

1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

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

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

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Percal

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Terry Vogt was sworn in.

4. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

- 1. SP 2044** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Bnos Yaakov Inc
Location: County Line Road and Kent Ave
Block 1 Lot 3
Block 1.01 Lot 5
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for building addition

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

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler

Abstain: Mr. Herzl, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

- 2. SD 1926** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: S&M Investors LLC
Location: Cedarbridge Avenue and New Hampshire Avenue
Block 1603 Lot 1.04 (old Lot 1.02)
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision for 66 duplex units, 1 single-family home, 2 open space lots, and 2 commercial lots

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

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman

Abstain: Mr. Herzl, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Percal

5. ORDINANCES FOR DISCUSSION

Deputy Mayor Ackerman stepped down for the ordinances.

- Section 18-1014 – regarding bulk requirements for duplexes as a conditional use

Mr. Jan Wouters, Esq. Said this changes the requirements for duplexes which basically allows them to be put wherever townhouses are currently allowed.

Mr. Neiman asked if any of the setbacks are being changed.

Mr. Wouters said no, just the locations.

Mr. Percal asked what the benefit of this is.

Mr. Wouters said there seems to be a trend in town and the Township Committee is always mindful of the needs and desires of the community. It appears that duplexes are a more favored structure than townhouses. The purpose of this is to make duplexes as a type of residential unit available in those areas where it's currently not available.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to recommend this ordinance to the Township Committee.

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

No: Mr. Percal

- Section 18-901B – zoning changes in the residential area around the hospital support zone

Mr. Wouters said most of these lots are in the Williams/Prospect/Cedar area. There are three different clusters. A list is on the back of the ordinance. The intent is to re-zone from R-12 to R-10, R-10A or R-7.5. This is all being done at the recommendation of the township planner and/or at the request of the individual property owners. Because this re-zoning was not contemplated in the Master Plan, there will be a public hearing on this ordinance before the Township Committee where all property owners affected plus property owners within 200 ft will be notified and will have the chance to voice their opinions.

Mr. Schmuckler asked how this will affect the Smart Growth Plan.

Mr. Wouters reiterated that the Township Planner recommended this as part of the ongoing Smart Growth Plan. Even though it wasn't included in the original Master Plan it should be part of the Smart Growth.

Mr. Schmuckler said there is no infrastructure being recommended along with these changes.

Mr. Wouters said to answer that question properly you would have to read the rather extensive Planner's report which does go in to those things. He will make sure that report is available to the Board.

Mr. Schmuckler wants to make sure the Planner understands that there are certain areas including James and Prospect that are really stressed right now.

Mr. Wouters said this ordinance will be heard on March 20, 2014 he will have available to the Board the Planner's report before then.

Mr. Neiman said they are making these areas denser so they would like to see some infrastructure improvements as well.

Mr. Wouters said to include that in their recommendation.

Mr. Banas asked about the Master Plan review.

Mr. Vogt said the requirement to review the Master Plan used to be 7 years but he believes it was extended to 10 years.

Mrs. Morris said a Re-Examination report was including along with the Smart Growth Plan.

Mr. Schmuckler asked when the infrastructure would be put in place.

Mr. Wouters said it is hard to say. Some may be done before hand and some may be done as the property is being developed.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. _____ to recommend the ordinance to the Township Committee. The Board would like the Committee to look in to the following intersections: Massachusetts and Prospect, Williams and James, Williams and Prospect as well as other general infrastructure upgrades that may be needed.

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

No: Mr. Percal

- Section 18-806 – regarding non-conforming uses and lots

Mr. Wouters said the intent of this ordinance is to allow a non-conforming structure to be replaced with a structure that could even be larger provided that it meets all the bulk requirements of that zone.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Herzl to recommend the ordinance to the Township Committee.

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

- Section 18-902 – regarding permitted lot coverage percentages in residential zones

Mr. Wouters said most if not all zoning ordinances are a reflection of the needs of the community. In this case, it has become apparent to the community that in many of the instances the residential zone requirements that regulate the amount of lot coverage that a house can

maintain on a lot are undersized. Basically, what they are doing is increasing maximum building lot coverage across the board by 5%.

Mr. Percal asked if a study has been made to see how this would impact the community.

Mr. Neiman said lot coverage helps with drainage. Now they are increasing by 5%, he asked if that is going to affect drainage.

Mr. Jackson said this is going to affect the intensity. He said 30% is common in a lot of towns though.

Mr. Neiman would rather this be asked for a variance as opposed to just granting it.

Mr. Percal agrees. He would rather have an applicant come before this Board to ask for a variance and state exactly why they need this variance.

Mr. Jackson made the point that that type of application would go in front of the Zoning Board if it were a free standing lot.

Mr. Vogt said the engineering aspect of this is not really the issue. The issue is what the Board feels comfortable with in terms of keeping control over what plans are coming in front the Board.

Mr. Franklin said it is actually being increased further because the next ordinance proposes to exclude decks.

A motion was made and seconded to not recommend this ordinance to the Township Committee for adoption.

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

- Section 18-200 – new definition for “Building Coverage” to exclude decks

Mrs. Morris said this is an ordinance introducing a definition for building coverage. Currently the UDO does not have a definition. When calculating the coverage, they go by the definition for building which is any vertical face higher than 3 ft. This would exclude decks and porches for building coverage, however, with the definition for building a deck higher than 3 ft still would have to comply with the setbacks.

Mr. Percal said the maximum coverage change is still much bigger than meets the eye. The previous coverage of 25% did not include decks. If it went to 26% because they had a deck, they would have to ask for a variance.

Mr. Schmuckler suggested denying the other ordinance which increases the maximum building coverage by 5% and allow decks to give you an additional 5% as long as it keep the setbacks.

Mr. Neiman and Mr. Percal agree.

Mr. Jackson suggested the Board recommend a definition be made for porches as well.

Mrs. Morris said right now if a porch is lower than 3 ft and does not have a roof it is not part of the building and is not included in any of the calculations.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler and seconded by Mr. Percal to recommend this ordinance to the Township Committee to allow the decks to exceed by 5% as long as the setbacks are not affected.

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

6. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

1. **SD 1932** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Roger & Claudia Lebedz
Location: 220 Newport Ave
Block 496 Lot 2
Minor Subdivision to create four lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing property totaling 187,321 square feet (4.30 acres) in area known as Lot 2 in Block 496 into four (4) residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.04 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing two-story dwelling and a detached garage. The existing driveway would be relocated and the existing garage will be removed to create three (3) new residential building lots for future dwellings on proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.03. The existing two-story dwelling will remain on proposed Lot 2.04. The proposed minor subdivision has been designed for all new lots to meet the minimum area requirement for the zone of forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF). Public water and sewer is not available. The Improvement Plan indicates the proposed lots shall be served by individual septic systems and potable wells. The site is situated in the western portion of the Township along the Jackson Township border. Three (3) right-of-ways surround the site, Doria Avenue on the northwest side, Bellevue Avenue on the northeast side, and Newport Avenue on the southeast side. Doria Avenue is an unimproved seventy-five foot (75') right-of-way. Bellevue Avenue is a narrow improved Township Road in good condition with an approximately twenty feet (20') wide pavement width and no existing curb or sidewalk. Bellevue Avenue has an existing right-of-way width of seventy-five feet (75'). Newport Avenue also has an existing right-of-way width of seventy-five feet (75'). It is also a narrow improved Township Road in good condition without curb and sidewalk, having an existing pavement width of about eighteen feet (18'). No road widening or construction of curb and sidewalk is proposed. Except for the existing improvements previously mentioned, the entire tract is wooded. The site is located on a ridge with most of the land sloping toward the south. The only utilities available appear to be overhead electric. Proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.03 would become new residential building lots and contain areas of just over forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF). Proposed Lot 2.04 would become a new lot for the existing dwelling to remain and contain an area of 67,125 square feet. The lots are situated within the R-40 Single Family Residential Zone. A lot width variance is being requested for proposed Lot 2.04. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-40 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single Family Detached Housing is a permitted use in the zone. 2. Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following lot width variance is required: • Minimum Lot Width – Proposed Lot 2.04, 130.79 feet proposed, one hundred fifty feet (150')

required – proposed condition. 3. A design waiver is required for the proposed side lot lines not being at right angles to the street lines. However, the proposed side lot lines have been designed parallel to the surrounding street lines. Therefore, we recommend approval of this design waiver. 4. A design waiver is required to permit a stone driveway for proposed Lot 2.04. We recommend the design waiver be denied and the new driveway for proposed Lot 2.04 be paved. 5. At a minimum, the following design waivers are also required: • Providing curb and sidewalk along the project frontages. • Providing shade trees along the project frontages. 6. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variance. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments 1. Both Newport and Bellevue Avenues are narrow improved roads. Assuming these roads are classified as “Rural Lanes” RSIS permits a pavement width of only eighteen feet (18’) without on-street parking. Furthermore, the configuration of Newport Avenue is along the southeastern edge of the right-of-way and encroaches onto private property. a. As mentioned previously, the existing pavement width of Newport Avenue is only about eighteen feet (18’). If this subdivision is approved, Department of Public Works approval will be required for curbside pickup from proposed Lot 2.04, as well as addressing turnaround capabilities along Newport Avenue. b. As mentioned previously, the existing pavement width for Bellevue Avenue is only about twenty feet (20’). Site access to proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.03 shall be subject to Department of Public Works approval, as well as addressing turnaround capabilities along Bellevue Avenue. 2. The following corrections are required to the Topographic Survey submitted: c. The addition of existing mailboxes. d. The addition of existing signs. e. The existing pavement for Bellevue Avenue shall be shown continuing to the northeast onto Doria Avenue. 3. The Survey submitted is titled Topographic Survey. An Outbound Survey is also required. 4. A Topographic Survey of Property with tree locations has been submitted. The Notes indicate the property known as part of Lot 2 in Block 496. The Tax Maps show Lot 2 being larger, extending southward beyond the boundary line shown. The applicant’s surveyor has indicated to our office that there is a title problem with this southern section of the property. Unless resolved, the Survey and Minor Subdivision should be revised to show a gore to the south of the tract since no adjoining lot has been indicated. 5. Stray five foot (5’) text should be erased from the unimproved right-of-ways on the Survey, Minor Subdivision, and Improvement Plan. 6. The Title Boxes of the Survey, Minor Subdivision, and Improvement Plan shall be revised to list Lot 2 as singular. 7. The existing wood picket fence crossing the property line shall be noted to be removed on the Minor Subdivision Plan. 8. General Note #2 references the Outbound and Topographic Survey submitted, along with assumed datum. The benchmark information shown on the Survey should be provided on the Subdivision and also referenced in General Note #2. 9. A proposed monument shall be added where new Lot 2.04 intersects the Jackson Township Municipal Boundary Line and where the proposed subdivision line between new Lots 2.03 and 2.04 intersects the Doria Avenue right-of-way. 10. The symbol for “capped pin found” shall be consistent between the Plan and the Legend. 11. A stray 262.2’ text on the Minor Subdivision Plan should be erased. 12. The future status of the existing onsite utility poles must be addressed since they would be located on various lots with the subdivision approval. 13. All lots shall be serviced by individual septic systems and potable wells. Accordingly, approvals will be required from the Ocean County Board of Health. Subdivision approval will also be required from the Ocean County Board of Health to permit the existing well shown for proposed Lot 2.04 and the existing septic system which is not shown for new Lot 2.04 to continue to serve the existing dwelling to remain. 14. A proposed six foot (6’) wide Shade Tree and Utility Easement to Lakewood Township is shown directly behind the existing right-of-ways along Newport and

Bellevue Avenues. Although the Doria Avenue right-of-way is unimproved, the Shade Tree and Utility Easement shall be extended along this frontage unless a waiver is granted. Proposed distances on an individual lot basis must be added to the inside of the easements to check the easement areas shown. 15. Sight Triangle Easements have not been provided at the intersections. 16. The Zone Requirements indicate that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be required for each unit and that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each unit. The Improvement Plan shows that the parking configurations will provide at least four (4) off-street parking spaces per unit. Off-street parking shall be in accordance with the Township Parking Ordinance. A minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces for a dwelling unit with a basement is to be provided. 17. 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. 18. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since the proposed monuments have not been set. 19. Soil boring logs and locations must be provided on the Improvement Plan. A two foot (2') separation from seasonal high water table will be required for new lots where basements will be provided. 20. The Improvement Plan proposes no street trees which are required unless a waiver is granted. 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 2/19/14 indicates the survey accurately locates the existing trees on-site. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. Based on the proposed improvements shown for the new lots, the trees to be removed should be indicated. 21. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development of new lots. 22. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. Proposed grading is indicated on the Improvement Plan for the new lots. Proposed grading should be designed to maximize runoff directed to the streets and minimize runoff directed toward adjoining lots. 23. Due to no construction proposed at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. 24. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 25. Construction details must be added to the Improvement Plan. 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; d. Ocean County Board of Health; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are required for minimum lot width. There are also requests for design waivers.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. This is a subdivision to create four lots. One of the lots will need a slight variance. That will be addressed at the public hearing.

Mr. Neiman asked if they are asking for a waiver from installing curb and sidewalk.

Mr. Doyle said yes. It is currently a rural area and they would like to keep it as such.

Mr. Schmuckler said this area is only going to get denser so they should be required to put in sidewalks.

Mr. Flannery would like to address the waiver requests at the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Herzl to advance the application to the April 29, 2014 meeting. No further notices.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

2. **SD 1933** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Fourth Street Properties, LLC
Location: 886 River Ave
Block 430 Lot 10
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

Applicant has requested to carry this project to the April 8th, 2014 meeting. This project will not be heard.

3. **SD 1934** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Benjamin Weber
Location: East County Line Road & Brook Road
Block 175.02 Lot 1, 2, & 4
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision and Site Plan to create 8 single-family lots and 1 commercial lot for a combined retail and office building

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision approval, as well as a Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. The applicant proposes the subdivision of three (3) existing lots to create ten (10) proposed lots. The ten (10) proposed lots would be developed as eight (8) lots for new residential two-story dwellings, one (1) storm water management lot, and one (1) commercial lot for a new retail/office building. The existing three (3) lots known as Lots 1, 2, and 4 in Block 175.02 are proposed to be subdivided into proposed Lots 1.01 and 4.01 through 4.09 on the Major Subdivision Plan. The subject property is located on the northeasterly corner of Brook Road and East County Line Road. Both roads are County Highways, in the northeast portion of the Township. The intersection of these highways is signalized. The highways are improved, with only a stretch of existing curb in the vicinity of the intersection. No sidewalk exists, and the construction of curb and sidewalk along the County Highways is not proposed. The proposed subdivision would create a cul-de-sac on the north side of the project with access to Brook Road. The cul-de-sac is proposed to be called Schuster Way upon which all eight (8) of the residential lots would front. Another proposed lot with frontage only on Brook Road would provide storm water management facilities for the residential section of the subdivision. The proposed large remainder lot on the south side of the project would be for a retail/office use commercial site plan. A ten and half foot (10.50') right-of-way dedication has been proposed along the East County Line Road frontage. No dedication has been proposed along the site's Brook Road frontage even though the existing right-of-way width does not meet County standards. The site is currently occupied by numerous structures in the southwest corner. All existing improvements will be removed to make way for the proposed subdivision and site plan. Most of the existing 5.577 acre area of the site is wooded and slopes toward a low area in the center of the property. The assumed elevations drop from about sixty-two (62) to fifty-six (56). Proposed storm water management facilities and utilities are associated with this project. The proposed drainage system for the residential portion of the subdivision

consists of a conventional storm sewer collection system that collects storm water and directs runoff to an onsite underground recharge system and an onsite infiltration basin. The proposed drainage system for the commercial portion of the subdivision consists of a conventional storm sewer collection system that collects storm water and directs runoff to an onsite underground recharge system. Proposed sanitary sewer and potable water for the subdivision will need to be extended to existing offsite mains. Four (4) off-street parking spaces are proposed for each residential lot. One hundred forty-nine (149) off-street parking spaces are proposed for the retail/office use. The subject site is located within the R-15 Single Family Residential Zone District. The site is situated in a predominately residential area. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. B2 -- Topography within 200 feet thereof. 2. B4 -- Contours of the area within 200 feet of the site boundaries. 3. B10 -- Man-made features within 200 feet thereof. The applicant's engineer indicates that topography has been provided to the centerline of the adjoining roadways and all areas draining onto the property. We concur with the applicant's engineer's opinion and can support the above referenced submission waiver requests. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-15, Single Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached housing on minimum fifteen thousand square foot (15,000 SF) lots is permitted in the Zone. Commercial uses on properties with frontage on Ocean County Route No. 526 in accordance with the conditions and standards of Section 18-1019 is a Conditional Use in the Zone. 2. According to our review of the Major Subdivision Plan and the zone requirements, the following variances are required for the single family residential portion of the subdivision approval requested: • Minimum Lot Areas – Proposed minimum lot areas of twelve thousand square feet (12,000 SF), whereas fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF) is required. • Minimum Lot Widths – Proposed minimum lot widths of ninety feet (90'), whereas one hundred feet (100') is required. • It should be noted that proposed Lot 4.09 is only 8,517 square feet. However, the proposed lot will be for an infiltration basin and will not be for residential development. 3. No variances have been requested for the commercial portion of the subdivision approval submitted. 4. A ten and a half foot (10.50') right-of-way dedication to Ocean County has been proposed along the East County Line Road project frontage. No right-of-way dedication has been proposed along the Brook Road project frontage even though it appears a five foot (5') dedication is necessary. Should Ocean County require that right-of-way be dedicated along Brook Road, either additional variances or a redesign will be required. 5. Waivers are required for proposed lot lines which are not perpendicular or radial to the right-of-way. 6. Waivers are required from the construction of curb and sidewalk along the County Highway frontages. 7. A design waiver is required from Section 18-1019E.1.d., of the ordinance. The proposed trash enclosure for the commercial portion of the subdivision will be less than fifty feet (50') from the future residential portion of the subdivision. 8. A design waiver is required from Section 18-803E.2.a., of the UDO for the commercial portion of the subdivision. The buffer should be increased to fifty feet (50') where the nonresidential use is adjacent to an area zoned for residential land uses. 9. A design waiver is required from Section 18-807C.4., of the UDO for the commercial portion of the subdivision. A forty foot (40') foot wide access driveway is proposed along the Brook Road frontage where only a thirty foot (30') wide driveway is permitted. 10. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. III. Review Comments A. General 1. A separate Site Plan application is recommended for proposed Lot 1.01. The creation of the proposed lot for this site plan is subject to subdivision approval. 2. Separate Outbound and Topographic Surveys have been submitted. An encroachment from

adjoining Lot 84.07 implies the outbound for existing Lot 4 is incorrect. A driveway encroachment from adjoining Lot 87 will conflict with the proposed landscape buffer on the commercial site. Any approvals should be conditioned upon the encroachments being addressed. 3. Off-street parking for the residential portion of the subdivision: According to the plans provided, the applicant is proposing four (4) off-street parking spaces per dwelling which is enough to be in compliance with the RSIS and Township standards of four (4) off-street parking spaces required. Up to six (6) bedrooms per unit with an unfinished basement are permitted for this project to be in compliance with parking ordinance 2010-62. The construction plans indicate that basements will be proposed. According to the layout submitted, it is not clear how a minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces per dwelling will be provided. 4. The applicant shall confirm that trash and recyclable collection for the residential portion of the subdivision is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood. 5. A new road name, Schuster Way, has been proposed for the project. 6. The proposed lot numbers shall be approved by the Tax Assessor. The Final Plat shall be signed by the Lakewood Tax Assessor. 7. The requirements in 18-821 (Building Uniformity in Residential Developments) must be addressed. A minimum of four (4) basic house designs are required for this development consisting of between seven (7) and fifteen (15) homes. 8. Virtually all proposed storm water management for the residential portion of the subdivision has been designed within proposed easements and right-of-ways. An infiltration basin has been designed on proposed Lot 4.09 which would be turned over to the Township. Therefore, it is anticipated the Township of Lakewood will be responsible for operation and maintenance. Accordingly, a one-time fee of six thousand dollars (\$6,000.00) should be paid based on eight (8) single family detached dwellings at seven hundred fifty dollars (\$750.00) per unit. Department of Public Works approval will be required. 9. Testimony should be provided on the proposed uses for the commercial portion of the subdivision to insure compliance with Section 18-1019B., of the ordinance. B. Plan Review 1. The General Notes must be edited. 2. The Existing Conditions Plan erroneously shows a proposed wall along the East County Line Road frontage. 3. Soil boring locations should be added to the Existing Conditions Plan. 4. Curb and sidewalk is proposed for the residential cul-de-sac. Proposed sidewalk shall be five feet (5') wide, unless pedestrian bypass areas are designed. The limits of proposed curb and sidewalk terminate at the cul-de-sac returns along Brook Road. Curb and sidewalk is required across the entire project frontages unless waivers are granted. Proposed curb and sidewalk locations along Brook Road and East County Line Road will be dictated by the County of Ocean. Limits of proposed Township and County curb should be identified. 5. Proposed inlets for the residential cul-de-sac conflict with curb ramps. The design should be revised to eliminate the conflicts as well as storm drainage easements. We recommend the proposed drainage be designed to provide storm sewer pipes within the County right-of-way to transport runoff to the infiltration basin. In this manner there will be no drainage easements for the Department of Public Works to maintain on private property. 6. Centerline and right-of-way information must be completed for Brook Road in order to determine whether the proposed stationing for the residential cul-de-sac is correct. 7. Sight Triangle Easements to the County of Ocean should be proposed at all vehicular intersection points along Brook Road and East County Line Road. Since both roads are County Highways, any sight triangle easement requirements will be dictated by the County of Ocean, not the Township. 8. Six foot (6') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easements are proposed along the road frontages. All proposed easements shall be completed with bearings, distances, curve data, and areas provided on an individual lot basis. 9. The Layout Plans should have typical dimensions completed. 10. Dimensions should be provided for the proposed building on the commercial portion of the subdivision. 11. The largest individual commercial use shall be added to the Zone Schedule for the commercial portion of the subdivision to insure Section 18-1019D.7., of the

ordinance is complied with. 12. One hundred forty-nine (149) off-street parking spaces have been proposed on the commercial portion of the subdivision. Of these, five (5) of the spaces have been proposed as ADA accessible. However, only one (1) curb ramp has been provided for three (3) accessible aisles, and only three (3) signs for the five (5) spaces. Revisions are required. 13. A proposed loading zone is shown behind the building on the commercial portion of the subdivision. A size should be specified, along with testimony on operation. 14. A proposed refuse enclosure is depicted in the northeast corner of the proposed commercial lot of the subdivision. 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 area shall be dimensioned, screened on three (3) sides, and designed in accordance with Section 18-809E., of the UDO. C. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural drawings have been provided for the commercial portion of the subdivision. Based on the elevations provided, the proposed building may exceed a height of thirty-five feet (35'). Corrections to the proposed building elevations should be provided. The architectural elevations must be dimensioned to confirm the allowable thirty-five foot (35') maximum building height is not violated. We recommend that color renderings be provided for the Board's review for the Public Hearing. 2. An unfinished basement if proposed for the commercial building with interior access from stairwells and elevators. 3. The proposed first floor of the commercial building is broken up into seven (7) areas with a main hall separating the larger spaces from the smaller spaces. 4. The proposed second floor of the commercial building is broken up into fourteen (14) areas serviced by a central corridor. 5. Elevators are proposed within the building. Therefore, ADA accessibility is addressed. 6. We recommend that locations of HVAC equipment be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. 7. Proposed utility connections should be added. Testimony should be provided as to whether the proposed commercial building will have a sprinkler system. D. Grading 1. Grading is provided for the residential portion of the subdivision on a Grading Plan which is Sheet 5 of 13. The design will fill the site in order to provide a proposed gravity sanitary sewer collection system for the basements of the dwellings. 2. Grading is provided for the commercial portion of the subdivision on a Grading Plan which is Sheet 6 of 13. The design will fill the site in order to provide a proposed storm water management recharge system for the commercial development. 3. A profile has been provided for proposed Schuster Way. 4. Off road profiles are required for the proposed storm drainage systems. 5. A detailed review of the grading can be completed during compliance submission; if/when this subdivision and subsequent site plan is approved. E. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm sewer collection system has been designed to collect and convey storm water runoff to an underground recharge system and an infiltration basin on the residential portion of the subdivision. A proposed storm sewer collection system has been designed to collect and convey storm water runoff to underground recharge systems on the commercial portion of the subdivision. These designs will require approval from Ocean County. If approvals are granted, a meeting with the Department of Public Works will be necessary for the residential portion of the subdivision to review the design and maintenance responsibilities. 2. Our review of the project indicates it will be classified as Major Development since more than a quarter acre of impervious surface will be added and over an acre of disturbance will take place. As a result, the project must meet water quality and water quantity reduction rate requirements. The Storm Water Management Report should be revised to use three inches per hour (3 in/hr) for the infiltration rates of the soils beneath the proposed storm water management systems in order to provide the proper factor of safety. 3. Soil boring locations must be shown within the proposed project to confirm the seasonal high water table depth. 4. Drainage Area Maps must be provided for our review of the Storm Water Management Report and Design. 5. The Storm Water Management Report and Design will be reviewed in detail after

revisions to the project are made. 6. A separate Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual shall be submitted for the commercial portion of the subdivision per the NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township Code. The Manual will be reviewed in detail after the storm water management design is found to be acceptable. F. Traffic 1. A Traffic Report should be submitted for the proposed project which incorporates how the development will impact the planned County intersection improvements. Furthermore, the Traffic Report should also address proposed onsite circulation for the commercial portion of the subdivision. 2. Copies of the pertinent County Intersection Improvement Plans should be provided to check coordination with the applicant's proposed project. G. Landscaping 1. Shade trees, ornamental trees, and coniferous screening trees have been provided on Sheet 9 of 13. 2. All proposed Easements shall be added to the Plan. Except for the proposed shade tree and utility easements, landscaping should not be located in the easements. 3. Proposed utilities have been shown to avoid planting conflicts. 4. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations from the Shade Tree Commission as practicable. The site will be cleared as necessary for the construction of the project. Compensatory plantings shall be addressed with the Tree Protection Management Plan. 5. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted. H. Lighting 1. Lighting has been provided for the proposed cul-de-sac on the residential site and the future parking lot on the commercial site. The proposed lighting is shown on Sheet 8 of 13. 2. The Plan indicates that three (3) pole mounted fixtures are proposed for residential street lighting of the cul-de-sac. Additional fixtures are required and the proposed pole locations shall not conflict with other site improvements such as driveways and utilities. 3. The Plan also indicates that eleven (11) pole mounted fixtures are proposed for the future parking lot on the commercial site. The proposed Schedule shows three (3) different type lighting fixtures would be used. 4. A point to point diagram has been provided to verify the adequacy of the proposed lighting. Accordingly, revisions are required. The proposed street lighting shall be designed with a minimum intensity of 0.2 foot-candles, an average intensity of 0.5 foot-candles, and a uniformity ratio not exceeding 12:1. The proposed parking lot lighting shall be designed with a minimum intensity of 0.5 foot-candles, an average intensity of 1.0 foot-candles, and a uniformity ratio not exceeding 15:1. 5. It is anticipated that all lighting within public right-of-ways will be owned and maintained by the Township and all fixtures on the commercial lot will be privately owned and maintained. Confirming testimony should be provided regarding lighting ownership. 6. Lighting shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted. I. Utilities 1. Potable water and sanitary sewer service will be provided by the New Jersey American Water Company. The project is within the franchise area of the New Jersey American Water Company. 2. The existing onsite structures are most likely serviced by septic systems and potable wells. Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for abandonment. 3. The proposed sanitary sewer will connect to a system to be constructed in Park Slope Terrace. The proposed design will be deep enough to provide gravity service to the basements of the dwellings. 4. Potable water is proposed to be extended from an existing main at the Brook Road and East County Line Road intersection. 5. Testimony should be provided regarding other proposed utilities. Additional underground connections will be required if gas is proposed. J. Signage 1. Three (3) proposed project signs are indicated for the commercial portion of the subdivision. All of the proposed signs are located at the required minimum setback of fifteen feet (15') from the right-of-ways. No construction details for the proposed signage are provided within the current design submission. All proposed signs are noted to be seventy-five square feet (75 SF) and twenty feet (20') high. Zoning information is required for the proposed signs to determine whether any relief by the Board must be approved as part of the application. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed

and approved as part of this application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. K. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the site is currently occupied by various structures near the intersection of Brook Road and East County Line Road. The remainder of the property is wooded with light underbrush. Most of the existing 5.57 acre area of the site slopes to the center of the tract with elevations dropping from about sixty-two (62) to fifty-six (56). The site is bounded by East County Line Road to the south, Brook Road to the west, the Frank Bartolf Sports Complex to the north, and residential property to the east. 2. Environmental Impact Statement A Limited Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has been prepared for the project to satisfy Section 18-820 of the UDO. 3. Tree Management A Tree Protection Management Plan has been submitted. The plan shall be completed in accordance with current ordinance Chapter XIX, Protection of Trees. L. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 12 and 13 of 13. 2. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township or NJDOT standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. 3. Final review of construction details will take place after compliance submission, if/when this project is approved by the Board. M. Final Plat (Major Subdivision) 1. Certifications shall be revised in accordance with Section 18-604B.3., of the UDO. 2. The Subdivision Data indicates the Survey Datum is in New Jersey State Plane System. However, the coordinates for the project boundary corners are in an assumed datum. 3. Non-radial lines shall be labeled. 4. All proposed easements should be added. All proposed easement data should be provided on an individual lot basis. 5. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 6. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after design revisions are undertaken for the project. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. Ocean County Board of Health (well and septic abandonment); and f. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities. A revised submission should be provided separating the subdivision and site plan projects and addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.

Mr. Vogt stated that the applicant previously obtained a use variance for a very similar concept. A separate site plan application is recommended for the proposed commercial lot.

Mr. Flannery said he would revise the plans and address the engineering comments. The commercial application is virtually conforming. There are some variances on the residential subdivision and supporting testimony will be provided at the public hearing. He requested that this application be heard on the April 8, 2014 meeting.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Herzl to advance this application to the April 8, 2014 meeting. No further notices.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

- 4. SP 2052** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Sarah Faiga, Inc
Location: 1518 Tanglewood Ave
Block 25.06 Lot 17

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for proposed synagogue

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a one-story synagogue, which includes a basement, within a 2,729 square foot footprint. The site plans indicate the proposed synagogue will contain eleven hundred square feet (1,100 SF) of main sanctuary area. Off-street parking is proposed consisting of eleven (11) parking spaces, one (1) being handicapped accessible, and site improvements are also proposed within the property. The tract consists of an irregular shaped lot that totals 11,032 square feet (0.25 acres) in area. The site contains an existing one-story dwelling which would be removed for the proposed synagogue. The site is located in the northwest portion of the Township on the southwest corner of the Tangelwood Lane and County Line Road West intersection. Tangelwood Lane is a Municipal Road in fair condition with a sixty foot (60') right-of-way and a forty foot (40') pavement width. Curb in fair condition exists along the Tangelwood Lane frontage, but sidewalk does not. County Line Road West is a four (4) lane County Highway with a variable width right-of-way and a pavement width in excess of fifty-two feet (52'). The County Highway property frontage contains existing curb and sidewalk. Sanitary sewer is available to the property in the center of Tangelwood Lane. Potable water exists in the northwest side of Tangelwood Lane. Overhead electric is present on the northwest side of the Tangelwood Lane right-of-way. Some large trees exist on the site and the land generally slopes towards the adjoining streets. The adjacent and surrounding properties are developed, most of which are residential. Off-street parking spaces are proposed perpendicular to Tangelwood Lane on the southeast side of the site, consisting of eleven (11) spaces with roughly a hundred feet (100') of depressed curb. Other site improvements are proposed for the project which includes drainage, fencing, landscaping, and lighting. The property is located in the R-12 Zone District. Places of worship are a permitted use. I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. B2 – Topography within two hundred feet (200') thereof. 2. B4 – Contours within two hundred feet (200') of the site. The subject property is situated within a developed residential area and there is no proposal to disturb and/or modify existing topography beyond the tract. Therefore, the applicant requests a waiver from these requirements. We can support the requested waiver request provided a Topographic Survey of Lot 17 is provided with a resubmission of revised plans for the Public Hearing. II. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-12 Single-Family District. Places of worship are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the provisions of Section 18-905 of the UDO. 2. A variance is required for Minimum Lot Area. The existing lot area is 11,032 square feet, whereas twelve thousand square feet (12,000 SF) is required. The proposed lot area is also shown as 11,032 square feet. However, based on the configuration of adjacent Lot 18 and the fact that this property (Lot 17) encroaches into the existing sidewalk area of County Line Road West, we anticipate a right-of-way dedication will be required by the County. Therefore, we recommend the applicant consider proposing a smaller lot area for Board action to prevent returning for an amended approval. 3. A variance is required for Minimum Rear Yard Setback. A minimum rear yard setback of 17.50 feet is being proposed for the building, whereas a twenty foot (20') rear yard setback is required. 4. We calculate that five (5) off-street parking spaces are required for this property based on the proposed size of the main sanctuary shown on the preliminary architectural plans. Eleven (11) spaces are being provided, one (1) of which is designated handicapped. However, approximately a hundred feet (100') of depressed curb is proposed to access these off-street parking spaces. Therefore, a design waiver is required for the width of a nonresidential driveway exceeding thirty feet (30'). 5. According to Section 18-905B.1., Perimeter Buffer: For properties adjacent to residential properties, if the site leaves a twenty foot (20') undisturbed area then there is no requirements

for buffering. If the twenty foot (20') buffer is invaded or disturbed than requirements indicated in 18-905B.3., shall be put in place along the invaded area. The applicant is proposing fencing and landscaping to meet the perimeter buffer requirements. The proposed fencing height is reduced from six feet (6') to four feet (4') in the front yard setback areas as required. 6. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A Survey of Property has been submitted for Lot 17. The following must be addressed: a. Topography as shown on the base map and referenced in General Note #2 on the Site Plan. b. Horizontal and vertical datum shall be noted as assumed, and a bench mark should be added. c. The existing lot area should be added. d. A double inlet shall be shown on the southwest side of the existing driveway. e. The existing mailbox should be added. f. The existing street sign should be added. 2. A General Note on the Site Plan indicates horizontal and vertical datum is assumed, reference to a bench mark shall be added. 3. The General Notes indicate that three (3) off-street parking spaces are required and eleven (11) off-street parking spaces are proposed. Our review of the architectural plans indicates the main sanctuary to be about 1,240 square feet, which would require five (5) off-street parking spaces. Furthermore, our site investigation notes it would be unlikely to physically relocate the existing utility pole and guy wire to a place that would not conflict with the off-street parking proposed. An alternate off-street parking design should be considered. 4. Proposed waiver information shall be completed in the General Notes. 5. An existing chain link fence crosses the property line of Lots 17 and 18. The future status of the existing chain link fence must be indicated since a proposed vinyl fence will conflict. 6. Unless reduced by a County right-of-way taking, the lot area on the site plan shall be corrected to 11,032 square feet. 7. Proposed building dimensions shall be added. 8. An adjustment to the proposed building access locations is required. The Site Plan and Architectural Plan must be coordinated. 9. The proposed concrete sidewalk along Tangelwood Lane shall connect to the existing concrete sidewalk along County Line Road West. 10. The proposed County Sight Triangle Easement shall be labeled and show bearings, distances, and an area. 11. A proposed refuse enclosure has been depicted on the plans. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony to confirm that the congregation proposes to use curbside pickup by the Township. 12. A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement has been provided with bearings, distances, and an area dedicated to the Township. Proposed off-street parking and a sight triangle easement only permits room for one (1) new shade tree. A deed of easement and description shall be provided for review by the Planning Board Attorney and Engineer prior to filing with the Ocean County Clerk, should site plan approval be granted. B. Architectural 1. The proposed building is only a one-story structure. Therefore, the proposed building does not exceed the allowable height of thirty-five feet (35'). 2. The proposed building layout and square footage must be checked and coordinated with the site plan. 3. A proposed handicap ramp is located on the northeast side of the building to provide ADA accessibility. 4. Testimony should be provided as to whether the proposed synagogue will have a sprinkler system. Proposed utility services have not been addressed on the Improvement Plan. 5. All proposed HVAC equipment shall be shown and adequately screened. 6. The roof drainage of the proposed building must be coordinated with the site plan. 7. We recommend that color renderings of the building be provided for the Board's use at the forthcoming public hearing for the application. C. Grading 1. Grading information is provided on the current Improvement Plan. 2. Per review of the proposed contours, corrections are required. 3. A soil boring location and profile is indicated on the drawings. Based on the soil log provided, the basement floor elevation shown on the site plan is greater than two feet (2') above

the seasonal high water table elevation. The existing elevation on the soil boring profile shall be corrected to fifty-two (52). 4. Proposed gutter grades must be designed along Tangelwood Lane to insure a positive slope to the existing double inlet. In fact, the grate elevation of the existing double inlet must be lowered since our site investigation confirms the existing gutter grade to the southwest is lower. 5. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review should approval be granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. The Roof Drywell Design provided properly accounts for a twenty-five (25) year storm. The proposed roof runoff will be collected and piped into two (2), forty foot (40') long, eighteen inch (18") perforated polyethylene pipes surrounded by stone, where it will be recharged into the soil. 2. The design needs to be completed for the roof drainage system. Proposed cleanouts and inverts must be provided. 3. Storm water management will be reviewed in detail with a revised submission. E. Landscaping and Lighting 1. A dedicated Landscaping Plan is provided with the submission; proposed landscaping is depicted on Sheet 4 of the plans. Proposed landscaping includes buffer and foundation plantings. 2. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board and recommendations from the Shade Tree Commission. 3. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. 4. A dedicated Lighting Plan is provided with the submission; proposed lighting is depicted on Sheet 5 of the plans. Proposed lighting includes six (6) wall mounted fixtures and one (1) wall sconce for the parking area in front of the building. 5. A point to point diagram will be required for the parking area. 6. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 7. Lighting will be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. F. Utilities 1. The proposed building will be served by public water and sewer from New Jersey American Water Company since the project is within their franchise area. The Site Plans should include information on sewer and water services. G. Signage 1. No site identification or building 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. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. H. Environmental 1. To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. Testimony should be provided on any known areas of environmental concern that exist within the property. 2. The existing property has some large trees which must be removed for the proposed project. Accordingly, a Tree Protection Management Plan is required. 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. 2. All details of proposed work have not been included on the plans. 3. Construction details are provided with the current design submission. We will review the construction details during compliance should site plan approval be granted. 4. Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are required for minimum lot area and minimum rear yard setback. Waivers are being requested for topography and contours within 200 ft. The waivers are supported provided the applicant provides a topographic survey of lot 17.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waivers.

Affirmative: Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esq. on behalf of the applicant stated that the engineer's comments will be addressed at the public hearing. The plans will be revised per his comments. The variances are existing and they are either bringing them more conforming or leaving them as is.

Mr. Schmuckler asked that he be prepared to discuss the parking configuration at the public hearing. He asked if there will be a basement.

Mr. Pfeffer said yes.

Mr. Schmuckler asked that he be ready to address that as well.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Sussman to advance this application to the April 8, 2014 meeting. No further notices.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

5. **SD 1937** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Lakewood Investments, LLC
Location: Williams Street
Block 420 Lot 21.01, 21.02, 23 & 24
Minor Subdivision to create 7 lots

Mrs. Morris stated the applicant thought they were on the March 18th meeting so this application will be carried to that date.

6. **SP 2053** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Bnos Melech of Lakewood
Location: James Street
Block 364 Lot 1
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for addition to existing school and provisions for Phase II construction of a high school and parking facilities

Project Description

The applicant previously obtained Site Plan exemption/Change of Use approval for conversion of a portion of an existing 100' by 200' industrial building and property for a school, including classrooms, offices, several conference rooms, a second story "multi-purpose room" and amenities per Section 18-906.B of the UDO (via SP#1979) . Per available information, the school will continue to serve (K-8) grade students. The existing school is identified as "Existing 2-Story Girls Grammar School" on the site plans. Additionally, existing access, paving and parking improvements to the main parking lot fronting James Street are depicted on the Site Plans, including but not limited to two (2) accesses and drive along the southeast portion of the

frontage to provide for bus and car circulation, resurfacing and striping. Proposed (phased) site improvements for which Site Plan approval are requested include the following:

- Phase 1, including a two-story building addition to the existing school, new parking (in place of spaces to be removed with the building addition), a (future) pool, a Recreation Area and a retention basin.
- Phase 2, including a proposed 2-story Girls High School and two (2) new parking lots. The site is located in the northwest portion of Industrial Park, on the south side of James Street, west of the intersection with Ridgeway Place. The tract is irregular in shape, and is 7.58 acres in area. Commercial and light industrial sites are in the vicinity of the property. We offer the following comments and recommendations:

I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested (or appear necessary):

1. B2 - Topography within 200 feet thereof (50 feet provided).
2. B4 - Contours within 200 feet of the site.
3. B10 – Man-made features within 200 feet of site.
4. C10 - Shade Trees (none provided).
5. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement.
6. C14 - Tree Protection Management Plan.
7. C15 – Landscaping Plan.

We support the above-referenced submission waivers Site Plan hearing purposes. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to meeting Township Tree Protection requirements as a condition of Board approval (if/when forthcoming). Landscaping (if any is required by the Board) will be provided during compliance as a condition of Board approval (if/when forthcoming).

II. Zoning 1. The property is located in the M-1 (Industrial) Zone. Schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906 of the UDO.

2. Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, the existing and proposed layout complies with the Bulk requirements of the M-1 zone.
3. No bulk variances appear necessary for the Site Plan application.
4. Perimeter buffer relief is necessary per 18-906A(1), where 10 foot buffer (or equivalent screening) is required from adjacent property lines.
5. Per review of the parking schedule on the Cover Sheet, (short-term) relief for number of off-street parking spaces appears necessary (i.e., prior to Phase 2 construction). Seventy-one (71) parking spaces are identified to be constructed with Phase 1 of the improvements (90 required per UDO). However, an additional one hundred (100) spaces will be provided in Phase 2, which will bring overall parking in excess of UDO standards at that time.

III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking

1. Testimony should be provided by the applicant for the Board summarizing the proposed expansion of the existing facility (by phase), including but not limited to the following:
 - a. How many students are proposed at the school.
 - b. Will any parents drive and park at the school.
 - c. How many buses are proposed
 - d. Will any students will be dropped off and picked up (by car).
2. The "Site Layout: Plan (Sheet 3 of 12) depicts proposed circulation of the expanded facility, by phase. As depicted, the existing access points and drive serving the existing school facility would be extended around the proposed school addition (Phase 1) and between the proposed high school and existing school buildings, also providing access to future parking areas and bus stalls (Phase 2). Per communications with the applicant's professionals, minor revisions to the phasing of said improvements, and a dimensioned Circulation Plan will be provided as conditions of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. Per review of available information, the proposed circulation design appears well-prepared.
3. 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.
4. Testimony should also be provided as to the maximum number of staff professionals at the site during school operations.
5. As shown on the Site Plan, bus stalls are identified to be installed on the west side on the existing school building as part of the Phase 2 improvements. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided identifying proposed bus drop-offs associated with the existing school addition (Phase 1).
6. The existing refuse enclosure will be relocated as depicted on the Site Plans to accommodate Phase 1 improvements. If Township pickup will continue, 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 (including necessary vehicular access prior to the Phase 2 improvements). Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to this condition. 7. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, summary testimony describing the proposed Recreation Area and Pool facilities will be provided at the Public Hearing. Details for these facilities will be provided for review during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. B. Architectural 1. Architectural plans have been provided for the proposed school addition (Phase 1). As depicted, the addition will be less than 28 feet in height, and lower than the height of the existing school building. The allowable building height is sixty-five feet (65'). 2. Per review of the architectural plans, the proposed school addition will be constructed on slab (i.e., no basement). 3. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, proposed water and sewer connections for the additional and future high school will be provided during compliance, if/when approval is granted. This is satisfactory for hearing purposes. 4. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, both the school addition and future high school will be designed to comply with applicable fire code requirements (based on existing and proposed water service). This is satisfactory. 5. 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. 6. We recommend that color renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. C. Grading 1. Per review of the proposed grading plan (Sheets 3 and 4), the initial design concept is detailed and well-prepared. We commend the applicant's professionals' work, which resulted in the current design. 2. Final grading design revisions will be addressed during compliance review (including but not limited to design of proposed retaining walls) if/when approval is granted. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. 3. The final grading design must be coordinated with the architectural plans (including future plans for the proposed high school) as final plans are developed. Revised plans can be provided with resolution compliance submission. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. 4. Soils data are necessary to review the final design, including but not limited to the proposed recharge basin to be constructed in Phase 1 (and recharge piping throughout the site). Said data can be provided with resolution compliance submission. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. D. Storm Water Management 1. As indicated on the Grading and Drainage Plans (Sheets 3 and 4 of 12), stormwater management for the improvements consists of collection piping serving a recharge basin proposed as part of the Phase 1 improvements, and collection/recharge piping proposed for Phase 2 of the improvements. Per review of the design concept, it is feasible as proposed. 2. A stormwater management report has been provided for the current design in accordance with NJ Stormwater Rule (NJAC 7:8) requirements. The design would be reviewed in detail during compliance (if approval granted), based on forthcoming soils data. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. 3. A Storm Water Management Facilities Operation and Maintenance Manual must be provided (if approval granted). The O & M Manual can be provided with resolution compliance submission. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. 4. If maintenance of the proposed system by DPW is desired, DPW approval of the proposed design would be necessary (if approval granted). Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. E. Landscaping and Lighting 1. As indicated previously, no landscaping is proposed at this time. Landscaping (if any) should be provided as desired by the Board as a condition of approval, if/when forthcoming. Per communications with

the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. 2. As identified on the submitted Lighting Plan, future site lighting will be provided by a network of 15' high, pole mounted light fixtures. The lighting concept, as depicted is generally well-prepared, pending minor modifications and shielding to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties. 3. We recommend that the final lighting designs necessary to support the proposed buildings, accessways, parking areas and site amenities be reviewed as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. 4. We recommend that non-security lighting be placed on timers so that site lighting is deactivated off-hours. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. 5. This project, if approved must comply with applicable requirements of the Township's Tree Protection ordinance. Compliance may be demonstrated during compliance review. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said condition would be satisfactory. F. Utilities 1. The plans indicate the site is served by public water and sewer. 2. Detailed water and sewer plans will be required to demonstrate adequate water, sewer and fire suppression service to the expanded school and future high school. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, said information would be prepared during compliance (if/when approval is granted), and be subject to NJAW review and approval. This is satisfactory. G. Signage 1. No signage information is provided (other than standard traffic and directional signage). Per communications with the applicant's professionals, no signage is proposed at this time. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. H. Environmental To assess the site for environmental concerns, a natural resources search of the property and surroundings was completed using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. Per review of said mapping, no wetlands, water bodies or known environmental constraints exist on this property. 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. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. Water and sewer utilities, prior to occupancy permits; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt said there are no variances but there are waivers which need to be acted upon by the Board. The waivers are supported provided the applicant agrees to meet Township Tree Protection requirements.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waivers.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

Mr. Abe Penzer, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. He stated that the only comment he has is the maintenance of the system is not by Public Works. The school maintains the system. He requested to be on the March 18, 2014 meeting as there is a great need for this school.

Mr. Vogt has no objections to that. Revised plans would be provided during the compliance phase.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance this application to the March 18, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

7. **SP 2054** Concept Plan Review
Applicant: Rabbi Schwab
Location: Union, Lambert, and Essex Avenues
 Block 1121 Lots 6 & 7
 Concept Plan for a proposed school

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Board input for a proposed (66' by 110') Girls School on the (unimproved) south side of Essex Avenue, approximately 170 feet east of the intersection of Essex Avenue and Vermont Avenue. The site and surrounding lands are predominantly wooded and undeveloped in its current condition. The site is rectangular in shape, and 36,000 sf in area (slightly less than the 40,000 lot area minimum). As shown, the applicant intends to provide vehicular access to the proposed school by extending a 24'-wide "Two-Way Proposed Driveway" from the existing intersection with Vermont Avenue, within the unimproved Essex Avenue right of way. Curbing is proposed on the south side of the roadway. I. Zoning 1. The property is located in the R-40/20 (Single Family Residential) Zone. Schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906 of the UDO. 2. Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, the school would meet the bulk requirements of the R-40 Zone except for minimum Lot Area. II. Review Comments 1. Testimony should be provided by the applicant for the Board summarizing the proposed use of the school, including but not limited to the following: a. How many students are proposed at the school. b. How many employees are proposed at the school at any one time. c. How many buses are proposed (daily). d. Will any students will be dropped off and picked up (by car). 2. As shown on the Concept Plan, twenty-three (23) off-street parking spaces are depicted as proposed (presumably 9'x18' in size per Township standards). Assuming the school building as depicted is one floor (only), proposed parking appears reasonable. Actual parking requirements per UDO standards (Section 18-906) would be determined at Site Plan (and architectural plan) review. 3. As depicted on the Concept Plan, a circular 24-foot wide drive is proposed for site access, as well as for staging of buses per two (2) bus stalls shown in front of the building. Adequacy of circulation would be determined at time of site plan review. 4. As depicted on the Concept Plan, two (2) trash enclosures are proposed adjacent to the accessway, in the northeast corner of the site. Approval of the location and access will require DPW approval (unless private disposal is required). 5. Landscaping (if any) shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 6. Township approval of the proposed access driveway within the Essex Avenue ROW would be required as a condition of site plan approval 7. Any information necessary to document compliance with Section 18-906, "Public and Private Schools" of the UDO will be required at time of site plan review.

Mr. Flannery said the applicant is looking to build a girl's elementary school. This property is in the woods off of Vermont Avenue. Most of the area in front of the school is wooded and undeveloped. The applicant would like some advice from the Board before preparing a full site plan.

Mr. Franklin said the road would not be wide enough for parking.

Mr. Neiman does not believe they are asking too much to extend the road to 32 ft or even 30 ft. They are not requiring curbs and sidewalks.

Mr. Flannery said the 24 ft provides access. The parking could be done with gravel along the sides. That provides the parking without providing something that needs to get torn up if someone comes in to develop the property.

Mr. Neiman would like to see some sort of lighting along the street.

Mr. Flannery said that is a public street so there would be street lights.

Mr. Vogt said the road design would be a Township approval. At some point this road may be upgraded to a 30 ft cartway with curbing and sidewalk. That would have to be fleshed out. It is good that the applicant has come now to discuss this.

Mr. Flannery said the applicant intends to go to Public Works as well.

Mr. Neiman asked about the busing.

Mr. Flannery said there is room in front for 2 buses. Ultimately, there is going to be 200 students so you are looking at 4 or 5 buses. There is a turnaround for the buses.

Mr. Neiman would still like to see that road widened further than 24 ft.

Mr. Flannery said 28 ft would be RSIS compliant.

Mr. Neiman said that would be fine.

Mr. Franklin believes it should be 32 ft wide.

- 8. SP 2056** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Chemdat Hatorah
Location: Massachusetts Avenue
Block 440 Lots 27 & 44
Site Plan for addition to existing school

Project Description

The applicant is seeking site plan approval for expansion of an existing two-story school and dormitory, to an existing 1-story dwelling and site improvements which were approved via Board approval SP#1936. Existing site improvements include a one-way access drive along the property's Massachusetts Avenue frontage, connecting to a two-way access drive leading to off-street parking located behind the existing building. Proposed improvements include expansion and improvements of the basement, two full stories and an "Accessory Storage Attic/Mezzanine" as depicted on the architectural plans. In addition, a 45.75' by 91' "Proposed Gym" is depicted to be constructed 10 feet behind the location of the proposed building addition. The existing parking spaces and access drive will be expanded as depicted on the Site Plans to

provide fifty-one (51) off-street spaces. The site is located on the west side of Massachusetts Avenue, approximately 250 feet north of its intersection with Cross Street. Developed areas south and east of the site are predominantly residential. Per the current site plans and per information presented with the prior application (SP1936), existing utilities include two (2) potable wells, and a septic system. Sidewalk exists along the property frontage. We offer the following comments and recommendations regarding this project: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested (or appear necessary): 1. B2 - Topography within 200 feet thereof (50 feet provided). 2. B4 - Contours within 200 feet of the site. 3. B10 – Man-made features within 200 feet of site. 4. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. We support the above-referenced submission waivers Site Plan hearing purposes. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to meeting Township Tree Protection requirements as a condition of Board approval (if/when forthcoming). II. Zoning 1. The property is located in the R-20/12 (Single Family residential) Zone. Schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906 of the UDO. 2. Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, the existing and proposed layout complies with the Bulk requirements of the R-20 zone. 3. No bulk variances appear necessary for the Site Plan application. As noted, there is an existing non-conforming front yard setback for the existing building. 4. Perimeter buffer relief is necessary per 18-906A(2), where 10 foot buffer (or equivalent screening) is required from adjacent property lines. 5. The Site Plans depict an existing trailer to be relocated away from the Bushwick Avenue ROW. The distance of the proposed setback should be provided to ensure relief is not necessary. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Additional coordination will be required between the site plans and architectural plans. This can be addressed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 2. Testimony should be provided from the applicant's professionals regarding the proposed gymnasium including days and hours of operations. Architectural plans will be required during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 3. Per the site plans, the facility will continue to use the existing dumpster area as designated on the Site Plans, located immediately north of the existing paved access area. We recommend, as a condition of approval, that DPW review the current area for adequacy in light of the proposed facility expansion. 4. A note should be added to the plans to replace deteriorated or damaged existing curb. 5. A note should be added that existing paving that is deteriorated or damaged (and disturbed for stormwater pipe installation will be replaced as part of the proposed parking lot expansion. Construction details will have to address all proposed restoration activities. 6. As noted on the plans, proposed off-street parking (51 spaces) will well exceed UDO requirements (35 spaces) based upon current design information. B. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural plans have been provided for the proposed school building expansion. Proposed improvements include expansion and improvements of the basement, two full stories and an "Accessory Storage Attic/Mezzanine" as depicted on the architectural plans. 2. Per the Zoning Data on the site plans, both the building addition and gymnasium buildings will be within the 35 foot zoning height limitation. The applicant's professionals should provide confirming testimony (or seek the appropriate relief). 3. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing. 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. Per the Grading and Drainage Plan, the grading design as proposed is feasible and generally well-prepared. Proposed site grades are consistent with existing grades, and are less than 5% slope (with the exception of the proposed retention basin. 2. Final grading will be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. The

Grading and Drainage Plans depict stormwater collection piping, and roof leaders from the school addition and gymnasium leading to a proposed recharge basin proposed in the rear of the site. 2. Stormwater calculations were provided for review. Said calculations will be reviewed and finalized during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 3. Soil data, including but not limited to permeability data in the vicinity of the proposed recharge basin bottom will be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 4. A stormwater maintenance plan will be prepared in accordance with NJAC 7:8 will be provided during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. 5. 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. Otherwise, DPW approval of the proposed design will be required. E. Landscaping 1. The Lighting and Landscape Plan includes Red Maples, arborvitae, Japanese Holly and Spirea as depicted. 2. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board as practicable. 3. A final review of landscaping can be conducted during compliance, should site plan approval be granted. F. Lighting 1. As identified on the Landscape and Lighting Plan, future site lighting will be provided by a network of 16' high, pole mounted light fixtures as well as several building-mounted lights. The lighting concept, as depicted is generally well-prepared, pending minor modifications and shielding to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties. 2. We recommend that the final lighting designs necessary to support the proposed buildings and expanded parking areas and site amenities be reviewed as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. 3. We recommend that non-security lighting be placed on timers so that site lighting is deactivated off-hours. G. Utilities 1. Per the current site plans and per information presented with the prior application (SP1936), existing utilities include two (2) potable wells, and a septic system. 2. Detailed water and sewer plans will be required to demonstrate adequate water, sewer and fire suppression service to the expanded school and gymnasium. Said information can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 3. Approval for the water and septic system expansions will be required from the Ocean County Board of Health. 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. A Tree Protection Management Plan must be provided as a condition of approval, including compensatory plantings. J. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; if/when this application is approved. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. Ocean County Board of Health; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Sam Brown, Esq. on behalf of the applicant stated that there are no variances associated with this application.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waivers.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance this application to the March 18, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Deputy Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

7. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. **SP 2047** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Olam Chesed Inc
Location: Hillside Boulevard
Block 11.12 Lot 25, 26, & 28
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for proposed synagogue

Mrs. Morris stated the applicant requested this project be carried to the March 18th, 2014 meeting.

Mr. Jackson announced that this application will be carried to the March 18th, 2014 meeting. No further notices.

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

8. CORRESPONDENCE

- **SD 1564** – Major Subdivision amended approval request for re-aligned roadway

Mrs. Morris stated that the applicant asked this be carried to the March 18th, 2014 meeting.

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

- **SD 1940** – Block 119, Lot 12 - subdivision of Lakewood Township owned property (municipal parking lot)

Mr. Wouters said this is a minor subdivision request by the Township to create a new lot. The municipal complex which includes the building, parking lot and the front area is all on one lot and block. There is a very small portion of 2,800 sf that is technically part of the municipal parking lot. It is not used as such and it would be difficult to configure for additional parking and the Township has made a determination that it would better suited for an addition to the adjoining parcel which is on the corner of Clifton Avenue and Fourth Street with the specific

requirement that a structure be built on that lot. In order to accomplish this, they need to create a new lot.

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

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

9. PUBLIC PORTION

Mr. Schmuckler would like to see some sort of policy be put in place to permit a deadline for carrying applications as people have to make certain arrangements in order to get to the meeting.

Deputy Mayor Ackerman said, for example, one of the objectors had hired an attorney and if the application gets carried last minute they would still have to pay the attorney fees.

Mr. Jackson said you could create a policy but things come up in the last minute.

Deputy Mayor Ackerman agrees with that but this would at least hold people back from doing it multiple times on the same application.

Mr. Neiman said they will try to enforce it for 3pm on Mondays and it will be the Board's discretion to have the applicant to re-notice.

Mrs. Morris said she will make a point to keep track of when she receives notices to carry applications.

Mr. Schmuckler said to let it be known to the applicants that they need to let Mrs. Morris know by 3pm.

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

11. APPROVAL OF BILLS

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary