

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. Sabel, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert were present.

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

3. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

1. **SP 2233 Zichron Chaim Inc.**
712 New Hampshire Ave & 1474 Oak St Block 1159.03, Lots 13 & 17
Extension of Minor Subdivision to realign lot lines

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

2. **SD 2452 Ahron Reiner**
300 Sampson Ave & 297 Dewey Ave Block 246, Lots 19 & 53.04
Minor Subdivision to realign lot lines

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

4. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **SP 2388 Congregation Ohel Elimelech**
Linden Avenue Block 189.01, Lots 189.01-189.03
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a synagogue and house

Mr. Vogt said from our October 5th review, top of page 3, submission waivers, the following have been identified: traffic study, proof of submission to Ocean County Planning Board, topo within 200', contours within 200', plans and profiles, an EIS. We recommend the waivers for reasons indicated in the letter for hearing purposes.

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

Mr. Vogt said on page 4 under zoning, our first comment we are going to get testimony shortly relative to the proposed rabbi's residence and whether it conforms with zoning. Bulk variances include side yard setback as well as aggregate, perimeter buffer relief is required although we know that they do have some buffers proposed. Finally, the applicant will have to testify relative to variances. There's an existing design waiver with respect to the right-of-way dedication that will have to be reaffirmed. Finally a design waiver is required from providing shade trees in

Linden Avenue. If feasible, we recommend that parking be pulled out of the easement such that street trees can be put in. I'm sure we'll get testimony on that shortly.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant. She said we are here for site plan approval to construct a new two-story shul with a basement and then a separate residence, as was pointed out, to serve as the rabbi's residence. This property was previously subdivided into three lots, one which would be a zero lot line duplex and one for a single-family lot. You'll note that tonight's applications both appear to be for shuls, and you'll probably ask why we need another shul. In this case, the Rabbi, Rabbi Ginsberg, is a well-known rabbi in Brooklyn. He came to visit his son about a year and a half ago, and realized that this area really had no place to pray. The neighbors begged him to open up a shul in the area. While he had no intention of relocating to Lakewood at the time, he saw a void. So they started praying in a house, and today there is literally standing room only. This has been a collaborative project between the Rabbi and the neighbors and actually all of the neighbors really wanted to attend this meeting. I told them that's not such a great idea, I think they emailed their support in to Ally instead. If this would have been a public hearing, we would have had a packed room. She had Mr. Brian Flannery, professional engineer and professional planner, affirmed.

Mr. Flannery said as indicated, this is a site plan for a shul on the subject property. It's a neighborhood where an additional shul is needed. Looking at Terry's report, the first comment with respect to zoning is that the shul and rabbi's residence is a permitted use. We've submitted architectural plans for both buildings. It's a small residential structure, a parish house, to provide a residence for the rabbi, so it is a conforming use. Item 2 in the report indicates that we have a retaining wall by the concrete patio, and the RVE opinion is that a variance is needed for that. My opinion would be different, but out of an abundance of caution I will provide the testimony to provide the variance relief for that. It's a patio, not a deck, and patios don't need to meet the setback. As you can see on the plan, there's a walk that goes around that provides access. It's going to function like a patio, not a deck, and I'll provide the information on why the Board should grant that variance even though I don't believe that technically a variance is required. The same refers to the combined side yard setback, because it was one of the sides because of the retaining wall. I will provide that as well. Item 4 is with respect to the 20' buffer, and this shul, similar to many others, is providing fencing and landscaping to meet the intent of that buffer requirement. But we do need that relief. With respect to the relief, the Master Plan of 2017 on page 7, the vision statement, says encourage growth and development in appropriate locations and consistent with established land uses. This is a residential neighborhood, there are other shuls in the neighborhood but there is a capacity issue. This is particularly well-suited, the property is next to the Board of Education property, it's on Linden Avenue, which is a thoroughfare to the Lakewood Highschool and Middle School. The architectural plans have been submitted, it's a beautiful shul that will fit nicely in the neighborhood, and obviously Lakewood encourages shuls to accommodate the needs of the people. The Municipal Land Use Law, NJAC 40:55D2 under purposes of the act, says encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands in the state, in a manner which will promote public health, safety, morals, and general welfare. And this promotes the general welfare of the neighborhood. The variances listed are C2 variances. We need to show it relates to a specific piece of property. The geometry of this property is not rectangular, it's next to a Board of Education property so as far as impact to the neighbors there is already a school there. The purpose of the MLUL will be advanced, which is what I read, and the variance can be granted without substantial detriment on the public good. The variances will not impair the intent of the zone plan and zoning ordinance because it's a technical-type variance. And the benefits outweigh the detriments. In my opinion, there are no detriments. So the Board can grant these variances in accordance with MLUL. Continuing in the report, there was a comment with respect to the Rabbi's residence. We have provided plans for it. It's a five-bedroom residence with an unfinished basement. The plan as indicated in the report had three parking spaces along the front. We will reorient them to add a stacked four parking spaces, so we will have four parking spaces for the residence, which certainly would accommodate the five-bedroom residence, even if at some point in the future a couple bedrooms are constructed in the basement. The Rabbi has no intent of doing that, but the Board always asks well what about in the future. We are providing 21 parking spaces for the shul where only 20 are required.

