

**LAKWOOD PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
JULY 26, 2005**

I. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Banas called the meeting to order at 6:02 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Mr. Kielt read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings Act:

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the Ocean County Observer and 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 purpose of public inspection and a copy of this Agenda has been mailed, faxed or delivered to at least two of the following newspapers: The Asbury Park Press, The Ocean County Observer, or The Tri-Town News at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

II. ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr Miller, Mr. Neiman (arrived late), Mr. Banas, Mr. Dolobowsky, Mr. Ackerman (arrived late).

Also present were:
Attorney Mark Kitrick, Engineer Jeff Winegar and Planner Stanley Slachetka

Mr. Banas asked if there were any changes to the agenda.
Mr. Kielt replied that there were no changes.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. SD #1488** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Somerset Development
Location: Pine Street, west of New Hampshire Avenue
Block 961.01 Lot 1
Final Major Subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Winegar stated the applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to create one new lot containing a stormwater management basin and easement area. The site is part of the Cedarbridge Corporate Campus located on Pine Street near the intersection with New Hampshire Avenue within the DA-1 zone. No variances are required. It appears that the applicant will be required to obtain an approval from Ocean County Planning Board. Evidence that the approval has been granted should be made a condition of final approval. The final plat has been revised to conform to the New Jersey Map Filing Law.

Mr. Slachetka stated his comments were technical comments. The proposed new lot lines are not in compliance with Chapter 17-8.4a in as much that the “side lot lines shall be at right angles to straight streets.” A design waiver is required. In the new ordinance it reads in so far as is practical side lot lines shall be at right angles to straight streets.

Ray Shea, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. He stated the subdivision is to create one lot. They are following the contour lines of the existing stormwater basin that services the Pine River Village residential project across the street. The recommendations were satisfactory to the applicant.

Mr. Franklin stated Mr. Peters called the application a minor subdivision and Mr. Slachetka stated it was a major. Mr. Slachetka stated it was a typographical error and they should both indicate major.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public.

William Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, Lakewood, was sworn in. He asked if the lot was on the north side of Pine Street. Mr. Banas replied it was. Mr. Hobday asked if that was the parcels given to Cedarbridge. Mr. Banas replied it was. Mr. Hobday thought it was Cedarbridge but the applicant was Somerset and he wanted to know if Cedarbridge still owned the property. Mr. Shea stated that Cedarbridge owns the north and south side. They sold the south side to Somerset who received an approval for an active adult community. There is an easement to take the storm sewer from the south side to the north side. Mr. Hobday stated this was dividing property on the north side that was still owned by Cedarbridge. Mr. Shea replied he was correct and then it would be turned over to Somerset. Mr. Hobday asked if Cedarbridge would still be a corporate park and Mr. Shea replied yes.

Mr. Slachetka stated that the applicant does require a variance for lot width. Mr. Shea stated it was corrected at the technical meeting. He stated it was 198 feet where 300 feet is required.

Seeing no further person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

Mr. Banas stated that the lot is 1.01 not lot 1. Mr. Dolobowsky stated the block is 961.02.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Franklin, the application was hereby approved.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Banas, yes;
and Mr. Dolobowsky, yes.

Mr. Neiman arrived at the meeting.

- 2. SD#1489** (No variance requested)
Applicant: Somerset Development
Location: corner of Pine Street and New Hampshire Avenue
Block 961.01 Lots 1.02 & 2
Final Major Subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Winegar stated the applicant is seeking final major subdivision approval to create three new lots. The site is part of the Cedarbridge Corporate Campus, located at the intersection of Pine Street and New Hampshire Avenue within the DA-1 zone. No variances are required. It appears the applicant will be required to obtain an approval from Ocean County Planning Board. Evidence that the approval has been granted should be made a condition of final approval. The plans have been revised to conform to the New Jersey Map Filing Law.

Mr. Slachetka stated the zoning schedule should be revised to delete any reference to building and site improvements and a loading zone, since no construction is proposed in conjunction with this application. The parking and loading issues will be addressed as part of the site plan application. Ocean County Planning Board approval is required. Compliance with the map filing law is required. The applicant should provide testimony that the proposed subdivision is consistent with the approved general development plan of the corporate campus. The plan notes that new lots 2.01 and 2.02 are subject to the cross ingress, egress, access and shared parking rights.

Ray Shea, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. The application is to create three lots. It is consistent with the original approval granted to Cedarbridge. One building of 120,000 square feet will be built. Instead, the exact amount of square footage would be built, but on three separate lots. Lot 1.03 is the third lot being created. This lot would be retained by the MUA for a new well. The reports of the professionals were acceptable.

Mr. Dolobowsky stated they were creating two lots for building purposes and one for the MUA. One lot would have two buildings and one lot would have one building. He asked why not put them all on individual lots or all on one lot. He asked what the logic was. Mr. Shea stated he never questioned the logic. The two buildings on one lot are moving forward immediately. The second lot with one building would be in the future.

Mr. Ackerman arrived at the meeting.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked the lots and block numbers on the agenda be reviewed to ensure they were correct.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Neiman, the application was hereby approved.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 3. SP #1818** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Somerset Development
Location: corner of Pine Street and New Hampshire Avenue
Block 961.01 Lot 2.01

Preliminary & final site plan - proposed (3) 40,000 square foot office buildings

Mr. Winegar stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of three 40,000 square foot office buildings within the Cedarbridge Corporate Campus. The site is located at the intersection of Pine Street and New Hampshire Avenue within the DA-1 zone. The applicant has requested a variance for minimum number of loading spaces. Two loading spaces are required for proposed lot 2.01 and one loading space is required for proposed lot 2.02. The applicant has requested providing no loading spaces for either lot. It appears the applicant will be required to obtain approvals from Ocean County Planning Board, Soil Erosion and Sediment Control and NJDEP permits for Treatment Works Approval and Water Main Extension. Evidence that these permits have been received should be made a condition of final approval. The plans have been revised to address our comments presented during the technical review of the project.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant has addressed a substantial number of comments in a prior review letter. Additional landscaping has been provided on the site plan to screen the northeastern parking area and the stormwater basin. Details of the proposed trash enclosure are now provided. The details of all freestanding signage should be provided on the site plan. The signage should be consistent with the architecture of the office complex. Architectural plans have been submitted for review of the Planning Board. A phasing plan has been provided as requested. The applicant must address all outside agency approvals. The landscaping plan is acceptable.

Ray Shea, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant.

David Minnow, 80 Lambert Lane, Lambertville, New Jersey, was sworn in.
Thomas O'Shea, VanNote-Harvey Associates, Princeton, New Jersey, was sworn in.
Ralph Petrella, VanNote-Harvey Associates, Princeton, New Jersey, was sworn in.

Mr. Shea stated there were no objections to the recommendations in the reports of the board's professionals. This was the first submission for Cedarbridge Corporate Campus. There would be three buildings of 40,000 square feet each which is consistent with the original approval. The buildings face the interior of the lot. They requested a waiver of the loading space. They are office buildings with front deliveries from FedEx, UPS, etc. No loading docks are anticipated. All the revisions have been submitted and reviewed.

Mr. Banas stated the board has documents File No. 110D1 dated June 13, 2005. Mr. Shea stated the newest revision was July 14, 2005. Mr. Banas stated the next set does have that date. Mr. Shea stated the revisions were submitted in a timely fashion. Mr. Slachetka stated they did review the revised plans.

Mr. Minnow gave his credentials and they were accepted. This design was to keep the quality of the area in tact. Most office complexes have a great deal of parking on the main road. They reversed that. The buildings and landscaping are adjacent to the road. The main parking is located towards the back. The third building will be similar. The client told him that he wanted to have a non-traditional feel to the buildings in the sense that most office buildings are very contemporary looking. Their look goes back to the Camden Yards look. He showed three elevations that were submitted. Sheet A1 shows the concept elevation at the main entry. As you drive in, the elevation is what you would see. It is a full masonry building with individual window openings. It was a nice entry. The corners of the buildings, they took small tower elements to highlight the corners. Each corner is topped out with the roof on top. As you see the building from sheet A2 you see something very similar in that the wing of the building is turning away. Someone could walk up and enter the building from the sidewalk. Sheet A3 shows the right elevation of the building and the left side. He felt it would be a great addition to the town. The buildings are two story and stucco.

Mr. Dolobowsky stated that on the plans it shows a slab towards the back of the buildings. Mr. Minnow stated it was an entry slab. He stated it was shown on A1. It was a through lobby. Mr. Dolobowsky stated it leads to a grass area with no way to get to it. Mr. Shea stated it was for emergency access to the building. Mr. Dolobowsky stated he has seen these before and they tend to attract the smokers from the buildings. He did not mind that. However, some kind of buffering should be placed around it. Mr. Minnow stated the existing tree line would serve as a buffer. He explained the same as well as the new tree line. They provided an extensive landscaping plan. Mr. Dolobowsky stated he was impressed with the landscaping plan.

Mr. Neiman asked about the detention basin. He felt the buildings were beautiful. He asked how high the water would rise. Mr. O'Shea gave his credentials and they were accepted. The retention basin which is part of the GPU approval is standing water of approximately nine feet deep and the water surface will raise it approximately three feet during the 100 year storm. Mr. Neiman asked if there was proposed fencing. Mr. Shea stated that the board asked them to consider the Franklin fence. Mr. Neiman thought it would be nicer without the fence but he would defer it to the board. Mr. Shea stated if it was a residential development he would understand a fence. He thought that the issue of child safety was not an issue in a corporate park. Mr. Banas stated that the water was deep. Mr. Neiman stated he saw basins with fountains and thought it would look nice. Mr. Shea stated if it was a retention basin, he would agree because then there would be standing water. Mr. O'Shea stated the design was based on DEP approval. If it was a retention basin the water is guaranteed to be there. Mr. Banas thought Mr. Neiman's request was a legitimate one. Mr. Neiman stated that the basins with the fountains gives it a good look. Mr. Shea stated that if they put it in, it can only work when the water is present. The board agreed. Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the fence since the basin was 12 to 14 feet deep and there is residential across the street. Mr. Neiman felt a fence should be installed. Mr. Shea suggested a different, decorative fence instead of the Franklin fence. Mr. Neiman stated the fence near the Agway site was nice. Mr. Franklin did not feel it would work in this area. Mr. Dolobowsky suggested a black metal similar to Georgian Court. Mr. Shea stated he would work it out with the planner. The board was in favor of same.

Mr. Banas asked why the pathway was not around the entire project. Mr. Minnow stated it was laid out based upon the GDP approval. He thought it laid out in accordance with the G.P. Mr. Shea stated the paths were oversized to eight feet. Mr. Banas stated he thought it was to go around the entire project and connect to the existing road, Boulevard of Americas. Mr. Shea asked if there was any sidewalk proposed for the Boulevard of Americas. Mr. Minnow stated what was shown on the plans is what was in the G.P. and going around the entire site was not shown on the GDP. Mr. Shea stated they were encouraging people to walk through and around the different campuses rather than putting them on the streets. Mr. Banas did not have the maps for that in front of him. He thought the sidewalks were to go around the entire project and running parallel to Pine Street. Mr. Shea stated that they would agree to be bound by whatever is revealed in the GDP on that section. He thought what they represented was true. Mr. Banas asked about Lafayette Street. It was not in this part but it was in the same area and he wanted to know why it was not reforested. Mr. Shea stated he has a memorandum into Cedarbridge to get a response. Somerset is only involved with this specific application. Mr. Banas stated that the entire application is up for review when they consider one part of it. Mr. Shea stated that the only thing under review is this portion. Mr. Banas disagreed. Mr. Shea stated he did not have an answer. Mr. Franklin stated cars are driving up there. Something is needed so the cars do not drive up there. Mr. Banas stated that in front of the basin, from Pine Street, three or four trees. There are two tall ones and some shrubs. There was an attempt to do it but it was a lame attempt.

Mr. Slachetka asked about the signage. Mr. Shea stated that details of all freestanding signs were shown on the site plan. They would abide by the professionals recommendations. The exact location of the signs are shown on the plans. Mr. Banas asked how the people in all three buildings would be feed. He asked if there was some kind of a food service. Mr. Shea stated that the GDP includes the inclusion of retail uses in the office building to service those people who work in the building. He could not represent that the first two buildings have any space to feed the employees. Mr. Banas asked how they would service the cafeteria without a loading dock. Mr. Shea stated that he was not representing that there would be any retail in this proposal on these buildings. There is no retail proposed at this time for the three buildings. Mr. Banas asked how many people they would have in the building. Mr. Shea stated that about it is calculated at 250 square feet per person. Mr. Banas could not conceive of not having some means of feeding the people. Mr. Shea stated it is about 135 people per building. Many office buildings have kitchens for the people to use for lunch. Mr. Banas asked about mail and UPS deliveries. Mr. Shea stated that it would be through the front door. Mr. Minnow stated there is not a designated area. Mr. Shea stated they would pull in, stop at the front, run in and then leave. Mr. Banas stated that they could block people in who are using the parking spaces. Mr. Shea stated they could use the parking spaces but they could not make them. Mr. Minnow stated there is a concrete area in front of the building that they could use and not block any spaces.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public.

William Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, was sworn in. He stated he was concerned about the furniture, equipment and supplies that would be coming in and out. With the square footage of the three buildings, he did not think it was in their best interest to use the front door. He could not tell if there was a service elevator. Mr. Minnow stated there are elevators. The deliveries that occur would be through the front door as in other corporate offices. Mr. Hobday did not see UPS delivering office equipment and furniture through the front door. Mr. Minnow stated that furniture deliveries would be scheduled during off hours. Mr. Hobday was concerned with that and the board should ensure that it would be followed. It was just common practice to have a loading area.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked how many spaces per building were proposed. Mr. Minnow stated that each building would have 120 spaces. The way that the site is laid out, they have a little in excess of 120 spaces per building. The first two buildings would actually build 37 more parking spaces than the minimum required. By the time the third building is done there would be about six additional spaces per building. Mr. Dolobowsky stated he did not want to sacrifice any spaces. Building three has a spot along the side of the building that could be designated to park a delivery truck. He has seen it in buildings that the UPS or FedEx comes in and signs in, then goes to the office that is needed. The truck could be out front for 15 minutes. He suggested designating a spot at the other two buildings. At building A, a couple of spaces could be removed near the dumpster for trucks and something at the other building. Mr. Shea stated that they could do that. Mr. Dolobowsky stated that it was up to the applicant, but it should be near the entrance. Mr. Minnow stated he would like to provide a pull off area and not reduce the number of parking spaces. Mr. Shea stated they would accept that as a condition of the approval.

Mr. Neiman asked if there was an inlet where there are no spaces. Mr. Shea stated there is in front of each front door. Mr. Banas stated that the engineer would be providing an additional space for loading and unloading. Mr. Dolobowsky stated that Schuster's comes to deliver, the truck would pull up and remain there for awhile. The flow around the area would be blocked. Mr. O'Shea stated that his office is two stories and it is similar to this layout in that there is a concrete area in front of the building. The trucks park there. They block off parking in the front of the building if they are having a scheduled delivery. They could add pull off locations for the same. Mr. Banas wanted the signage included as to where the deliveries would be made. Mr. Shea stated they would provide the signage and the space.

Mr. Neiman stated he works in the office without a loading dock and the furniture deliveries are normally done during off hours. Sometimes they use the back doors. If not, they pull in the front and they do not block any parking.

Seeing no further person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

Mr. Shea stated that if the application is approved it would be conditioned upon a decorative fence around the basin, an air-rater in the pond, and the addition of parking slots for commercial vehicles at each of the three buildings at a point and place to be agreed upon with professionals to include proper signage. Mr. Banas stated that reforestation of Lafayette would be done and the walkway to go around the entire build-

ing. The applicant would provide whatever the GPD indicates. Mr. Dolobowsky stated the GPD did not have this road so it did not show a walkway. He wanted to know if the applicant considered foot traffic through the area. Mr. Minnow explained what was being provided for foot traffic. The way the parking is set up, people would walk to the parking isles. The sidewalk system would be adequate. Mr. Banas did not think it was. He felt it should be continued and connect to Avenue of the Americas. It should go around the building. He explained where the walkway should be. Mr. Neiman agreed. Mr. Shea stated that a lot of vegetation would have to be removed. Mr. O'Shea stated it could be done. He suggested where the walkway should run. Mr. Banas felt that was acceptable. Mr. O'Shea stated there is a sidewalk on the one side that connects to the parking lot. Mr. Shea stated the pathway in the GPD went around the entire site without making connections. Mr. Neiman asked if there was going to be more building and if the walkway would go around those buildings and connect in the front. Mr. Shea replied yes. The issue of the walkway was discussed further as to what was being requested and what was included in the GPD. The walkway was also discussed in connection with the landscaping plan. Mr. Shea stated that 15 parcels were going to be developed and he explained the walkway in connection with the GPD. He stated that would comply with the GPD and work it out with the planner. Mr. Slachetka was willing to work with the applicant to connect the southern and northern ends.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Neiman, the application was hereby approved as discussed.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 4. SD #1490** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Mordechai Rozsansky
Location: corner of East County Line road and Brook Road
Block 174 Lot 51
Minor subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Winegar stated the applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to create two lots. The site is located at the intersection of East County Line Road and Brook Road within the R-15 zone. A variance will be required for minimum lot area where 15,000 square feet is required and 12,332 square feet for lot 51.01 is proposed and 12,086 square feet is proposed for lot 51.02. A variance will be required for minimum lot width where 100 feet is required and 94.1 feet is proposed for lot 51.02. The applicant will be required to obtain approval from Ocean County Planning Board, Ocean County Health Department and Soil Conservation District. Evidence that these permits have been received should be made a condition of final approval. The applicant has provided off-street parking in accordance with RSIS standards. The board should determine if shade tree easements will be required. The applicant has added a note to the plans indicating that curb and sidewalk are to be installed in conformance with Ocean County Planning Board requirements.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant should address the positive and negative criteria for each of the requested variances. The plat has been revised to relocate the proposed

driveway on new lot 51.02 away from the intersection as requested by the planning board. The proposed lot line between new lots 51.01 and 51.02 is not in compliance with chapter 17-8.4a in as much that "side lot lines shall be at right angles to straight streets." In the new ordinance it indicates in so far as is practical side lot lines shall be at right angles to straight streets. There are some technical items. No additional street trees have been provided since the previous revision and that no new trees are proposed for lot 15.01. The existing dwellings and existing septic disposal fields which are proposed to be removed should be removed prior to submission of the map for signature or a performance bond posted with the Township. The balance of the comments are technical in nature.

Abraham Penzer, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Stillwell's letter was submitted at the previous meeting. He is a member of the police department and was in favor of the application. They were trying to improve the situation. If you are standing at the stop light southward, you can see what TV show is being watched, etc. The house is too close to the street. They were trying to create two conforming lots which would be a better condition than what is existing. They have two houses on one lot and the housing location is not good. This was the best plan that they could come up with. They also agreed to put in curbs and sidewalks. They have no problems with the engineering recommendations. The only issue is whether or not the board wants a shade tree easement. The driveway was revised. The side lot lines being at right angles would not work because of the design of the lot. They had no problem complying with items three, four, and six of the planner's recommendations. The septic would be removed before the map is signed. All the approvals are necessary and would be provided. Their position is clear that they believe they are improving the situation as it stands right now.

Mr. Neiman asked about the off-street parking and if it was hazardous. Mr. Penzer replied it was not.

Mr. Dolobowsky stated they were just looking at the subdivision. Mr. Penzer stated it was the site plan also. Mr. Dolobowsky stated he was not happy about voting on a plan where they were creating two undersized lots. This would improve the situation because it would move the houses further back. He would like to see a shade tree easement. In looking at lot 51.01 and he saw another 40 inch of caliber trees to be removed because a two story home is being proposed. On lot 51.02 it was a similar situation. He would like to see a reasonable amount of landscaping to be replaced. The board usually asks for a 1 to 4 ratio. He would like to see the shade trees and another 10 inch of caliber of trees. This would provide buffering in the front from the headlights. He wanted the professionals to work together to come up with some kind of buffering. Mr. Penzer agreed to the same.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Miller, the application was hereby approved as discussed granting the requested variances.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Miller, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

5. DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE OF 2005 - Planned Affordable Residential Development

Mr. Slachetka stated it was an ordinance to provide for the zoning that would allow the township to implement some of the various agreements that the Township has put in place in transferring land for affordable housing purposes to non-profit entities. The ordinance is very specific in that the purpose is to provide for the ability of non-profit entities to provide affordable housing units. It would be a permitted use in the R-40 district. It would be the R-40/R-20 cluster area. The board's role in this is advise the committee as to the consistency or inconsistency of the proposal with respect to the master plan and to make recommendations that are deemed appropriate. This amends the newly adopted ordinance.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked if he should vote on it since he was the Mayor's designee. Mr. Jackson stated he should not.

On motion by Mr. Herzl and seconded by Mr. Ackerman, the board recommended to the committee that the board finds no fault with the ordinance as presented and that approval is recommended.

Mr. Kielt noted that Mr. Kitrick was ready to send a letter.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Neiman, abstain; Mr. Banas, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

IV. CORRESPONDENCE

Mr. Kielt noted there was correspondence from Kew Garden Association. It was a letter regarding a prior approval. It was approved as the Gardens by Yomah. There is some concern regarding the ownership of the clubhouse. Mr. Banas asked if this was a procedure that they followed. Mr. Kielt stated he received it and felt it should go under correspondence. Mr. Dolobowsky suggested that the person who sent the letter should contact the board's attorney and review the resolution. If the clubhouse was to be turned over to the homeowners and it was in the resolution then they would know that. If it is not in there, there may be other avenues that they could pursue. He did not think there was anything that the board could do. Mr. Banas stated that the letter would be kept on file.

V. PUBLIC PORTION

William Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane, asked about the proposed amended to the unified development ordinance. Mr. Kielt stated it was introduced on first reading and then it was available in the clerk's office. Mr. Banas gave him his copy of the ordinance. Mr. Hobday asked if the amendments, after acceptance, are available on the website. Mr. Banas replied they were. Mr. Hobday asked if it was within a set time frame. Mr. Banas thought it was. Mr. Hobday stated he was asking because at a prior committee meeting, the amendments were included and it replaced the text and it was difficult to figure out

what changed. He recommended that any amendment be kept in a separate data base so it could be viewed prior to being added to the ordinance. Mr. Dolobowsky stated that the Mayor suggested that a redlined copy be posted so that anything being deleted would have a line through it and anything new would be underlined. Mr. Hobday felt that was an excellent idea.

Mr. Kielt stated that he gave out a bulletin regarding mandatory education for all board members. He felt the members should review it. Mr. Kitrick explained the new law. Mr. Dolobowsky stated the classes are normally only offered on Saturdays which is difficult in Lakewood. Mr. Kitrick would follow up on it.

VI. APPROVAL OF BILLS

On motion by Mr. Neiman and seconded by Mr. Herzl, the submitted bills were hereby approved for payment.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

VII. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Neiman, the minutes of June 21, 2005 and June 28, 2005 were hereby approved.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Anderson
Planning Board Recording Secretary