

I. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

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

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

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Committeeman Ackerman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

4. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

1. **SP 1976** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Calvary Lighthouse
Location: East County Line Road, west of Ridge Avenue
Block 175.01 Lot 34
Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed addition to existing school & church

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Committeeman Ackerman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal
Abstained: Mr. Banas

2. **SD 1838** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Mizz Builders, LLC
Location: East County Line Road, west of Apple Street
Block 171 Lot 3.02
Minor Subdivision & Variance to create two zero lot line lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MAY 15, 2012**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING**

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

Abstained: Committeeman Ackerman

- 3. SD 1841** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Mizz Builders, LLC
Location: East County Line Road, west of Apple Street
Block 171 Lot 3.01
Minor Subdivision & Variance to create two zero lot line lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

Abstained: Committeeman Ackerman

- 4. SD 1836** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Homes For All, Inc.
Location: Vine Avenue, south of Oak Street
Block 1146 Lot 1
Block 1147 Lot 1
Block 1154 Lot 1
Block 1155 Lot 1
Block 1156 Lot 1
Maple Tree Village – Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision to create 71 residential single family dwellings & duplex affordable housing

Mr. Jackson announced that this resolution will be tabled to the next public hearing meeting.

- 5. SD 1834** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Jacob & Karen Craven
Location: Corner of Ridge Avenue, East Fifth Street & Ridge Fourth Street
Block 239 Lots 1 & 2
Minor Subdivision to create two zero lot line lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

Abstained: Committeeman Ackerman

6. **SD 1837** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Park & Second Acquisition, LLC
Location: Southeast corner of East Second Street & the railroad
Block 248.01 Lots 63.02 & part of 78
Amended Preliminary & Final Subdivision to construct 21 townhouse units

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal
Abstained: Committeeman Ackerman

7. **SP 1979** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Bnos Melech of Lakewood
Location: James Street
Block 364 Lot 1
Administrative Change of Use Site Plan to change from vacant industrial use to a proposed school

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal
Abstained: Committeeman Ackerman

5. NEW BUSINESS

1. **SP 1978** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Abraham Newman
Location: Coleman Avenue, north of Milton Street
Block 104 Lot 24
Site Plan for proposed gymnasium as accessory use for previously approved dormitory

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Site Plan approval to construct a gymnasium behind an existing dwelling which is being converted to a dormitory. The proposed gymnasium will be on Lot 24 in Block 104. The proposed dormitory conversion approved under Resolution Number SP 1970, will be largely unaffected by the proposed project. The site plan and architectural plans propose a 60' X 80', four thousand eight hundred square foot (4,800 SF) gymnasium. The proposed gymnasium will be located behind the existing dwelling currently being converted into

a dormitory. The proposed gymnasium will be set ten feet (10') from the existing side and rear property lines. The site is located in the northern portion of the Township on the east side of Coleman Avenue, two hundred feet (200') north of Milton Street. Coleman Avenue is an improved dead end municipal street with a fifty foot (50') right-of-way. The 100' X 150' tract, which is near the terminus of Coleman Avenue, is rectangular in shape and consists of fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF) in area. Residential development generally surrounds the property. The school to be served by the dormitory and gymnasium is located to the south on adjacent Lot 23.01 (see attached site plan), as noted in Resolution Numbers SP 1902 and 1970. The following findings of fact from Resolution Number SP 1970 are relevant to this application:

1. Lots 23.01 and 24 will not be consolidated due to mortgage purposes. The proposed dormitory will be utilized as an accessory use to the adjoining school. Therefore, the proposed gymnasium will also be used as an accessory use to the school.
2. The proposed dormitory would contain a maximum of seventeen (17) beds.
3. The students will be residing in the proposed dormitory.
4. The age of the students would range from 17-19 years old.
5. The students would dine next door in the adjacent school.
6. The applicant would comply with all requirements relative to fire and health codes.
7. The students would not be driving or be dropped off.
8. There will be no additional parking required and the existing driveway at the site will remain unchanged.
9. Very little refuse will be produced by the dormitory use. Dumpster and recycling provisions are located next door. Curb exists across the frontage of the project, but sidewalk does not. Sidewalk is proposed and will meet and match the existing sidewalk in front of Lot 23.01 to the south. No water and sewer is proposed for the gymnasium, but the project site will be serviced by sanitary sewer and a potable well.

We offer the following comments and recommendations:

- I. Zoning 1. The property is located in the R-12 Residential District. Schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906 of the UDO. We recognize that the gymnasium in question will serve as an accessory building/use in support of the school.
2. Confirming testimony should be provided by the applicant and/or professionals regarding the requested gymnasium and its relationship to the existing (adjacent) school use on Lot 23.01.
3. Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, the existing and proposed layout generally complies with the Bulk requirements of the R-12 zone. A variance is requested for Maximum Building Coverage. A building coverage of 44.3% is proposed for Lot 24, whereas a building coverage of twenty-five percent (25%) is allowed. It should be noted that when considering the entire complex (Lots 23.01 and 24) of the existing school, dormitory under conversion, and proposed gymnasium, the building coverage would be just below thirty percent (30%).
4. Relief is requested from Section 18-906A, to provide a twenty foot (20') buffer from residential uses.
5. The following design waivers are required for the project:
 - a. Providing an updated Survey.
 - b. Providing additional site lighting. In the Land Development Checklist, the applicant's engineer indicates topography of the site will be provided. The site plan information provided is sufficient for completeness purposes and the providing of an updated Survey may be made a condition of approval. It should be noted that site lighting is already in place for the existing school on Lot 23.01. The applicant's professionals should address the need for site lighting of the proposed gymnasium area.

