industrial buildings. Access to the site is from Swarthmore Avenue and Kenyon Drive, which are improved Township Roads having sixty foot (60') wide right-of-ways with forty foot (40') pavement widths. Curbing exists along the frontages of Swarthmore Avenue and Kenyon Drive, but sidewalk does not. The project

is located in the M-1 Industrial Zone. 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.C8 - Location, names, and widths of all existing and proposed streets on the property and within 200 feet of tract. 5. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 6. C17 - Design calculations showing proposed drainage facilities to be in accordance with the appropriate drainage runoff requirements. We can support granting the Site Features and Improvements waivers outside the site boundaries since no offsite design is necessary. We support the granting of the requested Environmental Impact Statement waiver, since the site and surroundings have been previously developed. We cannot support a waiver from providing drainage design calculations. Significant proposed pavement area would be added to the site requiring additional onsite drainage. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the M-1 Zone. Testimony should be provided confirming the existing and proposed uses are permitted. 2. Per review of the site plans and application, no bulk variances are requested for the facility expansion. 3. It is not clear whether any sign variances are required. Addition information must be provided. 4. A design waiver is required from providing sidewalk along the site frontages. It should be noted the project is in the Industrial Park and there are no sidewalks along the street frontages of adjoining properties. III. Review Comments Per review of the current design plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations: A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. At a minimum, a partial Topographic Survey would be required for resolution compliance to base the drawings on since the original site plan drawings were prepared in 1989. We note the proposed dimensional layout of the improvements does not match the existing conditions. Furthermore, the proposed grading is based on the old design drawings instead of existing elevations. This survey (and final design revisions) may be provided during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. 2. Our site investigation noted that striping is needed for the existing off-street parking and the ADA spaces are not compliant. 3. Information on vertical datum shall be updated. A horizontal datum and a vertical bench mark shall be provided. 4. All proposed building dimensions and access points should be coordinated between the architectural plans and site plans since they impact design. 5. The applicant's professionals should provide summary testimony of the existing and proposed (expanded) use of the facility, including hours of operation, shifts, maximum employees on site per shift, etc. 6. As illustrated on the Site Plans, a thirty-two thousand square foot (32,000 SF) addition at the southwest end of the building is proposed 7. As shown on the site plan, new parking areas are proposed to serve the expanded facility. The existing access drives from the facility's Kenyon Drive and Swarthmore Avenue frontage would be unchanged. 8. Testimony should be provided regarding anticipated truck traffic to the expanded facility, including sizes of delivery and transport trucks. An existing loading area is being removed. Applicant should indicate whether the loading on the southeast side of the building will be sufficient. Confirming testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals at the Public Hearing. 9. A circulation plan should be provided to demonstrate that the largest anticipated vehicles can safely enter and exit the property. Per available information, it appears that existing trucks access the existing building from internal loading areas within the southeast side, and exit through the existing access drive northeast of the building. The circulation plan can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 10. Sight triangles should be provided at the site access drives from Swarthmore Avenue and Kenyon Drive. 11. An 8' X 8' trash container is shown on the southeast side of the existing building in the current design. Our site investigation noted two (2) other open dumpsters on the project site. Testimony should be provided on collection of trash and recyclable materials. It should be clarified whether the Township or a private company will be responsible for removal. 12. In the Schedule of Requirements, the following should be corrected in the Phase 2 information provided: a. Front Setback, 50.2 feet. b. Side Setback, 107.8 feet. c. Combined Side Setback, not applicable. 13. Stop signs and stop bars should be added to all access driveways. 14. Based on the total number of off-street parking spaces proposed for the site, four (4) conforming handicap parking spaces shall be provided. 15. The Schedule of Requirements shows the proposed building height to be twenty-seven feet (27'), while the architectural plans show the height at thirty feet (30'). B. Architectural

1. Architectural floor plans and elevations are provided with the site plan design drawings. Per review of the submitted plans, the elevation views of the proposed addition on the architectural plans show a maximum height of thirty feet (30'). The proposed height would be much less than the allowable height of sixty-five feet (65'). 2. We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring color renderings of the expanded building to the Public Hearing, and provide testimony regarding proposed building facades and treatments. 3. The Site Plan should show all existing and proposed ground mounted HVAC equipment. Adequate screening of the equipment should be provided. Said information can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 4. Water and sewer connections to the proposed building addition are being provided. 5. The site plans and architectural plans must be coordinated. C. Grading 1. The proposed grading, drainage, and utilities are all shown on the Site Plan sheet submitted. 2. Spot elevations should be added to all building access points. 3. A retaining wall is proposed along the southwest property line to address the grade differential which would be created by the future building addition and access aisle. 4. A review of final grading revisions will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. A Storm Water Management Report should be provided. It appears more than a quarter acre (0.25 Ac.) of net new impervious coverage is proposed. Storm water management for the new improvements would have to be designed in accordance with NJAC 7:8. 2. Pipe sizing calculations should be completed for any new proposed collection systems. 3. As required a Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual should be provided. The Manual can be provided during compliance, should site plan approval be granted. 4. A review of the final drainage design will be performed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. E. Landscaping 1. The Landscape Plan can be found on Sheet 2. This plan should also be revised based on existing conditions. Revisions are required to the Landscape Schedule: Phase II. Existing landscaping should be differentiated from proposed landscaping. 2. The proposed planting and seeding schedule along with the details can be found on Sheet 2. 3. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and input (if any) from the Shade Tree Commission. 4. The final landscaping design will be reviewed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. F. Lighting 1. A Lighting Plan has been provided on Sheet 2. Per review of the Lighting Plan, it appears that three (3) single pole mounted lights and four (4) wall mounted lights are proposed for the future addition to the property. Once again, this plan should be revised based on existing conditions. The site has existing lighting. 2. The proposed height of the pole mounted lights is sixteen feet (16'). The wattage for the proposed pole mounted lighting is one hundred fifty watts (150W). The proposed height of the wall mounted lights is twenty feet (20'). The wattage for the proposed wall mounted lighting is two hundred watts (200W). 3. A point to point diagram should be submitted to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. Adjustments to lighting may be necessary. 4. A wall mounted light is erroneously shown between the existing building and the proposed addition. 5. Final lighting design revisions can be addressed during compliance review, if/when approval is granted. G. Utilities 1. Public water and sewer services are being provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. 2. The plans indicate the future building expansion will be served by new utility connections. 3. Testimony should be provided regarding the adequacy of proposed fire protection measures for the facility expansion. H. Signage 1. No project identification signs are proposed. 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. I. Environmental 1. Site Summary Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract is mostly developed with an undeveloped wooded area on the southwest end. The property is located on the southeastern intersection of Kenyon Drive and Swarthmore Avenue, east of New Hampshire Avenue. The property generally slopes downwards from south to north. 2. Environmental Impact Statement A waiver was requested from submitting an Environmental Impact Statement. 3. Tree Management Plan A Tree Preservation Plan has been submitted. The plan shall be finalized in accordance with the current ordinance. Conformance with the Township's Tree Protection ordinance will be addressed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheet 3 of 6 in the plan set. 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. Construction details will be reviewed after revisions are submitted for the project. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Industrial Commission; d. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; e. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); f. Ocean County Planning Board; g. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer stated they have no objections to the engineer's review letter.

Mr. Magno stated the submission waivers are acceptable provided that drainage calculations are provided.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waivers.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

A motion was made and seconded to advance the application to the January 20, 2015 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

2. SP 2096 (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Bais Kaila Torah Preparatory School for Girls

Location: Spruce Street & Washington Avenue
Block 778.01 Lot 1

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a building addition, 2 houses, and a gym

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. This site plan is for a proposed one thousand three hundred square foot (1,300 SF) addition to an existing school, along with a seven thousand square foot (7,000 SF) gymnasium, and two (2) residential buildings for faculty use. The site being developed consists of the existing high school, several trailers used for educational class rooms, and an enclosed pool. The applicant proposes to further develop the site with associated parking lots, landscaping, lighting, and utilities. The proposed 20' X 64' addition would be located on the southwest corner of the existing school building facing Spruce Street. The proposed 70' X 102' gymnasium would be a standalone building located to the south of the existing school building along Spruce Street. The proposed two (2) residential buildings for faculty use would be constructed in the wooded northern section of the site. A proposed residence would face Vine Avenue and the other would face Green Street. The existing "L" shaped property totaling 189,177 square feet, or 4.343 acres in area is known as existing Lot 1 in Block 778.01. The large site is located in the central portion of the Township on the northwest corner of Spruce Street and Washington Avenue. The project site has frontage on Spruce Street, Washington Avenue, Green Street, and Vine Avenue. All of these surrounding streets are municipal roads. Vine Avenue has a sixty-six foot (66') right-of-way, while the other roads all have fifty foot (50') right-of-ways. Virtually no curb and sidewalk exist along the site frontages and no new curb or sidewalk is being proposed along these frontages. The project is proposing an additional forty-five (45) off-street parking spaces for the school to bring the total to sixty-six (66) off-street parking spaces at the above-referenced location. Two (2) of the additional proposed spaces will be designated as handicap. Proposed standard parking spaces will be a minimum of 9' X 18' with access aisles being a minimum of twenty-four foot (24') in width. Access to the proposed school development will be provided by multiple access driveways. Two (2) access ways are on Spruce Street, two (2) one-way accesses are on Washington Avenue, and the other is at the terminus of Vine Avenue. Off-street parking for the proposed residences has not been clearly defined. Two (2) underground recharge basins are being

proposed for storm water management. Water and sewer services are to be provided by New Jersey American Water Company. The project is located in the R-12 and R-40/20 Cluster Residential Zones. The surrounding lands are either residentially developed or vacant. Schools are permitted uses in the zones.

I. Waivers A. The following waiver has been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. We can support granting the Environmental Impact Statement waiver since much of the project site is already developed. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-12 and R-40/20 Cluster Residential Zones. Private schools are permitted uses in the zones. 2. A Front Yard Setback Variance is being requested for the proposed gymnasium. A twenty foot (20') setback from Spruce Street is being proposed, whereas a thirty foot (30') setback is required for this location which is in the R-12 Zone. 3. It appears a Side Yard Setback Variance for an Accessory Building is required. An existing trailer is shown within the ten foot (10') side setback line. 4. The plan recognizes an existing Rear Yard Setback Variance for an Accessory Building. A 9.8 foot rear yard setback is shown from an existing one-story modular building, where a ten foot (10') rear yard setback is required. 5. A Front Yard Setback Variance is being requested for the proposed faculty residences. A minimum front yard setback of twenty-five feet (25') is proposed from Green Street. A fifty foot (50') front yard setback is required for the R-40 Zone and a thirty foot (30') front yard setback is required for the R-20 Zone. 6. A Variance is required for Maximum Building Coverage. A building coverage of thirty-two percent (32%) is proposed, whereas an allowable building coverage of no more than thirty percent (30%) is permitted. 7. Review of the Site Plan and zone requirements indicates the following relief is required from Section 18-906 of the UDO:

- In accordance with Section 18-906A of the UDO, a ten foot (10') wide landscape buffer is required from non-residential uses and zones. Relief is necessary on the northwest sides of the project.
- In accordance with Section 18-906B of the UDO, parking is not permitted in any required buffer. Relief is necessary on the west side of the project.

8. The following waivers are required along the project frontages:

- Construction of curb.
- Construction of sidewalk.
- Planting of street trees.
- Providing a shade tree and utility easement.

9. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances and waivers. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may 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 Per review of the current design plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations: A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A Boundary and Topographic Survey has been provided. The following corrections should be provided: a. In Course #4 of the Description, "Vine Street" should be "Vine Avenue". b. The bench mark location should be corrected to "top of monument found at southwest corner of Spruce Street and Vine Avenue". 2. Zones and Zone Boundary Lines shall be completed on the Existing Conditions Plan. 3. An existing fence and gate is located within the Vine Avenue right-of-way. A redesign of the Vine Avenue site access is recommended to alleviate this encroachment. Furthermore, a better location should be chosen for the three (3) proposed off-street parking spaces near this site access point. 4. The one-way access driveways intersecting Washington Avenue need to be indicated on the site plan. 5. Existing off-street parking spaces need to be striped. Our site investigation noted that no off-street parking spaces are striped. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements indicates there are twenty-one (21) existing off-street parking spaces on the site. However, the locations of the existing spaces are not shown on the site plan. 6. The parking requirements indicate that sixty-six (66) off-street parking spaces would be needed. A breakdown of the rooms needs to be provided for justification. 7. Based on the total of sixty-six (66) off-street parking spaces, a minimum of three (3) ADA spaces would be required. The new off-street parking proposed would provide two (2) of these spaces, one (1) of which would be van accessible. 8. Testimony should be provided as to whether students will be allowed to park onsite. 9. No school bus information has been provided. Testimony should be provided on site operations. 10. Dimensioning should be completed on the Site Plan. 11. The plans incorrectly show a thirty foot (30') rear setback line in the vicinity of Vine Avenue. 12. Our site investigation noted existing dumpsters near the Vine Avenue access. No proposed trash enclosures have been indicated and should be provided. A note on the Site Plan

indicates that a private company will be responsible for trash and recycling removal. 13. No sight triangle easements associated with the street intersections and site access points have been indicated. Proposed sight triangle easements should be added. 14. Two (2) proposed underground recharge basins are located on site. Confirming testimony should be provided that the proposed storm water management system will be owned and maintained by the applicant. 15. The Notes on the Site Plan require editing. 16. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements requires editing. 17. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements provides setback information for a freestanding sign. However, we cannot find a freestanding sign location on the site plan. 18. Because of the multiple existing and proposed buildings on the site plan, a building coverage summary should be provided. According to the provided coverage shown in the Schedule of Bulk Requirements, a variance would be necessary. 19. The proposed gymnasium would be located with an existing Jersey Central Power and Light Easement. Therefore, approval will be required from Jersey Central Power and Light. 20. The proposed parking lot access east of the new gymnasium is being offset from the Vine Avenue centerline intersection with Spruce Street.

B. Architectural

1. Preliminary architectural floor plans and elevations were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the proposed addition and buildings will be below the allowable height of thirty-five feet (35').
2. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the proposed building facades and treatments. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum.
3. Testimony should be provided as to whether any roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed. If so, said equipment should be adequately screened.
4. Proposed water and sewer connections need to be completed for the proposed addition and buildings. A proposed fire service line is shown for the gymnasium.
5. Basements are proposed for the faculty residential dwellings. Soils information determining seasonal high water table requires corrections.

C. Grading

1. Detailed grading is provided on Sheets 4 and 5 of 12. A storm sewer collection system is proposed to collect runoff and convey it to underground infiltration basins. A total of two (2) below ground recharge basins are being provided on site.
2. Corrections are required to the proposed spot elevations for handicapped parking areas to insure slope compliance. Proposed railings are required along all accessible routes where the grade exceeds five percent (5%).
3. Proposed grading and storm sewer is shown conflicting with existing improvements to the trailers on the west side of the site. However, the plans do not show the existing trailers to be removed or relocated.
4. Proposed retaining walls have been designed around the perimeter of much of the new gymnasium and in front of the building addition.
5. A review of final grading revisions will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

D. Storm Water Management

1. A proposed storm water management system has been designed. The design proposes a storm sewer collection system with two (2) underground recharge basins located beneath the parking lots on either side of the new gymnasium. The project qualifies as major development and must meet the requirements of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Storm Water Management Rules (NJAC 7:8). Per review of the design, it is feasible and can be finalized during compliance review if/when board approval is granted.
2. Ownership and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system must be addressed.
3. Permeability testing and seasonal high water table information has been provided in the Report to justify the proposed design and depth of the recharge basins. The locations of Soil Logs have been provided on the Grading and Drainage Plan.
4. We recommend the Drainage Area Maps be checked for accuracy since they impact the design. We disagree with the maps provided.
5. A cursory review of the Report indicates the runoff reduction rates will be met.
6. Storm sewer and recharge basin profiles have been included with the plans.
7. As required, a Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual must be provided. The Manual and final design will be reviewed with resolution compliance submission should site plan approval be granted.

