

**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. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mrs. Koutsouris, Mr. Banas, Committeeman Akerman, Mr. Fink, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal, Mr. Schmuckler

**3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS**

Mr. Terrance Vogt was sworn in.

**4. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS**

**1. Discussion/Recommendation: Amended B-5 Zone to add an overlay zone**

Sean Gertner on behalf of the Township Committee where I serve as special council on the governing body with Mr. Vogt in terms of putting together this Ordinance which was passed on first reading and then referred to the Planning Board pursuant to procedure. The reason for this Ordinance is first and foremost to address the housing pressures that the Municipality faces. The goal of the Ordinance is to create a situation on parcels where it makes sense, to create a situation where it encourages mixed use to support commercial development protect the tax rate and ratable while providing for a housing opportunities that are needed. We think we came up with a compromise that meets both goals to the best of our abilities, to be fair and I will point this right out so that it is not hidden, the compromise that we had to make from a professional prospective was to deal with Route 70 a little bit and to deal with some of the setback opportunity because you have to give a little to get a little. We felt overall to protect the commercial element given the economy, we address that by protecting the internal development, the internal structure, the separation between commercial and residential while giving a potential developer the opportunity to come before the Board and encourage this kind of mixed use which is Smart Growth, Smart Planning and supports the protection of the tax base. It is the Municipality trying to be forward thinking, looking at economic realities here today on the ground, and speaking on behalf of the people saying, how do we make sure, given the fact that municipalities must raise revenue from property taxes by and large, how do we make sure that that smart growth and that thought is protected while at the same time providing necessary housing opportunity.

Mr. Banas said when I read the proposed ordinance on the computer last week, I scratched my head and said where do we have 20 acres left? That's one of the constraints of the ordinance that is being proposed. But after your explanation, and I again had an opportunity to re-read it, I'm

pleased that it did follow basically the same thing that was found in the re-examination in the last master plan and to me it looks good.

Mr. Vogt stated I think that's an excellent point. We've been involved with this and the recommendation is not only consistent with the master plan, it's also consistent with the smart growth carder goals, its basically right out of the playbook essentially.

Mr. Banas said it appears to be just that. Questions from the board.

Committeeman Akerman stepped down from this vote because it will be voted on by the Township Committee of which he is a part.

Movement by Mr. Schmuckler made a motion to return back to the governing body with a positive recommendation. Seconded by Mr. Herzl.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

## 2. SP # 1952

Applicant: Beth Medrash Govoha  
Location: Southwest corner of Eighth Street & Clifton Avenue  
Block 96 Lot 4  
Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed storage building

### Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. This site plan is for constructing a pre-engineered facilities building for Beth Medrash Govoha on Lot 4 in Block 96. The current site holds student dormitories as part of a Planned Educational Campus. The existing student housing will remain and the proposed storage building will be added to the site. The site plan indicates ten (10) off-street parking spaces will be required by the tenants of the dormitory. This is based on 0.25 off-street parking spaces required for each dwelling unit. The subject 150' X 150' lot is located on the southwest corner of Eighth Street and Clifton Avenue, and contains twenty-two thousand five hundred square feet (22,500 SF), which is 0.517 acres. The proposed 6,528 square foot facilities building will be "L" shaped so it can be situated around the south and west sides of the existing dormitory. An infiltration recharge system has been proposed to mitigate the increase in storm water runoff which would be generated by the site. The project is located in the northern portion of the Township and is generally surrounded by developed land. The plans list the project as part of a Planned Educational Campus since additional property (Block 98) is within five hundred feet (500'). We offer the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning** (1) The plans indicate the site is situated within four hundred twenty feet (420') of Block 98. Per Ordinance #2009-53, Section 18-902.H.6.b., "A Planned Educational Campus may only be developed on one or more contiguous parcels of land having a minimum gross acreage of three (3) acres. Paper streets, existing rights-of-way, or easements shall not be deemed to divide acreage." The Schedule of Bulk Requirements indicates that four (4) acres of land is being provided. Testimony is required on compliance with the Ordinance. Only information on the

half acre Lot 4 to be used for the facilities building has been provided for this application. *Per communications with the applicant's professionals, this property is part of the main BMG campus which exceeds three (3) acres in area.* (2) The allowable Maximum Building Coverage is forty-five percent (45%) of the gross tract area. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements indicates the Maximum Building Coverage provided is forty-five percent (45%). (3) The allowable Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage is eighty-five percent (85%) of the gross tract area. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements indicates the Maximum Impervious Surface Coverage is fifty percent (50%). (4) No variances are being sought in connection with this application. (II) **Review Comments** (A) **Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** (1) Corrections are required to the Existing Conditions Plan. Based on the spot elevations shown, existing contour lines must be revised. Tree #42 is between the existing curb and sidewalk, not behind the sidewalk. An air conditioning unit is behind the two-story portion of the existing structure. Large hedge rows across much of the property are not shown. Also, a Legend has not been provided. (2) Corrections are required to the General Notes to reflect the proposed site plan conditions. The General Notes indicate the Existing Conditions Plan is based on a topographic survey prepared by Clearpoint Services. A copy of this survey and an Outbound Survey must be provided. (3) Proposed dimensions are required on the Site Plan. Accordingly, the provided information in the Schedule of Bulk Requirements cannot be verified. However, it appears no variances will be required. (4) Off-street parking requirements for student dormitories indicate 0.25 spaces shall be provided for each dwelling unit. The plans indicate that ten (10) spaces are required. We assume two (2) garage spaces in the two-story portion of the existing structure are being counted to provide the ten (10) required spaces. Testimony shall be provided on off-street parking. (5) The site plan proposes a six foot (6') high white vinyl fence to replace an existing chain link fence on the adjoining western property line. The proposed limit of new fence is twenty-five feet (25') from the right-of-way of Eighth Street. Fencing is proposed along the southern property line. (6) As indicated in the site plans, five (5) proposed parking spaces are provided from an existing access drive on Eighth Street. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, this parking lot is existing. (7) The proposed access points to the facilities building should be added to the plans. The location of the proposed driveway from Eighth Street to the overhead door should be shown reversed with the concrete pad for the man door. The utility pole with transformers will need to be relocated to allow construction of the proposed driveway. (8) Trash and recycling collection should be addressed. Existing debris should be removed from the site. (9) Driveway access to the proposed building is being provided from both streets. Testimony is required on proposed facility operations. (10) Proposed pedestrian access points to the proposed building must be added on the site plan. No sidewalk is proposed to connect with the building access points on the Eighth Street side of the building. (11) The existing sidewalk is in poor condition and has numerous tripping hazard locations. We recommend sidewalk replacement across the entire project frontage. Existing handicapped ramps at the intersection must be upgraded to current standards. Proposed handicapped ramp locations have been shown for the new driveway location on the Clifton Avenue side of the site. (12) Sight triangles have not been provided at the intersection and for the access drive on Clifton Avenue. The sight triangles may not be required since Eighth Street has a sixty foot (60') right-of-way and Clifton Avenue an eighty foot (80') right-of-way. Confirming testimony should be provided. (13) Curb is required to be replaced along the frontage if has been broken due to construction activities. (B) **Architectural** (1) Architectural floor plans and elevations have been provided for the proposed pre-engineered

facilities building. The proposed building is one (1) floor with the larger southern wing being higher. The proposed building height for the southern wing is twenty-six feet (26'). The allowable building height is sixty-five feet (65')

(2) Testimony should be provided on proposed building signage. No signage is shown on the architectural plans. (3) The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the facades and treatments of the proposed new building. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. (4) No water and sewer connections are shown for the proposed building. The building interior is shown to be unfinished. (5) If heating and/or cooling is proposed, we recommend that the location of proposed HVAC equipment be shown. If air conditioning is proposed, equipment should be adequately screened.

