

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. Advance written Notice has been filed with the Township Clerk for purpose of public inspection and, a copy of this Agenda has been mailed, faxed or delivered to the following newspapers: *The Asbury Park Press*, and *The Tri-Town News* at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal, Mr. Lankry (BOA)

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

4. PROPOSED ORDINANCE REVIEW

1. Zoning Map Revisions

A map was available which showed a portion of land that is proposed to be rezoned from M-1 to R-20.

Mr. Schmuckler said he has no problem.

A motion was made by Mr. Follman, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to recommend the proposed ordinance.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

4. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

- 1. SD 1887** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Harold Frankel
Location: County Line Road East & Clifton Avenue
Block 106 Lots 4 & 5
Minor Subdivision to create three lots (two duplex units and one synagogue)

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval for the subdivision of two (2) existing residential lots into three (3) residential lots for a zero lot line duplex and an existing single family dwelling to remain. The project involves an existing 23,778.71 square foot (0.54 acre) property comprised of two (2) lots known as Lots 4 and 5 in Block 106. The proposed properties are designated as proposed Lots 5.01 through 5.03 on the subdivision plan. Existing Lot 4 is an irregular corner parcel containing a one-story frame dwelling. This dwelling would remain on proposed Lot 5.03, which is proposed to be smaller than existing Lot 4. Existing Lot 5 is a rectangular tract with frontage on a County Highway, containing a one-story frame dwelling. This existing dwelling would be removed. A duplex is proposed for new Lots 5.01 and 5.02. Area from existing Lot 4 would be added to new Lot 5.02 in order to provide the required square footage for a zero lot line duplex. Public water and sewer is available. Curb exists along the frontage of the entire property. Sidewalk exists along only one (1) frontage of site. However, sidewalk is proposed across the frontage of the tract where it is currently missing. The site is situated in the northern portion of the Township on the southeast corner of Clifton Avenue and County Line Road East. Clifton Avenue is a fully improved Township Road with an eighty foot (80') right-of-way. County Line Road East is an improved County Highway with a varying width right-of-way. Proposed Lots 5.01 and 5.02 would become zero lot line properties for the proposed duplex, with frontage only on County Line Road East. The zero lot line properties would have a combined area of just over twelve thousand square feet (12,000 SF). Proposed Lot 5.03 would become an irregular corner lot for the existing single family dwelling to remain having an area of 11,777.19 square feet. The adjacent lots are residential uses. A cemetery exists on the opposite side of Clifton Avenue and commercial uses exist on the opposite side of County Line Road East. The lots are situated within the R-10 Single Family Residential Zone. Variances are required for the proposed subdivision. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single Family Detached Housing and Zero Lot Line Duplex Housing having a minimum combined lot area of twelve thousand square feet (12,000 SF) are permitted uses in the zone. 2. Front Yard Setback variances are required for proposed Lot 5.03 to allow the existing dwelling with nonconforming front yard setbacks to remain. The existing dwelling's front yard setback to Clifton Avenue is shown to be 19.8 feet and the front yard setback to County Line Road East is indicated as 24.8 feet. A thirty foot (30') front yard setback is required. 3. Per review of the Architectural Plans and the zone requirements, the Maximum Building Coverage of twenty-five percent (25%) will be exceeded for the combination of proposed Lots 5.01 and 5.02. The proposed building area should either be decreased, or the lot areas increased, unless a variance is requested. 4. A variance is required for the number of off-street parking spaces for proposed Lot 5.01. Two (2) off-street parking spaces are proposed, whereas four (4) off-street parking spaces are required. 5. Unless off-street parking is added to new Lot 5.03, a variance would be required for the number of off-street parking spaces. The existing dwelling to remain on proposed Lot 5.03 is nonconforming with respect to the number of off-street parking spaces since less than three (3) off-street parking spaces are available. 6. 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 Outbound & Topographic Survey Plan provided and the following revisions are required: a. Provide individual areas for Lots 4 and 5. b. Provide horizontal and vertical datum, including a bench mark. c. Continuation of the fence encroaching into the County Line Road East right-of-way in front of Lot 5. d. Correct the rectangle shown in the County Line Road East right-of-way

to a monitoring well. e. Correct the manhole next to the sidewalk shown at the intersection to an NJDOT junction box. f. Complete existing water and sewer line locations. g. Locate the large trees for future compliance with the Township Tree Ordinance. 2. The future status of the fence encroaching into the County Line Road East right-of-way must be indicated. The fence must either be relocated or removed. 3. The site location shall be identified on the Zone Map. 4. The Zoning Data requires numerous revisions. The applicant's professionals should contact our office to review the table. 5. The owners and applicants must be clarified. The General Notes list two (2) owner/applicants. The application lists only one (1) applicant. The Owner's Certification lists a third owner. 6. The General Notes reference the survey provided. Horizontal and vertical datum must be provided along with a bench mark. In addition, coordinates must be provided on at least three (3) outbound property corners. 7. General Note #6 shall be revised to "this project consists of subdividing two (2) lots into three (3) lots". 8. General Note #8 lists the total existing site area as 23,778.71 square feet. This cannot be confirmed since the areas of the two (2) existing lots have not been provided on the survey. 9. General Note #9 indicates that solid waste and recycling is to be collected curbside using robo-cans by the Township and the robo-cans stored on the sides of the building. The Improvement Plan and Architectural Plans should be revised accordingly, with screening proposed for the refuse enclosure areas. 10. General Note #10 shall be eliminated. The project is too small to be classified as major development and will not have to meet water quality standards and water quantity reduction rates. However, the applicant is not relieved from handling the increase in runoff from the proposed duplex development. 11. A 30' X 30' Sight Triangle Easement to Lakewood Township is proposed at the intersection of Clifton Avenue and County Line Road East. The proposed Sight Triangle Easement is unnecessary and should be eliminated since the intersection is signalized. 12. The following corrections are required on the Minor Subdivision Map: a. The 59.49 foot dimension of the front property line for proposed Lot 5.02 should be 64.54 feet. b. A 27.66 foot dimension is missing from the skewed property line for proposed Lot 5.02 c. Front setback dimensions of 30.5 feet are shown for proposed Lots 5.01 and 5.02. However, the proposed duplex is located encroaching into the thirty foot (30') required front yard setback. 13. Access easements will be required for the proposed circular driveway configuration on proposed Lots 5.01 and 5.02. The driveway access points to County Line Road East are narrow. However, the final approval of these driveways will be controlled by Ocean County. 14. Since a basement is already proposed for the duplex, seasonal high water table information must be provided. 15. A Zone Boundary Line shall be added to County Line Road East. 16. 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. 17. 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. 18. The plans have numerous overwrites and some view port cutoffs which need to be corrected. 19. Six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easements dedicated to the Township are proposed along the property frontages of new Lots 5.01 through 5.03. The proposed easement information and areas are shown on an individual lot basis. However, the proposed easement areas require corrections. 20. A Tree List proposes ten (10) "October Glory Maple" street 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 some large existing trees on-site. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. 21. The applicant proposes to construct new sidewalk on County Line Road East, as well as driveway aprons along the property frontage of new Lots 5.01 and 5.02. The proposed

sidewalk location shall be dimensioned from the existing curb. A note shall be added to the plans that any existing sidewalk and curb damaged during construction shall be replaced at the direction of the Township Engineer. 22. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development. The project is too small to qualify as major development. At a minimum, dry wells will be required for storm water management and shall be provided when plot plans are submitted. 23. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. No proposed grading is indicated on the Improvement Plan. Proposed grading shall be designed. At a minimum, proposed grading must be included on the plot plan submittals. 24. 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. 25. The subdivision map date in the Surveyor's Certification shall be corrected. The certification has not been signed since the monuments are not in place. 26. The Legend should be revised to "monument to be set". 27. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 28. Construction details should be revised on the Improvement Plan in accordance with the conditions of any approvals. 29. 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; and d. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. said that the subdivision and site plan should be seen as one application although the Board would have to vote on them separately. The minor subdivision will be creating three lots. There is currently a SFD which will be converted into a synagogue, a house which will be on a separate lot and a third lot to create a duplex. They will be able to respond to all of the comments in the review letter at the public hearing.

Mr. Lines stated that they will be moving the lot line between the duplex and the SFD lot and that should eliminate the building coverage variance. All three lots will then be conforming.

A motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance the application to the June 11, 2013 meeting. No further notice required.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

- 2. SP 2003** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Harold Frankel
Location: County Line Road East & Clifton Avenue
Block 106 Lot 5 (proposed Lot 5.03)
Site Plan to convert existing single-family residence to a synagogue with a building addition

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Site Plan Exemption/Change of Use approval for conversion of an existing one-story single-family residential dwelling into a synagogue, via a 1,280 sf building addition to the rear. The Lot (5.03) as depicted is proposed via a minor subdivision application (SD1887) to be considered by the Board, concurrent with this application. This new lot will be created by the subdivision of existing Lots 4 and 5, where a small portion of Lot 4 will be

conveyed to create a duplex property immediately east of this property. As depicted on the Change of Use site plans, the existing driveway off of Clifton Avenue will be removed and replaced with a new paved driveway sized to provide two (2) off-street parking spaces. Both the change of use site plan and the accompanying minor subdivision plan submission (SD1887) depict existing curbing along both frontages, and sidewalk along the Clifton Avenue frontage. New sidewalk is proposed along the County Line Road frontage. Street trees are also proposed along both property frontages. As indicated on the architectural plans, the proposed synagogue will contain a 729.1 sf Bais Medrash area, an adjoining 410.9 sf library, a 411.3 sf Ezras Noshim area, and an existing kitchen. A 143.1 sf office is also proposed. The architectural plans depict a basement, partially-existing with an area shown as unfinished as well as new 'hall' and 'break area'. The site is situated in the northern portion of the Township on the southeast corner of Clifton Avenue and County Line Road East. Clifton Avenue is a fully improved Township Road with an eighty foot (80') right-of-way. County Line Road East is an improved County Highway with a varying width right-of-way. The adjacent lots are residential uses. A cemetery exists on the opposite side of Clifton Avenue and commercial uses exist on the opposite side of County Line Road East. The lots are situated within the R-10 Single Family Residential Zone.

