

1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Neiman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Ally Morris read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings 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 at least 48 hours in advance. The public has the right to attend this meeting, and minutes of this meeting will be available for public inspection. This meeting meets the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

4. DISCUSSION

- SP1927A Four Corners revised resolution

Mr. Jackson stated that the Board requested an amended revised resolution for the Four Corners restaurant which he has done. As the Board recalls, they have had discussions that they could have overflow seating at their new location. The Board said no catering hall upstairs but if they wanted to take overflow seating from the restaurant and put that downstairs, that was acceptable. Apparently when they were going through their bonding approvals, the Township Attorney, Jan Wouters, thought there was a contradiction in the way the resolution was prepared. Therefore, he has attempted to remedy that. He handed out the revised resolution to the Board members. The revised resolution specifically states that there will be no retail sales on the second floor of the proposed commercial building, the first floor may not be used as a catering hall but may be used as otherwise permitted by law, the Planning Board hereby supplements the resolution that the motion of approval prohibited the use of the second floor for service of food but did not restrict the use of the floor for lawful activity including service of food to overflow patrons. The applicant is therefore not prohibited from service of food on the first floor as may otherwise be permitted by law. There shall be no renting of either floor for catering type operations. The applicant may have up to eight tables, but no cash register or servers, etc. If they do that then it becomes an actual restaurant which would require further site plan approval and they would have to come back to this Board for an amended site plan.

Mr. Neiman said the owner of the restaurant is here and he wants to make sure he understands the resolution. If during peak hours, there are a lot of patrons at the current restaurant, they could pay for their food and proceed to eat it on the first floor in the building. There can't be any servers, food displays, cash registers in the new building. If the applicant wants that, they would have to come back to this Board for approval.

Mr. Newhouse stated that the neighbors did not want a catering business in the new building which he understands. Their core business is a restaurant. He has no problem with what the Board is presenting, however, he would like to be able to have as many seats as permitted by law. They are proposing an

additional 24 parking spaces without having any additional employees working at that building. He would like the language changed to state that they could have as many tables, seats as permitted by law per the parking requirements.

Mr. Jackson believes the Board is being very liberally. If the applicant wants a restaurant, they would need to show the layout, parking requirements, etc. He believes eight tables is a good benchmark.

Mr. Penzer would like to know why they cannot put as permitted by law in the resolution instead of limiting the amount of tables.

Mr. Neiman said because that is very vague and Jan Wouters had an issue with that.

Mr. Jackson stated they did try doing that initially.

Mr. Neiman said if the applicant sees down the road that eight tables is not enough then they can do a change of use to a restaurant.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Herzl to approve the revised resolution.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman

Abstain: Mr. Rennert

- Green Acres Application

Mrs. Morris stated as part of the application to the State, the Township needs a recommendation from the Planning Board indicating that they feel the parks they have selected are within the reign of the Master Plan.

A motion was made by Mr. Rennert, seconded by Mr. Banas to recommend the application to the State.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

- Franklin Street Study Area – Ordinance 2014-263

Mrs. Morris stated the Committee has passed an ordinance that the Township possibly look at the Franklin Street area as being a redevelopment area. The Planning Board's responsibility is to determine whether or not that area qualifies as a redevelopment area. Considering that not much has changed since the last time the Board has determined that it is in need of redevelopment, she believes the Board's position would be the same.

Mr. Neiman asked why they are discussing this again as they have already voiced their opinion.

Mr. Vogt said this is part of the process the Township needs to go through for the new redevelopment law.

Mr. Rennert said when this was first called a redevelopment area, the State does not feel it was done correctly administratively that it would pass certain standards.

A motion was made by Mr. Banas, seconded by Mr. Herzl to recommend the redevelopment of the Franklin Street area.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman

Abstained: Mr. Rennert

- Ordinance Amending and Supplementing Chapter 18.901 Zoning Districts and Maps – Cross Street, James Street, White Street, and Nieman Road

Mrs. Morris states that this ordinance follows exactly what was adopted in the Master Plan Amendment by this Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Banas, seconded by Mr. Herzl to recommend the ordinance to the Committee.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

5. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

- 1. SD 1564A** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Harvard Partners LLC
Location: Lanes Mill Road & Hidden Lane
Block 187.15 Lot 9

Amended Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 15 lots; Subdivision was previously approved however access onto Lanes Mill Road is no longer proposed

Project Description

The applicant is seeking amended Preliminary and Final Subdivision approval. A prior subdivision approval (SD #1564) was granted in 2007 for a conforming 15-lot single family subdivision at 1603 Lanes Mill Road, an irregular 6.95 acre lot located northwest of Barrymore Drive. A 16th lot (Lot 9.12) was granted lot area and lot width variance relief and is intended to function as an infiltration basin. The existing property totals 302,919 square feet, or 6.95 acres in area. The large mostly vacant flat tract is wooded except for a dwelling along the Lanes Mill Road frontage. The property is situated in the northern portion of the township on Lanes Mill Road south of the intersection of Malibu Drive. The site has approximately four hundred forty feet (440') of frontage along Lanes Mill Drive. Lanes Mill Road is an improved county road, with a varying right-of-way width. Curbing and Sidewalk are proposed along this frontage. A right-of-way dedication along Lanes Mill Road is also proposed. The original project was design and approved to provide access by extending Hidden Lane from the existing cul-de-sac terminus into the property. Eight (8) of the fifteen (15) single-family lots will access the extended roadway, which will end as a new cul-de-sac terminus near the rear of Lot 2. A new road (Hershey Lane) was also approved under application SD1564, extending from Hidden Lane and connecting to the north side of Lanes Mill Road (as a "T" intersection). Hershey Lane was designed to provide access to the remaining seven (7) approved single-family lots. Per testimony provided by the applicant's professionals at a recent public hearing, Ocean County denied approval necessary for the Board-approved connection of Hershey Lane to (County-owned) Lanes Mill Road. As a result, the current (amended) application was redesigned to proposed Hershey Lane as a cul-de-sac road with no connection to Lanes Mill Road. Per review of the currently-submitted subdivision plans vs. the original (2007) approved design, no other substantive design changes are proposed (other than the Hershey Lane terminus). The only lots directly affected by the amended design are approved lots (9.01-9.02) and (9.15-9.16), which appear to remain as conforming lots as per the existing Board approval. The project is located in the R-15 Residential Zone. The surrounding land is primarily residential. 1. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-15 Residential Zone. Per Sections 18-902D.1.a., and, of the Ordinance, detached single-family dwellings are permitted. 2. The following bulk variances were approved for the above-referenced infiltration basin property (Lot 9.12), and remain necessary for the amended application: • Minimum Lot Area – ten thousand eight hundred square feet (10,800 SF) proposed for infiltration basin on proposed Lot 9.12, whereas fifteen

thousand square feet (15,000') required – proposed condition. • Minimum Lot Width – seventy-two feet (72') proposed for infiltration basin on proposed Lot 9.12, whereas one hundred feet (100') required – proposed condition. • All other lots will remain as minimum 15,000 sf in size (or variance relied should be requested by the applicant as part of this approval). 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 may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments Per review of the current design plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations: 1. Testimony must be provided by the applicant's professionals summarizing the current (amended) application, and that no other design changes are proposed (other than as outlined in our review letter and as stipulated in Board resolution SD#1564). 2. As per public testimony at the recent public hearing, concerns were raised regarding the newly-proposed (sole) access from future residents of this project onto Hidden Lane and Barrymore Drive, resulting from the County's elimination of the previous (secondary) access onto Lanes Mill Road. The applicant's professionals must provide professional testimony at the Public hearing addressing said concerns to the Board's satisfaction. We recommend that a summary report be provided prior to the public hearing, summarizing anticipated traffic generation and local Levels of Service anticipated from the previously approved (SD#1564) and proposed (SD#1564A) design conditions. 3. If/when Board approval of the amended subdivision is granted, the applicant will be responsible to comply with any (applicable) remaining conditions of the existing approval (SD#1564). III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Lakewood Industrial Commission; d. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; e. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); f. Ocean County Planning Board; g. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; h. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection CARFA Permit; and i. All other required outside agency approvals. The applicant will be responsible for obtaining, renewing or amending previously-necessary outside agency approvals including those listed above.

Mr. Ray Shea said this is an amended subdivision necessitated by the position taken by the County that they will not permit access to Lanes Mill Road. The project has been redesigned to create a cul-de-sac where there once was a through street. He has reviewed the engineer's review letter and it is acceptable.

Mr. Neiman asked why the County is not allowing access on Lanes Mill Road.

Mr. Carpenter said the County told them that there are two other streets that are in close proximity to the proposed road and they felt it was a traffic problem to have another access point.

Mr. Neiman said he will allow one neighbor to speak for a few minutes as this is not a public meeting.

Ms. ? stated that all the neighbors understand that a lot of time and effort went into the planning of this development. She believes the project was more practical with two access points. The neighbors are protesting due to safety and traffic concerns.

Mr. Neiman asked Mr. Shea to try and work something out to accommodate the neighbors.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Rennert to advance the application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

Applicant: Joseph Goldberg
Location: Delaware Trail
Block 2.04 Lots 2.02 & 2.03
Minor Subdivision to create 3 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide two (2) existing lots in Block 2.04 previously created by Minor Subdivision Application SD# 1832 into three (3) new residential lots. The subject properties consist of existing Lots 2.02 & 2.03, created by Filed Map L3840. The proposed residential lots are designated as new Lots 2.04 through 2.06 on the subdivision plan. The “wedge-shaped” properties which decrease in width towards the rear total 1.14 acres in area. The existing two (2) lots in question were never developed under the previous approval and are vacant. However, a sanitary sewer lateral was constructed beneath the front yard of existing Lot 2.02. The site is situated in the northwestern corner of the Township, next to Jackson Township. The tract consists of land located on the east side of where Lenape Trail and Delaware Trail intersect, south of County Line Road West. The roads are improved with existing curbing, but not sidewalk. The pavement and curbing in front of the site is in poor condition, partially because of a gas line utility trench. An existing drainage easement dedicated to Ocean County crosses the rear of the lots. The subdivision proposes to create three (3) new lots requiring width variances. Proposed Lots 2.04, 2.05, and 2.06 would be new residential building lots. Curb in poor condition exists along the frontage which will be replaced. No sidewalk exists, but is proposed. Public water and sewer is available. The proposed lots are situated within the R-12, Single Family Residential Zone. The site is surrounded by mixed development because of its proximity to County Line Road West. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-12 Single Family Residential Zone. Single family detached housing is a permitted use in the zone. 2. This property was previously subdivided and approved under Resolution SD#1832. 3. Lot width variances are required for the subdivision. All proposed lots will require lot width variances. The actual provided lot widths (measured at the front setback line) are less than the values shown in the Zoning Data. Lot widths of ninety feet (90') are required. 4. All existing and proposed non-radial lot lines shall be indicated. It is not clear whether a design waiver is required for non-radial lot lines between proposed Lots 2.04 and 2.05, as well as Lots 2.05 and 2.06. 5. 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 General Information references a survey which has not been provided. The survey must be provided prior to scheduling a public hearing. 2. The General Information requires editing. 3. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since all of the monuments have not been set. The survey date in the Surveyor's Certification does not match the survey date listed in the General Information. 4. The outbound information for the tract proposed to be subdivided must be correctly shown. 5. The Lenape Trail right-of-way width varies. 6. The existing Drainage Easement owned by Ocean County is missing from the drawing. 7. Zones and Zone Boundary Lines must be added to the drawing. 8. Coordinate locations and values shall be corrected to the current outbound. 9. The Legend and symbolism must be reversed to show proposed monuments as solid and existing monuments as open. 10. Monuments are required at the current outbound corners. 11. We recommend the plan be revised to consistently provide two (2) significant figures. 12. The existing easement information should be revised to provide proposed dimensions and areas on an individual lot basis. 13. A space should be provided in the Notary Public Certification for the Owner's name. 14. The existing use should be listed as vacant. 15. In the Zoning Data, the Maximum Building Coverage allowed should be corrected to thirty percent (30%). 16. The lot depth of proposed Lot 2.04 should be corrected. 17. The Zoning Data shall address off-street parking. 18. The Tax Assessor is required to approve the new lot numbers. 19. Proposed sidewalk along the property frontage should be properly labeled. A pedestrian bypass should

be added. 20. The existing property has substantial relief and generally slopes towards the rear of the lots. Since no units are depicted at this time for proposed Lots 2.04, 2.05, and 2.06, testimony is required to address proposed grading and drainage. Proposed grades shall be provided for the curb replacement to insure the gutter drains to the existing inlet. Furthermore, we recommend that a resubmission of the plan be made prior to the Public Hearing using a conforming building box to delineate proposed layout, grading, and drainage schemes. 21. Sidewalk is proposed along the frontage of the project. Construction details for the curb replacement shall include the gutter to be reconstructed because of its poor condition. 22. General Note # 14 on the Improvement Plan shall be corrected. 23. Testimony should be provided as to whether basements will be proposed for the future dwellings on new Lots 2.04 through 2.06. If so, seasonal high water table information will be required. 24. Individual tree locations shown on the previous Minor Subdivision Plan shall be added to the Improvement Plan. We observed that the site is partially wooded during our site investigation. 25. Street trees are proposed for the project. The proposed locations should be evaluated since a street tree is proposed within the existing sanitary sewer easement. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 26. Testimony should be provided regarding whether there are any specimen trees located on the property. Compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code. 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 2.04 through 2.06 submitted for Township review should include tree protection measures to save mature vegetation where practicable. 27. Due to no construction proposed at this time on new Lots 2.04 through 2.06, 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. 28. Testimony should be provided on existing utilities. There are existing utility poles, gas, drainage, sanitary sewer, and potable water shown on the plans. 29. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 30. Construction details shall be completed on the Improvement Plan. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance; b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and d. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Lines stated that they are subdividing two existing lots to create three new lots right on the Jackson border. A lot width variance is requesting but they would be conforming setbacks for all the houses. He has reviewed the engineer's review letter and all of the comments can be addressed.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded to advance this application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

- 3. SD 1961** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Rachel Reiner
Location: 515, 521, & 533 Stirling Avenue
Block 189.01 Lots 191, 194, & 195
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 10 lots (5 duplex buildings)

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision approval. The applicant proposes the subdivision of three (3) existing lots to create ten (10) zero lot line properties for five (5) duplex structures. The existing tract known as Lots 191, 194, and 195 in Block 189.01 are proposed to be subdivided into new Lots 191.01 through 191.10 on the Major Subdivision Plan. The project site consists of approximately 1.744 acres. The property contains three (3) dwellings, two (2) sheds, and a garage. The plans state that all existing structures are to be removed. The land is very flat and generally slopes

from east to west. The site is situated in the northern portion of the Township on the north side of Stirling Avenue, west of its intersection with Linden Avenue. Stirling Avenue is a paved municipal road in fair condition with a variable width right-of-way and about a thirty foot (30') pavement width. A five foot (5') right-of-way dedication is proposed from existing Lot 191, which would create the proper twenty-five feet (25') half right-of-way width in front of the entire site. Stirling Avenue has existing curb in fair condition, but no sidewalk in front of the site. The curb would be replaced in front of the site and sidewalk is proposed. The plans indicate the new lots are to be serviced by public water and sewer. There are existing water and sewer lines located in Stirling Avenue. A gas line exists on the south side of Stirling Avenue. Overhead electric is available from the north side of Stirling Avenue. There are many large trees on the site. The development proposes four (4) off-street parking spaces for each unit. The architectural plans specify five (5) bedroom units with unfinished basements. The subject site is located within the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Therefore, zero lot line duplex housing is a permitted use in the zone district with twelve thousand square foot (12,000 SF) minimum lot areas for duplex structures. The site is situated within a predominantly residential area. However, recreational fields associated with the Ella G. Clarke Elementary School borders the project to the north. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. B2 - Topography within 200 feet thereof. 2. B4 - Contours of the area within 200 feet of the site boundaries. 3. B10 - Man-made features within 200 feet thereof. 4. C14 -Tree Protection Management Plan. We have reviewed the requested waivers from the Land Development Checklist and offer the following comments for the Board's consideration: We can support the granting of the requested B-Site Features waivers, since enough topographic information has been provided to support the necessary designs. A Tree Protection Management Plan can be waived for completeness purposes, but should be required as a condition of subdivision approval. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone District. As stated previously, Two-Family and Duplexes, with a minimum lot area of twelve thousand square feet (12,000 SF) and a minimum lot width of seventy-five feet (75') is listed as a permitted use. Zero lot line subdivisions for duplexes are permitted in the Zone. 2. Variances are requested for Minimum Lot Width. A 72.6 foot lot width is proposed on the combination of new Lots 191.01/191.02. A sixty foot (60') lot width is proposed on the combination of new Lots 191.03/191.04, 191.05/191.06, 191.07/191.08, and 191.09/191.10. Whereas a seventy-five foot (75') lot width is required. 3. Variances are requested for Minimum Side Yard Setback. A minimum side yard setback of seven feet (7') is proposed on the combination of new Lots 191.01/191.02. A minimum side yard setback of six feet (6') is proposed on the combination of new Lots 191.03/191.04, 191.05/191.06, 191.07/191.08, and 191.09/191.10. Whereas a ten foot (10') side yard is required. 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 will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. III. Review Comments A. General 1. Our site investigation noted a common driveway serving existing Lots 153 and 191. Since existing Lot 153 is not part of the proposed subdivision, future access to this property must be addressed. 2. Off-street parking: According to the plans provided, the applicant is proposing four (4) off-street parking spaces per unit which is enough to be in compliance with the RSIS standards for the five (5) bedroom units with unfinished basements shown on the architectural plans. Up to six (6) bedrooms per unit with a basement will be permitted for this project to also comply with parking ordinance 2010-62. 3. The General Notes indicate that trash and recyclable collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood. Each unit shall have an area designated for the storage of trash and recycling containers. 4. The proposed lot numbers shall be approved by the Tax Assessor. The Final Plat shall be signed by the Lakewood Tax Assessor. 5. 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, including provisions to address items associated with the use, maintenance, and repair of common areas and facilities associated with the overall property. Said agreement must be filed as part of this application to obtain

the zero lot line subdivision approval from Lakewood Township. B. Plan Review 1. A Survey for the property has been provided. The following revisions to the survey are required: a. Show the east border of the common driveway on Lots 153 and 191. Future access to Lot 153 will have to be addressed. b. Note #7 shall be revised to state "elevations are based on NAVD 88 datum". 2. The General Notes shall be edited. 3. A General Note indicates vertical datum is NAVD 1988. Horizontal datum and a vertical bench mark must be provided. 4. A Site Plan Certification on the Title Sheet shall be eliminated. 5. The Existing Conditions/Demolition Plan must address the common driveway on Lots 153 and 191. 6. Dimensions for the duplexes on proposed Lots 191.03 through 191.10 do not match those shown on the architectural plans. 7. The side yard setback dimensions for the duplex on the combination of proposed Lots 191.01/191.02 should be corrected. 8. Proposed lot dimensions and areas shall be added to the Preliminary Subdivision Plan. 9. Zoning Data shall be provided. 10. Zones and Zone Boundary Lines shall be added. 11. The basis for the north arrow shall be added. 12. A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is shown across the project frontage. The proposed easement should be labeled. 13. Curb and sidewalk is proposed along the road frontage. A dimension of four feet (4') is provided for the new sidewalk. In order for the driveways to be used as pedestrian passing lanes, a detail must be shown to ensure the first foot of driveway does not exceed the maximum cross slope for ADA compliance. Furthermore, based on the proposed note, depressed curb shall be provided where the sidewalk intersects the aprons. 14. The existing utility pole located in the proposed driveway apron for the combination of new Lots 191.05/191.06 is shown to be relocated to the property line extension of future Lots 191.04 and 191.05. C. Architectural 1. Two (2) preliminary architectural plans have provided. A wider duplex unit has been proposed on the combination of new Lots 191.01/191.02. Deeper duplex units have been proposed for the combinations of the other new lots. The proposed heights of all units would be less than the allowable thirty-five feet (35'). 2. We recommend that locations of HVAC equipment be shown and adequately screened. 3. The architectural plans need to coordinate with the subdivision plans. D. Grading 1. Grading is provided for the residential subdivision on the Drainage & Utility Plan which is Sheet 4 of 5. 2. Proposed curb and gutter grades shall be designed along Stirling Avenue to insure a positive gutter flow. 3. Proposed grades shall be provided at all new front lot corners. 4. Basements are proposed for all units. Seasonal high water table information has been provided to substantiate a minimum two foot (2') separation to the proposed basement floors. 5. A detailed review of the grading can be completed during compliance submission; if/when this subdivision is approved. E. Storm Water Management 1. The project will be classified as Major Development since more than a quarter acre of impervious surface will be added and over an acre of land disturbed. As a result, the project has been designed to meet water quality and water quantity reduction rate requirements. 2. Drainage Area Maps should be provided to evaluate the proposed design. 3. The proposed underground recharge systems would collect and infiltrate the roof runoff produced by the site. Runoff from the proposed driveways will drain to the road. 4. Soil permeability testing must be provided within the proposed project to confirm infiltration rates since underground recharge is being designed. 5. A Storm Water Management Report and Design can be reviewed in detail with a revised submission of the project. 6. A Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual shall be submitted for the residential subdivision per the NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township Code. The Manual will be reviewed in detail after the storm water management design is found to be acceptable. F. Landscaping 1. Six (6) Red Maple street trees have been proposed within the shade tree and utility easement. 2. Proposed utility connections have been shown to avoid planting conflicts. 3. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations from the Shade Tree Commission as practicable. The site will be cleared as necessary for the construction of the project. Compensatory plantings shall be addressed with the Tree Protection Management Plan. 4. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted. G. Lighting 1. Proposed street lighting has not been provided since no new roads are proposed. The project fronts an existing street on which curbing would be replaced, sidewalk constructed, and street trees planted H. Utilities 1. Public potable water and sanitary sewer service will be provided by

the New Jersey American Water Company. The project is within the franchise area of the New Jersey American Water Company. 2. Proposed sanitary sewer connections would be made by extending sanitary sewer in Stirling Avenue to service the proposed duplex units. 3. Proposed potable water services will be installed from the future units to an existing main in the north side of Stirling Avenue. 4. Testimony should be provided regarding other proposed utilities. Additional underground connections will be required if gas is proposed. There is an existing gas main under the south side of Stirling Avenue. 5. The proposed utility connections would disturb more than twenty percent (20%) of the pavement in front of the site. Therefore, a full width overlay would be required at the completion of construction. I. Signage 1. No regulatory signage is shown or proposed. 2. No project identification signs are proposed. 3. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. J. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract has three (3) dwellings located on the property. The site contains some large trees. The existing on-site topography is relatively flat. Utility poles for overhead electric exist on the Stirling Avenue frontage. 2. Environmental Impact Statement A limited Environmental Impact Statement was submitted which provides a general overview of the environmental impacts of the proposed subdivision application. 3. Tree Management No Tree Protection Management Plan was submitted. However, a Tree Protection Management Plan should be required as a condition of subdivision approval. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details shall be provided for all proposed improvements. 2. The construction details indicate the recharge trench would be a Cultec Recharger 280HD, while the plans indicate a Cultec Recharger 330XLHD. According to the Storm Water Management Report, the Cultec Recharger 330XLHD was used in the calculations, so the detail must be corrected. 3. 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. 4. Final review of construction details will take place after compliance submission, if/when this project is approved by the Board. L. Final Plat (Major Subdivision) 1. The Final Plat shall be corrected in accordance with the previous applicable plan review comments. 2. The Certifications shall be in accordance with Section 18-604B.3., of the UDO. 3. The Subdivision Data requires corrections. 4. A map reference has not been provided. 5. Coordinates shall be provided on at least three (3) outbound corners. 6. A Legend shall be added. 7. Proposed monuments shall be shown as solid squares. 8. Areas are required for the proposed dedication and easements. 9. The rear lot line dimension for proposed Lot 191.03 needs to be corrected. 10. The correct depths of proposed Lots 191.01 and 191.02 should be two hundred twenty-three feet (223'). The proposed lot areas should be corrected accordingly. 11. Proposed dimensions and areas should be to two (2) significant figures. 12. The Zoning Table requires corrections. 13. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 14. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after design revisions are undertaken for the project. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities.

Mr. Vogt stated that waivers are requested for topography, contours and man-made features within 200 feet as well as tree protection management plan. The B-Site features waivers can be granted since enough topography information has been provided to support the necessary changes. The tree protection management plan can be waived for completeness purposes, but should be required as a condition of approval.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the waivers.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are requested for minimum lot width and side yard setback.

Mr. Ray Shea, Esq., on behalf of the applicant, stated the variances only deal with the side yard setbacks. All of the lot sizes are conforming.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Herzl to advance the application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

- 4. SD 1962** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Ben Parnes
Location: Hudson Street
Block 107 Lot 8
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing residential lot into two (2) new residential lots for single family dwellings. The project involves an existing fifteen thousand square foot (15,000 SF) property know as Lot 8 in Block 107. The proposed properties are designated as new Lots 8.01 and 8.02 on the subdivision plan. Existing Lot 8 contains a one-story dwelling. The subdivision plan indicates all existing structures would be removed. Public water and sewer is available. Curb in fair condition exists along the frontage of the entire property, but sidewalk does not. The site is situated in the northern portion of the Township on the north side of Hudson Street, west of Lexington Avenue. Hudson Street is an improved municipal road in good condition. Hudson Street has a fifty foot (50') right-of-way with a pavement width of approximately thirty-two feet (32'). The site is relatively flat and contains several large trees. Potable water is readily available under the north side of Hudson Street. Sanitary sewer exists on Lexington Avenue and would have to be extended to the site. Gas exists under the south side of Hudson Street. Overhead electric is located on the south side of the Hudson Street right-of-way. This subdivision proposes to create variances. The surrounding lots are predominately residential uses. The lots are situated within the R-10 Single Family Residential Zone. 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 residences with a minimum lot area of ten thousand square feet (10,000 SF) are permitted in this zone. 2. Minimum Lot Area variances are required for the proposed lots. Lots areas of seven thousand five hundred square feet (7,500 SF) are proposed. Ten thousand square foot (10,000 SF) lot areas are required. 3. Front Yard Setback variances are required for the proposed lots. Front yard setbacks of twenty-five feet (25') are proposed, whereas thirty foot (30') setbacks are required. 4. Side Yard Setback variances are required for the proposed lots. Side yard setbacks of nine feet (9') are proposed, whereas ten foot (10') setbacks are required. 5. Aggregate Side Yard Setback variances are required for the proposed lots. Aggregate side yard setbacks of nineteen feet (19') are proposed, whereas twenty-five foot (25') aggregate side yard setbacks are required. 6. Maximum Lot Coverage variances are required for the proposed lots. Coverage of thirty-four percent (34%) is proposed for the new lots, whereas a maximum of thirty percent (30%) lot coverage is allowed. 7. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments 1. A Survey of Property has been submitted. A Topographic Survey Plan shall be provided which includes the following information shown on the base map for the Improvement Plan: a. Existing contours. b. Existing spot elevations. c. Existing curb. d. Existing utilities. e. Existing tree locations. 2. The surveyor should indicate whether any fence encroachments need to be rectified. 3. Zones and Zone Boundary Lines shall be added to the Area

Map. 4. The General Notes require editing and must be coordinated between the Minor Subdivision Plan and Improvement Plan. 5. Asterisks should be added to the Minimum Side Yard Setback values in the Zoning Data to indicate variances are required. 6. The required Maximum Lot Coverage in the Zoning Data should be corrected to thirty (30%), a variance is still required. 7. General Notes indicate that the horizontal and vertical datum is assumed. A benchmark should be shown on the plan. 8. The proposed building envelopes in accordance with the variance requests have been shown on the plans. 9. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed even though the outbound corner markers are shown to be in place. 10. Four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided per unit. This exceeds the three (3) off-street parking spaces which are required for units with unspecified number of bedrooms to comply with the NJ R.S.I.S. parking requirements. The plans indicate that four (4) off-street parking spaces per unit will be required. A minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces are required for proposed units with basements. Parking should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 11. The Minor Subdivision Plan shows new lot numbers were assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. 12. Public water and sewer is available to the project site. The project will be serviced by New Jersey American Water Company, since the site is within their franchise area. 13. The General Notes on the Improvement Plan indicate that soil borings shall get performed to determine a seasonal high water table, implying basements will be proposed. 14. Six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easements dedicated to the Township are proposed along the property frontages of new Lots 8.01 and 8.02. The proposed easement information and areas are shown on an individual lot basis. 15. The Improvement Plan proposes two (2) "Green Vase Zelkova" shade trees. The locations of the proposed shade trees are shown on the Improvement Plan. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. Our site investigation indicates there are a few large existing trees on-site. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. 16. Proposed grading is shown on the Improvement Plan. Proposed top of curb and gutter elevations shall be provided on Hudson Street to insure positive gutter flow. Proposed grading shall be revised accordingly and designed to minimize runoff directed to adjoining properties. 17. The General Notes indicate the northerly half of the future dwellings shall be piped into drywells. Calculations will be required to determine whether additional measures shall be necessary. 18. Construction details, as well as profiles for the proposed sewer line shall be provided. 19. The proposed doghouse manhole at the intersection of Hudson Street and Lexington Avenue should be a standard manhole. The proposed 46.57 invert should be labeled as out. 20. The proposed utility connections and sanitary sewer line installation will disturb more than twenty percent (20%) of the road length along the site frontage. Therefore, an overlay would be required. 21. Due to no construction proposed at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of the improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. 22. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 23. Construction details should be revised on the Improvement Plan in accordance with the conditions of any approvals. 24. Final construction details will be reviewed during compliance should subdivision approval be granted. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d. Ocean County Board of Health (septic abandonment); and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Surmonte stated that this is a previously approved subdivision but they are seeking some modified variance relief. The engineer's review letter was reviewed and is acceptable.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance the application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

5. **SP 2078** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Park Lane Associates
Location: New Hampshire Ave & Bellinger Street
Block 1160.06 Lots 265 & 249.02
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for expansion of an existing manufacturing building

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval for expansion of the existing Astor Chocolate manufacturing facility, located at 651 New Hampshire Avenue within the M-1 Zone. The applicant intends to expand its existing use of manufacturing gourmet chocolates. The existing commercial structure is a rectangular building with a footprint of 112,200 square feet. The proposed additions on either side of the building total 122,345 square feet. The proposed off-street parking would be along the northeast side of the building, and in the southwestern corner of the lot. According to the site plan, the proposed off-street parking will be three hundred three (303) spaces. Eight (8) of the proposed spaces will be handicapped, two (2) of which being van accessible. Proposed parking spaces will be a minimum of 9' X 18'. Proposed aisles would be a minimum of twenty-four feet (24') wide. Access to the site will be provided by two (2) driveways from New Hampshire Avenue. A variance will be required for the number of off-street parking spaces. The tract consists of an almost rectangular property which is listed as 13.85 acres in area. The lot where this facility is located is generally bounded industrial buildings, with a residential neighborhood on the opposite side of New Hampshire Avenue. The southeastern and northeastern sides of the property contain wetland regions which slightly encroach onto the site. The property generally slopes downward from west to east, as it approaches the wetland lines. Access to the site is from New Hampshire Avenue, which is an improved County Road having an eighty foot (80') wide right-of-way in front of Lot 265. A dedication is proposed along the frontage of Lot 249.02 to provide an eighty foot (80') wide right-of-way across the entire site. Curbing exists along the frontage of New Hampshire Avenue, but sidewalk does not. All utilities servicing the site are from New Hampshire Avenue. The project is located in the M-1 Industrial Zone. I. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the M-1 Zone. Per Section 18-903M.1.d., of the UDO, Manufacturing is a permitted use in this zone 2. Per review of the site plans and application, no bulk variances are required for the facility expansion. The following off-street parking variance is required: • Minimum Number of Parking Spaces – Three hundred three (303) spaces are provided, whereas six hundred twelve (612) spaces are required. Testimony should be provided at the Public Hearing, justifying the requested number of spaces (i.e., based on maximum employees per shift, other rationale). 3. It is not clear whether any sign variances are required. Addition information must be provided. 4. It should be noted the front yard setback of one hundred feet (100') may be reduced to fifty feet (50') with approval of the Lakewood Industrial Commission. The front yard setback of the existing building is 55.12 feet. The proposed addition would have a front yard setback of 55.91 feet. 5. Design waivers appear necessary from providing sidewalks, street trees, and shade tree easements along the New Hampshire Avenue frontage. We note that these amenities are not present at the existing facility, nor immediately-adjacent to the site. II. Review Comments Per review of the current design plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations: A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Our review of the survey notes significant differences in bearings of lines that are either parallel or nearly parallel. A revised survey must be submitted. 2. In addition to the corrected survey being required, the proposed lot area must consider the dedication to Ocean County. Confirmation will be needed that a Maximum Building Coverage variance will not be required. 3. The plans indicate vertical datum is based on NAVD 88. A horizontal datum and a vertical bench mark shall be provided. 4. Under proposed conditions, the site will include five (5) storm water infiltration basins. Three (3) of the basins will be above ground and two (2) will be below grade. The proposed above ground basins will not be fenced and have no vehicular access. 5. All

proposed building dimensions and access points should be coordinated between the architectural plans and site plans since they impact design. 6. Proposed setback dimensions must be provided for the accessory building to confirm the values shown in the Zoning Table. 7. The existing lots should be consolidated should site plan approval be granted. 8. The applicant's professionals should provide summary testimony of the existing and proposed (expanded) use of the facility, including hours of operation, shifts, maximum employees on site per shift, etc. 9. As illustrated on the Site Plans, two (2) additions to the existing building are proposed – a 59,700 square foot addition at the northeast end of the building, and a 62,650 square foot addition at the southwest end of the building. We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring renderings of the expanded building to the Public Hearing. 10. As illustrated on the site plan, two (2) new parking lots are proposed to serve the expanded facility. Two (2) access drives are proposed from the facility's New Hampshire Avenue frontage. 11. Testimony should be provided regarding anticipated truck traffic to the expanded facility, including sizes of delivery and transport trucks. Per review of the Site Plan (Sheet C-04) and the submitted architectural drawings (Sheets A100 and A200), it appears that trucks will continue to deliver and be loaded from a number of internal loading areas accessed from the southeast side of the expanded building. The proposed (paved) access and loading appear to be designed to accommodate truck traffic to/from the southeast side of the expanded building. Confirming testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals at the Public Hearing. 12. A circulation plan should be provided to demonstrate that the largest anticipated vehicles can safely enter and exit the property. Per available information, it appears that existing trucks access the existing building from internal loading areas within the southeast side, and exit through the existing access drive northeast of the building. The proposed design also appears to separate trucks to the northeast side of the facility, and cars to the southwest (which would be favorable). The circulation plan can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 13. Sight triangles are provided at the site access drives from New Hampshire Avenue. Designs for the access drives, and sight triangles are subject to Ocean County approval. 14. No trash/recycling enclosures are provided in the current design. Testimony should be provided on collection of trash and recyclable materials. It should be clarified whether the Township or a private company will be responsible for removal. 15. Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed "Shed" depicted within the larger (southerly) parking lot. 16. Outbound information, setback lines, and complete dimensioning should be completed on the Site Plan. Said information can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 17. The plans indicate the CAFRA requirements for maximum impervious coverage and minimum tree preservation for the forested portion of the site will be met.

B. Architectural

1. A "Building Outline" plan and "preliminary" architectural elevations are provided as sheets A100 and A200 of the design drawings. Per review of the submitted plans, the elevation views of the proposed addition on the architectural plans show a maximum height of fifty feet (50'). The proposed height falls within the legal limits of sixty-five feet (65').

2. We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring color renderings of the expanded building to the Public Hearing, and provide testimony regarding proposed building facades and treatments.

3. The Site Plan should show all existing and proposed ground mounted HVAC equipment. Adequate screening of the equipment should be provided. Said information can be provided during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted.

4. More detailed architectural plans should be provided.

5. The site plans and architectural plans must be coordinated.

C. Grading

1. A Grading, Drainage, & Utility Plan is Sheet C-05. The current design is well-prepared, and adequate to serve the expanded facility.

2. Spot elevations should be added to all building access points.

3. Along the rear of the property, the property slopes into a wetland region. No curbing is proposed, which will allow storm water to drain directly into the wetlands. We recommend curbing be proposed along the entire asphalt area and storm water be drained into one of the basins for water quality purposes. The applicant's engineer can address this issue with our office.

4. A review of final grading revisions will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

D. Storm Water Management

1. A proposed storm water management system has been designed. The design proposes a storm sewer collection system with two (2) underground recharge systems, and three (3) above-ground infiltration basins

located on the site. The project qualifies as major development and must meet the requirements of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Storm Water Management Rules (NJAC 7:8).

2. Per review of the current design, it is generally well-prepared.

3. Permeability testing and seasonal high water table information has been provided in the Report to justify the proposed depth of the storm water recharge systems. The locations of Soil Logs should be provided on the Existing Conditions Plan.

4. We recommend the Drainage Area Maps be checked for accuracy since they impact the design.

5. The invert at CB-12 does not agree with pipe slopes and lengths.

6. Pipe sizing calculations should be completed for the proposed collection systems.

7. As required a Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual should be provided. The Manual can be provided during compliance, should site plan approval be granted.

8. It should be noted that New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's pending CAFRA review could have an impact on the storm water management design.

9. A review of the final drainage design will be performed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted.

E. Landscaping

1. The Landscape Plan can be found on Sheet C-07. As noted, twenty (20) sugar maples are proposed in the parking lot islands in the proposed (southwesterly) parking lot, and four (4) sugar and red maples are proposed along the New Hampshire Avenue frontage. A row of boxwoods is proposed along the front of the northeasterly building addition.

2. The proposed planting and seeding schedule along with the details can be found on Sheet C-12.

3. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and input (if any) from the Shade Tree Commission.

4. The final landscaping design will be reviewed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted.

F. Lighting

1. A Lighting Plan has been provided on Sheet C-06. Per review of the Lighting Plan, there are ten (10) single pole mounted lights and six (6) double pole mounted lights proposed for the property. Seventeen (17) proposed wall mounted lights are added on the northeast and southeast sides of the building.

2. The proposed height of the pole mounted lights is thirty feet (30'). The wattage for the proposed pole mounted lighting has not been shown. The proposed height of the wall mounted lights is twenty feet (20'). The wattage for the proposed wall mounted lighting is seventy watts (70W).

3. A point to point diagram has been submitted to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. Adjustments to lighting may be necessary since the calculations show the minimum intensity level is not being met.

4. The existing design is well-prepared. Final lighting design revisions can be addressed during compliance review, if/when approval is granted.

G. Traffic

1. A Traffic Impact Assessment Report was submitted for review. Per review of The Report, it is generally well-prepared and consistent with industry standards.

2. As referenced on page 4 of the report, the author performed an analysis of anticipated traffic by applying a pro-rated increase (109%) of the existing peak hour trip generation, matching the proposed expansion of the existing facility.

3. Using the above referenced rationale, as referenced on page 7 of the report, traffic is projected to enter and exit the facility at a Level of Service (C), with no anticipated degradation of service anticipated to nearby intersections.

4. We recommend that the applicant's professionals provide summary testimony regarding traffic impacts from the expansion at the forthcoming Public Hearing.

5. As indicated previously, Ocean County Planning Board review and approval of the road designs, entrances, and exits is required since the facility is on New Hampshire Avenue.

H. Utilities

1. Public water and sewer services are being provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority.

2. The plans indicate the site will continue to be served by the existing utilities.

3. Testimony should be provided regarding the adequacy of proposed fire protection measures for the facility expansion.

I. Signage

1. Proposed signage includes handicap parking signs and a stop sign for each new entrance driveway being proposed, both of which support two-way traffic.

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.

J. 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 an undeveloped wooded area on the northeast and southwest ends. The property borders New Hampshire Avenue on the northwestern edge of the property. The property generally slopes downwards from west to east. Wetlands have been delineated on the southeast and northeast edges of the site.

2. Environmental Impact Statement An Environmental

Impact Statement has been submitted. As indicated on page 8 of the report, existing treed areas proposed to be cleared to accommodate the building expansion are predominantly pitch pines and other native species, with no specimen trees anticipated to be removed. The EIS report also indicates that the facility is subject to NJDEP-CAFRA review and approval, and that the current design meets the CAFRA policy requiring a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the existing forested area of the property to remain forested. Finally, NJDEP-GIS mapping as well as the submitted site survey depict freshwater wetlands present immediately-northeast and southeast of the site. Although no wetlands are proposed to be disturbed to construct the facility expansion, it appears that a minor disturbance of the assumed (50 foot intermediate value) wetlands buffer is proposed. This disturbance is likely permissible via either a buffer-averaging plan or Transition Area Waiver (TAW). This approval will likely be issued in conjunction with the forthcoming NJDEP-CAFRA approval for the facility expansion. 3. Tree Management Plan Tree surveys of existing vegetation on the northeast and southwest ends of the site are provided on the property survey and identified in the site plans. As referenced on page 6 of the EIS report, it is the applicant's intent to meet the Township's Tree Protection Ordinance requirements by providing new compensatory landscaping in the final Landscape Plan design. Compliance with the Township's Tree Protection ordinance will be addressed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets C-09 through C-13 in the plan set. 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. 3. Construction details will be reviewed after revisions are submitted for the project. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Industrial Commission; d. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; e. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); f. Ocean County Planning Board; g. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; h. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (CAFRA, other); and i. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Michael Gross, Esq., on behalf of the applicant, stated they have reviewed the engineer's letter and they will be prepared to testify at the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Rennert to advance the application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

- 6. SP 2079** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Sudler Lakewood Land, LLC
Location: Oak Street & Paco Way
Block 1160 Lots 240 & 251
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for 2 new buildings

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval with variances to expand its existing operations on the subject properties. The applicant proposes to construct two (2) new warehouses with supporting office space. As indicated in the Application Rider, the existing 61,445 square foot warehouse fronting Oak Street will remain, with the parking and access to be redeveloped to accommodate the surrounding development. Building #33 will include seventy-four thousand four hundred square feet (74,400 SF) of floor area and will be located on the southeastern portion of the site (accessed from Oak Street). The eastern section of the proposed Building #33 will provide thirty-three (33) spaces for trailers. Building #34 will include forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF) of floor area, and will be accessed from the property's Towbin Avenue frontage. The southern section of the

proposed Building #34 will provide eighteen (18) spaces for trailers. Parking for employees will be provided on the western side of the Building #33 and the southern and western sides of Building #34. A total of one-hundred seventy-three (173) off-street parking spaces are proposed to serve proposed Building #33 as well as the adjacent existing building on Lot 240. Forty (40) off-street parking spaces are provided to the proposed Building #34. In addition, thirty-seven (37) trailer storage spaces are provided outside Building #34. Three (3) handicap parking spaces will serve the proposed Building #33, seven (7) will serve the existing building on Lot 240, and two (2) will serve the proposed Building #34. Access to the proposed Building #33 will be provided via a driveway on Oak Street, and access to the proposed Building #34 will be provided via a driveway on Towbin Avenue. The tract consists of approximately 59 acres in area, and contains wooded, wetlands areas within the northern portion of the site which will not be developed. Several small tracts of state open waters exist on the site. Four (4) basins and associated inlets and piping are provided for storm water management. In addition, two (2) drainage trenches are proposed in front of the two (2) buildings. Lands to the south are all improved with large commercial and industrial land uses. The site is located in the M-1 Industrial Zone and the AHZ Airport Hazard Zone, within the Industrial Park. Warehouses and terminal facilities 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 and terminal facilities. 2. As referenced on the Overall Plan, Lakewood Industrial Commission approval is required for the proposed front yard setback of 91.72 feet for Building #33. The existing setback for existing building #1715 is 50.3 feet. 3. A variance has been requested for the twenty-five foot (25') non-residential perimeter buffer as defined per Section 18-803E.2., of the UDO. As evidenced in the design documents and per aerial photography, existing development immediately adjacent to the property is predominantly commercial/industrial in nature, consistent with the M-1 zone. Testimony shall be provided at the Public Hearing to support the requested relief. 4. Per review of the site plans and application, the following design waivers appear necessary:

- Providing sidewalk along the project frontage. It should be noted that there is no existing sidewalk along Oak Street or Towbin Avenue in the vicinity of this project which is in the Industrial Park.
- Maximum number of driveways permitted. Per Section 18-807C.4., of the UDO, two (2) driveways per three hundred feet (300') of lot frontage are permitted whereas two (2) driveways per two hundred seventy five feet (275') of lot frontage is being proposed.
- Providing street trees and a shade tree and utility easement along the project frontages. As illustrated on the Landscape Plan, an extensive amount of interior landscaping is proposed.

II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Boundary and Topographic Surveys of the parcels have been submitted. 2. Site Plans (labeled "Geometry Plan-1" and "Geometry Plan-2") are included as Sheets 4 and 5 of the Plan Set. Said plans are well-prepared for an initial submission. 3. As illustrated on "Geometry Plan-1", Building #33, seventy-four thousand four hundred square feet (74,400 SF) of flex space will be constructed east of the existing building to remain. A new, thirty foot (30') wide "U-shaped" facility access drive is proposed, with two (2) access points from Oak Street which will provide for vehicle and truck access for proposed Building #33 as well as parking access for additional off-street parking spaces proposed along the west side of the existing building. 4. Additionally, an extension of the above-referenced U-shaped drive is proposed to provide another thirty foot (30') wide access drive connecting to the existing truck loading area located on the west side of the existing building. 5. Finally, an area of twenty (20) "banked" parking spaces is identified immediately north of proposed Building #33. Said spaces could provide additional off-street parking if necessary at a future date. Off-street parking for both new facilities should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 6. As illustrated on "Geometry Plan-2", Building #34, forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF) of flex space will be accessed by a thirty foot (30') wide driveway extending from Towbin Avenue into the property. This access drive will lead to a forty (40) space parking lot proposed along the west site of Building #34, as well as a thirty-seven (37) stall trailer storage area (including a truck turnaround) and eighteen (18) truck stalls proposed along the south side of Building #34. 7. Dimensioned Vehicular Circulation Plans should be provided to confirm accessibility for the largest trucks anticipated to access the sites. These Plans may be provided during compliance, if/when Board

approval is granted. Per cursory review of the proposed Towbin Avenue access as depicted (to serve Building #34), widening of the access and/or acceleration of deceleration lanes may be necessary for trucks to enter and exit the facility. This information may be provided during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. 8. No refuse and recycling area has been proposed for either proposed building. The plans note that trash and recyclables are to be collected and stored inside. Testimony shall be provided as to whether private or public (DPW) handling of trash and recyclables is proposed, 9. No sight triangles associated with the proposed vehicular site access points are provided on the circulation plans. Said information should be provided during compliance, if/when approval is granted. 10. All proposed building access points should be shown on the site plans and coordinated with the final architectural plans (during compliance, if approval is granted). 11. The plans call out an edge of pavement on the east side of the proposed heavy duty pavement. Curb is required. The curb may be depressed to allow sheet flow runoff to drain into the proposed swale. 12. The survey for Lot 251 should be updated since it is more than ten (10) years old. B. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural floor plans and elevations were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the buildings will be about thirty-six feet (36') high, well within the sixty-five foot (65') allowable height. The structures will house the warehouse and office space. 2. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the proposed building facades, and treatments. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. 3. Testimony should be provided as to whether any roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed. If so, said equipment should be adequately screened. Screening can be addressed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. 4. Testimony should be provided at the Public Hearing in regard to how much of the floor space will be dedicated to the warehouse and the remaining office layout (for each new building). 5. The site plans and architectural plans must be coordinated. The architectural plans show many more building access locations than the site plans. The most significant conflict appears to be a "scissor" type handicap ramp structure depicted near the southeast corner of Building #34, which would conflict with truck stalls proposed in that area. All ramps, landings and building accesses will be coordinated between final architectural designs and site plan designs during compliance, if/when approval is granted. C. Grading 1. Detailed grading is provided on Sheets 6 and 7 of 22. Per review of the initial grading designs serving both proposed buildings and amenities, the designs are feasible and generally well-prepared. 2. Access points and corresponding elevations should be provided. 3. The proposed elevations associated with the handicap parking areas should be shown to make sure they comply with regulations. 4. A review of final grading will be performed during compliance, if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. Proposed storm drainage designs have been provided to support both proposed buildings and amenities as illustrated on Site Plan Sheets 6 and 7. Per review of the current designs, they are feasible and generally well-prepared for initial submissions. 2. Storm water collection systems supporting improvements for Building #33 (and the existing building) will discharge into two (2) above ground infiltration/detention basins (with overflow discharges and emergency weirs) as depicted on Site Plan Sheet #6, as well as a proposed underground recharge system proposed immediately west of Building #33. 3. Similarly, Site Plan Sheet #7 depicts two (2) above ground infiltration/detention basins (with overflow discharges and emergency weirs), as well as a proposed underground recharge system immediately south of Building #34. 4. Storm sewer collection systems for both new facilities have been designed utilizing reinforced concrete pipe to convey storm water runoff into proposed infiltration basins. 5. Pipe collection system calculations appear to require minor corrections as follows: a. On page G2, the rim elevation for Line No. 2 is incorrect. It should be 50.96. b. On page G7, the Line 5 Line ID is mislabeled as P23, whereas it should be corrected to G5. c. On page G9, the Line 1 Line ID is mislabeled as P69, whereas it should be corrected to J1. 6. The following pipes may be undersized based on calculations: a. Outfall – 1 to E2 (page G5) b. G4 – G3 (page G7) c. G3 – G2(1) (page G7) 7. The length of the infiltration pipe connecting the G8-G7 inlet should be 456 LF according to the Pipe calculations. 8. The pipe connecting K8 to K7 is not labeled. 9. Delete the stray N2 inlet label on the east side of Basin #4. 10. Roof leader discharge connection(s) should be provided for Building #34.

11. The following minor utility profile corrections are required: a. The existing storm manhole invert on the A3-Ex. System Profile should be corrected to 46.24. b. The length of the infiltration pipe on the G8-G2 profile should be 456 LF. c. The invert of the L1 pipe in the L2-L1 profile is not labeled. d. The K8 to K7 pipe should be labeled on the K8-K1 Profile. 12. A storm water management maintenance manual(s) shall be provided in accordance with NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township standards, identifying the responsible parties for both facilities. 13. It should be noted that New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection's pending CAFRA review could have an impact on the storm water management design. 14. A final review of the storm water designs for both facilities will be performed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. E. Landscaping 1. Comprehensive landscape plans for both building facilities are provided on Site Plan Sheets #10 and #11. As depicted, a substantial amount of new landscaping is proposed within the interiors of both facilities. We commend the applicant and its professionals for the extent of landscape improvements currently-proposed. 2. The following quantity revisions the appear necessary to the Plant Schedule: a. "BENH" trees should be corrected from 25 to 15. b. "MAVI" trees should be corrected from 5 to 6 c. "ITVH" trees should be corrected from 29 to 31. 3. The following planting quantities appear to be larger than what is shown on the plans: a. "ACRR", 17 are listed, 10 are shown b. "LISR", 19 are listed, 18 are shown c. "QUPA", 26 are listed, 23 are shown d. "QUSH", 22 are listed, 17 are shown e. "TADI", 30 are listed, 15 are shown f. "PIAB", 29 are listed, 23 are shown g. "PIST", 47 are listed, 41 are shown h. "AMLA", 19 are listed, 18 are shown i. "ARAR", 12 are listed, 11 are shown j. "COCB, 73 are listed, 21 are shown k. "ILGH", 79 are listed, 52 are shown l. "MYPE", 28 are listed, 18 are shown m. "VIDC", 99 are listed, 87 are shown 4. The following plants are listed but are not shown on the plan: "NYSY", "JUVS", "PSME", "CECA", "CECL", "SYXC", and "VIDE". 5. On the south side of Building #34, five (5) "AMLA" trees are called out, but only four (4) are depicted. The eighteen (18) listed above count the five (5) shown. 6. Utilities and easements should be shown on the Landscape Plan to avoid planting conflicts. 7. We recommend that the applicant consider drip irrigation or similar measures for landscape maintenance purposes. 8. The final landscaping design will be reviewed during resolution compliance if/when Board approval is granted. F. Lighting 1. Detailed lighting designs for both facilities are provided on the Lighting Plans, Site Plan Sheets 12 and 13. Both designs provide a total of twenty (20) pole mounted fixtures at heights of thirty feet (30'), and sixteen (16) building mounted fixtures with mounting heights of thirty feet (30'). Per review of the initial lighting designs, both are generally well-prepared 2. The details of the different light fixtures can be found on Detail Sheet – 5, Sheet 20 of 22. 3. One (1) SL-1 light has been listed in the schedule, but twelve (12) are shown in the plans. 4. Five (5) SL-2 lights have been listed in the schedule, but eight (8) are shown in the plans. 5. Point-to-point diagrams were provided to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. 6. We recommend that non-security lighting be placed on timers. 7. A final review of the lighting designs will be performed during resolution compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. G. Utilities 1. Other than storm water management, proposed utility services design information (water, sewer, other) is not depicted on the initial design plans. 2. Per review of the design plans and surveys, twelve inch (12") diameter gravity sanitary sewer and a twelve inch (12") diameter water main exist within Oak Street, along the frontage of proposed Building #33. 3. Neither existing nor proposed utilities are identified near the Towbin Avenue access for proposed Building #34. Said information must be provided in the final design (at a minimum). 4. Final water and sewer designs for both new facilities will be subject to Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (LTMUA) review and approval. H. Signage 1. No detailed signage information was provided in the initial design (other than locations and details for directional signage). Per review of the Geometry Plans, unlabelled structures consistent with free-standing signs are identified near the westerly Oak Street entrance to Building #33, and the Towbin Avenue entrance to Building #34, but no other information is provided. Testimony should be provided regarding proposed new signage (if any) for each facility. 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 Description A extensive amount of environmental information has been provided with this application,

including but not limited to wetlands and buffer delineations, an Environmental Compliance Report (prepared to address NJDEP-CAFRA policies for NJDEP permitting purposes), and a geotechnical report. As depicted on the design documents and per NJDEP-GIS mapping, freshwater wetlands exist within the central and northern portions of the property. As referenced on Page 5 of the CAFRA Compliance Report, the wetlands and wetlands buffer delineations as depicted on the submitted surveys and design documents have already been reviewed and approved by the NJDEP. As referenced on page 5 of the CAFRA Compliance Report, in addition to the CAFRA permit required for the project, the applicant is requesting a General Freshwater Wetlands Permit for the Towbin Avenue access, as well as a Buffer Average/Transition Area Waiver approval necessary for construction of Building #34. Said improvements are depicted on Site Plan Sheet #7. NJDEP will review all associated environmental impacts associated with this project as part of the CAFRA/Land Use permit review process. Per review of the design and submitted environmental documents, the current design appears to comply with applicable NJDEP Land Use policies. 2. Tree Management Plan A Tree Protection Management Plan has been submitted. The final design, if approved, will be subject to the Township Tree Protection Ordinance as well as CAFRA tree clearing policies. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 16-22 of 22 in the plan set. 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. 3. No details are shown for the Infiltration Trenches. 4. Construction details will be reviewed during resolution compliance should approval be granted. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Township Industrial Commission; d. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; e. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); f. Ocean County Planning Board; g. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; h. NJDEP CAFRA, Wetlands Permitting; and i. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated no waivers or bulk variances are requested. Relief will be sought for the perimeter buffer and the Industrial Commission will have to submit their review of the application.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded to advance the application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

- 7. SP 2015A** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Chambers Crescent, LLC
Location: Cedar Bridge Avenue
Block 536 Lot 122
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for 63 affordable multi-family units

Project Description

The applicant (Chambers Crescent, LLC) is seeking to amend a Preliminary Site Plan approval and obtain a Final Site Plan approval for the redevelopment of the existing John F. Kennedy Apartments (Public Housing). The 6.93 acre development consists of Lot 122 in Block 536. The site is located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Cedar Bridge Avenue and South Clover Street, both being County Highways. The owner of the existing development is the Lakewood Housing Authority (LHA). The subject property is presently developed with sixty-two (62) residential affordable multi-family housing units in twelve (12) buildings, plus one (1) common building. The proposal is to raze two (2) of the residential structures containing nine (9) units and the common building. The construction would consist of two (2) new buildings containing ten (10) units and one (1) new single story 1,750 square foot “office/common space structure”. The total number of dwelling units would be increased by one (1), to

sixty-three (63). The buildings to be removed would allow construction of a new expanded parking lot with access only from South Clover Street. This would be a huge safety improvement since Cedar Bridge Avenue is an arterial County Highway. All of the new buildings would be located on the northern section of the development. The proposed off-street parking would be increased to one hundred ten (110) spaces. Curb and sidewalk in good condition exist along the property frontage. Curb and sidewalk in poor condition exists throughout the interior of the site. The interior curb and sidewalk would be replaced with the revamping of this tract. The existing backyard patios are being removed to decrease impervious surface. Storm water management would be improved with the construction of a new drainage collection system. The development is located in the PH-1, Public Housing, and R-40, Single-Family Residential Zones. All dwelling units would be within the PH-1 Zone. The applicant received preliminary approval for a prior redevelopment design of the property (Application SP#2015), approved at the May 21, 2013 Planning Board Meeting. The approval was for six (6) new Garden Apartment Buildings with sixty-three (63) units and a new 1,750 square foot common area building. It is our understanding that this previous approval will be vacated if the current application receives Board approval.

I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 – Environmental Impact Statement 2. C14 – Tree Protection Management Plan We can support the granting of waivers from Checklist Items C13 and C14. The entire site is already developed and the proposed development only occurs on a disturbed footprint. There is no new environmental impact, and a new landscaping plan has been submitted. II. Zoning 1. The site is located in the in the PH-1 Zone, Public Housing, and R-40, Single-Family Residential Zone. Multi-Family housing is permitted in both zones. Per Section 18-902J., of the UDO, low income housing is permitted in the PH-1 Zone. Further, per Section 18-902B.7., of the UDO, Planned Affordable Residential Development (including multifamily residential development) is a permitted use in the R-40 (Single-Family Residential) Zoning District. Therefore, it is our opinion that the proposed redevelopment of this property as proposed remains permitted (per the UDO). 2. A variance has been requested for the average minimum dwelling unit size. A unit size of 875 SF is proposed and 1,100 SF is required in the R-40 Zone. Professional testimony will be necessary to justify the requested variance. 3. A variance has been requested for the required off-street parking spaces. A minimum of one hundred forty-five (145) off-street parking spaces are required in the R-40 Zone, whereas only one hundred ten (110) are proposed. All of the parking spaces as well as most of the buildings are located in the PH-1 Zone. Professional testimony will be necessary to justify the requested variance. 4. A design waiver is required from providing street trees, as well as shade tree and utility easements along the project frontages. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. An ALTA/ACSM Land Title Survey has been provided. 2. Benchmark reference as stated in the General Notes is Dover 1 PID NO. JU4430 Elevation: 29.72 feet. Also in the General Notes, the horizontal datum is relative to the New Jersey State Plane Coordinate System and adjusted to NAD 1983. In addition, the Vertical Datum is relative to NAVD 1988. 3. There is a distance discrepancy in Course #9 of the description with the outbound. 4. The Zoning Requirements for Public Housing shall be completed in accordance with 18-902J., of the UDO. 5. The applicant's professionals should provide summary testimony to the Board's satisfaction including but not limited to revisions to the previously-approved project, new apartments, proposed improvements to existing facilities, vehicular access, off-street parking, and pedestrian amenities. 6. Per review of the vehicular circulation as depicted on the Dimension Plan, the proposed access drive and interior drive designs are generally well-prepared, and will provide improved site access and off-street parking facilities. Testimony should be provided as to whether school buses are anticipated to drive within the site (and if so, where). 7. All proposed curb dimensioning and radii for the proposed two-way access boulevard, parking areas, and interior access drives should be shown on the Dimension Plan. This information can be provided as a condition of Board approval (if granted). 8. The new (proposed) pedestrian access network (sidewalks) is depicted on Dimension Plan. The design as proposed is well-prepared. Proposed sidewalk widths are depicted at 6 feet (typical), in excess of ADA standards. However, additional dimensioning is necessary to construct the access ways. This information can be provided as a condition of Board approval (if granted). 9.

Proposed curb ramps must be clearly delineated (shaded, other) on the Dimension Plan. This information can be provided as a condition of Board approval (if granted). 10. Proposed shade tree and utility easements (if any) should be shown and labeled accordingly, complete with dimensioning. 11. Sight Triangle Easements should be provided for the proposed two-way intersection. This information can be provided as a condition of Board approval (if granted). 12. Two (2) dumpster enclosure locations are identified on the plans. Testimony should be provided regarding the adequacy of these areas to serve the development. If public pickup is proposed, DPW approval will be necessary. 13. The proposed Dimension Plan shall be coordinated with the Preliminary Architectural Plans. Proposed dimensions for the buildings and setbacks must be to the hundredth of a foot, since it impacts the layout. Proposed building square footage should also be coordinated.

B. Architectural

1. Architectural plans were submitted for review, including floor plans and elevations for the proposed four-unit and six-unit apartment buildings. As depicted, both building will be two-stories. We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring renderings of both buildings for review at the forthcoming Public Hearing.

2. Similarly, architectural plans were provided for the proposed "Club House". We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring renderings of the building for review at the forthcoming Public Hearing.

3. HVAC equipment proposed in the rear of the new residential units appears to be depicted on the Dimension Plan but not in the architectural plans. Said equipment should be screened.

4. Similarly, HVAC equipment appears proposed in the rear of the Club House (but not in architectural plans). Said equipment should be screened.

C. Grading

1. A detailed Grading Plan is provided on Sheet 5. The current grading design depicts proposed grades for the new parking areas and access ways around buildings, along the new pedestrian access ways, and promotes positive drainage within open and common areas within the property. Per review of the current design, it is feasible and generally well-prepared.

2. Access point elevations should be provided for the proposed buildings.

3. Proposed spot grades are required at the corners of the dumpster enclosures.

4. Additional grading information is necessary to finalize the design, including but not limited to additional spot elevations along the two way access drive, parking areas, handicap ramps, and pedestrian pathways throughout the site. This information may be provided during compliance review (if/when approval is granted).

D. Storm Water Management

1. A proposed storm water management system has been designed for the site. Post development runoff will be handled by a proposed drainage system consisting of a series of inlets and pipes that will convey flow to an existing pipe system across Clover Street.

2. As referenced above, an interior storm water collection system is proposed within the property, and will collect storm water from a number of low points throughout the site to better promote positive drainage throughout the site. The current design concept is generally well-prepared.

3. The "Storm Water Management Statement" provided correctly assesses the project's proposed compliance with the NJ Storm Water Rule. Although impervious cover will be reduced (slightly), the project is still classified as "Major Development" due to the proposed disturbance.

4. Utility profiles are provided on Plan Sheets 7-9, and are generally acceptable. For the section of pipe from "A" Inlet #14 to Existing Inlet (Cedar Bridge), the pipe calculations match the utility profiles, but differ from what is shown on the utility plan.

5. Utility plan and profiles have minor inconsistencies with the pipe slopes and lengths. Although they may be the result of rounding error, the plans should be corrected to show the same dimensions.

6. A Storm Water Maintenance Plan must be prepared per NJAC 7:8-5 for the proposed design, identifying the Responsible Party for storm water system maintenance.

7. Final storm water design revisions will be reviewed during compliance, if/when Board approval is received.

E. Landscaping

1. A detailed Landscaping Plan is provided on Sheet 12. The plan includes but is not limited to shade and ornamental trees along the proposed two-way access drive, around new parking areas, and throughout "common areas" within the site. Foundation plantings are proposed along new as well as existing buildings. Per review of the current design, it is generally well-prepared.

2. A summary table indicating the proposed numbers and types of new trees and shrubbery proposed should be added to the final Landscaping design.

3. A label for one (1) ACA tree is missing at the south end of the development.

4. The final Landscaping design is subject to approval by the Board and input (if any) received from the

Environmental Commission. 5. The final landscape design will be reviewed during compliance, if/when Board approval is received (including compliance with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance). F. Lighting 1. A Lighting Plan is provided on Sheet 13, indicating that eighteen foot (18') high pole-mounted lights are proposed throughout the site. Per review of the current design, we note revisions are necessary since the 15:1 uniformity ratio would be exceeded. 2. We recommend that cut-offs be provided on interior fixtures to minimize potential glare within existing and proposed apartment units. 3. A lighting schedule summarizing the number and types of fixtures shall be provided. 4. The final Lighting Design will be reviewed during compliance, if/when approval is granted (including but not limited to construction details and foundation designs). G. Utilities 1. Water and sewer service shall be provided via existing lines on Cedar Bridge Avenue and Clover Street. New Jersey American Water Company approval is likely necessary. H. Signage 1. 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 investigation of the property, the project site is already developed. J. Traffic 1. The applicant's professionals should be prepared to testify regarding existing and anticipated proposed traffic conditions associated with the project. K. 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. 2. Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Fire Commissioners; d. Ocean County Planning Board; e. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; f. NJ American Water (water and sewer, if necessary); and g. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Rennert stepped down.

Mr. Sal Alfieri, Esq., on behalf of the applicant, stated this application has already received preliminary approval. His client is taking over this project from the Lakewood Housing Authority. All the houses will be low income housing units. The original plan was to demolish all the units and reconstruct. This revised plan is to retain some of the buildings and demolish two of the buildings. Otherwise it is essentially the same layout. They have reviewed the engineer's review letter and will be providing testimony at the public hearing. He asked this application be heard on September 9, 2014.

A motion was made and seconded to advance to the September 9, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman

- 8. SP 2080** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Erez Holdings, LLC
Location: Boulevard of Americas & New Hampshire Avenue
Block 961.01 Lots 2.03 & 2.06
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a two story office building

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval to construct a new two-story, (approximately) sixty-one thousand two hundred ninety square foot (61,290 SF) office building on Lot 2.06. According to the application, the building is currently proposed as headquarters for one (1) primary tenant (LTS Consulting Services). The property on which the office building and off-street parking are proposed is Lot 2.06, a 5.35 acre parcel near the southwest corner of the intersection of

New Hampshire Avenue and the Boulevard of the Americas. To provide storm water management for this property, a new storm water recharge pond (depicted as Basin #5) is proposed on Lot 2.03, located southwest of the proposed office facility. As referenced on Site Plan Sheet 5, this basin will take the place of originally-approved "Basin #5" as part of the originally-approved Cedarbridge Corporate Campus infrastructure design. This basin relocation will require the vacation of an existing drainage easement that runs from the north of the lot to the east. Off-street parking for the proposed office facility will be provided on the north and south sides of the proposed office building. A total of two hundred sixty-eight (268) off-street parking spaces are proposed. Eight (8) handicap parking spaces are proposed, two (2) of which are van accessible. Access to the proposed development will be provided by a driveway on the Boulevard of the Americas. Surrounding lands are generally improved with large commercial and industrial land uses. The site is located in the DA-1 Cedarbridge Redevelopment Area. Office buildings are permitted in the zone. We offer the following comments and recommendations: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 2. C14 - Tree Management Protection Plan. Compliance with the Tree Protection ordinance will be addressed during compliance (if/when Board approval is granted). No environmental-constraints are depicted on NJDEP-GIS mapping on or adjacent to these lots. Therefore, we support with submission waivers as requested. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the DA-1, Cedarbridge Redevelopment Area. Per Section 18-903L.1.a., of the UDO, under "permitted uses" in the DA-1 zone cites office buildings. 2. Per review of the application documents and the Bulk Requirements Table on Sheet 1 of the Site Plans, no bulk variances or relief appears necessary for the project as designed. 3. The project requires the extinguishing of several easements. On Lot 2.06, a gas pipeline easement and drainage easement run along the rear of the lot and requiring vacation. On Lot 2.03, a drainage easement runs through the north east portion of the lot and requires vacation for the construction of the drainage basin. 4. A design waiver is necessary due to sidewalk and curbing not being proposed along the site's frontages. Per review of the Site Plans, it appears that a pedestrian access way is proposed within a portion of the Boulevard of the Americas frontage, and extending towards Pine Street. Professional testimony shall be provided at time of Public Hearing in support of the requested relief. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A Boundary and Topographic Survey has been submitted. The following revisions are required: a. The drainage easement should be shown on Lot. 2.03. b. Water mains should be shown along Pine Street. c. Sidewalk bypass should be shown on Pine Street. d. General Note #1 should correct Block 111 to Block 961.01. 2. Per review of the survey and design documents, there are number of easements that must be extinguished and/or relocated. This work can be addressed as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. 3. As indicated previously, site access to the office property will be provided via a twenty-four foot (24') wide drive extending from the Boulevard of the Americas. This drive will lead to a forty-seven (47) space parking lot north of the office building, and a (larger) two hundred twenty-one (221) space parking facility to the south of the building. Per the engineer's calculations, off-street parking will exceed UDO requirements. 4. Testimony should be provided regarding the proposed site access to the property (i.e., access to/from the Boulevard of the Americas). Are left-turns proposed into (and out of) the facility? Additional review and/or design at this intersection is necessary to accommodate left turn movements from and onto the Boulevard of the Americas (if proposed), including but not limited to directional signage, striping, islands, etc.. Enlargement and/or reconfiguration of the intersection may be necessary to accommodate multiple movements (if proposed) exiting the site. 5. A vehicular circulation plan should be provided to confirm accessibility for the largest vehicles anticipated to access this site. This plan must demonstrate adequate interior access, as well as access to and from the proposed loading area at the southwest corner of the office building. This plan can be provided as a condition of Board approval (if/when granted). 6. A refuse enclosure is proposed to the east of the office building, but requires dimensioning. Testimony should be provided on collection of trash and recyclable material. It should be clarified whether the Township or a private company will be responsible for removal. The waste receptacle area should be designed in accordance with Section 18-809E., of the UDO. 7. Testimony should be provided

to address the largest vehicles anticipated to access the proposed 20'x50' loading zone. 8. No sight triangle or sight distance information is provided. At a minimum, sight distance at the facility entrance/exit must be addressed. 9. Proposed handicap parking aisles and spots should be dimensioned. Van accessible spots shall have an eight foot (8') wide aisle, while the others shall have a five foot (5') wide aisle. 10. We recommend that the locations of the handicap-accessible spaces on the south side of the building shall be relocated to provide a shorter distance to the office entrance. 11. Proposed curb ramps shall be added. 12. All proposed building access points should be coordinated between the architectural plans and site plans since they impact the design. Final coordination will be addressed during compliance, if/when approval is granted. 13. A setback distance from New Hampshire Avenue to the southern parking lot should be provided on the plan. 14. A stray street sign is shown in the southwestern corner of Lot 2.06 in the middle of the access roadway and should be removed. B. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural floor plans and elevations were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the building will be about thirty-seven feet (37') high, significantly below the sixty-five foot (65') allowable height. Additionally, the building height includes what appear to be a front panel as well as mechanical screening of roof-mounted HVAC units. Confirming testimony should be provided. 2. 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. 3. The site plans and architectural plans must be coordinated. The design of the access point at the southern corner of the building is different in the two (2) plans. C. Grading 1. Detailed grading is provided on Sheet 4 (office) and Sheet 5 (basin). Per review of the office facility design, it is feasible and generally well-prepared for an initial design submission. 2. Additional spot elevations are required at the locations of handicap parking spaces, interior sidewalks, and pedestrian access ways, as well as at building access points. 3. Additional grading information is necessary at the front of the building. 4. A review of final grading will be performed during compliance review, if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm sewer collection system has been designed utilizing reinforced concrete pipe to convey storm water runoff into a proposed retention pond. As indicated previously, the design includes installation of a retention basin facility (designated Basin #5) that was incorporated in the 2001 NJDEP-CAFRA approval issued for Cedarbridge Corporate Campus facility. 2. The author of the storm water report references a meeting held with NJDEP Land Use personnel, who informed the applicant that the (2001) design standards used for design of the Cedarbridge Campus could be used for the replacement basin (#5). 3. Per cursory review of the proposed pond, the initial design is feasible. 4. Inverts in the Pipe Calculations do not match what is shown on the Utility Plan. 5. Calculations are needed for piping shown along Pine Street. 6. The storm water piping profiles require minor corrections. 7. The invert for Inlet 224 needs to be corrected on both the profile and the utility plan. 8. Roof leaders and manifold connections should be provided to convey roof runoff into the proposed collection system. 9. A Storm Water Management Maintenance Manual shall be provided in accordance with NJ Storm Water Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township standards, including the Responsible Party for basin maintenance. If Township maintenance is proposed, DPW approval of the design will be required during compliance (if approved). 10. Water quality maintenance necessary for the pond (i.e., aeration, other) will be addressed during compliance (if approved). 11. A final review of the storm water design will be performed during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. E. Landscaping 1. A detailed Landscaping Plan is provided on Site Plan Sheet 9. As illustrated, significant landscaping is proposed around the perimeter of the access drives and parking areas, within landscape islands, and along portions of the north and west sides of the office building. Foundation plantings are proposed along portions of the north and south building elevations. The Landscape design is well-prepared for an initial submission. 2. The following corrections must be made to the Landscape Plan: a. Eighty-four (84) "EA" plants should be shown in the schedule. Eight (8) plants are unlabeled that could be the missing "EA" plants. b. The plan should call out thirty (30) "ZLKV" trees around the perimeter of the site. c. The plan should call out twelve (12) "AR" trees along the west side of the building. d. Two (2) trees are not labeled in the rear of the building and could

be the missing "LS" trees that are listed in the schedule. e. Nine (9) "GT" trees should be listed in the schedule on part 2 of the Landscape Plan. 3. We recommend that the applicant consider drip irrigation or similar measures for long-term maintenance of the proposed landscaping. 4. The Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority may require relocation of some proposed plantings. Utilities and easements should be shown on the Landscape Plan to avoid planting conflicts. 5. Landscaping will be reviewed in detail during resolution compliance review, should approval be granted. F. Lighting 1. A detailed lighting design is provided on the Lighting Plan, Sheet 11 of 15. The design consists of five (5) pole mounted single fixtures, seven (7) pole mounted double fixtures, and five (5) building mounted fixtures. The overall design is feasible, and generally well-prepared for an initial submission. 2. The details of the different light fixtures should be given. 3. A point to point diagram has been provided and the minimum lighting conditions appear to have been met. The Calculation Summary shows a maximum of 6.3 foot-candles in the North entrance, but it is not shown on the diagram. 4. We recommend that non-security lighting be installed on timers 5. The lighting design can be finalized for compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. G. Utilities 1. Utility information is shown on Site Plan Sheet 6. Water and sewer service will be extended from existing systems within the Boulevard of the Americas right-of-way as depicted on the plan. 2. Public water and sewer services will be provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. 3. Proposed fire protection measures include an onsite fire hydrant. Testimony should be provided as to whether building sprinklers are proposed. G. Traffic 1. No traffic reports or analysis have been provided with the initial submission. 2. We recommend that a traffic analysis from a qualified professional be provided for the Board's use prior to the Public Hearing, assessing impacts of the proposed facility on the Boulevard of the Americas and surrounding roads, assuming full build-out of the Cedarbridge Campus. 3. Based on the findings of the study as referenced above, recommendations regarding design of the proposed site access should be provided by the traffic professional (including turn restrictions, if any are warranted). I. Signage 1. No site identification sign has been proposed 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. J. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract is a vacant, wooded property with access from the Boulevard of the Americas. The property slopes gently downwards from north to the south. Per review of design documents and NJDEP-GIS mapping of the area, no freshwater wetlands or state open waters exist on-site or within three hundred feet (300') of the site. Testimony should be provided regarding the status of NJDEP-CAFRA approvals necessary for the project (i.e., if a new or amended CAFRA permit is necessary). 2. Tree Management Plan A Tree Management Protection Plan should be required as a condition of approval. The project's compliance with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance must be addressed during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. K. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 14 and 15 in the plan set. 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. 3. Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. 4. Construction details will be reviewed during resolution compliance should approval be granted. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Developers Agreement; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Lakewood Fire Commissioners; d. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority (water and sewer); e. Ocean County Planning Board; f. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; g. NJDEP Individual CAFRA Permit (or modification); and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that waivers are requested for EIS and tree management protection plan. Compliance with the tree protection ordinance will be addressed during resolution compliance. The waivers are supported as submitted.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the waivers.
Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

Mr. Vogt stated one of the concerns in the intersection coming into this property. He wants to make sure they design it correctly to make it safe.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq., on behalf of the applicant, stated there was a traffic study done a few years ago for this area. They would make sure to update/change it in a timely fashion so he can comment on it

A motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance the application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

- 9. SD 1963** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Nachman Taub
Location: Read Place
Block 855.02 Lot 26
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval for the subdivision of one (1) existing residential lot into two (2) equal sized residential lots for future single family dwellings. The project involves an existing forty-five thousand square foot (45,000 SF) property comprised of one (1) lot known as Lot 26 in Block 855.02. The proposed properties are designated as new Lots 26.01 and 26.02 on the subdivision plan would each contain twenty-two thousand five hundred square feet (22,500 SF). Existing Lot 26 is a vacant rectangular parcel that is lightly wooded. An existing fence and driveway encroach on the property, but they are indicated to be removed and relocated to adjoining Lot 34. Public water and sewer is not available. The site is situated in the central portion of the Township on the northeast side of Read Place, northwest of the intersection with New Hampshire Avenue. Read Place is an improved Township Road in fair condition with a fifty foot (50') right-of-way. No curbing or sidewalk exists. The pavement is being undermined by erosion of the adjacent soil at the gutter line. The site slopes toward the rear of the property and is wooded. Since public water and sewer is not available individual well and septic systems must be approved by the Ocean County Health Department. Overhead electric is located on the north side of Read Place. The surrounding lots are predominately residential uses. The lots are situated within the R-20 Single Family Residential Zone. Width variances are required for this proposed subdivision. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-20 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Residential Housing with a minimum lot area of twenty thousand square feet (20,000 SF) is a permitted use in the zone. 2. Minimum Lot Width variances are required for proposed Lots 26.01 & 26.02. Lot widths of seventy-five feet (75') are proposed. A one hundred foot (100') lot width is required. 3. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments 1. We have reviewed the Survey Plan provided and the following revision is required: a. Add the lot area. 2. A bituminous concrete driveway and vinyl fencing from Lot 34 encroach onto proposed Lot 26.01. The plan indicates that the driveway and fencing will be relocated onto Lot 34. 3. Sidewalk and curbing are proposed along the property frontage. This will eliminate pavement cracking due to erosion from flowing storm water down the gutter of the street which is undermining the road. 4. Provide coordinates at a minimum of three (3) outbound corners. The General Notes indicate that horizontal datum has been assumed. 5. The General Notes also indicate vertical datum has been assumed. An elevation and location shall be shown for the vertical benchmark referenced. 6. A

proposed monument shall be provided for the northeast outbound corner. 7. The referenced rebar found shall be shown on the southeast outbound corner. 8. The Legend shall be expanded. 9. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since all the corner markers have not been set. 10. The General Notes and Zoning Data indicate that four (4) off-street parking spaces are required and four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided per unit. Parking shall be provided in accordance with the Township Parking Ordinance. A minimum of four (4) spaces for a dwelling with a basement is to be provided. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 11. General Note #12 indicates that no freshwater wetlands are located on the site per a report by Aqua-Terra Environmental Services. A copy of the report shall be submitted. 12. The Minor Subdivision Plan shows new lot numbers were assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. 13. Six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easements dedicated to the Township are proposed along the property frontages of new Lots 26.01 and 26.02. The proposed easement areas should be shown on an individual lot basis. 14. A Tree List proposes four (4) "October Glory Maple" street trees. Only two (2) locations of the proposed shade trees are shown on the Improvement Plan. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board, and should conform to recommendation (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. Our site investigation indicates there are several large existing trees on-site. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. 15. The Notes on the Improvement Plan require editing. 16. The Improvement Plan indicates that seasonal high water table information will be provided at time of plot plan submittal. 17. The Improvement Plan indicates Storm Water Management will be provided with plot plan submittal. At a minimum, dry wells will be required for storm water management and shall be sized when plot plans are submitted. 18. Public water and sewer is not proposed for the project. The Improvement Plan indicates that the new lots would be serviced by individual well and septic. Approval from the Ocean County Health Department would be required. 19. The Improvement Plan proposes widening of Read Place to a fifteen foot (15') half pavement width. Proposed grading shall be added along with dimensions for the pavement tapers. 20. The Improvement Plan indicates that proposed lot grading will be submitted with plot plans. 21. Due to no construction proposed at this time, the Board may wish to require the cost of improvements to be bonded or placed in escrow to avoid replacing them in the future. 22. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 23. Construction details should be revised on the Improvement Plan in accordance with the conditions of any approvals. 24. Final construction details will be reviewed during compliance should subdivision approval be granted. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d. Ocean County Board of Health; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated the applicant is seeking minimum lot width variances.

Mr. Lines stated the lots will be 20,000 SF, similar to other subdivisions in the area.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Herzl to advance the application to the September 23, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

6. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **SP 2077** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Kol Torah
Location: Oak Street
Block 1009 Lot 1.01

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a boys elementary school

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval for constructing a boy's elementary school. The proposed project will construct a two-story school building and associated facilities. The proposed recreation facilities associated with this school application include a baseball field, basketball courts, a pool, and playground areas. The plans indicate the irregular tract contains two hundred thirty-nine thousand seven hundred square feet (239,700 SF), which is 5.50 acres. The proposed site is located on the south side of Oak Street east of its intersection with Route 9. Oak Street is an improved municipally owned collector road having a sixty-six foot (66') right-of-way with a forty foot (40') pavement width. There is curbing, but no sidewalk along the property frontage. The current property contains several trailers, a paved parking lot, basketball courts, and a playground. The survey indicates that the playground area does not impede upon the unimproved Clyde Avenue right-of-way which borders the tract on the eastern side. However, from review of aerial photos, the basketball courts are located in the right-of-way. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the basketball court is being removed. The survey also shows an exit drive from the parking lot encroaching into the right-of-way (which is being constructed as part of the "Tashbar" application). Otherwise, the surrounding area is primarily wooded. It appears that the existing structures and parking lot will remain. The site plans indicate that the project area includes unimproved Horton Avenue. Site plan approval would require that Horton Avenue be vacated. The site plan indicates forty-three (43) off-street parking spaces will be required for off-street parking. This is based on one (1) off-street parking space required for each classroom, tutor room, library, meeting room, or office. According to the site plan, ninety-one (91) off-street parking spaces will be provided in the parking lot served by two (2) access driveways. Of these parking spaces, five (5) spots are proposed for handicap use. Two (2) spaces would be van accessible, but the other three (3) need wider adjoining aisles to comply with the ADA requirements. Six (6) proposed 12' X 40' bus drop-off spaces are shown. Proposed bus traffic would circulate counterclockwise through the site. The project is located in the southern portion of the Township and is generally surrounded by vacant land and other school sites. The plans list the project in the R-12 Zone. We offer the following comments and recommendations per review of the revised submission and comments from our initial review letter dated July 16, 2014: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. B2 - Topography within 200 feet thereof. 2. B4 - Contours of the area within 200 feet of the site boundaries. 3. B10 - Man-made features within 200 feet thereof. 4. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. The Survey Plan provided, which is dated December 14, 2012 is no longer valid. Our site investigation on July 10, 2014 notes the following: a. The site has been excavated and the topography does not depict the existing conditions. b. The existing storm sewer in Oak Street has not been shown (to be provided). Per the engineer's response letter, the applicant agrees to update the survey once NJAW completes its work along the right-of-way. This is satisfactory. All other submission waivers were granted. II. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-12 Single-Family Residential District. Public and private schools are permitted in the zone, subject to the provisions of Section 18-906. Fact. 2. The applicant is seeking approval from the Board to make the existing trailers permanent. Fact. 3. No variances or design waivers are being requested in connection with this application. Fact. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. As currently configured, Site Plan approval is contingent upon the vacation of Horton Avenue. The applicant shall request that the Lakewood Township Committee vacate Horton Avenue in its entirety. Fact. As illustrated on the revised plans, vacation for a small portion of the Halsey Street ROW is also necessary for the project. 2. An updated outbound and topographic survey for the tract is required since we note discrepancies with the base map shown on the site plan. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 3. New Jersey American Water Company will be constructing sanitary sewer in Clyde Avenue, Halsey Street, and Argyle Avenue which border this project on the eastern side. Eventually these roads will be improved with the neighboring Tashbar project. Proposed improvements to this project must be

coordinated with the adjoining approved designs. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 4. The General Notes require some minor editing. Some revisions were Made, remaining revisions to be addressed (if approved). 5. Horizontal and vertical datum shall be provided along with a bench mark. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 6. The following Zoning Data on the title page requires editing: a. The provided setback from Argyle Avenue is not one hundred twenty-seven feet (127'). b. The provided setback from Halsey Street should be added. c. Since the side setback from Lot 1.03 is one hundred twenty-seven feet (127'), the provided aggregate side yard setback should be one hundred fifty-two feet (152'). d. Maximum Building Coverage allowed is thirty percent (30%) not twenty-five percent (25%). Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 7. Additional proposed dimensions are required on the Site Plan; particularly curb radii, aisle widths, and handicap space access. Some revisions made. Remainder to be addressed in compliance (if/when approved). 8. Proposed setback lines should be shown in order to ensure compliance of the building and accessory structures. Addressed. 9. Existing structures to be removed or remain should be labeled. Addressed. 10. Five (5) handicap parking spaces, two (2) being van accessible, are proposed for the project. Currently, the other three (3) spaces are not shown to comply with requirements. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 11. No signage (regulatory) for the parking lots is shown. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 12. Handicap access via ramp or sidewalk is not shown on the plans. Addressed. 13. Depressed curb at driveways should be indicated. Addressed. 14. 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). A Circulation Plan has been provided for the proposed bus routes. Fact. If approved, the circulation design will be revised during compliance (i.e., expansion of the proposed northerly access, other) to allow for entering buses to circulate around buses already parked in the proposed bus stalls. Directional signage will be provided as well. 15. No proposed refuse enclosure is depicted. 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. Any proposed waste receptacle area shall be screened and designed in accordance with Section 18-809E., of the UDO. A trash enclosure is proposed near the northeast corner of the school. DPW approval will be necessary. 16. Curb is proposed throughout the project and along the road frontages surrounding the property, but sidewalk is not. Proposed sidewalk is required unless a design waiver is granted by the Board. Proposed sidewalk shall be a minimum of five feet (5') in width, unless pedestrian bypass areas are designed. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). Sidewalk is depicted on the revised plans. 17. Proposed sight triangle easements should be addressed throughout the proposed project. Testimony on sight triangles should be provided. Addressed. 18. Shade tree and utility easements shall be completed for the site. Addressed. 19. Testimony should be provided on loading and deliveries proposed for the site. Fact. 20. The plans show a future addition. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, this addition will include nine (9) classrooms. Testimony should be provided at Public Hearing. Fact. 21. The proposed building must be coordinated between the Site Plans and Architectural Plans. Fact. B. Architectural 1. Dimensions on the elevation are not provided. The applicant's professionals have indicated that the allowable thirty-five foot (35') height will not be exceeded. Fact. As indicated previously, a floor plan schematic was provided. 2. Dimensions for the floor plan should be provided in order to verify with the site plan. Fact. 3. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the facades and treatments of the proposed buildings. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. Fact. 4. Testimony should be provided as to whether the building will have a sprinkler system. Fact. 5. Testimony should be provided as to whether ground mounted or roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed for the building. Said equipment should be adequately screened. Fact. 6. The proposed school building will have an elevator to meet applicable ADA accessibility requirements. Fact. C. Grading 1. A grading plan is provided on Sheet 3. A storm sewer collection system is proposed to collect runoff and direct it to underground recharge systems. Fact. 2. The topography must be updated to evaluate the proposed

grading scheme. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 3. We recommend the following be added to the grading plan: a. Proposed top of curb elevations for the parking lot. b. Proposed building corner elevations. c. Proposed building access point elevations. d. Proposed elevations at handicap parking spots and ramps. e. Proposed retaining wall elevations. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 4. The roads to the east of the project which include Clyde Avenue, Halsey Street, and Argyle Avenue have been designed for construction of the neighboring Tashbar project. Grading should be proposed for the eastern part of the site and should tie into the approved design. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 5. The proposed grading will be reviewed in detail after plan revisions are submitted for resolution compliance should site plan approval be granted. Fact. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm water management system has been designed. The design proposes a storm sewer collection system with two (2) underground recharge systems located under the parking lot. The project qualifies as major development and must meet the requirements of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Storm Water Management Rules (NJAC 7:8). Fact. 2. A narrative should be submitted with the Storm Water Management Report. This should include verification that the requirements for major development will be met. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 3. Pipe design calculations should be added to the Report. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 4. Storm sewer profiles should be added to the plans. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 5. The pipe at the east entrance should be labeled as twenty-four (24) linear feet with a slope of one percent (1.0%). Addressed. 6. According to the Storm Water Management Plan, the proposed upper parking lot recharge trench should be labeled as triple thirty inch (30") pipes. The proposed lower parking lot recharge trench should be labeled as double pipes. Details for each of the trenches should be provided. Addressed 7. The submission of a Storm Water Management Operation & Maintenance Manual will be required. The Manual can be provided during compliance submission should site plan approval be granted. Fact. E. Landscaping 1. A landscape design has been provided on sheet 4. Fact. 2. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. Fact. 3. We recommend all proposed sight triangles, utilities, and easements be added to the plan to prevent any planting conflicts. Addressed. 4. Additional landscaping should be proposed. Fact (foundation plantings to be provided in compliance if/when approved). 5. A detailed review of the landscape design will be undertaken when plan revisions are submitted for resolution compliance should site plan approval be granted. Fact. F. Lighting 1. A lighting plan is indicated on sheet 4. Fact. 2. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. Fact. 3. A point to point diagram will be required. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). 4. Lighting will be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. Fact. G. Utilities 1. The project is located in the New Jersey American Water franchise area. Therefore, public water and sewer service would be constructed by NJAWC. Fact. 2. No proposed utilities are shown. As mentioned previously, sanitary sewer will be constructed immediately east of this project. A potable water main exists on the north side of Oak Street. This information will be provided during compliance (if approval is given). Fact. H. Signage 1. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with the Township Ordinance. Fact. 2. Per review of the design documents, it appears that no signage is proposed at this time. Fact (directional signage to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). I. Environmental 1. A waiver from preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was granted 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 data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. Fact. 2. A Tree Protection Sheet has been included in the plan set which is not accurate. The topographic base map requires

updating along with the locating of the current tree line. Fact (to be addressed in compliance if/when approved). J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 6 and 7 of the site plans. Fact. 2 .A detail for the recharge trenches should be included to verify storage volume. Addressed 3. 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. Fact. 4. Construction details will be reviewed in depth after plan revisions are submitted for resolution compliance should site plan approval be granted. Fact. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Township Committee (street vacation); b. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; c. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); d. Ocean County Planning Board; e. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; f. Ocean County Board of Health; and g. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Abe Penzer, Esq., on behalf of the applicant, stated the school is growing very rapidly. He thanked the Board for hearing this application at a plan review meeting.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He stated this is an existing boy's school that is expanding. The application is conforming. They have provided more parking than what the ordinance requires.

Mr. Penzer stated they would like to do this project in phases. Phase 2 would be done in about three years.

Mr. Neiman asked about the busing.

Mr. Flannery stated the buses will come in the front entrance. There is an area for them to stack. They have submitted a plan showing how the buses can get in and out. There is more than enough room for six buses which would be the maximum. A few radius changes will be needed so that one bus can pass another bus and they would agree to do that.

Mr. Neiman asked about the dumpsters.

Mr. Flannery said there was a dumpster added to the plan. They will be meeting with Public Works to get their approval.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public, seeing no one come forward, he closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Herzl to approve the application.
Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

- 2. SD 1948** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Shvilay Hatalmud, Inc.
Location: 961 East County Line Road and Kennedy Boulevard East
Block 174.04 Lot 57
Preliminary & Final Major Subdivision to create 5 lots

The applicant's attorney has requested this project be carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Sussman to carry this application to the August 26, 2014 meeting.
Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

- 3. SP 2065** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Shvilay Hatalmud, Inc.
Location: 961 East County Line Road
Block 174.04 Lot 57
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for addition to existing school and a new dormitory building

The applicant's attorney has requested this project be carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Sussman to carry this application to the August 26, 2014 meeting.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert

7. PUBLIC PORTION

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

9. APPROVAL OF BILLS

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary