

1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Neiman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Mr. Kiert 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

MR. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mrs. Koutsouris, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Follman, Mr. Schmuckler

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

4. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

1. DISCUSSION- Review/Recommendation of proposed ordinance pertaining to two family housing & duplexes (Section 18-902.F and Section 18-902.G).

The Board found that the proposed Ordinance is consistent with the goals and objectives for the master plan and favorably recommends it's adoption on second reading by the Township Committee.

2. SD # 1727 (Variance Request)

Applicant: Yehoshua Frenkel
Location: Albert Avenue and Towers Street
Block 826 Lots 3&4
Minor Subdivision with Variances

Mr. Vogt prepared a letter dated March 24, 2010 and it is entered in its entirety. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 200' X 200' property totaling 40,000 square feet (0.918 acres) in area known as Lots 3 and 4 in Block 826 into two (2) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 3.01 and 3.02 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing one-story dwelling which will remain on proposed Lot 3.01. Proposed Lot 3.02 will become a new residential building lot. Public water and sewer is not available. Therefore, private individual septic disposal systems and potable wells will be required. The site is situated in the southern portion of the Township on the west side of Albert Avenue, the north side of Towers Street, and the east side of Charity Tull Avenue. An existing dwelling neighbors the property to the north on existing Lot 1. Albert Avenue is a well traveled paved road in good condition, the paving of Towers Street ends at the southwest corner of the site, and Charity Tull Avenue is unimproved. All three (3) streets have existing right-of-way widths of fifty feet (50'). Proposed Lot 3.01 would be larger than proposed Lot 3.02. The proposed lot line is being created based on a minimum distance of ten feet (10') being held behind the existing one-story dwelling. Curb and sidewalk does not exist along any of the street frontages. The lots are situated within the R-20 Single Family Residential Zone. Variances are required to create this subdivision. 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: Minimum Lot Area (proposed Lot 3.02, 17,282 SF, 20,000 SF required) – proposed condition. Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lot 3.02, 86.41 feet, 100 feet required) – proposed condition. Minimum Rear Yard (proposed Lot 3.01, 10.00 feet, 20 feet required) – proposed condition. (3) Waivers are being requested from providing curb and sidewalk. (4) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances and waivers. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** **(II.) Review Comments** (1.) The proposed setback lines indicate the proposed side yards and rear yards are based on the Towers Street frontage. However, a rear yard setback variance is being requested for proposed Lot 3.01, which is shown as a side yard on the map. It should be noted the front of the existing dwelling does face Albert Avenue which may be the reason for the variance request. A proposed rear yard variance will not be required should the proposed setback lines remain as shown. (2) The Zoning Data indicates a side yard setback of 16.41 feet for proposed Lot 3.02. However, no proposed dwelling unit is indicated. Clarifying testimony should be provided. (3) The Zoning Data also indicates maximum building coverage of nine percent (9%) and twelve percent (12%) for proposed Lots 3.01 and 3.02, respectively. However, no dimensions are shown for the existing dwelling to remain on proposed Lot 3.01 and no dwelling is indicated for proposed Lot 3.02. Testimony for the basis of the proposed building coverage should be provided. (4) The Minor Subdivision is based on a Survey dated 2/25/10. Based on our field observations the Survey must be corrected and/or updated to show the following: (a) Dimensions of the existing one-story dwelling. (b) Existing spot shots and elevations, particularly along the roadways. The existing edge of pavement along Towers Street is not straight as sketched. (c) The two (2) monuments shown as “set” were not found. Furthermore, there was no evidence of disturbance of vegetation in these areas. (5) No site improvements are proposed along the frontages of the project. Albert Avenue is a paved road in good condition across the eastern frontage of the property. Towers Street is paved across the southern frontage of the site and is in poor condition. The existing edge of pavement is irregular and instances of pavement failure were observed. Charity Tull Avenue is a wooded right-of-way on the western frontage of the tract. At a minimum, we recommend improvements be undertaken to Towers Street. (6) The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for unspecified number of bedroom single-family dwellings. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements does not address off-street parking. The existing driveway on proposed Lot 3.01 must be dimensioned to confirm that the driveway is large enough to accommodate the proper number of spaces. Some of the driveway is being removed as to not encroach on proposed Lot 3.02. Testimony should be provided regarding the number of bedrooms in the existing dwelling to remain in order to determine whether additional off-street parking is required. Furthermore, testimony should be provided regarding the future plans for proposed Lot 3.02. (7) Testimony should be provided as to whether a basement is proposed for the future dwelling on proposed Lot 3.02. **If a basement is proposed, we recommend a minimum of four (4) spaces be provided.** Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (8) The certifications on the plan should be corrected to conform to Section 18-604B.1., of the UDO. (9) There is not enough separation between the

approximate locations shown for the existing septic system and well on proposed Lot 3.01. Proposed well and septic disposal field locations are indicated for proposed Lot 3.02. Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for the Minor Subdivision. (10) Proposed lot and block numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. (11) Shade tree and utility easements are proposed along the property's frontage. Dimensions for the proposed easements must be completed. The proposed shade tree and utility easement area fronting Towers Street for proposed Lot 3.02 must be corrected to 386.46 square feet.