Item 3 in the report indicates adding some drainage in Linden, and we would agree to work that out with Terry during resolution compliance. Item 4 is with respect to parking spaces in the shade tree and utility easement, and it's my opinion that parking spaces as well as access drives and certain other things are not restricted from the easement. We have room to add a couple of shade trees, and it's my opinion that leaving the parking spaces in and having one extra space rather than be deficient one is a benefit.

Mr. Vogt said in reference to the comment about the shade trees, does the applicant agree to provide the trees where feasible during compliance?

Mr. Flannery said yes.

Mr. Herzl said what are you doing with garbage.

Mr. Flannery said there's a trash receptacle area and the cans would be rolled out to the street.

Mr. Garfield said some of the shuls in the area have 15, 18 garbage cans out and they really should have a dumpster.

Mr. Flannery said we could put a dumpster in, I think the aesthetics of a dumpster wouldn't be the best and I think that in order to do it we would probably lose a parking space. If the Board would prefer a dumpster...

Mr. Herzl said my only question is, if they're going to have a party over there and 30 cans outside, like Dave was saying.

Mr. Flannery said as Miriam indicated this isn't intended to have a lot of usage, it's intended to provide a need in the neighborhood and the usage accordingly can be handled by roll-out cans.

Mr. Herzl said my question is if we're going to lose any parking, and you're going to bring out a whole bunch of containers and you can't pull in because you're blocking the driveway.

Mr. Flannery said the Board certainly would have a better grasp on what would be the appropriate choice for the school, to eliminate one parking space and have a dumpster, because I've been out of Lakewood a while. But I've seen both situations work, dumpsters and cans. In this particular case we felt it was a smaller shul that was not going to be a minyan factory or anything of that nature, so we thought roll out cans would work. But we would defer to the Board.

Mr. Garfield said what about having the dumpster, and putting a nice white fence around it with doors.

Mr. Flannery said we would comply with whatever the Board decides.

Mr. Herzl said and you don't need a variance because you've already provided one additional parking space.

Mr. Flannery said that's correct.

Mr. Sabel said DPW's review letter says it's going to be private sanitation. So I think it's going to have to be a dumpster.

Mr. Flannery said this would be the first shul in Lakewood that I've done were it's private, but again if that's the case, if DPW says for some reason they aren't going to provide service, then we would need a dumpster and we would eliminate one space as part of resolution compliance.

Mr. Herzl said if you put a dumpster, can you show where and could a truck access it?

Mr. Flannery said if it's going to be private, it could be scheduled at a time we could have a roll-out container. Obviously we would eliminate one of the parking spaces and work with the Board Engineer to pick the space that works best. It would seem that one of the ones closer to the road would accommodate it better. But we defer to the Board and the Board Engineer's opinion as to where that should be. And it would be fenced with gates.

