

## 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. Stern, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert were present.

Mr. Dave Magno, P.E., P.P. was sworn.

## 3. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

1. **SP 2390AA Simcha Gellerman**  
420 Cross Street Block 524.36, Lot 9  
Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to convert a house to a school

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

2. **SD 2446 Chasidei Skulen de Lakewood**  
555 & 559 Park Avenue Block 238, Lots 8 & 10  
Minor Subdivision to create 4 lots

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

3. **SD 2439 Shlomo Wilner**  
303 Albert Ave & Charity Tull Ave Block 827, Lots 4 & 5  
Minor Subdivision to create 3 lots

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

## 4. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **SD 2448 Daniel Roth**  
6 Miller Road Block 11.04, Lot 9  
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Mr. Magno said this is a minor subdivision at the intersection of Miller Road and Lakewood-New Egypt Road. The minor subdivision is sort of complex, so we will break it down into four segments. We will discuss the submission waivers first, then the zoning, then the design waivers, and lastly the plan review comments before we open it up to the public. As far as submission waivers, three are needed. Topography of the site, contours of the site to determine the natural drainage of the land, and a Letter of Interpretation from the NJDEP. There are wetlands on the site and the project is at the intersection of two County highways, so that's why it's somewhat complex. The

topography on the site is partial. It's not going into the woods or wetlands, we'll need testimony to make sure that the site will not be disturbed there, and if that's the case that will be fine. We will also need testimony from Mr. Kociuba on the status of the LOI.

Mr. Herzl said so I think we're going to wait and not ask for a motion yet. Do you want to continue your report and then he'll give his testimony one he gets sworn in?

Mr. Magno said going on to zoning, it looks to me that in order to get the required parking on the corner Lot, 9.01, he may have to take additional land from Lot 9.02 which would mean it would have to be narrower than what is shown on the plan.

Mr. Rennert said can I cut in? Ally, the plans are not on the drive.

Mrs. Morris said that may have been an oversight, I'm sorry about that. I am adding them to the drive now and they are uploading.

Mr. Magno said so looking at the development plan, the issue is you can see the new right-of-way lines for the widening of Miller and Whitesville Road. What happened was the existing house that's going to remain on the corner Lot 9.01, the driveway isn't going to work. I think it can work if the lot line is moved over to the right and increases the width variance on 9.02 and a different shaped house is proposed. Really, we need testimony from Joe.

Mr. Herzl said it's a tremendous piece of property.

Mr. Magno said it goes back quite a ways and a lot of it is restricted by wetlands and a buffer.

Mr. Herzl said it's interesting, such a big piece of property, to have variances.

Mr. Magno said as far as design waivers, there's a couple that are required. Sidewalk. Our recommendation is to put sidewalk on Miller Road up to the intersection, and no sidewalk on Whitesville because Whitesville is undeveloped in that area with not only the wetlands but existing trees. So we don't think the sidewalk is going to serve any purpose going in on Whitesville. The same issue with the street trees, there's no sense putting street trees on Whitesville because the woods are there and we recommend just putting street trees along Miller. We will wait on the review comments until after Joe is sworn in.

Mr. Joseph Kociuba, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Kociuba, the first thing we did not address any waivers. I need you to address that and then any variances on the plan.

Mr. Kociuba said the waivers are for topography, which is basically on the very western portion of the property inside the wetlands, because our surveyor couldn't get down into the wetter portion. But we provide topography on 90-95% of the lot. I don't feel that it's necessary to provide the rest of the topography, everything drains towards the wetlands. You can see on your screen at the top left of the property, that's about the only area that we are not providing topography. The submission waiver being requested is certainly warranted.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Magno, is that ok with you?

Mr. Magno said Mr. Kociuba, so basically you are going to keep your disturbance outside of the wetlands buffer?

Mr. Kociuba said right, we aren't proposing any disturbance in the buffer or wetlands. We're not permitted to unless we get a DEP permit.

Mr. Magno said that's fine. What's the status of your Letter of Interpretation? Obviously the wetlands have been delineated.