(12) No shade trees are proposed for the project. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (13) The Plan does not indicate any existing trees on the site. Testimony should be provided regarding whether there are any specimen trees located on the property. Compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code (if applicable). Additionally, protective measures around mature trees to remain (e.g., snow fencing or tree wells at drip lines) should be provided. If this subdivision is approved, the final plot plan for proposed Lot 3.02 submitted for Township review should include tree protective measures to save mature vegetation where practicable. (14) Due to no construction of the new dwelling on proposed Lot 3.02 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. (15) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. (16) Construction details are required for improvements required by the Board. **(III.)Regulatory Agency Approvals-** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: Ocean County Planning Board; Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); Ocean County Board of Health (well & septic); and 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.**

Attorney for Mr. Frenkel stated the existing house is staying its two or three feet over the property line. We are requesting variances to reset the property line by ten feet.

Mr Neiman asked will there still be room for four parking spaces?

Mr. Frenkels Attorney stated that parking spacing will not be a problem.

Mr. Neiman asked if there were any other questions and when would the hearing date be for this request.

Mr Kielt stated that the meeting date would be set for June 15th.

Motion made by Mr. Herszl to move variance request to June 15 meeting seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

Roll Call: Mr. Herszl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr, Banas, yes, Mr, Schmuckler, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Follman, yes.

Mr Kitrick announced that the Frankel application SD #1727 will be heard at June 15 meeting at the public hearing, comments from the public will be entertained at that time.

Mr. Neiman requested that Item #3 will wait until after Georgian Court University application because they made a notice for 7:00 p.m.

4. SD #1932

Applicant: Georgian Court University

Location: Block 44–Lots 1, 25, & 26; Block 45–Lots 1 & 4; Block 46–Lot 1; Block 47–Lot 1; Block 48–Lot 1; Ninth St., Lakewood Ave., N. Lake Dr., and Case Rd. R-12 (Single-Family Residential Zone)

General Development Plan

Mr. Vogt prepared a letter dated April 29, 2010 and it is entered in its entirety. The applicant is Georgian Court University and is seeking approval of a General Development Plan. As part of its campus facilities master plan, the University has prepared a General Development Plan in accordance with NJSA 40:55D-45.2 and Section 18-606 of the UDO. Georgian Court University occupies a total of approximately 156.3 acres, which includes the main campus (149.4 acres) and other parcels along the easterly side of Lakewood Avenue and the westerly side of Cedarview Drive. The campus is generally bounded by residential uses along Fourteenth Street to the north, residential uses along Forest Avenue to the east, by Ninth Street, Lakewood Avenue, and North Lake Drive to the south, and Case Road to the west. Over the next twenty (20) years, Georgian Court University intends to construct new academic buildings, dormitories, athletic facilities, parking, and other miscellaneous improvements on its campus. The proposed non-residential floor area would increase from 6.66% to 15.6%. The proposed building lot coverage would increase from 4.6% to 9.7%. The proposed number of parking spaces would increase by one thousand twenty-two (1,022) from seven hundred ninety-seven (797) to one thousand eight hundred nineteen (1,819). (I.) **Waivers** (1) Georgian Court University is not submitting a Housing Plan with the application as the University is exempt from COAH under NJSA 40:55D-8.4(b). The Board should grant a waiver from Section 18-606.B of the UDO which requires a Housing Plan. Testimony should be provided from the applicant. (II.) **Zoning** (1) The site is located in the R-12 Single-Family Residential Zone. Places of worship and private schools are permitted uses in the R-12 Zone. (2) The application qualifies for a General Development Plan submission since the project comprises over one hundred (100) acres and more than one hundred fifty thousand square feet (150,000 SF) of non-residential building area. No variances are being requested at this time. (III.) **Review Comments** (A) **General Land Use Plan** (1) The General Land Use Plan lists the existing land uses as follows: Worship Place, 0.2 acres; Private School, 7.1 acres; Recreation, 21.2 acres; Parking, 7.4 acres; Open Space, 120.4 acres for a total of 156.3 acres. (2) The General Land Use Plan lists the proposed land uses as follows: Worship Place, 0.2 acres; Private School, 14.5 acres; Recreation, 27.1 acres; Parking, 17.9 acres; Open Space, 96.6 acres for a total of 156.3 acres. (3) The existing number of parking spaces is being increased from seven hundred ninety-seven (797) to one thousand eight hundred nineteen (1,819). Testimony should be provided as to how the proposed number of total spaces was calculated. (4) A Table has been provided listing the proposed buildings, types of buildings, building areas, and total floor areas. A summary total of the building areas and total floor areas should be added to the Table. (5) The Library Addition should be listed as Building "P" on the site plan. (6) The square footages on Academic Buildings "L-O" should be corrected to fifty-one thousand square feet (51,000 SF). (7) The square footages of the existing buildings have not been addressed. (8) Proposed dormitories have been indicated, but no account of the proposed number of dormitory rooms provided. (A) **Open Space Plan** (1) Most of the proposed site is comprised of undesignated open space. The Legend and Plan delineates the following five

(5) specific recreation and open space uses: a. Proposed Active Recreation. b. Existing Active Recreation. c. Proposed Passive Recreation. d. Existing Passive Recreation. e. Conservation Area. (2) We recommend a more detailed breakdown and description of the types of recreation and open space areas be supplied, such as the number of courts and fields. (3) Acreage should accompany the types of recreation and open space areas. **(C) Utility Plan** (1) The site is located within the New Jersey American Water franchise area. We recommend that "will serve letters" be obtained from New Jersey American Water to insure future water and sewer capacity is available for the proposed project. (2) Additional sanitary sewer lines are proposed to service the new buildings. A pump station is proposed in the northwest section of the site to collect sanitary sewerage which cannot be conveyed by gravity to existing facilities. The force main from the pump station is being routed to the existing system at the end of Case Road. (3) No sanitary sewer lines are provided to the proposed small athletic building and maintenance building on the east side of the site. Potable water extends to the maintenance building and the water passes close enough to the small athletic building for a connection. (4) The plan notes Georgian Court University will maintain the sanitary sewer and proposed pumping station facilities. (5) Additional potable water lines are proposed to service the new buildings. Consideration should be given to main sizing, hydrant location, and irrigation. Irrigation should be provided to the sports fields unless synthetic turf is proposed. (6) The plan notes Georgian Court University will maintain the potable water service system. (7) The plan notes solid waste and recyclables are collected by the Georgian Court University Facilities Staff and brought to the existing storage area on Lakewood Avenue. This area is located on the east side of Lakewood Avenue between Seventh and Eighth Streets. The Township collects the solid waste and recyclables from the storage area. (8) An additional on-site recyclable and solid waste storage area is proposed in the maintenance yard on the east side of the project. **(D) Storm Water Management Plan** (1) The Storm Water Management Plan designates seven (7) future locations for storm water management basins, plus an underground infiltration basin. (2) Summary drainage calculations should be provided to determine whether the sizes of the designated storm water management locations are reasonable. The applicant's designer should contact our office for further guidance. (3) The amount of proposed storm sewer schematically shown will be inadequate. cursory review indicates additional structures and piping will be necessary. **(D) Environmental Inventory Plan** (1) The Environmental Inventory Plan depicts topography and soil classifications. (2) The General Notes on the Cover Sheet indicate that the topographic information was taken from a plan entitled "Georgian Court Aerial Survey, P/O Lot 1, Block 44, Lakewood Township, Ocean County, New Jersey". The date of this plan should be provided. (3) A legend and descriptions should be provided for the soil classifications listed on the plan. **(F) Community Facility Plan** (1) The Community Facility Plan notes support for the University Campus will include staffed and gated entry points, two (2) campus maintenance facilities, two (2) chapel buildings, and a library. The existing University Chapel is highlighted on the plan, but no other chapel building is highlighted. Clarification is necessary. (2) Four (4) gated entry points are shown. Proposed gated entries are located at Case Road opposite Magnolia Drive, the extension of Cedarview Drive, and at Ninth Street opposite Private Way. A gate house is shown at an existing access point along Lakewood Avenue across from Seventh Street. The status of the existing access at the intersection of Lakewood Avenue and Ninth Street is unclear. (3) The existing library is proposed to receive an eighteen thousand square foot (18,000 SF) addition consisting of two-stories and a basement level.

(4) An on-site maintenance building and yard is proposed to supplement the existing maintenance garage facility on Lakewood Avenue between Seventh and Eighth Streets. (5) A proposed eight thousand square foot (8,000 SF) student center consisting of one-story and a basement level is also a highlight of the Community Facility Plan. (G) **Local Service Plan** (1) The Local Service Plan states local services to be provided will include telephone, natural gas, electric, and cable television. (2) The plans should add the providers of the various local services. (3) The plans note that all future services will be installed underground. (4) We notice that in some instances natural gas is not being provided to new buildings, thereby eliminating natural gas as a potential source for heating. (H) **Circulation Plan** (1) The Circulation Plan considers routes for emergency access throughout the site. (2) Testimony should confirm whether all circulation is through private pedestrian paths and individual vehicles. No public transportation is indicated. (I) **Phasing Plan** (1) The Phasing Plan contains a proposed implementation schedule for the Facilities Master Plan, which encompasses the next twenty (20) years. (2) Construction of the Ninth Street entrance across from Private Way and Parking Lot "O" is imminent. A previous site plan approval was granted for this work. (3) Excepting the imminent construction project, the next phase of work is not slated until 2013. The construction of Parking Lots "L" and "Q" are projected to start in May of 2013. (4) The next building to be constructed "Academic Building K" will not be undertaken until 2014. Since its location is within an existing park lot, it is imperative that Parking Lot "Q" be completed first. (J) **Traffic** (1) A Traffic and Circulation Master Plan has been submitted for review, assessing impacts of this project on the adjacent community. (2) The Report recommends the University implement strategies to minimize future vehicular traffic generated to and from campus, including public and mass transit. Construction of future on-site housing is proposed, but public or mass transit has not been addressed. (3) The Report recommends additional access points for vehicular traffic. The two (2) locations discussed, access to Fourteenth Street via Cedarview Drive and access to Case Road opposite Magnolia Drive, are both proposed on the GDP, consistent with the Report. (4) Future traffic signal warrants will need to be conducted at various intersections as future traffic volumes increase. Some surrounding intersections are already operating at poor levels of service. These studies may be performed in support of future plan applications. (5) The Report gives an endorsement to the GDP for the on-site circulation of vehicles and pedestrians, as well as the future additional parking facilities in areas proximate to points of interest within the campus. (K) **Fiscal Report** (1) A Fiscal Report describing the anticipated demand on municipal services to be generated by the project and any other financial impacts to be faced by the municipality should be submitted in accordance with Section 18-606B.10 of the UDO.

We have no objection to the GDP as proposed, contingent upon board recommendations and recommendations contained herein.

Mr. Vogt stated that there are no variances requested at this time. Just a little background for everyone here since we don't see many GDP plans here in Lakewood, There is a section in the UDO as well as the Land Use Law that states that for sites over 100 acres and want to seek approvals for planned development such as this they have the option of doing what is known as a General Development Plan or a GDP. Just reading from 18.606A in the UDO "Applicants of a Planned Development of at least 100 acres comprised of a minimum of 75 dormer units or 150,000 square feet of non-residential building area

shall have the option of bifurcating preliminary approval into two phases. Phase One is the GDP which is what they are here for and Phase Two is a preliminary approval of part or all of the project. An applicant can seek variances for density, non-residential square footage or use at the time of phase one submission, all other variances shall be sought at phase two or the preliminary approval." Now this applicant as we understand it is not requesting variances at this time, they are exercising the option to seek a GDP plan approval for the overall concept. Looking at the plan you have a 156 acre property you would be developing primarily the Northern part of the campus and I believe the improvements are spread over 20 years as planned. I'll turn it over to their attorney now.

Good evening I am Grace Berton of McElroy, Deutch, Mulvany and Carpenter. Part of the genesis for the GDP plan was that several years ago when we were here for the application for the new gate at 9th and Private Way several of the Board members at that time inquired if there was an overall master plan for the University? The answer is yes but at that point we did not have it all planned out. We have been working on that and the GDP that we have put together and present to you this evening is result of the planning of those last several years. A master plan for the university is being phased over 20 years. Other than the gate at 9th & private way is immanent nothing else is immanent at this point this is a concept plan at this point. I have read Mr. Vogts letter and would like to address some of the concerns in the letter with the help of Mr. McKenna the University Engineer.

(I.) Waivers (1)Georgian Court University is not submitting a Housing Plan with the application as the University is exempt from COAH under NJSA 40:55D-8.4(b). The Board should grant a waiver from Section 18-606.B of the UDO which requires a Housing Plan. Testimony should be provided from the applicant. *Ms. Bertone answered that she will provide testimony at a later date in reference to the University being exempt from COAH.*

(II.) Zoning (1)The site is located in the R-12 Single-Family Residential Zone. Places of worship and private schools are permitted uses in the R-12 Zone. (2) The application qualifies for a General Development Plan submission since the project comprises over one hundred (100) acres and more than one hundred fifty thousand square feet (150,000 SF) of non-residential building area. No variances are being requested at this time. *Ms. Bertone agrees with this comment.*

(III.)Review Comments **(A)General Land Use Plan** (1)The General Land Use Plan lists the existing land uses as follows: Worship Place, 0.2 acres; Private School, 7.1 acres; Recreation, 21.2 acres; Parking,7.4 acres; Open Space, 120.4 acres for a total of 156.3 acres. (2) The General Land Use Plan lists the proposed land uses as follows: Worship Place, 0.2 acres; Private School,14.5 acres; Recreation, 27.1 acres; Parking, 17.9 acres; Open Space, 96.6 acres for a total of 156.3 acres. (3)The existing number of parking spaces is being increased from seven hundred ninety-seven (797) to one thousand eight hundred nineteen (1,819). Testimony should be provided as to how the proposed number of total spaces was calculated. *Ms. Bertone stated that will be done in detail at the hearing.* (4) A Table has been provided listing the proposed buildings, types of buildings, building areas, and total floor areas. A summary total of the building areas and total floor areas should be added to the Table. *Ms. Bertone stated that this request would be alright if all the Board was looking for is a total number of square footage.* (5) The Library Addition should be listed as Building "P" on the site plan. *Ms. Bertone stated that this was correct.* (6)The square footages on Academic Buildings "L-O" should be corrected to fifty-one thousand square feet (51,000 SF). *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct and the number 57,000 on the original plan was an error.* (7) The square footages of the existing buildings have not been addressed. *Ms. Bertone stated that this will be done for the next plan.* (8) Proposed dormitories have been indicated, but no account of the proposed number

of dormitory rooms provided. *of Ms. Bertone stated that the actual number of beds would increase by one hundred beds per dorm built The University is planning to build three dorms over the next twenty years for an additional three hundred beds bring the total number of beds at the end of the plan to seven hundred fifty beds.* (A) **Open Space Plan** (1) Most of the proposed site is comprised of undesignated open space. The Legend and Plan delineates the following five (5) specific recreation and open space uses: a. Proposed Active Recreation. b. Existing Active Recreation. c. Proposed Passive Recreation. d. Existing Passive Recreation. e. Conservation Area. *Ms. Bertone said they would supply the number of fields and approximate acreage.* (2) We recommend a more detailed breakdown and description of the types of recreation and open space areas be supplied, such as the number of courts and fields. *Mr. Vogt said that he would meet with the University to go over the details due to the size of the project.* (3) Acreage should accompany the types of recreation and open space areas. *Ms. Bertone said that the Board would get something in writing as a response to this concern.* (C) **Utility Plan** (1) The site is located within the New Jersey American Water franchise area. We recommend that "will serve letters" be obtained from New Jersey American Water to insure future water and sewer capacity is available for the proposed project. *Ms. Bertone thought that it may be to premature to get the "will serve letter" before the site plan application. Mr Vogt stated they the University should at least notify New Jersey American Water of their plan, they may not get a "will serve letter" but they may get something in writing.* (2) Additional sanitary sewer lines are proposed to service the new buildings. A pump station is proposed in the northwest section of the site to collect sanitary sewerage which cannot be conveyed by gravity to existing facilities. The force main from the pump station is being routed to the existing system at the end of Case Road. *Ms. Bertone stated that the pumping station exists, there may be some modifications but it will remain at the existing site.* (3) No sanitary sewer lines are provided to the proposed small athletic building and maintenance building on the east side of the site. Potable water extends to the maintenance building and the water passes close enough to the small athletic building for a connection. *The proposed building is really a hot dog stand and it is close enough to an existing sewer line.* (4) The plan notes Georgian Court University will maintain the sanitary sewer and proposed pumping station facilities. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (5) Additional potable water lines are proposed to service the new buildings. Consideration should be given to main sizing, hydrant location, and irrigation. Irrigation should be provided to the sports fields unless synthetic turf is proposed. *Ms. Bertone stated that this request may be a bit premature and needs more discussion at a later time. Irrigation at the University is done by wells, two wells exist already* (6) The plan notes Georgian Court University will maintain the potable water service system. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (7) The plan notes solid waste and recyclables are collected by the Georgian Court University Facilities Staff and brought to the existing storage area on Lakewood Avenue. This area is located on the east side of Lakewood Avenue between Seventh and Eighth Streets. The Township collects the solid waste and recyclables from the storage area. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (8) An additional on-site recyclable and solid waste storage area is proposed in the maintenance yard on the east side of the project. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (D) **Storm Water Management Plan** (1) The Storm Water Management Plan designates seven (7) future locations for storm water management basins, plus an underground infiltration basin. (2) Summary drainage calculations should be provided to determine whether the sizes of the designated storm water management locations are reasonable. The applicant's designer