- II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking
 1. The General Notes state that boundary and existing conditions are taken from a survey by Clearpoint Services, LLC dated 6-28-07. An updated Survey should be made a condition of approval.
 2. Additional coordination is required between the site plans and architectural plans. The three (3) access doors for the proposed building should be added to the site plan layout along with access walkways.
 3. Testimony should be provided from the applicant's professionals regarding the gymnasium operations.
 4. No refuse enclosures are depicted on the site plan. General Note #9 indicates solid waste and

recycling to be disposed of in a dumpster at the school on Lot 23.01. 5. A note should be added to the plans to replace deteriorated or damaged existing curb. 6. A Deed of Easement and description shall be provided for the proposed six foot (6') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easement for review and approval by the Board Attorney and Engineer prior to filing with the Ocean County Clerk. B. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural plans have been provided for the proposed gymnasium building. The set includes floor plans and elevations. The proposed building will be twenty-two feet, nine and a half inches (22'-9.5") high, which is less than the allowable building height of thirty-five feet (35'). 2. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing. 3. According to the proposed architectural plans, the floor area will be completely open with structural members along the longitudinal walls. 4. No proposed water and sewer connections are shown for the gymnasium building. 5. No mechanical equipment has been shown for the proposed building. The sizes and locations of the proposed equipment must be shown on the site plans and architectural plans. The proposed equipment should be adequately screened. C. Grading 1. According to our review of the site plan and architectural plans, the proposed gymnasium appears to be a slab on grade design. A grading plan will be required when the updated survey is completed. Final grading will be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. The proposed project will not be considered Major Development since less than a quarter acre of new impervious surface is proposed and less than an acre of disturbance will occur. An underground recharge system, similar to what has been installed on the adjoining school site, is recommended to account for the increase in impervious area and to insure the surrounding residences are not adversely impacted by the project. A Storm Water Management design for the project should be a condition of approval. Storm Water Management can be addressed during resolution compliance review should approval be granted. 2. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of any proposed on-site storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. E. Landscaping 1. Four (4) October Glory Maple shade trees are proposed along Coleman Avenue. Twenty-two (22) Emerald Arborvitaes are proposed for landscape screening behind the gymnasium building. 2. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board and the Shade Tree Commission as practicable. 3. A final review of landscaping can be conducted during compliance, should site plan approval be granted. F. Lighting 1. A waiver from providing additional site lighting has been requested. Testimony should be provided on the need for site lighting in the vicinity of the proposed gymnasium building. G. Utilities 1. The plans indicate the project site will be serviced by a proposed well and a proposed sanitary sewer lateral. 2. Approval for the proposed sanitary sewer will be required from the New Jersey American Water Company since the project is within their franchise area. 3. Approval for the proposed well will be required from the Ocean County Board of Health. 4. The existing on-site well and septic system shall be abandoned. Ocean County Board of Health approvals will be required. H. Signage 1. No signage information is provided in the site plan submission. A full signage package for any 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. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. I. Environmental 1. 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. The data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of

this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. 2. We recommend that all on-site materials from the proposed conversion activities be removed and disposed in accordance with applicable local and state regulations. 3. A Tree Protection Management Plan must be provided as a condition of approval, including compensatory plantings. Our site investigation on 3/27/12 noted existing trees will be removed with the construction of the project. I. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; if/when this application is approved. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. Ocean County Board of Health; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Rennert stepped down for this application.

Mr. Vogt stated that relief is being sought for maximum building coverage as well as partial relief for the 20' perimeter buffer.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E. was sworn in. He stated that they are requested approval to construct an 80 ft by 60 ft rectangular gymnasium at the rear of the property that has previously received approval for the existing home to be used as a dormitory. The dorm and gym will support the school that is on the corner of Milton and Colman Avenue. As Terry indicated, there is a lot coverage variance of 44.3% which is just for the lot with the gym and dorm. When looking at it as a whole the coverage was calculated at 27.9%. For financial reasons, they cannot merge the two lots together.

Mr. Banas expressed the concern of the lot coverage being at 30%.

Mr. Penzer, Esq. on behalf of the application stated that if you put the benefits versus the detriments, it's 27% and the 2% will mean that they can have recreation inside instead of being out in the street.

Mr. Abraham Newman was sworn in. He stated that they will not be doing any more building after the gymnasium. He is willing to restrict that this building will only be used for a gymnasium.

Mr. Neiman opened the microphone to the public.

Ms. Gerri Balwinz was sworn in. She stated that there is an apartment complex behind this project and the renters would not have been noticed. She is concerned about the owners possibly having parties in the gymnasium.

Mr. William Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, was sworn in. He expressed his concerns with the lot coverage variance.

Ms. Noreen Gill, 192 Coventry Drive, was sworn in. She stated that when the school was originally approved they should have put aside land for recreation. She expressed concerns for the quality of life in Lakewood.

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

Mr. Penzer stated that they were just able to purchase this property. It was not available at the time of the original approval.