Mr. Herzl said why would DPW not accept it?

Mr. Sabel said referring to the letter, item number 14. I don't have the letter, the letter's not online. But as to the letter, item number 14 says this is going to be private.

Mr. Herzl said item 14 from Terry's report?

Mrs. Morris said Mr. Sabel, I did just email you the review letter per your request and put it up on the online drive. That was my oversight.

Mr. Herzl said item 14 from which letter? I don't see that.

Mr. Sabel said I'm just reading what DPW said. Per note number 14 on the plans, it's to be private.

Mr. Herzl said on this plan?

Mr. Sabel said I think regardless it should be a dumpster, so we have to plan accordingly. They're not going to walk 200 feet back and forth every time, they're just going to stay up front.

Mr. Vogt said I'm looking at the plans revised September 24th, and there is a note 13 that says solid waste and recycling to be collected by Lakewood DPW curbside. So there seems to be a difference in information.

Mr. Flannery said if it's the determination of the Board that we need a dumpster, we can do that as part of resolution compliance. The applicant is flexible either way, we've indicated our preference.

Mr. Herzl said would DPW pick it up?

Mr. Flannery said if DPW doesn't pick it up and we are required to have a dumpster, then...

Mrs. Morris put the DPW review letter on the screen.

Mr. Herzl said Brian can you explain this?

Mrs. Morris said I can say that typically when DPW reviews the plans, it's very early in the application project, prior to the plan review meeting. So there's a chance there was a mistake or the intention changed after that initial submission to DPW. Terry requires during resolution compliance a resubmission to DPW if there were changes.

Mr. Flannery said and we would resubmit to DPW with the dumpster location that it sounds like the Board is saying we need. I'm assuming DPW will pick it up and we'll make a dumpster that can accommodate DPW pick up or we'll have to have private pick up.

Mr. Herzl said ok.

Mr. Flannery said the one other item, I know there was a question with respect to a mikvah in the basement and the Ordinance requires additional parking if there are more than 5 changing rooms. There will be less than 5 changing rooms so no parking is needed for the mikvah in the basement.

Mr. Herzl said is there any simcha hall downstairs?

Mr. Flannery said there is no simcha hall.

Mr. Herzl said you're using it for a mikvah, and it's not for the public it's for the congregants.

Mr. Flannery said yes.

Mr. Garfield said it's about 16,000 sf according to the drawings here.

Mr. Herzl said 19,000.

Mr. Flannery said it's a 1,991 sf sanctuary, which is what the ordinance categorizes shuls based on. To put it into perspective, an 800 sf sanctuary requires no parking at all. So this is roughly twice as big. Compared to some of the larger shuls, it's my opinion it's on the smaller side. It's under 2,000, and the ordinance graduates them into under 800, under 2,000, under 3,000, over 3,000. So we are in the second category of shuls.

Mr. Garfield said two times nothing is still nothing. There's two entrances?

Mr. Herzl said there's only one, one is the rabbi's driveway.

Mr. Sabel said the dumpster is going to be fenced in?

Mr. Flannery said yes.

Mr. Garfield said I only see one driveway.

Mr. Herzl said there is one driveway for the house with four spaces, and one driveway for the synagogue.

Mr. Flannery said correct.

Mr. Garfield said is one driveway allowed?

Mr. Flannery said the driveways are in accordance with the ordinance.

Mr. Rennert said I saw in the comments, that there is some concern about some buffering from some neighbors. If you could talk to that. Secondly, the Rabbi said he is not going to be using the downstairs hall during weekdays. I want that to go into the resolution. Thirdly, my personal opinion is if this place isn't going to be used during the week I don't see why it cannot be DPW that does the pick up.

Mr. Flannery said with respect to buffering, we have one side as the Board of Education site and we are proposing a fence. There was an aerial that was submitted, to the south there are some duplexes and again we would provide a 6' fence. All of these neighbors have been noticed and certainly to the extent if they want something beyond what we've offered, the applicant is trying to be a good neighbor and provide a service to the neighborhood. We would do whatever is requested by the neighbors. But it's my testimony that the fence along the property line, and it indicates the fence on the plans, would comply with the intent of the ordinance.