E. Landscaping

1. The Landscape Plan can be found on Sheets 6 and 7 of 12.
2. The planting and seeding schedules along with the details can also be found on Sheets 6 and 7 of 12.
3. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and recommendations (if any) from the Shade Tree Commission.
4. Proposed utilities and easements should be shown on the Landscape Plan to avoid planting conflicts. Shade tree and utility easements have not been shown along

the property frontages, which require a waiver. Some street trees are being proposed in the right-of-ways instead of locations where shade tree and utility easements are usually provided. 5. The Planting Schedule requires a revision. We count one hundred sixty-one (161) proposed Compact Inkberry Holly. 6. Landscaping will be reviewed in detail after plan revisions are submitted. F. Lighting 1. A Lighting Plan has been provided on Sheets 6 and 7 of 12. 2. Details of the light fixtures, poles, and the mounting heights can be found on Sheets 6 and 7 of 12. Three (3) wall mounted fixtures on the new gymnasium and three (3) pole mounted fixtures are proposed to illuminate the two (2) new parking lots. The proposed mounting height of all lights would be sixteen feet (16'). 3. A point to point diagram has been submitted to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. We find that the proposed parking lots lighting must be revised to conform to the requirements of 0.5 minimum foot-candles. The 1.0 average foot-candles and a 15:1 uniformity ratio is being met. 4. Site lighting for the remainder of the project has not been addressed. 5. Final lighting design can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. H. Utilities 1. Public water and sewer services are being provided by the New Jersey American Water Company since the project is within their franchise area. 2. Proposed water services to all new additions and buildings will be provided from water mains in the fronting streets. A proposed domestic water service and a separate fire suppression line are being connected to the new gymnasium building. 3. Proposed sanitary sewer laterals for all new additions and buildings will be connected to existing sewer mains shown in the fronting streets. 4. The plans indicate that electric, telephone, and cable services shall be installed underground. However, this is in conflict with the existing conditions. I. Signage 1. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements provides setback information for freestanding signage. However, we find no freestanding signage on the plans. 2. Proposed regulatory signage has been shown on the plans. Regulatory sign details should be completed. 3. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with the Township Ordinance. J. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography and a site inspection of the property, the tract consists of a total 4.343 acres in area, and is currently developed as a girl's high school. The site being developed consists of the existing high school, several trailers used for educational class rooms, and an enclosed pool. The undeveloped portions of the site are wooded. The project is located in the central portion of the Township on the northwesterly corner of Spruce Street and Washington Avenue. 2. Environmental Impact Statement The applicant has requested a waiver from providing an Environmental Impact Statement. 3. Tree Management Pla A Tree Management Plan has been submitted. The plan will be reviewed in accordance with current ordinance Chapter XIX, Protection of Trees during resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on at least Sheets 9 and 10 of 12 in the plan set. 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. Construction details will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission for the project should site plan approval be granted. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; d. Jersey Central Power and Light; e. New Jersey American Water Company (water and sewer); f. Ocean County Planning Board; g. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Flannery said they are asking for a waiver from EIS.

Mr. Magno said the waiver is recommended as the site is already developed.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to approve the waivers.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

Mr. Flannery said there is a variance on the plan that is not needed. They put down impervious coverage instead of building coverage. The building coverage is only 22% where 30% is allowed so they are well under. A minor front setback for the gym and front setbacks for the two residential units are requested which is consistent with the other houses in the area. Further testimony will be provided at the public hearing.

Mr. Neiman asked if sidewalks are being provided on Spruce Street.

Mr. Flannery said the plan does not show sidewalks but he knows the Board will want them. Sidewalks will be installed along the project frontages.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Rennert to advance the application to the December 16, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 3. SP 2097** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Monmouth Medical Center, Inc.
Location: River Avenue
Block 421 Lot 1

Preliminary and Final Site Plan for alterations and improvements to the existing entrance and for additional parking at the existing hospital

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval with bulk variances as part of a capital improvement program to renovate and refurbish the Route 9 frontage and a portion of the façade of the existing hospital, located on Lot 1 in Block 421. The property is located within the Hospital Support District, where a hospital is a permitted use. The applicant is currently undertaking a significant capital improvement program to improve the hospital facilities and access to the medical services offered at the hospital. Through this application, the applicant proposes improvements to the approximately 1.7 acre project area located between the existing hospital buildings and Route 9. Specifically, the applicant seeks approval for the following: 1. Create an auxiliary entry court with thirty-four (34) off-street parking spaces, a turnaround area, and an entry plaza to provide better access to the hospital's cardiac rehabilitation, mammography, and wound care facilities, thus decreasing the distance that patients seeking those services must travel. 2. Realign the driveway from Prospect Street, which services the loading dock, by shifting the driveway further west from the intersection of Prospect Street and Route 9. The shift in the driveway location will improve traffic flow and safety both onsite and offsite, as well as reduce conflicts at the intersection. 3. Close the existing mid-block driveway that provides direct access from Route 9 to the hospital. Instead, vehicles will access this area of the hospital from the driveway located on West Spruce Street. 4. Remove aging landscaping from the project area and replant more and different species to improve the overall streetscape along Route 9. 5. Remove six hundred ninety-one square feet (691 SF) of existing walkway to the mobile medical imaging unit to create an entry plaza. The mobile medical imaging unit will be relocated to another portion of the project area, as shown on the plans. 6. Update a portion of the hospital's facade facing Route 9. 7. Replace and update the hospital's signage, both in the project area and in other portions of the property. The applicant is proposing eight (8) freestanding signs (six of which are replacement signs) and two (2) wall signs (one of which is a replacement sign). I. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the HS, Hospital Support Zone. Per Section 18-903S.1.a., of the UDO, hospitals and medical centers are permitted uses in this zone. 2. Per review of the survey, site plans, and application, the project has the following existing

nonconformities: a. Front yard setback to West Spruce Street. There is an existing front yard setback of 44.22 feet, whereas fifty feet (50') is required. b. Front yard setback to Route 9. There is an existing front yard setback of 68.9 feet, whereas seventy-five feet (75') is required. However, it should be noted that the proposed building reconfiguration would increase the front yard setback to seventy-two feet (72'). 3. The following sign variances are required: a. Section 18-812A.6., of the UDO, freestanding sign setback at intersection. Twenty-five foot (25') setbacks are required while five foot (5') setbacks have been proposed for Signs # 1 & 4. It should be noted these proposed sign locations will require approval by Ocean County and the New Jersey Department of Transportation. Prospect Street is a County Highway and Route 9 is a State Highway. b. Section 18-812A.9.b., of the UDO, freestanding sign setback. Fifteen foot (15') setbacks are required while five foot (5') setbacks have been proposed for Signs # 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, & 10. It should be noted that the proposed sign locations near access driveways along Prospect Street will require County approval since they would be within the standard sight triangle easements. c. Section 18-812A.9.d., of the UDO, freestanding and wall signs may not be used together to identify the same establishment on the same street. Freestanding and wall signs are proposed along Route 9 and Prospect Street. d. Section 18-812A.10.b., of the UDO, number of business signs. One (1) sign is permitted for each separate street frontage. Ten (10) signs are proposed for three (3) frontages. Seven (7) signs are being replaced, while three (3) of the signs are newly proposed. e. Section 18-812A.11.a., of the UDO, area of freestanding signs. Thirty-five square feet (35 SF) is permitted for signs on Route 9 and fifteen square feet (15 SF) is permitted for signs on Prospect Street and West Spruce Street. Two (2) sixty square feet (60 SF) signs (Signs # 1 & 4) are being proposed on Route 9. Two (2) forty-eight square foot (48 SF) signs (Signs # 6 & 7) are being proposed on Prospect Street. An eighty-four square foot (84 SF) sign (Sign # 8) is being proposed on Prospect Street. f. Section 18-812A.11.a., of the UDO, freestanding sign height. Six foot (6') tall signs are permitted on Route 9, while five foot (5') high signs are permitted on Prospect Street and West Spruce Street. Ten foot (10') tall signs are proposed on Route 9 (Signs # 1 & 4) and six foot (6') tall signs are proposed on West Spruce Street (Sign # 10) and Prospect Street (Signs # 5, 6, 7, & 8). 4. Per review of the site plans and application, a design waiver is required from providing shade tree and utility easements. 5. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances and waivers. 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. II. Review Comments Per review of the current design plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations: A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A Survey has been submitted. The General Notes indicate the survey is based on New Jersey State Plane Coordinate System. The vertical datum is based on NAVD 1988. The following corrections should be provided. a. The addition of a vertical bench mark. b. Fixing a text overwrite in the Legend. 2. The General Notes should be edited. Horizontal and vertical datum as well as a vertical bench mark shall be provided. 3. Outbound information must be added to the Site Plan. 4. The project is proposing thirty-four (34) additional off-street parking spaces, with four (4) new ADA spaces, two (2) of which would be van accessible. This would increase the existing number of five hundred twenty-four (524) off-street parking spaces to five hundred fifty-eight (558). The required number of off-street parking spaces is three hundred thirty-two (332). Information shall be provided on the total number of ADA spaces. Based upon the total number of proposed off-street parking spaces, at least twelve (12) ADA spaces are required. 5. The plans do not show an "NJDOT Desirable Typical Section" which is usually a width of fifty-seven feet (57') from the centerline of Route 9. The inclusion of this section could impact the proposed design. The applicant's professionals should provide information and testimony regarding any future widening plans and/or property acquisition along Route 9. 6. As illustrated on the site plan, a new parking lot with a turnaround is proposed to serve the renovated facility. The existing access drive is proposed to be altered from the facility's West Spruce Street frontage. Also, realignment to the loading dock driveway is proposed. The proposed location would be moved away from the signalized intersection of Prospect Street and Route 9. 7. The proposed aisle width between parking spaces should be labeled on the Site Plan as twenty-four feet (24'). The

proposed minimum parking spaces size would be 9' X 18'. 8. Unless a waiver is granted by the Board, a shade tree and utility easement shall be added to the project. 9. Testimony should be provided regarding anticipated truck traffic to the expanded facility, including sizes of delivery and transport trucks. Per review of the Site Plan (Sheet C-101) and the submitted architectural drawings, it appears that trucks will continue to deliver and be loaded from a loading area accessed from Prospect Street. Confirming testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals at the Public Hearing. 10. A circulation plan should be provided to demonstrate that the largest anticipated vehicles can safely enter and exit the property. Per available information, it appears that trucks will access the existing building from a loading area on the north side of the project area. The circulation plan can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 11. No sight triangles have been provided at the site access drives from West Spruce Street or Prospect Street, as well as the street intersections with Route 9. Designs for the access drives, and sight triangles along Prospect Street are subject to Ocean County approval. Sight triangles at the street intersections with Route 9 are subject to County and State approval. 12. Testimony should be provided on collection of trash and recyclable materials. It should be clarified whether the Township or a private company will be responsible for removal. 13. All sidewalks within the proposed project area are either being replaced or having new sidewalk constructed to a minimum width of at least five feet (5'). Therefore, ADA requirements would be met. 14. Outbound information, setback lines, and complete dimensioning should be completed on the Site Plan. Said information can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 15. The plans indicate the CAFRA requirements for impervious and vegetative coverage of the site will be met. B. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural floor plans and elevations are provided for review. It should be noted the height of the existing building will not be impacted. 2. We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring color renderings of the renovated building to the Public Hearing, and provide testimony regarding proposed building facades and treatments. 3. The Site Plan should show any existing and proposed ground mounted HVAC equipment. Adequate screening of the equipment should be provided. Said information can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 4. Final coordination of the site plans and architectural plans must be provided should approval be granted. C. Grading 1. Sheet C-201 is the Grading, Drainage, & Utility Plan. The current design is well-prepared, and adequate to serve the renovated facility. 2. Proposed spot elevations should be added to all changes in curb direction, building access points, handicap ramps, and ADA parking spaces. 3. A review of final grading will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm water management system has been designed. The proposed drainage collection system has been positioned to accommodate the existing drywell locations, and to allow for the existing on-site infiltration systems to be maintained. The portion of the storm water runoff from the improvement area will be collected and conveyed to the proposed underground infiltration basin, Cultec Recharger chamber system. The project qualifies as major development and must meet the requirements of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Storm Water Management Rules (NJAC 7:8). 2. Per review of the current design, it is generally well-prepared. Pretreatment has been designed for the proposed underground infiltration basin design using Contech Stormfilter Systems. The proposed footprint of the underground recharge basin is approximately 25' X 142', with five (5) rows of twenty (20) chambers each. 3. Permeability testing and seasonal high water table information has been provided in the Report to justify the proposed depth of the storm water recharge systems. The locations of Soil Logs have been provided on the Grading, Drainage, and Utility Plan. 4. It should be noted that New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's pending CAFRA review could have an impact on the storm water management design. 5. A separate Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual shall be provided after final approval of the storm water management design by CAFRA. 6. A review of the final drainage design will be performed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. E. Landscaping 1. The Landscape Plan can be found on Sheet C-501. A very detailed Planting Schedule has been included. 2. Leaders should be added to all of the taller proposed Serbian Spruce callouts. 3. The quantity of proposed October Glory Red Maple trees should be seven (7). 4. The

proposed planting and seeding schedule along with the details can be found on Sheet C-502. 5. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and input (if any) from the Shade Tree Commission. 6. Proposed easements and utilities should be added to the plan to prevent planting conflicts. 7. The final landscaping design will be reviewed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. F. Lighting 1. A Lighting Plan has been provided on Sheet C-401. Per review of the Lighting Plan, there are eleven (11) single pole mounted lights. 2. The proposed height of the pole mounted lights is thirty feet (30'). The wattage for the proposed pole mounted lighting is four hundred watts (400W). 3. A lighting schedule should be added to the Lighting Plan indicating eleven (11) proposed lights. 4. Any proposed or existing wall mounted lights should be shown on the Lighting Plan. 5. A point to point diagram has not been submitted to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. Adjustments to lighting may be necessary. 6. If no double-arm light poles are proposed the detail should be removed from the Lighting Plan. 7. Final lighting design revisions can be addressed during compliance review, if/when approval is granted. G. Traffic 1. A Traffic Impact Assessment Report was not submitted for review. 2. We recommend that the applicant's professionals provide summary testimony regarding traffic impacts from the expansion at the forthcoming Public Hearing. 3. As indicated previously, Ocean County Planning Board review and approval of the design, entrances, and exits is required since the facility is on Prospect Street. 4. New Jersey Department of Transportation review and approval is required since the facility is on Route 9. H. Utilities 1. Public water and sewer services are being provided by the New Jersey American Water Company since the project is within their franchise area. 2. It is anticipated that the site will continue to be served by the existing utilities. I. Signage 1. Proposed signage includes handicap parking signs and a stop sign for each new entrance driveway being proposed, both of which support two-way traffic. 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. J. Environmental 1. Site Summary The project site, Lot 1 in Block 421, is located on the western side of Route 9 and also abuts Prospect Street, West Spruce Street, and Williams Street to the north, south, and west respectively. The site is mostly developed and occupied by the Monmouth Medical Center - South Campus building complex and parking areas. The front yard area of the site near Route 9 is landscaped and includes a cluster of large, planted, individual pine trees. The property is characterized by fairly level topography. The property is surrounded by a mixture of residential, commercial, industrial, and charitable institutional land uses. An additional portion of the Monmouth Medical Center - South Campus exists to the north of the project site, across Prospect Street. Some commercial, residential, and vacant properties also exist to the north of the subject site. Properties to the south, west, and northwest are predominantly residential. The properties to the east are commercial, charitable institutional, and residential. A medical office complex, commercial, and residential properties exist to the northeast of the project site. 2. Environmental Impact Statement The CAFRA Individual Permit Application Report serves as the Environmental Impact Statement. 3. Tree Management Plan The Tree Removal and Demolition Plan can be expanded to include a Tree Protection Management Plan. Compliance with the Township's Tree Protection ordinance must be addressed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets C-701 and C-702 in the plan set. 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. Construction details will be reviewed during resolution compliance, if/when this project is approved by the Board. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; d. Ocean County Planning Board; e. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; f. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (CAFRA); g. New Jersey Department of Transportation; and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Ms. Jennifer Smith explained the project (inaudible).