Committeeman Ackerman made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Follman.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Committeeman Ackerman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

2. **SP 1985** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Bais Tova, Inc.
Location: Oak Street, east of Vine Avenue
Block 792 Lot 1
Block 795 Lot 1.01

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for proposed new girls high school & gymnasium addition to existing Bais Tova school

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a gymnasium as an addition to Bais Tova School for Girls along with a new girl's high school building, Shiras Devorah, on the subject premises. The revised plans propose an addition consisting of a nine thousand three hundred eighty-five square foot (9,385 SF) gymnasium and link. The proposed Shiras Devorah High School for Girls contains a thirty-six thousand six hundred seventy square foot (36,670 SF) footprint which includes an improved basement, two (2) floors of classrooms, offices, pray room, and gymnasium. The revised site plans indicate an interior parking area consisting of four hundred fourteen (414) parking spaces and site improvements for the two (2) schools are proposed within the property. Multiple vehicular access points to the existing Bais Tova School for Girls and proposed Shiras Devorah High School for Girls is provided from Oak Street. Curb and sidewalk generally exist along the project frontages, except sidewalk does not exist along Bellinger Street and at the intersection of Funston Avenue and Bellinger Street. Bellinger Street has not been improved across the last one hundred twenty-five feet (125') of project frontage, which is to the east of Lot 2, a 125' X 200' out parcel. The proposed project would be serviced by sanitary sewer and potable water. The surrounding lands are either vacant or recently developed non-residential uses. A non-residential use, Tiferes Bais Yaakov, exists immediately east of the project site. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 5/1/12 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting, and comments from our initial review letter dated April 23, 2012: 1. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-40/20 Cluster Residential District. Private schools are a permitted use in the zone. Statements of fact. 2. Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, the following relief is required for the proposed project: • In accordance with Section 18-906A of the UDO, a ten foot (10') wide perimeter landscape buffer is required from non-residential uses and zones. Said buffer is required along the easterly property line. Relief

is necessary on this portion of the project. It should be noted the land to the east is non-residentially developed, while zoned residential. The Board shall take action on the required relief. 3. Partial design waivers are required from extending Bellinger Street the last one hundred twenty-five feet (125') across the property frontage and providing sidewalk along the entire Bellinger Street frontage of the site, as well as at its intersection with Funston Avenue. It should be noted an eight foot (8') high chain link fence with screening has been erected directly behind the south curb line of Bellinger Street. The Board shall take action on the required design waivers. 4. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Testimony should be given regarding proposed circulation with the site layout (parking, loading area, access, etc.). There is an existing two-way access driveway on Funston Avenue in the northwest corner of the site. There is an existing one-way counterclockwise driveway accessing Oak Street in front of the Bais Tova School. A two-way access driveway to Oak Street is proposed in the southeast corner of the site near the new high school. Two (2) one-way exit driveways are proposed to Oak Street between the school buildings. Testimony should be provided on proposed circulation. 2. The General Notes reference the Boundary & Topographic Survey provided and vertical datum based on NGVD 1929. A bench mark shall be listed. This may be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved. 3. The General Notes indicate the existing lots are to be consolidated as part of the site plan approval. This would be required since the proposed high school crosses the existing lot line. The lot consolidation may be made a condition of approval. 4. The Boundary & Topographic Survey provided requires some corrections and additional inverts for the storm drainage. A developed portion of the existing property on the west side of the site was not surveyed. However, this area is beyond the proposed limits of work for this site plan. Therefore, we find the area surveyed more than adequate for the proposed design. The corrections may be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved. 5. The proposed front yard setback dimension to the high school building is shown to the prayer room. The correct proposed front yard for the building should be to the covered entry. However, it should be noted the required minimum front yard setback of fifty feet (50') would still be met. Also, because of the multiple road frontages, a minimum aggregate side yard setback does not apply. Corrections must be made in the Zone Requirements Table. The corrections may be provided with resolution compliance submission. The proposed front yard setback has been corrected. The provided minimum aggregate side yard setback is not applicable and the correction can be submitted for resolution compliance review if approved. 6. Proposed dimensioning must be completed on the site plan for the sizes and locations of improvements. Of particular importance is the distance between the easterly property line and the proposed face of curb since buffer relief is being requested. Proposed dimensioning can be provided with resolution compliance submission. The distance between the easterly property line and the proposed face of curb is 7.1 feet. 7. As indicated previously, a four hundred seventeen (417) space parking lot is being proposed for the two (2) schools. However, the count is overestimated since seven (7) existing handicapped spaces and their adjacent pedestrian access aisles are all being shown as existing parking spaces. Five (5) handicapped spaces are being proposed in front of the high school. The applicant's engineer shall indicate the existing handicapped parking spaces and pedestrian access aisles for the Bais Tova School and confirm the correct number of spaces proposed for the complex. We also note there are other existing and proposed rooms within the complex that require off-street parking spaces which are not