Mr. Herzl said you testified there's no simcha hall here?

Mr. Flannery said there is a room in the basement, but it's for Shabbos. It's not intended to be a hall, we are not providing parking for that.

Mr. Herzl said it's not open to the public.

Mr. Flannery said correct.

Mr. Stern said Brian, the secondary room is 1600 sf, 40 by 40. It's kind of a blank slate. Can you tell us more about the intentions for that space?

Mr. Flannery said Miriam has spoken to the Rabbi at length about that and could probably describe it better.

Mr. Stern said the main sanctuary is 1991 and the secondary room is 1600, so it's not that much smaller.

Mrs. Weinstein said that's a kiddush hall. Every shul has the ability to have a kiddush on Shabbos that would be restricted from anyone who wasn't a member and it would only be used on Shabbos.

Mr. Rennert said you agree to put that in the resolution?

Mrs. Weinstein said yes.

Mr. Jackson said when we get to the appropriate time, there were comments submitted by neighbors and Ms. McLeer indicated that many of the comments indicated that the Rabbi had promised them that the hall would only be used on weekends.

Mrs. Weinstein said correct.

Mr. Stern said what gives me comfort is there is no kitchen, no plumbing, no sink, no gas. Is it clear that after we approve this the applicant couldn't come back later and decide to put in a kitchen without coming back to us?

Mr. Jackson said that would have to be a condition of approval. I don't know anything that stops you from putting a kitchen in unless it's a condition of approval.

Mr. Stern said Ms. Weinstein, are you comfortable agreeing that the applicant would have to come back to the Board and seek our approval for a kitchen in the basement?

Mrs. Weinstein said there wouldn't be a kitchen but there would possibly be for warming food on Shabbos, so they need some type of warmer and I wouldn't want to restrict from that.

Mr. Stern said you can put a hot plate anywhere.

Mrs. Weinstein said the intent is not to put a kitchen and not to use this room for anything but Shabbos.

Mr. Stern said a hot plate does not constitute a kitchen in my opinion.

Mrs. Weinstein said I hear you, I just want to make sure there's no restriction on that.

Mr. Herzl said I don't think there are any outside stairs to the basement either.

Mr. Stern said it probably does.

Mr. Sabel said stairway A does. And the other one as well.

Mr. Herzl said so no outside people can rent the hall, and you're not making a full-fledged kitchen down there.

Mrs. Weinstein said correct.

Mr. Stern said to be clear, if they want to put one in they would have to come back to us.

Mr. Garfield said this room in the basement, does the basement have windows large enough that someone can get out if necessary?

Mr. Sabel said there are two staircases.

Mr. Garfield said that's where you can get a problem with everyone trying to get out at once.

Mr. Herzl said that's a fire code, building code, and if they don't have means of egress they won't get approved to use it. They have to comply with the fire code in order to get approved, that's a building issue.

Mr. Rennert said to go back to the buffering on the side, just because I saw it in some of the comments, whatever buffering people requested, is that on the side that you're putting the fence on and does that take care of their concern?

Mr. Flannery said our only residential neighbors are to the south and that is where we are putting the fence. The northerly side is the Lakewood Board of Education property and it's wooded.

Mr. Rennert said thank you.

Mr. Jackson said I make a recommendation that you as chair ask that any comments opposed to this application be voiced first. After that, there were a series of positive comments that I have asked Ms. McLeer to summarize.

Mr. Sabel said I want to go back to the dumpster for one second. If you want to do a fenced in dumpster, how tall is the fence?

Mr. Flannery said 6'.

Mr. Sabel said will you have grass by the chainlink, those inserts?

Mr. Flannery said we could do chainlink with inserts, or a vinyl fence, whichever the Board prefers.

Mr. Sabel said ok.

Mr. Herzl said I like vinyl. I don't want to see chain link.

Mr. Sabel said ok so a 6' vinyl fence.