(C) **Grading** (1) A grading plan is provided on Sheet 4. The proposed grading has been designed to generally slope towards the streets. A storm sewer collection system is proposed to collect runoff. (2) The proposed grading scheme cannot be evaluated until the existing contour lines are corrected. In accordance with our 3/17/11 site investigation, the existing property slopes gently from south to north. (3) Proposed elevations are required for the inlet grates and manhole rims. (4) The proposed grading will be reviewed in detail after plan revisions are submitted. (D) **Storm Water Management** (1) A proposed storm sewer management system has been designed. The proposed underground recharge system is located along the Clifton Avenue side of the site. Collection of runoff will be from proposed Type E Inlets and a proposed trench drain at the Clifton Avenue driveway. (2) Permeability testing justifies the infiltration rate proposed for the design. (3) A soil boring taken within the proposed recharge area indicates a two foot (2') separation will be maintained from the seasonal high water table elevation to the bottom of the recharge bed. (4) Predevelopment and Post Development Drainage Area Maps are required to assist in the review of the design. (5) Review of the Storm Water Management Report indicates design revisions are necessary. Additional runoff should be collected to reduce bypass areas and properly decrease runoff from smaller storms. The volume of the recharge system must be increased since the system's size is being exceeded for the 100 Year Storm. (6) Proposed roof drains and the proposed trench drain shall be connected to the storm water management system. (7) The submission of a Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual has been included. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. The Manual must be edited to be project specific for a storm sewer collection and underground recharge system. (E) **Landscaping** (1) The only proposed landscaping consists of buffer plantings being provided between the facilities building and the adjoining properties. Twenty-four (24) Leyland Cypress evergreens are proposed along the western property boundary. Twenty-two (22) Green Giant Arborvitae evergreens are proposed along the southern property line. (2) The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. (F) **Lighting** (1) The only proposed lighting consists of one (1), one hundred seventy-five watt (175W) wall mounted light, twenty-five foot (25') high shown on the east side of the building with the two (2) overhead doors. The adequacy of the proposed lighting must be addressed. (2) The overall lighting design is subject to review and approval by the Board. (G) **Utilities** (1) General Note #10 on the Site Plan indicates that electric, telephone, gas, and CATV services will be installed underground in accordance with the regulations of the local utility company. Testimony should be provided on proposed utilities needed for the structure, especially since no utility connections are shown. (H)

**Signage** (1) Signage information is not provided for this site plan application. Any free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plan (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of this 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 the Township Ordinance. (I) **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) The Tree Protection Management Plan indicates that two (2) specimen trees are to be removed having a total diameter of fifty inches (50"). However, the location of the two (2) specimen trees being removed is not clear. Compensatory plantings will be reviewed during compliance if/when approval is granted. (J) **Construction Details** (1) Construction details are provided on Sheets 6 and 7 of the plans. (2) All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township or NJDOT 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. Construction details will be reviewed after plan revisions are submitted. (3) We recommend the applicant's engineer contact our office to review the construction details. (4) Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Amended outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; (b) Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); (c) Ocean County Planning Board; (d) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and (e) 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. on behalf of the applicant stated although this is a lengthy report, we can do everything that's on there. There is no problem at all. We meet this on the campus ordinance, this is our main part of the campus, as you know, the campus ordinance provides, that anything within 500 ft is part of the campus, we are 420 ft, and therefore we meet it fully on its base. If you go 420 feet in all directions for about four blocks we are part of the campus direction, Yeshiva dormitories. Yeshiva apartments, the Kleinman building, all of them are in the proximity so we are in the campus area, and that's our case.

Mr. Schmuckler asked what are you doing with garbage removal.

Mr. Flannery states there is currently a dumpster on the site and the dumpster will be between the 2 buildings hidden in the back that will be screened. That was one of the comments in Mr. Vogt's report and we will respond to it.

Mr. Penzer pointed out that the neighbor Mr. Ginsberg was present.

Mr. Banas asked if there are any other questions. Seeing none he asked for a motion.

Motion made by Mr. Herzl to advance this application to the April 12<sup>th</sup> Public Hearing. Seconded by Mr. Percal.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes, Committeeman Akerman, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that the application is being advanced to the Public Meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup> in this meeting hall, no further notice is required.

**3. SP # 1891A**

Applicant: Bnos Devorah  
Location: Prospect Street, west of Williams Street  
Block 411 Lot 26  
Amended Site Plan proposed addition to existing school

**Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Amended Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a one-story building addition with unfinished basement to the existing school building for additional classrooms and educational facilities. Besides the proposed 58' X 87', 5,046 square foot addition footprint, an expanded parking lot is proposed as well. The site is located within the southwest section of the Township and fronts on the north side of Prospect Street, west of Williams Street. Access to the site is afforded from a counterclockwise one-way circular driveway. Prospect Street is a County Road. The property contains approximately 0.843 acres. A new one-story school building with a basement exists on-site with associated parking and site improvements. The applicant is proposing 10,092 square feet of addition space among the unfinished basement and first floor. The plans indicate twelve (12) off-street parking spaces will be required. The looped driveway and parking lot is proposed to be expanded for the existing access of the school and the proposed addition section. Some wooded area exists in the rear of the site. The property slopes from south to north. Since Prospect Street and the site are already developed existing utilities are available to the site. Existing sanitary sewer and potable water connections are planned to be used for the project. 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 a mixture of uses. New sidewalk with handicapped ramps exists across the frontage of the site. The site is located in the R-12 Single-Family Residential 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) Submission of an Environmental Impact Statement. (2) Submission of a Tree Management Plan. We support the requested waiver from the Environmental Impact Statement because of the size of the site. A Tree Management Plan can be provided as a condition of approval, conforming with the ordinance as applicable. (II) **Zoning** (1) The site is situated within the R-12, Single-Family Residential Zone. Public and private schools are a "permitted use" per Section 18-906 of the UDO. (2) According to the initial approval, the project received relief from Section 18-906.A.2 of the UDO. A maximum twenty foot (20') wide buffer is required, whereas the applicant received approval for a seventeen foot (17') side yard building setback

on the east side with seven (7) white pines and compact inkberry holly for a low level screen. The proposed addition will continue the 17.26 foot side yard setback, exclusive of the handicap access ramp. Nine (9) additional white pines and four (4) additional compact inkberry holly are proposed within the reduced buffer. The applicant's professionals should confirm whether an access proposed on the west side of the addition will violate the twenty foot (20') wide buffer. (3) Relief is required from Section 18-906.B of the UDO which does not permit parking within any required buffer. The existing parking is already within five feet (5') of the western property line. The proposed parking lot expansion will be less than five feet (5') from the eastern property line. (4) The initial approval granted relief from Section 18-906.E of the UDO, where school bus loading and unloading areas shall be designed such that children do not have to cross a parking area. Testimony should be provided on this matter because of the expanded parking area configuration. (5) We observed a project identification sign during our site investigation conducted on 3/17/11 which is not shown on the Existing Conditions Plan. The sign is close to the right-of-way and may be within the sight triangle. The initial approval did not grant any sign variances. At a minimum, a setback variance would be required for this existing sign. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals. (6) We also observed an existing shed behind the school on the east side of the property. A side yard variance for an accessory structure may be required. Testimony on the shed should be provided by the applicant's professionals. (7) 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. (III)Review**

**Comments (A) Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** (1) The General Notes indicate the Outbound and Existing Conditions were taken from a survey prepared by Clearpoint Services, LLC, dated 8/10/09. Based on our site investigation, the Existing Conditions Plan provided is out of date. At a minimum, the following must be added: (a) Traffic and site identification signs. (b) Limits of concrete curb, Belgian block curb, and depressed curb for drainage. (c) Existing traffic striping, parking spaces, handicapped spaces, and detectable warning surfaces (d) Existing landscaping which must have been planted for the original approval. (e) Limits of chain link and wood fencing. (f) Existing playground and shed locations. (g) Existing HVAC units around the building. (2) The Zoning Requirements show (11) off-street parking spaces are required and twelve (12) off-street parking spaces provided for the proposed project. One (1) off-street parking space is required for every Classroom, Tutor Room, Library, Meeting Room, or Office proposed. Review of the architectural plans indicate nine (9) Classrooms, one (1) Library, and two (2) Offices that are proposed for the existing school building and proposed addition as described per Section 18-906C of the UDO. Therefore, the required number of off-street parking spaces shall be revised to twelve (12). (3) The proposed parking configuration must be clarified by the applicant's engineer, particularly with respect to handicapped parking. A circulation pattern for the proposed buses should be provided to insure there are no conflicts. (4) Handicapped parking and detectable warning surfaces must be proposed to the current code. (5) Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to student bussing, as well as the maximum number of staff professionals at the site during school operations. (6) A one-way drop-off area from the parking lot will require students to cross parking in front of the main school access. (7) 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). (8) Because of the acknowledged deed overlap, the proposed side yard setbacks should be confirmed. (9) 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.(10) The proposed curb radius on the entrance drive is being altered for the parking lot expansion. This will require approval from the Ocean County Planning Board. (11) New sidewalk has been constructed around an existing tree in the center island of the one-way circular drive. Either a sidewalk easement must be provided or the existing tree removed and the walk relocated within the right-of-way. The existing tree is within a sight triangle easement. (12) Existing chain link fencing encroaches onto the property and into the right-of-way on the west side of the site and should be removed. The existing residential driveway next to the fence also encroaches on the property. The existing on-site curb adjacent this fence and driveway shall be removed and replaced with depressed curb to allow for the future extension of sidewalk westward. (13) An existing sight triangle easement associated with the vehicular site exit has been indicated. Bearings, distances, and an area must be added to the existing easement. No shade tree and utility easement exists or has been proposed since the sight triangle encompasses the entire lot frontage. (14) An underground recharge system is proposed behind the building addition. (15) The existing playground is not compliant with the original approval since no safety surface has been constructed. (16) No pedestrian route has been proposed for the building access on the west side of the addition. (B) **Architectural** (1) Architectural floor plans and elevations have been provided for the proposed school addition. The proposed building addition includes one (1) floor and a basement. Testimony should be provided on the proposed building height. The allowable building height is thirty-five feet (35'). (2) The Rear Elevation has been incorrectly labeled the Front Elevation. (3) Testimony should be provided on proposed building signage. No signage is shown on the architectural plans. (4) The architect should provide testimony on handicapped accessibility. Testimony is required from the architect on the specific uses for the proposed individual floors, as well as the existing building. (5) 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. (6) We recommend that the location of proposed air conditioning equipment be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. (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 landings 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 3/17/11 site investigation, on-site grades generally slope to the north. (3) An inlet should be provided at the low point in the proposed parking lot expansion and storm water piped to the proposed recharge system. This will allow the poor condition of the drainage swale on the west side of the existing building to be restored. (4) The proposed playground area behind the addition must be added to the Grading and Drainage Plan. (5) No soil boring locations are indicated on the drawings. No boring logs or seasonal high water table information has been provided to justify the proposed depth of the basement and storm water recharge system. (D) **Storm Water Management** (1) A proposed storm water management system will utilize perforated high density polyethylene pipe to convey storm water runoff into a proposed



underground recharge system. The proposed underground recharge system is located under the new playground area behind the building addition. The proposed recharge system consists of twenty-four inch (24") perforated polyethylene (P.E.) pipe. (2) Storm water calculations have been submitted for review. The drainage area used for the proposed storm water management system is too small. Therefore, the volume of the proposed system needs to be increased. (3) 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 for the project. (4) A storm water collection system for the roof of the proposed school building addition has been provided. Additional information is required for the underground roof drainage system such as pipe sizes, slopes, inverts, and cleanouts. (5) A Storm Water Management Facilities Maintenance Plan may be required. 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 6 of the plans. The existing landscaping planted for the original approval should be added. (2) Buffer planting on the east side of the proposed addition consists of four (4) Compact Inkberry Holly and nine (9) White Pines. The buffer planting on the west side of the proposed addition consists of fifteen (15) Leyland Cypress trees staggered in rows. (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 and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. (5) Landscaping will be reviewed in detail during compliance should approval be granted. (F) **Lighting** (1) No existing or proposed lighting is depicted on of the plans. Testimony on site lighting should be provided from the applicant's professionals. (G) **Utilities** (1) The plans state that existing utilities connections shall be used if possible. Approval will be required from New Jersey American Water 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 since it is a developed site and the proposal concentrates on only a portion of the tract. (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. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. (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) Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township (b) Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); (c) Ocean County Planning Board; (d) Ocean County Soil

Conservation District; and (e) 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. Miriam Weinstein Esq. on behalf of the applicant, stated once again this is a lengthy report, most of it are not issues and we can certainly comply with them. We are seeking the two waivers for the submission of the environmental impact statement as well as the tree management plan. With regard to the sign that's there, the applicant will remove that sign. The shed, the applicant will remove as well. I will make note though, that that shed did exist when we got the initial approval on this, about three years ago. Other than that, if there's anything in particular that the board wants to hear from the applicants then we are good with everything that's in the report.

Mr. Follman asks if Mr. Vogt had any issues with this application.

Mr. Vogt stated no.

Mrs. Weinstein asked if we could talk about the garbages for one second, the school has been rolling trash cans to the curb and I guess a question for Mr. Franklin as well, how do you want to handle the garbage? The applicant is more than happy to continue with the trash cans.

Mr. Vogt stated that on an application like this, if it's going to be up to Township approval continued it would be subject to public works approval.

Mrs. Weinstein says correct, so I guess we look to public works for their guidance on that.

Mr. Follman asks how many students they have?

Mrs. Weinstein says presently there are almost 100. And they will put a dumpster there.

Mr. Banas asks for any other questions? There were none.

He says let's dispose of the waivers that were requested. The engineer has indicated that he has no problems with it. Asks if the board has any problems with the granting of the waivers? Seeing none, asks for motion.

Motion made by Mr. Follman to grant the waivers, seconded by Mr. Percal.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes, Committeeman Akerman, abstained.

Motion made by Mr. Schmuckler to move the application to the April 12<sup>th</sup> Public Meeting, seconded by Mr. Follman

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes, Committeeman Akerman, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that the application is being advanced to the Public Meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup> in this meeting hall, no further notice is required.

#### **4. SP # 1953**

Applicant: Yeshiva Shagas Aryeh  
Location: Northeast corner of West Cross Street and Neiman Road  
Block 251.03 Lot 19

Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed school.

### **Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a two-story school building, which includes an unimproved basement, within a 16,409 square foot footprint and to retain the existing building for a nursery. It is our understanding that the school will serve Pre-kindergarten through 5<sup>th</sup> grades (boys) at this time. The site plans and architectural plans indicate the proposed first floor of the high school building will contain nineteen (19) classrooms and one (1) office. The second floor will contain twenty (20) classrooms and one (1) office. Four (4) parking areas, comprising ninety-five (95) proposed parking spaces are proposed in front and behind the proposed school building. An interior circulation drive is also proposed, including a 36 foot wide cartway leading from a proposed Niemann Road entrance in front of the proposed school building, as well as a 25-foot wide aisle with access onto West Cross Street, a County Road. Per a statement in the Environmental Impact Report, buses will exit the site onto Niemann Road. Per the site plans and reports, well and septic system service is proposed to service the new school. A “recharge” basin as referenced in the report is proposed for stormwater management. As currently designed, the system would allow for infiltration but also have a detention outflow via a piped discharge to the rear of the site. In addition to the above referenced improvements, a 6,000 square foot pool and a 6,000 sf gym are shown as “future” amenities the between the school and the proposed stormwater basin. The surrounding land consists of mainly residential uses. (I) **Zoning** (1) The parcels are located in the R-40 Residential District. Private schools are permitted uses in the zone. (2) Per review of the Site Plans and the zone requirements, no variances have been requested for this application, nor appear necessary. Further, in accordance with Section 18-906A of the UDO, a 20’ foot wide perimeter landscape buffer is proposed along adjacent properties. However, the property has a dual frontage on Niemann Road, which should be addressed in the Bulk Requirements Table on Sheet 3 of the site plans. (3) The applicant’s professionals should indicate whether any design waivers are being sought as part of this application. At a minimum, signed and sealed copies of the submitted survey plan and architectural plans must be provided prior to the forthcoming public hearing on the application. (4) The architectural plans appear to indicate that thirty-nine (39) classrooms and two (2) offices are proposed for the facility. No other facilities (libraries, tutor rooms, etc.) are depicted. (II) **Review Comments** (A) **Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** (1) As indicated previously, Four (4) parking areas, comprising ninety-five (95) proposed parking spaces are proposed in front and behind the proposed school building. An interior circulation drive is also proposed, including a 36 foot wide cartway leading from a proposed Niemann Road entrance in front of the proposed school building, as well as a 25-foot wide aisle with access onto West Cross Street, a County Road. Per a statement in the Environmental Impact Report, buses will exit the site onto Niemann Road. (2) Per the schedule indicated on the site plans, based on one (1) space required per classroom or office, fifty (50) parking spaces are required per UDO standards. Testimony should be provided by the applicant as to whether this figure includes the existing nursery at the front of the site. Testimony should be provided as to whether any Tutor Rooms, Libraries, or Meeting Rooms are proposed as described per Section 18-906C of the UDO.

Parking should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (3) Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether all students will be bused, or will be allowed to be driven to the site, as well as the maximum number of staff professionals at the site during school operations. (4) Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals regarding proposed ingress and egress from the property. Both proposed accesses into the site as well as the interior access drives are all designed for two-way traffic as depicted. It is our understanding that buses will enter the site from West Cross Street and exit onto Niemann Road. (5) Site triangles must be provided for both proposed entrances. (6) Testimony should be provided regarding the number of potential buses anticipated to service the school. A dedicated bus drop-off area should be identified based on the anticipate number of buses that could stage on site for drop-off or pickup at any one time, including but not limited to times, sizes, and types of vehicles anticipated (i.e., buses, vans, cars, others). (7) Testimony should be provided as to whether any students are anticipated to walk to or from the school. If so, internal pedestrian circulation (in addition to the proposed sidewalk along the school frontage) must be addressed on the plans. Additionally, a landing and sidewalk appear necessary for a proposed door on the north face of the school building as depicted on the site plans. (8) Per cursory review of the proposed parking and access layout, there appears to be adequate space provided for the maneuvering of buses and other large vehicles within the site. However, a vehicle circulation plan should be provided for review prior to the public hearing. (9) Testimony should be provided regarding the chain link fence proposed at the front of the school. We assume this is a staging area for children entering or exiting school buses. (10) Additional grading information and construction details are required for the proposed 'u-shaped' handicap ramp as depicted in front of the school. (11) Additional information is required regarding the adequacy of the local Niemann Road paving near the proposed site entrance to accommodate long-term bus traffic. Additional paving and road improvements near the proposed entrance may be warranted. At a minimum, paving repairs along the existing road edge along the property frontage appear necessary. (12) The loading dock proposed at the rear of the school building must be dimensioned. (13) A proposed refuse enclosure is depicted in the corner of the proposed rear parking lot, adjacent to the loading dock at the rear of the building. Testimony should be provided whether DPW or private pickup is necessary. (14) The anticipated timetable for the "future" pool and gym facilities should be addressed by the applicant. (15) Survey data must be provided for all proposed easements. (B) **Architectural** (1) Architectural plans have been provided for the proposed high school. The set includes floor plans and front elevation and left side elevations. The proposed building includes two (2) floors and an unfinished basement. The proposed building height at the front parapet is less than 32.5 feet high, with the remainder of the building (scaling) less than 30 feet high. The allowable building height is thirty-five feet (35'). (2) As depicted on the building elevations, the façade will be a stucco veneer selected by the owner. **We recommend that the applicant bring color renderings for the Board's consideration at the forthcoming public hearing.** (3) Seasonal high water table information is required to substantiate the proposed basement floor elevation. (4) As noted on the proposed architectural plans, the basement is unfinished at this time. Testimony should be provided from the applicant regarding future use of the basement space. (5) Per information provided on the site plans, an on-site well is proposed for water service. 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. (C) **Grading** (1) Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design

concept is feasible. The preliminary grading design is generally well-prepared, and reasonably-limits necessary development of wooded areas on-site. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. (2) No soil boring information is indicated on the drawings. Seasonal high water table information must be provided to justify the proposed basement elevation of the high school and the depth of the storm water recharge system. For preliminary review purposes, we note that the mapped soil types for the site are generally well-drained with significant depths to water table. (D) **Storm Water Management** (1) Stormwater management for the project is proposed by a network of inlets and collection piping for the parking areas and access drive, leading to a proposed (hybrid) recharge basin toward the rear of the site. The basin includes an elevated discharge pipe and outfall, as well as an emergency spillway structure. Per the stormwater report submitted with the application, roof leaders from the proposed school will discharge onto the ground and water collected by the proposed inlets and collection piping system. (2) Per review of the preliminary drainage design and favorable on-site soil conditions, there is more than sufficient on-site property available to install an on-site recharge system similar to what is proposed in the preliminary design. However, the following items must be addressed, at a minimum, to finalize the stormwater design during compliance (if/when approval is granted): (a) Collection system calculations supporting the proposed inlets and piping. (b) Sizing of the proposed basin outfall piping (and basin discharge orifice. (c) Soils data to properly-size the recharge basin and to ensure adequate separation for the seasonal high ground water table (data are forthcoming per the stormwater report). (d) Means of vehicular access to the basin for desilting and maintenance purposes. (e) The addressing of water quality standards (e.g., are flo-guards or similar measures proposed to achieve the 80% TSS removal standards. (f) Given the nature of the use involving school age children, a fence or similar measures around the basin should be considered for safety purposes. (g) If not done already, the basin should be sized to account for the future gym and pool facilities, or additional measures will be required at a later date. (3) 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. This plan can be provided during compliance review if/when Board approval is granted. (E) **Landscaping and Lighting** (1) A dedicated landscaping and lighting plan is provided with the submission; proposed landscaping is depicted on Sheet 4 of the plans. (2) A six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is proposed across the frontage of the property. (3) As proposed, a double row of white pines is proposed to supplement the existing perimeter buffer along the northerly property line. Additionally, red maples are proposed around the front parking areas as depicted on the plans. (4) As evidenced per a site inspection of the property, a significant amount of vegetation within the interior must be cleared to construct the proposed project, most of which is unavoidable. Final grading will be reviewed during compliance (if/when approval is granted) to minimize clearing where practicable, and to provide measures such as snow fencing along limits of disturbance intended to remain. (5) This application will be subject to the requirements of the new Tree Clearing ordinance if/when approved. The survey as well as the "Tree Management Sheet" (sheet 8) depicts sample tree counts from two (2) on-site areas. Data from these counts and other information necessary to document compliance with the Tree Clearing ordinance (i.e., additional plantings and/or monetary contributions) will be required during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. (6) Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree

Commission, as practicable. (7) The Lighting Plan appears to show eleven (11) pole mounted lights around the proposed parking area, and (unlabelled) isofootcandle lines. (8) Additional information is needed to evaluate proposed lighting to ensure conformance with Township standards, including but not limited to pole heights and bases, lighting equipment construction details, and lighting details including isofootcandle intensities. Additional construction detail information is required for the light pole bases. (9) Additional information regarding building-mounted lighting (if any) should be provided on the plans. (10) Light shields should be provided where necessary to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties (11) We recommend that lighting (other than security lighting) be installed on time systems. (F) **Utilities** (1) The plans indicate the site will be served by private on-site (well) water and septic systems. Outside agency approvals from the Ocean County Health Department are necessary. (2) If not done already, the applicant should ensure that adequate source well water is available to service the proposed school, including but not limited to fire suppression systems (if proposed) for the building and amenities such as the future pool facility. Otherwise, public water service may be necessary. (3) Fire hydrants (if proposed) should be indicated on the plans. (G) **Traffic** (1) Minimal traffic information is provided with the preliminary submission. There is a reference on page 6 of the environmental report citing twelve (12) proposed buses daily in the morning and afternoon, and up to forty (40) vehicle trips daily by school personnel and parental pick-ups and drop-offs. (2) More detailed traffic information and testimony should be provided for the Board's consideration. At a minimum, a traffic generation report should be provided to quantify potential traffic generation from the school using industry standards (e.g., ITE manual trip generation rates), and potential traffic impacts to the intersection assessed. Testimony from a qualified traffic consultant should be provided at the forthcoming public hearing. (3) As cited previously, testimony should be provided as to whether significant pedestrian traffic is anticipated for the school. (4) Ocean County approval will be necessary for the proposed West Cross Street entrance. (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. Sheet 1 contains a note to this effect. (I) **Environmental** (1) An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) 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. The following data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-constrained lands such as wetlands or floodplains exist within the site 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 (1) 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. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; (b) Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); (c) Ocean County Planning Board; (d) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; (e) Ocean County Health (well and septic system approvals); (f) 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. Stephen Pfeffer Esq. on behalf of the applicant. This is a site plan application and we have absolutely no variances what so ever it is a conforming plan and with that if you wish we go through the engineering report?

Mr. Banas says I would ask a simple question. You've read the report of the engineer, are there any exceptions that you find meeting the constraints?

Mr. Lines stated the applicant would have no problem at all.

Mr. Pfeffer stated I would just like to indicate one correction, it might have come from a prior application at this site, on page 4 under architectural, there is a reference to a proposed high school, this is a boys elementary school, it's not a high school. On a prior application this site did have to do with a high school. Other than that it adequate for both my client and the engineer.

Mr. Banas asks for questions from the board?

Mr. Follman asks that they intend on having sidewalks?

Mr. Lines says we are proposing them.

Mr. Banas asks for any other questions? Asks for motion.

Motion made to move this application to the April 12<sup>th</sup> meeting by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Fink.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes, Committeeman Akerman, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that the application is being advanced to the Public Meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup> in this meeting hall, no further notice is required.

**5. SP # 1949**

Applicant: County of Ocean  
Location: Ocean County Recycling Center – New Hampshire Avenue  
Block 1160.06 Lot 241  
Courtesy review of proposed replacement of building #68

**Project Description**

The applicant (Ocean County) proposes to make modifications to its existing Northern Recycling Facility, located on the eastern side of New Hampshire Avenue, immediately south

of Oberlin Avenue. As referenced in the application, site modifications include but are not limited to replacement of an existing 3,200 square foot building known as "Building 68", a new 3,000 sf washbay for vehicles, a 2,900 sf Employee Resource Building, and various modifications to existing internal drives and underground utilities necessary to support the proposed improvements. (I) We have the following comments and recommendations: (1) The site is located in a M-1 (Industrial) Zone. The existing use appears to be permitted, at a minimum, under the definition of public utility. Proposed bulk requirements for the upgraded facility conform to M-1 standards. (2) Per review of the original 1989 survey and existing conditions as identified on the "Courtesy" plans, there are deviations in what is depicted as existing. Per review of aerial photography, existing conditions as depicted on the Courtesy plans appears to be more accurate than the 1989 survey conditions. **We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring an (accurate) regional rendering showing the locations of the existing and proposed improvements for the Board's consideration at the forthcoming public hearing.** (3) Per the Courtesy plans, new Building 68, the proposed wash bay and new access drives are proposed immediately west of the existing Vehicle Services Building. It appears that an existing road from New Hampshire Avenue will connect to the new (internal) drive. Testimony should be provided from the applicant's professionals detailing what road improvements are proposed in this area.(4) Per review of the Courtesy plans vs. conditions shown on the 1989 survey, the proposed Employee Resource Building and supporting access drives and parking are proposed immediately inside (north) of an existing fence, located approximately 100 feet east of New Hampshire Avenue, within a previously disturbed area. Confirming testimony regarding these improvements should be provided by the applicant's professionals. (5) General testimony regarding the proposed improvements should be provided to the Board's satisfaction, including but not limited to when these improvements are proposed, proposed hours of operations for the upgraded facilities, and potential traffic impacts (if any). (II) **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) NJDEP (if necessary); and (d) All other required outside agency approvals.

Committeeman Akerman stepped down from the dais for this application.

Mr. Vogt stated that this a courtesy review.

Mr. Ernie Polewine, Solid Waste Manager for the town, also with me is Mr. Joseph Kohler P.E. Mr. Polewine stated one of the benefits I would like to point out on the project, is that with the movement of all these buildings, it will allow us to improve the driveway into the resident recycling center, and that along with the current road improvements out on New Hampshire Ave. should make for a much safer and efficient operation for the public that uses the facility. Mr. Kohler can get into some more or the details of the project.

Mr. Banas asks but in terms of that, are you reopening the old entrance to the dump on New Hampshire Ave.?

Mr. Kohler stated no, what we have here is the whole recycling facility in Lakewood. This is New Hampshire Ave. right here, over here is the parkway, on top here is Oberlin Ave. Over here you have Towbin Ave. which comes into the bottom and this is the main access for all the commercial traffic that comes up through here and across the scales, and comes into the back of the facility.



We have currently traffic that comes in off of New Hampshire Ave. that goes into a drop-off center and then leaves by going back into New Hampshire Ave. and then we also have traffic that comes in off of Oberlin that drops off oil and also tires and the like. This traffic that comes in off of Oberlin intermingles with on-site traffic which creates a little bit of hazard. What this project is going to do is eliminate traffic that intermingles with on-site traffic. So what I've done here, I got a little closer view which shows what buildings we are going to do here. We have existing building number 68 is housed right here. County is going to split that operation and move the employees here over to the separate employee building over here. And then here is going to be the new building 68 which will receive oil and computers and so forth, and then were also going to put in, a quickly wash bay right here. So there will be 3 buildings, employee resource building, new building 68, and the wash bay. Traffic, instead of leaving to go back onto New Hampshire Ave. will now wrap around the back of the existing building here and dump onto an existing access road on Oberlin. Also the traffic coming in off of Oberlin will be able to exit onto Oberlin.

Mr. Banas asks a new lane on New Hampshire Ave.?

Mr. Polewine stated when New Hampshire is improved there will be a turning lane, which will allow that access into that 24 hour drop off where now you're in the left lane making a left.

Mr. Banas says yes, that's good. I like that. Any questions from the board?

Mr. Schmuckler says I have a small comment. I happen to know that the township has built a truck wash in public works maybe a mile down the road, I'm not sure if you're aware of it, maybe it would be more efficient to use that instead of building two truck washes?

Mr. Franklin says no, ours is for washing trucks and theirs is for washing equipment.

Mr. Banas asks for any other questions?

Motion made by Mr. Fink to endorse this plan, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

**6. SP # 1950**

Applicant: Zebra Holdings  
Location: Main Street (Route 88) East of Clifton Avenue  
Block 122 Lot 2.01  
Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed supermarket

**Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. This site plan proposes to replace the temporary supermarket structure currently on the site with a permanent one-story supermarket. It is also proposes to build a loading dock with a second story office above the loading dock. The supermarket is to remain open during construction. The existing property consists of an irregular shaped lot totaling 0.87 acres

which is Lot 2.01 in Block 122. The tract has existing frontages on two (2) streets. Main Street, which is Route 88 a State Highway, has an eighty foot (80') right-of-way and is located to the south. First Street with a sixty foot (60') right-of-way is located to the north. The site shares parking with the parcel to the east, Lot 8, which contains a Laundromat. The proposed building will be approximately twenty-one thousand square feet (21,000 SF). A total of fifty-seven (57) parking spaces are proposed to be shared for the sites. The parking lot generally has a one-way circulation pattern from Main Street to First Street.. The site is in the developed downtown section of the Township. The surrounding area contains a mixture of various uses. We have the following comments and recommendations.

**(I) Waiver (A) The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist:** (1) Storm Water Management Report. (2) Environmental Impact Statement. (3) Tree Plan. We support the waivers requested from providing an Environmental Impact Statement and a Tree Plan. Since the site is developed, providing an Environmental Impact Statement is unnecessary. Since there are few existing trees on the site, providing a Tree Plan seems needless. The applicant shall provide supporting testimony on the requested waivers as required. At a minimum, we recommend the applicant's engineer provide a narrative summary for storm water management regarding the existing and proposed storm water management conditions on the site. The Board shall take action on the requested waivers. **(II) Zoning (1)** The site is located in the B-2 Central Business Zone. Grocery stores and offices are permitted in the Zone. Testimony should be provided that the limited second floor office use is associated with the grocery store operations. (2) A rear yard setback variance is being requested. A 2.6' setback is proposed for the supermarket building. The Zoning requires a rear yard setback of ten feet (10'). (3) A seven foot (7') side yard setback with an aggregate of fifteen feet (15') is required. A four foot (4') side yard setback is proposed from the supermarket building to neighboring Lot 5 to the west. An 8.17 foot side yard setback is proposed from the supermarket to neighboring Lot 8 to the east. Therefore, an aggregate of 12.17 feet is proposed for the side yards. The ordinance indicates a side yard setback is not required between two (2) business uses. Lot 8 contains the Laundromat while Lot 5 is contains a parking lot for the church at the corner of Clifton Avenue and First Street. It is our opinion a side yard variance is required for the proposed four foot (4') side yard setback between the supermarket and Lot 5. **(4) Per Note 4 on the plans, and per communications with the applicant's professionals, the proposed supermarket footprint is similar to the existing (interim) supermarket area footprint, as well as the footprint of the former building (per review of 2002 aerial photography).** **(5) Per communications with the applicant's professionals, supplemental information regarding the requested setbacks for the new building vs. pre-existing conditions, and former operations at the site will be provided for review at the forthcoming public hearing.** **(6)** All non-residential uses in the B-2 Zone are exempt from parking requirements. (7) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the required variances. **(III) Review Comments (A) Site Plan/Circulation/Parking (1)** The existing parking lot has conflicting striping between angle and perpendicular parking spaces. A proposed dimensioned parking plan should be provided. Proposed improvements associated with the supermarket cross onto neighboring Lot 8. (2) The applicant's professionals have indicated there is a cross access agreement between Lots 2.01 and 8. A copy of the agreement should be made part of the submission. (3) The parking lot generally operates in a one-way fashion entering from Main Street and exiting onto First Street. Testimony on the parking operations should be provided by the applicant's professionals. We recommend consideration be given to limiting the Main Street access to a one-way in to avoid the vehicular conflicts we observed during our 3/17/11 site investigation. (4) As depicted on the current design, three (3) handicapped spaces, none of which are van-accessible, are proposed near the main supermarket entrance. We observed existing handicapped spaces across the

aisle in front of the Laundromat. However, the site plan shows these spaces as existing angled parking. Clarification is required. (5) Building offset dimensioning should be provided to the hundredth of a foot since variances are required. The west wall dimension of the supermarket must be corrected to 170.67 feet. (6) A loading area which should be dimensioned is proposed on the north side of the building. The loading area will accommodate four (4) trucks. Two (2) of the loading bays will be depressed and large enough for tractor-trailers. The other two (2) loading bays will be at grade. A design for the depressed loading dock is required which shall include limits of concrete, walls, and railing. Proposed grading and drainage will also be required. (7) A trash compactor on a concrete pad is shown to remain in the northwest corner of the site next to a shed which will be removed. Testimony is required from the applicant's professionals confirming collection from a private hauler. The compactor area should be enclosed and screened. (8) An existing dumpster was observed on Lot 8 where "no parking" striping is proposed. This container should be enclosed, screened, and designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E. of the UDO. Proposed dimensions are required for this "no parking island". (9) Curb and sidewalk exist along both street frontages. The entrance driveway along Main Street requires replacement. Any other curb and sidewalk along the project frontages found in disrepair or damaged by construction activities should be replaced. (10) Unless a waiver is sought, concrete curb is required with the proposed sidewalk adjacent the supermarket. (11) The site plans shall show the proposed building access points indicated on the architectural plans. The site plans should also show proposed shopping cart storage. (12) Proposed roof overhangs should be shown on the site plan to assure the property line of adjoining Lot 8 is not crossed. (13) All surrounding fencing is in poor condition. Consideration should be given to installing new fencing along the property lines. (14) The applicant's professionals should address the need for sight triangle easements. (B) **Architectural (1)** Architectural Plans were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the building will have an average height of less than thirty feet (30'). The allowable height is sixty-five feet (65'). (2) Testimony should be provided on proposed building signage. Building signage is shown on the architectural plans, but no zoning data has been provided. (3) The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the proposed building façade and treatments. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. (4) Testimony should be provided as to whether any roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed for the complex. If so, said equipment should be adequately screened. (C) **Grading (1)** The overall grading design is feasible and will be addressed further during compliance review if/when approval is granted. (2) Additional proposed contours and spot elevations are required for work in and around the proposed building. The only proposed grades shown are the finished floor and most of the building corners. (3) The existing contours require correction because a wall that surrounds some of the existing supermarket is not shown. Existing grading revisions are required in order to review the proposed grading scheme. (D) **Storm Water Management (1)** No storm water management system has been shown or designed for the site. While the site is virtually impervious, testimony is required on the existing storm water management conditions. (2) The proposed depressed loading dock will require some type of storm water management system. (E) **Landscaping (1)** No landscaping has been provided for the project. Shade trees, as well as shade tree and utility easements are required unless waived by the Board. (2) Final landscape design is subject to Board approval and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. (F) **Lighting (1)** Eight (8), one hundred watt (100W) proposed building mounted "Wall Director Lights" have been shown on the site plan. Existing site lighting has not been shown. Therefore, it is not clear whether the proposed lighting is adequate. Testimony should be provided on site lighting. (2) The overall lighting design is subject to review and approval by the Board. (G) **Utilities (1)** No new water or sewer service is proposed. Existing water and sewer service is provided by New Jersey American Water Company. (H) **Signage (1)** A dilapidated existing freestanding sign which is not indicated on the Site Plan is located adjacent the Main Street right-of-way in the

southwest corner of the site. The architectural plans indicate proposed wall sign locations on the east and south sides of the grocery store. No dimensions or details have been provided to confirm that the signs comply with the ordinance requirements. Existing and proposed signage must be addressed. (2) All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with the Township Ordinance. (I) **Environmental (1)** No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for this project since it is a developed site. (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. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. (3) A waiver from a Tree Management Plan has been requested. There are few existing trees on-site. The only existing trees observed are near property lines. (J) **Construction Details (1)** Additional construction details are required with the current design submission. We recommend that final construction details be revised as necessary during compliance review, if/when this project is approved by the Board. (IV) **Regulatory Agency Approval** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: (a) Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township;(b) Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable);(c) Ocean County Planning Board; (d) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; (e) New Jersey Department of Transportation; and (f) 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. Herzl and Mr. Schmuckler both stepped down from the dais for this application due to a conflict of interest.

A motion to approve the waivers was made by Mr. Akerman and seconded by Mr. Fink.

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Committeeman Akerman, yes.

