

1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

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

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

2. ROLL CALL

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal, Mr. Schmuckler.

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Terrance Vogt was sworn in.

4. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

1. SP # 1948

Applicant: Yeshiva Orchos Chaim
Location: Corner of Cedar Bridge Ave, Oberlin Ave South & Syracuse Ct
Block 827 Lot 3
Amended Site Plan proposed addition to existing school

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a three-story building addition to the existing school building for additional classrooms and educational facilities. Besides the 19,875 square foot addition footprint, a new access/drop-off driveway is proposed as well. The site is within the Lakewood Industrial Park and fronts on Cedar Bridge Avenue, Oberlin Avenue South, and Syracuse Court. Access to the site is afforded from the Oberlin Avenue South and Syracuse Court frontages. A fifty foot (50') wide vegetative buffer easement exists along the Cedar Bridge Avenue side of the site. Cedar Bridge Avenue is a County Road and its intersection with Oberlin Avenue South is signalized. The property contains 9.696 acres. A one-story school building exists on-site with associated parking and site improvements. Numerous temporary trailers are located throughout the site which will be removed with the completion of the

proposed addition. The applicant is proposing just less than sixty thousand square feet (60,000 SF) of addition space among the three (3) floors. The architectural plans are preliminary in nature so the breakdown of the existing and proposed layout has not been summarized. The plans indicate one hundred twenty-four (124) parking spaces will be required. A one-way drop-off looped driveway is proposed for the existing front access of the school and the proposed addition section. Some wooded areas exist on the site, particularly around the perimeter boundaries. The property gently slopes from north to south. Since the site is already developed existing utilities surround the site. New sanitary sewer and potable water connections are proposed for the addition. Additional storm water management facilities have been designed to incorporate the additional impervious areas proposed for the site. The surrounding lands and roadways are all improved with large commercial and industrial uses. Sidewalk does not exist in the vicinity because of the nature of the uses which does not lend to pedestrian traffic. The site is located in the M-1 Industrial Zone. Private educational facilities are a permitted use in the zone. (I) **Waivers** (A) **The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist:** (1) North arrow including the reference meridian, pointing to top of the map (2) Topography of the site and within two hundred feet (200') thereof. (3) Location of individual trees ten inches (10") or more. (4) Profiles are not provided for the proposed utilities. We support the requested waivers. The plan orientation best fits the project site. The topography supplied is sufficient for design and review. The proposed development is mainly in cleared areas of the site, additional site clearing will be minimal. Profiles can be provided as a condition of approval. (II) **Zoning** (1) The site is situated within the M-1, Industrial Zone. Quasi-public and private educational facilities are a "permitted use" per Section 18-903M.1.m., of the UDO. The Zoning Requirements on the plans incorrectly list private school as a conditional use. (2) No variances have been requested. Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, it appears no variances are required for the proposed project. (3) Per review of the site plans and application, the following design waivers are required: (a) No sidewalk has been proposed along any of the site frontages. This is consistent with other site plans in the Industrial Park. (b) No shade tree and utility easements have been provided along any of the site frontages. (c) No shade trees have been provided along any of the site frontages. (d) Any and all other design waivers deemed necessary by the Board. (III) **Review Comments** (A) **Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** (1) As indicated previously, the Zoning Requirements show one hundred twenty-four (124) off-street parking spaces are required and provided for the proposed project. One (1) off-street parking space is required for every Classroom, Tutor Room, Library, Meeting Room, or Office proposed. Testimony should be provided on the total number of Classrooms, Tutor Rooms, Libraries, Meeting Rooms and Offices that are proposed for the existing school building and proposed addition as described per Section 18-906C of the UDO. (2) Our review indicates one hundred twenty-six (126) normal parking spaces and fifteen (15) bus parking spaces will be provided. Except for the five (5) proposed angled parking spaces in front of the main building access and the handicapped spaces, the parking spaces are 10' X 20'. Many of the parking lot aisle widths are only twenty-two feet (22') wide. Therefore, we recommend the spaces be striped to 9' X 18' dimensions which would allow additional proposed spaces and wider aisles. Dimensions are required for the

proposed bus parking spaces. (3) Handicapped parking must be proposed to the current code. (4) Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether students will only be bused, or will be allowed to park on-site, as well as the maximum number of staff professionals at the site during school operations. (5) A one-way drop-off area, separate from the parking area, is proposed in front of the main school access. A vehicle circulation plan should be provided for the proposed bus routes. (6) Testimony is necessary from the applicant's professionals regarding how the proposed drop-off area will be used, including but not limited to times, sizes, and types of vehicles anticipated (i.e., buses, vans, cars, others). (7) The project has road frontage on three (3) sides of the site. Therefore, there is only one (1) side yard. The Zoning Requirements must be corrected accordingly. (8) Testimony is required from the applicant's professionals addressing who will collect the trash. If Township pickup is proposed, approval from the DPW Director is necessary. No waste receptacle area is shown. An enclosure shall be screened and designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E. of the UDO. (9) Proposed curb radii have been shown for some of the layout. The proposed tangent points should be added. The limits of proposed and existing curb are not clear, especially within the existing parking area. (10) Proposed building dimensions on the site plan do not yield the proposed footprint square footage. Coordination with the architectural plans is required. (11) The proposed building addition is replacing an area that consists largely of asphalt. However, it is not clear whether the existing asphalt north of the proposed building addition is being removed. It is also not clear what the disposition of the existing temporary trailer areas to be removed will be. The proposed limits of work should be better defined on the drawings. (12) The existing curb island at the site's access with Oberlin Avenue South is proposed to be removed, paved, and striped. Testimony should be provided on the proposed revised site access. (13) No sight triangles associated with the proposed vehicular site access points have been indicated. (14) An underground recharge system is proposed within the landscape area of the proposed circular drop-off. (15) A delivery area is proposed on the south side of the proposed building addition. (16) The site plan does not show all building access points and corresponding steps. (B) **Architectural** (1) Conceptual architectural floor plans and elevations have been provided for the proposed school addition. The proposed building addition includes three (3) floors. Testimony should be provided on the proposed building height. The allowable building height is sixty-five feet (65'). (2) Testimony should be provided on proposed building signage. No signage is shown on the conceptual architectural plans. (3) The architect should confirm whether an elevator is proposed to make all floor levels handicapped accessible. Testimony is required from the architect on the specific uses for the proposed individual floors, as well as the existing building.

(4) The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the facades and treatments of the proposed new building addition. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. (5) Water and sewer connections are shown for the proposed school building addition. Based on the design of the water connection, the proposed building addition will include a sprinkler system. (6) We recommend that the location of proposed air conditioning equipment be shown. Said equipment should be

adequately screened. (7) More detailed architectural plans should be provided. (C) **Grading** (1) Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design concept is feasible. However, additional proposed elevations and proposed contours are required to complete the grading design. Proposed elevations should be provided at control points, such as curb returns and corners, and building access points. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. (2) Per review of the existing elevations and per review of site conditions during our 2/10/11 site inspection, on-site grades generally slope to the south. (3) A low point is inadvertently being created northwest of the proposed addition and the existing building. (4) Soil boring locations are indicated on the drawings. However, no boring logs or seasonal high water table information has been provided to justify the proposed depth of the storm water recharge system. (D) **Storm Water Management** (1) A proposed storm water management system has been designed utilizing a combination of a vegetated swale, inlets, and perforated high density polyethylene pipe to convey storm water runoff into a proposed underground recharge system. The proposed underground recharge system is located in the landscape area of the looped access drive and drop-off area. The proposed recharge system consists of a network of twenty-four inch (24") perforated polyethylene (P.E.) pipe in a rectangular stone bed. As indicated in the Storm Water Management Narrative, impervious area will be increased by more than 0.25 acres thereby classifying the project as major development. Storm water calculations have been submitted to demonstrate that the proposed storm water management system is adequately-sized to meet the required quantity reductions and water quality requirements. (2) A two foot (2') vertical separation between the proposed bottom of the storm water management system and the seasonal high water table must be demonstrated. Permeability test results should be provided to justify the recharge calculations used for the project. (3) A storm water collection system for the roof of the proposed school building has been provided. (4) A Storm Water Management Facilities Maintenance Plan must be provided. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. (E) **Landscaping** (1) A dedicated landscaping plan is provided with the submission; proposed landscaping is depicted on Sheet 3 of the plans. The landscaping is only proposed for the section of the site east of the Oberlin Avenue South access drive in the vicinity of the proposed building addition. (2) Buffer planting is proposed across the Oberlin Avenue South frontage of the property. Thirteen (13) Norway Spruces and eleven (11) Short Leaf Pines are proposed for the buffer. (3) The remainder of the proposed landscaping consists of three (3) White Oaks, sixteen (16) Little Leaf Lindens, and thirty-five (35) Hetz Junipers. (4) Testimony should be provided as to whether compensatory landscaping is proposed (or necessary). It should be noted that tree protection details are provided on the plans for mature vegetation that is salvageable during construction. (5) Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (6) Landscaping will be reviewed in detail during compliance should approval be granted. (F) **Lighting** (1) A dedicated lighting plan is provided with the submission; proposed lighting is depicted on Sheet 3 of the plans. The lighting is only proposed for the section of the site east of the Oberlin Avenue South access drive in the vicinity of the proposed building addition. (2) The Lighting Plan shows two (2) relocated pole mounted

lights, four (4) proposed pole mounted lights, and one (1) proposed wall mounted light for the delivery area. All lighting fixtures are proposed to be mounted twenty feet (20') high. The proposed area should be adequately illuminated by the design. (3) The location of the existing pole being moved along the existing access drive must be shown. (4) Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (5) The concrete for the Pole Foundation Detail shall be Class B. (6) Lighting will be reviewed in detail during compliance should approval be granted. (G) **Utilities** (1) Public water and sewer services will be provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. Proposed utility connections are shown for the building addition. A separate fire service line is proposed for the building addition. (2) Water service to the proposed building addition will be from an existing water connection along Oberlin Avenue South as depicted on the plan. A sanitary sewer lateral for the proposed school addition connects to an existing manhole in Oberlin Avenue South within the dividing island near the intersection with Cedar Bridge Avenue. (H) **Signage** (1) No signage information is provided, except for regulatory signage. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. (2) All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. (I) **Environmental** (1) No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for this project since it is a developed site and the proposal concentrates on only a portion of the tract.

To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. (2) We recommend that all on-site materials from the proposed demolition activities be removed and disposed in accordance with applicable local and state regulations. (J) **Construction Details (1)** All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; if/when this application is approved. (IV) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Lakewood Township MUA (water and sewer service); (b) Ocean County Planning Board; (c) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and (d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing**

the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.

Mr. Abraham Penzer Esq for the applicant the school existing, as you know, Yeshiva Orchos Chaim is there. We have one of the largest campuses, over nine acres. We're very very proud that Kainhara, that our school is growing so...that's spelled Kainhara for the record. What I told Rabbi Mandlebaum is that instead of coming back, because of the growth of the year, I said build out your piece or do it in phases over five years instead of coming back. So what you see is the basic phase, the first phase of the building. The next phase is going to be more parking and then at the end will be a gym, way at the end on it. But were phasing different stages, what I'm holding before you is the actual picture I was told that the bushes over here are so real, even if only for ten minutes they'll be that purple color, but they will be that purple color. It's a real deal in regard to it. It's a three story building, consisting of proximately 20 thousand square feet, so it's a 60 thousand square foot addition on there, and it's been made in such a way that the real part that Rabbi Mandlebaum was in my office was so proud of, if you look at your map, the buses are completely away from the building, and it's been done with a great deal of thought for it. So this is a very good pattern. Mr. Banas is very conscious about this, we take a great deal of pride to tell you that he made it run completely away from the whole area. So even though it would be a school of this size, it would be nowhere near the area of the buildings, instead it would be near the parking area. And basically speaking, every single thing that Terry says we can agree to, they are reasonable, they can be done. And we can save the time on the 8 pages.

Chairman Mr. Neiman asked what is with the sidewalks? Is this normal in the industrial park?

Mr. Vogt stated on similar applications on the industrial park because you're trying to keep more circulation inside the park, you have waived it in the past.

Mr. Penzer states also forgive me but when you approved the original, we talked about not having anywhere in the industrial park sidewalks. This is in the center of the industrial park so it's either you're going to change the whole industrial park or us.

Chairman Neiman replies I hear you. I just wanted it on the record showing why we would grant the waiver where we normally don't grant waivers.

Mr. Penzer stated as you can see over here the phase one is a three story addition. This is the existing building over here, were building more off on the side. Then the next step over here, the future phase two, is restriping as I've said before. And the third phase is a gym annex over 10 thousand square feet. I told them max it out.

Chairman Neiman asked if they are adding anymore parking spots with phase two and three?

Mr. Penzer replied yes, phase two we're adding spots, more than enough over here. And we also added something unique here, a special bus parking lot so that the buses have a place where they'll pick up the children. You'll notice the longated spots, this is car parking, this is bus parking. So this is the first time of all the schools, out of 178 schools, that I have the privilege of doing, that we ever had that before. So we're very proud of this application.

Chairman Neiman asked if there are any questions from the board on this application?

Mr. Banas stated that he's concerned about the pupils that are there. They do have a break, and they have a tendency to walk, are you providing any type of physical facilities for them to blow off the steam some place?

Mr. Penzer replied yes, you see this wonderful area here? This is as far as you can blow, there she blows.

Mr. Banas continued and said okay, because they do walk around and they need the exercise.

Mr. Penzer stated that's the beauty of it. Not only that but there's two fields, one here and one over there as well. And that's the beauty of 9 acres. I wish we could have other campuses as big as this. Now we have an existing playground over here as well so basically speaking we really have three different areas that exist .

Chairman Neiman says one other thing also that we've done, another school also that phased in, we asked during construction just to gate in the area so the kids can't get to that.

Mr. Penzer stated no problem, excellent idea for safety.

Chairman Neiman asked if there were any other questions? Kevin, when is this going to be heard?

Mr. Kielt says the school asked as a courtesy to be moved ahead to the next public hearing on March 15th instead of waiting a month.

Chairman Neiman says can we have a motion to move to March 15th?

Motion made by Mr. Herzel and seconded by Mr. Banas.

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that this application is moved to the March 15, 2011 Public Hearing. There is no further notice required.

2. SP # 1947

Applicant: Congregation Pri Aharon
Location: East County Line Road, east of Somerset Avenue
Block 208 Lot 163
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for proposed school

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a two (2) phased Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval. Phase One will be for the construction of a one-story school building and associated parking. The existing dwelling towards the front of the site will remain, but the attached garage will be removed to allow access to the proposed school in the rear of the site. Phase Two will consist of the construction of a second story addition to the school building and the removal of the existing dwelling. The site plans and architectural plans indicate the first phase of the proposed school building will include an unimproved basement and a first floor with three (3) classrooms and three (3) offices. The next phase of the project would add a second floor addition which will contain four (4) classrooms. An interior parking area consisting of eight (8) parking spaces, one (1) being van accessible handicapped, and site improvements are also proposed within the property. The project includes a one-way circular driveway with a bus drop-off area. Access to the site is provided from East County Line Road, a County Road. The site is located in the northern portion of the Township on the south side of East County Line Road. The tract consists of an irregular somewhat rectangular shaped lot that totals 33,681 square feet (0.77 acres) in area. The property contains a one and a half story dwelling and a couple of sheds. Few trees exist on the site. Road widening with curb and sidewalk is proposed across the entire frontage of the project. The proposed project would be serviced by sanitary sewer and potable water. The surrounding land consists of mainly residential uses with some sprinkled in commercial uses. (1) **Zoning** (1) The parcel is located in the R-12 Single-Family Residential District. Single-family detached housing and private schools are permitted uses in the zone. Private schools shall be in accordance with the requirements of Section 18-906 of the UDO. (2) Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, the following relief is required for proposed project: (a) In accordance with Section 18-906A of the UDO, a twenty foot (20') wide perimeter landscape buffer is required from residential uses and zones. The buffer is not being provided along the side property lines. The applicant is providing some combinations of six foot (6') high solid vinyl

fencing and landscaping in both side yard areas to compensate for the necessary buffer. A partial design waiver is necessary. (3) The architectural plans indicate that three (3) classrooms and three (3) offices are proposed for the first phase of the facility. Four (4) more classrooms are being proposed for the second phase addition to the building. A variance for the number of off-street parking spaces may be required. Nine (9) off-street parking spaces are proposed for the first phase of the project, but the perpendicular space proposed in front of the existing dwelling does not have the minimum required twenty-four foot (24') adjacent aisle width. When the existing dwelling is removed in the second phase of the project, there will be only eight (8) off-street parking spaces. However, there will be a total of ten (10) classrooms and offices. Clarifying testimony regarding the facility should be provided by the applicant's professionals. (4) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** (II) **Review Comments** (A) **Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** (1) The Area Map on the Cover Sheet is upside down and needs to be rotated. The project site is actually on the south side of East County Line Road, west of Somerset Avenue. Zone Boundary Lines should also be added to the Area Map. (2) Minor corrections are required to the General Notes. The Zone Requirements should be expanded to include proposed conditions for both phases. (3) The General Notes state the Outbound and Topographic Survey have been prepared by Charles Surmonte, P.E. & P.L.S. A Topographic Survey has been included within the plan set. An Outbound Survey must also be provided. The wire fence encroachment shown along the south part of the east side line must be addressed. (4) Based on the configuration of the proposed parking lot and driveways, access through the site will be clockwise in a one-way direction with the entrance on the east side of the site and the exit on the west side of the lot. A vehicular circulation plan for a bus has been included on the Geometric Plan. (5) The General Notes indicate that all students will be bused, and no students will be permitted drive to and from school. The proposed grades for the school shall be from ninth through twelfth. The hours of operation will be Monday through Friday and Sunday from 7:30 AM to 9:00 PM. The total number of students projected is between sixty (60) and one hundred (100). (6) A one-way bus drop off area is within the proposed parking area. Testimony should be provided on proposed conflicting vehicular movements from the proposed parking spaces, bus drop off area, refuse collection, and deliveries. (7) Testimony is necessary from the applicant's professionals regarding how the proposed bus drop off area will be used, including but not limited to times, sizes, and types of vehicles anticipated (i.e., buses, vans, cars, others). (8) Sidewalk and curbing, along with road widening is proposed across the frontage of the site. In accordance with our 2/9/11 site inspection, we note that no sidewalk and

curbing exist along East County Line Road in front of the site or on the adjacent properties. A more detailed road widening design is required, including the relocation of existing facilities. (9) A proposed refuse enclosure is depicted on the eastern side of the property. Testimony is required from the applicant's professionals addressing who will collect the trash. If Township pickup is proposed, approval from the DPW Director is necessary. The waste receptacle area shall be screened and designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E. of the UDO. (10) The Schedule of Bulk Requirements shows that no variances will be required. However, the proposed building configuration and dimensions do not agree between the site plans and architectural plans. The configuration and dimensions must be coordinated between the drawings with dimensions given to the hundredth of a foot to insure zoning compliance. Proposed building access points must also be added to the site plans. (11) All proposed curb radii and tangent points have been shown for accuracy of the layout. (12) The location of the proposed sidewalk along East County Line Road encroaches on the property. Therefore, a sidewalk easement shall be proposed along the front property line. (13) A sight triangle easement is proposed at the exit drive. The easement shall be dedicated to the County of Ocean since East County Line Road is a County Road. The proposed sight triangle effectively negates a shade tree and utility easement across the project frontage since virtually the entire frontage is impacted. (14) Parking must be addressed for the existing dwelling to remain during the first phase of the project. (15) Six foot (6') high decorative vinyl fencing is proposed for the west side of the property from the front yard setback to the rear yard setback limits. The proposed fence must commence at the sight triangle limit instead of the front yard setback. (16) Fencing is also proposed for a portion of the east side of the property. Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed fencing limits along the east side line. It is not clear whether a proposed dimension along the east property line is for the fence location. (B) **Architectural** (1) Preliminary architectural plans have been provided for the proposed school. The plan sheet includes floor plans and elevations. After complete build out, the proposed building includes two (2) floors and an unfinished basement. The proposed building height must be confirmed by the architect. The allowable building height is thirty-five feet (35'). (2) The elevations show an attic floor is proposed above the second story of the building. However, the proposed height of the attic seems too low to be useable for anything more than storage. Testimony should be provided on the proposed attic. (3) Testimony is required on ADA accessibility. It appears only the first floor is accessible. (4) The proposed basement floor will be eleven feet (11') below the first floor level and six feet, four inches (6'-4") below finished grade. Seasonal high water table information has been provided to substantiate the proposed basement floor elevation. (5) Water and sewer connections are shown for the proposed school building. Testimony should be provided as to whether the proposed building will include a sprinkler system. (6) We recommend that the location of proposed air

conditioning equipment be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. (7) We recommend that color renderings of the building be provided for the Board's use at the forthcoming public hearing for the application. (C) **Grading** (1) Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design concept is feasible. However, corrections to the proposed elevations and proposed contours are required to complete the grading design. Proposed elevations must be provided at control points, such as building access points and landings. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. (2) Per review of the existing elevations and per review of site conditions during our 2/9/11 site inspection, on-site grades generally slope to the south. (3) The proposed grading traps runoff on the adjoining property to the west. The proposed grading for the rear yard is also very flat. We recommend the cleanouts proposed for the roof drainage is replaced with yard inlets set low enough to alleviate these problems. (4) The architectural plans indicate a four foot, eight inch (4'-8") elevation difference between the proposed first floor and finished grade. This elevation difference is reflected on the site plans. (5) A soil boring location is indicated on the drawings. Based on the soil log provided, the proposed basement floor elevation of 54.00 shown on the site plan is greater than two feet (2') above the seasonal high water table elevation of 50.8. (D) **Storm Water Management** (1) A proposed storm water management system has been designed to convey storm water runoff into a proposed underground recharge system. The proposed underground recharge system is located under the parking area. The proposed system consists of a network of thirty inch (30") perforated polyethylene (P.E.) pipe in a rectangular stone bed. As indicated in the Storm Water Management Report, new impervious area will be more than 0.25 acres. Revisions to the storm water calculations will be required during compliance review (if approved) to demonstrate that the proposed storm water management system is adequately-sized to meet the required quantity reductions and water quality requirements. (2) A storm water collection system for the roof of the proposed school building is provided. We recommend cleanouts be added at the bends and yard inlets replace the terminal cleanouts to alleviate trapped runoff. (3) The storm water management concept for this project is viable, additional design information must be provided during compliance (if approved), including the following items at a minimum: (a) The perimeter manifold piping lengths between the inspection manholes are either thirty feet (30') or forty-four feet (44'). (b) The pipe lengths of the six (6) interior pipes are all forty-seven feet (47'). (c) The report narrative needs to address water quality standards. (4) Confirmation is required that the inlet filters proposed to address water quality standards fit the inlets proposed and meets NJDEP requirements. (5) A separate Storm Water Management Facilities Maintenance Plan must be provided. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. (E) **Landscaping** (1) A dedicated

Landscaping Plan is provided with the submission; proposed landscaping is depicted on Sheet 5 of the plans. (2) A six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is not proposed across the frontage of the property because the proposed sight triangle easement encompasses virtually all of this area. The Board should grant a waiver from providing the shade tree easement. (3) Testimony should be provided as to whether compensatory landscaping is proposed (or necessary). (4) Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board.(5) Landscaping will be reviewed in detail during compliance should approval be granted. (F) **Lighting** (1) A dedicated Lighting Plan is provided with the submission; proposed lighting is depicted on Sheet 6 of the plans. (2) The Lighting Plan proposes three (3) fourteen foot (14') high pole mounted lights and three (3) bollard lights. The proposed bollard lighting is too weak to adequately illuminate the area in front of the building. Additional proposed lighting is required. (3) Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (4) Lighting will be reviewed in detail during compliance should approval be granted. (G) **Utilities** (1) The plans indicate the site will be served by public water and sewer. Water service to the proposed school building from the north side of East County Line Road is depicted on the plan. A proposed sanitary sewer lateral for the new school is indicated from the building and connects to an existing main in the center of East County Line Road (2) Approvals will be required from the New Jersey American Water Company for water and sewer since the project is within their franchise area. (H) **Signage** (1) No signage information is provided. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. (2) All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. (I) **Environmental** (1) No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for this project.To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether there are any known areas of environmental concern (i.e. fuel tanks, fuel spills, etc.) that exist within the property. (2) We recommend that all on-site materials from the proposed demolition activities be removed and disposed in accordance with applicable local and state regulations. (J) **Construction Details**(1) All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A comprehensive review of construction details will occur during

compliance; if/when this application is approved. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following (a) Ocean County Planning Board; (b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District (c) NJAW (water and sewer service); and (d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mrs. Weinstein Esq. for the applicant, good evening. Just to go back to the buffer that we are requesting, we've actually increased in landscaping along that buffer. We've been in contact with the next door neighbor and we have in fact increased the number of trees so we will get you the revised plans for that along with the 6 foot vinyl fence, but we are requesting that buffer. One more point I'd like to point out is in regard to the comment on the parking. I'd just like to clarify this is phased, we are proposing to do this in phases, with the first phase just being a one story building which will contain three classrooms and some offices. To clarify this is a boys high school, there will even after the second phase of this project is completed, there will only be a total of four classrooms, there will be one ninth grade, one tenth grade, one eleventh grade, and one twelfth grade and that's it. So there is a comment that makes mention of the fact that there may be insufficient parking because there are seven classrooms, there are not going to be seven classrooms. What's going to happen is that in phase two the second story will contain all four classrooms and then first story will become an enlarged study hall which is just a study hall where the boys will be able to study. So there really will only be four classrooms in this building so the parking should be sufficient for four classrooms.

Chairman Neiman asked how many parking spots you have though.

Mr. Surmonte stated there are 8 sports for the school.

Chairman Neiman asked if you have had a chance to review the other comments and are you able to comply with those comments?

Mr. Surmonte said yes, he will be.

Chairman Neiman asked if there is going to be bus drop off at this school? Can you just go quickly through the circulation of bus drop offs?

Mr. Surmonte explained that the circulation is going to be clockwise through the site. The throat between the curb adjacent to the school and the parking spots is 34 feet. There is sufficient room here for a bus to come up against the curb and still circulation inside the bus lane.

Chairman Neiman stated there is an existing home in the front, and it's staying.

Mrs. Weinstein says yes it's staying for the first phase of this development and it's going to eventually go.

Mr. Vogt mentioned that the garage is going to be removed.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if there is a timeline of the first and second phase? When do you expect to move that house and go into second phase?

Mrs. Weinstein states that it is anticipated to be about 2 years depending on the yeshiva, this is an existing Yashiva.

Chairman Neiman asks any other questions.

Motion made by Mr. Schmuckler to move this application to the March, 15th Public Hearing and seconded by Mr. Follman.

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that this application is moved to the March 15, 2011 Public Hearing. There is no further notice required.

3. SP # 1945

Applicant: Congregation Stolin Karlin
Location: East Seventh Street & Cornelius Street
Block 231 Lots 21 & 22
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for proposed synagogue

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a two-story synagogue, which includes an improved basement, within a 4,072 square foot footprint. The architectural plans indicate the proposed synagogue will contain 1,995 square feet of main sanctuary area. An interior parking area and a perpendicular row of parking consisting of twenty-two (22) parking spaces, one (1) being van accessible handicapped, and site improvements are also proposed for the site. A two-way access drive to the property is provided from Cornelius Street. An exit only drive from the property is proposed along East Seventh Street. The tract consists of two (2) rectangular shaped properties known as Lots 21 and 22 in Block 231. The total area of the 100' X 150' site is fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF), which is 0.34 acres. The land contains two (2) existing one-story framed dwellings which will be removed. The site is located in the northern portion of the Township on the northwest corner of East Seventh Street and Cornelius Street. The property frontage on East Seventh Street has existing curb and sidewalk. The road frontage on Cornelius Street does not contain existing curb and sidewalk. The surrounding properties are mostly developed with residential

uses. The property is located in the R-7.5 Zone District. Places of worship are permitted uses. (I) **Zoning** (1) The parcel is located in the R-7.5 Single-Family Residential District. Places of worship are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the provisions of Section 18-905. (2) No variances or waivers have been requested or appear necessary from our review of the plans and application. (3) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** (II) **Review Comments (A) Site Plan/Circulation/Parking**

(1) The status of the existing fence shown on the Boundary and Topographic Survey, which crosses the property lines between Lots 22 and 23, must be addressed on the site plan. (2) The Storm Water Maintenance Plan Sheet should be eliminated from the Index of Drawings since the project is too small to be classified as a major development. (3) As indicated previously, twenty-two (22) off-street parking spaces with one (1) handicapped space is being provided for the proposed synagogue. Since 1,995 SF of sanctuary area is proposed, the number of off-street parking spaces is compliant. (4) Per our 2/10/11 site inspection, we note that sidewalk and curbing exist along the East Seventh Street frontage of the site, but not along the Cornelius Street frontage. (5) Existing sidewalk and curb will be removed for the proposed driveway area on East Seventh Street, and new curbs and handicapped ramps will be installed to cross the proposed pavement. An existing driveway apron on East Seventh Street should be removed and the depressed curb replaced with full height curb. A new code compliant handicapped ramp is required at the intersection of East Seventh Street and Cornelius Street. (6) Curb and sidewalk are proposed for the Cornelius Street frontage of the project. Sidewalk must be proposed across the entire frontage except where pavement is proposed for the parking spaces and access driveway. Curb ramps shall be provided at all pavement crossings. Proposed sidewalk locations should be dimensioned. (7) The applicant's professionals indicate the congregation proposes to use curbside pickup by the Township. A proposed 4' X 16' concrete pad for trash can storage is depicted on the plans along the west wall of the building. The first floor building projection should be high enough to allow for trash and recyclable storage to fit below. (8) Concrete pads and landings must be coordinated between the site plan and architectural drawings. (9) Most proposed curb radii have been shown for accuracy of the layout. The missing curb radii shall be added. In addition, the proposed curb return points should be added. (10) A proposed six foot (6') high privacy fence encompasses the side portions of the property from the front yard setback limits on the side property lines. (11) AASHTO lines of sight for sight triangle easements are shown for the exit drive on East Seventh Street and the intersection of Cornelius Street with East Seventh Street. However, a sight triangle easement is not proposed for the access drive on Cornelius Street. A 25' X 25'

sight triangle is not being provided at the intersecting streets. Survey data and testimony shall be provided for sight triangle easements. Descriptions will need to be reviewed before filing any proposed easements with the County. (12) Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed traffic circulation pattern. (13) Proposed traffic and handicapped parking sign locations shall be added to the site plan. (14) Proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easements shall be added to the site plan and labeled along with providing bearings, distances, and areas. Descriptions will need to be reviewed before filing the proposed easements with the County. (15) Wheel stops should be added for the proposed parking spaces abutting the raised access landing to the building. (16) The site plan calls out a bituminous parking area with an underground storm water recharge system. However, no design information has been provided for the recharge system. (B) **Architectural** (1) The proposed building is approximately twenty-nine feet (29') high consisting of a two-story structure with a finished basement. The first floor is proposed to be three feet six inches (3'-6") above proposed grade. The building does not exceed the allowable height of thirty-five feet (35'). (2) The proposed building square footage needs to be corrected. The proposed square footage of the first floor is greater than the basement because of the building projections, yet the square footages are listed to be equal. (3) The basement floor elevation has been set to provide at least a two foot (2') separation from the seasonal high water table shown on the soil log taken within the proposed building footprint. (4) Testimony is required on ADA accessibility. It appears only the first floor is accessible. (5) Testimony should be provided as to whether the proposed synagogue will include a sprinkler system. (6) The location of proposed air conditioning equipment has been shown on the west side of the building. Said equipment will be adequately screened by landscaping and the privacy fence. (7) The disposition of storm water from the proposed roof of the building must be addressed. (8) We recommend that color renderings of the building be provided for the Board's use at the forthcoming public hearing for the application. (C) **Grading** (1) Per review of the proposed grading, the overall design is feasible. (2) Grading information is provided on Sheet 3 of the Site Plans. Coordination of proposed elevations is required between the architectural drawings and site plans to evaluate the grading. Corrected proposed elevations must be provided at control points, such as building corners, access points, and landings. (3) The architectural plans indicate a three foot six inch (3'-6") elevation difference between the proposed first floor and finished grade. This elevation difference is not reflected on the site plans. Revisions are required and the plans must be coordinated. (4) Per review of the existing elevations and per review of site conditions during our 2/10/11 site inspection, on-site grades generally slope towards the existing roadways to the east and south of the property. (5) Soil log locations are indicated on the drawings. Based on the soil log provided within the building footprint, the proposed basement floor elevation of 95.67 shown on the site plan is greater

than two feet (2') above the seasonal high water table elevation of 92.5. The other soil log location is inaccurately shown within the footprint of an existing dwelling to be removed. (6) A road widening design for Cornelius Street is required which also addresses proposed grading and the disposition of storm water runoff. (7) All of the above items can be addressed during compliance review should approval be granted. (D) **Storm Water Management** (1) The increase in impervious coverage has been calculated at less than a quarter acre to determine that the project is not major development per NJAC 7:8. However, runoff from the proposed project is being directed to the existing streets in front of the site with no information on the final disposition of storm water runoff. We recommend the applicant's engineer contact our office for mitigating potential drainage impacts. (E) **Landscaping and Lighting** (1) A dedicated Landscaping & Tree Protection Plan is provided with the submission; proposed landscaping is depicted on Sheet 4 of the plans. (2) A six foot (6') high privacy fence and substantial landscaping has been proposed to buffer the project for compliance with Section 18-905 of the UDO. (3) Unless waived by the Board, shade tree and utility easements should be shown across the frontage of the property. Proposed shade trees shall not conflict with sight triangle easements. (4) No existing trees are shown to be retained with the landscaping design. There are few existing trees on the site, none of which appear salvageable. (5) Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (6) Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. (7) A dedicated Lighting Plan is provided with the submission; proposed lighting is depicted on Sheet 5 of the plans. (8) The Lighting design shows three (3) fourteen foot (14') high pole mounted lights and three (3) wall mounted lights for the proposed project. The wall mounted light at the proposed south entry would be twenty foot (20') high and the other wall mounted lights would be sixteen foot (16') high. A point to point diagram has been provided to show the adequacy of the proposed site lighting. (9) Shielding shall be provided to prevent light spillage onto adjoining properties. (10) Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (11) Lighting shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. (F) **Utilities** (1) The plans indicate the site is served by public water and sewer. A proposed water service to the building is shown from a water main in the north side of East Seventh Street as depicted on the plan. A proposed sanitary sewer connection for the new building is indicated to an existing main shown in the approximate centerline of East Seventh Street. (2) The applicant must receive necessary approvals from New Jersey American Water since the project is within their franchise area. (G) **Signage** (1) No signage information is provided. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. (2) All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply

with Township ordinance. (H) **Environmental** (1) No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for this project or required due to the project size. (2) To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. The data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. (3) We recommend that all on-site materials from the proposed demolition activities be removed and disposed in accordance with applicable local and state regulations. (I) **Construction Details** (1) All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete @ 4,500 psi. (2) Construction details are provided with the current design submission. We will review the construction details during compliance should site plan approval be granted. (3) Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Ocean County Planning Board; (b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; (c) New Jersey American Water prior to occupancy; an (d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mr. Brown appearing on behalf of the applicant and to my right is Mr. Macfarlane who is the engineer for the applicant. To make a really long story short we have no problem complying and or addressing all of the comments in the report from your professionals so if there isn't anything further, my humble recommendation is that we say as little as possible.

Chairman Neiman commented on the fact that they have sufficient parking because it's always been an issue with synagogues and you seem to have sufficient parking and I thank you for that.

Mr. Brown stated that the parking is sufficient and then some. My only regret, and I say this very honestly, is that this particular synagogue is not being built closer to where I live.

Chairman Neiman says he was thinking the same thing when he read it.

Mr. Follman made a motion to move this application to the March 15th Public Hearing, , seconded by Mr. Percal.

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that this application is moved to the March 15, 2011 Public Hearing. There is no further notice required.

4. SP # 1946

Applicant: Knesset Yisrael

Location: Cedar Street, south of Pine Street
Block 777 Lot 8

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for proposed synagogue

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a two-story synagogue, which includes an exposed basement and a parking lot. The site plans indicate the proposed synagogue will contain one thousand seven hundred fifty square feet (1,750 SF) of main sanctuary area. An interior parking area consisting of seventeen (17) parking spaces, one (1) being van accessible handicapped, and site improvements are also proposed within the property. Access to the site is provided from Cedar Street. The tract consists of a 100' X 150' rectangular shaped lot that totals fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF) 0.34 acres in area. The existing property contains a one-story dwelling and a shed. All existing structures and site improvements are to be removed. The site is located in the central portion of the Township on the west side of Cedar Street, south of the intersection with Pine Street. Cedar Street is improved with utilities, curbing on both sides, and has a pavement width of only twenty-five feet (25') and a right-of-way width of thirty-three feet (33'). While a road widening is not proposed, the applicant is proposing to provide the Township with an 8.5' wide easement for road widening purposes. There is no existing sidewalk across the property frontage, but sidewalk is proposed. Freshwater wetlands are shown off-site to the west and a fifty foot (50') buffer line passes across the rear portion of the property. The adjacent and surrounding properties are mostly developed, with residential uses. The property is located in the R-10 Zone District. Places of worship are permitted uses. (l) **Zoning**

(1) The parcel is located in the R-10 Single-Family Residential District. Places of worship are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the provisions of Section 18-905.

(2) A variance is required for Maximum Building Coverage. A maximum building coverage of twenty-five percent (25%) is allowed. The proposed basic building of 50' X 75' contains three thousand seven hundred fifty square feet (3,750 SF), which is twenty-five percent (25%) of the fifteen thousand square foot (15,000) lot area. However, the covered access stoop and first floor projections cause the allowable building coverage to be exceeded. The actual building coverage should be provided, and variance requested.