Mr. Neiman asked if there is going to be another entrance on Route 9.

Ms. Smith (inaudible).

Mr. Neiman asked if the variance requested is an existing variance.

Ms. Smith said the variance is for signage.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. _____ to advance the application to the January 20, 2015 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 4. SP 2098** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Cedarbridge Holdings, LLC
Location: Cedarbridge Avenue
Block 1603 Lot 1.04 (Approved Lot 1)
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a 4-story office building

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. This site plan is for a proposed four-story office building. The proposed office building would be located on a lot which would be surrounded by a future Quick Chek and duplex housing. The applicant proposes to develop the site which is currently vacant. The construction of a 10,964 square foot office building with associated access, parking lot, landscaping, lighting, and utilities is proposed. The irregular property totaling 2.607 acres in area is being created from a previously approved Major Subdivision Application (SD-1926). The vacant wooded tract is located to the southeast of intersecting County Highways Cedar Bridge Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue. The project site has frontage on Cedar Bridge Avenue. A total of ninety-three (93) off-street parking spaces are proposed at the above-referenced location. Four (4) of the proposed spaces will be designated as handicap. Proposed standard parking spaces will be a minimum of 9' X 18' with access aisles being a minimum of twenty-four foot (24') in width. Access to the proposed building will be provided from Chase Avenue, an access driveway, and by two (2) access driveways intersecting Chase Avenue. Chase Avenue would connect to a future stub of Flannery Avenue on the southeast side of the site. Flannery Avenue will intersect Cedar Bridge Avenue at a future traffic signal about eight hundred feet (800') southeast of New Hampshire Avenue. Cedar Bridge Avenue is a County Road with a one hundred foot (100') right-of-way. Curb and sidewalk is being proposed along Cedar Bridge Avenue. Four foot (4') wide sidewalk is proposed along the northeast side of Chase Avenue. An underground infiltration basin is being proposed for storm water management. Water and sewer services are to be provided by Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. The project is located in the B-6 Corporate Campus/Stadium Support Zone. Office buildings are permitted in this zone. I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. We can support granting the waiver since environmental issues were addressed during the major subdivision application. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the B-6 Corporate Campus/Stadium Support Zone. Section 18-903R.1.d., of the UDO permits office buildings. 2. A proposed front yard setback of 87.79 feet for this site was previously granted by the Board under SD-1926. The footnote should be corrected in the Schedule of Bulk Requirements. 3. A variance is needed for the number of off-street parking spaces. The preliminary architectural plans are calculating a usable floor area of twenty-eight thousand five hundred square feet (28,500 SF) by eliminating common areas. Based on one (1) off-street parking space required for every three hundred square feet (300 SF) of floor area, ninety-five (95) off-street parking spaces are required. The site plan only proposes ninety-three

(93) off-street parking spaces. 4. Per review of the site plans and application, the following design waiver is being requested: • Providing a fifty foot (50') buffer to a property which will have a residential use. 5. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances and waivers. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may 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 Per review of the current design plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations: A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parkin 1. Since the Final Plat for Application SD-1926 has not been filed, the Site Plan should indicate the future Block and Lot numbers approved by the Tax Assessor. 2. Sheet numbering shall be coordinated. 3. The General Notes require some editing. Horizontal datum and a vertical bench mark should be referenced. 4. In the Schedule of Bulk Requirements, the proposed combined side yard setback should be revised to 179.2 feet. 5. The provided off-street parking count should be revised to ninety-three (93). 6. A Legend should be provided. 7. Dimensioning should be completed on the Site Plan. Proposed distances should be provided to the hundredth of a foot where appropriate. 8. A proposed trash enclosure without dimensions has been indicated. Testimony should be provided on collection of trash and recyclable material. It should be clarified whether the Township or a private company will be responsible for removal. The waste receptacle area is being designed in accordance with Section 18-809E., of the UDO. The proposed enclosure is being screened. 9. No graphic sight triangle easements associated with the site access points along Chase Avenue have been indicated. Proposed sight triangle easements at the Chase Avenue and Flannery Avenue intersection should be added. 10. Some minor corrections to the proposed building dimensions are required. Dashed lines should be shown where upper floors cover the proposed building access points. 11. Traffic Striping is proposed throughout the site. Testimony is required to document the adequacy of proposed vehicular circulation for facility operations. 12. Proposed "No Parking fire Lane" signs should be added to the site plan. 13. Pedestrian bypass areas should be labeled on the Site Plan. 14. All proposed depressed curb and curb ramps should be shown throughout the site. 15. No proposed delivery areas are shown for the site. Testimony should be provided as to how the largest anticipated vehicles will access this area and when. A circulation plan demonstrating ingress and egress may be necessary as a condition of Board approval (if/when forthcoming). 16. We recommend the fourteen (14) proposed off-street parking spaces perpendicular to Chase Avenue be designated as Employee Parking. B. Architectural 1. Architectural floor plans and elevations were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the building will be a maximum of fifty feet (50') in height. The proposed building height is equal to the allowable height. All proposed floors would house office space. 2. 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. 3. Testimony should be provided as to whether any roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed. If so, said equipment should be adequately screened. 4. The preliminary architectural plans indicate that a fire suppression system is proposed. A separate four inch (4") fire service connection is proposed on the Utility Plan. 5. Downspouts will need to be depicted on the architectural drawings and be coordinated with underground roof leader design. 6. Two (2) elevators are proposed for the building. C. Grading 1. A detailed Grading and Drainage Plan is provided on Sheet 5 of 15. Proposed grading has been designed to tie into the surrounding sites. A retaining wall is proposed on the northwest side of the project. A storm sewer collection system is proposed to collect runoff on the site and convey it to an underground infiltration basin being provided under the parking lot. 2. Proposed spot elevations should be added to handicapped parking areas to insure slope compliance. 3. A review of final grading revisions will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm water management system has been designed. The design proposes a storm sewer collection system to convey runoff into an underground infiltration basin located in the parking lot. The project qualifies as major development and must meet the requirements of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Storm Water Management Rules (NJAC 7:8). Per review of the design, it is

feasible and can be finalized during compliance review if/when board approval is granted. 2. Ownership and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system must be addressed. A storm water maintenance plan must be provided per NJAC 7:8-5. 3. Permeability testing and seasonal high water table information has been provided in the Report to justify the proposed design and depth of the infiltration basin. The locations of Soil Logs should be provided on the Grading and Drainage Plan. 4. An outlet pipe has been designed above the 100 year storm elevation in the basin to relieve flooding in case of infiltration failure. 5. A cursory review of the Report indicates the runoff reduction rates will be met. 6. Storm Sewer and Recharge Basin profiles have been included with the plans. 7. A final review of the storm water management design will occur during resolution compliance submission should site plan approval be granted. E. Traffic 1. A Traffic Impact Analysis was previously submitted for review with the subdivision application and considered the development of this site. F. Landscaping 1. The Landscape Plan can be found on Sheet 7 of 15. 2. The planting and seeding schedule along with the details can also be found on Sheets 7 and 8 of 15. 3. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and recommendations (if any) from the Shade Tree Commission. 4. Proposed easements and utilities should be shown on the Landscape Plan to avoid planting conflicts. The plan should differentiate proposed plantings associated with this Site Plan from those associated with the Quick Chek Site Plan and Cedarwood Hills Subdivision. 5. It appears the Planting Schedule requires the following revisions: a. There are many unlabeled trees. b. The proposed number of "Fascination Azalea" should be changed to twenty-three (23). c. The "River Birch" label on the plan should be coordinated to match the Planting Schedule. 6. Landscaping will be reviewed in detail after plan revisions are submitted. G. Lighting 1. A Lighting Plan has been provided on Sheet 7 of 15. 2. Details of the light fixtures, poles, and the mounting heights can be found on Sheets 7 and 8 of 15. 3. A point to point diagram has been submitted to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. We find the proposed commercial parking lighting conforms to the requirements of 0.5 minimum foot-candles, 1.0 average foot-candles, and a 15:1 uniformity ratio. 4. Final lighting design can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. H. Utilities 1. Public water and sewer services are being provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority since the project is within their franchise area. 2. Proposed sanitary sewer from the building will be constructed to connect to Chase Avenue. 3. Proposed potable and fire suppression services, as well as a six inch (6") water main for a hydrant, will connect to a water main in Chase Avenue. I. Signage 1. Proposed regulatory signage has been shown on the plans. Regulatory sign details should be completed. 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. J. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography and a site inspection of the property, the tract consists of a total 2.607 acres in area, and is currently undeveloped and contains forested uplands. The project is located in the eastern portion of the Township on the northeasterly side of Cedar Bridge Avenue, southeast of New Hampshire Avenue. The intersection is signalized. The site will be bordered to the northwest by a future Quick Chek, and to the northeast and southeast by a future residential development and commercial development of the Industrial Park. 2. Environmental Impact Statement The applicant has requested a waiver from providing an Environmental Impact Statement. 3. Tree Management Plan A Tree Management Plan has been submitted. The plan shall be revised for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on at least Sheets 13 through 15 of 15 in the plan set. 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. Construction details will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission for the project should site plan approval be granted. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Industrial Commission; d. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; e. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); f. Ocean County

Planning Board; g. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Flannery said they are asking for a waiver from providing the EIS.

Mr. Magno said the waiver is recommended.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Herzl to approve the waiver.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

Mr. Flannery said they are asking for a front yard setback variance but that was granted at the time of the subdivision application. They are also asking for relief for parking. They are providing 93 spaces where 95 spaces are required.

Mr. Neiman asked why they are requesting relief from providing 50 foot buffer to the residential lots.

Mr. Flannery said the ordinance states you can have 25 feet if sufficient landscaping is provided.

Testimony will be provided at the public hearing.

Mr. Neiman said he would like to try and keep the 50 foot buffer.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. _____ to advance the application to the January 20, 2015 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

5. **SD 2002** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Sanz of Lakewood
Location: River Avenue & Gila Place
Block 423.14 Lot 13
Minor Subdivision to create 4 fee-simple duplex lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing rectangular property totaling 0.465 acres in area known as Lot 13 in Block 423.14 into four (4) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 13.01 through 13.04 on the subdivision plan. The site is vacant and would be subdivided to construct two (2) zero lot line duplexes on the four (4) lots. Public water and sewer is available. The site is situated in the southern portion of the Township with double frontage between the west side of Route 9 and the east side of Rena Lane, north of Gila Place. The tract is vacant and the land slopes sharply downward from southeast to northwest. The site may be devoid of trees. A row of coniferous trees are located in the vicinity of the southern boundary and some newly planted street trees are located along the Rena Lane frontage. Rena Lane is a newly improved municipal road with an existing fifty feet (50') right-of-way. New pavement, new Belgian block curb, new concrete sidewalk, and new street lighting exist on Rena Lane. River Avenue (Route 9) is an improved State Highway with an existing sixty-six foot (66') right-of-way. New concrete curb and new sidewalk exist along the River Avenue street frontage of the property. The proposed lots would become 33.78' X 150' rectangular properties. The proposed zero lot line duplexes have been designed such that each pair of lots exceeds ten thousand square feet (10,000 SF) in area. A setback variance from Route 9 is being requested to create the proposed subdivision. Even though Route 9 is a State Highway, most of the surrounding uses are residential. The lots are situated within the HD-7 Highway Development Zone. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the HD-7, Highway

Development Zone District. "Duplexes" are listed as a conditional use. Therefore, the provisions of Section 18-1014 apply for "duplexes". 2. A Minimum Front Yard Setback variance from a State Highway is being requested for proposed Lots 13.01 through 13.04. Fifty-one feet (51') is proposed, while seventy-five feet (75') is required. 3. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the 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. II. Review Comments 1. We have reviewed the Boundary and Topographic survey provided. Revisions required to the survey include the following: a. Add the existing sidewalk. b. Label the existing curb along Rena Lane as Belgian block. c. Label the existing curb along Route 9 as concrete. d. Show all existing appurtenances onsite and within the right-of-way frontages such as trees, signs, and poles. 2. The Survey shows a sign from neighboring Lot 10.61 encroaching onto the site. The Minor Subdivision must address the future status of this sign. 3. Coordinates are required on at least three (3) outbound corners. 4. The General Notes indicate the vertical datum is in NGVD 1929. The bench mark is said to be the rim of a manhole in the intersection of Gila Place and River Avenue. The bench mark should be shown on the subdivision plan. 5. Horizontal datum should be referenced. 6. The only utilities that are shown on the Subdivision Plan is existing sanitary sewer. 7. The proposed side yard setbacks should be revised to 7.78 feet. 8. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements should include off-street parking spaces required and parking spaces provided. 9. The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces when the number of bedrooms is not specified. The proposed driveways for the duplex off-street parking have been designed to accommodate four (4) double stacked spaces for each unit. 10. Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed for the future dwellings on Lots 13.01 through 13.04. If basements are proposed, the minimum of four (4) spaces being provided will comply with the Township Parking Ordinance. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 11. If basements are proposed for Lots 13.01 through 13.04, seasonal high water table information will be required. Test pit locations are shown on the Survey. 12. The plan indicates the new lots are to be connected to existing public water and sewer lines. The project is within the New Jersey American Water Company franchise area for both water and sewer. 13. Proposed lot numbers shall be assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. 14. There are duplicate Surveyor's Certifications on the plans. 15. Existing shade tree and utility easements are shown along Rena Lane. Proposed lot areas of two hundred three square feet (203 SF) must be added for the shade tree and utility easements on each new lot. 16. The New Jersey Department of Transportation Desired Typical Section along Route 9 should be added on the plan. A shade tree and utility easement should be proposed directly behind the Desired Typical Section. 17. No landscaping is proposed for this application. Unless a waiver is granted, street trees are required. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to recommendations from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. 18. The Plan does not indicate any existing trees on the site. Our site investigation notes that only newly planted street trees and a row of coniferous trees may be within the project limits. Testimony should be provided regarding whether these trees are located on the property or project limits. If applicable, compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code. Additionally, protective measures around trees to remain (e.g., snow fencing or tree wells at drip lines) should be provided. If this subdivision is approved, the final plot plans for proposed Lots 13.01 through 13.04 submitted for Township review should include tree protective measures to save any vegetation where practicable. 19. Because of the new pavement on Rena Lane, we recommend the Board require resurfacing within the project limits after utility connections are completed. 20. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. The project site slopes significantly to the northwest. 21. Testimony should be provided on proposed storm water management. Measures to prevent runoff from impacting neighboring property to the north must be addressed. 22. Based on the intensity of the proposed development, an Improvement Plan should be required which at a minimum addresses proposed storm water management, utilities, grading, depressed curb, aprons, driveways, and landscaping. 23. Due to no construction proposed at this time,

the Board may wish to require the cost of improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. 24. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 25. Construction details are required for proposed improvements. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance (if applicable); b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); d. New Jersey Department of Transportation (if necessary); and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Magno stated a minimum front yard setback variance is required.

Mr. Flannery said the desired typical section is 108 feet which would be 54 feet on each side. This does not impact the desired typical setback.

A motion was made and seconded to advance the application to the January 20, 2015 meeting.
Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

7. PUBLIC HEARING

- 1. SP 2080** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Erez Holdings, LLC
Location: Boulevard of Americas & New Hampshire Avenue
Block 961.01 Lots 2.03 & 2.06
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a two story office building

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval to construct a new two-story, (approximately) sixty-one thousand two hundred ninety square foot (61,290 SF) office building on Lot 2.06. According to the application, the building is currently proposed as headquarters for one (1) primary tenant (LTS Consulting Services). The property on which the office building and off-street parking are proposed is Lot 2.06, a 5.35 acre parcel near the southwest corner of the intersection of New Hampshire Avenue and the Boulevard of the Americas. To provide storm water management for this property, a new storm water recharge pond (depicted as Basin #5) is proposed on Lot 2.03, located southwest of the proposed office facility. As referenced on Site Plan Sheet 5, this basin will take the place of originally-approved "Basin #5" as part of the originally-approved Cedarbridge Corporate Campus infrastructure design. This basin relocation will require the vacation of an existing drainage easement that runs from the north of the lot to the east. Off-street parking for the proposed office facility will be provided on the north and south sides of the proposed office building. A total of two hundred sixty-eight (268) off-street parking spaces are proposed. Eight (8) handicap parking spaces are proposed, two (2) of which are van accessible. Access to the proposed development will be provided by a driveway on the Boulevard of the Americas. Surrounding lands are generally improved with large commercial and industrial land uses. The site is located in the DA-1 Cedarbridge Redevelopment Area. Office buildings are permitted in the zone. We offer the following comments and recommendations per review of the revised submission and applicable comments from our initial review letter dated August 7, 2014: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 2. C14 - Tree Management Protection Plan. Compliance with the Tree Protection ordinance will be addressed during compliance (if/when Board approval is granted). No environmental-constraints are depicted on NJDEP-GIS mapping on or adjacent to these lots. Therefore, we support with submission waivers as requested. Fact. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the DA-1, Cedarbridge Redevelopment Area. Per Section 18-903L.1.a., of the UDO, under "permitted uses" in the DA-1 zone cites office buildings. Fact. 2. Per review of the application documents and the Bulk

Requirements Table on Sheet 1 of the Site Plans, no bulk variances or relief appears necessary for the project as designed. Fact. 3. The project requires the extinguishing of several easements. On Lot 2.06, a gas pipeline easement and drainage easement run along the rear of the lot and requiring vacation. On Lot 2.03, a drainage easement runs through the north east portion of the lot and requires vacation for the construction of the drainage basin. Fact. 4. A design waiver is necessary due to sidewalk and curbing not being proposed along the site's frontages. Per review of the Site Plans, it appears that a pedestrian access way is proposed within a portion of the Boulevard of the Americas frontage, and extending towards Pine Street. Professional testimony shall be provided at time of Public Hearing in support of the requested relief. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A Boundary and Topographic Survey has been submitted. The following revisions are required: a. The drainage easement should be shown on Lot. 2.03. This has been addressed. b. Water mains should be shown along Pine Street. Addressed (on site plan). c. Sidewalk bypass should be shown on Pine Street. Addressed. d. General Note #1 should correct Block 111 to Block 961.01. This has been addressed. 2. Per review of the survey and design documents, there are number of easements that must be extinguished and/or relocated. This work can be addressed as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. Fact. 3. As indicated previously, site access to the office property will be provided via a twenty-four foot (24') wide drive extending from the Boulevard of the Americas. This drive will lead to a forty-seven (47) space parking lot north of the office building, and a (larger) two hundred twenty-one (221) space parking facility to the south of the building. Per the engineer's calculations, off-street parking will exceed UDO requirements. Fact. 4. Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed site access to the property (i.e., access to/from the Boulevard of the Americas). Enlargement and/or reconfiguration of the intersection may be necessary to accommodate multiple movements (if proposed) exiting the site. Our office has been in contact with the applicant's professionals regarding final design of the site access. The applicant agrees to work with our office during compliance, if approval is granted, to provide the necessary design revisions for proper vehicular access to and from the proposed facility. The applicant has retained a traffic engineer to assist with the final design (based on anticipated build-out conditions for the Corporate Campus). This is satisfactory for public hearing purposes. 5. A vehicular circulation plan should be provided to confirm accessibility for the largest vehicles anticipated to access this site. This plan must demonstrate adequate interior access, as well as access to and from the proposed loading area at the southwest corner of the office building. This plan can be provided as a condition of Board approval (if/when granted). Fact. 6. A refuse enclosure is proposed to the east of the office building, but requires dimensioning. Testimony should be provided on collection of trash and recyclable material. It should be clarified whether the Township or a private company will be responsible for removal. The waste receptacle area should be designed in accordance with Section 18-809E., of the UDO. Trash enclosure dimensions are provided on the details sheet on page 14. DPW approval will be required if public pick-up is proposed. 7. Testimony should be provided to address the largest vehicles anticipated to access the proposed 20'x50' loading zone. Fact. 8. No sight triangle or sight distance information is provided. At a minimum, sight distance at the facility entrance/exit must be addressed. Fact. 9. Proposed handicap parking aisles and spots should be dimensioned. Van accessible spots shall have an eight foot (8') wide aisle, while the others shall have a five foot (5') wide aisle. Details are provided on Site Plan Sheet 14. The proposed van accessible aisle width should be increased to 8 feet. 10. We recommend that the locations of the handicap-accessible spaces on the south side of the building shall be relocated to provide a shorter distance to the office entrance. Addressed. 11. Proposed curb ramps shall be added. Addressed. 12. All proposed building access points should be coordinated between the architectural plans and site plans since they impact the design. Final coordination will be addressed during compliance, if/when approval is granted. Fact. 13. A setback distance from New Hampshire Avenue to the southern parking lot should be provided on the plan. Addressed (50 feet). 14. A stray street sign is shown in the southwestern corner of Lot 2.06 in the middle of the access roadway and should be removed. Addressed. B. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural floor plans and elevations were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the building will be about thirty-seven

feet (37') high, significantly below the sixty-five foot (65') allowable height. Additionally, the building height includes what appear to be a front panel as well as mechanical screening of roof-mounted HVAC units. Confirming testimony should be provided. Fact. 2. 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. Fact. 3. The site plans and architectural plans must be coordinated. The design of the access point at the southern corner of the building is different in the two (2) plans. Fact. C. Grading 1. Detailed grading is provided on Sheet 4 (office) and Sheet 5 (basin). Per review of the office facility design, it is feasible and generally well-prepared for an initial design submission. Fact. 2. Additional spot elevations are required at the locations of handicap parking spaces, interior sidewalks, and pedestrian access ways, as well as at building access points. Addressed. 3. Additional grading information is necessary at the front of the building. This has been addressed. 4. A review of final grading will be performed during compliance review, if/when approval is granted. Fact. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm sewer collection system has been designed utilizing reinforced concrete pipe to convey storm water runoff into a proposed retention pond. As indicated previously, the design includes installation of a retention basin facility (designated Basin #5) that was incorporated in the 2001 NJDEP-CAFRA approval issued for Cedarbridge Corporate Campus facility. Fact. 2. The author of the storm water report references a meeting held with NJDEP Land Use personnel, who informed the applicant that the (2001) design standards used for design of the Cedarbridge Campus could be used for the replacement basin (#5). Fact. 3. Per cursory review of the proposed pond, the initial design is feasible. Fact. 4. Inverts in the Pipe Calculations do not match what is shown on the Utility Plan. Revisions were made, which will be reviewed during compliance (if approval is granted). 5. Calculations are needed for piping shown along Pine Street. Revisions were made, which will be reviewed during compliance (if approval is granted). 6. The storm water piping profiles require minor corrections. Revisions were made, which will be reviewed during compliance (if approval is granted) 7. The invert for Inlet 224 needs to be corrected on both the profile and the utility plan. This has been addressed. 8. Roof leaders and manifold connections should be provided to convey roof runoff into the proposed collection system. Roof leaders locations have been provided. 9. A Storm Water Management Maintenance Manual shall be provided in accordance with NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township standards, including the Responsible Party for basin maintenance. If Township maintenance is proposed, DPW approval of the design will be required during compliance (if approved). Fact. 10. Water quality maintenance necessary for the pond (i.e., aeration, other) will be addressed during compliance (if approved). An aerator fountain has been added to basin. We commend the applicant and professionals for providing this amenity. The system design will be reviewed during compliance (if approval is granted). Fact. 11. A final review of the storm water design will be performed during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. Fact. E. Landscaping 1. A detailed Landscaping Plan is provided on Site Plan Sheet 9. As illustrated, significant landscaping is proposed around the perimeter of the access drives and parking areas, within landscape islands, and along portions of the north and west sides of the office building. Foundation plantings are proposed along portions of the north and south building elevations. The Landscape design is well-prepared for an initial submission. 2. The following corrections must be made to the Landscape Plan: a. Eighty-four (84) "EA" plants should be shown in the schedule. Eight (8) plants are unlabeled that could be the missing "EA" plants. This has been addressed. b. The plan should call out thirty (30) "ZLKV" trees around the perimeter of the site. This has been addressed. c. The plan should call out twelve (12) "AR" trees along the west side of the building. Plan and schedule show 13 AR trees. This has been addressed. d. Two (2) trees are not labeled in the rear of the building and could be the missing "LS" trees that are listed in the schedule. Trees now labeled as LT trees. This has been addressed. e. Nine (9) "GT" trees should be listed in the schedule on part 2 of the Landscape Plan. This has been addressed. 3. We recommend that the applicant consider drip irrigation or similar measures for long-term maintenance of the proposed landscaping. Applicant will address at the public meeting. 4. The Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority may require relocation of some proposed plantings. Utilities and easements should be shown

on the Landscape Plan to avoid planting conflicts. Fact. 5. Landscaping will be reviewed in detail during resolution compliance review, should approval be granted. Fact. F. Lighting 1. A detailed lighting design is provided on the Lighting Plan, Sheet 11 of 15. The design consists of five (5) pole mounted single fixtures, seven (7) pole mounted double fixtures, and five (5) building mounted fixtures. The overall design is feasible, and generally well-prepared for an initial submission. Fact. 2. The details of the different light fixtures should be given. This has been addressed. 3. A point to point diagram has been provided and the minimum lighting conditions appear to have been met. The Calculation Summary shows a maximum of 6.3 foot-candles in the North entrance, but it is not shown on the diagram. This has been addressed. 4. We recommend that non-security lighting be installed on timers. Fact. 5. The lighting design can be finalized for compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. Fact. G. Utilities 1. Utility information is shown on Site Plan Sheet 6. Water and sewer service will be extended from existing systems within the Boulevard of the Americas right-of-way as depicted on the plan. Fact. 2. Public water and sewer services will be provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. Fact. 3. Proposed fire protection measures include an onsite fire hydrant. Testimony should be provided as to whether building sprinklers are proposed. Fact. H. Traffic 1. We recommend that a traffic analysis from a qualified professional be provided for the Board's use prior to the Public Hearing, assessing impacts of the proposed facility on the Boulevard of the Americas and surrounding roads, assuming full build-out of the Cedarbridge Campus. A traffic study was prepared and provided for review. It is well-prepared. 2. As indicated in the report, the analysis was performed assuming a 2024 buildout of the area, and accounted for several recent approved projects including the Lakewood Commons, Avenue Shoppes, America Avenue office building, and the Quick Check convenience store. 3. The author indicates that right-turn (only) movements from America Avenue onto New Hampshire Avenue will operate at (2024) peak hour levels in the (B-C) range. Level of services for New Hampshire Avenue and Pine Street will operate at (2024) peak hour levels in the (C-E) range. All movements at the (primary) site access to the Boulevard of the Americas will operate at (2024) peak hour levels in the (A) or better range. 4. The author also indicates that a future (secondary) access to/from a future office building proposed at Lot 20.05, west of this property, is proposed when that site is designed. A secondary access would further improve circulation to and from this site. 5. Based on the traffic review as referenced above, recommendations regarding design of the proposed site access should be provided by the traffic professional (including turn restrictions, if any are warranted). As indicated previously, the applicant has agreed to provide necessary design revisions to promote safe access as a condition of Board approval, if granted. This is sufficient for Board hearing purposes. I. Signage 1. No site identification sign has been proposed. 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. J. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract is a vacant, wooded property with access from the Boulevard of the Americas. The property slopes gently downwards from north to the south. Per review of design documents and NJDEP-GIS mapping of the area, no freshwater wetlands or state open waters exist on-site or within three hundred feet (300') of the site. Testimony should be provided regarding the status of NJDEP-CAFRA approvals necessary for the project (i.e., if a new or amended CAFRA permit is necessary). 2. Tree Management Plan A Tree Management Protection Plan should be required as a condition of approval. The project's compliance with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance must be addressed during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. Fact. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 14 and 15 in the plan set. Fact. 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. Fact. 3. Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. Fact. 4. Construction details will be reviewed during resolution compliance should approval be granted. Fact. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers

Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; d. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); e. Ocean County Planning Board; f. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; g. NJDEP Individual CAFRA Permit (or modification); and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. stated that no waivers or variances are requested.

Mr. Charles Surmonte, P.E. was sworn in. He stated they will be relocating the detention basin (inaudible).

Mr. Neiman asked if that is okay.

Mr. Magno stated he does not know the exact calculations but it should be fine (inaudible).

Mr. Joseph Feltz, AIA was sworn in (inaudible).

Mr. Neiman asked if they are asking for a sign variance.

Mr. Feltz (inaudible).

Mr. Doyle said they intend to have site signage. This is likely to be for the most part a single user and certainly there will be an identification sign and it will comply.