Mr. Kociuba said they've been delineated. We aren't disturbing anything in the wetlands or wetland buffer, so we are requesting a waiver from providing an LOI. We can certainly provide a report from our environmental consultant that identifies it, but we're not proposing anything anywhere near the wetlands. We are merely subdividing the property and developing the right-hand side, which you can see on the screen all that is up by Miller Road much further from the wetlands.

Mr. Magno said I don't have a problem with not having the LOI as a submission item, however you're going to need it in order for us to sign off on the plat and file it.

Mr. Kociuba said ok well it would be our requirement to demonstrate that we are not in the wetlands and we've obviously demonstrated that and our environmental consultant can confirm that. I'm not aware of anything in the map filing law that says we have to delineate.

Mr. Magno said I don't think we can sign off on it either, but for hearing purposes I'm ok with you moving along.

Mr. Flancbaum said it's common for us to say we can listen to and approve applications subject to the applicant providing a Letter of Interpretation. Joe and Dave have more experience than I do, but I've never heard an applicant say well we have wetlands but we're not going to do an LOI. Sometimes there's a question of whether there is wetlands and they provide a presence or absence letter, and we accept that, but I've never heard of an applicant saying there is wetlands but no LOI. But that's just me, Joe and Dave have a lot more experience than I do.

Mr. Herzl said for hearing purposes we can go ahead. They won't get resolution compliance until they have the LOI.

Mr. Jackson said the whole idea of the LOI is it shows what we're approving and where the lines are. I think what Mr. Flancbaum said is you can't evaluate the case without knowing for sure where the wetlands are.

Mr. Flancbaum said what I'm saying is that we've heard applications in the past saying it's subject to the LOI, if the LOI delineates the wetlands differently and if it makes a difference to the approval then we would hear it again. But this applicant is saying we have wetlands but we're not going to give an LOI.

Mr. Kociuba said in many of those cases we are developing much closer to the wetlands and we need to delineate them to make sure that we are not going to affect them. In this case, we are subdividing off the property and only developing the adjacent lot in the front much further from the wetlands.

Mr. Flancbaum said have you verified the wetlands?

Mr. Kociuba said our environmental consultant has field verified the wetlands, yes. That's where the line we show came from.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Kociuba, if Mr. Magno is the one who has to sign off, he's not going to sign it without an LOI, we are going in circles, right?

Mr. Kociuba said if he is identifying the Ordinance or the Map Filing Law that requires that we do it, we certainly will. My point is that it's a time and expense that the client wasn't anticipating and we aren't developing anything near the wetlands that would necessitate it. But if there's something that I'm missing...

Mr. Herzl said I'm ok with going forward for hearing purposes only, subject to getting an LOI or subject to if there's any issue, your approval doesn't stand.

Mr. Flancbaum said I'm with you Chairman. I'm ok to hear it subject to the LOI. I just think when there is wetlands on the property, if we're going to start saying we don't need an LOI, that's... We're treading on light water there. I have no problem hearing it subject to the LOI.

Mr. Herzl said ok. I would ask for a motion to go along with the engineer's recommendation. So for the LOI it's only for hearing purposes, and the other one we are waiving. Topography.

A motion was made and seconded to support the submission waiver requests in accordance with the engineer's recommendations. All were in favor.

Mr. Kociuba said so there were two questions in the design waivers. The parking, at the existing house, again that driveway exists, that house exists, we aren't proposing any changes there. Right now it has a four bedroom house, we have room for three parking stalls. The parking stalls shown on our plan are shifted slightly to the right, because of a site triangle shown with the County. The site triangle is as a result of some, in some cases substantial, dedication to the County. That property line along Whitesville has been shifted back substantially, in fact close to 17 feet. And shifted back 5 feet along the front. So when we add that site triangle in, those parking stalls are slightly in there. We can redesign that to provide some asphalt on the right side of the home...

Mr. Herzl said how many parking spaces can you get total on the existing house?

Mr. Kociuba said right now there is plenty of room because if you look at the front of the property, from the right-of-way line to the curb, and there's no sidewalk there, there's substantial room, you could fit 5 or 6 cars in that driveway today without issue.

Mr. Herzl said ok. I think we need minimum four.

Mr. Kociuba said there's four bedrooms, and there is no unit in the basement, so technically it only requires 3.

Mr. Herzl said but you could easily put four on this property.

Mr. Kociuba said we can easily fit four in the driveway.

Mr. Magno said let's clarify. So then how many parking spaces are you proposing to the Board, because that matters because the County is involved in this approval and they are going to have a say on what you do with the driveway. So are you requesting three spaces be approved or four spaces?

Mr. Kociuba said we are requesting three which is required by Ordinance and there is no variance needed for that.

Mr. Magno said thank you.

Mr. Herzl said please continue.

Mr. Kociuba said we agree with Mr. Magno that as far as sidewalks, we would provide along Miller Road but that sidewalk on Whitesville is not preferred in this location and that due to the wetlands a majority of the sidewalk would not be permitted to be constructed.

Mr. Rennert said can I go back to the parking? How many are you putting in for the proposed dwelling?

Mr. Kociuba said we are showing three stalls there as well.

Mr. Rennert said is there going to be a basement apartment?

Mr. Kociuba said that would be subject to plot plan review. So if we proposed more than 4 bedrooms, we have to provide 4 parking spots.

Mr. Rennert said is there going to be a basement apartment in this house?

Mr. Kociuba said it's an R-12 home, so we are anticipating a single-family home.

Mr. Rennert said I'm only comfortable with this application if we get four parking spots. Do you have a place for a fourth?

Mr. Kociuba said we are showing a fourth in the garage currently. We have no objection to providing four parking spots.

Mr. Herzl said ok. Mr. Rennert, every house in Lakewood has a basement that's going to be rented out. We have to account for that. So I think you are correct, we need four on this one.

Mr. Kociuba said understood. As far as variances are concerned, both lots are oversized. It's an R-12 zone. Lot 9.01 is 17,748. Lot 9.02, 20,330. Due to the location of the existing home, we do create a lot width variance on 9.02 at 77.54 feet. The lot is 80' wide at the frontage of the street, where 90 is required at the front setback. Obviously it narrows. And if you look at the rear of the property obviously it gets much wider. The average of the property is well above 90. But in the front area it does get narrow due to the existing geometry and the existing home.

Mr. Stern said for my edification, do we count the wetlands as part of the calculation? New Lot 9.02...

Mr. Kociuba said the Ordinance does not preclude wetlands from the lot area.

Mr. Herzl said for lot coverage under area, but on the lot width you still need a variance.

Mr. Kociuba said lot width we require a variance, yes.

Mr. Stern said so the R-12, really you're using wetlands to say you're over that.

Mr. Kociuba said correct, just like any other property. You still own that land, pay taxes on it, you just can't develop that portion of it. You can enjoy the area, especially the buffers are in many cases lawn areas, you can utilize it you just can't put any proposed improvements in it.

Mr. Flancbaum said can you show us on the map where the applicant is requesting a waiver for sidewalks?

Mr. Herzl said he said on Whitesville Road, not on Miller.

Mr. Kociuba said the frontage in the wooded area on Whitesville, that's where we're requesting.

Mr. Flancbaum said and that's towards Gudz?

Mr. Herzl said where do the wetlands start, the buffer? I think on that bend they should have sidewalks.

Mr. Flancbaum said is that Whitesville going towards Gudz?

Mr. Kociuba said yes. There's a stream and a headwall that there's no way to cross, to provide sidewalk through that area. So if we continued sidewalk, we don't have an objection to continuing for that first 20 feet until we hit the wetland buffer. Right in front of the woods. We could certainly turn it at the corner and essentially end it at that inlet. But any further through there is going to be a sidewalk to nowhere because of the headwall, and the stream, there's no ability to continue sidewalk through that area.

Mr. Herzl said my opinion is that it's a dangerous corner, on the bend we should have sidewalks.

Mr. Flancbaum said I lost connection where Joe said that the sidewalk would be going nowhere.

Mr. Herzl said that he said he is willing to make the sidewalk from Miller, across the bend, going up to where the wetland buffer is. Ally is showing you.

Mr. Kociuba said well up to the tree line. I don't think the extra ten feet is worth clearing out some of the woods there. So we would take it right up to the tree line.

Mr. Herzl said I don't want people walking on that corner without a sidewalk.

Mr. Kociuba said understood. The width variance is the only variance being requested, everything else is totally conforming.