should contact our office for further guidance. (3) The amount of proposed storm sewer schematically shown will be inadequate. cursory review indicates additional structures and piping will be necessary. *Mr. Mike McKenna the University Engineer stated that there is a master plan for this work and he would be glad to meet with the Township Engineer at a later date.* (D) **Environmental Inventory Plan** (1) The Environmental Inventory Plan depicts topography and soil classifications. (2) The General Notes on the Cover Sheet indicate that the topographic information was taken from a plan entitled "Georgian Court Aerial Survey, P/O Lot 1, Block 44, Lakewood Township, Ocean County, New Jersey". The date of this plan should be provided. (3) A legend and descriptions should be provided for the soil classifications listed on the plan. *Ms. Bertone stated that topographical information will be done at the time of the site plan application.* (F) **Community Facility Plan** (1) The Community Facility Plan notes support for the University Campus will include staffed and gated entry points, two (2) campus maintenance facilities, two (2) chapel buildings, and a library. The existing University Chapel is highlighted on the plan, but no other chapel building is highlighted. Clarification is necessary. *Ms. Bertone stated that the Chapel is not in use as a chapel and will be changed in the future plans.* (2) Four (4) gated entry points are shown. Proposed gated entries are located at Case Road opposite Magnolia Drive, the extension of Cedarview Drive, and at Ninth Street opposite Private Way. A gate house is shown at an existing access point along Lakewood Avenue across from Seventh Street. The status of the existing access at the intersection of Lakewood Avenue and Ninth Street is unclear. *Ms. Bertone stated that the Lakewood Ave & 9th street gate is for exit only and the other two gates are planned for ten and fifteen years out in the phasing plan.* (3) The existing library is proposed to receive an eighteen thousand square foot (18,000 SF) addition consisting of two-stories and a basement level. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (4) An on-site maintenance building and yard is proposed to supplement the existing maintenance garage facility on Lakewood Avenue between Seventh and Eighth Streets. *Ms. Bertone stated that this was correct.* (5) A proposed eight thousand square foot (8,000 SF) student center consisting of one-story and a basement level is also a highlight of the Community Facility Plan. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (G) **Local Service Plan** (1) The Local Service Plan states local services to be provided will include telephone, natural gas, electric, and cable television. *Ms. Bertone stated that this will be done.* (2) The plans should add the providers of the various local services. *Ms. Bertone stated that this will be done.* (3) The plans note that all future services will be installed underground. *Ms. Bertone stated that this was correct and will be noted on the plan.* (4) We notice that in some instances natural gas is not being provided to new buildings, thereby eliminating natural gas as a potential source for heating. *Ms. Bertone stated that this was not a correct conclusion but that that level of detail was not included in the plan but it will be.* (H) **Circulation Plan** (1) The Circulation Plan considers routes for emergency access throughout the site. (2) Testimony should confirm whether all circulation is through private pedestrian paths and individual vehicles. No public transportation is indicated. *Ms. Bertone stated that the University would work with the Township as well as New Jersey Transit to come up with a plan to help the students get to the University via public transportation.* (I) **Phasing Plan** (1) The Phasing Plan contains a proposed implementation schedule for the Facilities Master Plan, which encompasses the next twenty (20) years. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (2) Construction of the Ninth Street entrance across from Private Way and Parking Lot "O" is imminent. A previous site plan approval was granted for this work. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (3) Excepting the imminent construction project, the

next phase of work is not slated until 2013. The construction of Parking Lots "L" and "Q" are projected to start in May of 2013. *Ms. Bertone stated that this is correct.* (4) The next building to be constructed "Academic Building K" will not be undertaken until 2014. Since its location is within an existing park lot, it is imperative that Parking Lot "Q" be completed first. *Ms. Bertone stated that parking lots L and Q would be complete by 2013 before Building K.* (J) **Traffic** *Ms. Bertone stated that each of the following items would be addressed at the Public Hearing.* (1) A Traffic and Circulation Master Plan has been submitted for review, assessing impacts of this project on the adjacent community. (2) The Report recommends the University implement strategies to minimize future vehicular traffic generated to and from campus, including public and mass transit. Construction of future on-site housing is proposed, but public or mass transit has not been addressed. (3) The Report recommends additional access points for vehicular traffic. The two (2) locations discussed, access to Fourteenth Street via Cedarview Drive and access to Case Road opposite Magnolia Drive, are both proposed on the GDP, consistent with the Report. (4) Future traffic signal warrants will need to be conducted at various intersections as future traffic volumes increase. Some surrounding intersections are already operating at poor levels of service. These studies may be performed in support of future plan applications. (5) The Report gives an endorsement to the GDP for the on-site circulation of vehicles and pedestrians, as well as the future additional parking facilities in areas proximate to points of interest within the campus. (K) **Fiscal Report** (1)A Fiscal Report describing the anticipated demand on municipal services to be generated by the project and any other financial impacts to be faced by the municipality should be submitted in accordance with Section 18-606B.10 of the UDO. Ms. Bertone explained that the University did do a Fiscal Plan but would the Board want an outside expert to do the plan.

Mr. Neiman stated that the only other time he can remember having a GDP was for Cederbridge Development on the south east side of town that had no direct effect on the residential community as a whole. The chairman does not feel that the Board may be capable of hearing the information and making an informed decision that will affect thousands of people in the immediate area of the University.

Mr. Kitrick stated that the application is a function of the planning board not the zoning board. The planning board may need additional expert opinions in the areas of concern due to the size and length of the project.

Mr. Schmuckler asked should the fiscal report be sent to the Twp Committee for their opinion?

Mr. Kitrick stated that, that it may be problematic securing input and not testimony, not a good direction at this time.

Ms. Bertone stated that she would object to sending the entire plan to other venues. GCU has had Andrew Christ VP of GCU study the impact on the surrounding neighborhood and John Rea , GCU traffic expert also studied how the traffic would flow as well as their engineer Mike McKenna has helped with the studies.

Mr. Neiman asked, Is this a conceptual plan?

Mr. Kielt stated that this is a blueprint for the future nothing will be approved until the site plans are done, any time a phase is done GCU will come back to the Planning Board with the next phase and site plans.

Ms. Bertone agreed with Kevin that this is a concept plan.