Mr. Herzl said do we have any opposition.

Mrs. Morris said I didn't receive any emailed opposition but we have a few callers we should open up to.

No one came forward.

Mr. Jackson said it appears there is no one who opposes this. I think members of the public have the ability to hit the space bar to unmute. If anyone has any opposition or conditions they would like to see added, please unmute your microphone and speak now.

No one came forward.

Mr. Jackson said with your permission Mr. Chairman, I would ask that Jilian summarize the emails in favor.

Ms. McLeer said as Mr. Jackson indicated we have received and reviewed approximately 36 email comments from the public. The comments we received were all in support of the application, and generally speak to the belief that the proposed shul will enhance the neighborhood, will be beneficial to the families in the neighborhood, and fulfill an essential need of the neighborhood. As was mentioned, several of the comments referenced a meeting with the Rabbi where he assured neighbors that the proposed hall won't be used during week days, only on Shabbos, and that the applicant will accommodate any privacy issues raised by adjacent homeowners. Thank you.

Mr. Herzl said thank you. All those emails are for the public to see?

Mrs. Morris said yes they are in the online public drive with the plans and review letters.

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

Mr. Rennert made a motion to approve, with the condition that the resolution state the kiddush room is only going to be used on weekends, not during the week, and as mentioned there is buffering to the neighbors. As far as garbage, because it's not going to be a commercial use, I'm ok if DPW reviews it and says they are ok picking up the trash, but I will go along with the majority of the Board.

Mr. Stern seconded. And to clarify that there is no kitchen being built without Board approval.

Mr. Sabel asked to repeat the motion.

Mr. Rennert said to approve, but for the resolution to mention that kiddush facilities are to be used only on Saturday, if there is going to be a kitchen put in it has to come back to the Planning Board, and if DPW is ok with picking up the trash here I'm ok with that.

Mr. Sabel said did you mention about a dumpster?

Mr. Rennert said the motion is that it was not necessary because it's not a commercial use.

Mr. Herzl said on Shabbos there's going to be a lot of garbage. I'm ok leaving it up to DPW, whatever they feel is best.

Mr. Rennert said if there has to be a dumpster, then it should be enclosed in a 6' high vinyl fence.

All were in favor.

2. SP 2385 Congregation Meor Hatefilah Inc.

145 Flintlock Drive

Block 284.12, Lot 1

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for an addition to an existing synagogue

Mr. Vogt said from my October 12th review, page 2 submission waivers, they include traffic study, proof of submission to Ocean County planning, topo, contours, and manmade features within 200', EIS, and soil erosion plan. We recommend the waivers for hearing purposes for reasons stated in the letter.

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

Mr. Vogt said continuing under zoning, variance relief includes minimum front yard, rear yard, maximum building coverage, and apparently number of parking spaces and also variance relief appears necessary for perimeter buffer. A design waiver appears necessary for fencing.

Mr. Herzl said basically every variance.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant. He said I understand the Chairman indicates there is every variance being sought, this is a very unique situation. I will put the elephant in the room now, yes, we have no parking. You have to understand the area to understand the application. This is an existing synagogue that's been around for many years. It's located (muffled). This is not an area that's up for development. It's already been developed. There are no open parcels that I'm aware of that can be built up. These are all R-12, R-15 parcels, so 12 or 15,000 sf lots with existing homes. This congregation is getting a little bit older, many of the congregants purchased homes in this area 10-15 years ago. The request this evening for this extension to expand the existing synagogue is really for their own children, who are getting older and coming to the synagogue. They're trying to accommodate their own community. You will hear later on, as a quick review of the letters that have come in, I believe there are approximately 60 something emails in support of this congregation. If you look at the tax map in front of us and you start counting, 60 some emails, even if only half of them, double for a husband and wife, you have almost all the surrounding lots in favor and support of this. We do have Glenn Lines who will address the technical questions, we do have the architect who is available to address any architectural questions, and we have a representative of the synagogue here to confirm what I'm saying in that this is not for new people coming to the area. There are no new houses in the area. If someone sells a house, it's not going to be an additional family. He had Glenn Lines, professional engineer and professional planner, affirmed.