Mr. Herzl said ok. Mr. Roth if he wants to speak has to be sworn in.

Mr. Daniel Roth appeared and was affirmed. He said for whatever it's worth, the plan is to take that proposed side lot and incorporate it into my property. I don't plan on building on it. I don't know if that's relevant, it's a lot less of an issue because I'm just incorporating that into the adjacent property. I'm not building a dwelling on it.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Kociuba...

Mr. Kociuba said Mr. Roth is indicating that where we are showing the proposed dwelling, it's not his plan to construct that and instead proposed Lot 9.02 would be merged with his lot immediately to the east and therefore it would not create a new home on that location. His lot is Lot 15.01.

Mr. Roth said there is one existing house there, and the intention is I'm just trying to absorb that middle lot into my property without building a dwelling.

Mr. Stern said so why do you have a plan for that?

Mr. Roth said that was the original plan, and then I bought the property from the person who was subdividing. I was told that I have to do a subdivision this way and then later I can consolidate the lots.

Mr. Stern said oh you can't join it until you separate it.

Mr. Roth said exactly.

Mr. Herzl said I'm totally lost.

Mr. Stern said he owns the house to the right. He wants merely to add that piece of dirt to his lot, and not build a house. To do that, he's got to subdivide what he's got.

Mr. Kociuba said we are now stipulating that the proposed dwelling shown on the development plan, we will create the lot, but it will be merged with Lot 15.01, and therefore there will be no improvements and then no impact on the wetlands. There would be no improvements proposed at all, only the sidewalk requirements that the Board had.

Mr. Herzl said one house...

Mr. Flancbaum said so we aren't approving a subdivision with a dwelling on a new lot. You want a subdivision and then you want to consolidate this new lot with your existing property.

Mr. Roth said that's the plan, I don't know if it's better for ownership to have it approved as a potential building lot, so it's been proposed as such, but my intention is not to build on that new lot. That proposed dwelling that you see on the picture is not planned to be built.

Mr. Herzl said but you're showing two separate lots right now.

Mr. Roth said right, because I'm subdividing. The eventual plan is that the lot on the corner will be separated, and the lot to the right will be incorporated into the 15.01 lot that is to the right of the picture.

Mr. Kociuba said you're stipulating that you're not proposing to construct that dwelling and there's not improvements on the lot other than the sidewalk. Is that correct?

Mr. Roth said that's correct.

Mr. Flancbaum said that's the application then? A subdivision and a consolidation?

Mr. Magno said I think I understand what Mr. Roth wants to do, but you don't have an application and plan before you for what he just told us he wants to do.

Mr. Roth said I'm going to leave the proposal as it is so we can carry on.

Mr. Magno said that's fine.

Mr. Herzl asked for questions from the Board.

Mr. Garfield said I want to clarify with the sidewalks, to have in there as much as we can. I know the street well and you see people walking all the time. In busy times there's cars parked on both sides and you have to walk around

them. Some areas if you can't put the sidewalks at least maybe they can have the County stripe where the people are parking now to open that up for walking.

Mr. Herzl said they said they would put the sidewalks up to the point where the trees are.

Mr. Garfield said can we recommend the County or the Town, whatever... cars are parking along those runoff areas. And I'd like to see that be striped because kids cannot walk there. They have to walk between cars.

Mr. Herzl said ok. Any Board members have any questions?

Mr. Rennert said I think it's simpler to approve this as a subdivision without a proposed dwelling, without looking at four spots. The way Mr. Roth is asking us to do it is as a subdivision. And if he ever wants to build on this lot he has to submit to the building department and conform to the Township Ordinances. I think it's better to do it that way than to figure out where he's going to stick a fourth parking spot.

Mr. Herzl said I think if he wants to consolidate he doesn't have to come back to the Board.

Mr. Rennert said it's none of our business what he wants to do after he gets the subdivision approved. However he consolidates his lots, however he does that, it's not our business. It's one less headache to figure out how to fit a fourth parking spot that he's never going to use.

Mr. Herzl said and if he's not doing the dwelling there, it's a variance-free application basically.

Mr. Rennert said right, I don't see why we don't just approve it without that dwelling there.