(3) According to Section 18-905 A. 2, relief is required for

parking areas located closer than five feet (5') to any side property lines that are adjacent to residential zoned properties. The proposed parking area is two feet (2') from the side lot lines. A six foot (6') high vinyl fence is proposed along the front portion of the north side line of the project. (4) According to Section 18-905 B. 1. Perimeter Buffer: For properties adjacent to residential properties, if the site leaves a twenty foot (20') undisturbed area then there is no requirements for buffering. If the twenty foot (20') buffer is invaded or disturbed than requirements indicated in Section 18-905 B. 3 shall be put in place along the invaded area. A six foot (6') high vinyl fence is proposed along the front portion of the north side line of the project. (5) The Board shall take action on whether to accept an 8.5' wide easement for road widening purposes as opposed to a right-of-way dedication. Whatever the Board approves will require a description for review prior to filing with the County. (6) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the required variance and justify relief where necessary. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** (II) **Review Comments** (A) **Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** (1) General Note #5 indicates "Boundary and topography taken from survey by Charles Surmonte dated 12-10-09". A map entitled "Topographic Survey of Property, Lot 8, Block 777, Lakewood Township, Ocean County, New Jersey" consisting of one (1) sheet dated 12-31-09 prepared by Charles Surmonte P.E. & P.L.S., has been submitted. Coordination of the Survey data should be completed. (2) The status of the existing wood fence shown on the Topographic Survey, which is on the line between Lots 8 and 9, has not been indicated on the site plan. (3) As indicated previously, a seventeen (17) space parking lot with one (1) van accessible handicapped space is being provided for the proposed synagogue. The net sanctuary area must be coordinated between the site plans and architectural plans. The 7.5 required spaces shown on the site plans should also be corrected. (4) Testimony is required for the configuration of the proposed parking lot and driveways. Vehicles entering the site will be from a two-way driveway aisle with perpendicular parking on both sides. The proposed parking stalls to the north of the two-way aisle are double stacked. This requires vehicles to fill the northern most rows of spaces first and exit the site from a single one-way driveway. Do Not Enter signs are required for the exit driveway. (5) The applicant's professionals indicate the congregation proposes to use curbside pickup by the Township. A proposed 4' X 12' refuse enclosure is depicted on the plans along the north wall of the building. (6) The General Notes require some minor corrections. (7) A six foot (6') vinyl fence is called out on the front portion of the north side of the property adjacent existing Lot 7. Existing and proposed fencing limits must be clarified. (8) Sight triangle easements are proposed at the exit drives. Survey data and a description will be required for review prior to filing with the County. (9) A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement dedicated to the Township is proposed across the frontage of the property, behind the proposed road widening easement. A description will be required for review prior to filing with the County. (10) Revisions are required for the Site Plans to match with the Architectural Plans for the proposed building. (11) The plans show a wetlands line taken from a map entitled "Freshwater Wetlands Map, Block 777, Lot 8, Lakewood Township,

Ocean County, New Jersey”, prepared by Trident Environmental Consultants, dated 7-1-09. A copy of this map must be provided along with any Letter of Interpretation obtained. (12) A Buffer Line offset by fifty feet (50’) from associated off-site wetlands is shown crossing the rear edge of the property. Survey data is required for this buffer line to insure there will be no encroachment from proposed improvements. (13) Per our 2/10/11 site investigation, we note that curb exists along Cedar Street in front of the site, but sidewalk does not. Depressed curbing is proposed in the front of the site where the access driveways are proposed. Sidewalk is proposed across the frontage and handicapped ramps will be installed to cross the access driveways. An existing pole conflicts with the proposed exit driveway. The relocation of this pole should be noted. (B) **Architectural** (1) The proposed building height of twenty-nine feet (29’) for the two-story structure with exposed basement should be confirmed. The distance between the proposed basement floor and first floor is ten feet (10’). The difference between the proposed first floor and second floor is also ten feet (10’). The building does not exceed the allowable height of thirty-five feet (35’). (2) A useable sanctuary space of one thousand seven hundred forty square feet (1,740 SF) is shown for the proposed building. This figure should be coordinated with the site plan. Dimensions are required on the floor plan to confirm the proposed sanctuary space since it impacts the number of required off-street parking spaces. (3) Testimony is required on ADA accessibility. It appears only the first floor of the proposed building is accessible. (4) The basement floor has been set to provide at least a two foot (2’) separation from the seasonal high water table, as indicated on the soil boring log submitted. (5) Testimony should be provided as to whether the proposed synagogue will include a sprinkler system. (6) The location of proposed air conditioning equipment is shown on the site plan. Said equipment should be adequately screened. (7) Proposed roof leaders must be added to the drawings since the storm water management narrative states that the roof leaders will be provided with stabilization measures to prevent erosion from the roof drains. (8) We recommend that color renderings of the building be provided for the Board’s use at the forthcoming public hearing for the application. (C) **Grading** (1) Grading information is provided on Sheet 2 of the Site Plans. Coordination of proposed elevations is required between the architectural drawings and site plans to evaluate the grading. Proposed elevations should be provided at control points such as building access points and landings. (2) Per review of the existing elevations and per review of site conditions during our 2/10/11 site inspection, on-site grades generally slope westward towards the existing wetlands. (3) The architectural plans generally indicate a nine foot (9’) elevation difference between the proposed first floor and finished grade. This elevation difference is not reflected on the site plans. Revisions are required and the plans must be coordinated. (4) A soil boring location is indicated on the drawings. Based on the soil log provided, the proposed basement floor elevation of 48.33 shown on the site plan should be greater than two feet (2’) above the seasonal high water table elevation. (5) The gutter in front of the site traps runoff. However, there is not enough surrounding topography to recommend a solution. (D) **Storm Water Management** (1) The increase in impervious coverage has been calculated at less than a quarter acre to determine that the project is not major development per NJAC 7:8. Therefore, no on-site storm water management system has been proposed. However, runoff from the proposed parking lot is being

directed to the existing street in front of the site which appears to be an existing low point per the topography. Perhaps the site can be graded to direct runoff to the rear of the property and into the wetlands. (2) We recommend meeting with the applicant's engineer prior to the public hearing to address storm water concerns. (E) **Landscaping and Lighting** (1) Landscaping and Lighting is provided with the submission; proposed landscaping and lighting is depicted on Sheet 2 of the plans. (2) A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is shown across the frontage of the property. Two (2) Red Maple shade trees are proposed within the easement. (3) Proposed sight triangle easements must be added to the Lighting & Landscaping Plan. Proposed shade trees shall not conflict with the sight triangle easements. (4) Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (5) Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. (6) The Lighting design only shows one (1), sixteen foot (16') high pole mounted light in the proposed parking lot. Testimony should be provided on the adequacy of the proposed site lighting. Additional information is necessary including shielding. The photometric pattern on the site plan needs to match the 0.5 foot candle contour shown on the detail. (7) Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (8) Lighting shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. (F) **Utilities** (1) The plans indicate the site is served by public water and sewer. A proposed water service to the proposed building is shown from a water meter behind the curb in Cedar Street as depicted on the plan. A proposed sanitary sewer connection for the new building is indicated to an existing main shown in the approximate centerline of Cedar Street. (2) The applicant must receive necessary approvals from New Jersey American Water since the project is within their franchise area. (G) **Signage** (1) No signage information is provided other than traffic signage. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. (2) All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. (H) **Environmental** (1) No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for this project or required due to the project size. (2) To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. The data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. Other than wetlands, no areas of concern are mapped. (I) **Construction Details** (1) All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete @ 4,500 psi. (2) Construction details are provided with the current design submission. We will review the construction details during compliance should site plan approval be granted. (3) Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a)

Ocean County Planning Board; (b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; (c) NJDEP Letter of Interpretation/Absence; and (d) All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Once again members of the board, Mr. Brown appearing on behalf of the applicant and to my right is Mr. Lines who is the engineer for the applicant. There is one variance with respect to building coverage and that's because of an overhang on the second floor, all of the testimony with respect to that variance will be presented at the public hearing. There are some issues with regards to the side yards and we'll have testimony by way of either correspondence and/or the neighbors themselves who will be here to testify as to those elements. There's nothing further in this letter which we will have a problem with addressing and/or satisfying at the public hearing.

Chairman Neiman asked the applicant to talk about parking.

Mr. Lines stated we have 17 spaces, there are 9.4 required, so we have an excess of required parking. There is a slightly different parking pattern double stacked row of parking on the north side of the lot, which would have a one way exit out but because people will come to the property on a regular basis, they'll understand to go all the way through to the front spot and then you pull straight out and others will back up and then pull out.

Mr. Brown stated the circulation isn't ideal but based on the property and based on the fact that we are trying to accommodate as much parking as possible, approximately doubled of what is required, we would ask for that from the Board. We definitely need the parking and that's why we're trying to provide it but we're providing it with the provision that there will have to be signage and understanding as to how the circulation operates.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if this parking configuration works?

Mr. Lines stated yes, you have an 18 ft wide aisle on the exit and you can pull out and go out that way with no problem because there is no back up movement required to leave from those spaces. The others, you have a 24 ft wide aisle and you can back out and pull out.

Mr. Brown asked how many spaces have the 24 ft aisle?

Mr. Lines answered 11.

Mr. Brown stated 11 is more than the required amount correct, and then the overflow parking, we'll call it just for purposes of this conversation, have that nuance where you have only 18 foot.

Mr. Lines stated yes.

Chairman Neiman asks if there were any questions?

Mr. Banas asked what the maximum coverage is.

Mr. Lines answered the building coverage is 25%

Mr. Banas then inquired he thought that's the amount that you have and that is what the ordinance provides.

Mr. Lines stated we have that for the building but the final design for the building, which we were trying to rush to get everything in, I missed that there's an overhang, like a porch overhang on the front of the building, that's also included. The coverage is 25.6% just slightly over 25%.

Mr. Brown asked if the actual footprint of the building itself, is that part of the 25%.

Mr. Lines stated the actual footprint of the building is 25%

Mr. Vogt stated technically they do need to have the waiver and the number will have to be changed on the plan to be 25.6% and then when they come to the public hearing they'll have to see if they need relief.

Chairman Neiman asked we have an LOI for the wetlands that might be there?

Mr. Brown stated we do not have an LOI yet, we've had the wetlands delineated.

Chairman Neiman asked if there were any other questions.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzel to move this application to the March 15th Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Percal

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that this application is moved to the March 15, 2011 Public Hearing. There is no further notice required.

5. SP # 1764A

Applicant: Somerset Development
Location: Route 70 & New Hampshire Avenue
Block 1248 Lot 2

Amended Site Plan to convert 144 age restricted units to 144 nonage restricted units

Project Description

The applicant proposes to amend the Board approval granted for The Willows @ Lakewood age-restricted project, to allow for non age-restricted housing. The existing project approval (Resolution SP #1764), allowed for the construction of a one hundred forty-four (144) unit age-restricted development, based on site plans prepared by DW Smith Associates, LLC. As part of the conversion, the applicant is proposing to replace the previously approved in-ground swimming pool with a playground. No other site plan amendments are proposed as part of this conversion application. The prior application granted the applicant approval to construct a residential age-restricted project consisting of one hundred forty-four (144) units located in twelve (12) buildings together with a clubhouse and associated off-street parking. Each proposed residential building will be four (4) stories high. The ground floor of the proposed buildings will be utilized as a residents parking garage. Twenty-one (21) parking stalls are proposed for each building, one (1) of which will be van accessible handicapped. Four (4) residential units per floor were approved for floors two (2) through four (4) for a total of twelve (12) units per building. Fifty (50) additional off-street parking spaces were provided throughout the site, four (4) of which are also van accessible handicapped. A two-story clubhouse with a basement was also approved, having a footprint of two thousand four hundred square feet (2,400 SF). The project is located at the southeast corner of Route 70 and New Hampshire Avenue. The site consisting of 17.73 acres in area received a Minimum Lot Area variance since it did not meet the required twenty (20) acre minimum. The land is currently wooded and vacant. An infiltration recharge basin has been proposed in the southwest corner of the site adjacent Kettle Creek. The project is located in the southern portion of the Township and is generally surrounded by commercial and multi-family developed land. The project is within the B-5, Highway Development Zone. We offer the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning** (1) The site is situated within the B-5, Highway Development Zone. Only age-restricted multi-family housing is permitted in the zone. Therefore, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 45:22A-46.6 (a.k.a., the "conversion act"), the applicant is seeking an amendment to the previously approved site plan approval to develop the land as a converted development. **The applicant's professionals should provide testimony to the Board's satisfaction regarding compliance with the requirements of N.J.S.A. 45:22A-46.6, as applicable.** (2) No new waivers and/or variances are being sought in connection with this amended application and none appear required. (II) **Review Comments** (A) **General** (1) As set forth in the memorandum prepared by DW Smith Associates, LLC, the project meets the Residential Site Improvement Standards for off-street parking. Garden Apartments have a requirement of two (2) off-street parking spaces for two (2) bedroom units. Based on the one hundred forty-four (144) units proposed, a total of two hundred

eighty-eight (288) spaces are required. Three hundred two (302) off-street parking spaces are proposed for the site, sixteen (16) of which are van accessible handicapped. The project provides more parking than required by RSIS. (2) A swimming pool that was approved with the age-restricted community is being replaced with a playground area with equipment for children. Sample plans for the playground equipment have been provided. Proposed grading plans and construction details are required. (3) As set forth in the DW Smith memorandum, the water supply system is adequate to meet the needs of the converted development. The LTMUA required a flow rate which was equivalent to a non age-restricted development during the initial design. (4) As set forth in the DW Smith memorandum, the proposed sanitary sewer infrastructure should be adequate to handle the 7,920 gallon per day increase for the converted development. LTMUA approval is required. (5) The only material change proposed for the site is the replacement of the proposed swimming pool with a proposed playground area. This will have an inconsequential alteration in the impervious coverage (less than 1%). Therefore, revisions to the proposed storm water calculations and improvements are not required. (6) The plans indicate the storm water management system will be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association. Testimony should be provided on ownership and maintenance of other common elements. Unless previously approved, Homeowners Association documents should be provided. (B) **Architectural** (1) The proposed buildings are not impacted by this amended site plan application. Therefore, architectural floor plans and elevations were not submitted for review. (C) **Grading** (1) A detailed grading plan of the proposed playground area which replaces the approved swimming pool is required. (D) **Storm Water Management (1)** The proposed replacement of the approved swimming pool with a playground area has an insignificant affect on impervious coverage of the site and the proposed storm sewer management system that has been designed. (2) The plans indicate the storm water management system will be owned and maintained by the Homeowners Association. Unless previously approved, submission of a Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual should be included. (E) **Landscaping** (1) Minor revisions to the proposed landscaping will be required if the amended site plan application is approved. (F) **Lighting** (1) The proposed lighting is unaffected by this amended site plan application. (G) **Utilities** (1) The design of the proposed utilities is unchanged by the amended site plan application. The Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority must accept the increase in sanitary sewer flows for the converted development. The potable water demand has already been approved by the LTMUA. (H) **Signage** (1) Signage information has not been altered for this amended site plan application. (I) **Construction Details** (1) Construction details for the proposed playground must be provided on the plans. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Ocean County Planning Board; (b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; (c) Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); (d) New Jersey Department of Transportation (Access); (e) New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection; and (f) All other required outside agency approvals. The plans show many of the outside agency approvals to be in excess of five (5) years old and therefore may have expired. Copies of outside agency approvals should be submitted. **A revised submission should be provided**

addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.

My name is Michael J. Gross, for the applicant. I have Robert McCarthy from DW Smith associates, he is our engineer. We do have Mr. Vogt's letter from February 16th, he makes a number of points in that letter. Mr. Vogt wanted some testimony at the hearing in terms of the conversion act. I think there are findings in this letter that we do comply with, the parking provisions, there are 288 spaces and we provide 302, the state required to provide 2 spaces per unit. Mr. Vogt concludes as we do that there's sewer and water capacity. He asks who is going to own and maintain the other common elements of the playground and we will have a home owner's association. The operation maintenance manual storm water has already been approved on the original plan. He requests minor landscape provisions which we have no problem with. He requests grading and construction details for the playground which of course we can provide as a condition of the approval. Other than that there are really no other issues that that letter raises.

Chairman Neiman asks if there is a Shul planning to be built on this site?

Mr. Gross stated, no not to his knowledge.

Chairman Neiman stated he doesn't know how he's looking to market this but it might be necessary to have a Shul on premises.

Mr. Schmuckler wanted to know if the applicant will be able to go into more detail by the public meeting to better understand it?

Mr. Gross stated what was originally approved were 144 plats in 12 buildings along with a club house that plan is shown here. Other than the conversion of a pool to a playground there are no changes to this plan, the layout remains the same, the storm water remains the same, the units remain the same. It's a pretty straight forward plan.

Mr. Banas asked how many parking spaces do you have per unit in the senior settlement? The portion that is reserved for seniors?

Chairman Neiman says there is none. They are converting it.

Mr. Banas stated he knows but right now it is an adult community and wants to know how many spaces per unit there are.

Mr. McCarthy stated about 2 spaces.

Mr. Banas replied okay except that the amount of parking that the planning board requires for every other community is 4 parking spaces per unit. Where are you going to get the other 2 spaces?

Mr. Gross stated he thinks those are single family homes, these are only flats that are not large units and I think that applies to single family homes if I'm correct.

Mr. McCarthy stated it should also be known that the units do not have basements.

Mr. Banas stated yes he is aware of that. Except that any other home that comes in for development, we generally ask for 4 parking spaces.

Chairman Neiman says that's because the homes that come in have basements.

Mr. McCarthy stated, well these are primarily 2 bedroom units, normally they wouldn't have more than 2 cars.

Mr. Neiman stated the applicant should be prepared at the public hearing to show the floor plan so Mr. Banas can be satisfied that parking will be sufficient.

Mr. Banas says he's only asking to alert you to the fact that he will be directly asking that at the public hearing.

Chairman Neiman asks any other questions?

A motion was made by Mr. Percal to move this application to the April 12th Public Hearing, seconded by Mr. Follman.

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that this application is moved to the April 12, 2011 Public Hearing. There is no further notice required.

6. SD # 1795

Applicant: Michael Rottenberg
Location: Albert Avenue, north of Read Place
Block 827 Lot 3
Minor Subdivision & Variance for 2 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 200' X 200' property totaling 40,000 square feet (0.918 acres) in area known as Lot 3 in Block 827 into two (2) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 3.01 and 3.02 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing two-story dwelling and a wood shed, both of which will remain on proposed Lot 3.02. Proposed Lot 3.01 will become a new residential building lot. Public water and sewer is not available. Therefore, private individual septic disposal systems and potable wells will be required. The site is situated in the south central portion of the Township on the west side of Albert Avenue, north of Read Place, and on the east side of Charity Tull Avenue. Albert Avenue is a well traveled paved road in good condition. Charity Tull Avenue is unimproved. Both streets have existing right-of-way widths of fifty feet (50'). Proposed Lots 3.01 and 3.02 will both be 100' X 200', twenty thousand square foot (20,000 SF) lots. The proposed lot line will create a side yard variance for Lot 3.02 based on the location of the existing two-story dwelling. Curb and sidewalk does not exist along the Albert Avenue street frontage, but is proposed. The lots are situated within the R-20 Single Family Residential Zone. We have the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning** (1) The parcels are located in the R-20 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. (2) Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variance is requested: (a) Minimum Side Yard (proposed Lot 3.02, 5.92 feet, 10 feet required) – proposed condition. (3) Waivers are being requested from providing curb and sidewalk along Charity Tull Avenue since it is unimproved. (4) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variance. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** (II) **Review Comments** (1) The General Notes indicate the coordinates are on an assumed datum. A vertical datum and bench mark should be provided. (2) Existing improvements on proposed Lot 3.01, such as an underground oil tank which serves the existing dwelling on proposed Lot 3.02 will need to be removed. (3) The Minor Subdivision is based on a Survey dated 2/14/10. A copy of the Survey should be provided. (4) The four (4) monuments shown as "set" are not in place, so the monument certification has not been signed. (5) Site improvements are proposed along the Albert Avenue frontage of the project. Albert Avenue is a paved road in good condition across the eastern frontage of the property. Charity Tull Avenue is a wooded right-of-way on the western frontage of the tract where no road improvements are being undertaken. (6) The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for unspecified number of bedroom single-family dwellings. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements does address off-street parking. The existing driveway on proposed Lot 3.02 is large enough to accommodate more than the four (4) off-street parking spaces proposed. A note states that proposed Lot 3.01 will conform to requirements of RSIS upon preparation of architectural plans and submittal of plot plan. The note should be expanded to also conform to the new parking ordinance. (7) Testimony should be provided as to whether a basement is proposed for the future dwelling on proposed Lot 3.01. If a basement is proposed, we recommend a minimum of four (4) spaces be provided. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (8) If a basement is

proposed for Lot 3.01, seasonal high water table information is required. (9) The General Notes indicate water and sewer services to be provided by septic systems and private wells. Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for the Minor Subdivision. (10) Proposed lot numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. (11) Shade tree and utility easements are proposed along the property frontages. The proposed shade tree and utility easement areas shall be listed on a per lot basis. (12) Eight (8) October Glory Maple and five (5) Pin Oak shade trees are proposed for the project. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (13) The Plan does not indicate any existing trees on the site. Testimony should be provided regarding whether there are any specimen trees located on the property. Compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code (if applicable). Additionally, protective measures around mature trees to remain (e.g., snow fencing or tree wells at drip lines) should be provided. If this subdivision is approved, the final plot plan for proposed Lot 3.01 submitted for Township review should include tree protective measures to save mature vegetation where practicable. (14) Testimony should be provided on proposed storm water management. (15) Due to no construction of the new dwelling on proposed Lot 3.01 at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of the improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. (16) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. (17) The following revisions are required to the construction details: (a) The stabilized base thickness for the pavement repair strip on Albert Avenue shall be increased to three inches (3"). The stone thickness may be decreased. (b) A dimension is required between the proposed curb and sidewalk along Albert Avenue. (c) The limits of the eighteen inch (18") dimension shall be corrected on the depressed curb detail. Also, the 12-15 inch dimension for the contraction joints shall be removed. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Ocean County Planning Board; (b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); (c) Ocean County Board of Health (well & septic); and (d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mr. Penzer on behalf of the applicant. We completely comply with everything except because of the existing house, instead of having 10 feet we have only 5.9 feet. We have no problems with anything except that Mr. Vogt asked that the underground air tank not be removed yet, once we work on it, then to remove it not move it now. We comply with everything else.

Chairman Neiman stated you're not asking for any relief for the size of the lot, it's just that existing lot to the lot line.

Mr. Penzer stated right, only because of the existing house.

Chairman Neiman asks for any questions.

A motion to move this application to the April 12th Public Hearing was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that this application is moved to the April 12, 2011 Public Hearing. There is no further notice required.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

6. PUBLIC PORTION

7. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

- Minutes from February 15, 2011 Planning Board Meeting

Moved by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Follman

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

8. APPROVAL OF BILLS

Moved by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Follman

Roll Call Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Margaret Stazko
Secretary