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. Herzl to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 2. SD 1977** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Shimshon Bandman
Location: Linden Avenue
Block 189.01 Lot 53
Minor Subdivision to create 3 lots

Project Description

The applicant proposes to subdivide one (1) existing lot into three (3) new lots consisting of two (2) new zero lot line properties with a duplex building and one (1) lot for a single family dwelling. Existing Lot 189 will be subdivided into proposed Lots 189.01, 189.02, and 189.03 as designated on the subdivision plan. There is an existing dwelling on the original property. It appears all existing structures on the tract are to be removed. Public water and sewer is available. The site is situated in the north central portion of the Township on the west side of Linden Avenue, north of Stirling Avenue. The surrounding area is predominantly residential with a Township school site located to the north. Linden Avenue is a paved road in poor condition, with curb and sidewalk in fair condition, and utility poles immediately behind the curb. Linden Avenue has an existing right-of-way width of forty feet (40'). New sidewalk and curb is proposed along the property frontage. Sanitary sewer will have to be extended from the existing manhole at the intersection of Stirling and Linden Avenues to service the site. Water is located on the east side of Linden Avenue and gas is located on the west side. Large trees have been located on the survey. The fence adjacent to the north side of the property belongs to the adjoining school. The existing property which would be subdivided falls within the R-10 Single Family Residential Zone. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The property is located within the R-10

Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single family detached housing and zero lot line duplex housing are permitted uses in the zone. 2. A Minimum Lot Width variance is required for proposed Lots 189.01, 189.02, and 189.03. While the ordinance requires a lot width of seventy five feet (75'), a minimum lot width of sixty feet (60') is proposed for the combination of new Lots 189.01 and 189.02. A lot width of 57.73 feet is proposed for new Lot 189.03. 3. Minimum Side Yard Setback variances are required. Side yard setbacks of seven feet (7') are proposed for the duplex on the combination of new Lots 189.01 and 189.02. A side yard setback of seven and a half feet (7.5') is proposed for the single family dwelling on new Lot 189.03. Side yard setbacks of ten feet (10') are required. 4. An Aggregate Side Yard Setback variance is required. An aggregate side yard setback of fifteen feet (15') is proposed for the single family dwelling on new Lot 189.03, whereas twenty-five feet (25') is required. 5. No right-of-way dedication is proposed. There is a road widening easement of five feet (5') proposed for the project. A waiver from the right-of-way dedication is required. 6. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any requested 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. II. Review Comments 1. A survey has been provided. The remaining concrete pad from the metal shed which has been removed is encroaching into the school property and must be addressed. 2. The General Notes indicate that horizontal and vertical datum has been assumed. 3. The General Notes should be edited. Duplicate information has been provided in General Notes # 8 and 12. 4. Zones and Zone Boundary Lines shall be added. 5. The proposed monuments should be offset to the easement line since the construction of sidewalk would be conflicting. 6. The Zoning Data indicates that four (4) off-street parking spaces are required and will be provided for the proposed future dwellings. The proposed off-street parking should be dimensioned on the Improvement Plan for confirmation. The applicant should provided testimony detailing the number of bedrooms proposed for the future dwellings. If basements are proposed, a minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces would be required to comply with the Township Parking Ordinance. Parking must be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 7. Testimony should be provided whether basements will be proposed for the future dwellings on proposed Lots 189.01, 189.02, and 189.03. If so, seasonal high water table information will be required. 8. The existing and proposed lot areas should be verified. 9. The proposed dimensions for the single family dwelling on new Lot 189.03 require a minor correction. 10. The Minor Subdivision Plan shows new lot numbers were assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. 11. A six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement dedicated to the Township is proposed along the frontage. Proposed easements areas have been shown on an individual lot basis. 12. The utility poles shown on the survey must be added to the Improvement Plan base map. An existing pole will conflict with a proposed driveway. 13. The proposed sidewalk will encroach into the road widening easement to avoid conflicts with utility poles. 14. The proposed limits of four inch (4") and six inch (6") thick sidewalk, as well as driveway aprons, must be better delineated on the Improvement Plan. 15. Proposed water and sewer will be provided by New Jersey American Water Company since the project is within their franchise area. 16. Proposed sanitary sewer will be extended on Linden Avenue. The existing dwelling to be removed must be on septic. Therefore, Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for its removal. 17. The combination of sanitary sewer installation and utility connections will disturb more than twenty percent (20%) of Linden Avenue in front of the site. Therefore, the appropriate road restoration details must be provided, including a final overlay at completion. 18. Proposed top and bottom of curb grades are required for the curb replacement on the Improvement Plan. The gutter slope is too slight to convey runoff and drainage shall be added. The existing gutter has a low point since there was a puddle in front of the driveway on Linden Avenue at the time of our site investigation. 19. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development of the proposed lots. The property is very flat and slopes slightly northward toward the existing school. 20. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. No proposed grading is indicated on the plan. The General Notes indicate that proposed grading will be included on the plot plan submissions. 21. Three (3) October Glory Maple street trees

are proposed within the shade tree and utility easement. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to any recommendations from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. Our site investigation noted that the large trees were located on the survey. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review for proposed Lots 189.01 through 189.03. 22. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since the monuments have not been set. 23. Due to no construction proposed at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. 24. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 25. Final review of construction details will be conducted during compliance if approval is given. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d. Ocean County Board of Health (septic system removal); and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Magno said there are variances for lot width, side yard setback, and aggregate side yard setback. The project will require a waiver from dedication. A 5 foot road widening easement is proposed instead.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. stated this is for a three lot minor subdivision. A duplex will be constructed on fee simple lots as well as one single family residence. This project is located in an area that is in need of redevelopment. This area has been recommended to be rezoned to R-7.5. There is one change that the applicant would like to request. Since this application was submitted, there was an application approved by this Board around the corner from this one. The applicant would really like to have 6 foot side yard setbacks which would allow him to make the units 24 feet wide which is definitely more sellable today in the market.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., P.P. was sworn in.

Mr. Neiman asked if they would still need variances if this was in an R-7.5 zone.

Mr. Lines (inaudible).

Mr. Neiman does not want to give variances which allows them to go below the R-7.5 zone. If the R-7.5 calls for 7 feet then he would like to keep it as such.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if this was R-7.5, this plan would have no variances.

Mr. Lines said that is correct.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 3. SD 1980** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Apple 25, LLC
Location: Hope Chapel Road & Hope Hill Lane
Block 11 Lot 4
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a Minor Subdivision approval to subdivide one (1) existing lot known as Lot 4 in Block 11 to create two (2) proposed single family residential lots. The proposed lots are designated as new Lots 4.01 and 4.02 on the subdivision plan. An existing single family dwelling would remain on proposed Lot 4.01 and proposed Lot 4.02 would be for a future residential home. The subject property is located on the southeasterly intersection of Hope Hill Lane and Hope Chapel Road, in the northwestern portion of the Township. Hope Chapel Road is an improved County Highway. The existing right-of-way width of Hope Chapel varies and a three foot (3') dedication is being proposed in front of the site to bring the half right-of-way width to thirty-three feet (33'). There is no curbing or sidewalk on Hope Chapel Road. Hope Hill Lane is an improved Township Road. The existing right-of-way width of Hope Hill Lane is fifty feet (50'). The curb and pavement are in good condition, and the sidewalk is in fair condition. The existing lot is approximately 0.57 acres. The site currently contains a house fronting Hope Chapel Road and has many trees, especially the southern area of the site. A gravel driveway encroaches onto neighboring Lot 139. Two (2) wood sheds are also on the southeastern portion of the site, and are to be removed. The land slopes from north to south. The larger trees on the site have not been located on the Minor Subdivision plan. Public water and sewer is not available. Gas is located on the east side of Hope Hill Lane and the south side of Hope Chapel Road. The subject site is located within the R-15 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 10/7/14 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated September 29, 2014: I. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-15, Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family residences are a permitted use in the zone district. Statements of fact. 2. Variances are required for Minimum Lot Area. Lot areas of 12,490 square feet and 12,001 square feet are proposed for new Lots 4.01 and Lot 4.02, respectively. Whereas fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF) is required. The Board shall take action on the requested lot area variances. 3. A variance is required for Minimum Front Yard Setback. A front yard setback of 17.91 feet is proposed for new Lot 4.01, whereas thirty feet (30') is required. The Board shall take action on the requested front yard setback variance. 4. Unless design waivers are granted, curb and sidewalk shall be proposed along Hope Chapel Road, and street trees shall be provided along the project frontages. Curb and sidewalk has been proposed along Hope Chapel Road as shown on the Improvement Plan. The applicant's engineer indicates that street trees will be provided along the frontages of both lots. Proposed street trees shall be depicted on the Improvement Plan with resolution compliance submission if approval is granted. 5. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the 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. II. Review Comments 1. A separate Boundary and Topographic Survey of the property should be provided since revisions will be required to the Minor Subdivision. Our site investigation notes the following survey revisions should be provided: a. Individual tree locations for the large trees within the site. b. The street light on Hope Hill Lane. c. The street sign which is shown as a traffic sign. d. A delineator which is shown as a traffic sign. e. The septic system location for the existing house. Providing a separate revised Boundary and Topographic Survey shall be a condition of any approvals. 2. General Note 3 indicates topography is based on NAVD 1988. A vertical bench mark shall be provided. The information shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. The Zone Requirements must be edited. The provided new Lot 4.01 minimum lot width is incorrect. The proposed width should be measured at the front yard setback. The provided new Lot 4.02 minimum lot width shall be corrected to 132.99 feet. The maximum building coverage allowed is thirty percent (30%). Therefore, the provided percentages will change. A revised plan has been submitted. The provided minimum lot width for proposed Lot 4.02 shall be corrected to 132.99 feet. The provided maximum building coverage for proposed Lot 4.02 should be corrected to less than thirty percent (<30%). The corrections can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. The proposed rear offset shall be added to new Lot 4.01. The offset shall

be provided for resolution compliance submission if approval is granted. 5. A twenty foot (20') dimension shall be added to the proposed rear yard setback line on new Lot 4.01. The dimension shall be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. Testimony must be provided on off-street parking. The proposed right-of-way dedication and physical widening of Hope Chapel Road will impact the existing off-street parking. The applicant's engineer indicates that there will enough room to satisfy necessary off-street parking in the reconfigured gravel driveway for new Lot 4.01 and that the driveway for new Lot 4.02 will be large enough to accommodate required off-street parking. 7. If a basement is proposed for the future dwelling on proposed Lot 4.02, seasonal high water table information will be required. Statement of fact. 8. A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is shown on the subdivision plan. The proposed easement shall be dedicated to Lakewood Township. Proposed easement dimensions and areas for the individual lots should be given. The revised plan shows the proposed easement has been dedicated to Lakewood Township, but no dimensions and areas have been provided. Proposed easement dimensions and areas for the individual lots shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 9. The proposed new lot corners shown as "set" are not in place. The nomenclature shall be revised to "to be set". This has not been addressed. Corrections shall be provided for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 10. We recommend the proposed monument for the side lot line being created between new Lots 4.01 and 4.02 be offset to the easement line. This has not been addressed. The proposed monument shall be provided for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 11. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since the monuments have not been set. Statement of fact. 12. The Legend should be expanded to include surveying symbols. This has been partially addressed. "Monument to be set" must be added to the Legend for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 13. Proposed lot numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. A signature box should be provided. The applicant's engineer indicates that the proposed lot numbers have been approved but no signature box has been provided on the subdivision plan. The map shall be signed by the tax assessor prior to filing should approval be granted. 14. Unless a waiver is requested from and granted by the Planning Board, street trees shall be proposed within the shade tree and utility easements for the project. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. The applicant's engineer indicates that street trees will be provided. The proposed street trees shall be added to the Improvement Plan for review by the Township Shade Tree Commission. A landscape buffer has been proposed along the rear lot line of new Lot 4.02. The applicant's engineer indicates that the buffer is proposed to provide privacy to both the current and future residents, and to reduce impacts to the adjoining land owner. A fifteen foot (15') wide buffer is proposed, which will include a deed restriction from the removal of planted trees, and require the buffer to be maintained in perpetuity. The Board should provide landscape recommendations. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan Review. Statement of fact. 15. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development. The project appears too small to qualify as a major development. At a minimum, a drywell will be required for storm water management and shall be provided when the plot plan for proposed Lot 4.02 is submitted. The applicant's engineer acknowledges that a dry well system will be provided for Lot 4.02 to accommodate runoff from the roof of the proposed home. Details for the dry well system will be developed at the time of Plot Plan design, and will be subject to review and approval of the Township Engineer. 16. Testimony is required on site grading from the development. When a plot plan is submitted for proposed Lot 4.02, grading will be reviewed for feasibility and compliance. The applicant's engineer indicates that lot grading for new Lot 4.01 will be completed on the Improvement Plan that requires the installation of curb, sidewalk, and driveways. Lot grading for proposed Lot 4.02 will be depicted on the Plot Plan as part of the Building Permit process. 17. The gravel driveway encroachments must be addressed. The applicant's engineer indicates that the encroachments will be eliminated. This shall be addressed on revised plans with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 18. Public water and sewer is not

available to the site. General Note 12 properly indicates that location of the septic system for the existing house is to be confirmed prior to map filing. If the system requires relocation, the work shall be completed prior to signing of the plat. Statements of fact. 19. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 20. An Improvement Plan for the widening of Hope Chapel Road must include grading, drainage, and construction details as required. This Improvement Plan may be provided during compliance if approval is given. An incomplete Improvement Plan for the widening of Hope Chapel Road has been submitted and a finished plan shall be provided for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. Approval of the design by the Ocean County Engineering Department is required. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance; b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Board of Health (well and septic); d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Gasiorowski, on behalf of an objector (inaudible).

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. He stated the applicant proposed to take this large lot, which has a single house fronting on Hope Chapel Road, and subdivide it. Both lots would be slightly undersized they would meet the requirements of the R-12 zone in terms of square footage. They would meet, on the new lots, all of the required bulk requirements for the R-15 zone. The existing home has some variances. Significant public improvements will be provided along Hope Chapel Road as suggested by the County. The driveway will be moved for the existing home from Hope Chapel Road to Hope Hill Lane. The one neighbor who shares the most boundary with this project, who is a client of Mr. Gasiorowski, expressed some concerns about the buffer of the newly created lot. They have agreed to plant a double line of arborvitae that will curl around to the northerly edge. In addition, because of the peculiar lot configuration in that area, the objector, in order to get to the local shul or Hope Hill Lane would have to take a very circuitous route. They would give him an easement that would not affect the setbacks or building envelope.

Mr. Graham MacFarlane, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He described the project (inaudible).

Mr. Neiman asked if they are providing sidewalks on Hope Chapel Road.

Mr. MacFarlane confirmed.

Mr. Doyle said they would also agree that if the existing house would be demolished and replaced, they would not make any application for setback or bulk variances.

Mr. Neiman asked if a Percal map was prepared.

Mr. MacFarlane provided a map to the Board (inaudible).

A discussion ensued concerning the map shown to the Board.

Mr. Doyle said they would not be out of place in the neighborhood. There are lots smaller and lots larger.

Mr. MacFarlane said that is correct (inaudible).

Mr. Franklin would like the driveway paved.

Mr. MacFarlane said it would be paved.

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

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 4. SD 1981** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Times Square Homes, LLC
Location: 1957 & 1963 Central Avenue
Block 11 Lots 116.01 & 118.01
Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision to create 4 lots

