

**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**

Mr. Neiman welcomed back Mr. Franklin to the Board. Mr. Jackson swore in Mr. Franklin with the oath of office.

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

**3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS**

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

**4. PUBLIC HEARING ITEM**

**1. SP# 1940 (Variance Requested)**

Applicant: Congregation Kehillas

Location: Northeast corner of Hearthstone Drive and Jenna Court  
Block 428.01 Lot 1

Conceptual Change of Use Site Plan from residence to synagogue

**Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Conceptual Site Plan/Change of Use approval to convert a one story dwelling, containing approximately 1,550 s.f., to a neighborhood synagogue with approximately 800 s.f. floor area. No exterior building construction is proposed, with the exception of a 55 s.f. addition to enclose an existing jog in the front building line. Two (2) small concrete pads are being added as noted. Additionally, an internal walkway within the Hearthstone Drive frontage is being eliminated. The site is located on the northeast corner of Hearthstone Drive & Jenna Court, within the existing Hearthstone residential development. No site improvements are proposed. As depicted on the site plan, curb and sidewalk exist along both property frontages. (1)**Zoning and waivers** 1)The subject parcel is located in the R-12 single family residential district. Synagogues are permitted in the zone.2)Per review of the plan and the zoning requirements, variances are required for the following **pre-existing** non-conforming property conditions: a. Minimum Lot Area – The existing property is 9,129 sf in area, 12,000 square feet

required. b. Minimum Front Yard Setback – The property’s existing setback on Hearthstone Drive setback is 25.7 feet, 30 feet required. c. Minimum Accessory Building Setback – The existing shed is less than the 10 feet minimum zoning requirement. It should be noted that the property was created per the original approval of the Hearthstone Community Development Project, which was approved by the Planning Board pursuant to the requirements of the former Zoning Ordinance, Section 18-22 “Community Development Project”.3) The following Change of Use Site Plan submission waivers are required: a. Checklist item C1 – location of buffers. B. Checklist item C13 – landscape and lighting. C. Checklist item C14\_– topography and proposed grading (see general note #14 on the Change of Use Site Plan).Due to the absence of proposed site improvements, we recommend granting the waivers as requested. (II) **Review Comments** 1) The applicant and/or professionals should provide summary testimony addressing the requested change of use. 2) It should be noted that Section 18-905A-1 of the UDO does not require off-street parking spaces for sanctuaries up to 800 sf in floor area. The existing driveway providing access from Hearthstone Drive provides for at least two (2) 9’x18’ parking spaces. 3) The bulk requirements table should be revised to add the zoning requirement for the existing accessory structure (shed), and indicate existing and required setback.4) A 6 ft. high wood fence exists along a portion of the outbound of the subject parcel. The limits of this fence should be clearly indicated on the plan. 5) Per our site inspection of the property, we note that a (6 -7) foot high hedge row exists along the frontage of Jenna Court. This hedge row should be added to the plan. (III) **Outside Agency Approvals**Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Lakewood Township (Building Code, Fire) and all other required outside agency approvals

Mr. Penzer for the application there will be nothing done to this existing home except to square off a 55 sq foot addition to an existing jog in the front an there will be two concrete pads. The variances are all the houses in the Hearthstone Dev. are 9,000 sq feet and so is this house even though it is in an R-12 Zone and so is the same thing as the front yard setback. Basically we are taking an existing house and making it into a Shul, we are only going to have 698 sq. feet so we are exempt from the parking requirements. The rest of the items in Mr. Vogts letter are minor in nature.

Mr. Neiman asked if there were any questions from the Board and there were none., he then opened this portion of the application to the public.

Mr. Steve Adler 133 Lancewood Court was sworn in and spoke. I do not understand why another Shul is needed in this area, there is an existing Shul on Lancewood Court.

Mr. Neiman explained that the ordinance was changed recently that if someone was using an existing property and changing the permitted use they now have to come before the Planning Board in the past all they needed to

do was go to the building department and file for the change.

Mr. Adler asked if this includes signage and handicapped access ramps.

Mr. Neiman explained that the need for another Shul in the area is probably due to the growth of the Orthodox community in the area.

Mr. Jackson explained that the need for the Shul is not relevant to the application. This Boards determination is weather the plan should be approved or not approved but not as to the need.

Colleen Baily 943 Hearthstone Drive was sworn in she stated, I understand there may be a need for a Shul but not all the residents are Jewish and this is a residential neighborhood. Will there be any changes to the look of the house. Will there be any signs on the building? I feel that this should remain a residential area and be balanced with other people in the area.

Mr. Lines P.E. stated that there is a recessed front porch to the house that will be closed in so the front of the house will be more squared off. They are also adding two doors to the sides of the house for exits for safety reasons. There will be no freestanding signs but there will be a small sign on the building which is a permitted signage. The building will not change much it will look like a home with a sign on it.

Mr. Laslie Vargas 915 Morris Ave. was sworn in, he stated that he feels there may be a problem with the parking in the area, and the increase in the traffic in the area. He doesn't mind having any kind of religious buildings in the area but he is concerned about the traffic and parking in a residential area.

A motion to approve this application was made by Mrs. Koutsouris and seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

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

Mr. Kielt asked if there were any issues for the 2011 calendar of dates for the Planning Board meetings.

There were no concerns.

A motion was made by Mr. Banas to accept the dates on the calendar and was seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

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

## **5. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS**

### **1. SP #1939 (No Variance Requested)**

Applicant: Yeshiva Gedola of Woodlake Village Inc.  
Location: southeast corner of Joe Parker Road and County Line Road  
Block 189.15 Lots 44.01, 44.02 & 45  
Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed school and dormitory

### **Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a two-story boy's high school building and dormitory, which includes an unimproved basement, within a 14,523 square foot footprint and to keep two (2) existing dwellings and a garage on the site. The site plans and architectural plans indicate the proposed first floor of the high school building will contain six (6) classrooms and four (4) offices. The second floor will contain nineteen (19) dorm rooms for ninety-two (92) students and a counselor, complete with bathrooms and a laundry. An interior parking area consisting of eleven (11) parking spaces, one (1) being handicapped accessible, and site improvements are also proposed within the property, including a one-way bus drop-off area. Access to the proposed high school is provided from Joe Parker Road, a County Road. The existing two-story dwelling and garage at 1360 Lanes Mill Road and the existing one-story dwelling at 1366 Lanes Mill Road will remain. Proposed access to 1360 Lanes Mill Road will continue to be from Lanes Mill Road. Proposed access to 1366 Lanes Mill Road will be switched to Joe Parker Road. The site is located in the northeastern portion of the Township on the southeast intersection of Lanes Mill Road and Joe Parker Road, both being County Roads. The tract consists of three (3) lots that total 1.91 acres in area. Existing Lot 44.01 of the site contains an existing two-story frame dwelling and garage which will remain. Existing Lot 44.02 of the site is vacant. Existing Lot 45 of the site contains an existing one-story dwelling which will remain and two (2) existing garages which will be removed. Curb and sidewalk are proposed across the entire frontage of the project. The proposed project would be serviced by sanitary sewer and potable water. The existing three (3) lots would be consolidated as part of the site plan approval. The surrounding land consists of mainly residential uses. (I) **Zoning** 1)The parcels are located in the R-20 Residential District. Single-family detached housing and private schools are permitted uses in the zone. 2) Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, the following variance is required for proposed project: In accordance with Section 18-906A of the UDO, a 20' foot wide perimeter landscape buffer is required from residential uses and zones. Said buffer is required along the southerly property line (adjacent to proposed parking) and at the rear corner of proposed Lot 46, where relief appears necessary. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant is willing to install a six foot (6') high buffer and/or fencing in both areas to provide the necessary buffer. 3)The site plans appear to indicate that six (6) classrooms and four (4) offices are proposed for the facility. Confirming testimony regarding the facility should be provided by the applicant's professionals. (II) **Review Comments (A) Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** 1) As indicated previously, an eleven (11) space parking lot with one (1) handicapped space is being provided for the proposed high school. Since a total of ten (10) classrooms and offices are proposed, ten (10) off-street parking

spaces are required. 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. 2) Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether students (including those using the proposed dormitories) will be bused, or will be allowed to park on-site, as well as the maximum number of staff professionals at the site during school operations. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, no students will be using the proposed off-street parking area. 3) A one-way bus drop off area, separate from the parking area, is proposed parallel to Joe Parker Road. Although it appears that adequate turning movements will be provided for the proposed bus drop off area, refuse collection, and deliveries, a vehicle circulation plan should be provided as confirmation. 4) Testimony is necessary from the applicant's professionals regarding how the proposed bus drop off area will be used, including but not limited to times, sizes, and types of vehicles anticipated (i.e., buses, vans, cars, others). 5) Sidewalk and curbing, along with road widening is proposed across the frontage of the site. 6) A proposed refuse enclosure is depicted on the northern side of the proposed bus drop. Testimony is required from the applicant's professionals addressing who will collect the trash. If Township pickup is proposed, approval from the DPW Director is necessary. The waste receptacle area shall be screened and designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E. of the UDO. 7) The General Notes reference an outbound and topographic survey. A signed and sealed copy of the referenced survey must be provided as a separate document. 8) It is not clear whether a minor subdivision or a lot consolidation is proposed. 9) The proposed parking area extends beyond the limits of the proposed delineated parking spaces. An explanation for this proposed configuration is required. Curb is proposed for the proposed parking area. Proposed sidewalk should be added along the building side of the proposed parking lot and an accessible route provided to the elevator. 10) All proposed curb radii have been shown for accuracy of the layout. The proposed tangent points should be added. 11) Proposed building dimensions are required on the site plan to check coordination with the architectural plans. There is a discrepancy in the footprint square footages between the plans. 12) Proposed building setback lines must be added to the site plan. 13) The inside radius of the proposed sidewalk easement shall be extended until it intersects the front property line along Joe Parker Road. 14) Survey data must be provided for all proposed easements. 15) Parking must be addressed for the existing dwellings to remain. Complete dimensioning of the driveways is required. 16) The site plan does not show all the building access points and corresponding steps. (A) **Architectural** 1) Architectural plans have been provided for the proposed high school. The set includes floor plans and elevations. The proposed building includes two (2) floors and an unfinished basement. The proposed building height is only twenty-three feet (23'). The allowable building height is thirty-five feet (35'). 2) The proposed basement depth needs to be clarified on the plans. It appears the proposed basement floor will be ten feet (10') below the first floor level and eight feet (8') below finished grade. Seasonal high water table information is required to substantiate the proposed basement floor elevation. 3) As noted on the proposed architectural plans, the basement is unfinished, the first floor contains numerous facilities, and the second floor contains dorm rooms. An elevator is proposed to make all floor levels handicapped accessible. Testimony is required

from the architect on the specific uses for the individual floors. 4) Proposed water and sewer connections are shown for the proposed high school building. Testimony should be provided as to whether the proposed building will include a sprinkler system. 5) We recommend that the location of proposed air conditioning equipment be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. (A) **Grading** 1) Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design concept is feasible. However, additional proposed elevations and proposed contours are required to complete the grading design. Proposed elevations should be provided at control points, such as curb returns and corners, building access points, and building corners. 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 9/15/10 site inspection, on-site grades generally slope to the south. 3) The proposed floor elevations should be added to the grading plans. Proposed outside access to the elevator must be clarified. 4) No soil boring information is indicated on the drawings. Therefore, 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. (D) **Storm Water Management** 1) A recharge system of twenty-four inch (24") perforated polyethylene (P.E.) pipe in a stone trench is proposed for the storm water management system. As indicated in the Storm Water Management Narrative, impervious area will be increased by more than 0.25 acres thereby classifying the project as major development. Storm water calculations will be required during compliance review (if approved) to demonstrate that the proposed storm water management system is adequately-sized to meet the required quantity reductions and water quality requirements. 2) A storm water collection system for the roof of the proposed high school building is recommended. 3) While the storm water management concept for this project appears viable, additional design information must be provided during compliance (if approved), including the following items at a minimum: a) Information regarding the proposed roof leaders and their discharge(s) into the proposed storm water recharge system. b) Pre and post development storm water calculations for the 2, 10, and 100 year storms. c) The addressing of water quality standards. 4) A Storm Water Management Facilities Maintenance Plan must be provided. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. (E) **Landscaping and Lighting** 1) A dedicated landscaping 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. Ten (10) Red Maple shade trees are proposed within the easement. 3) The remainder of the proposed landscaping consists of ten (10) American Arborvitae, eighteen (18) Japanese Holly, and thirty-five (35) Anthony Waterer Spirea. Plant counts on the plan for the Anthony Waterer Spirea require correction. Screening should be proposed for the trash enclosure. 4) Testimony should be provided as to whether compensatory landscaping is proposed (or necessary). It should be noted that tree protection details are provided on the plans for mature vegetation that is salvageable during construction. 5) Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 6) Corrections are required to the Planting and Seeding Notes. 7) A dedicated lighting plan is provided with the submission; proposed lighting is depicted on Sheet 4 of the plans. 8) The Lighting

Plan shows six (6) sixteen foot (16') high pole mounted lights, three (3) for the proposed parking area, and three (3) for the bus drop off. The proposed parking area and bus drop off should be adequately illuminated by the design. Additional construction detail information is required for the light pole bases. 9) Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. (F) **Utilities** 1) The plans indicate the site will be served by public water and sewer. Proposed water service to the proposed high school building from Joe Parker Road is depicted on the plan. A proposed sanitary sewer lateral for the new high school is indicated behind the building and connects to an existing manhole in Joe Parker Road near the south end of the property. No existing or proposed water and sewer services are shown for the existing dwellings to remain. 2) Approvals will be required from the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority for water and sewer since the project is within their franchise area. (G) **Signage** 1) No signage information is provided. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. 2) All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. (H) **Environmental** 1) No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was prepared for this project. 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-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether there are any known areas of environmental concern (i.e. fuel tanks, fuel spills, etc.) that exist within the property. 2) We recommend that all on-site materials from the proposed demolition activities be removed and disposed in accordance with applicable local and state regulations. (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) Ocean County Planning Board; b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; c) Lakewood Township MUA (water and sewer service); and d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mr. Vogt stated that there are two places where they will be putting in a 6 foot fence where needed.

Mr. Abe Penzer for the applicant stated that he had read the letter from Mr. Vogt and will have no problem addressing all the concerns at the next Public Hearing.

A motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing was made by Mr. Follman and seconded by Mrs. .Koutsouris

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**2. SD # 1586C** (No Variance Requested)

Applicant: Thompson Grove Associates

Location: Drake Road – opposite Neiman

Block 251.01                      Lots 32, 88

Amended Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision – eliminates sanitary sewer

**Project Description**

The applicant is seeking another amended preliminary and final major subdivision approval with associated variances for Block 251.01, Lots 32 and 88. A twenty-first (21<sup>st</sup>) lot is proposed for this amended subdivision application. The previously approved Basin and Open Space Lot to be dedicated to the Homeowners Association is proposed to be subdivided into two (2) lots. Proposed Lot 32.11 will be reduced in size from over nine (9) acres to 7.15 acres and be an Open Space Lot dedicated to the Homeowners Association. Proposed Lot 32.21 of 2.42 acres would be a Basin Lot to be dedicated to the Township of Lakewood. This Amended Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision application also proposes individual septic systems for each of the dwelling units. The project will be developed in similar manner as the previously approved Amended Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision (SD# 1568B), however, instead of connection to a public sewer line which was to be located within the Serenity Way right-of-way, there will be septic fields located in the rear of each residential lot. The changes that were made to the plans include removal of the sewer main, addition of the septic fields in the rear of residential lots, and adjustment of the storm water conveyance system to accommodate adjusted flows in correlation to the location of the proposed septic fields. The previous change for which amended preliminary and final major subdivision approval was granted was the proposed phasing of the project. The applicant initially received approval to subdivide the two (2) existing lots into twenty (20) lots. The existing houses on Lot 32 and Lot 88 were to remain, and seventeen (17) additional residential lots were proposed as well as one (1) common open space lot with a playground. This amendment would subdivide the project into twenty-one (21) lots. The existing houses on Lot 32 and Lot 88 would remain, seventeen (17) additional residential lots would be proposed, one (1) common open space lot with a playground, and one (1) basin lot dedicated to the Township with a wet pond. The applicant has proposed a six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement along the frontages of all proposed lots. Proposed sight triangle



easements will be dedicated to the Township of Lakewood at the intersection of Serenity Way and Drake Road. A Homeowners Association will be proposed for Phase 2 to maintain the future proposed open space lot. The proposed basin lot with the wet pond is proposed to be dedicated to the Township. Finally, the original subdivision was approved including public water and sewer service for all of the proposed residential lots on the future cul-de-sac. Per our review of the amended application, septic systems are now proposed for all residential lots. Private wells are proposed for the three (3) residential lots in proposed Phase I; although, the two (2) residential lots on the future cul-de-sac will be converted to public water with the construction of Phase 2.

The following comments in **(bold)** indicate the current submission's compliance with our most recent review dated April 20, 2010: (I) **Engineering Review Comments** (A) **General** 1) The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision Approval for Block 251.01 Lots 32 & 88. The applicant proposes to subdivide the two (2) existing lots into twenty (20) new lots; nineteen (19) lots for single family use, one (1) lot for a stormwater management basin, and use by the Home Owners Association (HOA). The applicant proposes constructing seventeen (17) new single family dwellings, a cul-de-sac, and a stormwater management basin. The site is located on Drake Road, in the R-40 Zoning District with a small piece of the parcel containing the stormwater management basin located in the Crystal Lake Preserve Zone. **Phase 1 approval consists of the creation of four (4) lots, three (3) residential lots and the remainder to be developed as Phase 2 of the project. Two (2) residential lots are proposed along the beginning section of Serenity Way, one (1) of which includes the existing house on old Lot 32. The other proposed residential lot which includes the existing house on old Lot 88, would also be created. Finally, the remainder lot which will become Phase 2 of the project would be created. The Final Plat for Phase 1 has been revised to only indicate that four (4) lots are being created, the two (2) proposed residential lots along the beginning section of Serenity Way, the proposed residential lot with the existing dwelling to remain from old Lot 88, and the remaining lot (Lot 32.22) which will become Phase 2 of the project. A fourteen foot (14') gravel access drive would provide access to the two (2) residential lots along the beginning section of Serenity Way. These two (2) proposed lots would be serviced by individual subsurface septic systems and private wells. The beginning section of Serenity Way was approved without any proposed improvements. Proposed storm sewer improvements will not be addressed until Phase 2. Furthermore, no improvements are required along the western frontage of the property along Drake Road.** 2) The applicant is requesting the following (new) variances: a) Minimum lot area for Lots 32.03 through 32.09, and 32.12 through 32.20: Twelve of the sixteen lots range from 15,000 square feet to 20,000 square feet. The other four lots are sized between 20,000 square feet to 33,642 square feet where 40,000 square feet is required. b) Minimum lot width for Lots 32.01, 32.03 through 32.08, 32.12 through 32.18: Lot widths range from 94 feet to 135 feet, where 150 feet is required. c) Minimum front yard setback for Lots 32.01 through 32.09 and 32.12 through 32.20: 26 feet is proposed for Lot 32.19 and 30 feet is proposed for the other lots where 50 feet is required. d) Minimum side yard

**setback (combined) for Lots 32.03 and 32.17: 37 feet combined side yard setbacks are proposed where 40 feet is required. An additional Minimum Lot Width variance of twenty feet (20') is being requested for proposed Lot 32.22, the basin lot.** The following bulk variances were granted by the Board for the original and amended application: a) Minimum Lot Area: 40,000 square feet is required, whereas new Lots 32.03 through 32.09 and 32.12 through 32.20 propose between 15,003 square feet to 33,642 square feet; the remaining lots propose areas over 40,000 square feet. B) Minimum Lot Width: 150 feet is required, whereas new Lots 32.01, 32.03 through 32.08, 32.12 through 32.18 propose 90.00 feet to 135.44 feet. c) Minimum Front Yard Setback: 50 feet is required, whereas new Lot 32.19 proposes 26 feet and new Lots 32.01 through 32.09 and 32.12 through 32.20 propose 30 feet. Corrections are required to the plans and Phase 2 final Plat. It should be noted that the plans indicate a proposed front yard of thirty feet (30') for new Lot 32.19 and a proposed rear yard of twenty-six feet (26'). A rear yard variance was not granted. d) Minimum Side Yard Setback (combined): 40 feet is required, whereas 37 feet is proposed for new Lots 32.03 and 32.17. 3) The proposed dwellings will be served with public sewer and water line. **Existing septic and well facilities are shown for the existing dwelling to remain in the vicinity of the western frontage along Drake Road. The balance of the project will be served by individual subsurface septic systems and public water. The Phase 1 proposal indicates the two (2) proposed residential lots in the vicinity of the southerly frontage along Drake Road will be serviced by individual subsurface septic systems and private wells. These proposed Phase 1 properties will be converted to public water with the construction of Phase 2. A temporary sanitary sewer easement for an existing septic system is proposed on the remainder lot for the existing house on old Lot 32 since the existing septic system is located on the proposed remainder lot. A septic system is proposed for this particular lot when Phase 2 is constructed. Therefore, we recommend this septic system be constructed in Phase 1, since the applicant is no longer proposing to convert to sanitary sewer. The off-site Drake Road Plans and Profiles still show sanitary sewer, corrections are required.** 4) The applicant has provided six (6) foot shade tree and utility easements along the Drake Road frontage of Lots 32.01, 32.10, 32.11, and 32.20, and along proposed Serenity Way. Sight triangle easements at the entrance of the Serenity Way are also provided to be dedicated to the Township. **The proposed easements have been correctly shown on the Phase 1 Final Plat.** 5) Lot 32.11 and the improvements proposed on the lot will be owned and maintained by a Home Owner Association (H.O.A). The H.O.A. Documents shall be provided to the Planning Board Engineer and Solicitor for review. **The H.O.A. Documents will be provided for all common areas following the approval of Phase 2 of the project. Testimony on the extent of common areas is required. The Township will not take ownership of a roadway or drainage system which accepts storm water from drainage easements. The amended subdivision proposes two (2) drainage runs which would require easements. Furthermore, the proposed drainage areas are too large for conventional structures to collect the runoff (13.16 and 14.49 cubic feet per second, respectively). Proposed drainage revisions are necessary. We recommend the applicant consider proposing the septic systems in the front yard to allow the off-site runoff to be collected in the rear yards. Since proposed drainage easements seem inevitable, the applicant should consider**

**keeping the proposed drainage system as part of the Homeowner's Association.**

6) At the technical review meeting, the Board determined four (4) parking spaces will be required for each residential lot. The applicant shows on the plans driveway layouts that can only accommodate two (2) cars. The applicant stated in their March 12, 2008 response letter that testimony will be provided to the Board regarding this issue. ***It appears two (2) car garages are proposed to satisfy the parking requirements for the proposed single family dwellings. The existing residential dwelling on old Lot 32 to remain has enough driveway space to accommodate four (4) off-street parking spaces. Testimony is required regarding off-street parking for the existing residential dwelling on old Lot 88 to remain. The existing driveway is located within a freshwater wetlands transition area.***

7) Note number nine (9) shown on the plans regarding restricting the access of thru lots to Serenity Way only, shall be added to the Final Plat. ***Restricting the access of proposed Lot 32.01 to Serenity Way only, has been indicated on the Phase 1 Final Plat. Restricting the access of proposed Lots 32.16, 32.17, and 32.20 has been correctly indicated on the Phase 2 Final Plat.***

**B0 Plan Review**

1) The applicant is proposing a 20' access easement from Lot 32.11 to Drake Road through Lot 32.10 to be dedicated to a Home Owner Association (H.O.A.). We recommend the applicant rearrange the lot lines so the access strip will be part of the Lot 32.11 to avoid the easement issue. The applicant stated in the March 12, 2008 response letter testimony will be provided to the Board regarding this issue. ***The previously proposed access easement has been removed since it is no longer needed.***

2) Curbs and sidewalks are proposed along the southern Drake Road frontage of Lots 32.01 and 32.20 and along the proposed Serenity Way property frontage. The board should determine if curb and sidewalk will be required along the western Drake Road frontage along Lots 32.10 and 32.11. The applicant stated in the March 12, 2008 response letter, testimony will be provided to the Board regarding this issue. ***The amended resolution of approval granted a waiver from the requirement to install curbing and sidewalks on the western frontage of Drake Road and/or in front of proposed Lots 32.10 and 32.11.***

3) The applicant has added a detail for the 4' wide walking path to the community building as requested. In the detail, the applicant shows a maximum of 4% cross slope which does not comply with the ADA standard. Since the path is the only access way to the building, its detail shall be revised to comply with all ADA standards. ***The construction detail for the four foot (4') wide walking path must be added for ADA accessibility to the playground.***

4) The applicant shows on the Grading Plan SB-7 started at a ground elevation of 94.1; however, the boring is shown on the plan between existing contour 76 and 77. In addition, the ground elevation for SB-17 is left blank. The applicant shall address these issues. ***The Grading Plan has been revised to show an elevation of 76.4 for SB-7 and the ground elevation for SB-17 has been added. However, the soil log information is missing for SB-17.***

5) The applicant called out on the Grading and Drainage plan a 4" proposed concrete fence around the proposed basin. The fence shall be called out on the Site Development Plan and its detail shall be added to a Construction Detail Plan. ***The proposed fence has been corrected to a four foot (4') height as well as being added to the Site Development and Construction Detail Plans.***

6) The applicant shows on a Construction Detail Sheet a concrete cradle detail; however no concrete cradle is called out on the plans. The applicant shall show on the plans location(s) of the concrete cradle(s) or remove the detail from the Construction

Detail Sheet. ***It is presumed the Concrete Cradle Detail may be used for proposed potable water construction should field conditions warrant. The detail should remain on the plans.*** 7) A means of restricting public vehicle access to the basin access road shall be provided. We recommend the installation of a removable bollard in the middle of the access road, or a chain across the roadway from bollards on either side of the roadway. ***A fence and gates has been added to restrict public vehicular access to the basin access road. This has been detailed on the Site Development and Construction Detail Plans. The concrete piers for the proposed gates have been dimensioned, extended to a minimum depth of three feet (3'), and will be poured with Class "B" concrete.*** 8) The Serenity Way profile shall be revised to show the vertical curve and curve information at stations 0+70, 7+00, and 9+50. ***The proposed grading for the Serenity Way road profile should start at the gutter line of Drake Road. The vertical curves shown at stations 7+00 and 9+50 have been shortened to fifty feet (50') to prevent proposed slopes from being too slight at the respective low and high points which could trap runoff. A fifty foot (50') vertical curve must be added for the low point in the cul-de-sac. The horizontal curve information must still be added.*** C) Storm Water Report 1) In the outlet input data section of the storm water management report, the applicant shows a culvert outlet structure. It is our understanding that the culvert structure is meant to model the 132 foot RCP pipe downstream of the outlet control structure; however, PondPack will recognize that the culvert is part of the flow control devices, such as the 3.5 foot weir, 4 inch, and 8 inch orifices. As a result, the outlet structure will let out less flow than what PondPack has indicated. The applicant shall also be aware of the fact that runoff flow rates will be controlled by the orifices and weir prior to entering the inlet box. After entering, the flow rates will be controlled by the culvert. The applicant shall revise the PondPack to address the above issues. ***The Storm Water Management Report and pond have been revised by increasing the elevation of the emergency spillway. The proposed 100 Year flood elevation in the pond is elevation 70.67. The proposed crest of the emergency spillway shall be set at elevation 71.67 and the top of bank at elevation 72.67 in order to attain the proper freeboard for the size of the wet pond.*** 2) The applicant shall revise the Grading and Drainage Plan to show an invert elevation of 67.5 for the 30" RCP pipe downstream of the outlet control structure. ***A minor invert correction has been made to the downstream piping. The invert at proposed MH-1 is 67.14.*** D) Construction Details 1) Adding a note to the handicapped ramp detail to state that detectable warning surface is to be installed is insufficient. The applicant shall include a detail of the detectable warning surface next to the ramp detail. ***The details have been revised in accordance with the latest NJDOT Standards.*** 2) A detail for the construction of the basin access road shall be provided. ***The detail has been added. The dimension has been revised to show a fifty foot (50') emergency spillway. The proposed elevations on the emergency spillway have been corrected to 71.67 for the crest and 72.67 for the top of bank.*** 3) The stop sign detail shall be revised to include the notation that the face of the sign will have prismatic sheeting. ***The detail has been corrected.*** 4) The street sign detail shall be revised to include the following requirements. The sign shall utilize 3M Hi Intensity Prismatic Reflective sheeting or equal, the sheeting shall be white # 3930 Hi Intensity Prismatic as the background and blue transparent # 1175 as an overlay. The font shall be Swiss land narrow bold. All street name signs shall be nine inches wide. ***The detail has been***



*revised; the footing has been extended to a depth of three feet (3').* (E) **Landscaping** 1) The applicant proposes to retain existing vegetation to screen the residential lots from Drake Road and along the rear of the subdivision. We note that providing an additional landscape barrier for the lots that are adjacent to Ketchledge Farm may be desired by the landowners that purchase these homes, as this farm will most likely remain active in perpetuity if approved as part of the County's Farmland Preservation Program. ***A thirty foot (30') buffer has been provided adjacent Ketchledge Farm and a fifty foot (50') buffer along Drake Road. Supplemental plantings have been provided in the buffer area adjacent Ketchledge Farm, but not along Drake Road. The proposed sight triangle easements at the intersection of Serenity Way and Drake Road have been added to the Landscape Plan for proper grading and planting of trees.*** (II) **Final Proposed Phases Plat Review** (A) **Phase 1 Map** 1) The Phase 1 Map should only consist of four (4) proposed lots, the three (3) residential lots, and the remaining area lot. Any dedications associated with the project must also be included on the Map. ***The revised Final Plat for Phase 1 outlines the four (4) proposed lots. The proposed dedication for right-of-way has been included on the map.*** 2) The correct proposed shade tree and utility easements must be shown. ***A proposed shade tree and utility easement along Drake Road has been added to the east of the proposed sight triangle easement at the intersection of Serenity Way. Dimensioning of the proposed easements has been completed.*** 3) Because of the project phasing, new lot numbering approved by the Tax Assessor must be provided. ***The Lakewood Township Tax Assessor's Office must review the proposed lot numbering since an additional lot is proposed.*** 4) The correct wetlands transition areas with appropriate metes and bounds information must be added to the Map. ***The wetlands transition areas with metes and bounds have been added to the Map.*** 5) The Schedule of Bulk Requirements requires correction and should properly list the variances previously approved. Proposed Lot 32.10 shows variances requested which are not required. The correct proposed side and rear yards need to be shown for proposed Lot 32.10. ***The Schedule of Bulk Requirements has been revised to properly list the variances previously approved. The correct yards still need to be shown for proposed Lot 32.10*** 6) The Legend requires correction. ***The Legend has been corrected.*** 7) A right-of-way dedication along the westerly property frontage of Drake Road has not been addressed. ***The right-of-way dedication along the westerly property frontage of Drake Road has been shown.*** 8) The General Note stating water and sewer service to be provided by New Jersey American Water Company is not true for Phase 1 of the project. ***The note has been removed.*** 9) The surveyor's signature block references the wrong land survey. ***The surveyor's signature block on Sheet 2 has been updated.*** 10) The date in the secretary's signature block needs to be revised. ***The date in the secretary's signature block has been revised.*** 11) The variable width access easement to the homeowners association may no longer be required since the community building is being replaced with a playground. ***The variable width access easement has been removed.*** (B) **Phase 2 Map** 1) The Phase 2 Final Plat will be reviewed for compliance once the Phase 1 Final Plat is corrected and if the amended subdivision is granted. ***Statement of fact.*** (III) **Resolution of Approval Comments (SD #1586B)** The amended project, if/when approved by the Board,

must comply with applicable remaining comments contained within Resolution SD #1586B, memorialized May 25, 2010. The applicant's professionals can contact our office if further information is necessary. IV) **Outside Agency Approvals** The required outside agency approvals include, but are not limited to: a) Ocean County Planning Board b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; c) Sewer and water utilities, prior to construction permits; and, d) All other required approvals. ***Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for septic systems and potable wells. New Jersey American Water will only be required for potable water to be constructed in Phase 2 since septic systems are proposed instead of sanitary sewer. Evidence of approvals must be provided.***

Mr. Ray Shea Esq. for the applicant, this subdivision was approved but there has been an effective moratorium now on sanitary sewer it is not within the 208 Water Quality Plan so we have to seek an individual onsite disposal system pursuant to chapter 199 the Ocean County Board of Health.

Mr. Flannery stated that the purpose of this application is phase II we want to ask the Boards permission that if we are not successful in getting sanitary sewer which we have not been for a while now that septic's would work we have shown where the septic's would fit the State seems to be favoring septic's in this area over the public sewer and if we can't convince them otherwise we do not want to be dead in the water. Also what we have shown is a separate lot previously for the detention basin previously that was within an easement on the homeowner association lot, we feel it would be more appropriate on its own lot. In Mr. Vogt's letter there are some concerns with the Storm Water Drainage we would like to meet with Mr. Vogt and DPW to go over those concerns before the next meeting. On page 4 of the report under #2 it says the applicant is requesting the following new variances there are no new variances required. We can work out all the concerns in the report by the next meeting.

Mr. Shea stated that this Board has already approved septic's on Phase I of this application.

Mr. Banas made a motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing Meeting. Seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**3. SD # 1756** (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Baruch Halpern

Location: Astor Drive, north of Kennedy Blvd. east  
Block 104 Lots 16 & 27

Minor Subdivision to create 4 lots

## Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide two (2) existing lots totaling 30,002 square feet (0.69 acres) in area known as Lots 16&27 in Block 104 into four (4) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 27.01-27.04 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing one-story dwelling, two (2) existing sheds, two (2) existing driveways, an existing septic system, and other appurtenances, all of which will be removed. Proposed Lots 27.01-27.04 will become new residential building lots. Public water will be available via a water main extension within Astor Drive as depicted on the plans. Septic systems are proposed for each of the new lots. The site has frontage and is situated on the west side of Astor Drive, across from its intersection with Coleman Avenue. All four (4) proposed lots will be 50' x 150.01' in size. Curb exists along the street frontage, but sidewalk does not. Sidewalk is proposed across the frontage of the new lots. The lots are situated within the R-12 Single Family Residential Zone. The surrounding area is predominantly residential.

We have the following comments and recommendations (I) **Zoning** 1) The parcels are located in the R-12 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 required: a) Minimum Lot Area (proposed Lots 27.01-27.04, 7,500.5 SF each, 12,000 SF required) – proposed conditions. B) Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lots 27.01-27.04, 50 ft each, 90 ft required) – proposed conditions. C) Minimum Side Yard Setback (proposed Lots 27.01-27.04, 7.5 ft each, 10 ft required) – proposed conditions. D) Minimum Aggregate Side Yard Setback (proposed Lots 27.01-27.04, 15 ft each, 25 ft required) – proposed conditions. The Improvement Plan shows varying sized units while the Minor Subdivision Plan shows all units to be the same size. Testimony shall be provided clarifying the unit size issue. Side yard variances may not be required for all proposed lots. 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) The existing home, sheds, driveway, interior sidewalks and appurtenances will be removed to develop the site. A note has been provided on the Improvement Plan. This item has been addressed. 2) 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 indicates that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each unit. The proposed driveways on the proposed lots have been dimensioned to be large enough to accommodate four (4) spaces. Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed number of bedrooms in order to determine whether additional off-street parking is required. 3) Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed for the proposed dwellings on proposed Lots 27.01-27.04. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 4) Proposed

lot and block numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. 5) Dimensions for the proposed building footprints were provided on the Improvement Plan to confirm less than 25% proposed building coverage on the new lots. 6) The Bulk Requirements table must be revised to specify a side yard width of 7.5 feet (not 7 feet) as depicted on the Subdivision Plan. 7) Grading and drainage information is proposed on the Improvement Plan. As depicted, proposed lots grading would convey most post-development storm water towards Astor Drive. We recommend that roof leaders be provided to direct all building runoff towards Astor Drive, or provide dry wells if not possible. A more detailed review of grading and drainage will be performed during plot plan review. 8) A six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is proposed for the Astor Drive frontage of the project. No shade trees are proposed along the property's frontage. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 9) The Plan indicates a number of mature trees exist on the site. Many of these trees are unsalvageable if the proposed lots are developed as shown, but some of these trees appear salvageable. 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 for proposed Lots 27.01-27.04 submitted for Township review should include tree protective measures to save mature vegetation where practicable. 10) The plans depict a proposed water main extension from Kennedy Boulevard East across the property frontage to serve the future lots. Testimony should be provided as to who is installing the main (and when) as well as the regulating agency (NJAW or LTMUA). Additionally, Ocean County Health Department should be listed as a Regulatory Agency approval needed for the proposed septic systems. If septic approvals cannot be obtained, extension of public sewer will also be necessary. 11) Virtually all of the existing curb will be disturbed by the construction of this subdivision. We recommend that this curb be replaced and the proposed gutter be reconstructed to allow runoff to drain to the existing inlet immediately to the south of the project. 12) Due to no construction of new dwellings on proposed Lots 27.01-27.04 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. 13) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 14) Construction details were provided and will be reviewed during Compliance if/when Board approval is granted. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a) Ocean County Planning Board; b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; c) Ocean County Health Department; d) New Jersey American Water (water main extension); 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 on behalf of the applicant stated that this property is next to a large Shul that is in the process of being finished on Kennedy Blvd. and Astor Dr. Next to it is an existing house that is in a state of disrepair there are some out buildings of another house that was there and has been destroyed you can see an existing driveway, we would clean



that area up consistent with the Engineers report we will provide sidewalks as requested we would replace the curbs with respect to landscaping he notes that there are some specimen trees that may be able to be saved we will review that and compensate where we can't. With respect to drainage we will provide roof leaders and we acknowledge there will be more drainage comments at plot plan. With that said and I think there was some need to reconcile the improvement plan with the plot plan and the elevations and we will make those all consistent, with the other technical comments we will meet them all. We acknowledge that there are variances to be requested and the planning testimony will be presented by Mr. Flannery at the time of the hearing.

Mr. Neiman asked what the other homes on Astor were like.

Mr. Flannery stated that one of the issues we will address is providing sanitary sewer for this and you will see in the testimony why we are asking for what we are asking for with these variances. We will provide testimony at the public hearing.

Mr. Neiman stated that they should come with there tax map to the hearing.

Motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 meeting by Mr. Banas, seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**4. SD # 1753** (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Regency Development

Location: Corner of 4<sup>th</sup> street, Monmouth Ave & Steckler Street  
Block 160 Lots 1,3,5,6,13,14 & 15

Minor Subdivision to realign lot lines

**Project Description**

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide Block 160, Lots 1, 3, 5, 6, 13-15 into two (2) properties, proposed Lots 1.01 and 1.02. The purpose of the Minor Subdivision application is to create a site for a retail/office development on proposed Lot 1.01. The 1.29 acre existing tract contains two (2) one-story masonry buildings, a trailer, and a two-story stucco building. The two (2) masonry buildings and trailer will be removed from proposed Lot 1.01, the site for the proposed retail/office development. The existing two-story stucco building will remain on proposed

Lot 1.02. Proposed Lot 1.01 is a somewhat L-shaped lot fronting Monmouth Avenue, Fourth Street, and Steckler Street. However, the Minor Subdivision Plan shows a proposed vacation of Steckler Street which would make the proposed area of Lot 1.01 58,240.70 square feet (1.34 acres). The existing two-story stucco building will remain on proposed Lot 1.02. Proposed Lot 1.02 fronts Monmouth Avenue and contains 5,239.46 square feet (0.12 acres). No construction is proposed under this application. The original properties are located in the northern portion of the Township with existing frontages on three (3) municipal streets. Monmouth Avenue which has an eighty foot (80') right-of-way is located to the west. Fourth Street with a sixty foot (60') right-of-way is located to the north. Steckler Street with a fifty foot (50') right-of-way is located to the east. However, the Minor Subdivision Plan proposes to vacate Steckler Street across the project frontage. The lots are entirely situated within the B-4, Wholesale Services Zone. The site is in a developed section of the Township. The surrounding area contains a mixture of various uses. Public water and sewer is available. Curb and sidewalk exist along the street frontages with the exception of Steckler Street, which is proposed to be vacated. We have the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning** 1) The proposed lots are located in the B-4 Wholesale Service Zone. The Minor Subdivision Plan lists both the existing and proposed uses as commercial. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals regarding the proposed uses to confirm compliance with the UDO for this Zone. It is our understanding the existing structures on proposed Lot 1.01 will be removed for a proposed retail/office use. The proposed use for the existing two-story stucco building to remain on proposed Lot 1.02 has not been indicated. 2) A minimum lot area variance is required for proposed Lot 1.02. A twenty thousand square foot (20,000 SF) lot area is required and a 5,239.46 square foot lot area is proposed. 3) A minimum lot width variance is required for proposed Lot 1.02. A one hundred foot (100') lot width is required and a 55.54 foot lot width is proposed. 4) The existing two-story stucco building to remain on proposed Lot 1.02 has an existing front yard setback of 7.48 feet which is nonconforming since twenty-five feet (25') is required. 5) A rear yard setback variance is required for proposed Lot 1.02. A thirty foot (30') rear yard setback is required and a zero foot (0') rear yard setback is proposed. 6) Side yard setback variances are required for proposed Lot 1.02. A side yard setback of ten feet (10') is required with an aggregate of twenty feet (20'). A zero foot (0') side yard setback is proposed with an aggregate of 0.25 feet. 7) There is no existing off-street parking for the existing two-story stucco building to remain on proposed Lot 1.02 and no off-street parking is proposed to remedy this nonconformance. 8) 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) The schedule of bulk requirements requires revisions. Proposed Lot 1.01 has many bulk requirements listed which are the subject of a separate Major Site Plan application. Proposed Lot 1.02 has many existing nonconformities listed which will be newly created variances. 2) The minor subdivision plan shows no construction is proposed at this time. A separate major site plan application has been submitted for a proposed retail/office building. The application has been

reviewed by our office under separate cover. 3) This Minor Subdivision approval as submitted is predicated on the proposed Steckler Street road vacation being approved by the Township. 4) A waiver is required from providing a six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement along all property frontages. No shade trees are proposed for new Lot 1.02. The Site Plan for new Lot 1.01 proposes shade trees and landscaping. 5) The area of 50,740.70 square feet shown for proposed Lot 1.01 does not include the proposed seven thousand five hundred square foot (7,500 SF) street vacation. 6) Minor corrections are required to the General Notes. 7) Zone Boundary Lines must be added to the map. 8) The proposed setback lines must be added to the proposed lots. 9) There is a discrepancy between the front and rear lot line dimensions on proposed Lot 1.02. The proposed bearings show the lot is a rectangle. Therefore, the proposed dimensions must be equal. 10) The structures to be removed on proposed Lot 1.01 shall be indicated. 11) Existing and proposed setback dimensions must be added to the plan. 12) The existing features shown on the survey, including the immediate surroundings, must be shown on the Minor Subdivision Map. 13) The proposed lot numbers must be assigned by the Tax Assessor and the plat signed by the Tax Assessor. 14) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a) Township Committee (Street Vacation); b) Ocean County Planning Board; c) Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if required); and d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mr. Steven Pfeffer Esq. on behalf of this application the only reason that this application did not make the last meeting is that the new minor subdivision map was not on file 10 days before our professionals were waiting for a new lot designation. At the meeting for the companion matter Site Plan Bais Rivka Rochel for the proposed Supermarket on 4<sup>th</sup> Street, some questions were raised by this Board in regard to traffic matters with regard to vacation of Steckler Street with regard to the issues regarding the UEZ and at the November meeting we will have members of the UEZ and LDC come to the meeting to show that this property is within the core of their proposed Master Plan. As I have indicted originally it is a question of which comes first, the Township Committee will vacate the street but per Mr. Bathgate, Township Counsel they can not approve that until we get our Site Plan approved subject to. Whatever variances we will need will be part of the whole mix at the November Public Hearing meeting. We are asking that this minor subdivision which just takes that one lot of a preexisting building that is just going to stay there be carried to the November meeting where we will have all of our professionals available to give testimony.

Motion to move this application to the November 23, 2010 meeting was made by Mr. Follman and seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris.

Motion to approve by Mr. Percal, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 23, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**5. SD # 1740** (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Star Developers LLC

Location: North Apple Street and Kennedy Boulevard  
Block 172 Lots 16.01

Minor Subdivision to create 2 – 0 lot line lots

**Project Description**

The applicant seeks a Zero Lot line subdivision approval in accordance with Section 18-911 of the UDO to subdivide an existing irregular 9,999.6 square foot property known as Lot 16.01 in Block 172 into two (2) new residential lots, designated Lots 16.03 and 16.04 on the subdivision plan. The site is currently being developed, with a two-story duplex building under construction. **It should be noted that the existing lot (Lot 16.01) was created via a Minor Subdivision approval granted by the Planning Board (SD 1425c) in November, 2008. This lot was proposed to contain one (1) single family dwelling per the prior approval.** The site is situated within a predominantly residential area, and has frontage along North Apple Street, approximately at the intersection with Kennedy Boulevard East. The subdivision plan depicts North Apple Street as having a 50' wide right-of-way, with curbing existing along the property frontage. We have the following comments and recommendations per our review of the application in accordance with the UDO, and the Township's Zero Lot Line Residential Development ordinance (Section 18-911): (I) **Zoning/Applicability** 1)The property is located in the B-4 Central Business Zone District. Zero lot line residential dwellings are permitted in the B-4 zoning district. 2) As noted on the minor subdivision plan, a variance is required for proposed Lot 16.03 (secondary) front yard setback onto Kennedy Boulevard East. 3) As noted on the minor subdivision plan, a lot coverage variance is required for proposed Lot 16.04. 4) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances. **At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area.** (II) **Property Development Standards (Section 18-911(D))** Per review of the application and the Property Development Standards set forth within the Zero Lot Line Ordinance as they apply to B-4 zoned parcels developed for two-family residential units, the proposed subdivision complies with the ordinance requirements as summarized below:

	<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Standard (limit)</b>	<b>(Lot 16.03)</b>	<b>(Lot 16.04)</b>
<b>Lot Area</b>	50% (5,000 square feet (sf)) (minimum)	6097.4 sf	3,902.2 sf
<b>Front yard</b>	25 feet (minimum)	20.03 feet(*)	25.54 feet
<b>Setback</b>			
<b>Side yard</b>	7 feet (minimum)	N/A	7 feet
<b>Setback</b>			
	<b>Zoning</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Standard (limit)</b>	<b>(Lot 16.03)</b>	<b>(Lot 16.04)</b>
<b>Rear yard</b>	15 feet (minimum)	30.23 feet	26.06 feet
<b>Setback</b>			
<b>Height</b>	35 feet (maximum)	35 feet	35 feet
<b>Building</b>	30% (maximum)	26.1%	36.3%(***)
<b>Coverage</b>			
<b>Parking</b>	Four (4) spaces per dwelling unit (minimum)	4 spaces(**)	4 spaces(**)

(\*) *Property has dual frontage, access proposed off of North Apple Street. Primary frontage is 25 feet, secondary (Kennedy Blvd) frontage is 20.03 feet.*

(\*\*) *The zero lot line ordinance requires parking for each duplex unit as if each unit was a single-family dwelling. The zoning schedule on the plan indicates that four (4) spaces are provided for each unit. Eight (8) 9'x18' spaces are proposed, five of which are on Lot 16.03. A cross-access easement is depicted for access to the 4<sup>th</sup> space from the owner of Lot 16.04 onto Lot 16.03. Therefore, four(4) spaces per dwelling would be provided.*

(\*\*\*) *Dwelling exceeds zoning standard. (III) **Recommendations** Per review of the above referenced application, if/when Planning Board approval is granted for this subdivision, we recommend approval of the requested zero lot line subdivision provided that a revised minor subdivision plan is submitted in accordance with the following conditions: (1) Per Subsection 18-911 F (2 (a-g)) of the zero lot line ordinance, a written agreement signed by the owner of the property is required. **Said agreement must address shared access of parking space 4 as depicted on Lot 16.03.***

2) Compliance with the Map Filing Law, as applicable. 1) Outstanding outside agency approvals (if any).

Mr. Ray Shea Esq. and Mr. Brian Flannery P.E. for the applicant. Mr. Flannery stated that as indicated the lot because it is on the corner one side is a little bigger than the other and the reason we are here is because we exceed the coverage. We will respond to all the technical comments at the Public Hearing.

Mr. Vogt stated that the Board has received a letter from the adjacent neighbor that will be addressed at the Public Meeting.

Mr. Schmuckler asked Mr. Flannery to explain the lot setup and to bring to the Public Meeting a cleaner map with all the information needed.

A member of the public brought up a different lot that this builder was involved in and that the setback that should have been 7 feet we only 5 feet. A discussion ensued with the result being that the member of the public should contact Mr. Kiert for clarification.

Motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 meeting was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**6. SD # 1759** (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Congregation Zichron Binyamin  
Location: Northeast corner of Princeton Ave and 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Block 165 Lot 19  
Minor Subdivision to create 3 lots

**Project Description**

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 150' X 150' lot totaling 22,501.5 square feet (0.52 acres) in area known as Lot 19 in Block 165 into three (3) new lots, designated as proposed Lots 19.01 through 19.03 on the subdivision plan. The existing synagogue building will remain on proposed Lot 19.01. One (1) zero lot line duplex building is proposed, with one dwelling unit within each proposed lot (19.02 and 19.03). Public water and sewer is available. The site is situated on the northeast corner of Princeton Avenue and Seventh Street. Access to the synagogue will remain from Seventh Street, with access for the duplexes proposed from Princeton Avenue. Curb and sidewalk exist along both street frontages. The property is situated in the Multi-Family Residential (RM) Zone. We

have the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning** 1) The parcels are located in the R-M Multi-Family Residential (RM) Zone District. The existing synagogue and the proposed duplex/zero lot dwellings are permitted uses in the zone. 2) Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: a) Minimum Front Yard Setbacks (proposed Lot 19.01 (synagogue) – 24.7 feet (Princeton Ave.), 6.5 feet (Seventh St.), 25 feet minimum required – existing condition. B) Minimum Side Yard Setback, proposed Lot 19.01, 4.72 feet, 12 feet required (Places of Worship) – proposed condition. c) Maximum Building Coverage, proposed Lot 19.01, 39% proposed, 35% maximum (Places of Worship) – 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) The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 3 off-street parking spaces dwelling unit. No parking schedule or number of units is provided on the subdivision plan. Off-street parking for the proposed duplex units must be provided per RSIS standards and to the satisfaction of the Board. 2) Several revisions are necessary to the Bulk Requirements Table on the subdivision plan (comments #3-#5 below). We recommend separate tables for the proposed synagogue lot and the proposed duplex units. 3) The per lot width requirements for the proposed duplex unit lots (19.02, 19.03) should be revised to 30 foot minimum (per Ordinance 2010-22), and the minimum lot width for proposed Lot 19.01 revised to 75 feet minimum. 4) The proposed side yard width requirement for Lot 19.01 should be revised to 12 foot minimum. 5) The maximum building coverage limit for Lot 19.01 should be revised to 35%. 6) We note that a 5' wide cross access easement within proposed Lot 19.02 is depicted, presumably to allow access to the existing walkway area behind the synagogue. Confirming testimony should be provided from the applicant's professionals. Per review of the subdivision plan, it appears that this easement must be widened (slightly) to provide access for the entire existing walkway. 7) We note that although listed as 7 foot (minimum), the proposed side yard setback line for proposed duplex Lot 19.02 is depicted at 12 feet as scaled on the subdivision plan (i.e., the unit setback is seven (7) feet from the proposed 5' wide cross access easement for the synagogue). Confirming testimony should be provided from the applicant's professionals. 8) The subdivision plan depicts 6' wide shade tree and utility easements along the property's Princeton Avenue frontage. Additionally, a site triangle easement is depicted at the property's intersection. 9) Proposed lot and block numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. 10) No grading or drainage is provided for the proposed duplex units. If/when this application is approved; it should be conditioned upon provision of plot plans to the Township Engineering office prior to duplex construction. 11) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 12) The existing handicap accessible ramp at the road corner must be upgraded per applicable NJDOT standards as a condition of approval. 13) Per Subsection 18-911 F (2 (a-g)) of the zero lot line ordinance, a written agreement signed by the owner of the property is required for Lots 19.02 and 19.03. (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) NJAW (water & sewer); and d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mr. Penzer Esq. for the applicant stated that this application is to split the lot in half. This is on 7<sup>th</sup> Street and Princeton. The Synagogue has frontage on Princeton Ave. and there will be driveways coming into the duplexes.

Mr. Banas stated that he did not like the fact that the zero lot line variance will result in a lot that is only 33 and 1/3 feet wide.

Mr. Penzer explained that most duplexes are being built in this way and because of a recent ordinance change the lots are now wider than in the past.

Mr. Schmuckler asked about parking. Mr. Penzer stated that there will be four spots per unit.

A financial subdivision is to create a lot for each unit for individual ownership.

A motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 meeting was made by Mr. Follman and seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**6. SD # 1760** (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Pine Street Development  
Location: Northwest corner of Vine Ave. & Pine Street  
Block 774.01 Lot 6  
Minor Subdivision to create 3 lots

**Project Description**

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 41,742 square foot irregular lot known as Lot 6 in Block 774.01 into three (3) new single-family residential lots. The proposed properties are designated as proposed Lots 6.01-6.03 on the subdivision plan. Duplex dwellings are under construction on proposed Lots 6.01 and 6.02, which would be created as "Zero Lot" subdivided lots as proposed under this approval. Proposed Lot 6.03 is not proposed to be developed at this time. Public water and sewer is available. The site is situated on the westerly side of Pine Street at its intersection with Vine Avenue, which is undeveloped at this time. Curb exists along the Pine Street frontage, and sidewalk



is proposed across the Pine Street frontage of the proposed lots. The lots are situated within the R-10 Single Family Residential Zone, with the northeasterly corner of proposed Lot 6.03 being zoned as R-7.5 Single Family Residential. Variances for proposed Lots 6.02 and 6.03 are required to create this subdivision. It should be noted that the aggregate size of proposed Lots 6.01 and 6.02 exceeds 12,000 square feet, which is the minimum size to construct duplex housing in the R-10 zone. Therefore, the proposed subdivision as it affects the duplex units under construction is in general conformance with the Township's Zero Lot Residential Development ordinance (Section 18-911). The surrounding area is predominantly single-family residential. We have the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning** 1) The parcels are located in the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached dwellings and duplex housing on zero lot line properties are permitted uses in the zone. 2) Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: a) Minimum Lot Width for a Single-Family Lot (proposed Lot 6.03 -- 55.36 feet proposed, 75 feet required) – proposed condition. b) Minimum Side Yard Setback (proposed Lot 6.03 – 7 feet proposed, 10 feet required) – proposed condition. c) Minimum Side Yard Setback (proposed Lot 6.02 – 7.9 feet proposed, 10 feet required) – proposed condition. d) Minimum Aggregate Side Yard Setback (proposed Lot 6.03 – 15 feet proposed, 25 feet required) – proposed condition. e) Maximum Building Coverage (proposed Lot 6.02 – 27.9% proposed, 25% required). 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) No architectural plans have been submitted with the application. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony as to how many bedrooms are proposed in each duplex residential unit, and whether developable basements are proposed in the units. 2) Per the Bulk Requirements table on the plan, four (4) off-street parking spaces are being provided for each proposed lot. The proposed driveway/parking areas should be dimensioned to confirm that four (4) 18' x 36' foot spaces can be provided for each dwelling unit. 3) The Bulk requirement Table incorrectly notes a proposed Lot coverage of 30% for Lot 6.03. Unless this is requested for future development, the table must be corrected. 4) Sidewalk is proposed along the property's Pine Street frontage, but not Vine Avenue, presumably because it is undeveloped at this time. Sidewalk shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 5) Since specific information (house type, grading, drainage, utilities, etc) is not provided for the development of Lots 6.01 and 6.02, we assume a plot plan was (or will be) provided for review and approval by the Township Engineering Department as a condition of approval. Confirming testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals. 6) The subdivision plat depicts a proposed 6 foot-wide Shade Tree Easement along the property's Pine Street frontage. Shade trees should be provided per the UDO, or waiver sought. 7) Proposed lot and block numbers must be approved by the Tax Assessor's office. 8) Testimony should be provided on storm water management proposed (if any) and the disposition of storm water from roof leaders. 9) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. At a minimum, a monument appears necessary where the proposed

zero lot line meets the Pine Street ROW. 10) Per Subsection 18-911 F (2 (a-g)) of the zero lot line ordinance, a written agreement signed by the owner of the property is required for Lots 6.01 and 6.02. 11) Construction details are provided on the plan, and will be reviewed during Compliance if/when this subdivision is approved. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a) Ocean County Planning Board; b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District;; c) New Jersey American Water (water & sewer); and d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mr. Penzer Esq. for the applicant stated that the applicant meets all the comments in the letter from Mr. Vogt. This is a minor subdivision of a duplex that is already being built. The variance is just to make it two lots for financial concerns. Because of the new ordinance this application is here tonight it really just needs to be at a Public Hearing meeting.

A motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 meeting was made by Mr. Follman and seconded by Mrs. Koutsouris.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**8. SD #1761 (No Variance Requested)**

Applicant: King Gardens 2010 LLC  
Location: Dr. Martin Luther King Drive  
Block 768 Lot s 55, 56 & 58  
Minor Subdivision - 4 zero lot line lots

**Project Description**

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 150' X 150' lot totaling 22,500 square feet (0.516 acres) in area known as Lots 55, 56 and 58 in Block 768 into four (4) new residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 56.01 through 56.04 on the subdivision plan. Two (2) zero lot line duplex buildings are proposed, with one dwelling unit within each proposed lot. The site contains three (3) existing dwellings and appurtenances which will be removed. Public water and sewer is available. The site is situated on the west side of Martin Luther King Drive,

immediately north of its intersection with Lincoln Street. Curbing and sidewalk exist along the property frontage. The property is situated in the Multi-Family Residential (RM) Zone. We have the following comments and recommendations: (I) **Zoning 10** The parcels are located in the R-M Multi-Family Residential (RM) Zone District. Duplex/zero lot dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. 2) Per review of the application and the subdivision plans, the application appears to comply with both the Two-Family bulk requirement standards within the R-M zone as well as the Township's Zero Lot line ordinance (18-911). Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether any variances are sought for this project. (II) **Review Comments** 1) The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 3 off-street parking spaces dwelling unit. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements indicates that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each unit. Although the proposed driveways must be dimensioned on the revised subdivision plans, they appear to be depicted as 18'x36' in size, and capable of providing four (4) 9'x18' spaces per dwelling unit. 2) Testimony should be provided regarding the number of bedrooms in the proposed dwellings to determine whether additional off-street parking is required. 3) Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 4) Proposed lot and block numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. 5) General Note 8 (should be corrected as '9') references the architectural dimensions of the proposed structures to be 29' x 55', which will provide less than twenty-nine percent (29%) lot coverage, within the allowable coverage of thirty percent (30%). 6) The Plan indicates a number of mature trees exist on the site. At least some of the mature trees in the future rear yards appear salvageable. 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. 7) A legend is required on the Minor Subdivision Plan. 8) A 6' wide shade tree and utility easement is proposed along the property's frontage. Two (2) Green Vase Zelkovas are proposed as shade trees. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 9) Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 10) Construction details are provided on the Improvement plan, and are in general conformance with Township standards. A detailed review of details will be performed during construction review if/when approved by the Board. 11) No pavement restoration details are provided. A detail(s) must be provided, as well as the proposed extent of restoration associated with the new service connections. Pavement restoration must be provided during construction to the satisfaction of the Township. 12) Existing deteriorated curb and sidewalk (if any) along the property frontage should be replaced during construction to the satisfaction of the Township. 13) Per Subsection 18-911 F (2 (a-g)) of the zero lot line ordinance, a written agreement signed by the owner of the property is required for the future lots. (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) NJAW or LTMUA (water & sewer); and d) All other required outside agency approvals. **A revised submission should be provided addressing the above-referenced comments, including a point-by-point summary letter of revisions.**

Mr. John Doyle Esq. for the applicant as your engineer noted there are no variances requested and we will acknowledge all the comments in the engineers letter and will comply.

A motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 meeting was made by Mrs. Koutsouris and seconded by Mr. Follman.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**9. SP # 1937 (Variance Requested)**

Applicant: KT Management Services  
Location: Syracuse Court, north of Oberlin Ave. South  
Block 1600 Lot 8  
Preliminary & Final Site Plan for proposed addition to existing warehouse

**Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval to add a twenty thousand four hundred square foot (20,400 SF) one-story warehouse addition to the existing twenty-one thousand square foot (21,000 SF) one-story masonry warehouse building within the Lakewood Industrial Park. The existing facility is located at 100 Syracuse Court. According to the site plan, the thirteen (13) existing off-street parking spaces will be expanded to fifty-seven (57) proposed off-street parking spaces. Two (2) of the proposed spaces will be handicapped, both being van accessible. Based on the parking requirements of one (1) space per employee on maximum shift plus ten (10) spaces for executives, this would allow for a total maximum shift of forty-seven (47) employees. Proposed parking spaces will be a minimum of 9' X 18'. Access to the site will be provided by an existing driveway from Syracuse Court. The tract consists of 3.73 acres in area, and is mostly developed with the exception of a wooded area on the west side of the property. The property slopes gently downwards from north to south. No freshwater wetlands or state open waters exist on-site or within three hundred feet (300') of the tract. The site has double frontage. The northeast side of the site fronts Syracuse Court while the west side fronts New Hampshire Avenue, a County Road. Access to the site is from Syracuse Court since the Existing Conditions Plan shows a fifty foot (50') wide existing Vegetative Buffer Easement along the New Hampshire Avenue frontage. The adjoining roadways are improved. Municipally supplied water and sewer services are already serving the site. Surrounding lands are all improved with large commercial and industrial land uses. The site is located in the M-1 Industrial Zone. Warehouses are a permitted use in the zone. (I) **Zoning** 1) The site is situated within the M-1, Industrial Zone. Per Section 18-903M.1.c., of the UDO, under

“permitted uses” in the M-1 zone cites warehouses. 2) Per review of the site plans and application, the following design waivers appear to be required: a) Providing concrete curb and sidewalk along the project frontage. There is existing curb, but no existing sidewalk along Syracuse Court. There is no existing curb and sidewalk along New Hampshire Avenue, a County Road. No additional curb and sidewalk is proposed across either of the site frontages. B) Providing shade trees and a shade tree and utility easement along the Syracuse Court project frontage. There is a fifty foot (50') wide Vegetative Buffer Easement across the New Hampshire Avenue frontage. (II) **Review Comments** Per review of the current design plans, the application is generally well prepared. We offer the following comments and recommendations: (A) **Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** 1) Per Section 18-903M.6.b., of the UDO, for industrial buildings having twenty thousand square feet (20,000 SF) to fifty thousand square feet (50,000 SF) of floor area shall provide one (1) parking space for each employee on the maximum work shift, plus ten (10) spaces for executives. As noted on the site plans, the number of proposed parking spaces will allow for a maximum shift of 47 employees 2) Two (2) handicapped parking spaces, both spaces being van accessible are proposed. A third handicapped parking space is required per ADA requirements since the number of proposed off-street parking spaces exceeds fifty (50). 3) A Vehicular Circulation Plan is required to confirm accessibility for tractor trailers, delivery, emergency, and trash pickup vehicles that will need to access the site. 4) Testimony should be provided on loading/unloading for the site. 5) A 9' X 18' solid waste enclosure on a 12' X 20' pad is proposed at the far side of the parking area across from the building. The refuse area is enclosed, and screening has been provided. The waste receptacle area has been designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E. of the UDO. 6) The ninety foot (90') property line perpendicular to New Hampshire Avenue is a side lot line. The rear yard setback line shown parallel to this lot line should be corrected to a forty foot (40') side yard setback line since the opposite side yard setback line is thirty feet (30'). The proposed combined side yards shown in the Zone Requirements shall be corrected to 106.8 feet. 7) Survey data should be provided for the existing fifty foot (50') Vegetative Buffer Easement and existing ten foot (10') Utility Easement. 8) An infiltration basin is proposed on the south side of the site. The proposed basin is shallow, having a depth of three and a half feet (3-1/2'). The basin will not be fenced and has no vehicular access. Two (2) small recharge areas are proposed along the north and west sides of the building addition. 9) No sight triangles associated with the site access have been indicated, and may not be necessary because of the configuration of Syracuse Court. 10) There appear to be errors with existing stormwater piping as depicted on the base maps. The applicant's engineer should contact our office for further clarification. (B) **Architectural** 1) Basic architectural floor plans and elevations were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the building will be twenty-six feet (26') high, far less than the sixty-five foot (65') allowable height. 2) The plans show the addition will only house warehouse space. Review of the utility plans indicates that restrooms will be proposed. Testimony should be provided on the proposed floor area usage. 3) The rear elevation shows a door which is not on the floor plan. The door is not indicated on the site plan. 4) The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the proposed building facade, and treatments. We recommend that renderings be

provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. 5) Testimony should be provided as to whether any roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed. If so, said equipment should be adequately screened. Two (2) proposed air conditioning units at ground level are shown on the site plans which have vegetative screening. (C) **Grading** 1) A detailed grading plan is provided on Sheet 4, and is generally well-prepared. A modular block retaining wall is proposed west of the proposed addition in order to preserve a tree save area on the west side of the site. 2) The site is generally well graded and slopes from north to south. Some proposed contours are missing and need to be added to the plans. 3) An infiltration basin is proposed on the southerly portion of the proposed project site. The basin will be less than four feet (4') deep, have a flat sand bottom, and have 4:1 side slopes. 4) Two small recharge areas are proposed on the north and west sides of the proposed building addition. An under drain for these proposed recharge areas connects to an existing twelve inch corrugated metal pipe (12" CMP) behind the north side of the existing building. 5) A review of final grading revisions will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted. (D) **Storm Water Management** 1) The site has been designed to incorporate the use of two (2) small proposed recharge areas and a small proposed infiltration basin. All runoff from new paved surfaces will sheet flow through a proposed curb cut and be conveyed to the proposed infiltration basin through a vegetated swale that will provide water quality and disconnect impervious surfaces. 2) A minimum two foot (2') vertical separation between the proposed bottom of the sand layers and the seasonal high water table has been provided. The proposed basin and recharge areas provide a six inch (6") thick proposed sand layer. 3) The proposed roof leaders on the site plans shall be revised to coordinate with the architectural drawings. 4) The proposed up invert for the trench drain at the new truck loading ramp should be 38.22. 5) The proposed recharge area located on the north side of the addition will collect roof runoff. It incorporates a depression to receive runoff from the downspouts on the north half of the building. Any excess runoff will be directed to an existing storm inlet located in the lawn area adjacent to Syracuse Court. 6) A small recharge area along the westerly side of the building addition is proposed. This depression will collect runoff from a portion of the wooded area to remain and some lawn area. 7) Coordination is required between the plan and section views of the recharge areas. 8) A storm water maintenance manual has not been provided in accordance with NJ Stormwater Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township standards. It is our understanding this document will not be prepared until after the initial CAFRA review. (E) **Landscaping** 1) A landscape plan has been provided for the project, and is generally well-prepared. Proposed landscape planting for the site consists of four (4) Swamp White Oak, four (4) Green Mountain Sugar Maples, fifteen (15) Japanese Pieris, fifteen (15) Morning Light Miscanthuses, and ten (10) Emerald Green Arborvitae. 2) The Emerald Green Arborvitae plant count around the trash enclosure shall be revised to ten (10) trees. 3) The applicant has not provided a six foot (6') shade tree and utility easement along the property frontage, and sight triangle easements for the existing site access driveway. If not proposed, design waivers will be necessary. 4) Revisions are required to the Planting Details, and can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. (F) **Lighting** 1) Per review of the Lighting and Landscape Plan, six (6) building mounted lights are proposed with the

addition. 2) Additional lighting appears necessary in portions of the site, and can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. (G) **Utilities** 1) Public water and sewer services will be provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. 2) Electric service is available from Jersey Central Power & Light. Gas service is available from New Jersey Natural Gas Company. 3) Testimony should be provided regarding proposed fire protection measures. (H) **Signage** 1) No proposed free-standing or wall mounted signage has been provided on the site plans. 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) Site Summary Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract is mostly developed with the exception of a wooded area on the west side of the property. The property slopes gently downwards from north to south. No freshwater wetlands or state open waters exist on-site or within three hundred feet (300') of the tract. To assess the site for environmental concerns, a natural resources search of the property and surroundings was completed 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. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether there are any known areas of environmental concern (i.e. fuel tanks, fuel spills, etc.) that exist within the property. 2) Tree Management Plan General Note #13 on the Cover Sheet states the entire site contains seventeen (17) trees of twelve inches (12") in caliper or greater, and no specimen trees. Less than ten (10) trees larger than twelve inch (12") caliper are proposed to be removed. Therefore, a Tree Protection Management Plan is not required. The locations of the larger seventeen (17) trees are shown on the Existing Conditions Plan. (J) **Construction Details** 1) Construction details are provided on Sheets 9 and 10 of the plans. 1) 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. The Class of concrete for the Concrete Wall and Protective Bollard Details shall be upgraded. 2) We recommend two inch (2") frames be used for the chain link gates on the Double Trash Enclosure Detail. No pilasters are shown for the decorative block walls. 3) Unless sidewalk is required along Syracuse Court, Curb Ramp Type 5 shall be eliminated. Only Curb Ramp Type 7 will be required for the site as currently proposed. 4) The leader arrow needs correction on the Concrete Loading Dock Apron Detail. 5) The striping color is required for the Van Accessible Handicapped Parking Detail. 6) The base course pavement should be thicker on the On-Site Pavement Section. 7) A depressed curb detail is required. 8) A detail must be provided for the retaining wall. 9) Rebar information is missing from the Concrete Wall Detail. (III) **Regulatory Agency Approval** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a) Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); b) Ocean County Planning Board; c) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d) NJDEP CAFRA Individual Permit; and e) All other required outside agency approval. **A revised submission should be**

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

Mr. Abe Penzer Esq. for the applicant all the items are minor in nature and we will be able to address all these items at the Public Hearing

A motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 meeting was made by Mr. Follman and seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**10. SP# 1938 (No Variance Requested)**

Applicant: Lakewood Realty/Lakewood Toyota  
Location: Route 88 (Ocean Ave) east of New Hampshire Ave  
Block 569 Lot 110  
Preliminary & Final Site Plan to provide additional service bays and offices.

**Project Description**

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval. The applicant proposes to expand the two (2) existing buildings. The existing 6,659 SF one-story show room building is proposed to be expanded to 7,559 SF. A partial second story addition of three thousand square feet (3,000 SF) for offices is also proposed for the rear section of the building. The existing 14,082 SF service building is proposed to be expanded by 6,006 SF for service bays. An existing second floor area for the service building of approximately six thousand square feet (6,000 SF) will not be added to. Therefore, a total floor area of about 36,647 SF is proposed within a 27,647 SF proposed building area. According to the site plan, the three hundred seven-two (372) existing off-street parking spaces will be reduced to three hundred forty-two (342) proposed off-street parking spaces. Two hundred thirty (230) of these spaces are not striped, used for vehicle sales storage, and will be unchanged from existing to proposed conditions. Therefore, a reduction of thirty (30) striped spaces (142 to 112) is proposed. Access to the site is be provided by two (2) existing two-way driveways from Ocean Avenue (Route 88). Route 88 is a State Highway. The tract consists of 4.67 acres in area, and is mostly developed with the exception of a wooded area in the southern portion of the property which is bounded by the South Branch of the Metedeconk River. The property slopes downwards from northeast to southwest. The south Branch of the Metedeconk River is designated as a C-1 waterway which carries a three hundred foot (300') Riparian Buffer. The site



fronts the southwest side of Ocean Avenue (Route 88). The roadway is improved with municipally supplied water and sewer services already serving the site. Except for the south side of the tract, surrounding lands are all improved with large commercial land uses. The site is located in the B-4 Wholesale Service Zone. New or used car lots are a permitted use in the zone. (I) **Waivers (A) The following waivers have been requested or are required from the Land Development Checklist:** 1) B -- Site Features. 2) C13 – Environmental Impact Statement. 3) C14 – Tree Protection Management Plan. 4) C17 – Design calculations showing proposed drainage facilities to be in accordance with the appropriate drainage runoff requirements. The Existing Conditions Plan does not show topography between the woods line and the South Branch of the Metedeconk River. The indicated reason for a waiver request on “B-Site Features” is that it would not impact the design. Waivers have been requested from the Environmental Impact Statement and drainage calculations because there is no increase in impervious coverage, and all construction is limited to currently improved areas. A waiver from a Tree Protection Management Plan is required, and site clearing is minimal. We support the requested waivers. However, a summary EIS should be provided addressing wetlands and category one buffer impacts, if any, on the proposed site design. (II) **Zoning** 1) The site is situated within the B-4, Wholesale Service Zone. Per Section 18-903D.1.e., of the UDO, under “permitted uses” in the B-4 zone cites new or used car lots. 2) Testimony is required on the number of off-street parking spaces. Per Section 18-807B.1., of the UDO, retail trade or personal service establishments, one (1) parking space shall be required for each two hundred square feet (200 SF) of gross floor area. Based on a proposed gross floor area of approximately 36,647 SF, one hundred eighty-four (184) parking spaces would be required. We count the project proposes one hundred twelve (112) striped spaces and two hundred thirty (230) unmarked spaces. 3) The site plans indicate no changes are proposed to any existing free standing signs and no new free standing signs are proposed. Per Section 18-812A.9.b., of the UDO, a fifteen foot (15') setback from the right-of-way is required and the existing free standing signs are within fifteen feet (15') of the right-of-way. This situation is an existing nonconformity. 4) The architectural plans indicate proposed wall mounted signage on two (2) sides of the showroom building and the front of the service building. However, the information is incomplete for the service building. Testimony is required on the compliance of the proposed wall mounted signage. Variances may be necessary. 5) Per review of the site plans and application, the following design waivers appear to be required: a) Providing parking facilities closer than twenty feet (20') from the street line (Subsection 18-807.C.6.). The nearest proposed parking facility to the street line is about five feet (5'). b) Providing concrete sidewalk along the project frontage (Subsection 18-814.M.). Asphalt pavement extends to the back of the existing curb along Route 88. c) Providing curb for the parking area. No curb exists or is proposed for the rear parking area allowing runoff to flow into the woods. d) Providing shade trees and a shade tree and utility easement along the project frontage. No shade trees or landscaping exist on the site and none is proposed. e) Any and all other design waivers deemed necessary by the Board. 6) The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the required variances and design waivers. **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 Site Plan/Circulation/Parking** 1) The B-4 Zone Requirements shown on the Cover Sheet must be corrected. Our review of the project to the correct design regulations indicates no setback variances will be required. 2) The Parking Requirements shown on the Cover Sheet must be corrected to conform to the proper section of the UDO. 3) The General Notes indicate that the outbound and topographic information was taken from a survey dated February 4, 2003. A copy of this survey shall be submitted. Updating of the survey is recommended since it is over seven (7) years old. 4) Testimony should be provided on loading/unloading of vehicles and service products. 5) Some aisle widths are too narrow for two-way circulation. We recommend a minimum aisle width of twenty-four feet (24') be adhered to. 6) A trash storage area for three (3) dumpsters is proposed behind the service building. Dimensions and construction details are required. Testimony is required regarding the adequacy of the trash storage area. The waste receptacle area should be designed in accordance with Section 18-809.E. of the UDO. 7) No sight triangles associated with the proposed vehicular site access points have been indicated. 8) Route 88 is improved with utilities, curbing, and pavement. No changes to the existing improvements are proposed along the site frontage or driveway access points. No sidewalk exists within the right-of-way and none is proposed. The adjoining sites do not have sidewalk within the right-of-way. 9) No provisions have been made for handicapped parking spaces. 10) The proposed number of parking spaces in the row adjacent the trash storage area shall be corrected to nine (9). 11) An additional door on the front side of the service building requires the elimination of two (2) striped parking spaces. 12) Proposed building dimensions must be added to the site plan. 13) A Riparian Buffer line should be added to the plans. 14) The General Notes should update the year of reference for the NJDOT Standards to 2007. (B) **Architectural** 1) Architectural floor plans and elevations were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the buildings will be far less than the forty-five foot (45') allowable height. A maximum height of thirty-four feet three inches (34'-3") is proposed. 2) The existing second floor for the service building must be shown. 3) Proposed building mounted signage information must be completed with respect to zoning requirements. 4) The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the proposed building facade, and treatments. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. 5) Testimony should be provided as to whether any roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed. If so, said equipment should be adequately screened. 6) ADA accessibility to the proposed buildings should be addressed. (C) **Grading** 1) A detailed grading plan is provided on Sheet 4. The site will be filled with the expansion of the buildings. Modular block retaining walls are proposed on the sides of the rear parking area in order to limit disturbance and tree clearing. 2) As indicated on the plans, site grading is proposed. Since fill is to be imported, we recommend that the applicant perform analytical testing, in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:26E-6.4(b)2.iii through iv, N.J.A.C. 7:26E-6.4(b)3, (d) and (e), on the fill at a frequency suitable to demonstrate that contaminants are not present within the fill soil at concentrations above the relevant NJDEP Soil Cleanup Criteria. 3) Grading is proposed on the

southerly portion of the project site. The rear parking area will be sloped at four percent (4%) and have walls constructed from modular block interlocking units on the sides. Unless the walls are moved inwards on the site, proposed clearing limits should be shown. Runoff will continue to drainage towards the South Branch of the Metedeconk River. 4) The proposed final grade around the showroom building will be 23.1. Proposed spot grades and contours are required around the building, particularly on the rear side where the most filling will occur. 5) The proposed retaining wall will be stepped at various locations. The grading plan indicates the locations of these steps with proposed top and bottom of wall elevations to insure proper construction. 6) Proposed spot grades should be added in the proposed handicapped parking areas to insure proposed slopes of two percent (2%) are not exceeded. (D) **Storm Water Management** 1) A waiver has been requested from the submission of drainage calculations and alteration to the storm sewer collection system as there is no change in impervious coverage on the site. (E) **Landscaping** 1) Proposed landscape planting for the site has not been provided. Furthermore, as observed from our site investigation, no ornamental landscaping exists on-site. 2) The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board. 3) The applicant has not provided shade trees, a six foot (6') shade tree and utility easement along the property frontage, and sight triangle easements for the existing site access driveways. (F) **Lighting** 1) The project contains existing site lighting. No alterations to the existing site lighting are proposed. Testimony should be provided on the adequacy of existing site lighting. (G) **Utilities** 1) Public water and sewer services are being provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. No new utilities are required to serve the buildings. 2) Electric service is available from Jersey Central Power & Light. Gas service is available from New Jersey Natural Gas Company. 3) Upgrades to existing utilities would be completed as required. (H) **Signage** 1) Existing free-standing signage is located within fifteen feet (15') of the right-of-way. 2) Signage information is provided for building mounted signage on the architectural plans. However, the information is incomplete for the service building. Testimony is required on the compliance of the proposed wall mounted signage. Variances may be necessary. 3) 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) **Site Description** Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract is a developed automobile sales and service lot fronting on the southwest side of Route 88 east of New Hampshire Avenue. The vegetation on site consists of only a wooded area on the south side of the site bordering the South Branch of the Metedeconk River. The property slopes downwards from northeast to southwest. The South Branch of the Metedeconk River is a C-1 waterway with an associated three hundred feet (300') Riparian Buffer. 2) **Environmental Impact Statement** No Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was submitted for the project and a waiver has been requested. 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: a) Known Contaminated Sites (including deed notices of contaminated areas); b) Wood Turtle and Urban Peregrine habitat areas; and c) NJDEP Landscape Project areas, including known forested wetlands, emergent wetlands, forest, and grassland habitat areas. We recommend the applicant's professionals provide testimony regarding the existence of freshwater wetlands and how the category one buffer could impact proposed improvements. 3) **Tree Protection Management Plan** A waiver is required from the submission of a Tree Protection Management Plan. No Tree Protection Management Plan was submitted or appears necessary given the minimal amount of clearing required for the proposed improvements. 4) **Phase I/AOC's** If existing, a Phase I study should be provided to address potential areas of environmental concern (AOC's), if any within the site. (J) **Construction Details** 1) Construction details are provided on Sheet 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. The concrete footing for the Protective Bollard Detail needs to be upgraded. 3) A detail is required for the trash storage area. 4) The Asphalt Parking Lot Detail is in conflict with the On-Site Pavement & Concrete Curb Section. 5) Signage and striping color must be provided for the Van Accessible Handicapped Parking Detail. 6) A final design must be provided for the retaining wall prior to construction. 7) Handicap Ramp Details must be in accordance with the latest NJDOT Standard Construction Details. 8) Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. (IV) **Regulatory Agency Approvals** Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a) Ocean County Planning Board; b) Ocean County Soil Conservation District; c) NJDEP (Freshwater Wetlands); d) NJDOT (Access, Right-of-Way, and/or Occupancy); 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. Ray Shea Esq. for the applicant, this application is to expand and modernize their facility. We are in full agreement with Mr. Vogts letter and request that you move this application to the next meeting.

Mr. Vogt stated that he was okay with the waivers requested but for the next meeting the applicant should be ready to address the applicability of the C-1 buffer. Mr. Shea stated that they will.

Motion for the waivers to be accepted was made by Mr. Banas and seconded by Mr. Follman.

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

A motion to move this application to the November 9, 2010 meeting was made by Mr. Follman and seconded by Mr. Banas.

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

Mr. Jackson stated that this application will be heard at the November 9, 2010 Public Hearing 6:00pm this meeting hall, there is no further notice required.

**6. CORRESPONDENCE**

**7. PUBLIC PORTION**

Mrs. Jerry Baldwins, Governors Road, she stated what is the process to having a member of a Board to sit on another Board. She thinks that a certain procedure should be put in place to make sure that there are Board members at each meeting.

Mr. Neiman

**8. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Minutes from September 14 , 2010 Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Banas stated that a motion that he made at the meeting was stated incorrectly, on page 14 it should have read that a Cert of Occupancy not be granted until the parking lot was fixed and striped.

Motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler to approve with the changes made by Mr. Banas, and seconded by Mr. Follman to approve.

Roll Call Mr. Franklin, not voting, Mrs. Koutsouris, yes. Mr. Neiman, yes, Mr. Banas, yes, Mr. Follman, yes, Mr. Schmuckler, yes.

**9. APPROVAL OF BILLS**

Motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, and seconded by Mr. Follman to approve.

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

**10. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted  
Margaret Stazko  
Planning Board Recording Secretary