Mr. Kitrick asked at what time will the GDP be brought back to the Board?

Mr. Kielt stated that the GDP will be brought to a public meeting after said meeting each piece of the plan will come back before the Planning board and then to a technical meeting for more information and then to a public meeting.

Ms. Bertone replied that the only part of the plan that does not need to come back before the board is the gate at 9th and private way. The primary reason for the GDP at this time is to ensure that going forward with such a lengthy plan that GCU would not run into problems if the Zoning laws were to change.

Mr. Neiman asked will this GDP set a precedence going forward?

Mr. Kitrick answered no the zoning for GCU is set and should not change.

Ms. Bertone agreed, site plan approval will not be automatic because of a GDP.

The chairman recognized Mr. Ron Gasioriski, Esq. who represents the property owners surrounding GCU. He stated that his clients would like to meet with GCU to discuss this plan in detail. He then went on to say that there can be no approval of a conceptual plan. A GDP is explained in the MLUL as a comprehensive plan of a planned development. In section 42 and 65D a planned development is explained as a Unit Residential Development, a Residential Cluster, a Planned Commercial, a Planned Industrial, a Planned Residential Development Zone for 55 and over or a Planned Business. It does not include a Planned Educational or Collegiate. Section C44, 55D-45 states you must have open land for residential use and the plan can not have an adverse impact on the community. If this is a planned development you need a site plan to go forward. The time period must be against the plan. If you don't know if everything will work how can you go forward without a site plan.

Ms. Bertone stated that It is a complete plan and is an appropriate application and GCU has provided everything necessary to go forward.

Mr. Ron Gasioriski, Esq. said that he thinks this is not a full plan but just a drawing and in the future the GDP can not be deviated from. He asked if the Township had an ordinance allowing a college to even do a GDP. He feels this can not be done. The municipality does not have the power to zone only the state does. MLUL has specific rules for a GDP.

Mr. Kitrick stated that Mr. Ron Gasioriski, Esq. arguments are appropriate at the time of a decision but this is a plan review, the decision to accent the plan will be some time in the future, there will be changes made by council along with better knowledge of the plan.

Mr. Neiman stated for a plan this large it might be beneficial to set up a sub-committee to help going forward with a GDP for both the college and community, to get input from the community and industry experts.

Ms. Bertone said she has done this with other municipalities and would speak to her client.

Mr. Ron Gasioriski, Esq. said the residents would welcome a committee for the GDP.

Mr Neiman said he would like to go ahead with a committee that would meet at least three times to discuss with the community.

Mr. Kitrick stated that there has to be a public meeting after a sub-committee technical review consistent with an open meeting forum.

The Chairman recognized Mr. David Hilleman esq., who also represents the property owners surrounding GCU, he stated that it would be helpful if there were additional expert information for the fiscal plan and the traffic pattern impact on the community.

Ms. Bertone said she had no objection but would like to expedite the process and make sure the meetings are structured.

Mr. Hilleman said that they would need site plans to see if the technical data would support the GDP. We need to find out if the plan would actually work.

Mr. Kitrick stated the University has given what the UDO requires for a GDP but the Board may request above and beyond for information for an affirmative approval.

Mr. Neiman asked if we could come up with a date for the first sub-committee meeting.

Mr. Kielt stated the timetable in the UDO is ninety-five days and that we are sixty-six days in and the deadline to hear is July 12, 2010.

Mr. Ron Gasioriski, Esq. said he could meet next week with the University and he would like copies of the GDP for himself and Mr. Hillebrand.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if the Township Engineer could do a Circulation Report or Pedestrian Safety Report.

Mr. Kielt said the Engineer could do the report on behalf of the Board and would be compensated out of escrow.

Ms. Bertone said that GCU has a traffic expert Mr. John Rea who did a traffic report.

Mr. Gasioriski, Esq. Gadorski asked if he could be given copies of the reports done.

Mr. Kitrick said that Mr. Ron Gasioriski, Esq. and Mr. Hillebrand, Esq. should meet with the applicant then go forward with only three board members on the sub-committee.

Mr. Ron Gasioriski, Esq. will report by May 17th for a review of the first meeting.

Mr. Kielt set the next meeting date of July 6th. GCU will consent to any time extensions if required.

A motion to move the next meeting to July 6th for a tech meeting by Mr. Banas and seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris.

ROLL CALL- MR. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

3. SD #1730(variance requested)
Applicant: Michael Herzog
Location: Attaya Road
Block 11.04 Lot 7
Minor subdivision with Variances

Project Description-The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing property totaling 48,089 square feet (1.104 acres) in area known as Lot 7 in Block 11.04 into two (2) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 7.01 and 7.02 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing one-story frame dwelling which will be removed. Public water and sewer is not available. Therefore, private individual septic disposal systems and potable well will be required. No construction is proposed under this application. The site is situated in the western portion of the Township on the south side of Attaya Road, west of the intersection with Miller Road. The property has over three hundred feet (300') of depth. The Map indicates that Freshwater Wetlands exist on the southerly part of the land. A fifty foot (50') buffer and associated conservation easement accompany the Freshwater Wetlands. In the worst case, the buffer extends no more than one hundred fifty feet (150') into the lot, leaving the majority of the site as uplands.