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a Major Subdivision approval. The applicant proposes the subdivision of two (2) existing lots to create four (4) proposed single family residential lots. The existing two (2) lots of 1.776 acres known as Lots 116.01 and 118.01 in Block 11 are proposed to be subdivided into proposed Lots 116.02 through 116.05 as shown 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 New Central Avenue across from Esther Court, in the northwest portion of the Township. New Central Avenue is an improved County Highway. A five foot (5') dedication is proposed to increase the half right-of-way width in front of the site to thirty feet (30'). Sidewalk and curbing have yet to be constructed along this portion of New Central Avenue. The site currently contains three (3) single family dwellings, all of which would be removed. Aside from the front right corner, the property slopes from front to back toward the north, falling about twenty-five feet (25') over a distance of three hundred fifty feet (350'). Water and sewer are available in front of the site. Sanitary sewer is under the southern side of the road because of the bend. Potable water and overhead electric are located on the north side. Proposed storm water management facilities and utilities are associated with this project. As mentioned in the Storm Water Management Report, runoff from the roadway, public sidewalks, driveways, and front yard lawn areas shall be collected in street inlets, conveyed through a water quality device, and into an infiltration system proposed below the cul-de-sac portion of the roadway. Two (2) inlets, connected by an infiltration pipe, are proposed within the curb line of New Central Avenue. Drywells are proposed to capture roof runoff. A four foot (4') wide public sidewalk will be constructed, and each dwelling will have an asphalt driveway. 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-15 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 10/7/14 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated September 29, 2014: I. Waivers A. The following waiver has been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. The applicant seeks a waiver from this requirement of providing an Environmental Impact Statement because these two (2) properties are currently residentially developed and there are no environmentally sensitive areas on the premises. We support the granting of this waiver. The Board shall take action on the submission waiver. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-15, Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family residences are a permitted use in the zone district. Statements of fact. 2. Variances are required for Minimum Lot Area. An area of 11,575 square feet is proposed for new Lot 116.02. An area of 13,619 square feet is proposed for new Lot 116.04. An area of 13,264 square feet is proposed for new Lot 116.05. Whereas fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF) is required. The Board shall take action on the requested lot area variances. 3. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested 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. General 1. An Outbound and Topographic Survey for the property has been provided. At a minimum, the following revisions are required: a. Existing bearings, distances, and areas shall be provided for Lots 116.01 and 118.01. This has been addressed. b. The correct road name, New Central Avenue shall be provided along with existing right-of-way information. This has been addressed. c. The sidewalk adjacent to the easterly side of the site should be labeled. The sidewalk location is not against the curb and shall be corrected for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. d. Chain link fencing meanders across existing property lines. An asphalt driveway encroaches onto neighboring Lot 121.01. These encroachments must be addressed. The encroachments shall be addressed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 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. Statements of fact. 3. Curb and sidewalk is proposed throughout the development. Unless five foot (5') wide sidewalk is proposed, pedestrian bypass areas will have to be designed. Pedestrian bypass areas have been added. A proposed curb ramp is missing from the northwesterly intersection of the cul-de-sac with New Central Avenue. The curb ramp can be added for 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. Confirmation shall be provided from the applicant's professionals. 5. A new road name for the cul-de-sac has yet to be proposed for the project. Statement of fact. 6. The proposed lot numbers shall be approved by the Tax Assessor. The Final Plat shall be signed by the Lakewood Tax Assessor prior to filing. The Lakewood Tax Assessor signature is required prior to map filing 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 three thousand dollars (\$3,000.00) is required based on four (4) proposed single family detached dwellings at seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750.00) per unit. The storm water management maintenance fee shall be provided to the Township once approval of the application is granted. 8. The requirements in 18-821 (Building Uniformity in Residential Developments) must be addressed. A minimum of two (2) basic house designs are required for developments consisting of between four (4) and six (6) homes. The designs are required prior to construction, should subdivision approval be granted. B. Plan Review 1. The General Notes require editing, especially the Requirements. The General Notes conflict between the Construction Plans and Final Plat. The Index should list Sheet 2 as Outbound and Topographic Survey. The Requirements still needs minor editing. The proposed Minimum Rear Yard Setbacks should be revised to twenty feet (20'). General Notes 7 through 9 on the Final Plat are from another project. Corrections can be provided for resolution compliance submission if approval is granted. 2. The encroachments indicated on the survey must be addressed. The applicant's professionals indicate the encroachments shall be removed. These matters must be addressed on the plans for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Sight Triangle Easements have been proposed at the intersection of the cul-de-sac with New Central Avenue. The proposed sight triangle easements will be dedicated to the County. Statements of fact. 4. Except for the proposed storm water management in New Central Avenue, the ownership of the entire storm water management system proposed under the cul-de-sac is intended to be the Township of Lakewood. Approval will be required from the Department of Public Works. Statements of fact. 5. Horizontal and Vertical Datum are assumed; a benchmark has been indicated on the Survey. Statement of fact. 6. Proposed off-street parking spaces in the driveways have been provided with minimum dimensions. Statement of fact. 7. The plans indicate the units will comply with the maximum lot coverage of thirty percent (30%). Statement of fact. 8. The proposed curb radii entering and exiting the cul-de-sac should be increased to twenty-five feet (25'). The proposed curb radius for the bulb shall be listed as forty feet (40'). The

proposed curb radii entering and exiting the cul-de-sac has been increased to twenty-five feet (25'). The proposed curb radius for the bulb shall be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 9. The proposed sidewalk along New Central Avenue should connect to the existing sidewalk to the east. A portion of the wall within the right-of-way easement on adjoining Lot 117 will have to be removed to connect to the existing sidewalk to the east. The plan revision can be made for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 10. Proposed depressed curb is incorrectly shown across the cul-de-sac intersection with the County Highway. The proposed depressed curb has been correctly removed. 11. Six foot (6') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easements have been proposed dedicated to the Township of Lakewood. The Final Plat shows proposed easement areas on an individual lot basis. Statements of fact. 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. The proposed design directs significant runoff down slopes toward adjoining properties to the north and west. The applicant's engineer shall address this matter. Design revisions with retaining walls should be considered. Proposed terraced retaining walls have been added to the Improvement Plan to reduce the slope towards the rear of the property. 2. A profile has been provided for the proposed cul-de-sac. The proposed cul-de-sac bulb shall be designed such that equal slopes and/or vertical curves enter and exit the bulb. Furthermore, proposed vertical curve length shall not exceed twenty-five feet (25') for every percent change in grade. The proposed vertical curves have been lengthened. The profile shall be finalized for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. An existing profile must be provided for New Central Road. The existing profile has been provided. 4. Basements are proposed for all units. Seasonal high water table information has been provided to substantiate a minimum two foot (2') separation to the proposed basement floors. Statements of fact. 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. Proposed storm water management facilities are associated with this project. As mentioned in the Storm Water Management Report, proposed site improvements include a short cul-de-sac and four (4) single family dwellings, each served by an asphalt drive. A four foot (4') wide public sidewalk will also be constructed. Runoff from the roadway, public sidewalks, driveways, and front yard lawn areas shall be collected in street inlets, conveyed through a water quality device, and into an infiltration system proposed below the cul-de-sac portion of the roadway. Two (2) inlets, connected by an infiltration pipe, are proposed within the curb line of New Central Avenue. Drywells are proposed to capture roof runoff. Statements of fact. 2. Our review indicates that the project will be classified as Major Development since more than a quarter acre of impervious surface will be added and over an acre of disturbance will occur. Accordingly, the Storm Water Management Report shall be revised to address how water quality and water quantity reduction rates are being met. The applicant's engineer indicates that the Storm Water Management Report will be revised for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Two (2) soil boring locations and logs have been provided within the proposed project to confirm the seasonal high water table. The permeability rate used in the recharge calculations is based on the soils samples tested from these logs. Statements of fact. 4. Drywells are proposed to capture runoff from the proposed dwelling roofs. Roof recharge beds are proposed for all 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. Testimony on the ownership of the drywells should be provided. 5. The Storm Water Management Report and Design will be reviewed in detail after revisions to the design are made. The applicant's engineer has indicated that revisions to the Drainage Area Maps and Storm Water Management Report will be made for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. A Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual must be submitted per the NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township Code. The O&M Manual can be provided for resolution compliance submission if approval is granted. E. Landscaping 1. A Landscaping and Tree Protection Plan has been provided on Sheet 4 of 10. Street trees have been proposed within the shade tree and utility easement for landscaping. Statements of fact. 2. Proposed utility connections

should be completed to avoid planting conflicts. The proposed utility connections can be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. 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. The site will be cleared as necessary for the construction of the project. Compensatory plantings must be addressed with the Tree Protection Management Plan. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations. The Tree Protection Management Plan shall be completed in accordance with the Ordinance and address compensatory plantings. 4. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should subdivision approval be granted. Statement of fact. F. Lighting 1. A Lighting Plan has been provided on Sheet 5 of 10. Statement of fact. 2. Proposed lighting has been provided for the cul-de-sac area. The Plan indicates four (4) pole mounted JCP&L approved 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 fourteen feet (14') and the overall height will be sixteen feet (16') high. Testimony should be provided confirming the proposed height of the fixtures. 3. 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. 4. Testimony should be provided regarding street lighting ownership. There is no indication a Homeowners Association is proposed. The applicant's professionals shall confirm that the proposed street lighting will be owned by the Township. 5. The proposed lighting locations shall be superimposed on the Improvement Plan to insure there are no conflicts. This has been addressed on the revised plans. 6. 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. 2. The proposed sanitary sewer will connect to an existing system in New Central Avenue. Statement of fact. 3. The proposed potable water design is incomplete. The design must be completed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. Testimony should be provided regarding other proposed utilities. Testimony should be provided on whether the other proposed utilities will be underground. H. Signage 1. Proposed regulatory signage has not been shown on the plans and should be added. Regulatory sign details shall be completed. A stop sign and stop bar, as well as details for both, has been added to the plans. A "No Outlet" sign shall be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. No project identification signs or street signs are proposed. A street sign shall be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. Statement of fact. I. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, Lots 116.01 and 118.01 each contain dwellings. The existing on-site topography slopes significantly from south to north. The larger trees on the site have been located on the survey. Statements of fact. 2. Environmental Impact Statement A waiver from submitting an Environmental Impact Statement has been requested. The Board shall take action on this submission waiver. 3. Tree Management Tree Protection Plan has been submitted. The Tree Protection Management Plan must be completed. The Tree Protection Management Plan shall be completed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 9 and 10 of the plans. Statement of fact. 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. Statements of fact. 3. 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. The Final Plat shall be corrected in accordance with the previous applicable plan review comments. The datum, benchmark, encroachments, General Notes, and Requirements can be addressed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. The title for the Final Plat shall be for Lots 116.01 and 118.01. This has been addressed. 3. The name of the County Highway shall be corrected and right-of-way

information provided. The name of the County Highway is now shown correctly. The right-of-way information can be provided for resolution compliance submission if approval is granted. 4. A Planning Board approval signature block shall be added. This has been addressed. 5. The survey date in the Surveyor's Certification does not match the Survey provided. The Certification has not been signed since the outbound corner markers have not been set. The date has been corrected. 6. Proposed monuments are required on all outbound corners. This has been addressed. 7. Coordinates shall be added to at least three (3) outbound corners. This has been addressed. 8. A proposed length of curve shall be added across the cul-de-sac right-of-way along New Central Avenue. This has not been addressed and can be provided for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 9. A proposed side yard setback dimension of ten feet (10') shall be provided on new Lot 116.02. This has been addressed. 10. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 11. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after design revisions are undertaken for the project. Statement of fact. 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; and e. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities.

Mr. Rennert stepped down.

Mr. Magno stated a variance is required for minimum lot area.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. stated the density is not being increased.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He stated that these lots were previously approved as flag lots. This is an application that provides lots that are closely conforming. If you take the overall lot area, minus the cul-de-sac, there is around 63,000 sf. It is an application that doesn't increase the density or traffic in the area.

Mr. Schmuckler asked why the lots can't be shifted in order to reduce the variances.

Mr. Flannery said it would cause problems with the grading.

Mr. Schmuckler asked how much further they would have to push lot 116.02 to get 12,000 sf. He does not want to go down more than one zone. The area is there, he does not understand why they have to go below one zone.

Mr. Doyle said they are meeting the setbacks and the topography is significant. They met with the neighbors and they made changes with respect to drainage to make this work for their benefit and the applicants.

Mr. Flannery said they will make that lot 12,000 sf.

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. Herzl to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler

5. **SP 2088** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Mayan Hatorah
Location: Milton Avenue
Block 104 Lots 23.01, 24, & 34

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for a new school building with dormitory rooms

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval to expand the existing Yeshiva Mayan Hatorah facility located at the intersection of Coleman Avenue and Milton Street. Said facility currently includes an existing Yeshiva Building, and existing gymnasium, an existing dwelling, an existing parking lot and other amenities located east of what was formerly Coleman Avenue (on Block 104, Lots 23.01 and Lot 24). Coleman Avenue was vacated by Township Committee via Township Ordinance #2013-84, memorialized December 19, 2014. The applicant proposes to consolidate all lots in a new lot (proposed Lot 23.02 as depicted on the plans). The applicant proposes to expand the facility via construction of a new two-story, 16,500 sf (+/-) Yeshiva with dormitory rooms (including a basement) on Block 104, Lot 34, located on the west side of the (former) Coleman Avenue cartway as depicted on the plans. This property would also be consolidated into proposed Lot 23.02, creating one property. As depicted on the site plans, the cartway within (former) Coleman Avenue, will be modified to create a 24-foot wide access drive and sixteen additional "head-in" parking spaces on the west side of the cartway. Sidewalk and curbing do exist along the property's Milton Street, and proposed Coleman Avenue frontages. Per the site plans, potable water service and sewer are available within Milton Street. The plans depict a proposed sewer extension to connect to existing gravity sewerage within Milton Street. As depicted on the survey, Lot 34 contains an existing dwelling, pool and driveway, all of which will be removed. The remainder of the property is predominantly developed. Properties surrounding the site appear are predominantly single-family residential in nature. We offer the following comments per review of the revised submission and remaining comments from our initial review letter dated October 1, 2014: I. Waivers A. The following waivers from the Land Development Checklist appear necessary: 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. The Survey and Site Plan show enough topography to prepare the design. The site is predominantly developed, and the applicant will comply with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance (as applicable) during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. Submission waivers were granted at the Workshop hearing. II. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-12 Residential District. Private schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906. Statement of fact. 2. The proposed building and site expansion complies with R-12 bulk standards. However, the current Bulk Requirements Table is erroneous, and requires several corrections. The applicant agrees to correcting this table as necessary. Revisions were made as requested, and are correct except for existing and proposed parking requirements (see comments, below). III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. The Outbound and Topographic Survey (Sheet 2) and subsequent site plan sheets must be revised to depict Coleman Avenue as vacated within the property, and reference the Township ordinance (#2013-84) and date of memorialization (December 19, 2013). All other site plans must be revised to reflect this condition as well. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to this condition. This has been partially addressed. The site plan sheets depict Coleman Avenue as vacated, and reference the Township ordinance, however the date of memorialization must be corrected to be 2013). 2. As depicted on the design plans, the existing terminus of the Coleman Avenue cartway will be reconfigured to provide a 24-foot wide, two-way access drive within the expanded school facility. Sixteen (16) head-in parking spaces are proposed on the west side of this access drive to serve the new Yeshiva building. One of these spaces is designated as handicap accessible. Statement of fact. 3. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, bus access is not proposed within the interior of the expanded school facility (i.e., using the newly proposed 24-foot wide

access drive). Statement of fact. 4. We recommend that the Lakewood Fire Commissioner review the proposed accessway as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. Statement of fact. 5. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to the maximum number of students and teachers/staff anticipated at the (expanded) site. Statement of fact. 6. Per review of the architectural floor plans, including "future" classrooms and offices, seventeen (17) classrooms and six (6) offices are proposed in the new Yeshiva building, requiring (23) off-street parking spaces per UDO requirements. Sixteen (16) new parking spaces are proposed. Nineteen (19) spaces are provided in the existing parking lot. The site plan shows twenty (20) spaces in the existing parking lot. A new space was created in the existing parking lot because a handicap spot and buffer have been relocated. This brings the total number of proposed parking spaces to thirty-six (36). 7. Per 2009 architectural plans provided by the applicant for the existing Yeshiva building, the existing Yeshiva building requires at least three (3) parking spaces for the study hall, one office and one classroom. Therefore, at least twenty-six (26) parking spaces are necessary to support both (existing, proposed) Yeshiva buildings. Thirty-five (35) spaces (total) will be provided as proposed. The applicant's professionals will provide summary testimony regarding parking to the Board's satisfaction. Thirty-six (36) spaces are proposed. 8. We recommend that proposed curbing on the west side of the new 24-foot wide access drive be extended around the nose-shaped "proposed solid yellow striping" as shown, as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. Curbing has been provided as requested. 9. A trash enclosure is depicted at the end of the proposed 24-foot wide cartway. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant desires DPW pickup of trash and recyclables. Therefore, DPW approval of the design will be necessary, if/when Board approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this condition. The proposed trash enclosure depicted at the end of the 24-foot wide cartway has been removed. The applicant's engineer has indicated that the existing trash enclosure will get enlarged. Dimensions as well as more detail of the enclosure are required. DPW approval will be required as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. 10. Per review of the current 24-foot wide cartway design, the proposed curbing on the eastern edge of the cartway must be designed to provide a 6" reveal except for the new access provided to the existing parking area located north of the existing Yeshiva building. The applicant agrees to this condition. This has been addressed. 11. A handicap ramp is necessary for where the proposed sidewalk on the east side of the new access drive will access the new opening for the above-referenced (existing) parking lot. The applicant agrees to this condition. This has been addressed. 12. A new driveway apron must be provided to maintain access to the existing dwelling located on existing Lot 24. The applicant agrees to this condition. This has been addressed. 13. A note must be added to the plan, indicating that the portion of the former Coleman Avenue cartway to remain will be repaired as necessary for construction of the new 24-foot wide access drive and head-in parking spaces. The applicant agrees to this condition. This has been addressed. 14. A Sight triangle must be provided for the new access to the existing parking lot. The applicant agrees to this condition. A Site triangle has been provided, but dimensions and area must also be included. 15. Coordination between the final site plans and final architectural plans will be required for the proposed school/dormitory building. Statement of fact. 16. All necessary signage should be completed on the site plan, such handicap signage and directional signage. The applicant agrees to this condition. Statement of fact. B. Architectural 1. Architectural plans have been provided for the proposed school/dormitories. The set includes floor plans and a building elevation. The proposed building includes two (2) floors and a finished basement. As depicted, classrooms, dormitories and offices are depicted on all three (3) floors, with the basement floor plan identifying all rooms as "future" facilities. Statement of fact. 2. The proposed school building height must be identified on the architecturals (Elevation Plan). Testimony should be provided. 3. The architectural elevation drawing must be revised to identify the finished basement as identified on the floor plans. Testimony should be provided. 4. As indicated on the architectural elevations, the proposed building height is slightly less than 35 feet. Statement of fact. 5. Per the architectural plans, sprinkler systems are proposed for the school/dormitory building. Statement of fact. 6. We recommend that the location of proposed HVAC equipment be shown for all buildings.