shown in the parking requirements. For example, the previous approval for the Bais Tova School required one hundred eleven (111) off-street parking spaces for all the qualifying rooms. Even considering the additional unaccounted for rooms, the proposed number of off-street parking spaces would far exceed those required per UDO standards. The Parking Requirements Table should be updated. Plan revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission. The revised plans propose four hundred fourteen (414) off-street parking spaces. The Parking Requirements Table shall be revised. The Bais Tova School requires one hundred eleven (111) off-street parking spaces (Resolution SP 1814A). We calculate the new high school requires at least thirty-seven (37) off-street parking spaces. Corrections can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved. 8. Detectable Warning Surface must be proposed throughout the site. Existing curb ramps are missing detectable warning surface. Some existing handicapped signage is also missing. Plan revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission. A General Note has been added that detectable warning surfaces shall be provided for handicap access ramps throughout the project site. The note can be expanded for resolution compliance submission, if approved, that missing handicap signage shall be installed. 9. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether the students will be allowed to park on-site. Testimony should also be provided as to the maximum number of staff professionals at the site during school operations. Testimony should be provided on site operations. 10. A nineteen (19) space bus parking area is proposed on the east side of the existing Bais Tova School. A ten (10) space one-way bus drop off area, which is included in the proposed parking area, runs parallel to Oak Street in front of the high school. Although it appears that adequate turning movements will be provided for the proposed bus parking, bus drop off area, refuse collection, and deliveries, a vehicle circulation plan should be provided as confirmation. The circulation plan can be provided with resolution compliance submission. A Bus Circulation Plan for directional purposes only has been provided. The proposed bus circulation shall be revised to check whether the designed curb radii are sufficient. The proposed circulation plan should also consider refuse collection, deliveries, and emergency vehicles. The revised Circulation Plan can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved. 11. Testimony is necessary from the applicant's professionals regarding how the proposed bus parking and bus drop off areas will be used, including but not limited to times, sizes, and types of vehicles anticipated (i.e., buses, vans, cars, others). Testimony should be provided on the proposed bus parking and bus drop off areas. 12. A proposed refuse enclosure is depicted on the eastern side of the site for the high school. A refuse enclosure for the Bais Tova School is required. The existing dumpsters being used by the Bais Tova School do not have a designated area. Testimony is required from the applicant's professionals addressing who will collect the trash. If Township pickup is proposed, approval from the DPW Director is necessary. The waste receptacle areas shall be screened and designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E., of the UDO. Plan revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission. A refuse enclosure has been proposed for the Bais Tova School. Adjustment of the location should be considered to not be over the existing recharge area. Testimony is required on collection. The proposed enclosure areas shall be screened. Revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved. 13. Retaining walls, in some cases with safety railing, are proposed throughout the site. There is an Allan Block Retaining Wall call out for the storm water management basin in an area without a proposed wall. Plan revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission. Proposed retaining wall locations have been clarified. Shop drawings shall be provided prior to construction. 14. The proposed shade tree and utility easements and the proposed sight triangle easements from the previously approved Bais Tova Site Plan are not

shown on the survey or this set of site plans. The applicant's professionals must address this matter, including any modified or additional easements required for the latest project. Plan revisions can be provided with resolution compliance submission. Existing, proposed, and relocated easements have been shown. Deeds of easements and descriptions shall be provided to the planning board attorney and engineer for review of any easements that have not already been filed with the Ocean County Clerk. The deeds of easements and descriptions can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved.

B. Architectural

1. Architectural plans have been provided for the proposed high school for Shiras Devorah and proposed link and gymnasium for Bais Tova. The set includes floor plans and elevations for both buildings. The front elevation for the proposed Shiras Devorah high school indicates a mean height of 39'-5.25" from average grade on the east side of the building. The elevations for the proposed Bais Tova link and gymnasium indicates a maximum height of thirty-six feet (36'). Testimony is required on whether the building height complies with the UDO or whether a variance is necessary. The allowable building height is thirty-five feet (35'). The applicant's professionals indicate that no variance is requested for building height since it is measured from the average grade at the front to the average height of the roof.

2. There is a discrepancy on the rear elevation for the high school which shows a proposed basement depth of thirteen feet (13') instead of the fifteen feet (15') below the first floor shown on the site plan. Seasonal high water table information substantiates the proposed basement floor elevation. Corrected architectural plans can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved.

3. We recommend that the location of proposed HVAC equipment be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. Revised architectural plans can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved.

C. Grading

1. Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design concept is feasible. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted.

2. The proposed grading must be coordinated with the architectural plans as final plans are developed. Revised plans can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved.

3. Profiles are required for proposed storm sewer. These can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved.

D. Storm Water Management

1. A design must be finalized for the storm water collection piping for the roof of the proposed high school building. This can be supplied with resolution compliance submission if approved.

2. Per review of the submitted information, the proposed system appears to be adequate for storm water management of the proposed improvements. A final storm water management review will be performed during compliance review if approved.

3. A Storm Water Management Facilities Operation and Maintenance Manual must be provided. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. The O & M Manual can be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved.

E. Landscaping and Lighting

1. At this time only three (3) Pin Oak, seven (7) Red Maple, and five (5) White Oak shade trees are proposed for the project. Additional landscaping can be added for resolution compliance submission. The revised plans only add seven (7) Norway Spruce coniferous trees to the project. We recommend additional landscaping be proposed for resolution compliance submission if approved.

2. The Shade Tree Commission recommends the addition of coniferous trees six to eight feet (6-8') in height be installed around the extended infiltration/detention basin. Also, missing shade trees should be proposed within the shade tree and utility easements around the perimeter of the site. The additional landscaping can be provided with resolution compliance submission. The revised plans only propose a small cluster of coniferous trees between the high school and basin. Additional landscaping should be provided with resolution compliance submission if approved.

3. Testimony should be provided as to whether compensatory landscaping is proposed (or

necessary). A Tree Protection Management Plan must be provided as a condition of approval to comply with new Tree Ordinance Chapter XIX. Due to previous disturbance there are few existing trees onsite. Testimony should be provided on compensatory landscaping. 4. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. 5. The Lighting Plan proposes six (6) pole mounted lights with double fixtures and eleven (11) pole mounted lights with single fixtures to be added for the project. The point to point diagram indicates the improvements for the new section of the proposed project will not be adequately illuminated by the design. Additional proposed lighting is required since illumination in many areas will only be 0.1 foot-candles. The additional lighting can be provided with the resolution compliance submission if approved. 6. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. The Board should provide lighting recommendations, if any. F. Utilities 1. A proposed water main is being extended to the high school building from an existing water main in Bellinger Street. A proposed domestic water service and a separate fire suppression line are being connected to the high school building. A fire hydrant is proposed near the high school building. Statements of fact. G. Signage 1. Other than limited signage shown on the elevations of the architectural plans, 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. Testimony should be provided on proposed building signage. H. Environmental 1. Virtually no existing trees with a diameter of ten inches (10") or greater can be saved during construction. A Tree Protection Management Plan must be supplied with resolution compliance submission, if approved, to comply with new Tree Ordinance Chapter XIX. Compliance with new Tree Ordinance Chapter XIX may be a condition of approval. I. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; if/when this application is approved. Final review of construction details will take place during compliance depending on Board approval of the site plan. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. Water and sewer utilities, prior to occupancy permits; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that they require relief for the 10' perimeter buffer and partial design waivers which were discussed at the plan review meeting.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. The two existing lots will be consolidated into a single new lot. The lot coverage is about 16%.