The subdivision proposes to create two (2) equal size lots with proposed areas of 24,044 square feet (0.552 acres). Proposed Lot 7.01 will have more uplands area than proposed Lot 7.02. Curb and sidewalk does not exist along the street frontage. The proposed lots are situated within the R-12, Single Family Residential Zone. The site is surrounded by other residential lands. Lot width variances are required to create this subdivision. We have the following comments and recommendations. **(I.) Zoning** (1)The parcels are located in the R-12 Single Family Residential Zone. Single family detached housing is a permitted use in the zone. (2)Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are requested: Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lots 7.01 & 7.02, 75 feet; 90 feet required) – proposed condition. (3) A waiver from constructing curb and sidewalk along the property frontage is necessary (if approved by the Board). (4) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances and waivers. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** **(II.) Review Comments** (1)The existing property has substantial varied relief and generally slopes away from Attaya Road. Since no units are depicted at this time, testimony is required to address proposed grading and drainage. Furthermore, we recommend that a resubmission of the plan be made prior to the Public Hearing using a conforming building box to delineate proposed layout, grading, and drainage schemes. (2) The General Notes indicate the outbound information was obtained from the survey provided for the project. However, the source of the topography must be provided. Also, no individual trees are shown on the survey and subdivision and we observed large individual trees outside the

wooded areas during our site investigation. (3) The General Notes also state that wetlands information was obtained from a plan entitled "Wetlands Location Plan, Lots 6 & 7 in Block 11.04". The plan was prepared by FWH Associates, P.A., and dated 9/06/05. A copy of this plan should be submitted along with any NJDEP Letter of Interpretation obtained. (4) The General Notes state all existing buildings and improvements are to be removed. The status of the meandering wire fence should be addressed since it meanders on existing Lots 6 & 7. (5) No site improvements are proposed along the frontage of the project. Attaya Road is a paved road generally having an existing pavement width of about twenty-four feet (24'). There are existing catch basins in front of the property and the road briefly widens to thirty feet (30') at the cross drains. Should the Board require curb for the project, the proposed curb should be set in line with the existing inlet and the road widened to the proper half width. A large tree adjacent the existing edge of pavement will need to be removed for the road widening and curb construction. (6) No construction or dwelling units are proposed at this time. However, the plan indicates the single-family detached dwelling units will have four (4) bedrooms. The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for four (4) bedroom single-family dwellings. The plans indicated that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each lot. (7) Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed for the future dwellings on proposed Lots 7.01 & 7.02. Based on the four (4) spaces being provided, it appears basements are contemplated. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (8) The proposed lot numbers have been assigned by the Tax Assessor and the plat signed by the Tax Assessor. (9) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. (10) The front monuments shown as set are not in place. The plat must be corrected, but the monuments must be in place prior to the Map being filed. (11) A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is depicted on the plan along the property frontage. The easement should be dedicated to the Township and the easement areas provided on a per lot basis. (12) No shade trees are proposed for the project. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (13) The Plan does not indicate any existing trees on the site. Testimony should be provided regarding whether there are any specimen trees located on the property. Compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code (if applicable). Additionally, protective measures around mature trees to remain (e.g., snow fencing or tree wells at drip lines) should be provided. If this subdivision is approved, the final plot plans submitted for Township review should include tree protection measures to save mature vegetation where practicable. (14) Due to no construction of new dwellings 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. (15) Unless the Board waives the construction of curb and sidewalk, construction details are required for improvements required by the Board. (16) Public sewer and water are not available at this time. The future dwellings are to be serviced by individual septic systems and potable wells. Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for the Minor Subdivision. (17) Testimony should be provided on existing utilities. It is believed that existing utilities would not be impacted by the Minor Subdivision. (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) NJDEP Letter of Interpretation (Freshwater Wetlands); 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. Kitrick opened by saying the Planning Board does not give waivers for curb and sidewalk. R12 Zone requesting variance for minimum lot width.

Brian Flannery Engineer for Mr. Herzog will give testimony at the public meeting and will provide an area map with curbs and sidewalks in the plan.

Mr. Neiman asked if there were any comments, moved the hearing to the June 15th meeting.

Motion to move to June 15th meeting was made by Mr. Banas and seconded by Mr. Follman.

ROLL CALL- Mr. Herzl, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

5. CORRESPONDENCE

6. PUBLIC PORTION

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There are no minutes

8. APPROVAL OF BILLS

Motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler and seconded by Mr. Banas to approve

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzel, yes, Mr. Franklin, yes, Mr. Koutsouris, yes, Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Margaret Stazko
Planning Board Recording Secretary