Said equipment should be adequately screened. HVAC equipment has been shown for the new proposed building, but should be revised to provide buffer facing adjacent Lot 39. This can be addressed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted.

C. Grading

1. Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design concept is feasible as proposed. However, the following remaining information is necessary to complete the design:

- a. Additional proposed elevations for accessible routes and ramp proposed for the handicap parking space to ensure slope compliance. This has been addressed.
- b. Additional proposed elevations provided at control points, such as building landings, curb corners, and curb returns. This has not been addressed.
- c. Additional grading information for the proposed "scissor ramp" at the northern end of the new school building. This has not been addressed.
- d. Additional curb grades (depicting curb reveal) along the east side of the 24-foot wide access drive. This has been addressed.
- e. Additional spot elevations will be needed in parking areas to complete the design. This has not been addressed.

The applicant agrees to providing this information (if/when approval is granted).

2. The final grading design will be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted.

Fact. D. Storm Water Management

1. The stormwater design is depicted on Site Plan Sheet 3. An underground recharge system is proposed to attenuate storm water runoff from the new building. The design is feasible as prepared. This has been addressed.

2. Roof leaders are depicted on the site plans, proposed to collect runoff from the new building and convey it into the proposed underground recharge system. This has been addressed.

3. As referenced on the site plans, the net increase in impervious coverage for the new school will be less than 5,100 sf. As such, the expansion is not subject to NJ Storm water Rule requirements. This has been addressed.

4. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to maintain the proposed recharge system, if/when approval is granted. A note has been added to the Improvement plan and the Site plan indicating that the applicant will maintain the proposed recharge system. Addressed.

5. The storm water design will be finalized during compliance review if/when board approval is granted. The applicant agrees to this condition.

Fact. E. Landscaping and Lighting

1. Proposed landscaping is depicted on Site Plan Sheet As depicted, one (1) red maple and 27 boxwoods are proposed. **Fact.**

2. Additional landscaping (if any) provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Board and/or Shade Tree Commission. The applicant agrees to this condition. **Statement of Fact.** Additional landscaping is provided on the revised plans.

3. Three (3) "LT" trees are shown on the landscaping plan, but the Plant List only shows two (2) "LT" trees.

4. A final review of the landscape design will be undertaken during compliance, if/when approval is granted. **Statement of fact.**

5. Lighting for the new school building, access way and head in parking spaces is identified on site plan Sheet 5, and is feasible as proposed. We recommend cut-off shields be added to fixtures to prevent glare. **Statement of fact.**

6. We recommend that non-security building lighting be placed on timers. **Fact.**

7. A final review of lighting will be provided during compliance, if/when approval is granted. **Statement of fact.**

F. Utilities

1. The plans indicate the site will be served by public water service (and public sewer. As such, New Jersey American Water approval is necessary. **Statement of fact.**

2. Fire hydrants (if proposed) should be indicated on the plans (or as directed by the Township Fire Official). **Statement of fact.**

G. Traffic

1. We recommend that the applicant's professionals be prepared to provide traffic testimony at the forthcoming public hearing. **Statement of fact.**

2. Testimony should be provided as to whether significant pedestrian traffic (from offsite) is anticipated for the school. **Statement of fact.**

H. Signage

1. No signage information is provided. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. **Statement of fact.**

2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. **Statement of fact.**

I. Environmental

To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings 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 issues associated with development of this property. No known areas of concern or environmentally-constraints exist within the property per NJDEP mapping.

Statement of fact. J. 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. Statement of fact. 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. Lakewood DPW (trash/recyclables pickup) c. New Jersey American Water (water and sewer service); d. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); e. Ocean County Planning Board; f. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; g. Ocean County Board of Health (existing well and septic, if any); and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Rennert stepped down.

Mr. Abraham Penzer, Esq. stated that there are no variances associated with the project. They are located on a dead end and have now vacated the street and own both sides of the property. The Yeshiva is growing so they are constructing a new building with dorms. All the items can be met in the engineer's review letter. The school currently has 75 students with a maximum capacity of 90 students. There are 7 staff and 13 study partners. They cannot give a quality education by having more than 90 students. There are no buses whatsoever as most, if not all, of the students reside in the dorms. The school forbids cars. They only need 26 parking spaces but they have provided 36 spaces. The building height is 135 ft.

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. Herzl to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler

- 6. SD 1982** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: 1260 ECL, LLC
Location: County Line Road
Block 187 Lot 100

Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision to create 4 lots and a cul-de-sac

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision approval. The applicant proposes the subdivision of one (1) existing lot to create four (4) proposed lots and a cul-de-sac road. The four (4) proposed lots would be for future single-family residential dwellings. The existing lot known as Lot 100 in Block 187 is proposed to be subdivided into proposed Lots 100.01 through 100.04 on the Major Subdivision Plan. The subject property is located in the northeast portion of the Township on the south side of East County Line Road, east of Ann Court. East County Line Road is an improved County Highway with a variable width right-of-way in front of the site. A dedication is proposed to bring the half width right-of-way to a consistent twenty-five feet (25') along the site frontage. The subdivision would create a cul-de-sac for the project that intersects the south side of East County Line Road. The cul-de-sac is proposed to be called Emerald Court, upon which the residential lots would front. Only a forty foot (40') right-of-way width with sidewalk on just one (1) side is proposed for access. Even though the proposed right-of-way width is substandard, a thirty foot (30') pavement width and an eighty foot (80') diameter cul-de-sac bulb has been designed with curbing. The proposed sidewalk on one (1) side of the road would require an easement because of the narrow right-of-way designed. Much of the existing 1.734 acre area of the site is covered by trees and is very flat. Presently, there is a one and half story single family dwelling, a detached garage, and three (3) sheds on the property to be subdivided. All structures located on the site will be removed in accordance with applicable local and state standards. Proposed

storm water management facilities and utilities are associated with this project. The proposed drainage system consists of a conventional storm sewer collection system that collects and directs runoff to underground infiltration areas. Proposed sanitary sewer and potable water for the subdivision will be extended from existing mains in East County Line Road. Four (4) off-street parking spaces are proposed for each lot. The subject site is located within the R-15 Single-Family Residential Zone District. The lands surrounding the site are exclusively residential. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 10/7/14 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated September 29, 2014: 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 can support granting the Site Features waivers since enough topography has been provided for design. The Board shall take action on the Site Features submission waivers. We support the granting of the requested Environmental Impact Statement waiver, since the site and surroundings have been previously developed. The Board shall take action on the requested Environmental Impact Statement submission waiver. We support the granting of the requested Tree Protection Management Plan waiver for completeness purposes. A Tree Protection Management Plan should be required prior to any construction. The applicant's engineer indicates the applicant agrees to provide a Tree Protection Management Plan prior to any construction. Therefore, the Board should grant this completeness submission waiver. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-15, Single-Family Zone District. Single-family detached housing on minimum fifteen thousand square foot (15,000 SF) lots is permitted in the Zone. Statements of fact. 2. According to our review of the Major Subdivision Plan and the zone requirements, variances are requested for Minimum Lot Width. Proposed Lots 100.03 and 100.04 would have lot widths of 60.51 feet and 61.59 feet respectively, where one hundred feet (100') is required. The Board shall take action on the requested lot width variances. 3. Our review of the Major Subdivision Plan and the zone requirements also indicates a variance is required for Minimum Rear Yard Setback on proposed Lot 100.02. The proposed rear yard would be adjacent to adjoining Lot 44 in Block 187 and Lot 13 in Block 187.05. Only an 18.1 foot setback is proposed from adjoining Lot 44, whereas a twenty foot (20') setback is required. It should be noted this required variance can easily be eliminated by altering the proposed configuration of the future dwelling. The Board shall take action on the required rear yard setback variance. 4. The revised plans propose an Aggregate Side Yard Setback variance for new Lot 100.03. An aggregate side yard setback of 24.1 feet is proposed, whereas twenty-five feet (25') is required. It should be noted this required variance can easily be eliminated by altering the proposed configuration of the future dwelling. The Board shall take action on the required aggregate side yard setback variance. 5. A waiver is required for the proposed right-of-way width of the cul-de-sac. A forty foot (40') right-of-way width is proposed, whereas a fifty foot (50') width is required. The Board shall take action on the required proposed right-of-way width waiver. 6. Concrete sidewalk is proposed throughout most of the cul-de-sac for the subdivision and along the site frontage with County Line Road East. Unless a waiver is granted by the Board, proposed sidewalk would need to be added along the west side of Emerald Court. The Board shall take action on the required proposed sidewalk waiver. 7. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the 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. General 1. Off-street parking: According to the plans provided, the applicant is proposing four (4) off-street parking spaces per unit which is enough to be in compliance with the RSIS and Township standards of four (4) off-street parking spaces required. Up to six (6) bedrooms per unit with an unfinished basement are permitted for this project to be in compliance with parking ordinance 2010-62. Testimony should be given as to how the four (4) off-street parking spaces per unit are being provided. The proposed driveways are only large enough to accommodate two (2) vehicles, but are wide enough to allow for two (2) car garages. The applicant's

engineer indicates that every unit will have a garage and testimony will be provided regarding how each home will meet the off-street parking requirements. 2. The applicant shall confirm that trash and recyclable collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony will be provided regarding trash and recyclable collection for the proposed subdivision. 3. A new road name, Emerald Court, has been proposed for the project. Statement of fact. 4. The proposed lot numbers shall be approved by the Tax Assessor. The Final Plat shall be signed by the Lakewood Tax Assessor. The Lakewood Tax Assessor signature is required prior to map filing should approval be granted. 5. The requirements in 18-821 (Building Uniformity in Residential Developments) must be addressed. A minimum of two (2) basic house designs are required for this development consisting of between four (4) and six (6) homes. The designs are required prior to construction, should subdivision approval be granted. 6. Most of the proposed storm water management has been designed within the proposed lots. Therefore, it is anticipated the Township of Lakewood will be responsible for operation and maintenance of the drainage system within the right-of-way, and the property owners will be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the recharge systems within the lots. Transition manholes will be required to separate ownership responsibilities. The proposed transition manholes can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. B. Plan Review 1. A Boundary and Topographic Survey was submitted. The following shall be addressed: a. The bench mark shown on the survey should be referenced in the General Notes and added on the construction plans where appropriate. b. The Ann Court right-of-way should be indicated since the tie distances in the deed description are shown. c. Adjoining Lots 83 and 84 should be labeled. d. Fence encroachments must be rectified. Fencing ownership must be clarified. A revised survey shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. The Sheet Index on the Title Sheet should coordinate with the plan set. This shall be addressed with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. A proposed Sight Triangle Easement to Ocean County has been shown at the intersection of Emerald Court with East County Line Road. Statement of fact. 4. A proposed six foot (6') wide Sidewalk, Shade Tree, and Utility Easement to the Township has been shown along the road frontages. Statement of fact. 5. The Site Development Plan should have typical dimensions and road stationing added. Typical dimensions and road stationing along East County Line Road can be addressed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. Curb and sidewalk is proposed for the cul-de-sac. Unless the proposed sidewalk width is increased to five feet (5'), pedestrian bypass areas will be necessary. The proposed sidewalk location shall be dimensioned with distances from face of curb. The revised construction details indicate that pedestrian bypass areas have been added at the proposed driveway locations. 7. The proposed setback lines require many corrections. The proposed side yard setbacks shall be corrected for resolution compliance submission if approval is granted. 8. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements requires many corrections. Final corrections to the Schedule of Bulk Requirements shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 9. A variable width dedication to the County of Ocean is being provided. The proposed half width right-of-way for East County Line Road would be twenty-five feet (25'). Statements of fact. C. Grading 1. A profile has been provided for proposed Emerald Court construction. The following revisions should be provided: a. Proposed road intersection added. b. Proposed horizontal control points added. c. Proposed vertical curves added. d. It appears the curb line profile should be between stations 1+42.58 and 4+18.45. The proposed profile will be reviewed subsequent to resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. A profile is required for East County Line Road. This profile can be completed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Spot elevations should be included for all corners of proposed lots. Proposed lot corner elevations can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. Soil boring locations and logs have been provided to demonstrate that a two foot (2') separation from seasonal high water table to proposed basement elevations is maintained. The plans label garage floor elevations ten feet (10') lower than first floor elevations. No basement floor elevations are shown. The revised plans label the basement floor elevations ten feet (10') lower than the first floor elevations. Proposed garage floor elevations have been included. 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. Our review of the project indicates it will be classified as Major Development since more than a quarter acre of impervious surface will be added and over an acre of disturbance will take place. As a result, the project must meet water quality and water quantity reduction rate requirements. The Storm Water Management Report should be revised to address water quality. The applicant's engineer indicates that the Storm Water Management Report will be revised for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. A Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual shall be submitted per NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township Code. The applicant's engineer indicates that an O&M Manual will be provided with resolution compliance submission once approval has been obtained. 3. The Storm Water Management Report and Design will be reviewed in detail during compliance, if/when approved.

Statement of fact. E. Landscaping 1. The proposed Sidewalk, Shade Tree, and Utility Easements shall be added to the Landscaping Plan. Proposed Sight Triangle Easements shall also be added. Proposed shade trees should not be located in the sight triangle easements. The proposed shade trees along the west side of Emerald Court will have to be located within the right-of-way. Proposed easements have been added to the Landscape Plan. We recommend the proposed shade trees along the west side of Emerald Court be eliminated because of the proximity to the future curb. 2. 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. The site will be cleared for the construction of the project. Compensatory plantings shall be addressed with the Tree Protection Management Plan. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations. The plans can be revised in accordance with the Shade Tree Commission recommendations for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. The Tree Protection Management Plan shall also be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted.

Statement of fact. F. Lighting 1. The Plan indicates that two (2) Cobra Head, one hundred watt (100W) high pressure sodium pole mounted fixtures are proposed. A detail shows the proposed height of the fixtures to be twenty-five feet (25'). Statements of fact. 2. A point to point diagram has been provided to verify the adequacy of the proposed lighting. Statement of fact. 3. It is anticipated that all lighting will be owned and maintained by the Township after installation since all fixtures will be within public right-of-ways. Confirming testimony should be provided regarding street lighting ownership. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony regarding the ownership of the proposed street lighting will be provided during the public hearing. 4. Lighting shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted.

Statement of fact. G. Utilities 1. Potable water and sanitary sewer service will be provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. The project is within the franchise area of the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. Statements of fact. 2. The plans state that proposed utilities are to be provided underground. Statement of fact. H. Signage 1. Proposed regulatory signage has been shown on the plans. A "No Outlet" sign should be added. Regulatory sign details should be completed. A "No Outlet" sign has been added. Regulatory sign details will be reviewed subsequent to resolution compliance submission should approval be granted.

I. Environmental 1. Tree Management A Tree Management Plan shall be submitted as a condition of any approval. The plan shall be completed in accordance with current ordinance Chapter XIX, Protection of Trees. The Tree Protection Management Plan shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted.

J. Construction Details 1. Final review of construction details will take place after compliance submission, if/when this project is approved by the Board.

Statement of fact. K. Final Plat (Major Subdivision) 1. Proposed changes to the Site Development Plan shall be incorporated into the Final Plat. The proposed changes shall be incorporated for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. Coordinates are required on at least three (3) outbound corners. The coordinates shall be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Some proposed outbound corner monuments should be added. Proposed outbound corner monuments shall be added for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. The references to the Zoning Board

shall be corrected to the Planning Board. The corrections shall be provided for resolution compliance submission if approval is granted. 5. The text in the Surveyor's Certification requires correction. The text shall be corrected for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 7. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after design revisions are undertaken for the project. Statement of fact. 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; and e. All other required outside agency approvals. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority will be responsible for approving potable water and sanitary sewer facilities.

Mr. Magno stated a variance is required for minimum lot width.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. stated this is minor subdivision to create four lots upon single family homes will be constructed. The application calls for the creation of a cul-de-sac off of East County Line Road. The lot width variances for a couple of the lots are due to the fact that these are pizza pie shaped lots. The lots are all larger than the required minimum lot size of 15,000 sf.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He showed a map to the Board indicating other lots in the area with the same lot widths. They will be eliminating the minimum rear yard setback variance. The only variance requested is for minimum lot width and aggregate side yard setback.

Mr. Neiman asked if they could eliminate that side yard setback.

Mr. Flannery said they could reduce the size of the house in order to eliminate that variance.

Mr. Neiman would like that.

Mr. Flannery agrees. The only variance now requested is lot width.

Mr. Neiman asked about the proposed sidewalks.

Mr. Flannery said they are proposing sidewalks along one side of the cul-de-sac but if the Board feels sidewalks is necessary they would provide same.

Mr. Neiman would like to see sidewalks on both sides.

Mr. Flannery said the applicant will provide that.

Mr. Franklin asked about the drainage.

Mr. Flannery said the homeowners would be responsible for the drainage in their yards. There will be manholes at the property line and the DPW would handle all the drainage within the right-of-way.

Mr. Schmuckler said the drains are shown right on the lot lines. He asked if they could be shifted so that one owner would be responsible.

Mr. Flannery prefers that both owners are responsible for the drains as it would be more likely they would be properly maintained.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Sussman seconded by Mr. Herzl to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 7. SD 1983** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Hendi Friedman
Location: Towers Street
Block 855.03 Lot 25
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing property known as Lot 25 in Block 855.03 and create two (2) rectangular single family residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 25.01 and 25.02 on the subdivision plan. Existing Lot 25 is a rectangular 193' X 230' tract containing 44,390 square feet (1.02 acres) with an existing dwelling and appurtenances, including an in ground pool. The proposed subdivision would create two (2) new single family residential lots of 98.06 feet wide by two hundred thirty feet (230') deep and 94.94 feet wide by two hundred thirty feet (230') deep. These proposed new Lots 25.01 and 25.02 would contain 22,553.80 square feet (0.52 acres) and 21,836.20 square feet (0.50 acres) respectively. It appears the proposed subdivision line location was chosen to keep the existing dwelling and in ground pool in conforming places on new Lot 25.01. Public water and sewer is not available. As noted on the subdivision plans, water and sewer service will be provided by private wells and septic systems. The site is situated in the central portion of the Township on the northeast side of Towers Street, northwest of New Hampshire Avenue. Towers Street is a paved municipal road in fair condition without existing curb and sidewalk in front of the site. The existing right-of-way width is fifty feet (50') with a variable paving width. Utility poles with overhead electric exist within the southwesterly side of the right-of-way. The property contains some large trees which have not been located on the survey. The site slopes to the south and freshwater wetlands have been mapped in the southerly corner. Curbing is proposed along the property frontage as depicted on the Improvement Plan, but sidewalk is not. The proposed lots are situated within the R-20 Single Family Residential Zone. The surrounding uses are predominantly single-family residential. Lot width variances are being requested for the creation of proposed Lots 25.01 and 25.02. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-20 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single Family Detached Housing is a permitted use in the zone. 2. Per review of the Minor Subdivision Map, the application, and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: • Minimum Lot Width for proposed Lots 25.01 and 25.02 - 98.06 feet proposed for new Lot 25.01 and 94.94 feet proposed for new Lot 25.02, one hundred feet (100') required – proposed condition. 3. It is not clear whether a variance is being requested for off-street parking on proposed Lot 25.01. Three (3) off-street parking spaces are proposed for new Lot 25.01, whereas the Zoning Data indicates four (4) off-street parking spaces are required. However, the plan also indicates there is a non-rentable basement for the existing dwelling to remain on proposed Lot 25.01. 4. It appears a waiver is being requested from the construction of sidewalk. New sidewalk, which is not shown on the plans, abuts the site on the northwest side. 5. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the 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. II. Review Comments 1. An Outbound and Topographic Survey has been provided. The survey should be revised to include the following: a. The bench mark referenced on the Minor Subdivision plan. b. The lot area. c. Adding existing curb and sidewalk terminating at the property line extension of adjoining Lot 30.03 since the information will be

needed for design purposes on the Improvement Plan. d. Bearings and distances for the wetland lines. e. Tie distances from the existing property corner to the intersections of the wetland lines with property lines. f. The direction of the monument found with the 0.02 foot offset. g. Add a detail of the northerly corner to clarify fence encroachments, if any. 2. The base map of the Minor Subdivision and Improvement Plans shall be revised in accordance with the appropriate survey revisions. 3. The plans indicate the sheds encroaching onto neighboring Lot 30.03 and into the accessory structure setback will be moved to comply with the ordinance. 4. General Note #3 shall be clarified with respect to owner and applicant, as well as their addresses. 5. General Note #5 indicates the coordinate datum has been assumed on the Minor Subdivision Plan. However, the coordinates provided do not appear to be in an assumed datum. 6. General Note #5 also indicates the vertical datum has been assumed. However, a vertical bench mark referenced in General Note #12 must be shown on the plans along with an elevation. 7. General Note #9 indicates that estimated seasonal high ground water elevation is greater than ten feet (10') as determined by Lines Engineering. Based on the topography and presence of freshwater wetlands, this seems unlikely. The soils information shall be provided. 8. A portion of new Lot 25.02 lies in a wetland area along with a fifty foot (50') wetland transition area. Pins shall be proposed for all intersecting points and changes in direction. Any approvals shall be subject to a Letter of Interpretation from the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection. 9. General Note #10 states the proposed dwellings shall be serviced by well and septic. Accordingly, Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required. 10. Zones and Zone Boundary Lines must be added. 11. A proposed six foot (6') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easement to Lakewood Township is shown along Towers Street. Proposed easement areas shall be shown on an individual lot basis. 12. The proposed subdivision line has been set ten feet (10') from the pool such that the proposed side yard for an accessory structure on new Lot 25.01 would comply. However, the existing improvements associated with the pool encroach onto new Lot 25.02. The situation shall be remedied. 13. The Minor Subdivision Plan shows new lot numbers were assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. 14. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since the monuments have not been set. 15. The Owner's Certification list the wrong Lot and Block. 16. Three (3) proposed October Glory Maple street trees are shown on the Improvement Plan within the shade tree and utility easement. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. There are many trees on the property. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. 17. Testimony should be provided on the disposition of storm water management for the proposed development of new Lot 25.02. At a minimum, drywells should be proposed to address storm water management from the development. Drywells shall be sized at the time of plot plan submission. 18. Proposed concrete curb to be set fifteen feet (15') from the centerline, will be provided along Towers Street according to the Improvement Plan. Existing curb and sidewalk which is not shown on the Improvement Plan borders the project to the northwest. Therefore, the proposed design of the curb across the frontage of the site must meet these existing improvements. 19. Testimony should be provided on proposed grading. A proposed grading design will be required on the Improvement Plan for the construction within the right-of-way. 20. Due to no construction proposed at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. 21. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 22. Construction details should be revised on the Improvement Plan in accordance with the any conditions of approval required by the Board. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d. Ocean County Board of Health (potable wells and septic systems); e. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Magno stated variances are requested for lot width.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., P.P. stated that they are providing sidewalks.

Mr. Magno asked about parking.

Mr. Lines said they are proposing three spaces but four can be provided if the Board wishes.

Mr. Neiman asked that they provide four spaces.

Mr. Lines said it came to his attention that the pool equipment may be a foot or two over the property line so the lot line may need to be adjusted. It would not affect the lot area.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Sussman to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Rennert

- 8. SD 1984** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Hendi Friedman
Location: East Spruce Street
Block 855.02 Lot 30
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing property known as Lot 30 in Block 855.02 and create two (2) identical rectangular single family residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 30.01 and 30.02 on the subdivision plan. Existing Lot 30 is a rectangular 150' X 300' tract containing forty-five thousand square feet (45,000 SF) or 1.033 acres with an existing dwelling and appurtenances. The proposed subdivision would create two (2) identical rectangular new single family residential lots of seventy-five feet (75') wide by three hundred feet (300') deep. These proposed lots would each contain twenty-two thousand five hundred square feet (22,500 SF) or 0.516 acres. Public water and sewer is not available. As noted on the subdivision plans, water and sewer service will be provided by private wells and septic systems. The site contains an existing one-story dwelling and a shed. All existing improvements are to be removed or moved. The plans show the existing dwelling to be moved onto proposed Lot 30.01 and all other appurtenances to be removed. Public water has recently been constructed on the north side of East Spruce Street, but is still far from this site. Public sewer is not available. The site is situated in the central portion of the Township on the southwest side of East Spruce Street, southeast of its intersection with Albert Avenue. East Spruce Street is a paved municipal road in good condition without existing curb and sidewalk in front of the site. The existing right-of-way width is fifty feet (50') with a pavement width of approximately twenty-eight feet (28'). Construction of curb and sidewalk is proposed with this application. Existing utility poles with overhead electric are located on the north side of East Spruce Street. The Survey and Improvement Plan shows the location of some individual trees on the site. Most of the site is covered with small trees. The topography indicates the property to be sloping northeastwards. In addition to the dwelling and shed, a well, and a driveway have been located. The proposed lots are situated within the R-20 Single Family Residential Zone. The surrounding uses are entirely residential. Variances are being requested for proposed Lots 30.01 and 30.02. We have the following comments and recommendations: 1. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-20 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single Family Detached Housing is a permitted use in the zone. 2. Per review of the Minor Subdivision Map, the application, and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: • Minimum Lot Width - Seventy-five feet

(75') for proposed Lots 30.01 and 30.02, whereas one hundred feet (100') is required – proposed condition. • Minimum Side Yard Setback – 4.64 feet for proposed Lot 30.01, whereas ten feet (10') is required - proposed condition. • Minimum Aggregate Side Yard Setback – 14.64 feet for proposed Lot 30.01, whereas twenty-five feet (25') is required. 3. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the 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. II. Review Comments 1. A Topographic Survey has been provided with outbound information. The following revisions are required: a. A revised Outbound and Topographic Survey shall be submitted. b. The lot area shall be provided. c. Horizontal datum shall be provided. d. The Notes indicate the elevations are based on an assumed datum. A bench mark of a permanent nature shall be provided. e. The existing mailbox in front of the site should be added. 2. The General Notes reference the Topographic Survey map submitted which has been used for the base map of the Minor Subdivision and Improvement Plan. 3. A benchmark of a permanent nature must be shown on the Minor Subdivision Plan. The benchmark selected will be disturbed by the proposed road widening. 4. General Note #5 indicates that horizontal and vertical datum has been assumed. 5. Coordinates shall be provided on at least three (3) outbound corners. 6. General Note #10 states the proposed dwellings shall be served by well and septic. 7. The Zoning Data should be revised to reflect the proposed Setbacks and Building Coverage for the dwellings shown on the Improvement Plan. The existing dwelling would be moved onto proposed Lot 30.01. 8. A proposed easement shown along East Spruce Street shall be revised to a six foot (6') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easement dedicated to Lakewood Township. Proposed easement areas shall be shown on an individual lot basis. 9. The Zoning Data indicates that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be required for each lot and that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each lot. The proposed driveways on the Improvement Plan have been dimensioned to show that the parking configuration will provide at least four (4) off-street parking spaces per lot. Off-street parking shall be in accordance with the Township Parking Ordinance. A minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces for a dwelling unit with a basement is to be provided. Durable surface asphalt driveways are being proposed. 10. Testimony should be provided as to whether any basements will be proposed. the Improvement Plan does not indicate any basement floor elevations. 11. The Minor Subdivision Plan shows new lot numbers were assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. 12. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since the monuments have not been set. 13. Four (4) proposed October Glory Maple street trees are shown on the Improvement Plan within the shade tree and utility easement. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. Our site investigation notes the larger existing trees in front of the existing dwelling have been located on the Survey and Improvement Plan. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. 14. General Note #9 indicates that estimated seasonal high ground water elevation is greater than ten feet (10') as determined by Lines Engineering. The soils information substantiating this note shall be submitted. 15. The proposed dwellings on new Lots 30.01 and 30.02 would be substantially setback from East Spruce Street to allow septic systems to be constructed in the front yards and potable wells to be placed in the rear yards. Approvals will be required from the Ocean County Board of Health. 16. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. Proposed grading is indicated on the Improvement Plan. The existing trees to be removed should be indicated. Our review of the proposed grading indicates that runoff will be trapped in the rear yards because of inadequate pitch towards East Spruce Street. Lawn inlets should be provided for rear yard drywells. 17. We recommend drywells be proposed in the rear yards to address storm water management from the development. Drywells can be sized at the time of plot plan submission. 18. Proposed five foot (5') wide concrete sidewalk will be provided along East Spruce Street according to the Improvement Plan. The proposed sidewalk location shall be dimensioned from the right-of-way and curb lines. 19. Concrete curb is proposed fifteen feet (15') from the centerline of East Spruce Street. Design of the pavement

tapers associated with the road widening shall be provided. 20. A proposed gutter reconstruction design is shown along East Spruce Street to provide adequate slope for drainage. 21. Due to no construction proposed at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. 22. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 23. Construction details should be revised on the Improvement Plan in accordance with any conditions of approval required by the Board. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d. Ocean County Board of Health (potable wells and septic systems); and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Magno stated that variances are required for lot width, side yard setback and aggregate side yard setback.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E. was sworn in. He said the existing house is in very good condition and it would be a shame to tear it down. They are proposing to move the existing house over and that would create the side yard setback. If the house does get torn down, then the house would have to meet all the setbacks.

Mr. Neiman asked if they could move the house a little more to eliminate the side yard setback.

Mr. Lines said they are trying to keep the 10 foot side yard setback on the other side in order to appease the existing neighbor.

Mr. Magno said the existing house is 60 feet wide and it's going to be on a 75 foot lot.

Mr. Neiman said the houses on Spruce Street are 25 feet apart. Now they are having houses that are 4 feet apart. It will start looking congested.

Mr. Lines said they are only asking for the lot width variance and would eliminate the side yard setback variance.

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

Mr. Lines said he would like to either tear down the house and build a new one or modify the house so that it fits within the side yard setbacks if the variance is denied.

Mr. Kitrick recommended that there be two separate votes.

A motion was made by Mr. Rennert, seconded by Mr. _____ to grant the minor subdivision with 75 foot wide lots.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Rennert

A motion was made by Mr. Rennert, seconded by Mr. Franklin to deny the side yard setback variance.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Rennert

8. CORRESPONDENCE

9. PUBLIC PORTION

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

11. APPROVAL OF BILLS

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary

Planning Board Recording Secretary