I. Zoning 1. The property is located in the R-10 (Single Family Residential) Zone. Places of worship are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-905 of the UDO. 2. Per review of the Change of Use Site Plan, no new bulk variances appear necessary for the change of use request. Pre-existing variances for front yard setback (both frontages) exist but will not be exacerbated with the proposed building addition. 3. Per review of the Change of Use Site Plan, the following design waivers are required for proposed project: • Providing site lighting. • Providing landscaping • Providing a 20 foot landscape perimeter buffer per Section 18-905B-1 of the UDO. 4. Additionally, submission waivers are requested for proposed grading, final design of access sidewalks and interior sidewalks. Said information will be provided in a future plot plan submission to the Engineering Department, if when Change of Use approval is granted. We support this waiver as requested. However, the applicant's professionals must supply information relative to proposed interior pedestrian access and handicap ramp location(s), in plan view, prior to or at the forthcoming public hearing to demonstrate pedestrian ingress and egress to the synagogue for the Board's consideration.

II. Review Comments 1. Testimony should be provided by the applicant for the Board to support the proposed change in use, including but not limited to the following issues: a. How many congregants (maximum) are anticipated for the sanctuary use? b. Are any other ancillary uses (i.e., school, other) proposed with this change of use? c. What is the anticipated parking demand for the sanctuary use? d. Is catering proposed at this facility? e. Is future expansion of the basement area anticipated? 2. Per Section 18-905A of the UDO, off-street parking for places of worship is not required where main sanctuaries are less than 800 sf, exclusive of secondary sanctuary space, kitchen, support rooms and other facilities. Parking will be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. It should be noted that a new driveway off of Clifton Avenue is proposed, capable of providing two (2) 'head in' parking spaces. Per review of the Change of Use plan, there appears to be space to provide a turnaround on the north side of the driveway (if desired by the Board). 3. Per Note #9 on the Change of Use site plan, trash and recyclables will be stored in Robo-cans on the side of the dwelling, and put curbside for Township pickup. 4. No new landscaping (other than street trees) is proposed. As indicated above, a waiver of the perimeter buffer requirement is necessary. At a minimum, screening along the property line near the existing dwelling on adjacent Lot 3 (i.e., solid fence and/or evergreen buffer) may be warranted. 5. Testimony should be provided regarding proposed lighting (building-mounted security lighting is proposed per note #15). Lighting shall be provided to the satisfaction of the

Board. 6. Construction details should be provided for any proposed new site improvements deemed necessary (if any), in accordance with Township standards. This information can be provided during plot plan (if/when approval is granted). 7. At the discretion of the Engineering Department, on-site stormwater retention measures (i.e., drywells, other) may be required if local drainage problems are known to exist. 8. Information and/or testimony should be provided that existing utilities serving the building are adequate for the proposed synagogue use. 9. Any additional information necessary to document compliance with Section 18-905, "Places of Worship and Religious Facilities" of the UDO should be provided. 10. The site plan waiver (if approved) does not relieve the applicant's obligation to obtain necessary building permits and construction code reviews.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Herzl to advance the application to the June 11, 2013 meeting. No further notice required.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

- 3. SD 1888** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Cushman Holdings II, LLC
Location: Warren Avenue & West Street
Block 768 Lot 59
Major Subdivision to create 6 lots

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision approval. The applicant proposes the subdivision of an existing lot to create six (6) proposed lots for three (3) duplex structures that would be developed as zero lot line properties. The existing lot known as Lot 59 in Block 768 is proposed to be subdivided into proposed Lots 59.01 – 59.06 on the Major Subdivision Plan. The 150' X 200', thirty thousand square foot (30,000 SF) property contains two (2) existing one-story frame dwellings and a couple of sheds. The plans state that all existing structures are to be removed. The land generally slopes from south to north. The site is situated in the central portion of the Township on the northeast corner of Warren Avenue and West Street, both of which are paved municipal roads without curb and sidewalk in front of the site. The existing right-of-way width of West Street is fifty feet (50'). The existing right-of-way width of Warren Avenue is sixty feet (60'). The proposed duplex unit on new Lots 59.01 and 59.02 would front Warren Avenue. The proposed duplex units on the combinations of new Lots 59.03/59.04 and 59.05/59.06 would front West Street. Both roadways abutting the site would be widened to provide fifteen foot (15') half pavement widths. Curb and sidewalk are also proposed as part of the road widening improvements. The plans indicate the new lots are to be serviced by public water and sewer. There are existing water and sewer lines located in Warren Avenue. Gas is available to the site since an existing gas main runs under the east side of Warren Avenue. Overhead electric is available from the west side of Warren Avenue. The development proposes four (4) off-street parking spaces for each unit. The number of bedrooms for the units is not specified on the subdivision plans. The subject site is located within the R-7.5 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Therefore, zero lot line duplex housing is a permitted use in the zone district with ten thousand square foot (10,000 SF) minimum lot areas for duplex structures. The site is situated within a predominantly residential area. 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. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 5. C14 - Tree Protection Management Plan. 6. C16 - Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. 7. C17 - Design calculations showing proposed drainage facilities. 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, provided additional topographic features, contours, and man-made features are added on the site and all adjoining roads. Road widening designs are required for Warren Avenue and West Street. Utility connections and possibly extensions will be needed. The current plans do not provide enough information to support the necessary designs. The Environmental Impact Statement waiver request is reasonable given the developed nature of the site. The Tree Protection Management Plan waiver may be granted for completeness purposes only. A Tree Protection Management Plan should be required as a condition of approval. The proposed project will disturb more than five thousand square feet (5,000 SF). Therefore, a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control certification will be required. The proposed project will significantly increase impervious surface. Therefore, calculations and proposed storm water management facilities will be required. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-7.5 Single-Family Residential Zone District. As stated previously, Two-Family Housing, with a minimum lot area of ten thousand square feet (10,000 SF) for two-family structures is listed as a permitted use. Zero lot line subdivisions for duplexes are permitted in the Zone. 2. A variance is requested for Minimum Front Yard Setback on proposed Lot 59.03. An eighteen foot (18') front yard setback is proposed, where a twenty-five foot (25') front yard setback is required. The proposed duplex unit on the combination of new Lots 59.03/59.04, faces West Street with a forty foot (40') front yard setback. The proposed configuration creates a corner property for new Lot 59.03. Therefore, proposed Lot 59.03 also has frontage on Warren Avenue, from which the setback variance is requested. The proposed design minimizes the side yard setback of new Lot 59.04 and leaves the eighteen foot (18') front yard setback (new Lot 59.03) on the opposite side of the duplex unit. 3. A variance has been requested from Maximum Building Coverage. Building coverage of 33.8% is proposed for the combination of new Lots 59.01/59.02, 59.03/59.04, and 59.05/59.06. The allowable building coverage is thirty percent (30%). It should be noted the building coverage is being exceeded by inclusion of the rear decks proposed for the duplex units. Without the proposed decks, the units would be complying. 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. The survey and base map must be updated to show all man-made features and topography within the adjoining right-of-ways in order to complete the design of proposed improvements. 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 of three (3) off-street parking spaces for unspecified number of bedroom units. Up to six (6) bedrooms per unit with an unfinished basement will be permitted for this project to also comply with parking ordinance 2010-62. 3. The applicant shall confirm 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 applicant's professionals indicate the proposed lot numbers have been assigned 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. The General Notes indicate that seasonal high water table and all proposed site improvements to be provided at time of plot plan submittal. Unless waived by the Board this information is required for a Major Subdivision.
2. The General Notes should reference the Survey submitted.
3. The General Notes indicate horizontal and vertical datum has been assumed. The bench mark shown on the construction plan should be referenced.
4. A proposed Sight Triangle Easement at the intersection of Warren Avenue with West Street shall be corrected to 25' X 25'. The proposed legs of the sight triangle easement must be indicated.
5. Zone Boundary Lines shall be added on Warren Avenue and Fern Street.
6. Building setback lines shall be added to the proposed lots.
7. The deck dimensions should be added to the plans and the proposed rear yard setback dimensions revised to the edge of the decks as opposed to the rear unit walls.
8. A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is shown across the project frontages. The easement area below the "required" section of the Zoning Data shall be erased. The easement area for proposed Lot 59.03 shall be corrected.
9. Proposed off-street parking spaces shall be provided with minimum dimensions.
10. Curb and sidewalk is proposed in conjunction with the road widening. Curb and sidewalk along the Warren Avenue frontage shall meet the existing new curb and sidewalk ending at the north edge of the site. A proposed pedestrian passing lane which must be dimensioned has been provided for the sidewalk along Warren Street. The proposed sidewalk location along West Street shall be dimensioned with distances from face of curb and right-of-way.
11. A proposed curb ramp is required at the intersection of West Street and Warren Avenue.
12. The proposed curb radius must be shown at the intersection of West Street and Warren Avenue.
13. The proposed pavement taper on West Street must be dimensioned.

C. Grading

1. Road widening designs are required for Warren Avenue and West Street. Proposed site grading cannot be evaluated without these designs.
2. Profiles are required for West Street and Warren Avenue with the road widening design. Proposed curb and gutter elevations must be included on the profiles.
3. Basements are proposed for all units. Seasonal high water table information must be provided to substantiate a minimum two foot (2') separation to the proposed basement floors.
4. A detailed review of the grading can be completed during compliance submission; if/when this subdivision is approved.

D. Storm Water Management

1. Our review of the project indicates significant impervious surface will be added. As a result, storm water management must be addressed.
2. Should recharge be designed for storm water management, soils information must be provided within the proposed project to confirm the seasonal high water table. In addition, permeability testing would be required for use in the recharge calculations.
3. A Storm Water Management Report and Design can be reviewed in detail with a revised submission of the project.

E. Landscaping

1. Ten (10) Willow Oak shade trees have been proposed within the shade tree and utility easement.
2. 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.
3. Per our site inspection of the property, there is a large existing tree near the intersection. This tree must be removed since it will be located within the proposed sight triangle easement. Other existing trees are growing on the eastern side of the site.
4. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted.

F. Lighting

1. Proposed street lighting has not been provided since no new roads are proposed. The project fronts existing streets which will be widened.

G. 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 must be added. It may be necessary to extend a sanitary sewer main onto West Street to service the proposed duplex units facing West Street. 3. Proposed potable water connections must be added. It may be necessary to extend a potable water main onto West Street to service the proposed duplex units facing West Street. 4. There is an existing well on the site. The plans should address the abandonment of this well. Approval would be required from the Ocean County Board of Health. H. Signage 1. The existing regulatory signage shown on the survey must be added the plans. This regulatory signage shall be shown to be relocated as part of the road widening design. 2. An existing street sign is mounted above the existing stop sign. A new street sign shall be proposed. 3. No project identification signs are proposed. 4. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. I. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract has two (2) existing residential dwellings and a couple of sheds located on the property. The site contains a large tree near the intersection of Warren Avenue and West Street and a treed area on the east side of the property. The existing on-site topography slopes from south to north. The existing pavement edges along West Street and Warren Avenue are poorly defined. A utility pole exists on the Warren Avenue frontage which serves as a guy pole to the overhead electric on the opposite side of the street. 2. Environmental Impact Statement A waiver was requested from submitting an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the project. 3. Tree Management As a condition of approval, a Tree Protection Management Plan in accordance with the current ordinance shall be submitted. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details shall be provided for all proposed improvements. 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. Final review of construction details will take place after compliance submission, if/when this project is approved by the Board. K. Final Plat (Major Subdivision) 1. The Final Plat shall be corrected in accordance with the previous applicable plan review comments. 2. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since the monuments have not been set. 3. The language for the Notary Public should be changed since a party has not been clearly designated. 4. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 5. 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 Board of Health (well abandonment); e. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and f. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities.

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esq. on behalf of the applicant stated that they have no objections to any of the comments in the review letter and will address the variance at the public hearing.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance the application to the June 18, 2013 meeting. No further notice required.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

4. SD 1890 (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Spruce Investment LLC
Location: East Spruce Street
Block 855.02 Lot 28
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 150' X 300' rectangular property totaling forty-five thousand square feet (45,000 SF) or 1.03 acres in area known as Lot 28 in Block 855.02 into two (2) single family residential lots. The two (2) proposed rectangular lots would be 75' X 300' twenty-two thousand five hundred square foot (22,500 SF) properties designated as new Lots 28.01 and 28.02 on the subdivision plan. The proposed lots would each have seventy-five feet (75') of frontage on East Spruce Street. The site contains an existing one-story dwelling and two (2) sheds. The existing one-story dwelling and a shed would remain on proposed Lot 28.02. The other existing shed would be removed and a two-story dwelling is proposed for new Lot 28.01. Public water has recently been constructed on the north side of East Spruce Street and is available. Public sewer is not available. The site is situated in the central portion of the Township on the southwest side of East Spruce Street, northwest of its intersection with New Hampshire Avenue. East Spruce Street is a paved municipal road in good condition without existing curb and sidewalk in front of the site. The existing right-of-way width is fifty feet (50') with a pavement width of approximately twenty-eight feet (28'). Construction of sidewalk is proposed with this application, but curb is not. Existing utility poles with overhead electric are located on the north side of East Spruce Street. An existing water main constructed from New Hampshire Avenue runs past the site in the north side of the pavement. Gas is also available to the site. The Improvement Plan shows the location of individual trees on the site. The topography indicates the property to be sloping northwards. In addition to the dwelling, sheds, fences, and driveways have been located. However, no existing septic system is shown. The proposed lots are situated within the R-20 Single Family Residential Zone. The surrounding uses are entirely residential. Waivers and variances are being requested for proposed Lots 28.01 and 28.02. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-20 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single Family Detached Housing is a permitted use in the zone. 2. Per review of the Minor Subdivision Map, the application, and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: • Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lots 28.01 and 28.02, 75 feet; 100 feet required) – proposed condition. 3. Per review of the Minor Subdivision Map, the following waiver is required: • Construction of curb along the project frontage. 4. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the 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. NJDEP I-Map indicates freshwater wetlands on the rear of the property. The applicant's professionals should address this matter. 2. The General Notes reference an Outbound and Topographic Survey map which has been used for the base map of the Minor Subdivision and Improvement Plan. Two (2) copies of this survey map should be provided for the Planning Board files. 3. The benchmark shown on the Improvement Plan must be referenced on the Minor Subdivision plan. 4. General Note #2 references the Outbound and Topographic Survey submitted. Horizontal and vertical datum has been assumed. 5. General Note #8 shall be revised since public water is available to the site. 6. The existing septic system serving the dwelling to remain on proposed Lot 28.02 shall be added to the base map. 7.

Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority and Ocean County Board of Health shall be added to the list of outside agency approvals. 8. A proposed six foot (6') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easement to Lakewood Township is shown along East Spruce Street. Proposed easement areas shall be shown on an individual lot basis. 9. Dimensions of fifteen feet (15') shall be added to the side setback lines of both new lots from the proposed subdivision line. 10. The future status of the existing improvements should be clarified. Should the existing refuse enclosure remain on proposed Lot 28.02, an accessory structure side yard setback variance would be required. 11. A proposed outbound corner marker should be added to the south corner of the site. 12. A Legend should be added. 13. The General Notes indicate that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be required for each lot and that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided for each lot. The Improvement Plan shows that the parking configuration will provide at least four (4) off-street parking spaces per lot. Off-street parking shall be in accordance with the Township Parking Ordinance. A minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces for a dwelling unit with a basement is to be provided. The stone driveways will be difficult to maintain in good condition. We recommend the Board require durable surface driveways. 14. 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. 15. Unless waived by the Board, street trees should be added to the Improvement Plan within the shade tree and utility easement. The types of proposed street trees should be identified. 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 notes the larger existing trees on-site have been located on the Improvement Plan. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. 16. The General Notes indicate that soil borings shall be performed prior to plot plan submission to determine the seasonal high water table information. 17. The proposed dwelling on new Lot 28.01 would be substantially setback from East Spruce Street to allow a septic system to be constructed in the front yard. The existing septic system must be shown on proposed Lot 28.02. Approvals will be required from the Ocean County Board of Health. 18. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development. We note that the fronts of the properties are very flat. 19. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. Proposed grading is indicated on the Improvement Plan and could be improved. As noted previously, the front of the site is very flat. 20. Proposed five foot (5') wide concrete sidewalk will be provided along East Spruce Street according to the Improvement Plan. The proposed sidewalk location shall be dimensioned within the right-of-way. 21. A proposed gutter reconstruction design is required along East Spruce Street to provide adequate slope for drainage. 22. 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. 23. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. 24. Construction details should be revised on the Improvement Plan in accordance with the any conditions of approval required by the Board. 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 systems); e. Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. stated that because of the depth of the lots, the street frontage is less and does not meet the ordinance. He noted that there are not curbs in this area and would ask for a waiver of same. They can address the engineer's review comments at the public hearing.

Mr. Schmuckler asked that he bring the Percal map.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance the application to the June 18, 2013 meeting. No further notice required.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

- 5. SP 2006** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Bais Elimelech
Location: East Harvard Street
Block 226 Lots 16 & 17
Site Plan for addition to existing synagogue

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval to consolidate the subject properties and construct a 1,164 square foot addition to an existing one-story synagogue, which includes a finished basement. The applicant also proposes to construct a parking lot for the synagogue. The two (2) existing lots would be consolidated into a single tract for the proposed site. The architectural plans indicate the proposed addition to the east side of the existing synagogue on Lot 16 would increase the main sanctuary area to 1,889 square feet. An interior parking area is proposed mostly on Lot 17 to the west, consisting of fifteen (15) off-street parking spaces, one (1) being van accessible handicapped. Another proposed off-street parking space is proposed by an existing driveway in front of the synagogue addition. Minimum parking space size would be 9' X 18', except for the three (3) proposed parallel spaces. The proposed parallel parking spaces on the opposite side of the access aisle for the parking lot would be 8' X 22'. Other site improvements are also proposed for the project. The site is located in the north central portion of the Township on the north side of East Harvard Street east of Railroad Street. The site encompasses Lots 16 and 17 in Block 226. The total area of the site is 14,501 square feet, which is 0.33 acres. The existing synagogue, along with a shed to remain to the rear, is located on Lot 16. An existing one-story dwelling, along with a detached garage to the rear, is located on Lot 17. All existing improvements on Lot 17 would be removed. Lot 16 has existing concrete curb and sidewalk along the site frontage in good condition. Lot 17 has existing curb, but no sidewalk along the frontage. East Harvard Street is an improved municipal road with a forty foot (40') right-of-way. The site is in a developed section of the Township with the surrounding properties having mixed uses. The property is located in the R-10 Zone District. Places of worship are a permitted use. 1. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-10 Single-Family Residential District. Places of worship are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the provisions of Section 18-905. 2. The existing right-of-way width for the entire length of East Harvard Street is forty feet (40'). The Board must decide whether to require any right-of-way dedications or road widening easements. Bulk variances and/or site design would be impacted in either case. The correct width for any dedication or easement required would be five feet (5'). 3. The existing synagogue has a nonconforming front yard setback of 17.1 feet. Therefore, to permit the proposed building addition, a front yard setback variance would be required. A minimum front yard setback of thirty feet (30') is required. 4. A variance is being requested for minimum side yard setback. A minimum side yard setback of 3.7 feet is being requested for the addition, where a ten foot (10') side yard setback is required. However, based on the existing

building offset provided on the survey, we calculate that the proposed side yard setback for the addition would be 3.4 feet. The applicant's professionals shall confirm the magnitude of the minimum side yard setback variance being requested. 5. A variance is being requested from maximum building coverage. A building coverage of 27.1% is being requested, where a twenty-five percent (25%) building coverage is permitted. The maximum building coverage might be met with the removal of the existing shed. 6. The existing shed, which is an accessory structure, has a nonconforming rear yard setback of 1.9 feet. Unless the shed is removed or relocated, a variance would be required for minimum rear yard setback of an accessory structure. A minimum rear yard setback of ten feet (10') is required for an accessory structure. 7. According to Section 18-905A.2., no parking area shall be located closer than five feet (5') to any side or rear property line that are adjacent to residential zoned properties. Much of the proposed parking area is two feet (2') from the side property line which permits the construction of a six foot (6') vinyl fence, but does not leave room for additional landscape screening. Therefore, a buffer waiver is required for the location and screening of the parking area. 8. According to Section 18-905B.1., Perimeter Buffer: For properties adjacent to residential properties, if the site leaves a twenty foot (20') undisturbed area then there is no requirements for buffering. If the twenty foot (20') buffer is invaded or disturbed than requirements indicated in 18-905B.3., shall be put in place along the invaded area. A waiver is necessary from the twenty foot (20') buffer requirement to neighboring Lot 15. 9. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. An Outbound and Topographic Survey has been submitted for Lots 16 and 17. The following must be addressed: a. Fencing and concrete from adjoining Lot 19 encroach onto the site. These existing improvements will conflict with the proposed site design. b. Horizontal and vertical datum, as well as a bench mark should be added. c. The length of the easterly property line of Lot 16 should be corrected to one hundred fifty feet (150'). d. The existing lot areas should be added. e. Existing bituminous areas east of the synagogue must be shown. These areas impact impervious surface and drainage calculations. f. The stone area behind the synagogue should be added. 2. A General Note shall be added regarding horizontal and vertical datum, as well as a bench mark. 3. The existing and provided side yard setbacks should be checked and corrected. A dimension shall be added from the northwest corner of the synagogue to the property line of adjoining Lot 19. This distance is necessary to calculate the provided aggregate side yard setback. 4. The existing and proposed building dimensions and areas must be coordinated between the site plans and architectural plans. This information is important since it impacts the magnitude of bulk variances. 5. A dimension for the provided rear yard setback of the accessory structure must be added to the Zoning Requirements Table. 6. Proposed waiver information shall be added to the General Notes. 7. Some editing is required to the General Notes. 8. As indicated previously, sixteen (16) off-street parking spaces with one (1) handicapped space is being provided for the synagogue with proposed addition. Based on the expansion of the main sanctuary area to just under nineteen hundred square feet (1,900 SF), eleven (11) off-street parking spaces are required. Testimony should be provided that no catering is proposed and the number of off-street parking spaces is compliant. 9. Per our 4/24/13 site inspection, we note that concrete curbing exists along the East Harvard Street frontage of the site. Sidewalk only exists across the frontage of Lot 16. Sidewalk is being proposed across most of the Lot 17 frontage. The proposed sidewalk should be extended to the west property line extension on East Harvard Street. Curb ramps should be provided on both sides where the sidewalk crosses the proposed

access driveway. 10. The existing concrete curb in front of Lot 17 will almost entirely be replaced with depressed concrete curb for the proposed driveway. The proposed limit of curb replacement in front of Lot 17 should extend to meet the existing full face curb to the east of the proposed driveway. A proposed two foot (2') gutter reconstruction should be shown with the curb replacement. 11. The existing asphalt driveway shown in the southeast corner of the site should be corrected to concrete. 12. The status of the existing air conditioning units which will conflict with the proposed parking area must be addressed. 13. Minor corrections should be made to the setback lines. 14. A deed of consolidation and description shall be provided for review by the Planning Board Attorney and Engineer prior to filing with the Ocean County Clerk, should site plan approval be granted. 15. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony as to whether the congregation proposes to use curbside pickup by the Township. If so, a proposed storage area should be depicted on the plans. 16. Testimony should be provided on lines of sight and whether sight triangle easements are necessary for the proposed access driveway. 17. Unless waived by the Board, a shade tree and utility easement shall be provided. In addition, a deed of easement and description shall be provided for review by the Planning Board Attorney and Engineer prior to filing with the Ocean County Clerk, should site plan approval be granted. 18. Proposed traffic and handicapped parking sign locations shall be added to the site plan. 19. A six foot (6') high solid white vinyl fence is being proposed along the westerly side property line and across the rear property line. The height of the proposed fence along the westerly property line is decreased to four feet (4') within the front yard setback as required by ordinance. An existing four foot (4') high chain link fence in poor condition on the easterly property line is being left in place. We recommend this fence be replaced with a six foot (6') high solid white vinyl fence, the same as the other property lines.

B. Architectural

1. The proposed building is approximately nineteen feet (19') high consisting of a one-story structure with a finished basement. The first floor is almost six feet (6') above grade. The building does not exceed the allowable height of thirty-five feet (35').
2. The building square footage should be checked and coordinated with the site plans.
3. Testimony is required on ADA accessibility. It appears only the first floor is accessible.
4. Testimony should be provided as to whether the synagogue has a sprinkler system. The proposed addition will not require any new sanitary sewer or potable water services.
5. The relocation of existing air conditioning equipment should be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened.
6. The proposed roof drainage of the building must be coordinated with the site plans.
7. We recommend that color renderings of the building be provided for the Board's use at the forthcoming public hearing for the application.

C. Grading

1. Per review of the proposed grading, the overall design is reasonable.
2. Grading information is provided on Sheet 2 of the Site Plans. The following additional information should be provided:
 - a. More proposed curb grades.
 - b. Proposed contour lines.
 - c. Proposed high points.
3. The architectural plans indicate about a six foot (6') elevation difference between the first floor and finished grade. This approximate elevation difference is reflected on the site plans.
4. A soil log location is indicated on the drawings. Based on the soil log provided, the basement floor elevation shown on the site plan is greater than two feet (2') above the seasonal high water table elevation.
5. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review should approval be granted.

D. Storm Water Management

1. The Drainage Report needs to be revised to include the additional impervious areas not shown on the survey.
2. The Drainage Report should discuss soil replacement beneath the proposed recharge system.
3. The width of the stone bed for the recharge system should be increased to reduce the discharge from the one-hundred year storm.
4. The proposed pipe inverts for the recharge system shall be corrected to 95.50. The proposed sump elevations should also be corrected.
5. The proposed elevation for the top of stone on the Recharge System Detail shall be 97.50.
6. The design needs to be

completed for the proposed underground roof drainage system. 7. Storm water management will be reviewed in detail with a revised submission. E. Landscaping and Lighting 1. A dedicated Landscaping Plan is provided with the submission; proposed landscaping is depicted on Sheet 3 of the plans. 2. A proposed planting buffer has not been provided for the rear of the project. 3. A shade tree and utility easement should be shown across the frontage of the property. Proposed shade trees shall not conflict with any sight triangle easements. 4. Landscaping should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 5. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. 6. A dedicated Lighting Plan is provided with the submission; proposed lighting is depicted on Sheet 4 of the plans. 7. The Lighting design shows two (2) pole mounted lights and two (2) wall mounted lights for the proposed parking area. All four (4) proposed light fixtures will be one hundred fifty watt (150W) high pressure sodium. The proposed mounting height of all the fixtures must be clarified. A point to point diagram has been provided to show the adequacy of the proposed site lighting. 8. Shielding shall be provided to prevent light spillage onto adjoining properties. 9. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 10. Lighting will be reviewed in detail during compliance should site plan approval be granted. F. Utilities 1. The site is served by public water and sewer from New Jersey American Water since the project is within their franchise area. The existing service lines should be adequate since the proposed addition does not require expansion of the plumbing system for the synagogue. G. Signage 1. Regulatory signage shall be proposed. 2. No site identification or building signage information is provided. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. 3. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. H. Environmental 1. To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. Testimony should be provided on any known areas of environmental concern that exist within the property. 2. The existing property has a few large trees. A Tree Protection Management Plan must be provided as a condition of approval to comply with the Township's Tree Ordinance. 3. We recommend that all on-site materials and debris be removed and disposed in accordance with applicable local and state regulations. I. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. 2. Construction details are provided with the current design submission. We will review the construction details during compliance should site plan approval be granted. 3. Performance guarantees should be posted for any required improvements in accordance with Ordinance provisions. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Moshe Klein, Esq. stated that the applicant purchased the lot next door and they will be expanding the existing synagogue. He stated that a lot of the variances requested are a result of existing conditions. The plan proposed will be an improvement over the current conditions.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance the application to the June 18, 2013 meeting. No further notice required.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

- 6. SP 2007** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: 40 Airport Acquisition LLC
Location: Marlin Avenue
Block 1160.12 Lot 263
Site Plan for a proposed office building

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval to add a second 14,933 square foot one-story office building to the site. There is a 5,968 square foot one-story office building currently on the property. This approval would amend a previous preliminary and final major site plan approval for four (4) building additions to the existing office building, in two (2) phases, approved under Resolution SP# 1799, memorialized February 15, 2005. The existing facility is located on Airport Road within the Lakewood Industrial Park. According to the site plan, fifty-four (54) off-street parking spaces are proposed in an existing paved parking lot. Two (2) of the proposed spaces will be handicapped, both being van accessible. The site plan also indicates that fifty-three (53) off-street parking spaces are required. The parking requirements are based on one (1) space per every four hundred square feet (400 SF) of professional office space. Proposed parking spaces will be a minimum of 9' X 18'. The existing parking lot also contains an existing gravel area for overflow parking. Access to the site will be provided by an existing driveway from Airport Road. The tract consists of an almost rectangular 326.87' X 387.77' lot, which is 2.91 acres in area. The site is developed with a one-story office building. There is wooded area on the undeveloped portions of the property. The property generally slopes downwards from the existing building to the southeast. Freshwater wetlands exist in the southern corner of the tract. The site fronts the southeast side of Airport Road, between the Parkway exit road from Interchange 89 and the intersection of Cedar Bridge Avenue. Access to the site is from Airport Road which is an improved County Road having a 72.23' wide right-of-way. The east side of Airport Road was widened to provide an extra lane of traffic from the Parkway Interchange 89 exit. Municipally supplied water and sewer services are already serving the site. The existing land around the site is wooded, while lands across the street are improved with other professional office uses. The site is located in the PS Industrial Park Professional Service Zone. Professional offices are a permitted use in the zone. 1. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the PS, Industrial Park Professional Service Zone. Per Section 18-903O of the UDO, professional offices is an allowed permitted use. 2. Per review of the site plans and application, the existing site is nonconforming with respect to minimum lot area. The nonconforming lot area is 2.91 acres, whereas the required minimum lot area is three (3) acres. The survey and site plan indicate a previous right-of-way taking of 12.23 feet along Airport Road, which thereby decreased the area of a previously conforming lot to a nonconforming lot. Accordingly, the Board should grant a variance for this nonconforming lot area. It should be noted this same variance was granted with Resolution SP# 1799. 3. Per review of the site plans and application, the following design waivers are required: • Providing sidewalk along the project frontage. It should be noted that there is no existing sidewalk along

Airport Road in the vicinity of this project which is in the Industrial Park. • Providing a shade tree and utility easement along the Airport Road project frontage. There are existing shade trees across the southern half of the project frontage and shade trees are proposed across the northern half of the project frontage. It should be noted this same waiver was granted with Resolution SP# 1799. II. Review Comments Per review of the current design plans, we offer the following comments and recommendations: A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. A Boundary and Topographic Survey has been submitted. A vertical datum based on NAVD 1988 relative to an NGS monument has been provided. A horizontal datum and a vertical bench mark shall be provided on the plan. 2. Existing curb and pavement grades for the parking lot need to be added to the survey to determine whether the area properly drains to the overflow gravel parking. 3. Our site investigation notes the grate is missing from the existing inlet at the eastern corner of the site. The grate should be replaced to eliminate this hazardous situation. 4. The Property Owners list on the Cover Sheet appears correct. However, Barnegat Township has been referenced. 5. The Area Map on the Cover Sheet should be revised to correctly show the adjoining drainage easements shown on the Tax Map and Survey. 6. General Note #11 on the Cover Sheet indicates that trash and recyclable collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood. This would require approval from the Department of Public Works. Two (2) dumpsters on a concrete pad which is not enclosed or screened, is proposed at the end of the gravel overflow parking area. 7. The Site Plan assumes a fifty foot (50') transition area will be approved with the delineated freshwater wetlands line submitted to the NJDEP. 8. The Environmental Impact Statement and Storm Water Management Report have conflicting information as to whether a Riparian Buffer will be required. 9. Existing curb and sidewalk on the site is in need of repairs. 10. The asphalt area of the existing parking lot is in fair to poor condition. An overlay with sections of reconstruction should be considered. This parking lot resurfacing was agreed to in the previous approval. 11. Two (2) handicapped parking spaces, both spaces being van accessible, are proposed in the asphalt area of the existing parking lot. Three (3) handicapped parking spaces are required per ADA requirements since the number of proposed off-street parking spaces will exceed fifty (50). 12. Proposed curb ramps with detectable warning surface shall be properly designed. 13. The proposed off-street parking has been designed with all perpendicular spaces. Proposed striping must be added for the paved portions. Minimum space size shall be 9' X 18' with a minimum aisle width of twenty-four feet (24'). 14. Testimony should be provided on loading and deliveries for the site. 15. An existing wood shed is shown on the property. The existing location easily meets the accessory side and rear yard setbacks. Testimony should be provided on the use of the shed. 16. All proposed building access points should be coordinated between the architectural plans and site plans since they impact the design. 17. No sight triangles associated with the site access have been indicated and should be added. B. Architectural 1. Preliminary architectural elevations and a floor plan were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the average building height will be about sixteen feet, four inches (16'-4") high, far less than the sixty-five foot (65') allowable height. 2. The title of the plans should be revised to show the correct block and lot numbers. 3. The preliminary architectural plans should be revised to show the proposed building square footage to be 14,933 square feet. 4. The plans show three (3) large proposed rooms running through the center of the building length. Mostly individual offices are proposed for the remainder of the building. Testimony should be provided on the proposed floor area usage. 5. 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. 6. Testimony should be provided as to whether any roof-mounted HVAC equipment is proposed. If so, said equipment should be adequately

screened. C. Grading 1. A Grading Plan is provided on Sheet 3 of 14. 2. According to our review of the architectural plans, the proposed building exposure should vary between elevations 31.0 and 32.2. Therefore, the proposed grading needs to be coordinated with the architectural plans. 3. The proposed floor of the storm water management basin needs to be raised to elevation 26.5 to insure a two foot (2') separation from the bottom of the sand layer to seasonal high water table. 4. A review of final grading revisions will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. The proposed building will add almost fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF) of new impervious coverage to the site, which is more than a quarter acre. This is exclusive of any site improvements which will add further new impervious coverage. Therefore, the project qualifies as major development and storm water management must be addressed accordingly. 2. Our review of the Drainage Area Maps indicates there are proposed improvements outside of the existing drainage area shown; therefore the existing drainage area should be revised. A proposed drainage area tributary to the basin should be delineated, with the remaining area consistent to the existing drainage area shown as a bypass area. The Storm Water Management Report shall be revised in accordance with the drainage area corrections. 3. Proposed roof downspouts are shown with an underground roof leader drainage system designed for the building. The design should be finalized with consideration given to other grading and storm water management comments. 4. A storm water management maintenance manual shall be provided in accordance with NJ Stormwater Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township standards. The manual may be limited to only the new storm water management proposed for the site. E. Landscaping 1. A Landscape Plan has been provided on Sheet 5 of 14. 2. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board. 3. Three (3) Pin Oaks in front of the new building is all that is proposed for landscaping. Additional landscaping should be proposed. 4. Utilities and easements should be shown on the Landscape Plan to avoid planting conflicts. 5. The Notes indicate an irrigation system will be installed. Confirming testimony should be provided. 6. Landscaping will be reviewed in detail after plan revisions are submitted. F. Lighting 1. A Lighting Plan has been provided which is Sheet 6 of 14. 2. In accordance with our site investigation, the existing site has two (2) pole mounted Town and Country lights, double flood lights mounted on a telephone pole, and a building mounted light on the rear of the existing building. Per review of the Lighting Plan, three (3) one hundred fifty watt (150W) building mounted lights are proposed for the new building and three (3) one hundred fifty watt (150W) pole mounted Town and Country lights are proposed for the overflow parking area. 3. The proposed height of the building mounted lights must be corrected since they exceed the one-story building height. 4. The existing pole mounted light further to the southeast is in poor condition and requires replacement. The pole mounted lights for the Town and Country lights are twelve feet (12') high. The double flood lights on the telephone pole are thirty feet (30') high. 5. A point to point diagram has been provided to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. Additional lighting shall be provided to increase the minimum intensity in the paved portion of the parking lot to 0.5 foot-candles. The increased intensity should improve the uniformity ratio to be less than the 15:1 permitted. It is our opinion that the overflow parking area should not have to meet the ordinance standards. 6. Details must be provided for the proposed light poles. 7. Lighting revisions can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. G. Utilities 1. Public water and sewer services are being provided by the Lakewood Township Municipal Utilities Authority. 2. The sewer lateral to the existing building should be shown. An existing clean out is indicated in the right-of-way. 3. Proposed water and sewer connections are shown for the new building. A six inch (6") sewer lateral is proposed. Proposed water service consists of a two inch (2") domestic line and a four inch (4") fire service. H. Signage 1. An

existing sign with a blank face is shown in front of the existing building. The future status of the sign has not been indicated. 2. No new proposed free-standing or wall mounted signage have been provided on the site plans. 3. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with the Township Ordinance. I. Environmental 1. Site Summary Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract is currently improved with an existing office building, parking, and other site amenities. Wooded area has been left on the undeveloped portions of the property. The property generally slopes downwards from the building to the southeast. Freshwater wetlands exist within the southern corner of the tract. To assess the site for environmental concerns, a natural resources search of the property and surroundings was completed using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. The project assumes a fifty foot (50') transition area will be assigned to the wetlands line submitted to the NJDEP for a Letter of Interpretation. 2. Environmental Impact Statement An Environmental Impact Statement has been submitted. The report requires some general revisions for coordination with the site plan. 3. Tree Management Plan The project must comply with the new Township Ordinance Chapter XIX, Protection of Trees. We recommend the applicant's engineer contact our office to review discrepancies in the Tree Save Plan provided. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 7 through 9 of 14 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 must be completed for all improvements. 4. 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; and i. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. wanted to clarify that this is not for an addition. It is for a second free standing building on the lot.

Mr. MacFarlane said that the only variance requested is for lot area which is an existing condition which was created by a right-of-way taking a few years back.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to advance the application to the June 18, 2013 meeting. No further notice required.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. **SP 2005AA** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Bais Medrash Chayim Inc
Location: James Street & Sunset Road

Block 284.06 Lot 22

Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to change a single-family home into a school and dormitory

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Site Plan Exemption/Change of Use approval for conversion of an existing two-story single-family residential dwelling into a proposed school with a dormitory, via a building addition to the rear. As depicted on the Change of Use site plans, the existing driveway will be enlarged a 24-foot wide interior access drive and eight (8) off-street parking spaces (four spaces proposed as stacked), and interior sidewalk extending from the stacked parking area, along the westerly side of the dwelling and along the rear of the proposed addition. As indicated on the architectural plan, a 1,013 sf area designated "Bais Medrash", two (2) classrooms, two (2) offices, a kitchen, and dining room are proposed on the first floor. On the second floor, two (2) new bathrooms and four (pre-existing) bedrooms are depicted. The site is located on the northwest corner of James Street and Sunset Road. Per the survey plan, curb and sidewalk exists along both property frontages. The property is irregular in shape, and is approximately 15,194 sf in area. The site is currently surrounded primarily by single-family development. The Change of Use site plans were revised per input received from Board members and the public at the 4/23/13 hearing. The following changes revisions were made to the Change of Use Site Plans: • To address concerns raised regarding buffer to adjacent properties, a perimeter buffer is proposed including 4-foot high Post and Rail Fence along portions of the property line between the proposed school building and adjacent Lot 21. • Additionally, evergreen buffer (32 Leyland Cypresses) is proposed along the side and rear yards to provide additional visual buffer. • Finally, 6' foot high vinyl fencing is depicted as proposed, behind (at least) a portion of the proposed evergreen landscaping facing existing Lot 21. We have the following comments per review of the revised submission, our initial review letter, and testimony at the 4/22/13 Planning Board hearing: I. Zoning • The property is located in the R-12 (Single Family Residential) Zone. Private schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906 of the UDO. Fact. • Per review of the Site Plan, no bulk variances appear necessary for the change of use request. Fact. • Per review of the Site Plan, the following design waivers are required for proposed project: • Providing shade trees across the site frontage (unless proposed). Fact. • Providing site lighting. Fact. • Providing a 20 foot landscape perimeter buffer per Section 18-906A-2 of the UDO. Per review of site information, it appears that there is existing vegetation present in the perimeter of the site. As indicated above, substantial additional buffer landscaping and screening has been provided on the revised plans. However, the limits of proposed fencing are not identified. We recommend that the applicant's professionals bring a rendering to the forthcoming hearing, identifying limits of fencing for the Board's review. II. Review Comments 1. Testimony should be provided by the applicant for the Board to support the proposed change in use, including but not limited to the following issues: a. How many students (and teachers and employees) are proposed for the school portion of the use. b. Will any students drive and park near the school? c. Is busing proposed? d. How students will be dropped off and picked up (by car)? e. How many students would be housed for the proposed dormitory use? f. How many staffers (rabbi, schoolteachers, maintenance, etc.) will be at the site at any one time? Testimony was provided at the 4/23/13 hearing. 2. Per Section 18-906C of the UDO, one (1) off-street parking space is required for each Meeting Room, Classroom and Office. Counting the "Bais Medrash" area as a Meeting Room area, and the two (2) classrooms and two (2) offices, five (5) off-street spaces are required per the UDO (excluding the proposed dormitory use). Eight (8) spaces are proposed. Parking will be

provided to the satisfaction of the Board. Fact. 3. Per Note #9 on the Change of Use site plan, professionals, trash and recyclables will put curbside for Township pickup. Fact. 4. Testimony should be provided regarding proposed existing and proposed lighting (if any). Lighting shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. Testimony was provided at the 4/23/13 hearing. 5. Construction details should be provided for any proposed new site improvements deemed necessary (if any), in accordance with Township standards. We note that details have been provided on the current plans. At a minimum, additional design information should be provided for the proposed handicap ramps at the new driveway crossing. This information can be provided during compliance review (if/when approval is granted). Fact. 6. Information and/or testimony should be provided that existing utilities serving the building are adequate for the proposed school use. The Change of Use plans show no information regarding existing and proposed utilities (i.e., water and sewer). Testimony was provided at the 4/23/13 hearing. As requested by the Board, on-site drainage (dry well other) will also be part of any forthcoming approvals. 7. Per Sheet 3 of the Change of Use site plan, site grading (and disturbance) is proposed to the limits of the property (potentially leaving no existing perimeter vegetation after construction). As indicated above, substantial additional buffer landscaping and screening has been provided on the revised plans. 8. Any additional information necessary to document compliance with Section 18-906, "Public and Private Schools" of the UDO should be provided. Fact. 9. The site plan waiver (if approved) does not relieve the applicant's obligation to obtain necessary building permits and construction code reviews. Fact.

Mr. Rennert stepped down.

Mr. Abraham Penzer, Esq. on behalf of the application stated that this is a continuation from the last meeting and a few of the members who were not at that meeting were kind enough to listen to the recording.

Mayor Ackerman and Mr. Lankry both listened to the April 23, 2013 recording for this application.

Mr. Jackson reminded Mr. Lines that he is still under oath.

Mr. Lines said that they are proposing a 6 ft white vinyl fence which will be 10 ft off the property line on the two sides and the rear. The fence will extend up to the front corner of the house on each side. On the outside of the white vinyl fence, they will put a single row of cypresses. He stated that there is an existing 6 ft fence on this property. So there will be a post and rail fence, a row of cypresses and then the white vinyl fence on the applicant's side.

Mr. Penzer said there will be either no windows on the second floor or they will be opaque so you can't see through them.

Mr. Lines also said that the windows on the first floor will be at least 6 ft off the ground so you won't be looking at the property next door.

Mr. Penzer read a letter from Yosef Magid who is the owner of the shopping center across the street.

Mr. Franklin asked how you can control that.

Mr. Penzer said you can't.

Mr. Franklin mentioned that he drove past the Princeton Avenue school and there is not supposed to be any parking on Mary's Lane but he said there is 37 cars parked there. He said there is going to be a problem if you can't control it.

Mr. Percal asked if he could put signs up to designate the spots.

Mr. Penzer said the owner can't do that because he needs a certain number of spaces as per his approval. These spaces are not used because they are furthest away from the stores and they are close to the school.

Mr. Franklin opened to the public.

Mr. Brandon Molte, 244 Sunset Road, was sworn in and stated that he counted all the spots in the shopping center and there are only 216 spots. Some of the spots have yellow lines painted over the white lines that say "loading zone" and it's for all the trucks for the non-profit grocery store. He went through the parking requirements for the shopping center. He said that they do not have the correct amount of parking spots to begin with and now the applicant wants to designate spots to that school. He stated that the parking lot is consistently full.

Mr. Schmuckler explained that the applicant does meet the UDO for parking but the Board feels they don't have enough spots.

Mr. Molte went on that the stacked parking is within the buffer which is not allowed.

Mr. Vogt said that two spaces are within the 20 ft buffer. If the Board eliminates those 2 spaces, you are then down to 6 spaces which is still above the requirement.

Mr. Molte said they were told the building was only going to be 16 ft high. After he reviewed the architectural plans, the building is actually 30 ft high.

Mr. Penzer doesn't know where 16 ft came from. The ordinance provides 35 ft in that zone and the building will be 30 ft.

Mr. Jackson reminded Mr. David Molte that he is still under oath. He stated that this is his personal private home and he is emotionally attached to it. He moved into a development, not a shopping center or next to an institution. He believes the development should be maintained. He said there are times he can't get out of his driveway. This will be a burden on his family. He stated he was looking for a kind of berm behind the fence that would add a natural blind, not just a cold fence. He will walk out his back door and he is going to be looking at a dormitory. He also said that the Rabbi does not live directly across the street. He lives approximately a block and a half away. He was disheartened to hear that because he thought the Rabbi would keep a close eye on the students in the evening and that is not so. He showed a map to the Board which showed where the school is and where the Rabbi lives.

Mr. Jackson marked the map as O-1.

Mr. Molte stated that if you stand at the Rabbi's house, the school is not visible.

Mr. Jackson reminded Mr. Dustin Molte that he is still under oath. He is concerned about the garbage and recycling for the site.

Conversation ensued between Mr. Penzer and Mr. Dustin Molte concerning this lot to be non-conforming.

Mr. Dustin Molte said that a dormitory is not listed under zone R-12.

Mr. Penzer said the definition of a dorm is an ancillary use and it has been done many times in the past. Where schools are permitted, dormitories are permitted. This Board has ruled on these kind of applications before.

Mr. Molte said that this is a planned educational campus. He proceeded to read the definition in the UDO.

Mr. Vogt said he believes that one of the requirements for a planned educational campus is a minimum of 3 acres.

Mr. Penzer said this is not a campus. It is a school with an ancillary dormitory.

Mr. Franklin asked if dorm rooms are permitted in the school ordinance.

Mrs. Morris said that to her knowledge, dorms are not specified anywhere within the ordinance as being permitted or not permitted as part of schools. Traditionally this Board has treated them as an ancillary use to the school. The campus ordinance, because it is newer and thoroughly developed, while not designed for this type of school, has a very broad ranging definition to which this type of development could fit within except for the fact the area requirement is 3 acres.

Mr. Vogt sees the planned educational campus as more of an overlay. If you meet the qualifications you can apply it. It doesn't necessarily fit everything.

Mr. Dustin Molte said it still doesn't change the fact that this is a campus.

The campus ordinance is an array of buildings consisting of classrooms, apartments with a rental component. The ordinance was not intended for one building.

There was conversation between several of the members and the professionals on whether or not this is a planned educational campus. The consequences of this ruling was discussed and how it would effect past approvals that were similar in nature.

Mr. Percal does not believe this is a campus, it is a school with a dormitory. He made the argument that if this application were to have a minimum of 3 acres then there would be approximately 6 students per acre. He further stated that if there is a minimum of 3 acres then there should be a minimum of students.

Mayor Ackerman said a few years ago the colleges got together because they wanted to do more on their properties so they created this ordinance for leniency purposes.

Mr. Dustin Molte also said that dormitories are mentioned in the UDO, just not under the R-12 which is what this is zoned for.

Mr. Moshe Newmark was sworn in. He testified that this school has a faculty member present from around 7:30 am to 1:00 am. He said it is less than a 5 minute walk from the dean's house to the school. He attested that the students are kind and well behaved. He does not believe there will be any issues.

Mr. Franklin asked if there is someone in charge when the dean goes home.

Mr. Newmark said that the oldest boy reports to the dean every morning.

Mr. Aaron Kreiswirth, 228 Sunset Road, was sworn in. He asked what happens if this application is approved and down the road there is a new school moving in and it's not the same boys.

Mr. Jackson said that the approval runs with the land not the property owners. The Board has to look at the property and the use more so than who the actual owner is currently.

Mr. Molte said there is a contradiction between the ages of the students in the school. He is concerned about the supervision.

Mr. Penzer said the Rabbi has been teaching boys for 30 years. He is a known leader in the Jewish world of taking care of the boys. He said if the rabbi is not present then it will be somebody who is at least 24 years old who will be designated to care of them at night. That can be a condition of the approval.

Mr. Franklin said that should be a condition.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if there is a basement.

Mr. Lines said no.

Mr. Schmuckler asked how the parking spaces were calculated.

Mr. Lines said it is based on staff. There will be 3 teachers and 2 office workers during the day.

Mr. Schmuckler said he is torn because it is a permitted use but on the other hand if a yeshiva were to move in next to him he would be very upset. He will not be making a motion.

Mr. Franklin said that back when the school ordinance first passed they did not imagine having hundreds of schools in Lakewood. This ordinance should be looked at closer now that more and more schools are coming in and it's getting tighter.

Mr. Percal agrees with Mr. Franklin.

Mr. Herzl made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Lankry.

Mr. Jackson said he had some notes which would be included in the motion. The school would be limited to 20 students. There will be no basement. The school would designate a supervisor for the overnight hours. There would be a maximum of 3 teachers during the day. All the items in the revised plans included but not limited to the fence, landscaping and windows. The agreement for additional parking spaces at the shopping center across the street.

Mr. Lankry asked about the possibility of a berm.

Mr. Lines said that it would create an issue with puddles. He will be putting in evergreens starting at 6 ft.

Mr. Lankry said that is acceptable.

Mr. Herzl wants to make sure that the lighting does not spill over into the neighbor's properties.

Mr. Penzer agreed.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Lankry

No: Mr. Franklin

Abstain: Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Schmuckler

Mr. Jackson believes the motion did not pass but he would look into it.

Mayor Ackerman may be able to vote on it next time if they carry it.

The Board took a ten minute recess.

Mr. Jackson confirmed that the motion did not pass. The Board may want to table the application until there are more members to sit in.

A motion was made by Mayor Ackerman to table this application to May 21, 2013.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Lankry, Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Schmuckler

Mr. Jackson recommends that the Board does not discuss this application except with the Board professionals.

Mr. Jackson announced that this application has been adjourned and will be heard on May 21, 2013. There will be no further notices.

- 2. SP 2004** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Bnos Devorah
Location: Vermont Avenue

Block 1154, 1155 Lots 1, 1
Site Plan for proposed girls school

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of an Elementary School for Girls along with site improvements, on the subject premises. This site is the same location as Conifer Village which was submitted to the Board last year. The Conifer Village project was not acted upon by the Board. According to the preliminary architectural plans submitted, the proposed building consists of seventy-nine thousand forty-one square feet (79,041 SF). A twenty-six thousand five hundred two square foot (26,502 SF) footprint which includes a basement and two (2) floors is proposed. The proposed project site consists of Lot 1 in Block 1154, and Lot 1 in Block 1155. Lot 1 in Block 1154 and Lot 1 in Block 1155 are owned by the Township of Lakewood. A previous approval under Resolution SD-1836, Homes for All, used a portion of Lot 1 in Block 1155 for a regional storm water management facility. The regional storm water management facility does not appear on this site plan. The site is in the southern portion of the Township, on the south side of Oak Street. According to the survey submitted, the subject 4.10 acre properties to be developed are surrounded by Lambert Avenue to the east, Madeline Avenue to the south, Vermont Avenue to the west, and Oak Street to the north. Lambert Avenue and Madeline Avenue are fifty foot (50') wide unimproved right-of-ways. A section of Lambert Avenue is proposed to be improved south of Oak Street. School bus egress from the site would be to Lambert Avenue. Vermont Avenue is a sixty-six foot (66') wide unimproved right-of-way. Vermont Avenue has been previously cleared, and poles with overhead electric lines have been constructed on the west side of the right-of-way. A small portion of Vermont Avenue is proposed to be improved as part of this project from where it intersects with a site ingress driveway to the south side of Oak Street. School bus access to the proposed site would be from this improved section of Vermont Avenue. Oak Street is an improved road with a sixty-six foot (66') right-of-way and a forty foot (40') pavement width borders the proposed future development to the north. A proposed access driveway too narrow for two-way traffic connects the parking area in front of the school with Oak Street. Proposed sanitary sewer service will connect to a pump station which would be constructed on-site. A proposed force main from this pump station would discharge flow into an existing sanitary sewer manhole near the intersection of Vine Avenue and Oak Street. Proposed potable water for the site will connect to an existing main on the south side of Oak Street. A seventy (70) space off-street parking lot with three (3) van accessible handicap spaces is proposed for the project. The project is also proposing sidewalk along the improved portions of its frontages on Vermont Avenue, Oak Street, and Lambert Avenue. As discussed at the May 7, 2013 workshop hearing, the project has been revised to shift the building location such that all previously-proposed variances (except front yard setback) have been eliminated. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable as requested per our following comments, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted. We have the following comments and recommendations: 1. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-40/20 Cluster Residential District. Private schools are a permitted use in the zone. 2. A variance has been requested for front yard setback. A front yard setback of twenty-four feet (24') is proposed from Lambert Avenue, whereas a fifty foot (50') setback is required. 3. Partial design waivers are required from completing road improvements across all of the project frontages. 4. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the required variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials

and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Maple Tree Village (applicant, Homes for All) was approved under Resolution SD-1836 with a storm water management basin proposed for a substantial portion of existing Lot 1 in Block 1155. This storm water management basin is missing from the site plan submitted. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, this will be addressed as a condition of Board approval (if forthcoming). 2. The General Notes should be revised to reference the survey submitted. Horizontal datum and a bench mark should be provided. The survey notes topographic information is based on NGVD 1929. 3. The General Notes require some editing. 4. The Zone Requirements need corrections. The provided lot area should be based on the survey submitted. The provided rear yard setback should be twenty-three feet (23'). The provided side yard setbacks do not appear to be applicable. The required accessory setbacks should be ten feet (10'). The provided building coverage based on the preliminary architectural plans and survey submitted is 14.8%, well below the twenty percent (20%) allowable. 5. Off-street parking: Based on the preliminary architectural plans submitted, the off-street parking requirements should be revised. 6. Curb and sidewalk is proposed within the interior of the development. Curb is proposed along both sides of Lambert Avenue and Vermont Avenue with the improvement of the roads. Sidewalk is proposed along the most of the project's improved road frontage. New sidewalk should be extended to the limits of the proposed road improvements along Lambert and Vermont Avenues. Proposed sidewalk must be widened to five feet (5') unless pedestrian bypass areas are designed. 7. A thirty foot (30') pavement width is proposed for Vermont Avenue. The existing right-of-way width for Vermont Avenue is sixty-six feet (66'). A proposed pavement width of forty feet (40') must be provided, consistent with previous approvals. It is likely Vermont Avenue will become a collector road in the future. 8. An eighteen foot (18') wide access driveway which is only wide enough for one-way traffic is proposed between the parking lot and Oak Street. The direction of proposed traffic flow has not been indicated. 9. Proposed school bus spaces of twelve foot (12') wide by forty foot (40') long should be striped in accordance with the ordinance. 10. The access aisle width behind the proposed handicap spaces will be inadequate when a school bus is parked in the vicinity. 11. Testimony should be given regarding proposed circulation with the site layout (parking, access, etc.). There is a one-way counterclockwise bus circulation proposed from Oak Street which enters the site from Vermont Avenue and exits the project to Lambert Avenue. 12. Testimony should also be provided as to the maximum number of staff professionals at the site during school operations. 13. Testimony is necessary from the applicant's professionals regarding how the proposed bus parking and bus drop off areas will be used, including but not limited to times, sizes, and types of vehicles anticipated. 14. The proposed Site Layout Plan requires better coordination with the preliminary Architectural Plans. Significant discrepancies have been noted between the footprints. Proposed dimensions for the building and setbacks must be to the hundredth of a foot, since it impacts the layout and variances required. Proposed building square footage should also be coordinated. 15. Proposed curb radii shall be provided at all locations which are not the typical five foot (5') radii. 16. Refuse and recycling areas are proposed for the project adjacent the terminus of the improvements to Lambert Avenue. The proposed location is poor since any future extension of Lambert Avenue will leave these areas at the front property line next to an improved street. Testimony should be provided on collection. If refuse and recycling collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood, DPW approval will be required. The proposed areas have not been screened. 17. The existing blocks and lots should be consolidated. 18. Sight Triangle Easements have not been proposed at the intersection of streets and should be added. 19. Proposed shade trees shall be added along all

improved frontages, and shade tree and utility easements shall be added to all frontages, unless waivers are sought. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

B. Architectural

1. Preliminary Architectural Plans were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, it is anticipated the proposed two (2) floor building with basement will be around thirty feet (30') in height. The proposed plans should be revised to indicate the proposed building height on the elevation views. Thirty-five feet (35') is the allowable building height.
2. Proposed layout, dimensions, and square footages must be coordinated between the architectural plans and site plans. Proposed setback variances could be impacted.
3. We recommend that renderings be provided for the board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum.
4. Testimony should confirm a sprinkler system is proposed. A four inch (4") water service connection which branches into fire and domestic service lines near the building is proposed on the site plans.
5. Testimony should be provided as to where HVAC equipment is proposed for the building and how the equipment will be adequately screened.
6. An elevator is proposed for handicap accessibility throughout the proposed building. Handicap access into the proposed building should be addressed. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

C. Grading

1. Detailed grading is provided on a Grading & Drainage Plan which is Sheet 3 of 20. The grading design generally directs runoff to proposed inlets. A storm sewer collection system is proposed to collect this runoff. Most of the proposed site runoff will be conveyed by piping to a proposed infiltration/detention basin. The school building roof runoff will be conveyed by piping to a proposed underground recharge system.
2. Profiles have been provided for Vermont Avenue and Lambert Avenue, as well as for the off-site force main proposed in Oak Street.
3. Profiles should be provided for the proposed storm drainage system.
4. The elevation for Test Pit #1 should be corrected to 82.4. This raises the seasonal high water table to elevation seventy-five (75). Therefore, the underground recharge system will need to be redesigned with a bottom elevation of seventy-seven (77), two feet (2') above seasonal high water table.
5. The proposed grading concept is feasible. We have not conducted a detailed review of the grading because of the plan revisions anticipated. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

D. Storm Water Management

1. Proposed storm sewer collection systems have been designed to convey storm water runoff to a proposed infiltration/detention basin. The proposed infiltration/detention basin is located in the northwest corner of the property near the intersection of Oak Street and Vermont Avenue. An underground recharge system has been designed beneath the proposed parking lot, south of Oak Street. The underground recharge system is for the proposed roof runoff from the school building. The plans indicate the ownership and maintenance of each storm water management system will be the responsibility of the property owner.
2. Proposed storm manholes shall be added at drainage piping intersections with the property lines to transition systems ownership between the Township and property owner.
3. The narrative of the Storm Water Management Report should better summarize the proposed design. Our review speculates the proposed separate infiltration/detention basin is being designed to accommodate water quality and quantity, while the proposed underground recharge system would just accommodate water quantity from roof runoff. Therefore, peak site discharges would be controlled by the combination of these two (2) components.
4. The design for the storm water collection piping for the roof of the proposed school building is only schematic at this time.
5. The Storm Water Management Design will be reviewed in detail after anticipated plan revisions are submitted. Per

communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

E. Landscaping

1. Landscaping has been provided on Sheet 5 of 20 of the Site Development Plans.
2. At this time only shade trees are proposed for landscaping. Additional landscaping should be provided.
3. All proposed shade tree and utility easements, sight triangle easements, and utility lines should be added to prevent planting conflicts.
4. 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. Per our site inspection of the property, the site is wooded with the exception of the Vermont Avenue right-of-way which has been cleared.
5. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after anticipated plan revisions are submitted. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

F. Lighting

1. Lighting has been provided for the parking areas of the site on Sheet 6 of 20 in the Site Development Plans.
2. The Plan indicates five (5) pole mounted double fixture lights are proposed on-site. Another pole mounted single fixture light is proposed for the entrance drive near Vermont Avenue. According to the Pole Mounted Lighting Detail, the proposed height will be eighteen feet (18').
3. A Building Mounted Light Detail has been provided, but no building lights shown.
4. A point to point diagram must be provided to verify the adequacy of the proposed lighting.
5. Lighting has not been provided for Vermont Avenue and Lambert Avenue.
6. Testimony should be provided regarding lighting ownership.
7. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board.
8. Lighting shall be reviewed in detail after anticipated plan revisions are submitted. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

G. Utilities

1. 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. An on-site pump station is proposed for sewage service. A proposed force main will be constructed from the pump station to an existing sanitary sewer manhole in the vicinity of the Oak Street and Vine Avenue intersection. Testimony should be provided as to whether the reason for not proposing gravity sewer is because of the depth of excavation that would be required. Also, testimony should be provided as to whether the pump station will be temporary since future sanitary sewer is being planned for Oak Street.
3. We recommend a "dry" sanitary sewer service lateral be proposed for future connection to a proposed system by others in Oak Street. A preliminary layout of the system by others was shown on Oak Street with the Conifer Village plans previously submitted to this Board.
4. Potable water service is proposed to be connected from an existing main on the south side of Oak Street.
5. The location of the closest fire hydrant should be added to the plans. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

H. Signage

1. Some proposed regulatory signage has been shown on the plans. Some regulatory sign details have been provided.
2. No project identification signage or building mounted signage has been proposed. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application.
3. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided as applicable, and remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted.

I. Environmental

1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site investigation of the property, the tract is wooded with the exception of Vermont Avenue which

has been cleared and has utility poles containing overhead electric lines. Fact. 2. Environmental Impact Statement An Environmental Impact Statement was provided for review and addresses environmental concerns as applicable. The project is exempt from CAFRA permit requirements as an educational facility. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) should be amended in accordance with anticipated plan revisions to the project. Fact. 3. Tree Management An incomplete Tree Protection Plan has been submitted. The Tree Protection Plan shall be completed and submitted with the project plan revisions. Fact. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 7 – 10 of 20 on the plans. 2. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township or NJDOT standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. 3. Review of construction details will take place after revised plans are submitted. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, remaining technical issues addressed during compliance if/when approval is granted. III. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Fire Commissioners; d. Ocean County Planning Board; e. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and f. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. stated that the applicant received approval back in 2008 for a girl's elementary school on Prospect Street. In 2011, they came back before the Board to construct an addition. The school has now outgrown that building and they have sold that building to a smaller school. They are now going to construct a brand new 80,000 SF facility. She said that the engineer's report mentioned that the property is still owned by Lakewood Township but that is incorrect. The applicant acquired the property since the time the application was filed. She said there are currently 13 classes from primary through fourth grade with a total of 327 students. Next year they are hoping for 16 classes from primary through fifth grade with approximately 400 students. The stormwater management required was for the past approval and that approval is no longer valid. She also mentioned that the applicant has executed a contract with the owner of lot 6 to purchase that lot. They will shift the building over and eliminate the front yard variance.

Mr. Graham MacFarlane, P.E., was sworn in. He reiterated that they will shift the building and eliminate that variance. They are providing 78 parking spaces. Two separate stormwater facilities consisting of a basin and an underground recharge system. They will be able to address the engineer's review letter. There will be a recreation in the rear of the school. The acquisition of lot 6 will allow them to expand the recreation area as well.

Mr. Herzl asked if there will be playground equipment.

Mr. MacFarlane said they will provide equipment but none is selected yet. Busses will be entering from a portion of Vermont Avenue that they will be improving. Staff members and other vehicles will be entering from Oak Street. All traffic will be exiting on a portion of Lambert Avenue which will be improved.

Mr. Franklin opened to the public, seeing no one he closed to the public.

Mr. Herzl made a motion to approve the application, seconded by Mr. Follman.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mayor Ackerman, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Percal

6. CORRESPONDENCE

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