Mr. Penzer stated Mr. Chairman you may recall, sitting here once upon a time, what we used to call the Lanes drugs shopping center and at that time the co-op was built, and the co-op was in operation when the fire came and this huge tent that was only supposed to be there for a short while took us a little bit more time to get our finances together. Believe it or not its 6 years since that happened, and now the township has asked us to get out of the tent and build a building and that's what we're doing over here. The only thing I told Mr. Vogt, I thought that the footprint is exactly the same, it's not, it's slightly larger and I think that's good to note. Other than that it really is the same area where the building existed previously. You are also aware that in the zone there is no parking necessary, however we have entered into a lease with the Laundromat, all the parking besides the one in front that they need immediately for the 5 year options of the lease with them. So we do have parking. And the idea that Mr. Vogt had is an excellent idea, which is coming in on Main St. and going out on First St. So we would drive through instead of going around. I spoke with Mr. Rothchild, who's here, and he thinks that it's a great idea, that it would probably be a much more safe idea. We would like to try and make that happen.

Mr. Banas says I remember that driveway only accommodated probably about 10 ft for one car.

Mr. Penzer says no, it was more than that but the problem is that in fact there is so much room, they made turn arounds on that. So they would park in front, turn around and go back out. Terry's idea for safety purposes, go in here and come out the other way, which makes sense.

Mr. Banas states that it makes sense, I think it's a good idea. But you're going to head into a lot of traffic on First St.

Mr. Penzer says it is what it is.

Mr. Follman asks Mr. Penzer, how much is a little larger?

Mr. Stevens stated I think what Mr. Penzer was trying to say, we will certainly give more testimony to the board when we come for a public hearing, but the idea is that the tent could stay in operation during a portion of the construction of this project. So what we want to do is to allow for areas outside the tent to build the foundations of the new building. In addition to that, were looking to replace a series of trailers that were using for storage now, we want to remove those trailers from the site and build a more permanent building in that area, that would allow for storage.

Mr. Penzer stated that the square footage of this building is actually less because the previous building had a second floor and this will not.

Mr. Stevens stated a portion of the building will have offices for the supermarket itself.

Mr. Follman stated that he actually knows the facility, I like the idea of having that other entrance on first. I think it's a wise move.

Mr. Penzer says we are going to try to do that if we can.

Mr. Stevens says we are going to make it one way. It's the way the facility is supposed to operate but because there is so much room people do use the parking lot to turn around and go back onto Main St.

Mr. Penzer states it will certainly be better than it is now.

Mr. Banas asks for any other questions from the board?

Motion made by Mr. Follman to move this application to the April 12<sup>th</sup> meeting, seconded by Mr. Percal.

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Committeeman Akerman, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that the application is being advanced to the Public Meeting on April 12<sup>th</sup> in this meeting hall, no further notice is required.

**7. SD # 1799**

Applicant: Mordechai Englard  
Location: South Street, west of New Hampshire Avenue  
Block 855.06                      Lots 30 & 31

Minor Subdivision & Variance to create 3 lots

**Project Description**

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 192.5' X 283' property totaling 54,477 square feet (1.25 acres) in area known as Lots 30 and 31 in Block 855.06 into three (3) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 31.01-31.03 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing frame dwelling which will remain on proposed Lot 31.01. Proposed Lots 31.02 and 31.03 will become new residential building lots. Public water and sewer is not available. Therefore, private individual septic disposal systems and potable wells will be required. The site is situated on the south side of South Street, approximately 722 feet east of its intersection with Albert Avenue. The surrounding area is predominantly single-family residential. South Street is a paved road that has an existing right-of-way width of fifty feet (50') and a varying pavement width (depicted at 22.9 feet). No curbing or sidewalk exists along the property frontage. Sidewalk, curbing, and additional pavement widening is proposed along the property frontage as part of this application. Proposed Lots 31.02 and 31.03 will require lot area and lot width relief. 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 variances are requested: (a) Minimum Lot Area (proposed Lots 31.02 and 31.03, 17,238 SF each, 20,000 SF required) – proposed condition. (b) Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lots 31.02 and 31.03, 89.55 feet each, 100 feet required) – proposed condition. (3) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested 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** (1) New chain link fence surrounds the entire property. The fence height complies with the ordinance being six feet (6') high behind the front yard setback line and four feet (4') high in front of the front yard setback line. (2) A Legend is required on the plans. (3) Site improvements are proposed along the frontage of the project. The proposed improvements include pavement widening, concrete curb, concrete driveway aprons, concrete sidewalk, and shade trees. We recommend that if approved, additional road restoration along the frontage resulting from deteriorated existing paving (if any) be performed as directed by the Township. (4) Proposed dimensions are required to properly locate the proposed sidewalk within the right-of-way. (5) Per review of the proposed grades for improvements in the right of way, minor grading revisions are necessary. We recommend the applicant's engineer contact our office for further guidance. (6) The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for unspecified number of bedroom single-family dwellings. The subdivision plan proposes new asphalt driveways capable of providing four (4) off-street parking spaces per lot, including a new driveway to serve the existing dwelling to remain on proposed Lot 31.01. (7) Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed for the future dwellings on proposed Lots 31.01 and 31.02. If so, seasonal high water table information will be required. (8) Ocean County Board of Health approval for new wells and septic systems necessary for proposed Lots 31.02 and 31.03 will be required for the Minor

Subdivision. (9) Proposed lot and block numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. (10) A proposed shade tree and utility easement is shown along the property's frontage. Easement areas for the proposed individual lots have been completed. (11) Six (6) shade trees (Green Vase Zelkovas) are proposed for the project. The label on the Minor Subdivision Improvement Plan referencing seven (7) trees must be corrected. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. The plans indicate a number of existing trees ten inch (10") diameter or greater within the site, at least some of which will be removed at time of construction. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan Review for the proposed lots. (12) Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from development of proposed Lots 31.02 and 31.03. (13) Due to no construction proposed 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. (14) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. At a minimum, the aggregate side yard setback for proposed Lot 31.01 (35 feet) must be corrected on the final plat. (15) Construction details will be reviewed in detail during compliance if approval is given. (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); (d) Township Tree ordinance (as applicable) and (e) 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. John Doyle Esq. on behalf of the applicant stated consistent with the master plan we proposed single family residential, consistent with what you would want us to do in terms of the engineer's report. All those terms, including the pavement restoration and sidewalks all would be done. Typically with drainage we would comply with whatever Terry wanted, we will provide dry wells for each of the houses that need. Simply put, a significant part of this application is that the existing house, along with the adjacent lot, forms a total of approx. 56,000 sq ft., barely shy of the 60,000 that would be required for 3 conforming lots. The existing house would be maintained and configured on the lot, slightly above the 20,000 required, the balance would be split into 2 lots, that would be approx. 17,500 sq ft. Each of the proposed houses would meet all of the bulk requirements. Under those circumstances, and given the additional fact that the lots across the street are uniformly of 90 ft width, which is what we're proposing, it is consistent with the neighborhood. We appreciate that that's a variance. That variance condition will be attested to in terms of master plan and conformance with it and the reason for granting the whole experience at the public hearing in which people will be heard. With that said, we will meet everything else that is requested.

Mr. Banas asks for questions from the board?

Mr. Percal asks if they will provide with a tax map.

Mr. Doyle stated yes, I would say that you would see from the tax map that the lots across the street are the same width. They meet the lot area because these two streets where they front and to the rear provides in depth. But the look of the lot on the street is the same.

Mr. Banas asks for any other questions?

A member of the audience wanted to know why he could not speak about this application at this meeting.

Mr. Jackson explained that this meeting was for the review of the application and the public portion of the application would be at a later date. Even though the notice was published to attend this meeting it is for review purposes only.

Motion made by Mr. Schmuckler to advanced this application to the May 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, seconded by Mr. Herzl.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Committeeman Akerman, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

Mr. Jackson stated that this application is being advanced to the Public Meeting on May 17<sup>th</sup> in this meeting hall, no further notice is required.

## 8. SP # 1951

Applicant: Tova Trust  
Location: Second Street, between Clifton Avenue & Lexington Avenue  
Block 120 Lot 3  
Preliminary & Final Site Plan proposed addition to existing retail/office building

### **Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a two-story building addition with unfinished basement to the existing retail/office building for additional retail and office space. The site is located within the downtown section of the Township and fronts on the north side of Second Street, east of Clifton Avenue. The property contains just less than seven thousand square feet (7,000 SF) or 0.16 acres. A two-story building with a basement exists on-site with retail use on the first floor, office use on the second floor, and parking/delivery behind the building. The applicant is proposing 8,897 square feet of addition space among the unfinished basement and two (2) floors. The proposed area for the unfinished basement is 2,991 square feet. The proposed area for the first floor retail use is 2,991 square feet which is planned to be divided among three (3) tenants. The proposed area for the second floor office use is 2,915 square feet which is also indicated to be divided among three (3) tenants. The site is developed and existing utilities are available to the project. The surrounding lands and roadways are all improved with commercial development. Existing sidewalk and curb front the site, and are also located on the east side of the property which is an access driveway to municipal parking.

The site is located in the B-2 Central Business Zone. Retail and office facilities are permitted uses in the zone. (1) **Zoning** (1) The site is situated within the B-2, Central Business Zone. Retail and offices are permitted uses in the Zone. (2) A seven foot (7') side yard setback with an aggregate of fifteen feet (15') is required. The ordinance indicates a side yard setback is not required between two (2) business uses. While a business use is located on the west side of the project, a municipal parking lot access driveway is located on the east side of the property. No side yard setbacks are proposed as the building addition intends to encompass the entire lot width. It is our opinion a side yard variance is required for the proposed zero foot (0') side yard setback from the east side of the project. Furthermore, it



was observed during our 3/17/11 site investigation that the proposed building addition would cover existing doors and windows, and require the removal of roof drains and air conditioning units on the neighboring building to the west of the site. The applicant may wish to contact construction personnel to confirm the proposed footprint is permissible. (3) All non-residential uses in the B-2 Zone are exempt from parking requirements. (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 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 General Notes indicate the Boundary and Topography were taken from a survey prepared by DVS & Associates, dated 12-1-10. A copy of this survey must be provided since we note a number of discrepancies. Most importantly, the width of the proposed building addition will exceed the existing lot width near the rear of the tract where the property narrows. Other physical features require correction such as utilities, signs, curb, and drainage. (2) An existing building wall connecting the existing market façade to the adjoining building on the site to the west must be added to the plan. Therefore, the proposed addition will make the side yard area on the west side of the market with the existing compressors and air conditioning units inaccessible. **Revisions are necessary.** (3) The proposed building addition will conflict with an existing basement access to the neighboring building on the west side of the project. Testimony is required as to how this conflict is being handled. (4) No loading or delivery areas are proposed. The current delivery operations taking place behind the building will be eliminated by the proposed addition. Testimony is required regarding **future** site operations, particularly deliveries for the retail uses. (5) Proposed building offsets must be clarified. The proposed side yard at the northeast corner of the addition is zero feet (0'), while the proposed side yard at the southeast corner of the addition is 0.4 feet. (6) The existing adjoining lots must be correctly shown on the site plan since off-site improvements are being undertaken on the property immediately east of the site. (7) The applicant proposes to replace the existing sidewalk which is in disrepair and partially located on the property, with new sidewalk adjacent the municipal parking lot driveway. Also, the depressed curb accessing the existing parking and delivery behind the current building will be replaced with full height curb. The new sidewalk will require the removal of existing trees and the relocation of existing signage, both of which are not shown on the site plan. (8) Existing and proposed building access points must be shown. The locations will impact the proposed sidewalk design. Sidewalk should be added behind the proposed addition since there will be building access points at the rear of the addition. (9) The General Notes indicate solid waste and recycling to be collected by the Township. **Approval from the DPW Director is necessary.** Testimony is required from the applicant's professionals addressing trash and recycling collection. No waste receptacle area is shown. (10) A six foot (6') high stockade fence with a gate is proposed around the rear yard. Construction details are required. (11) No shade tree and utility easement exists or has been proposed since the building front yard setback is only a half foot (0.5') from the right-of-way line. (12) Minor corrections are required to the General Notes. (A) **Architectural** (1) Architectural floor plans and elevations have been provided for the proposed building addition. The proposed building addition includes two-stories and an unfinished basement. The proposed building height is twenty-one feet six inches (21'-6"). The allowable building height is sixty-five feet (65'). (2) No restrooms are proposed in the building addition. Restrooms must be added since the restrooms in the existing section of the

building are not accessible by the future tenants of the addition. (3) The labeling of the Elevations need to be corrected. The Rear Elevation is the North Elevation. The North Side Elevation shall be revised to West Side Elevation. The South Side Elevation shall be revised to East Side Elevation. (4) The architect should provide testimony on handicapped accessibility. Testimony is required from the architect on the specific uses for the proposed individual floors, as well as the existing building. (5) 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. (6) We recommend that the location of proposed air conditioning equipment be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. (B) **Grading** (1) No proposed grading plan has been provided. Proposed elevations and contours are required to complete the project design. (2) Per review of the existing elevations and per review of site conditions during our 3/17/11 site investigation, on-site grades from the existing parking area behind the building slope eastward towards the municipal parking lot access driveway. (C) **Storm Water Management** (1) No storm water management system has been shown or designed for the site. The property is virtually impervious and small, being less than seven thousand square feet (7,000 SF). Testimony should be provided on the existing storm water management conditions. (D) **Landscaping** (1) No landscaping has been provided for the project. The only areas available for landscaping are the proposed rear yard and a strip of land adjacent the existing building. (2) Final landscape design (if any) is subject to Board approval and should conform to recommendations from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. (E) **Lighting** (1) An existing light pole is shown along Second Street in front of the building. No proposed lighting is depicted on of the plans. Testimony on site lighting should be provided from the applicant's professionals. (F) **Utilities** (1) The plans state that existing public water and sewer laterals to be reused. It appears new connections will be necessary unless major renovations are proposed to the plumbing of the existing building. Water and sewer approvals will be required from New Jersey American Water since the project is within their franchise area. (G) **Signage** (1) The Site Plan proposes no freestanding signage. The architectural plans indicate proposed wall sign locations on the east side of the proposed addition. No dimensions or details have been provided to confirm that the signs comply with the ordinance requirements. (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 since it is a developed site and the tract is less than seven thousand square feet (7,000 SF). (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. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. (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. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; 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) Developers Agreement at the discretion

of the Township: (b) Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); (c) Ocean County Planning Board; (d) Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if applicable); and (e) 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 stated that my respectful request for this application is that the tech portion of this application be moved to the next available meeting such that a neighboring property owner and the applicant can work out some difference. Is it possible to have it moved to the April 12<sup>th</sup> meeting?

Mr. Kielt says I would think it is not a good idea only because I have a large agenda with several schools. Can we move it to the next tech meeting?

Mr. Jackson asks if you can get your notice in the paper on time for April 12<sup>th</sup>?

Mr. Brown says yes, it is sufficient time. If it's a problem though then we stay consistent. May 3<sup>rd</sup> then.

Mr. Banas says very good.

Mr. Jackson announced that #8 Tova Trust is adjourned to May 3, 2011 six o'clock this meeting room, there will be notices.

## **5. CORRESPONDENCE**

## **6. PUBLIC PORTION**

Larry stated that on the agenda there is no longer the statement of a variance required are no longer on the agenda.

Mr. Kielt stated that he removed this wording because there were times when the information was incorrect and MR. Vogt states the variances in his explanation of the application.

## **7. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

- Minutes from March 15, 2011 Planning Board Meeting

Motion made by Mr. Follman to approve the minutes, seconded by Mr. Herzl.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Committeeman Akerman, abstain, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

## **8. APPROVAL OF BILLS**

Moved by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Herzl.

Roll Call Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Fink, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Percal, yes, Committeeman Akerman, abstain, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

## **9. ADJOURNMENT**

PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
MARCH 29, 2011

TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
PLAN REVIEW AGENDA

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted  
Margaret Stazko  
Secretary