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. Sabel, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert, and Mr. Isaacson were present.

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

3. CORRESPONDENCE

• SD 2010 Joseph Lipschitz, Block 782.01, Lots 2, 5, 11, & 16.01, Route 9 – Request to modify sidewalk along Route 9

Mrs. Morris said Mr. Pfeffer contacted me this afternoon. He was hired to represent this applicant but is not available tonight. He asked that the Board carry it to the next meeting, which is December 22, 2020.

Mr. Jackson made the announcement to carry this item with no further notice.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

1. SD 2426 David Holtz

1466 & 1484 Read Place
Minor Subdivision to create five lots

Block 855.03, Lots 17 & 20

Mr. Vogt said from our January 6th review, there is a submission waiver for proof of submission to Ocean County Planning Board. We support the waiver, because their approval will be required prior to filing of the map.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the submission waiver in accordance with the Board Engineer's recommendations. Mr. Garfield said no, the rest were in favor.

Mr. Vogt said continuing under zoning, variance relief includes lot area on several properties as well as lot widths. Also for side yard setback for an existing dwelling, and potentially for existing accessory structures on Lot 20.02. We need testimony on number 6, on whether a variance is required for the number of parking spaces.

Mr. Glenn Lines, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed. He said the application is to subdivide two existing lots on Read Place into five new single family home lots. While the map shows the existing house and pool, a decision has been made to remove those, so we are not requesting the variances under items number 4, 5, and 6. Those are no longer applicable. Any new house on the property will have the required number of parking spaces based on the number of bedrooms, and that will be reviewed at the time we submit for building permits.

Mr. Herzl said 4, 5, and 6 are only regarding variances for the existing house?

Mr. Lines said yes.

Mr. Lines said so we are left with the variances under 2 and 3.

Mr. Lines said correct. So the variances under item 3, that's the easier to provide testimony on. If you look at a tax map of the area, across the street on Read Place most of those are 75' wide lots. There's 8 75' wide lots and one 20' wide flag lot. The remaining four lots up until Lot 22, so from 26 to 23, those can also be subdivided possibly in the future and they would yield 75' wide lots with 22,000 square feet. Our lots are 4 at 75' wide and one lot at 86' wide, and that was just because that gave us the most room for the existing house.

Mr. Herzl said how wide do you need.

Mr. Lines said 100', it's an R-20. If you look at the rest of the tax map, basically none of the lots on this block are 100' wide. There's 86', 96.5', 93'. They're all in the mid to high 90's with the exception of the last lot out on New Hampshire. Actually, that last lot next to New Hampshire has actually been subdivided in half also, so that's two 95's or something. So generally, in this area, 75' wide lots are the norm on these blocks. The whole block gets narrower to the south, past Towers, so the lots are wider. But 75' wide lots are not uncommon on Read Place. Driving down Read Place, you won't notice any difference when these lots are subdivided because they'll look just like the ones across the street and will fit in nicely.

Mr. Herzl said how deep are your lots?

Mr. Line said our lots are 230', and across the street they are 300' deep. That's where the area variances come in. So we did some research on the neighborhood, just north of Read and Albert, there are a number of undersized lots that have been subdivided in the R-20 area. Those two lots on the corner, Lots 4 and 5, were recently subdivided into 3 16,875 sf lots. Then there's Lots 1.01, 1.02, and 1.03, at 16,875, and then 14,625 for Lot 5.01, and 5.02 and 5.03 are 18,000 sf. That's all R-20. We've got 17,250 sf for four of our lots, and 19,780 for the last one. There's also another subdivision about 3 blocks south of us, Block 855.06, Lot 32.01 is 14,533.75 and 32.02 is 14,514.50. All together that's ten other undersized lots in the neighborhood and those were all subdivided recently within the last few years.

Mr. Herzl said do you have any front or side yard setbacks? Any other variances besides the width and the area?

Mr. Lines said no. The houses will be built with conforming side yard setbacks.

Mr. Herzl said is there anything in the report that you don't agree with?

Mr. Lines said no.

Mr. Herzl said you are putting up curb and sidewalks?

Mr. Lines said we are putting curb and sidewalks.

Mr. Herzl said they are all single-family?

Mr. Lines said yes.

Mrs. Morris said since it seems to have come up last minute, if that house all the way on the left is not remaining, are you still keeping that one lot a little larger than the others or are you intending to split them all evenly?

Mr. Lines said no, the intention is to keep that one larger.

Mr. Garfield said I would prefer that the lots be equal. There's a very small distance between the houses, and it would give them more of a feeling of living there and not being in an apartment.

Mr. Herzl said if you make it equal, you may be adding a foot to each side of each house.

Mr. Lines said it would be 2 to 3 feet. It really isn't much, because the setbacks don't change. If you give someone a 78' wide lot, they're going to build 53' wide house.

Mr. Herzl said you don't have 3' per house. You have 11' total. It's 75 to 86, it's 11.

Mr. Lines said right, 11', if you split it up it's slightly over 2'.

Mr. Herzl said per house, that's a foot on each side.

Mr. Lines said you are correct.

Mr. Sabel asked if they remove the house, when is that done?

Mr. Lines said I believe it's being removed now, it may have been removed already. Probably before we file the map.

Mr. Herzl said it has to, because they aren't asking for any variances.

Mrs. Morris said it will either have to be down before we sign the map for filing, or they would have to provide a bond for its removal.

Mr. Sabel said would the applicant be ok putting a sidewalk from the basement entrance to the front, not including the driveway? A separate, independent, concrete sidewalk.

Mr. Isaacson said does the Board feel that adds curb appeal?