Mr. Lines said we have a few exhibits. A-1 is the tax map, A-2 is the site plan, and A-3 is the satellite overlay using google earth. Going through the variances first, number 2 is a front yard setback variance. The property is on the corner of Powderhorn and Flintlock. We are proposing an addition on the rear or northeast side of the property. We are proposing one handicapped parking space. With the addition as far as variances are required, number two is for a front yard setback on the Powerhorn side. We have an exterior staircase required for emergency access to

the second floor. The only place to put it is on that side of the building. 30' is required and the stairs are 23.29'. In my opinion, it's an open stairway, it doesn't block and sight triangles, it's not going to impose on anyone and I don't believe there is any detriment to that variance.

Mr. Pfeffer said because it's a corner lot, though it's really our side it's a front to Flintlock.

Mr. Lines said correct.

Mr. Pfeffer said what would be the side yard requirement.

Mr. Lines said 10 one side, total of 25. We already have 10 on the right side, so we would need 15 here and have 23.29. So if it were an interior lot, we would comply. The second is a rear yard setback for the addition. And we are just slightly over what the side yard would be if a corner lot had two sides. We are at 9.98'. There's really no activity on this side of the building, where in a normal house in the rear yard there would be. This is really just an emergency exit which would rarely be used and a storage area for trash cans. The neighboring Lot 2 to the northeast, this is the garage side of their house and a 2 car driveway on that side as seen on A-3. I don't believe the shul will impose much on that neighbor, they don't have a pool there or any activity other than parking cars. Because it's a quite side and the neighbor has a driveway there, I don't believe it has a negative impact. Building coverage, it is what it is. We have 25% permitted and we are at 40%. We are trying to expand the building to meet the needs of the neighborhood and the congregants, and any smaller of an addition wouldn't meet their needs so we are requesting that. The last one is the parking variance. Currently, there is no parking on site. 90%-95% of the people walk. There are a few people who park in the street. On the satellite view there are 5 cars in the street. Right now, the street isn't full of cars.

Mr. Herzl said how many on street parking can you have? Can you park on Powderhorn also?

Mr. Lines said it's 125' by 110, so you could fit easily 10 cars in front of the shul, 5 on each street. If they park on both sides of the streets, that's about 20 cars. But most of the people walk. There's no real need, they're not going to change their way of getting to the school. We don't have parking now, we are just meeting the needs for the teenagers of the shul. We don't think parking is going to all of a sudden become an issue.

Mr. Herzl asked Ally if she saw any opposition to this application.

Mrs. Morris said no, it all seemed to be in favor.

Mr. Herzl said so all the neighbors live within walking distance. There's not too many streets there. Powderhorn, Flintlock, Cannonball.

Mr. Lines said right and some of these are paper streets without houses at the end. It's really a limited neighborhood. There's a major shul on Sunset that takes care of those residents.

Mr. Herzl said yeah, Sunset is a big shul.

Mr. Lines said some people from New England go there, there's a subdivision behind that. There's another little shul over on James Street, one or two lots in from the corner. There are a few others in the area, so this one is really just people within reasonable walking distance.

Mr. Herzl asked Ally if she has the addresses of all the people who sent in the emails.

Mrs. Morris said no, I don't have a list, but I'm sure it's on the emails themselves.

Mr. Herzl said I'd like it to be part of the record, if we do approve it, showing the reason why we approved it is because everyone lives within a block or two or three and it wouldn't pay to take a car.

Mr. Vogt said does the applicant agree to the technical recommendations in our October 12th letter?

Mr. Lines said yeah we have no problem with those. There was one more variance for the 20' wide perimeter buffer. There is an existing fence, we'll just be extending that a little bit to enclose both sides of the school with fencing rather than a landscape buffer.

Mr. Rennert said I am familiar with this shul and it is a neighborhood shul. Everybody walks there. I did scroll through the comments from the public and see that the person that they're extending close to his property, he did send in a comment in support of the application.

