

## **1. FLAG SALUTE & CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE**

Chairman Yechiel Herzl 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 reasonable comprehensive minutes of this meeting will be available for public inspection. This meeting meets the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

## **2. REORGANIZATION**

### **A. OATH OF OFFICE**

- Class I Member-one year appointment to December 31, 2018
  - Mayor Raymond Coles
- Class II Member-one year appointment to December 31, 2018
  - Justin Flancbaum
- Mayor's Designee to serve to December 31, 2018
  - Angela Zografos
- Class III Member-one year appointment to December 31, 2018
  - Albert Akerman
- Class IV Member-four year appointment
  - Aron Shain
- Planning Board Member alternatives
  - Chaim Sabel

### **B. ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR THE CALENDAR YEAR OF 2018**

- Chairman
  - Yechiel Herzl
- Vice Chairman
  - Eli Rennert
- Secretary
  - Ally Morris
- Recording Secretary
  - Sarah Forsyth

### **C. SELECTION OF CONSULTANTS AND OTHER PERSONNEL**

- Attorney
  - John J. Jackson, Esq., King, Kitrick, Jackson & McWeeney, LLC (interim basis)
- Planner
  - Mr. Terrance Vogt, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineering (90 days)
- Engineer
  - Mr. Terrance Vogt, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineering (90 days)

## **3. ROLL CALL**

Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sabel, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert, Ms. Zografos

#### **4. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS**

Mr. Terrance Vogt, P.E., P.P., C.M.E. was sworn.

#### **5. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS**

- 1. SD 2175 Yecheskel Piotrovski**  
30 Gudz Road Block 11.30, Lot 13  
Denial of a Minor Subdivision to create four lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 2. SP 2248 Aharon Mansour**  
512 Chestnut Street Block 1087, Lot 20  
Denial of a Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a restaurant and office building

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 3. SP 2256 Congregation Khal Bais Avrohom**  
2 Poplar Street Block 1.05, Lot 12  
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a synagogue

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 4. SD 2146 Mordechai Eichorn**  
1301 Central Avenue Block 12.04, Lot 48  
Extension of a Minor Subdivision to create 3 lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 5. SD 2312 Tomchei Shabbos of Lakewood**  
Chambersbridge Road and Rutgers University Ave Block 1609, Lots 20 & 21  
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

- 6. SD 2143 Kikar Shabbos, LLC**  
305 & 383 Monmouth Ave Block 160, Lots 1.01 & 1.02  
Extension of Minor Subdivision to create two lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve the resolution.

## 6. CORRESPONDENCE

- **SP 2208 Lakeside Holdings, LLC** – administrative change to add an interior third floor to the approved office building

Mr. Joe Kociuba said they are proposing to revise the third floor compliant with the parking requirements and have submitted an architectural plan for the board engineer's review. Previously a small mezzanine was shown on the third floor and they had 12 excess parking spaces. Once the client looked at the architectural and cost, it didn't make sense to put a small mezzanine in so they decided to amend the plans. There is 4,390 sf on the third floor.

Mr. Herzl asked how many parking spaces they are proposing.

Mr. Kociuba said 149 spaces where 147 are required.

Mr. Herzl asked if any new variances are being created as a result of this change.

Mr. Kociuba said no, the board engineer did bring up that the architectural plan has a little bump out on the rear which extended into a setback but they are not asking for that variance. They are not going to amend the footprint at all.

Mr. Rennert questioned the front yard setback variance.

Mr. Kociuba said there was a 30 ft front yard setback which was previously granted by this board. It was where the building backs up to the Garden State Parkway access. There was also testimony at the time of the distance of the actual parkway road from the property line. The parkway right-of-way through that section is exceptionally wide but he doesn't remember the exact distance. His testimony was that it acts more as a side or rear setback given its location and given they are not permitted access to the parkway access point.

Mr. Rennert asked what sort of screening is being proposed.

Mr. Kociuba believes a row or two of evergreens.

Mr. Rennert said there is also a rear yard setback variance.

Mr. Kociuba confirmed, it backs up to a cogeneration plant.

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

- **SD 2010 Jacob Lipschitz** – administrative change to remove basin landscaping

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., P.P. said when this project was originally approved, there was a large underground detention basin on the west side of the property between the duplexes and River Avenue and because it was in the rear yards, to access it, there was a driveway proposed coming off of River Avenue so that it can be serviced. There is also a row of evergreens along the River Avenue frontage. Before it was built, they redesigned the entire recharge system to place it in the right-of-way of Hilton Avenue with some individual recharge systems for each of the duplexes. That made it so the rear 40 ft of the property between the duplexes and River Avenue did not have to be cleared. They are back tonight to get a waiver from providing a row of evergreens and the improvements. The DOT has been

out, inspected the site and have released them from any obligations from providing road improvements along Route 9.

Mr. Herzl asked what they are doing with that area.

Mr. Lines said they are leaving it exactly the way it is, it is wooded which provides a nice buffer to the backs of the homes. There is a deed restriction on the property.

Mr. Flanbaum questioned if they are requesting a waiver from providing fencing as well.

Mr. Josh Schmuckler said there probably will be fencing, it would be before the trees.

Mr. Flanbaum said it is important to have fencing along Route 9.

Mr. Schmuckler agreed, the other improvements will be removed.

A motion was made and seconded to approve.

All were in favor.

## **7. PUBLIC HEARING**

### **1. SD 2298 David Herzog**

E Kennedy Blvd, 1127 E Co Line Rd, E Co Line Rd Block 183, Lots 1, 2, & 4  
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create seven lots

*A review letter prepared by Remington & Vernick Engineers dated December 20, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.*

Mr. Vogt said submission waivers are requested including a traffic study, topography, contours and man-made features within 200 ft, an environmental impact statement and a tree protection management plan. They can support the traffic study waiver since the project fronts a County highway and they would have jurisdiction in terms of access, they also support topography, contours and man-made features within 200 ft as they feel the plans have enough information, the EIS is supported on the basis that DEP mapping does not show any known environmental constraints. Finally, the tree protection management waiver is supported for hearing purposes only. If the board acts favorably, they will receive a plan and will ensure compliance with the ordinance.

Mr. Rennert understands the County has jurisdiction but he would want to see a traffic study, especially if variances are being requested.

Mr. Herzl asked if the County will require a traffic study.

Mr. Vogt said typically they do.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn. He said the County will take a traffic impact statement on a project of this scope which is 7 houses. A traffic impact statement tells you how much traffic is being generated, what the roads are and it is very limited. A traffic study does counts and a lot of other things.

Mr. Rennert said it is not a good reason to grant the waiver just because the County is going to require it anyway.

Mr. Vogt said there is a difference between a traffic study and a traffic impact statement. The County is typically going to require what they need for several things. They regulate access so they are going to want enough information whether it is site design to know what they are proposing is adequate. Secondly, if there are long term improvements that this development is going to contribute to in terms of need, they are going to want to assign their own fee assessment.

Mr. Flannery said the board engineer supports the waiver because the traffic is going to be reviewed by the County. His experience for this size of development is that a simple traffic impact statement will be required.

Mr. Flancbaum said if it is a simple thing then a traffic impact statement should be provided to the board as well.

Mr. Vogt said a traffic impact analysis was provided. Procedurally, the County is going to require what it feels is necessary to ensure that what is proposed for access is adequate. He has no issue deferring the access to Ocean County as they know their roads better than anybody. The County will not approve this if they aren't comfortable.

Mr. Rennert said they have a huge problem with traffic and if something is required for the County, he doesn't want to just waive the requirement for this board as well.