Mr. Jackson said that's Mr. Rennert's comments, and the Board may go in that direction, but that to me means that he abandons the footprints on the plans. I don't know if the footprints have setback relief, etc. Mr. Magno, would the concept Mr. Rennert's proposing erase the footprints that are shown?

Mr. Magno said understand that this is just an improvement plan, it's not a plot plan. What the Board is really acting on is whether to grant a width variance on Lot 9.02. And if it's going to be built upon, how many parking spaces would that lot provide. The improvement plan shows that he's not looking for any setback variances. A couple last questions to Joe. Right now, the existing house out there is on septic. Water and sewer are both going to be extended to Lot 9.01 no matter what, correct?

Mr. Kociuba said correct.

Mr. Magno said there is a billboard on Lot 9.01, what's the status of that?

Mr. Kociuba said it's on Lot 9.01 but the County has required we dedicate the land to them, so it will be on County land, not on this property. It will be up to the County what happens at that point.

Mr. Magno said I'm not sure if the Board has any say about it then. It will be in the County right-of-way.

Mr. Kociuba said there is no use variance associated with the billboard because it will be in the County right-of-way.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.



Mrs. Morris said yes, before I read that I want to clarify. A lot of times these things come as a surprise to the applicant. I want to advise him while he's here that since he may not be proposing any construction, it's very likely that the Township Engineer will require that he provide a bond for that sidewalk before he signs off on the subdivision plat. With no house being constructed and no CO to hold up, there's no way to ensure that sidewalk gets installed. I have one public comment from Mr. Moshe Zeines.

Hi.

I urge the board to require sidewalk along both Miller Road and Lkwd New Egypt / Whitesville.

There are several other approvals in the area along Lkwd New Egypt and they all have sidewalks included. This application also needs sidewalks.

Thanks!

Moshe Zeines

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mr. Rennert made a motion to approve including the lot width variance, just the subdivision without any improvement on the property, and to include the sidewalk up to the wooded area. Mr. Stern seconded. All were in favor.

Mr. Kociuba said I want to clarify with Dave, obviously if there's no improvements there's no LOI required.

Mr. Magno said I disagree. You got a submission waiver granted but that doesn't relieve you from providing it. You still have to get it.

Mr. Jackson said and that's a condition of the subdivision, you don't create the lots until you submit that.

Mr. Magno said the DEP has to agree with your line.

Mr. Kociuba said ok.

**2. SD 2455AO Shimon Soloff**

Providence Avenue Block 1048, Lots 1.01-1.10, 5.01, 5.02, & 10  
Oak Street Administrative Minor Subdivision to create 12 lots

Mrs. Morris said I've asked Mr. Flannery to give an overview of the Ordinance that permits administrative minor subdivisions in the Oak Street area.

Mr. Magno said just one comment before Mr. Flannery testifies, if I am correct I believe this is a minor subdivision that's replacing a previous subdivision on this block. Maybe he can confirm that.

Mr. Brian Flannery, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed. He said any of the Board members who have been on a while recall the Oak Street Administrative Minors, and it was a special Ordinance passed that said because of the CAFRA permit that was received by the Township, any blocks in that area that have improvements that are being built in accordance with those plans, and all these improvements have been built in accordance with those plans, if they were subdividing into lots that did not require any relief, that it can be

done as an administrative minor. We put them on the agenda for the Board to look at and we used to do like 8 or 9 at a meeting. And the only question was any variances and are they in accordance with the CAFRA, and the answer to both those questions is yes. The answer to Dave's question is this property was subdivided previously.

Mr. Herzl said Mr. Flannery you said yes there are variances?

Mr. Flannery said no the answer to both questions is yes, we comply. There's no variances, it's a variance-free application and all of the improvements were constructed in accordance with the Oak Street CAFRA permit. The improvements are all in place, these are lots sitting on a street. In answer to Dave's question, there were 12 lots previously, the property was subdivided by the Krupnicks who owned all but one little piece. They subdivided out 11 conforming lots, but it was kind of messy. The current application purchased that little piece that was still there and now he's subdividing it into a straightforward application. So it's a by-right application. My opinion is the Board doesn't even need to approve the application because the Ordinance says it can be approved administratively, but since this is hopefully the last one the Board will be seeing, whether you vote or not is up to you.

Mr. Herzl said Dave, do you agree there are no variances?

Mr. Magno said correct. It is totally conforming.

Mr. Jackson said my recollection is slightly different from Mr. Flannery as to the purpose of these hearings. I thought it was so that the Board could review to make certain that they are compliant, and it does require a vote. It's an affirmation that it was reviewed and that the Board agrees that it's appropriate for administrative approval.

Mr. Herzl said I agree with you. The Board wanted to see it and to make sure that there's no variances. That's why I asked Mr. Magno to make sure and he agreed. He asked for questions from the Board and there were none. He opened to the public.

Mrs. Morris said I have public comment from Mr. Zeines again.

Hi Planning Board members.

Unfortunately I am sick in bed with a fever for the past few days but I am still joining you from a safe distance 😊.

I am writing regarding SD 2455AO.

This application involves Turin Avenue, Providence Avenue, Ostend Avenue, and a private road.

Upon approval of Lakewood Police Department's Traffic Safety Unit, I would like to recommend that the board condition its approval on the applicant installing the following:

1. Retro-reflective street name signs along all these corners, and that street name signs be installed on top of the stop signs to ensure they do not get blocked by other traffic control signs.
2. Crosswalks along all corners
3. Stop bars, as well as double yellow solid lines painted 50 feet from the stop bars

4. Yellow paint on the curbs 50 feet from the stop signs and 25 feet from the crosswalks (across from the stop signs) as well as No Parking signs along these areas, to guide drivers not to park too close to the corners.

5. Brite Sticks on each stop sign. A photo of a stop sign with a Brite stick is attached here. Lakewood Public Works has been going around town installing these brite Sticks to brighten up stop signs, so this should be the new standard as well for all new developments.

6. Finally, it is my assumption that the applicant expects school buses to travel on the private roadway. This is a narrow road and parking must be eliminated at least on one side and probably on both sides. I would like the applicant to discuss this with Traffic Safety. I would also like to point out to the board that the only way to really ensure that buses can use this road is if the township applies Title 39 to this road. I do not know whether or not Title 39 has been applied here. I would like the board to condition the application on the applicant discussing with Traffic Safety whether or not to apply Title 39 along this private roadway.

Very truly yours,

Moshe Zeines

Mrs. Morris said I have one more comment from the same person.

Hi.

I forgot to ask in my previous email.

Are we getting a sidewalk along the private roadway?

This private roadway is adjacent to a trailer shul on Turin Avenue (for which, by the way, the applicant agreed to discuss with the township about eliminating parking on one side along Turin Avenue, but no documents exist proving this ever happened).

In either case, people will definitely walk along the private roadway in order to get to the shul on Turin.

I urge the board to require a sidewalk along this road.

Thank you!

Moshe Zeines

Mr. Flannery said first of all it's not a private roadway, it's a Township-owned alley. It was done in accordance with the CAFRA plan, and these improvements are already in. This is a minor subdivision to take 12 lots and subdivide them into 12 lots. All of Mr. Zeines' comments are very nice, and the extent that's the standard in the Township, that's a good thing to do. But in this case the improvements are already in. They were done in accordance with a plan that was designed at the direction of the Township. I appreciate all of his comments but it's my opinion that they don't apply to a minor subdivision and Title 39 is not need because it's a Township-owned alley done in accordance with the plan the Township designed.

Mr. Herzl said what does it mean a Township -owned alley and are buses going to be going down it?

Mr. Flannery said the buses are welcome to go down the alley, that will be up to the Board of Education or the busing company. My recommendation is that the buses don't go there. It's an 18-foot-wide alley which is in accordance with the RSIS standards. The options that the Township had when they did this would be to put a cul-de-sac at the end of Providence and Turin, and then school buses would not and could not go down because of the cul-de-sacs. The Township, during the design process, because they owned the adjoining land, decided the alley was a better option because it provides vehicles options to go there. Again it's a conforming minor subdivision that follows strictly the administrative approval Ordinance that was passed specifically for this area by the Township. So it's my opinion that conditions on this particular application would be inappropriate.

Mr. Herzl said thank you and he closed to the public. He asked for questions, and seeing none he asked for a motion.

Mr. Flancbaum made a motion to approve as presented and Mr. Garfield 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