Mr. Herzl said thank you. Mr. Lines, do you have any handicapped parking?

Mr. Lines said we have one handicapped space proposed in the middle of the site. It eliminates an on-street parking space.

Mr. Herzl said even if people walk, you always have one or two elderly people who cannot walk. So you have to have consideration for them. I think you need at least one or two for elderly and infirm.

Mr. Lines said I would like to recommend rather than chunk out that piece in the middle of the property, to stripe out a handicapped space on the street and provide the necessary ramps and access from the space on the street. We could put it on the Powderhorn side near the sidewalk and it would keep the front of the shul visually nicer.

Mr. Herzl said Terry does that work on a public street?

Mr. Vogt said you would need Township approval to do so. I would recommend input from the Traffic and Safety section.

Mr. Herzl said I know stores have handicapped parking on private lots, I'm not sure if on the street you can restrict it.

Mr. Vogt said I'm not sure truthfully if you can create ADA compliance with street parking, because you have to comply with the ramp coming out of the space. We'll have to look at that carefully. I'm not sure that would be fully ADA compliant.

Mr. Sabel said can we put the parking off-street on Powderhorn, not Flintlock?

Mr. Lines said we could shift the handicapped space over to Powderhorn.

Mr. Herzl said where is the main entrance?

Mr. Pfeffer said on Flintlock.

Mr. Lines said the front corner of the building.

Mr. Herzl said the handicapped space has to have direct access to go in.

Mr. Lines said if we moved it to the side, it would be where the wording is where it says, "proposed stairs to second floor."

Mr. Sabel said which is even closer to the entrance and is not going to take away from the view, from the image of the building.

Mr. Rennert said I suggest they try to get permission to paint on the street for the handicapped and if they can't get it then they should have it either where it is proposed now or on the Powderhorn side.

Mr. Herzl said and we should have the ramp going up.

Mr. Pfeffer said the applicant will agree to do both. We will write to the Township requesting one ADA spot on either street, as well as provide one interior on the opposite side.

Mr. Lines said that would be fine.

Mr. Pfeffer said at a minimum we will have our one, but in addition we will ask the Township to allow us to have one on-street as well.

Mr. Sabel said the only problem with that is it takes away parking on Powderhorn at all.

Mr. Lines said we are going to move this space to the Powderhorn side, and you pick up the one on Flintlock. It's a wash.

Mr. Herzl said is there any hall in the basement?

Mr. Lines said there is no basement.

Mr. Herzl said and you're going to have sidewalks?

Mr. Lines said there are existing sidewalks in the front and part of the side, and there will be sidewalk to the addition.

Mr. Sabel said where is the trash?

Mr. Lines said on the back side of the building near where the addition is. It's called out, proposed 4x20 trash storage area. Roll out cans to be picked up by DPW. There's no simcha hall, no kiddush room, nothing. The last application had a room and you were concerned about the volume of garbage, I really don't think this one will have that much garbage.

Mr. Herzl said is this septic or sewer?

Mr. Stern said sewer. It's an old neighborhood. Are there any interior plans of what you're planning to put into this new addition?

Mrs. Morris pulled up the architectural plans on the screen.

Mr. Stern said basically it's just more tables and seats.

Mr. Pfeffer said the architect is on the meeting for any questions the Board may have.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mrs. Morris said I don't have any negative emails and I think John or Jilian will summarize.

Mr. Jackson said I recommend you again ask for anyone watching or observing who want to participate, give an objection or a request for a condition that the Board hasn't indicated they are going to impose, that they speak up so the Board can consider that.

No one came forward.

Ms. McLeer said we received and reviewed approximately 62 emailed comments from the public. All emailed comments expressed agreement with the relief requested in the application and expressed support of the expansion of the shul. The members of the public do believe that the expansion will not negatively affect the surrounding neighborhood. That is our review of the comments we received.

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

Mr. Rennert made a motion to approve as presented, and with the option of another handicapped spot if they can get it but if not it's fine. Mr. Sabel 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