The board granted the waivers as recommended by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Vogt said variances requested include minimum lot area and width. The architectural plans submitted proposed 5 bedrooms in the finished basement, second floor and attic. If approved, the off-street parking requirements would be determined at time of plot plan review and it would be based on UDO requirements. Design waivers required include improvement of the Major Avenue right-of-way, from providing street trees along the Major Avenue project frontage and from providing sidewalk along proposed lot 1.06 frontage of East County Line Road.

Mr. Flannery entered three exhibits into the record, A-1 is the tax map of the subject area, A-2 is a tax map of the development across the street which was approved by this board showing the development widths, the majority of them being 12,000 sf lots similar to what is being proposed here and exhibit A-3 is the subject property. They have one 25,000 sf lot, a 13,000 sf and the rest are around 12,000 sf which is consistent with the development across the street. Single family lots are being proposed where the average is roughly 15,000 sf. They are asking for a variance for minimum lot area variances where the minimum allowed is 15,000 sf, minimum lot widths from 63.23 to 75.07 ft is requested whereas 100 ft is required.

Mr. Herzl asked how wide the lots are across the street.

Mr. Flannery said 77 ft. The lots fit nice sized houses. One of the waivers requested is not improving Major Street, which is the paper street behind them. He is unsure how the area is going to be developed but this application doesn't need that street developed. A waiver from providing a shade tree easement and street trees on that road is requested as well.

Mr. Herzl asked if they plan on subdividing the 25,000 sf lot further.

Mr. Flannery said if the area in the back is developed without building that road then he would imagine the adjoining owners would ask for a vacation of that and the extra 25 ft would go to the lot owners.

Mr. Grunberger asked why sidewalks are not being providing along County Line Road.

Mr. Flannery said the reasoning when it was designed was the County is going to widen the road and the sidewalk would be eliminated. He knows that argument is not going to get far with this board so if the board feels they need sidewalk, they would provide it.

Mr. Herzl said sidewalk is required.

Mr. Rennert asked if he prepared a plan to see how many conforming lots could be built on this property.

Mr. Flannery did not. This property is located between schools and because there is a similar development across the street, it would be consistent with the area.

Mr. Rennert asked why it is a good reason the lots should be smaller because it is located between schools.

Mr. Flannery said because the issue with traffic congestion is density and density is impacted by what else is around. In this case, there are schools and a park nearby so they are not getting any density from there. They are talking one extra house in an area that is deficient in houses compared to other R-15 areas that don't have parks and schools. One extra house would not be detrimental in his opinion. This developer will be assessed an impact fee from the County. There is currently not a Township impact fee for this area but the Planning Board did recommend the fees should be Township wide.

Mr. Rennert asked how much the County impact fees usually are.

Mr. Flannery said about \$2,000 per unit.

Mr. Rennert said they want the board to grant variances in order to gain an extra unit.

Mr. Flannery believes the extra unit is a good thing. A 12,000 sf lot in Lakewood is almost like an estate zone, it is a beautiful sized lot.

Mr. Rennert agrees but on the other end, there is a Master Plan and zoning map with R-15 and R-20 areas. Perhaps he wants to change everything to R-12.

Mr. Flannery said if that was the case then he would be asking for 8 lots.

Mr. Vogt said this is not a density issue.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct, he is including the 25,000 sf lot.

Mr. Rennert said there is a density issue because if no variances were granted then there would be one less house.

Mr. Vogt wanted to clarify it was before the right board.

Mr. Flannery moved onto the engineer's report. Item #4 references the number of off-street parking spaces, these will be custom houses so if they have more bedrooms and require more parking then they'll slide the houses back and put more parking in. At time of plot plan, the number of parking spaces required will be provided. They are asking for design waivers from improving Major Avenue. The applicant will provide sidewalk along East County Line Road. Mr. Flannery referenced sections in the Master Plan to justify the variances requested.

Mr. Rennert said these arguments don't make any sense. The board just approved a Master Plan setting what the zones should be.