Mr. Graham MacFarlane, P.E. was sworn in and showed the site plan to the Board members.

Mr. Vogt stated that they have very minor comments.

Mr. MacFarlane feels that they have adequate landscaping.

Mrs. Weinstein stated that the students will not be permitted to drive to school.

Mr. Neiman opened the microphone to the public.

Mr. Bill Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, was sworn in. He said that this application was excellent and others should follow in its footsteps.

Mr. Larry Simons, 7 Schoolhouse Lane, was sworn in. He believes what Rabbi Sanders has done in the past has been beneficial in the past. He expressed his approval for this application.

Ms. Noreen Gill, 192 Coventry Drive, was sworn in. She also expressed her approval of the application and of Rabbi Sanders.

Mr. Greenwald, 15 Rena Lane, was sworn in. He works in the school next door and he expressed that Rabbi Sanders is a great neighbor and this is a model for all schools. He believes this should stay as a school zone.

Mr. Jonathan Sanders, 1431 Ardenwood Avenue, was sworn in. He thanked Mr. Hobday for his comments as well as others who have helped with this application.

Mr. Chaim Leser, was sworn in. He has children at Rabbi Sanders school and they love the school.

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

Mrs. Weinstein would like to have the application in two phases for the gymnasium and the school.

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

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Committeeman Ackerman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

Mr. Schmuckler and Mr. Rennert left the meeting.

- 3. SD 1839** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Park Avenue Realty, LLC
Location: Southwest corner of East Seventh Street & New York Avenue
Block 224 Lots 7 & 9
Minor Subdivision to create three lots (two single family homes and one duplex)

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide two (2) existing lots totaling 0.618 acres in area known as Lots 7 and 9 in Block 224 into three (3) new residential lots, proposed to provide for two (2) single-family homes and one (1) duplex, designated as proposed Lots 7.01 - 7.03 on the subdivision plan. Proposed Lot 7.01 will contain the duplex unit. Proposed Lots 7.02 and 7.03 will contain single-family dwellings. Public water and sewer is available. The site is situated in the north central portion of the Township on the southwest corner of East Seventh Street and New York Avenue. The existing right-of-way width of East Seventh Street in front of the site is sixty feet (60'). A variable width right-of-way exists for New York Avenue, varying in

width from thirty feet (30') to fifty feet (50'). A waiver from additional right-of-way dedication on New York Avenue was granted for a neighboring subdivision approval under Application Number SD 1758. A five foot (5') wide right-of-way easement was granted for that project where the existing right-of-way was only thirty feet (30') wide. This project proposes the continuation of that five foot (5') wide right-of-way easement. East Seventh Street is a paved road in fair condition. Curbing and sidewalk in good condition exists along the property frontage. New York Avenue is a narrow paved road in good condition. Curbing in good condition exists along the property frontage, but sidewalk does not. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 4/3/12 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated March 27, 2012: I. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached dwellings and duplex housing are permitted uses in the zone. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the proposed single-family detached lots comply with R-7.5 zone requirements 2. Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are required • Minimum Lot Area for Single-Family Lots (proposed Lots 7.02 and 7.03 – 7,427 SF and 7,500 SF proposed, 10,000 SF required) – proposed condition. • Minimum Lot Width for Single-Family Lots (proposed Lots 7.02 and 7.03 – 53.75 feet and 50 feet proposed, 75 feet required) – proposed condition. • Minimum Front Yard Setback (proposed Lots 7.01 through 7.03 – 25 feet proposed, 30 feet required) – proposed condition. • Minimum Side Yard Setback (proposed Lots 7.01 through 7.03 – 7.5 feet proposed, 10 feet required) – proposed condition. • Minimum Aggregate Side Yard Setback (proposed Lots 7.02 and 7.03 – 15 feet proposed, 25 feet required) – proposed condition. • Minimum Rear Yard Setback (proposed Lots 7.01 through 7.03 – 15 feet proposed, 20 feet required) – proposed condition. • Maximum Building Coverage (proposed Lots 7.01 through 7.03 – up to 30% proposed, 25% allowed) – proposed condition. The Board shall take action on the variances required. 3. Unless provided, a waiver from the construction of sidewalk along New York Avenue would be required. It should be noted that sidewalk is proposed for the neighboring approved subdivision on New York Avenue. Proposed sidewalk has been added along New York Avenue, negating the need for a waiver. 4. 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. II. Review Comments 1. An Outbound Survey of the property with topography has been provided. The survey shows some encroachments from adjoining properties. These encroachments must be addressed. The applicant's engineer indicates that resolving the encroachments will be addressed at time of plot plan review if/when approval is granted. 2. A chain link fence with screening encompasses the entire property. The fence may have been constructed since the date of the survey, because the survey does not show chain link fence around the entire property. There is also an existing driveway for Lot 9 which is not shown. The corrected survey and base map can be provided with resolution compliance submission. 3. The project is in the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone, the Schedule of Bulk Requirements should be corrected to Section 18-902F. The minimum requirements shall be corrected and the proper variances required indicated. 4. Setback variances are required; the setback lines shown shall be labeled as proposed. The typical side yard setback line shall be labeled as proposed. 5. Minor corrections are required to the General Notes. General Note #8 should be corrected. 6. Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed for the future dwellings on Lots 7.01 – 7.03, if so seasonal high water table information will be required. The applicant's engineer indicates that basements are proposed. 7. A new handicap curb ramp must be constructed at the corner of East Seventh

Street and New York Avenue. A proposed handicap curb ramp has been added at the corner of East Seventh Street and New York Avenue. A note has been added indicating the details for same shall be provided with the plot plan for Lot 7.01. 8. Should proposed utility connections disturb more than twenty percent (20%) of the road length in front of the site, an overlay would be required. Construction details may be provided with future plot plan submissions. 9. Proposed lot numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. Statement of fact. 10. The subdivision plat depicts a proposed five foot (5') wide right-of-way easement where the existing right-of-way is only thirty feet (30') wide on New York Avenue. This is consistent with the neighboring approved subdivision on New York Avenue. The Board should approve the proposed right-of-way easement since a right-of-way dedication is not being proposed. 11. A sight triangle easement has not been provided at the intersection of East Seventh Street and New York Avenue. A sight triangle easement should be added. 12. Unless a waiver is sought, shade trees shall be provided within the shade tree and utility easement 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. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan Review for the proposed lots. Six (6) Greenspire Little Leaf Linden shade trees have been provided on the revised plan. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. 13. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from development of proposed Lots 7.01 – 7.03. There is no existing storm drainage in the immediate vicinity of the site. The applicant's engineer indicates that dry well designs will be provided prior to construction. 14. Topography has been provided on the Survey. The site generally slopes to the northwest, with runoff being carried westward down the gutter of East Seventh Street. Testimony should be provided on proposed grading. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony on proposed grading will be provided at the hearing. 15. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 16. An Improvement Plan which includes grading, drainage, and construction details is required. This Improvement Plan may be provided during compliance if approval is given. The applicant's engineer indicates that grading, drainage, and construction details will be provided during plot plan submittals; this is acceptable. 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 Soil Conservation District; and d. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are being requested for minimum lot area, minimum lot width, front yard setback, side yard setback, minimum aggregate side yard setback, minimum rear yard setback and maximum building coverage.

A waiver will be necessary for the construction of sidewalk along New York Avenue.

Mr. Abraham Penzer, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. He stated that this area is predominately R 7-5 and if we had been in that zone there would be no variances.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P., was sworn in. He showed a map showing surrounding lots which are in the R 7-5 zone. He stated that this is an area that needs redevelopment and is consistent with the Board's recommendation back in 2007. If this property was in the R 7-5 zone, the only variance they would be requesting would be for minimum lot area on one of the single family lots. The remainder of the comments on the engineer's review letter are minor and detail and we can satisfy them.

Mr. Neiman opened the microphone to the public, seeing no one he closed to the public. A motion was made by Mr. Herzl to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Banas.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Committee Ackerman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

- 4. SD 1840** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Diversified Capital-Second St, LLC
Location: Northwest corner of Route 9 (Madison Avenue) & Second Street
Block 72 Lots 7 & 8
Minor Subdivision to create four lots

Project Description

The applicant proposes to subdivide the existing fifty-three thousand five hundred square foot (53,500 SF) tract into four (4) separate lots. Existing Lots 7 & 8 in Block 72 would be subdivided into proposed Lots 7.01 - 7.04 as designated on the subdivision plan. Proposed Lot 7.01 would be for a bank site and proposed Lots 7.02 – 7.04 would be for single family residences. Existing Lot 7 contains a vacant two and a half story commercial building. Existing Lot 8 contains a two and a half story frame dwelling. All existing improvements will be removed. Public water and sewer is available. The existing property which would be subdivided falls within the ROP Residential Office Park Zone. Proposed Lot 7.01 would be a 150' X 200', thirty thousand square foot (30,000 SF) bank site which is the subject of Site Plan Application Number SP 1980. Proposed Lots 7.02 and 7.03 would be 50' X 160', eight thousand square foot (8,000 SF) single family residential lots. Proposed Lot 7.04 would be a 50' X 150', seven thousand five hundred square foot (7,500 SF) single family residential lot. No variances are requested to create this subdivision. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 4/3/12 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated March 22, 2012:

- I. Zoning 1. The property is located within the ROP Residential Office Park Zone District. Per Section 18-903l.1.d., single-family detached dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. Per Section 18-903l.1.g., banks, including drive-in facilities are a permitted use in this zone. Statements of fact. 2. No variances have been requested or appear to be required for this subdivision. Statement of fact. II. Review Comments 1. The correct Ordinance Section shall be referenced in the Schedule of Bulk Requirements. Single family detached dwellings are under Section 18-903l.1.d., and banks, including drive-in facilities are under Section 18-903l.1.g. 2. The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for unspecified number of bedroom single-family dwellings. The zoning schedule indicates that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for the proposed future dwellings. Parking for the bank site will be provided on the Site Plan for Future Lot 7.01. Statements of fact. 3. Testimony should be provided whether basements will be proposed for the future dwellings on proposed Lots 7.02 – 7.04. If basements are proposed, a minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces would be required to comply with the Township Parking Ordinance. The applicant's engineer indicates that basements are proposed. 4. If basements are proposed, seasonal high water table information will be required. The applicant's engineer indicates that seasonal high water table information will be provided during plot plan design and review. 5. 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. Statements of fact. 6. Unless waived by the Board, street trees are required along the property frontage of proposed Lots 7.02 – 7.04.

Street trees for future Lot 7.01 will be reviewed as part of the Site Plan application for the bank. 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 on 3/14/12 indicates there are some large existing trees which have been located on the Survey. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review for proposed Lots 7.02 – 7.04 and Site Plan review for future Lot 7.01. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. 7. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development of proposed Lots 7.02 – 7.04. The property slopes northward toward other developed land. According to an Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the Site Plan of Future Lot 7.01, drywells will be designed for proposed Lots 7.02 – 7.04 at the time of construction. The applicant's engineer will provide designs for drywells prior to construction. 8. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. No proposed grading is indicated on the plan. Proposed grading must be included on the future plot plan submittals. Fact. 9. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 10. Final review of construction details will be conducted during compliance if approval is given. All construction details can be finalized for the resolution compliance submission. 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. New Jersey Department of Transportation; and e. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for water and sewer service.

Mr. Neiman announced that item no 4 and no 5 will be heard together.

Mr. Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He stated that no variances are required for the minor subdivision. The bank site plan will require one variance for the setback of the sign. The sign is supposed to be setback 15 ft but it would be in the parking lot if they did that. It will be consistent in the area and the back would have a problem with visibility if it was setback. They are requesting relief for the buffer between the proposed residential and the bank. They can comply with the engineer's review letters for both the site plan and subdivision.

Mr. Franklin asked about making a left into the bank from Madison Avenue.

Mr. Flannery stated that Madison Avenue is limited to right in and right out only as indicated on the plan. They will make sure the signage is properly done.

Mr. Percal asked about the buffer between the proposed houses and the bank.

Mr. Penzer stated that they will be building the proposed houses and they can advise the homeowners what the buffer will be.

Mr. Flannery stated that they will fence and landscape it adequately so they can sell the lot.

Mr. Banas asked about the buffer to the north.

Mr. Flannery stated that there is a fence there as well as other buffering.

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

A motion was made was Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Follman.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Committeeman Ackerman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

- 5. SP 1980** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Diversified Capital-Second St, LLC
Location: Northwest corner of Route 9 (Madison Avenue) & Second Street
Block 72 New Lot 7.01
Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed bank with drive through

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval for the construction of a one-story 3,767 square foot bank building and associated parking. The proposed building will be located on a 150' X 200', thirty thousand square foot (30,000 SF) property at the northwest intersection of Madison Avenue (Route 9) and Second Street. The site will consist of future Lot 7.01 which would be created from the subdivision of existing Lots 7 & 8, pending approval under Minor Subdivision Application Number SD 1840. The properties are presently developed with an abandoned commercial building on Lot 7 and an abandoned residential dwelling on Lot 8. The applicant has revised the plans to propose a total of seventeen (17) off-street parking spaces for the bank use. The architectural plans indicate the proposed floor area of the bank building will contain 3,767 square feet. Based on one (1) space required for every three hundred square feet (300 SF) of floor area, a total of thirteen (13) spaces are required for the site. The revised site plans propose seventeen (17) off-street parking spaces, two (2) of which are van accessible handicap. Therefore, the total spaces that will be provided exceed UDO requirements. The site is located in the northern portion of the Township at the northwest intersection of Second Street and Madison Avenue. The revised project layout proposes a "right turn in/right turn out" vehicular access on Madison Avenue (Route 9). A two-way vehicular access is proposed on Second Street. A counterclockwise flow is also proposed through the site, with the exception of the parking field in front of the bank on the Route 9 frontage. Curb and sidewalk exist across the entire frontage of the project. The project will be serviced by sanitary sewer and potable water. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 4/3/12 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated March 22, 2012: I. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the ROP, Residential Office Park Zone. Per Section 18-903I.1.g., banks, including drive-in facilities are a permitted use in this zone. Statements of fact. 2. A variance is required for the proposed sign location. A six foot (6') setback is proposed, while a fifteen foot (15') setback is required. The Board shall take action on the requested sign setback variance. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements should be edited as necessary. 3. A waiver is required from Ordinance Section 18-803 E.2.a., which summarizes: "A minimum twenty-five foot (25') buffer from the property line to the proposed use, up to fifty feet (50') from adjacent single family residential uses or zone areas". The Board shall take action on the required buffer relief. II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Additional proposed dimensions are required on the Site Plan, along with layout corrections. The proposed dimension for the depressed curb construction on Route 9 should be fifty-eight feet (58'). A "One Way Do Not Enter" sign is missing from the east side of the drive-thru exit. 2. The proposed dimensions of the covered drive-thru lanes do not match the architectural plans.

According to the architectural plans, the distance from the rear of the building to the proposed curb line should be forty-nine feet (49'). The distance from the proposed curb line to the property line should be sixteen feet (16'). The proposed width of the last drive-thru island should be revised to 3.17 feet. The proposed width of the outside lane should be revised to 13.58 feet.

3. The plans note the existing fence along the north property line to remain. However, the existing fence is in poor condition and should be replaced. New fencing is recommended along the north and west property lines, especially since buffer waivers are required. The revised plans propose to replace the fence along the north property line with an unspecified fence. No fencing is proposed along the west property line.

4. No loading area has been identified on the plans. Testimony is required to address proposed loading and delivery operations for the facility. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, only overnight-type deliveries are anticipated.

5. A trash enclosure is depicted in the northwest corner of the site. Testimony is required from the applicant's professionals addressing who will collect the trash. If Township pickup is proposed, approval from the DPW Director is necessary. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony on trash pickup shall be provided.

6. Sight triangles have not been provided on the plans. A sight triangle is not required at the intersection of Second Street and Madison Avenue since the intersection is signalized. The applicant's engineer indicates that based on the AASHTO Standards a sight triangle easement is not required for the right out only exit onto Route 9. The need for a sight triangle easement at the Second Street exit should be addressed.

B. Architectural

1. The applicant's professionals should provide renderings for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. The applicant's professionals indicate a rendering of the building shall be provided at the public hearing.

C. Grading

1. Proposed high points should be shown at the driveway access points and one-way access driveway on the north side of the building. Proposed high points can be added at the driveway access points for resolution compliance submission.

2. Some proposed spot elevations should be added or corrected. Some proposed contour lines are missing and should be added. We can review proposed grading corrections with the applicant's engineer prior to resolution compliance submission.

3. Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design concept is feasible. Final grading will be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. Final grading will be reviewed in detail after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted.

D. Storm Water Management

1. The Post Development Drainage Area Map needs to clarify the bypass areas. A dividing line can be added to separate the two (2) proposed bypass areas for resolution compliance submission.

2. No storm water collection for the roof of the proposed bank building has been designed. Roof leader connections to the proposed drainage system have been added to the plans. A design with inverts at the structures and clean outs can be provided for resolution compliance submission.

3. A recharge trench detail must be provided. Recharge trench details have been added and must be coordinated with the plans for resolution compliance submission.

4. The bulk of the proposed on-site recharge system is perforated twenty-four inch high density polyethylene (24" HDPE) pipe. We believe all the proposed inverts for this flat pipe should be set at elevation 92.50. The applicant's engineer should contact our office to review the storm water management design. All proposed inverts have been set to elevation 92.5. Dual perforated pipes have been proposed. The proposed onsite recharge system should be shown to scale on the Grading, Drainage, and Utility Plan. A revised Storm Water Management Report is required and can be provided with the submission for resolution compliance.

5. A Storm Water Management Facilities Maintenance Plan must be provided. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed on-site storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. A Storm Water Management O & M Manual has been provided and will be reviewed with

resolution compliance submission. The applicant will be responsible for ownership and maintenance of the proposed system. 6. The proposed storm water management design is feasible and can be finalized during compliance review should site plan approval be granted. The final storm water management design will be reviewed in detail after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. E. Traffic 1. NJDOT Access approval is necessary. Based on our review of the project, we recommend the Route 9 access driveway be restricted to a "right turn in/right turn out" controlled access driveway. We also recommend the applicant's professionals examine the stacking on Second Street associated with the signalized intersection. The situation may warrant a right turn only exit from the Second Street access driveway. We reiterate that NJDOT is the controlling agency for the Route 9 improvements. The project has been revised to provide a "right turn in/right turn out" controlled access driveway on Route 9. The applicant's engineer indicates that the necessary NJDOT Permits shall be obtained for this site. F. Landscaping 1. The shade tree and utility easements should be added across the frontages of the property. Proposed utilities and sight triangles should be added to prevent planting conflicts. The shade tree and utility easements have been added to the Landscape and Lighting Plan. Proposed utilities, and a sight triangle easement at the Second Street exit if required, can be added for resolution compliance submission to prevent planting conflicts. 2. The proposed landscaping within the NJDOT Desired Typical Section is subject to NJDOT approval. The proposed shade trees have been located behind the shade tree and utility easement along the Route 9 frontage. 3. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. 4. A final review of landscaping can be conducted during compliance, should site plan approval be granted. Final review of the landscaping design will be undertaken after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. G. Lighting 1. Testimony should be provided relative to the hours that the facility will be lit, and whether timers are proposed. Fact. 2. Shielding will be required to prevent light spillage onto adjoining properties. The applicant's engineer indicates that shielding will be provided. 3. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. The Board should provide lighting recommendations, if any. 4. Final lighting design can be reviewed during compliance should site plan approval be granted. Final review of the lighting design will be undertaken after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. H. Utilities 1. Fire protection should be addressed by the applicant's professionals. A separate fire suppression line has been provided. I. Signage 1. Signage information is provided for free-standing signage on Sheet 6A of the site plans. A free-standing sign identified on the site plan (requiring relief by the Board) has been provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. A variance is required for setback. The Board shall take action on the sign setback variance. J. Environmental 1. Tree Management Plan A Tree Protection Management Plan has been submitted for review. The applicant must comply with the requirements for tree protection and removal as applicable on the site in accordance with the Township Tree Ordinance. The Tree Protection Management Plan can be revised for resolution compliance submission to comply with the current ordinance. 2. Phase I/AOC's A Phase I Study was not performed on-site. While conducting the site investigation to complete the Environmental Impact Statement, Trident found the following area of concern. Miscellaneous non-hazardous solid waste and debris was observed scattered in the vicinity of the abandoned building on the subject property. The solid waste and debris consisted of plastic bottles, plastic bags, wood pieces, metal scraps, tires, metal wire fencing, and other miscellaneous debris. The applicant has agreed to remove said conditions during construction. K. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and

use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; if/when this application is approved. Final review of construction details will take place after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. III. 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 (if applicable); c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. New Jersey Department of Transportation; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

- 6. SP 1975** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Lakewood Housing Partners
Location: Southeast corner of Vermont Avenue & Oak Street
Block 1154 Lots 1 & 10
Block 1155 Lots 1 & 6
Amended Preliminary & Final Site Plan for seventy-three affordable housing rental units

Mr. Vogt announced that this application will be carried to the June 26, 2012 meeting. No further notices required.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

7. PUBLIC PORTION

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

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

9. APPROVAL OF BILLS

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

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

11. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MAY 15, 2012**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING**

Respectfully submitted
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary