

1. FLAG SALUTE & CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

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

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the *Asbury Park Press* and *The Star Ledger* and posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood at least 48 hours in advance. The public has the right to attend this meeting, and reasonable, comprehensive minutes of this meeting will be available for public inspection. This meeting meets the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL & SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr.. Garfield, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Isaacson, Mr. Meyer, Mr. Fuentes, Mr. Stern were present.

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

3. PUBLIC HEARING

2. SD 2457 Benjamin Barr

41 Sunset Road

Block 76, Lots 18 & 19

Minor Subdivision to adjust lot lines

Mrs. Morris said we have a request to carry this application. Mr. Kociuba is here to present that request to the Board.

Mr. Jackson said my understanding is there is an issue with neighbors and you’re looking into the drainage and you want to carry it so that you can circulate a drainage plan and see if the neighbors are satisfied with it, is that correct?

Mr. Kociuba said that’s correct.

Mr. Jackson said I recommend we pick a new date, make the announcement, and move on from there.

Mr. Donald Pepe, Esquire, appeared and said I want to add for the record that nothing has really happened in this regard between December and today. That’s almost two months. The neighborhood has two attorneys present as well as a professional planner and several members from the neighborhood, so even though I’m not going to create a defect by suggesting a request shouldn’t be granted, but I do think the Board should be cognizant of the fact that there are a lot of people who showed up tonight.

Mrs. Morris said do we need to put on the record who Mr. Pepe is or who he is representing?

Mr. Jackson said Mr. Pepe sent in a letter of representation. The record reflects that. Is there other counsel here on this matter?

Ms. Louis Sutton, Esquire, appeared and said I represent Eli and Grace Sutton. I had entered my appearance via email. I spoke a month ago to a representative of Benjamin Barr. He has not contacted me in the past month. He has refused to contact the neighbors that have reached out to him. I understand the Board will probably grant it but we’d like it to be on the record the applicant has not approached the neighbors and in fact they had been dealing with him prior to the application and I reiterate...

Mr. Jackson said do you oppose the current request to adjourn the matter?

Mr. Herzl said isn't the applicant asking to adjourn it to meet with the neighbors?

Mr. Jackson said yes. I reviewed an email from Mr. Kociuba that indicated there were issues with drainage that were raised to him and he has prepared a plan to address that and certain neighbors wanted time to review it, otherwise they are ready to go forward.

Mr. Herzl said to answer Ms. Sutton, she was saying she can't get through to the neighbors. The neighbors want to sit down with her. And that's why they are asking for an adjournment.

Ms. Sutton said no, I said that the neighbors were not approached by Mr. Barr, and he did not approach me, and the surveyor did not approach any of us, except for tonight, half an hour prior, saying they wanted an adjournment.

Mr. Herzl said I think an adjournment works for you, so you have time to sit down with the neighbors.

Mr. Kociuba said we request to be carried to February 16th.

Mr. Herzl said are both attorneys available then?

Mr. Pepe said Sam Bellamy is my planner, I'd like to ask if he is available. I'm checking right now.

Ms. Sutton said I'm available.

Mr. Bellamy said yes I should be available.

Mr. Pepe said I'm in Jersey City on the 16th.

Mrs. Morris said can you meet virtually with whatever you are doing?

Mr. Pepe said I could as long as this Board accommodates hearing this application at a time... my application there will be a half hour, so as long as we can hear this application outside of that half hour.

Mrs. Morris said we have three applications on that night, they should each take half an hour, so we can certainly work around your schedule.

Mr. Jackson said we start at 6pm. What time is your meeting?

Mr. Bellamy said Jersey City starts at 5:30pm.

Mr. Herzl said I think we should put him at the end of the agenda and we should have plenty of time to get to it.

Mr. Jackson made the announcement to carry the application to February 16th with no further notice.

Mr. Isaacson said I'm sure I'm speaking on behalf of everyone on the Board, by the next meeting we would have liked that the neighbors have been spoken to.

Mr. Kociuba said I've just been recently notified of that, and we did prepare a sketch of a drainage system available for everyone. We will have answers regarding the drainage ready for the hearing.

Mr. Herzl said if it is a height variance, then it doesn't belong by our Board, is that correct?

Mr. Jackson said the Board can grant a variance up to 10% above the allowed height, or just under 10%. So that would be 6.5' above the 65. I forget if it would be 71 or 70 and 11". And the Ordinance does define parapets as not counted towards the height, but I don't think the Ordinance contemplated a 10' high parapet wall. But Mr. Flannery can address that.

Mr. Flancbaum said I'm sorry to interrupt but I need to step down for this application.

Mr. Herzl said ok.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant. Regarding the parking issue, the Ordinance one per 400 is the section that has the language regarding "or one per employee." The section of the Ordinance where it's one per 250 does not have that same reference. The Board has told us, initially we came in at one per 400, the Board said they weren't happy before we got to the Board. We had some conversations with the professionals, and we have amended our plans and are fully compliant with the one per 250 ordinance. In any matter, we have testimony also that we meet the one per one person. As far as the parapet, my understanding is they are a design feature, as John indicated they don't usually get counted towards the height. They are to shadow the mechanicals and stuff on top. Brian will give additional testimony on that, and we have Scott Kennel to address traffic concerns.

Mr. Brian Flannery, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed.

Mr. Scott Kennel, traffic expert, appeared and was affirmed.

Mr. Flannery said exhibits were submitted as part of this application. A-1 is the tax map sheet 123, which shows where the property is. It's on Oberlin Ave, south of Cedarbridge Avenue. There are a couple schools and industrial uses in the area. This is an existing site with an existing building which has 32,000 sf of office space and 80,000 sf of warehouse space. An aerial exhibit was submitted, that's A-3. That shows the existing building, the school next to us with their parking and facilities in the back, and it shows some of the other industrial buildings in the area and some schools off to the side. A-2 is the site plan showing the turning movements and the proposed building with a total of 215 parking spaces. We also submitted, and I'm going to jump as per John's comments, we also submitted architectural and we have perspective renderings. On those the building shows the parapet walls. The 10' walls that are indicated, because there are two different parapet wall heights, the 10' walls are related to the glass area of the building. This is a very nice building, it's the kind of building I think everyone would be proud to have in the industrial park. In regards to John's items, the third one he indicated was the building height. The Lakewood UDO defines building height as the vertical dimension measured from the average elevation of the finished grade at the front of the building, to the highest point of the roof deck. For this particular roof, it's that simple. From the outside grade, to the highest point of the roof deck and we comply with the Ordinance. The parapets, maybe if it was 20 feet all the way around it wouldn't look appropriate, but when you look at 10' on a 65' high building, that's 15%. That certainly doesn't look out of character. I wouldn't change anything on the rendering because I think that's a beautiful feature. The walls have architectural features to make it stand out and look good. My professional opinion is we comply with the Ordinance. We are allowed parapet walls, that's what they are, they are above the roof deck and they hide the stuff on the roof, and they provide a nice façade to the building. My testimony is it complies, it's appropriate, and I wouldn't change a thing.

Mr. Stern said Brian can you go to 30,000 feet? This is a stunningly beautiful building. But it's being put in a completely industrial warehouse area. It seems so out of context and discordant. What's the genesis? The owner is going to put his company there?

Mr. Flannery said yes. The officer is going to put his company there, he is going to take one of the floors of the building and lease the rest.

Mr. Pfeffer said I believe the applicant already has three of the floors leased, one is himself and two other companies are each taking a floor. It's a boutique building.

Mr. Flannery said maybe it will start a trend. I'm not used to defending having a building look too nice, it's like defending having too much parking. Item 2 on John's list was with respect to the entrance at the curve. Scott Kennel can testify on that.

Mr. Herzl said how many entrances do you have?

Mr. Flannery said three.

Mr. Herzl said the one right on the bend is a little dangerous.

Mr. Flannery said the applicant is amenable to leaving it to your professional to checking the sight distances during resolution compliance to see that we comply with AASHTO regulations, or if the Board wants to determine that particular entrance be right-in and right-out, the applicant is ok with that as well.

Mr. Herzl said ok. What's the one all the way down on the plan?

Mr. Flannery said that's across the street and past our property. John's first item was with respect to parking. Fortunately the applicant revised the plans to provide one per 250 sf. There are two sections in the Ordinance, in the 900 section under the M-1 zone it says one per 400 sf or one per employee, whichever is greater. Section 800 of the ordinance says for office use, one per 250 sf. This plan complies with 1 per 250 sf, which is what the Board's Engineer said should be provided. Providing one per 250 sf we comply with the most restrictive part of the Ordinance. If we talk about number of employees, with what's anticipated, it would be closer to 1 per 400 sf. On each 10,000 sf floor we would expect approximately 30 employees per floor, times four would be 120, and we are providing more than that. Since we are providing one per 250, I don't think the number of employees is applicable.

Mr. Herzl said that's big offices, 30 employees per 10,000 sf.

Mr. Flannery said yes, the applicant is taking one of the floors and that's what he has. You can see it's a beautiful office building, and that's what's anticipated.

Mr. Stern said is one per 250 also 4 per thousand?

Mr. Flannery said yes it is.

Mr. Stern said that's pretty good.

Mr. Flannery said that section of the Ordinance was recently revised at the request of the Planning Board and adopted by the Committee that anywhere in Lakewood where you have general office that it be done at one per 250 or 4 per thousand. I think we are past those items, I'd like to get back to this particular application. As indicated, the existing is 32,000 sf of office and 80,000 sf of warehouse. And we are proposing just under 100,000 sf of new office building.

Mr. Herzl said any warehouse?

Mr. Flannery said the existing warehouse is staying, we've provided parking for that. We've provided 35 in accordance with the ordinance. We've provided parking for the existing office at 128, which is one per 250 sf, and we've provided 152 spaces for the new office, which is one per 250 sf. The one thing I'd like to point out on submission waivers, one of the items listed was Ocean County Planning Board. County Planning Board approval is not required, we aren't on a County road and we aren't doing an acre of new impervious. We don't impact any County facilities. My testimony is we are exempt and during resolution compliance we would provide proof of that. The other waivers that are requested, as Terry indicated sufficient information is provided for the Board.

Mr. Herzl said going back to the parking, what Terry brought up, your parking by the loading dock. Can you show us that?

Mr. Flannery said that is on the southeast side of the building. A-2 that was submitted does show a turning movement for a truck. There are parking spaces on the southerly side of that, that if there was a truck in there they'd have trouble getting in or out. What we'd like to do is provide that kind of detail to the Board engineer as part of resolution compliance, and to the extent we convince him that there is not a conflict we'd like it to remain as-is. The alternative, if the Board feels more comfortable, is we could designate those as employee spaces.

Mr. Herzl said what size truck are we talking about?

Mr. Flannery said tractor trailers. A full-sized truck. The plan submitted does show that there is room for a truck to pull in, pull up, and back in without impacting the parking spaces. As it gets down towards the end of the building, depending on where the driver pulls, it might be close for some of these spaces. We are indicating if the Board is not comfortable in letting the owner of the facility coordinating this so that the traffic works, in our opinion we are providing more parking than is actually needed.

Mr. Herzl said at one per 250, how much do you need and how much are you providing?

Mr. Flannery said the answer to both questions is 315. 315 are required and 315 are provided at a ratio of 1 per 250 for offices.

Mr. Stern said the 315, are you building 315 parking spaces? Or are you utilizing some of the existing stalls?

Mr. Flannery said the existing parking, there's a lot of existing already. We are reconfiguring the parking and adding a building. 315 is some of the existing parking plus some of the new parking.

Mr. Stern said you didn't answer the question. You've got an existing parking lot. And now you're building a building that needs 315 parking spots. How many new parking stalls are you building as part of this complex.

Mr. Flannery said the existing site has 326 parking spaces. So we are reconfiguring the spaces. This isn't a vacant site, this is a virtually fully developed site that is well over-parked. The existing facility needs 163 spaces and they have 326. What this applicant is doing is putting a building in there to match the parking needs with the building to be provided.

Mrs. Morris said Mr. Stern, I have put on the screen the existing conditions plan showing what is there now.

Mr. Stern said so my Google satellite view is wrong. Where your cursor is is all grass.

Mr. Flannery said yes, the applicant, since that picture was taken, had expanded the parking.

Mr. Stern said why.

Mr. Flannery said because he could. More parking is always good.

Mr. Stern said you don't spend that kind of money without a reason. And now you're saying you want to build a building on top of that parking.

Mr. Flannery said it's a by-right application, and there is a property that's suited for this development and we are building what's appropriate for the site.

Mr. Stern said why build a new parking lot?

Mr. Flannery said I understand the question and I don't have the answer.

Mr. Pfeffer said the previous parking lot was done for a previous owner that had other plans that didn't work out, and then this applicant purchased the property. Mr. Pfeffer said it's a valid question, but it was a previous owner.

Mr. Stern said ok.

Mr. Jackson said what were their plans?

Mr. Pfeffer said I don't know, it was a previous owner who sold the building.

Mr. Vogt said I want to clarify a couple things. The 315 you are citing, that's the proposed demand for the full site in total, correct?

Mr. Flannery said that is correct.

Mr. Vogt said did you answer John's question about the number of employees?

Mr. Flannery said yes. For a building of this nature, there would be 30 employees per floor or 120 employees which is less than the parking required per section 8 of the Ordinance.

Mr. Vogt said does that satisfy you John?

Mr. Jackson said I just asked because it's part of the criteria, Mr. Flannery is the architect, he's the one with knowledge. If the Board accepts his testimony... I did the math, it's like 130 sf per person. I guess if you figure in lobbies, bathrooms, hallways, conference rooms, the Board will have to determine if they accept Mr. Flannery's testimony. I think Mr. Stern thought that 4 per thousand is reasonable.

Mr. Flannery said if I continue, we are on zoning. Item 1 indicates that both the warehouse and general offices are permitted uses. It's a conforming use. Item 2 indicates the front yard setback, and we did get a determination from the Industrial Commission approving that so we don't need a variance for that. The parking we've gone over in detail, we comply with the most stringent at 315 parking spaces total. As far as truck circulation, there was a plan prepared that shows the turning movements. If there is tweaking needed to satisfy RVE we would do that as part of resolution compliance. Item 4 in the report talks about sidewalks towards the trash enclosure, and we would agree to add sidewalks to allow pedestrian access to the trash enclosure.

Mr. Herzl said where are we putting the trash enclosure and how many do you have.

Mr. Flannery said we have one, on the middle easterly side of the site.

Mr. Herzl said is that enough? It's a big property.

Mr. Flannery said yes it is. It's general office use which doesn't generate trash at the same rate as others. And it's all private pick up, so if they have to pick it up every day, the owner of the site will have to have it picked up every day. These are upscale type of offices. They usually have a cleaning crew that on their way out puts it where it belongs. I wanted to add in addition to the pedestrian sidewalk to the trash enclosure, we would add the Sabel sidewalk out to the Oberlin Avenue in order to provide access to the building so that pedestrians have sidewalk and crosswalks in order to safely transverse the site. Speaking of sidewalks, one of the design waivers in the plan is for sidewalks along Oberlin. We don't feel it's necessary, but you guys feel differently at times. If the Board says sidewalks, we will add the sidewalks. Item 5 on the report is with respect to signs. We aren't requesting any sign variances, the signs will comply with the Ordinance. Item 6 says we should talk about the positive and negative criteria. This is a by-right application, we really don't have to talk about positive and negative criteria. It's a use that is permitted and we are providing facilities in accordance with the Ordinance requirements. Design waivers in the report, the sidewalk along Oberlin which I indicated and we will be guided by the Board's decision on that. The provision of a 25' buffer. This is an existing developed site. Most of the area is developed. And we are proposing a building in the front which doesn't infringe on that perimeter, consistent with the existing site. Providing shade trees on Oberlin Avenue. There are existing trees, we think they satisfy it. But if the Board or the Board Engineer wants us to plant some trees, we will plant some trees. Hopefully we don't have to take some down in order to plant new ones. Terry's report does note that trees exist along the frontage. The last design waiver is with respect to curb along the existing parking area. We are respectfully asking not to change it, the existing site works very well. A lot of times with the new drainage rules it tends to encourage, in areas where it works, to let the water run off the pavement and into a vegetated area.

Mr. Vogt said Brian, did you address the height definition that Mr. Jackson brought up?

Mr. Flannery said yes I did.

Mr. Herzl said with the parapet, there are no rooms behind it, it's strictly for decoration?

Mr. Flannery said yes. There is a flat roof behind it, and it's open to the sky. It's there for architectural feature to look nice.

Mr. Herzl said and you won't close it up and use it as a room.

Mr. Flannery said correct.

Mr. Pfeffer said that can be a condition of the approval.

Mr. Flannery said the plans show that. If we were to close that in and use that, we'd be creating a variance situation. We are happy to have it as a condition of approval but it's unneeded.

Mr. Garfield said going back to the entrance and exits, would it be possible to move that one on the curve down about 200'? That would take it off the curve.

Mr. Flannery said that would be on someone else's property.

Mr. Garfield said your property doesn't run straight along the property line?

Mr. Flannery said I assume you're referring to the most easterly driveway where we had indicated potentially a right-in and right-out. The entrance is maybe 50' from the property corner and I don't think that's going to increase any visibility.

Mr. Garfield said bring it down about 220'. If you go out there into that parking lot.

Mr. Flannery said we have two other entrances in the parking lot. When you're saying bring it down, I don't know...

Mr. Garfield said what about that parking lot in front?

Mr. Herzl said could you show all the three entrances and the traffic circulation?

Mr. Flannery said in the westerly corner we have an entrance...

Mr. Jackson said direct your comments to the screen on the computer.

Mr. Flannery said if we look on the screen to the left, we can call that A, that's the most westerly entrance. That provides two-way entrance and egress from the parking lot for any employees. If you proceed easterly to the middle entrance, we will call that B, that's also a two-way full movement entrance and exit that allows another possibility for employees. Proceeding more to the right is the final one, which we will call C, which gets the truck traffic and allows employees or visitors in and out as well. That's the one we are suggesting, if there is a concern for visibility, that as part of resolution compliance we provide details and maybe some limited clearing or something to allow a full access. Or we just limit it to right-in and right-out. In this location, that won't be an imposition and it would work fine.

Mr. Herzl said where would the trucks go, come in and leave then?

Mr. Flannery said they would come in from Cedarbridge, and then they could make a right turn into the site, they come out and make a right turn onto Oberlin and out to New Hampshire. County roads on both sides allow for easy circulation.

Mr. Garfield said it's still a hidden driveway.

Mr. Flannery said I don't know how it's going to be hidden, the curbs are there, you're on a road where the other driveways... Perhaps you're saying because it's on a curve... any truck coming knows the site, and they'll have to be coming from Cedarbridge and making a right into the facility. When they leave, there is plenty of visibility for anyone making a right out of that entrance. To the extent that there is vegetation blocking the site triangle, and site triangle easements were provided on the plan and my opinion is that there is sufficient visibility for full access. And Mr. Kennel is on the call as well.

Mr. Herzl said trucks are not going to be using the other two entrances, correct?

Mr. Flannery said that is correct.

Mr. Herzl said those are strictly for cars. And my opinion here is you need a right-in, right-out. And also by the end of the driveway, make it so they can't make a left turn. A traffic island.

Mr. Stern said yes, that's what we decided.

Mr. Flannery said what we would request would be to have mountable curbs, which is typical for an entrance like this. Because if the trucks hit the curb and ruin a tire, that's not a good thing. A mountable curb serves the same purpose. People drive over the full-faced curbs as well. It's a matter of getting responsible drivers, and you aren't going to have employees using this entrance, they'll know to use the others. So it's only truck drivers...

Mr. Herzl said your testimony before was that if you can't fit the trucks there it will be for employees only.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct.

Mr. Herzl said so if a tractor trailer comes to deliver something, they call the employee down to move their car?

Mr. Flannery said no the employee vehicles are not in the way of the truck. The problem arises if there's a truck there, and someone wants to move their vehicle out. By limiting it to employees, they will know when it is appropriate or inappropriate to stay there and they will have some flexibility in dealing with the deliveries. So the very few spaces would ...(static).

Mr. Herzl said should the Board approve it, we would need signage for employees only.

Mr. Pfeffer said no objection. Our testimony is we believe the turning movements work as it is. Brian is offering in the event the engineering office wants something more, we agree that it will be for employee parking. And the only entrance for the trucks will be right-in and right-out only.

Mr. Jackson brought up a Google aerial. He said Mr. Flannery, these driveways are all right where you propose them, in their current location, right?

Mr. Flannery said yes.

Mr. Jackson said this is New Hampshire and this is Cedarbridge. So you make a right out, you go to Cedarbridge.

Mr. Flannery said yes you come in one way, you go out the other way. And it's all signalized intersections around there.

Mr. Herzl said I think that works.

Mr. Flannery spoke but it was static-y.

Mr. Jackson asked about the speed limit on Oberlin.

Mr. Flannery said I assume something in the vicinity of 35, Scott Kennel may know that better. The rest of the comments in the report we would comply with the recommendations and satisfy Terry during resolution compliance. I'd like to testify with respect to the Master Plan of 2017, in the vision statement, it says encourage development and redevelopment based on smart growth planning principles. And this is certainly utilizing a site, providing a ratable that's going to be welcome in the Township. The Municipal Land Use Law, NJAC 40:55D2 under purposes of the act, says encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use of all lands in the State, in a manner which will promote public health, safety, morals, and general welfare, and this does that. It says to provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of uses and again this does that. That is my testimony.

Mr. Vogt said I want to comment, about modifying the entrance right-in, right-out. Brian recommended a mountable island. We agree with that recommendation, the other reason being that you don't want to hamper Township emergency vehicles, specifically fire, having to jump the island.

Mr. Stern said on page 6, number 2, it says the revised plans propose additional off-street parking throughout the site. Where is the off-street parking and why do we need it?

Mr. Flannery said all of the parking is off-street parking, and on-street parking is the parking we don't get to count.

Mr. Stern said so it's on site. Got it. I see a pool and playground in the back left of the warehouse building. What's that?

Mr. Flannery said that is the adjoining school.

Mr. Isaacson said it's part of the Lakewood Cheder.

Mr. Stern said so 475 Oberlin does not have a school.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct. The school is at 725 Vassar.

Mr. Stern said it sounds like this complies but it looks a little squishy to me. Terry, are you confident we have parking for all of these uses?

Mr. Vogt said I am confident that they have the total number based upon the more restrictive one per 250 sf requirement. Our concern was the circulation, it showed there are a handful of spaces on the right side of the site that they appear to go against. We are going to work with the applicant's engineer during compliance to either resolve those conflicts or worst case they are going to agree on scheduling use of those spaces so it doesn't conflict with truck movements.

Mr. Stern said you're saying those spaces aren't there now, we are going to be adding those?

Mr. Vogt said that's my understanding, and they show to be on the edge of some of the truck template movements. The applicant's engineer may still be fine-tuning that. Brian feels they can eliminate the conflicts outright, but the back up position would be, as they agreed, that they will coordinate the employees of those spaces if necessary during truck traffic.

Mr. Garfield said if this is an office building, why are 18 wheelers coming in?

Mr. Herzl said because there is a warehouse there also.

Mr. Stern said there are two uses.

Mr. Herzl said I have a question for Terry. Should they make the warehouse office space, then the parking calculation goes up, right?

Mr. Vogt said I will rely on Scott shaking his head and assume yes.

Mr. Flannery said we cannot convert the warehouse to office because it won't comply.

Mr. Herzl said basically it will be as we approve it, you can't convert more warehouse space to office.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct.

Mr. Stern said those parking spots in the L in the lower right-hand corner, that means to get the ratio we need for the new four story office building people are going to be walking from those far spots?

Mr. Flannery said that would not be my testimony, because we have the existing building that already needs parking. So the people in the existing building can park there, and the people in the new building can park up front.

Mr. Stern said I'd just be concerned with an office person or visitor having to park all the way back there. There's no sidewalk and they're playing a game of chicken with 18 wheelers.

Mr. Vogt said can you add some crosswalks and signage to improve the pedestrian access on this property.

Mr. Pfeffer said yes, and we would work with you during resolution compliance to put as much as needed.

Mr. Isaacson said I think Brian referred to them as the Sabel sidewalks.

Mr. Herzl said I think we should hear from Mr. Kennel.

Mr. Kennel said talking about the parking, it's my opinion it is well distributed. Where you have close to 200 spaces on the west side or the front along Oberlin, where we determined that the office building requires 120 spaces. For the Board's benefit, on the south side of the lot, that's where the existing office is. So they are going to utilize those back spaces and won't be competing with each other. The office uses are separated. As said earlier, the 4 per thousand is an industry standard and in my opinion is adequate to support the parking needs. As it relates to the access, what I would suggest in addition to the right-in, right-out...

Mr. Herzl said do you feel that's the right thing to do?

Mr. Kennel said I feel it's appropriate given the road network we have. Again the truck activity is much lower than the passenger vehicles. But I think we should also consider trimming the vegetation and tree growth that has built up over time to optimize the sight lines along that location.

Mr. Herzl said are there any wetlands over there?

Mr. Kennel said the wetlands are beyond the property frontage.

Mr. Herzl said so everything could be removed.

Mr. Kennel said along our frontage, yes, and that would enhance sight lines of that driveway.

Mr. Stern said so LSTA does not have designated parking? That lot in the upper left-hand corner, that's free for all?

Mr. Kennel said that's my understanding, but that will be up to the users and tenants.

Mr. Stern said and the building next to it is a home improvement store, is it quasi-retail?

Mr. Kennel said I'm not aware.

Mr. Herzl said yes, I was there.

Mr. Stern said are the requirements for retail parking different than warehouse?

Mr. Kennel said my understanding is yes, but there are occasions where you have tile stores or things of that nature where it is a warehouse with limited retail activity. I can't qualify how much is there but it's not the activity you'd see at a grocery store.

Mr. Herzl said he's correct. It's not a supermarket with cars all the time. It's like plumbing supply or a tile store where you have some workers come and go, it's mainly a warehouse with limited retail. That's how it looks to me. I would like to hear the Board's opinion about sidewalks around the property. I think in the past we've asked for sidewalks or for meandering asphalt pathways. Do you have an opinion about that Mr. Stern?

Mr. Stern said I'm the parking guy, we need Mr. Sabel to chime in.

Mr. Sabel had previously arrived and said we need sidewalk.

Mr. Isaacson said the only think I see, I know we had an applicant previously with a right-in, right-out, where the triangle to force traffic was reinforced with bollards or something.

Mr. Herzl said the testimony from the applicant was it has to be a mountable curb. If we put the bollards a truck won't be able to make that turn.

Mr. Isaacson said they can't make the entrance wider?

Mr. Jackson said the question is, is there anything you can do to force the trucks to make a right, with some kind of improvement... I don't know if it would be curbing or something. Mr. Flannery or Mr. Vogt, do you know of any technique?

Mr. Kennel said well first off a physical island that encourages the proper traffic movement. We can also put signs that say no left turns and allow Title 39.

Mr. Herzl said Scott, this is Lakewood. Signs don't help.

Mr. Flannery said but we are looking at truck drivers that have CDL licenses, and if they lose that they lose their job. I don't think we are looking at the employees or passenger vehicles. The trucks in this particular case, with no left turn signs, I think will be responsible drivers.

Mr. Jackson said my question though is, is there any way to put a hardscape improvement into the ground that would really encourage it more so than a sign.

Mr. Isaacson said it's a school neighborhood, there's a school right across the street. I would want to reinforce that as much as possible.

Mr. Jackson said I guess that question is for Terry. Is there any kind of improvement that could be put into the curbing or the roadway shape so that it would be more difficult to make the left?

Mr. Vogt said my favorite improvement, and I say this only half-jokingly, is to have someone write a few tickets. In my experience that's the best human behavior modification. You have to balance accessibility. I agree with what Brian said, the truckers that are going to be using this won't want to damage their vehicles. I don't think they're going to be the problem. I think if you have a problem, it's going to be employees and regular cars.

Mr. Pfeffer said and we are agreeing to do the mountable curbing in that area and raise the center of the mountable curb if possible as well.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Isaacson, what was your opinion about sidewalks?

Mr. Isaacson said I always like sidewalks.

Mr. Garfield said yes sidewalks.

Mr. Meyer said sidewalks.

Mr. Pfeffer said the applicant is agreeing to whatever the Board wants, walking path, meandering path, sidewalks... we have no objection.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mrs. Morris said I received one public comment in objection to this application and asking it to be carried prior to the last public hearing. He did for the record submit a letter withdrawing any objection to the application at this time. So I do not have anything from the public. I don't have any new emails, so I just recommend that we confirm there is no one on who would like to speak.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Jackson do you have any emails?

Mr. Jackson said no I don't see any.

Mr. Herzl said is there anybody who wants to speak, and no one came forward. Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mr. Meyer made a motion to approve with the proper sidewalks, signage, and right-in, right-out on the far entrance, and parking by the loading docks for employee only. Mr. Stern seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Rennert had left before roll call, and Mr. Sabel arrived after the start of the application and was not included in the roll call.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

- **SP 2338, Congregation Lutzk, Block 251 Lot 16.01, New Egypt Road** – request to modify approved building addition

Mrs. Morris said this is a correspondence request to modify a previously-approved building addition.

Mr. Vogt said we don't have anything new. We've looked at the request and had a discussion with the applicant as well as staff. As the Board may recall, there was an approval for this application, I believe we signed off on compliance in 2020. What they want to do, as I understand it, is a slight exceedance of the Township requirement that a site plan is required if you add more than 1500 sf of building. It's my understanding that the applicant does not want to do a

formal amended application since they've gone through compliance already. In looking at the request, you're going to have minor changes to things like circulation, grading, drainage that, if the Board is comfortable, we can handle internally under an amended compliance procedure.

Mr. Jackson said I took a look at this and the question was whether this could be reviewed administratively by the Board, although it is with notice to the neighbors. So the only real thing that we are missing is the formality and the fees associated with a site plan application. So this was on notice. The applicant had an approval. The building would have been a certain size, plus 1500 sf. The addition they want in the back would be the same square footage as they were approved for, with the 1500 sf that they are entitled to. So the question is whether they have to pay the fees and everything or if this is a relatively nominal change that the Board can do in this format. And I stress that I do think this is a material change but since there is notice, I don't think there is anything wrong with doing it in this format.

Mr. Herzl said I want to add that Terry just testified that drainage, circulation, and parking there is basically no changes or if there are any it's minor and he could address it. If there are no major changes to the plan, in my personal opinion we can listen to it.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer appeared on behalf of the applicant. He said I think Terry and John described the request.

Mr. Glenn Lines, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed.

Mrs. Morris said I'm sorry, for clarity Mr. Meyer, Mr. Isaacson, Mr. Flancbaum have stepped down on this application. Sitting on this application are Mr. Garfield, Mr. Stern, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Fuentes, and Mr. Sabel.

Mr. Lines said when this was approved by the Board a year or two ago there was an addition being built on the front of the building. The scope of that addition has been reduced and part of the existing building has been removed. Basically what we were approved to do, they built 697 sf less than what was approved. What we'd like to do now is build a 2,192 sf addition which is 1500 sf plus the 697, so we are at 5 sf less than that would have been permitted.

Mr. Herzl said what's with the parking?

Mr. Lines said we are going to have to restripe one of the handicapped spaces...

Mr. Herzl said how many parking spaces do you have in total?

Mr. Lines said there's... we require 27, but if you've ever been to the site there is a very large parking area, gravel and dirt.

Mr. Herzl said you have 27.

Mr. Lines said we have more than that, we have probably close to 100 parking spaces.

Mr. Herzl said no I see right now you have 25, there's 4, 15, and 6... 25.

Mr. Lines said correct.

Mr. Herzl said oh you have two over there. So basically you are totally conforming with the parking, even on the new size.

Mr. Lines said correct. We were approved for everything that is on the plan.

Mr. Lines said septic... anything moving or changing?

Mr. Lines said no.

Mr. Herzl said you are just changing the configuration of the addition, but everything else stays the same.

Mr. Lines said yes.

Mr. Sabel said I'm looking for a plan that shows the sidewalk around the building. I know we approved it before, but I think there was some sort of sidewalk initially on that space. I want to make sure there is a normal continuation. Maybe Ally has to bring it up.

Mrs. Morris said I have on the screen the approved plan, I don't see any sidewalk.

Mr. Lines said the sidewalk that was shown on that plan was for access from the handicapped parking space to the building.

Mrs. Morris said there are two in the front.

Mr. Herzl said and where is the main entrance to the building?

Mr. Lines said in the front of the building.

Mr. Vogt said there also appears to be diagonal sidewalk from the parking area, it looks like it was access to a handicapped ramp. So you have several points of pedestrian access. Mr. Sabel, if you want more that could be incorporated into the amended approval of the concept that we would review in compliance.

Mr. Herzl said the main parking lot, where you have 15 and 6, that should somehow connect to the walkway for people walking into the building. Is that what you're saying Mr. Sabel?

Mr. Vogt said Glenn can correct me if I'm wrong, where you show those 6 spaces you have Belgian block curb. It may be possible to run sidewalk behind that curb.

Mr. Lines said yes. We can put a walkway in.

Mr. Vogt said you could almost connect to what is shown as an existing walk at the top of the property, to an adjoining structure.

Mr. Herzl said there is a 6' high fence.

Mr. Vogt said oh ok, that's fine. But you could definitely put some form of sidewalk, even if it's an asphalt path, behind that Belgian block curb.

Mr. Lines said we will provide an access to those 21 parking spaces on the left side of the building, to the front or the rear of the building. I don't want to bring people in the back door if that's not appropriate. I think most of the access if from the front of the building.

Mr. Sabel said I think today is a very good example of sidewalk, because of all the snow and mud. It's important to have pavement from parking lot to the building. I would like to see something.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Lines, you agree to put it in?

Mr. Lines said yes.

Mr. Sabel said what was the final on sidewalk in the front? I think it was 4' in or something? We had a discussion initially, does anyone remember?

Mrs. Morris said I don't recall but this is the plan that was reviewed and approved by Terry...

Mr. Sabel said I remember some sort of discussion about it.

Mr. Vogt said it's a County road, they don't have curbing. They'd make you put it outside of the future cartway, but even if you held the existing cartway, in the absence of curbing you would have to be at least 10 feet off the cartway, which means that it may conflict with those trees.

Mr. Sabel said I think sidewalk is more important than trees.

Mr. Herzl said safety comes before trees.

Mr. Lines said this is really the last property in Lakewood. There is on house next door, and then you're in to Jackson.

Mr. Herzl said Lakewood-New Egypt is a busy street.

Mr. Lines said yes and there are sidewalks to the east of this.

Mr. Stern said what is the current approved square footage and what will be the new total square footage.

Mr. Lines said we didn't put that on this plan. In total it's a 1500 sf increase over what was previously approved.

Mr. Stern said it looks like about 5200 and 4500, that's about 10,000. So we are adding 1500 sf to the existing 10,000 sf building. Is that approximately right?

Mr. Lines said probably approximately.

Mr. Stern said my concern is the precedent we are beginning to set. About 6-8 weeks ago we spent an hour and a half, maybe two hours on a letter that came in. I don't like this idea that we can sneak things in.

Mr. Pfeffer said we aren't sneaking anything in. We submitted it...

Mr. Jackson said the context of this is that they are entitled to put a 1500 sf addition on to the building without Board approval. That's exempt. Anybody with a shul could go and add 1500 sf onto it as long as it doesn't trigger any variances. It doesn't go to the Board.

Mr. Herzl said it goes to the Zoning Officer.

Mr. Jackson said by analogy, if you have a house and you met the setbacks and want to add a sunroom, you can. So that's the 1500 sf of this. What they did is they got an approval and from their approval they did not build approximately 300 sf of their approval. So what they want to do now is add 1800 sf in the back instead of 1500 sf. Technically they are not entitled to it, but had they put the 300 sf on in the front and 1500 in the back, it's a net equivalent of what they were approved by the Board or what they were approved by the Board and entitled to do by law. So the sequence would have been they could build the hold building, and then added on 1500 sf. Since they had a spare 200, 300 sf I thought the Board in its discretion, with notice to the neighbors, if it didn't change drainage, parking, site circulation, etc. Mr. Vogt indicated that he does not believe that it does. So my thought was they are winding up with the same square footage that they are entitled to, they just reconfigured it a little bit. I thought that was something the Board might want to allow to be done in this format.

Mr. Stern said we just determined they are adding 1500 sf net.

Mr. Jackson said but they are entitled to add the 1500 sf.

Mr. Stern said so for my education, what would prevent them from coming back in 6 months and adding another 1500 sf, and another 1500 sf?

Mr. Jackson said if they have a creeping subdivision type of policy, but I don't think they can add 1500 sf beyond an approved plan. Maybe Ms. Morris can...

Mr. Herzl said I don't think the Zoning Officer would sign it off. You don't have parking for it. If you trigger a variance you have to come to a Board. Right now they have enough parking for it so it's totally conforming. Is that correct?

Mrs. Morris said Bruce first off to answer your question unfortunately these exemptions don't go to the Zoning Officer. She won't review them so I review them. As far as I know, there is nothing that limits the number of 1500 sf additions you can come in for, one after the other, assuming that none of those additions trigger any type of variance with respect to lot coverage or parking or setbacks. If they are all conforming, theoretically they could get 1500 sf approved administratively, and then come back next year and get 1500 sf approved administratively.

Mr. Stern said so it's not an unfounded concern.

Mrs. Morris said it's not, but it is permitted. And on a site like this I would imagine they'd hit a parking issue before they put in another 1500 sf because the parking is based on the bais medrash area, so for them to increase the size of everything else but leave the bais medrash the size that it is, that wouldn't really accomplish much for the shul.

Mr. Sabel said it would. It could. Extra rooms, a study, a kollel...

Mrs. Morris said working within the constraints of the Ordinance, they would be permitted to do an additional 1500 sf addition again.

Mr. Sabel the original approval was 697 sf, and they added 1500 to that which I guess they are entitled to. Your question is regarding another 1500 soon, and therefore at least as far as circulation I would like to see normal sidewalk and to see how that works.

Mr. Stern said this is one of the busiest minyan factories in Lakewood. And that's a wonderful thing. I know sometimes there are people backed up on Lakewood New-Egypt Road, waiting to turn left to get in here. And the traffic backs up a lot.

Mr. Pfeffer said we are here for a 1799 sf addition. We had a previous approved addition and are looking to add the 1799 sf. The Board has some concerns about walkways and sidewalks and Glenn has indicated he can work with Terry to figure out the best locations for those, we have no objections to that. I don't know what more we can do here, it's as straightforward as it can be. This is everything. We are here before you tonight, this is the application, it's legal, it's correct, it's right, we aren't asking for any variances, and I ask that the Board approve it with the condition that we work with Terry to do the walking paths and the sidewalks.

Mr. Herzl said your other choice is to build the 300 originally, and then going to the Zoning Officer for less than 1500. To your credit, I think you're not asking for any variance, you're giving enough parking. Technically if you came to the full Board you would get it approved because it's basically by-right.

Mr. Sabel said but we would get to see how the circulation works. Now we don't. I think it's important on a shul of this manner to be able to see before it gets approved. I think Mr. Stern has concern for that also.

Mr. Pfeffer said it's a 1,799 sf addition. It's the same thing you've seen last time.

Mr. Sabel said and it's not working until now, we are trying to make it a little better.

Mr. Stern said and it's getting 15% bigger.

Mr. Pfeffer said and we are in agreement that should the Board approve it, that Glenn would work with Terry in his office to make sure that it meets Terry's requirements.

Mr. Sabel said not Terry and not Glenn daven in the shul, they don't know what's going on.

Mr. Stern said this shul creates a traffic mess. I'm going to vote for this with a full heart, but we don't want correspondence to be the new method of getting things in without thorough vetting. Let's not make this the new method.

Mr. Herzl said I agree. Terry do you feel comfortable that you can work out a circulation plan with Mr. Lines?

Mr. Vogt said due to the amount of relatively minor additions, yes. It's not going to reinvent the wheel. You aren't looking at anything major other than the pedestrian accesses that we discussed here.

Mr. Herzl said you heard the Board loud and clear, they would like walkways around the building to connect all the parking lots to the building.

Mr. Vogt said I have one question. We had discussion back and forth relative to sidewalk on the frontage. I expressed a concern that to put that in you have to be more than 10' away from the County cartway. Does the Board want the engineer to explore that, even if it means taking out trees.

Mr. Sabel said can they put asphalt?

Mr. Vogt said you can do but like I said the County is very strict with regards to sidewalk along County roads that do not have curbing.

Mr. Herzl said my personal opinion is safety comes before trees. We have to hear what the Board says, I'm just one vote.

Site Plan Exemption for an office building (located primarily in Jackson Township)

Mrs. Morris said this is a request for a site plan exemption for an office building. The reason for the request for an exemption instead of site plan is that most of the site and all of the building is located in Jackson, and the applicant will need a site plan approval from them. The Board does have the ability under our Ordinance to grant an exemption under circumstances they find appropriate. I will let Mr. Jackson or the applicant's professionals answer any questions you may have on that.

Mr. Herzl said as far as I recall I voted on this plan originally. It looks familiar.

Mr. Jackson said based on our discussions preparing for the meeting, you recalled this site and Ms. Morris found a resolution from 2006. I spoke with Mr. Pfeffer and I'll let him clarify, but I don't think they are pursuing that application and I think the parcels are different.

Mr. Herzl said so it's a total new application.

Mr. Jackson said that's my understanding. Also while this is site plan exempt, the Board still has to pass on it and the site traffic does go in to Lakewood so I think they should address number of users, hours, and all that.

Mr. Herzl said can you explain how it works if we approve it and Jackson doesn't.

Mr. Jackson said unless one town's governing body agrees to delegate the decision to the other town, both towns have to approve. It's kinda like getting County approval and getting Planning Board approval, you need both. I'm not aware of a contract deferring this approval to either town. So my presumption is that the applicant will need Jackson Township Planning or Zoning Board approval as well as Lakewood approval.

Mr. Herzl said basically for Lakewood it's just a few parking spaces and an access way. We aren't approving the whole building.

Mr. Jackson said you would be approving the structures and components that are in Lakewood Township. I don't know how it works with inspections and bonding and that kind of thing. But in so doing, I think it's the Board's duty and prerogative to look at the entire site because you can't understand the parking and circulation and impact on traffic unless you understand the rest of the site as well. Bear in mind likely the rest of it will have to be scrutinized by a Jackson land use board as well.

Mr. Herzl said and ultimately we are only approving the parking on the left bottom triangle.

Mr. Jackson said yes.

Mr. Vogt said per our letter dated December 28th, 2020, page 2, no waivers are requested. The property fully complies with Lakewood B-1 zoning requirements per our interpretation including parking. We just ask the applicant's professionals to testify as to the overall use, hours of operation, etc. The site improvements other than the one access drive and a small portion of the parking will be within Jackson. We commented that the intensity of the site appears to trigger Major Development according to the stormwater rule. It will have to be designed accordingly and reviewed in Jackson, that's where the stormwater facilities are being proposed. A maintenance plan will have to be filed. Applicant should testify regarding anticipated traffic. We had a comment on the circulation plan that is self-explanatory. The access to the property is subject to Ocean County review. We note an easement along the frontage. And we have a caveat that if the Board feels it's necessary, we could review specific items of the approval if necessary

in lieu of a full new application. Finally, the applicant is required to get any and all outside agency approvals. Other than getting testimony, this one is pretty straightforward.

Mr. Pfeffer said as indicated previously, a portion of this property had been before the Board in 2006. It was for even less of an area in Lakewood than you are looking at today. After that approval the project sat dormant. Recently the applicant has acquired some additional land and we are back now with this new application that includes other parcels that were not part of the original application.

Mr. Herzl said if I recall, we gave you the approval, you went to Jackson, then you came back to us because Jackson didn't like something. The buffer maybe.

Mr. Pfeffer said back in 2006 I was only given the task of handling the hearing. We did get it approved here. This is a new application, similar though. It's an office building with only an entrance way and some parking in Lakewood. Should the Board approve this, we still have to go to Jackson and get their approval in addition to the County approval as well.

Mr. Flannery appeared and was affirmed. He said this application is for two small lots in Lakewood that will contain parking for a facility being built in Jackson. The Jackson Planning Board does need to review and approve this also. Due to the limited nature of the impact on Lakewood on this .29 acres of property, and the access is from a County road so we need County approval as well...

Mr. Herzl said the main entrance is on Lakewood property. The traffic is on Lakewood property.

Mr. Flannery said we have two entrances, one in Lakewood and one in Jackson. As far as which would be the main, there will be traffic traveling in both towns. All on County Line Road. The prior approval was for a 3.14 acre site. We've added a couple lots and are now at 4.165 acres. The prior application was .14 acre in Lakewood and we are now at .92. We submitted as exhibits sheet 2 of the tax maps. We did submit the entire set of plans so the Lakewood Board can see. It was a set of 19 sheets. A-2 is sheet 4, which is the site plan, and it shows the 40,000 sf office. The prior office was a total of 28,000. In order to accommodate that, the Lakewood parking criteria is 1 per 250 sf as you heard on the prior application. For Jackson they require 1 per 200 sf, or 5 per thousand. The Lakewood criteria at 4 per thousand is a pretty typical standard. Jackson's is more stringent than most. The plan does provide...

Mr. Herzl said this plan goes along with the Jackson regulations.

Mr. Flannery said yes, it has parking at one per 189 sf. So there is sufficient parking. All of the details, the stormwater, everything Terry mentioned needs to get reviewed. The County approval needs to be done. We are building 49 parking spaces in Lakewood to accommodate this site and we are asking for an exemption from the Board for going through this whole process where the Board would review the property in Jackson which is going to get reviewed very stringently by Jackson as well.

Mr. Herzl said is there any variance on parking.

Mr. Flannery said there is no variance on parking on the entire property. In Lakewood it is in a B-1 zone which allows general office. It's a typical office that is occupied from 8am to 6pm. There's nothing unique about it. The report indicates under zoning that no bulk variance is required. None is required in Jackson either. Terry asked to describe the facility, and it's a two story general office building. All site improvements will be privately owned. No medical office and it will be private pick up (static). It's pretty simple, a non-intrusive use in Lakewood.

Mr. Herzl said are there any waivers for parking in the setbacks or... pertaining to Lakewood, you're totally no variances, no waivers.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct.

Mr. Sabel said this application is beautiful. Sidewalks around the building, two entrances, enough parking, no waivers requested, no zoning issues. I wish we could get an application like this in Lakewood. Does County Line have a divider here?

Mr. Flannery said yes. It's right-in, right-out only.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mrs. Morris said I did not receive any emails on this application.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mr. Sabel made a motion to approve and Mr. Isaacson seconded. Mr. Garfield nay, the rest were in favor.

Mr. Fuentes and Mr. Sabel left.

4. CORRESPONDENCE

- **SD 2088A, Ephraim Steinberg, Block 11.04 Lots 10.03 & 10.04, Gudz Road** – request to change a previously approved rear setback to a side setback

Mrs. Morris said this is a request to modify a previously approved rear yard setback variance from approximately 15.5' to 15'.

Mr. Herzl said so it's a difference of half a foot?

Mrs. Morris said yes.

Mr. Vogt said this is really procedural. If the Board doesn't have any issues, we don't. We just felt it's something the Board had to act upon in light of the previous bulk variance relief.

Mr. Herzl said thank you. Any Board members have any questions?

There were none.

Mr. Herzl said I think half a foot is de minimus.

Mrs. Morris said it is a variance, you may need testimony on the record for this.

Mr. Lines was affirmed and said as pointed out, originally they granted a variance for 15.5' rear yard setback. We are just asking for another half a foot. I don't know why it was subdivided with two rears, it has a rear on the north, and then there was another rear on the right. I think it should have been presented with one front, one rear, and everything else a side.

Mr. Herzl said because of the shape of the house on an angle, technically if you look at it you could see two rears. Even if you considered it a rear, the Board gave you a variance to 15 and a half, so just put it on the record you are asking to take it down to 15.

Mr. Lines said I agree. I think the change is de minimus. There are wetlands, to the north of this property. So we will not have any development directly on the other side of the property line.

Mr. Herzl said are you changing anything else?

Mr. Lines said no that is all.

Mr. Herzl asked if there were any comments from the public.

Mrs. Morris said she did not receive any emails on this.

The Board was in unanimous agreement that the change to the approval was non-material and did not require amended Board approval.

- 5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
- 6. APPROVAL OF BILLS**
- 7. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Ally Morris
Planning Board Recording Secretary