Mr. David Holtz, the applicant, appeared and was affirmed. He said if the Board feels that adds to the aesthetics, I'm prepared to do that.

Mr. Herzl said not so much for aesthetics as for safety.

Mr. Sabel said I think it's important.

Mr. Holtz said you're saying to where the basement entrance will be, it should be paved?

Mr. Sabel said yes, separate, not including the driveway because if someone has 4 cars there, there is no where to walk.

Mr. Holtz said understood.

Mr. Herzl said Glenn, do you have the room?

Mr. Lines said we have 10 and 15' required side yard setbacks, we have the space.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Sabel also just said that he wants window well covers. It's a safety issue.

Mr. Sabel said the metal ones, not the plastic.

Mr. Garfield said this will have a porch in the rear, correct?

Mr. Lines said yes the houses will have decks in the rear.

Mr. Herzl said it's 230' long, each property. As big as they make this house, I think there's plenty of room for a deck without violating the setback.

Mr. Garfield said from the house it's 20' to the setback.

Mr. Jackson said that's the building envelope.

Mr. Lines said the houses in this neighborhood generally are 50' back from the front. We normally have to put a septic in the front of the rear. So let's say it's 50' back, the house is another 50', the deck is going to be 15', that's 115'. The lot is 230. That only gets us halfway through the lot with the front yard, house, and a deck. I can assure you there will be no issue with the decks being too close to the property line.

Mr. Jackson said would you agree to a uniform front yard setback at a certain distance? You could build anywhere within the building envelope, would you agree as a condition to have a uniform frontage on those houses to give some kind of balance? I had experience with a subdivision where every body was upset, because they got the subdivision and then they put the house all the way against the back setback. And that put the house in everyone else's back yard and they have an enormous front yard. In some places that's appropriate, but I want to put that out there as a tool that the Board has. You can require that the front setback be uniform or at a certain distance, and that the house not be all the way against the back lot line.

Mr. Lines said if you look at the aerial, you can see the newer house to the right of our subdivision. That's a new home. See the big clearing in the back yard? That's where the septic system is going to go. And then the well has to be 100' away, so it will be in the front yard. What happens in this area, once the precedent is set, if you don't follow it, it's impossible to fit everything in. I can't put a well in the backyard next to that septic next door because I can't get the required health department separation. So whatever the first guy on the block does, everybody has to be that way. So there's really no way to put a house all the way to the rear, it just doesn't work with well and septic.

Mr. Herzl asked if he agrees with everything else in the report.

Mr. Lines said yes. The one comment, number 14, we will do whatever the Township requires as far as road repair., when the houses are built. There's a whole ordinance on that. We are only going to have two small excavations in the street for the gas, we aren't digging up for sewer or anything like that.

Mr. Vogt said we are ok with that if the condition in the resolution indicates that restoration is to the satisfaction of the Lakewood Engineering Department.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mrs. Morris said I have 8 comments, I'm not sure if Mr. Jackson reviewed them.

Mr. Herzl said if it's repetitious...

Mr. Jackson said my recollection is that they were all positive.

Mrs. Morris said yes, and some are logged in to the meeting. We should see if they want to speak or have their comment read, we can't do both.

Mr. Herzl said is there any opposition?

Mrs. Morris said no.

Mr. Jackson said they were all in support of the application. I'm not getting the sense that the Board is going to deny this application. The letters are all part of the record, they were up on the screen and available to the public. If you're satisfied with that, there's no need to read them individually if the Board is going to do what I think it's going to do.

Mr. Hillel Hertz appeared and was affirmed. He said I live on the block, closer to Albert. My lot is 75 wide, I've lived here for 5 or 6 years. 75 wide is definitely wide enough for my family and my neighbors. I think having another 5 lots approved would be a very big enhancement to the neighborhood. That part of the block is not very built up, it's dangerous, scary, it doesn't look nice. I think the size of the lot, 75 by 230, is very big. Mine happens to be 75 by 300, but the rest, the back 70 feet I don't do anything with that so I don't see a difference to 230. I think if we don't get this approved, there might be a risk of selling to a school or something and that would be detrimental to all of us. We see that around the corner on East Spruce, and no one wants to live on that block. All the other blocks in this neighborhood are beautiful with lots of houses, and we want more houses on our block. I hope this gets approved.

Mr. Herzl said all the other emails we read them and put them in the record, they're all the same. They want this to be approved.

Mr. Jackson said I just got an email from Mr. Moshe Zeines. He said last time the applicant agreed to put in an advanced drainage system due to all the flooding in that area. Can we get an enhanced drainage system in this case? So I would ask that to Mr. Lines. First of all, do you think that's necessary to incorporate here Mr. Vogt?

Mr. Vogt said I'm not sure if there's any drainage problems in the area. What's typically done when there is no new road improvements, each single lot when they go for plot plan approval is responsible for installing dry wells to manage the drainage from the individual homes. I don't have enough information on the property as to whether there are existing drainage problems. Glenn, it's my understanding you aren't proposing any road improvements, correct?

Mr. Lines said we are widening about 4' as everybody does.

Mr. Vogt said if deemed necessary by the Engineering Department, would it be possible to put in a perforated pipe under portions of that?

Mr. Lines said yes.

Mr. Herzl said is there any other correspondence?

Mrs. Morris said no.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public and asked for a motion.

Mr. Sabel made a motion to approve the application based on the previous conditions outlined, including the sidewalk, the window well covers, and the restoration to the Engineering Department as Terry indicated for the drainage, and any road improvements as needed.

Mr. Rennert seconded. All were in favor.

- 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