Mr. Flannery explained they are still saying it should be an R-12 but there are C-2 variances which are still permitted in accordance with the MLUL. To grant C-2 variances, they have to show that it relates to a specific piece of property, they have to show that the purpose of the MLUL would be advanced, they have to show that the variances can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good. The surrounding area is similar to this and it was approved by this board when that area was an R-15 and the Master Plan said it should be an R-15 but the reasoning at that time was the benefits outweigh the detriments. The detriment here would be traffic but one extra house on County Line Road where this applicant will be giving impact fees would be balanced.

Mr. Rennert asked if providing sidewalks and improving the road were brought up at the tech review meeting.

Mr. Flannery said there were some things on the plan that weren't there and it was indicated that those things had to be added including drainage calculations and road profiles so the engineer could review. Sidewalks and improving the road was brought up and one of the comments was the plan submitted was in accordance with RSIS with only 30 ft of cartway. One of the board engineer's comments was it should be 32 ft and it was subsequently changed. The applicant, with respect to the sidewalk, said that he'd rather not put in sidewalks as the County was going to be doing improvements.

Mr. Vogt said they provide technical comments on the original application as was evidence on both reviews. They identify where variances and design waivers are required. They can certainly talk about whether something is going to be approved or not but ultimately it's the jurisdiction of the board. This is his tenth year and the board has granted waivers in the past but the board has granted less waivers recently. What they talk about at the tech meeting are technical issues with the design that is presented and if the applicant is seeking design waivers then they identify those waivers and the applicant's professionals understand they have to make their case to the board.

Mr. Rennert said the board keeps hearing that the mayor doesn't want to approve any applications without improving roads.

Mr. Herzl said no parking variances as well.

Mr. Vogt said the applicant has the right to request deviations. It is up to the boards as to what they choose to approve and what they don't choose to approve. They can't legally say applicants are not allowed to request a variance. That procedure is allowed under the land use law and UDO. The board can hear the testimony and they can agree or disagree.

Mr. Herzl said perhaps something could be added to their review letters.

Mr. Vogt said they could make statements that in their experience, the variance may not be granted.

Mr. Herzl said sometimes the board overlooks these things but they should make sure to bring it to the board's attention as their professionals.

Mr. Vogt said on every application they recite submission waivers, variances and design waivers. He feels they have been thorough on that regard but if they can be more thorough, he is certainly receptive.

Mr. Flannery believes these variances can be granted without any detriment to the zone plan, zoning ordinance or to the public good.

Mr. Herzl questioned garbage pickup.

Mr. Flannery said it would be handled by Public Works and the cans would be rolled out to the street. The truck would turn around on Clayton Street.

Mr. Flancbaum asked about landscaping.

Mr. Flannery said the ordinance requires street trees which they put in. there was a recommendation from the Shade Tree Commission to put in foundation plantings and other trees and the applicant would certainly do any landscaping that the board feels appropriate.

Mr. Vogt asked if the applicant agrees to the recommendations of the Shade Tree Commission.

Mr. Flannery confirmed.

Mr. Flancbaum thinks if variances are being requested then they have to look at it as yes, they are giving the Township another housing opportunity which is nice but what is the Township getting in return. Are they getting something that looks nice, are they getting something that performs better.

Mr. Flannery said the benefits have to outweigh the detriments so the landscaping would be an additional benefit.

Mr. Franklin noticed there is asphalt curb shown on each end of the turnaround, he questioned why they can't provide depressed concrete curb.

Mr. Flannery said that is a good idea. The reason not to do that is that someone is going to have to rip it out after but he is 100% right, as it would preserve the pavement much better.

Mr. Franklin said the asphalt curb would last about three snow plowings.

Mr. Flannery said they would comply with the remaining items in the engineer's report.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Rennert, seconded by Mr. Flancbaum to deny the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sabel, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert, Ms. Zografos

- 2. SP 2269AA Bais Medrash Hope Chapel Inc**  
345 Hope Chapel Road Block 11, Lot 139  
Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to convert a house to a synagogue

*A review letter prepared by Remington & Vernick Engineers dated November 29, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.*

Mr. Rennert stepped down.

Mr. Vogt said submission waivers requested include a site plan designed by an engineer or architect, floor plan, minimum building setback lines, landscape and lighting, topography and proposed grading. Design waivers are required include lighting and landscaping, trash/recyclables storage and proposed grading. They typically do not ask for a vote on submission waivers on a change of use since this is not a full site plan or subdivision but it is certainly the board's choice. His recommendation would be to hear the application. More often than not, if the board may



require certain things as a condition of approval. The applicant, to meet the approval, would have to give a properly designed plan but at this point there is no plan. There is an existing nonconformance with respect to minimum lot area and minimum front yard setback, perimeter buffer relief is necessary as well as parking buffer relief.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. said this application is for a site plan exemption/change of use approval for conversion of the existing residence to a Bais Medrash study center consisting of a 622 sf sanctuary. They are providing 6 parking spaces, all of the members live in close proximity either on Hope Hill Lane or Clear Stream Road and literally do walk but there are 6 spaces for the people that don't. Technically, if the sanctuary is smaller than 800 sf then they don't need parking but of course they would like to see as many spaces as possible.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn. The parking provided exceeds ordinance requirements and they feel is sufficient for the proposed use. They are asking for waivers on the buffer where they need 20 ft and they only have 19 ft as well as parking within 20 ft of the buffer.

Mrs. Weinstein said they are trying to maximize the parking and that is the reason for the relief.

Mr. Flannery said this is a unique piece of property as there is a detention basin located behind it and it is something where the buffer relief requested is not negatively impacting any of the neighbors. They would obtain approval from DPW and comply with the other comments in the engineer's report.

Mr. Vogt questioned whether the wood ramp is accessible from the parking area to the building.

Mr. Flannery said as part of the permit from the building department, they would make it ADA accessible.

Mr. Grunberger asked if the applicant plans to construct a new building.

Mrs. Weinstein said perhaps in the future but not at this time.

Mr. Grunberger asked if the front yard setback variance would still be existing when they come in for a new building.

Mrs. Weinstein said no, they would have to ask for new variances.

Mr. Franklin asked if the parking spaces would be asphalt.

Mr. Flannery confirmed.

Mr. Franklin asked if curb is being provided.

Mr. Flannery said no because they are looking at fitting it into an existing house and that would cause drainage problems and other issues.

Mr. Herzl asked if sidewalks are being provided.

Mrs. Weinstein said there are existing sidewalks.

Mr. Herzl asked if one of the parking spaces would be handicapped.

Mr. Flannery said they didn't propose that because there is no parking required and the congregation doesn't feel it is needed.

Mr. Herzl opened to the board.

Mr. Louie Follman, 55 Clear Stream Road, was sworn. He said everybody who attends this congregation lives in the area and they won't have any issues with parking.

A motion was made by Mr. Flancbaum, seconded by Mr. Sabel to approve the application.  
All were in favor.

- 3. SD 2129A Miriam Klein**  
11 Forest Drive Block 12, Lot 201  
Amended Minor Subdivision to create two lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the February 6, 2018.  
All were in favor.

- 4. SP 2189A Sephardic Bet Yaakov Inc**  
243 & 247 Prospect Street Block 411, Lots 26 & 27  
Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for an addition to an existing school

*A review letter prepared by Remington & Vernick Engineers dated January 8, 2018 was entered as an exhibit.*

Mr. Vogt said a submission waiver from providing an environmental impact statement is requested. The waiver is supported since the surrounding properties are developed and the fact that there were previous approvals on this property for which the submission waiver was also granted.

The board granted the waiver as recommended by the Board Engineer and Planner.

Mr. Vogt said testimony shall be provided as to the existing site identification sign location and to whether variances are going to be necessary. It is their understanding that off-street parking relief was granted for the existing facility. The plans indicate that 24 off-street parking spaces are now proposed, testimony shall be provided to the board's satisfaction as to the adequacy of the proposed parking for the proposed expanded use and that a variance for the number of parking spaces appears necessary. Relief is necessary from buffer requirements, for allowing parking in the buffer and relief from Section 18-906E with respect to bus loading/unloading.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. said this application is actually an amendment to a previously approved application. This is an existing school but this board previously approved a first floor addition to the already existing school but that addition was never built. Since that addition got approved, the school is literally busting at the seams and they are back to amend that approval to include a second story. It would actually be three stories as it would be a basement plus two stories. This is the only girl's school in Lakewood to cater to the Sephardic community. They have both a full elementary school with parallel classes up to the 3rd grade and then they have just started a high school which includes 9th and 10th grades with about 30 girls. The elementary school has 6 buses in the morning and 5 buses in the afternoon. The high school right now has one mini bus. The school staggers the opening and dismissal times so that there are never more than 3 buses at any given time. All students are bused to school, no students are permitted to drive, there are no car drop offs other than the occasional student who missed the bus or has an appointment. No Simcha hall is being proposed. The only relief sought is with respect to buffering and parking within a buffer area.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., P.P. was sworn. The original application proposed a one-story addition with a basement in the back of the school and now they are proposing a two-story addition with a basement. There were some minor changes including turning one classroom into an office and adding a hallway for access. In the original application, there was an existing house which they proposed to keep but the school has since decided to remove that home. They have access in and out off Prospect Street. The school had 9 parking spaces and they are proposing a total of 25 spaces where approximately 27 spaces is required.

Mr. Rennert said the zoning table lists 25 spaces as being required.

Mr. Lines said they are showing 9 existing spaces and are proposing 16 additional spaces. For the new building, 16 spaces are required: 12 for the classrooms, 3 for the office and 1 for the library.

Mr. Vogt said they are deficient in parking for the expanded use. His understanding is that they have an existing parking condition and that they are not exacerbating that condition by what they are adding in terms of new parking for purpose of the addition.

Mr. Lines said if they didn't build the addition at all, they would be deficient in parking. They are still providing the 9 existing spaces and 16 additional spaces which is the requirement for the addition.

Mr. Rennert asked how many spaces are required.

Mr. Lines said 27.

Mrs. Weinstein believes there is a mistake on the zoning chart. The requirement should be 27, not 25.

Mr. Flancbaum asked if the proposed parking is within the buffer area.

Mr. Lines said no, they are almost 22 ft from the property line to the parking area.

Mr. Vogt said they were referring to the parking space furthest east.

Mr. Lines said the parking in the buffer is not on the side they are improving. That is an existing parking space on the east side of the building. That waiver was granted for the original application.

Mr. Rennert asked if there are 12 classrooms in both buildings.

Mr. Lines said no, there are 12 classrooms, 3 offices and 1 library in the new building.

Mr. Rennert asked how many classrooms there are altogether.

Mr. Lines does not have the architectural plans for the old building. His understanding is they are 2 spaces short.

Mrs. Weinstein said right now there are 10 classrooms but they are losing 2 which are getting converted into offices. So there will be 8 classrooms in the old portion and 12 in the new for a total of 20 classrooms. This application is a bit more complicated because it is an addition to an existing school. They are not asking for anything new with regard to the existing portion.

Mr. Herzl said Prospect Street is a heavily trafficked road and they have to try get as many parking spaces as possible.

Mr. Flancbaum said the plans show a dumpster in two of the existing parking spaces.

Mr. Lines said the dumpster is being moved to where the old house was.

Mr. Flancbaum said the plans show 6 existing spaces, not 9. The information needs to be up front and there can't be discrepancies between the plans and report.

Mr. Rennert asked how these students are getting dropped off and picked up during snow days as a lot of people drive.

Mrs. Weinstein said if they are a smart school, they won't have class when there is no busing. Most girl's schools today don't have school when there's no busing.

Mr. Herzl asked about bus circulation.

Mr. Lines said they have space for 3 buses across the front of the building and they turn around. They received approval from the County. They had original had the driveways offset but the County didn't want the existing driveway to line up with Murray Street so the buses would enter on the easterly driveway and exist on the westerly driveway.

Mr. Rennert is very concerned that there will not be enough parking on-site and would therefore be parking on Prospect Street as well as cars coming into drop off and pick up as there won't be sufficient room.

Mrs. Weinstein said this is an existing school with 9 parking spaces so they must be parking somewhere without a problem. They are not parking on Prospect Street. Yes, there will always be a few legal holidays where they won't have busing and on those days she doesn't seem to think there will be as much traffic on Prospect Street. The Rabbi said himself that he doesn't intend to have school if there is no busing as it would be difficult.

Mr. Grunberger asked if there are any classrooms in the basement.

Mrs. Weinstein said no, the basement is a gym.

Ms. Zografos asked if the children are walking across the parking lot to get to the buses.

Mr. Lines said the buses unload at the front of the school but there is a requirement that they would have to go around the cars which are parking in front of the school to the sidewalk to get to the existing school. They would have to walk through the parking lot to get to the front door of the high school. Once the buses are there, access by teachers and staff is not possible so there really isn't a conflict between cars coming and going and the students walking.

Mr. Herzl said this is tough as they are proposing a lot on a small piece of property.

Mr. Lines understands but the original application for the single story addition had a much higher parking deficiency.

Mr. Franklin suggested moving the dumpster 2 ft closer to the road and then add sidewalk going all the way up the back to the other school.

Mr. Lines said that is a great idea. The students can access the sidewalk from the west side of the property and out of the parking lot.

Mr. Rennert asked how many offices are proposed.

Mr. Lines said 7 total, 5 in the existing portion and 2 in the old portion.

Mr. Vogt asked about tutor rooms and other rooms as defined in the UDO.

Mr. Lines said there are no tutor rooms proposed.

Mr. Vogt said then the architectural plans are not accurate.

Mr. Herzl asked how many spaces they are deficient.

Mr. Lines said they are 3 spaces short. They have 25 and need 28 spaces.

Mr. Rennert questioned whether this is the right property to have this sort of school.

Mr. Moshe Semah was sworn. Right now when there is no busing, they have parents pull in three rows at one time and it works out very well. Now that the County made them change the access, it will be must easier for the parents to pull out onto Murray Street. Now there will be much more room and access for the parents to pull in and he doesn't think it will be an issue.

Mr. Herzl asked if cars and buses come in at the same time.

Mr. Semah said cars aren't allowed, he is talking about snow days or legal holidays. They have never had a time where they have had more than 2 buses pull in at the same time as they load and unload quickly.

Mr. Herzl asked if an office or classroom could be eliminated in order to conform with parking.

Mrs. Weinstein said they would agree to that. They could eliminate two offices in the new expansion and would request a variance for only 1 parking space.

Mr. Lines said they would agree to the other items in the engineer's report.

Mrs. Weinstein said they would also add that walkway as suggested by Mr. Franklin.

Mr. Rennert is not comfortable granting any variances on Prospect Street.

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

A motion was made by Ms. Zografos, seconded by Mr. Flancbaum to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sabel, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert, Ms. Zografos

Abstain: Mr. Grunberger

5. **SD 2101 Meyer Wainbrand**  
3 Cory Court Block 251, Lot 1.09  
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the February 6, 2018.  
All were in favor.

6. **SP 2262AA Congregation Toras Emes**  
577 James Street Block 370, Lot 1  
Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to permit school trailers

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the January 23, 2018.  
All were in favor.

8. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
9. **APPROVAL OF BILLS**
10. **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted  
Sarah L. Forsyth  
Planning Board Recording Secretary