

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, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

4. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

1. **SP 2000** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Sephardic Congregation of Lakewood, Inc.
Location: Spruce Street
Block 782 Lot 82
Site Plan for proposed house of worship

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler and seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the resolution.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Percal

5. PUBLIC HEARING

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 – no additional testimony proposed.

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 Cyprresses) 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.

Mrs. Morris stated that this application has been heard at two previous meetings and now no additional testimony is being proposed. Two board members, Mr. Neiman and Mr. Percal, have listened to the recordings and can now vote on this application.

A question arose as to exactly how many students there will be total in the school and dormitory.

Mr. Penzer stated that there will be a total of 20 students in the school.

Mr. Percal made a motion to approve this application based on all the previous testimony, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Percal
No: Mr. Franklin

2. **SP 2015** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Chambers Crescent, LLC
Location: Cedar Bridge Avenue
Block 536 Lot 122
Site Plan for 63 affordable housing multi-family units

Project Description

The applicant (Crescent Village, LLC) is seeking Preliminary Site Plan approval only for the redevelopment of the existing John F. Kennedy Apartments (Public Housing) development located at the northwest intersection of Cedarbridge Avenue and South Clover Street. The owner of the existing development is the Lakewood Housing Authority (LHA). The existing JFK Apartment Complex consists of eleven (11) residential apartment buildings, one (1) common building, and a recreation facility including a baseball field and basketball court. The proposed development includes demolition of all existing apartment buildings, and redevelopment of the existing developed footprint with six (6) new Garden Apartment Buildings, with sixty-three (63)

new 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom apartment units. Additional proposed improvements include a new 1,750 square foot common area building, a new access drive through the development, one hundred and thirty-four (134) new off-street parking spaces, on-site stormwater management, sidewalk, curbing, landscaping, and lighting. The proposed project site consists of Lot 122 in Block 536. As indicated previously, the owner of the property is the Lakewood Housing Authority (LHA). The property is approximately 6.93 acres in size. As illustrated on the "Key and Zoning Map" on Sheet 1 of the site plans, most of the property is located within the PH-1 (Public Housing) Zone. Three (3) portions of the property are located within the R-40 (Single Family Residential) Zone – two (2) sections of existing recreational use along Singer Way, and a triangular-shaped portion of undeveloped property in the northeast portion of the site. All proposed redevelopment, including new apartment buildings, access drive, off-street parking and new amenities appears to be within the portion of the property zoned as Public Housing (PH-1). As illustrated on the site plans, a U-shaped, twenty-four foot (24') wide, two-way interior access drive is proposed within the site, with both access points from the west side of South Clover Street. Curbing and sidewalk exist along the property frontage. Curbing and sidewalk are proposed throughout the interior of the project. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Waivers A. The following submission waivers have been requested: 1. C13 – Environmental Impact Statement 2. C14 – Tree Protection Management Plan. We support the above-referenced waivers for Preliminary Site Plan approval purposes. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to provide a site survey signed and sealed by a licensed land surveyor as part of the Final Site Plan application. Environmental Impact Statement and Tree Protection Plan waivers are sought because the existing property has previously been developed. II. Zoning 1. As noted previously, the majority of the site, including the area to be redeveloped is located in the Public Housing (PH-1) Zoning District. Per Section 18-902J of the UDO, low income housing is permitted in the PH-1 Zone. Further, per Section 18-902B-7 of the UDO, Planned Affordable Residential Development (including multifamily residential development) is a permitted use in the R-40 (Single-Family Residential) Zoning District. Therefore, it is our opinion that the proposed redevelopment of this property as proposed is permitted in the UDO. 2. A variance is requested for average minimum dwelling unit size. 1,017 square feet per unit is proposed, where 1,100 square foot minimum is required per UDO R-40 Planned Affordable Residential Development Standards. There is no minimum dwelling unit size requirement in the PH-1 Zone where the proposed units are located. Since the apartment buildings are proposed in the PH-1 Zone, we support this variance as proposed. 3. A variance is requested for the number of parking stalls proposed, versus required, per R-40 Zone requirements (i.e., 2.2 spaces per multi-family unit RSIS requirements). The applicant's engineer estimates 145 parking spaces required per R-40 (and RSIS) Standards, with 134 spaces proposed. It should be noted that in PH-1 Zoning, only one (1) space per dwelling unit is required. Since the apartment buildings are proposed in the PH-1 Zone, and that the existing public housing development has little dedicated off-street parking spaces, we support this variance as proposed. 4. A design waiver has been requested from providing shade tree and utility easements. However, the Landscape Plan proposes shade trees along the developed property frontages. Therefore, we recommend the easements be provided. 5. 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. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. Benchmark reference as stated in the General Notes is Dover 1 PID NO. JU4430 Elevation: 29.72 feet. Also in the General Notes, the horizontal datum is relative to

the New Jersey State Plane Coordinate System and adjusted to NAD 1983. In addition, the Vertical Datum is relative to N.A.V.D 1988. 2. A Site Survey can be provided as part of the Final Site Plan application. 3. The location of the Zone Boundary line shall be corrected. 4. The Singer Way right-of-way should be added to the plans. We note some existing recreational improvements encroach into this undeveloped right-of-way. 5. Based on the preliminary site development plans submitted, no on-street parking will be available. Proposed off-street parking will be available within the new development. 6. Curbs and sidewalk are proposed within the development. Curb is proposed along both sides of Chambers Crescent looped access driveway with perpendicular parking spaces. Existing sidewalk is proposed to meet the proposed six feet (6') wide concrete sidewalk within the development. 7. A twenty-four foot (24') aisle width is proposed for the Chambers Crescent looped access driveway, which will allow for two-way traffic. 8. 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. Proposed building square footage should also be coordinated. 9. Proposed curb radii shall be provided at all locations which are not the typical five foot (5') radii. 10. If refuse and recycling collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood, DPW approval will be required. 11. Sight Triangle Easements have been proposed at the intersections of South Clover Street. 12. Right-of-way dedications are being proposed along the developed project frontages.

B. Architectural

1. Preliminary Architectural Plans were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, it is anticipated the proposed three (3) floor buildings will be thirty-four feet and six inches (34'-6") in height. The proposed building height is indicated 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 setbacks 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. The Utility Plan indicates sprinkler systems are proposed.
5. Testimony should be provided as to where HVAC equipment is proposed for the buildings and how the equipment will be adequately screened.
6. Handicap access into the proposed buildings should be addressed.

C. Grading

1. Detailed grading is provided on a Grading Plan which is Sheet 4 of 12. The grading design generally directs runoff to proposed inlets.
2. Profiles should be provided for the looped drive and adjoining roads.
3. Profiles should be provided for the proposed storm drainage system.
4. The proposed grading concept is feasible and will be reviewed with a Final Site Plan application, should preliminary approval be granted.

D. Storm Water Management

1. Review of the Storm Water Management Report indicates that the proposed runoff from the site must be further reduced to meet water quantity standards.
2. Storm water quality measures will not need to be met because of the proposed decrease in impervious surface.
3. Existing storm sewer pipes must be added to the plans to determine whether the existing system can handle the flow from the proposed storm sewer connections.
4. A Proposed Drainage Area Plan must be provided for the individual inlets.
5. Pipe calculations must be provided for the proposed storm sewer design.
6. A Storm Water Management Operations and Maintenance Manual shall be provided with design revisions.

E. Landscaping

1. Landscaping has been provided on Sheet 8 of 12 of the Site Development Plans.
2. The Landscape Plan proposes deciduous shade trees, coniferous screening, and foundation plantings. Additional landscaping of an ornamental nature should be considered.
3. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations from the Shade Tree Commission as practicable.
4. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after anticipated plan revisions are submitted.

F. Lighting

1. Lighting has been provided for the off-street parking and

pedestrian areas of the site on Sheet 9 of 12 in the Preliminary Site Development Plans. 2. The Plan indicates eighteen (18) pole mounted double fixture lights are proposed on-site. Details on the light fixtures can be found on page 10 of 12 in the Preliminary Site Development Plans. The mounting height of the proposed one hundred forty watt (140 W) lights is eighteen feet (18'). 3. A point to point diagram must be provided to verify the adequacy of the proposed lighting. 4. Existing lighting along South Clover Street, and Cedar Bridge Avenue should be addressed. 5. Testimony should be provided regarding on-site lighting ownership. 6. Lighting should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 7. Lighting shall be reviewed in detail after anticipated plan revisions are submitted. 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. The locations of two (2) proposed, on-site fire hydrants have been shown on the plans. H. Signage 1. Some proposed regulatory signage has been shown on the plans. Some regulatory sign details have been provided. These details can be found on sheet 11 of 12 in the Preliminary Site Development Plan. 2. No project identification signage or building mounted signage has been proposed. A full signage package for any 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. I. Environmental 1. Environmental Impact Statement A waiver was requested from providing an Environmental Impact Statement since a development currently exists on the property and the new construction will take place within the same area. 2. Tree Management A waiver was requested from providing a Tree Protection Management Plan since little to no tree removal should be necessary. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 11 and 12 of 12 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. 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 (if applicable); 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. Morris stated that this application is for preliminary approval only. The applicant has asked that this be heard for both a tech and public review as they are under a deadline to get funding from the State.

Mr. Sal Alfieri, Esq. on behalf of the applicant stated that this is a public/private partnership between a private developer and the Lakewood Housing Authority to rebuild the JFK apartments. He said an application has to be filed with the State by the end of May in order to get funding from the State. He has reviewed the engineer's report and agree to address all of the comments.

Mr. Vogt is in support the requested submission waivers because the existing property has been previously developed.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the waivers.

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

Mr. Alfieri said that no construction will take place until they have final approval. The plans may have to be tweaked slightly to comply with the technical comments but the number of units and basic layout will stay the same. All the outside agency approvals will be in place as well.

Ms. Christiana Foglio, was sworn in, President, owner of Community Investment Strategies. CIS is an affordable housing developer who has been in business for 20 years. They have built close to 3,000 units in New Jersey which they construct, own and manage.

Mr. Neiman asked if they will be rentals.

Ms. Foglio said yes. She said that this is a partnership with the Lakewood Housing Authority. Approximately 4 months ago, HUD had an initiative to redevelop their sites. An RFP was submitted and CIS was chosen to be the partners. They then submitted an application with the Housing Authority to HUD. They were one of three applications approved for the State of New Jersey. This is the first time HUD has done this process. She said this is a 53 unit project. It is very similar in size and scope to the existing apartments. This project, however, all units will have a ground floor entrance so they can manage well and not have common areas where sometimes people who don't belong on that property may linger or create problems for the good residents. They are trying to use what they have learned in the past to have the best possible design that helps people live well, safely and creates a positive on the community. There will be a community center, coordination with a variety of non-profits in the community run after school programs, tutoring programs and the like. IT will still remain a low to moderate income project. People will need to be qualified through the State as well as credit and background checks. There will be a full time manager and community manager.

Mr. Schmuckler asked about the current residents.

Ms. Foglio said they will be doing on-site relocation. They would demolish a building, construct a building and then move residents in. The current residents will have priority but you need to be in good standing and need to meet the qualifications for the units.

Mr. Schmuckler asked about the community center.

Ms. Foglio said there is currently a community room. The new project proposes a stand free clubhouse and a fully managed office. She said the Township is very supportive of this project. They recently received a resolution of need which basically says to the State of New Jersey that this is something the Town is supportive of.

Mr. Banas asked every resident have a door on the ground floor but some of the buildings are three stories high.

Ms. Foglio said basically there are three front doors. One door will be walking up your own stairs inside your unit into your townhouse. The other door will open up to a flat that is ADA accessible. That way everybody has a secure entry.

Mr. Michael Farewell, AIA, was sworn in. A colored rendering of the site plan was entered as exhibit A-1. Elevations were entered as A-2. Unit plans as A-3. A three dimensional rendering was entered as A-4. The basic idea of this layout is to generate a complex of townhouse appearing buildings that are linked together and give good, safe access to all of the units. The buildings vary in number of units from 4 to 7 units. There is also a community space as well as the manager's office. The units are generally three stories and the idea is to do a flat on the ground floor which is fully accessible and varies between two and three bedrooms.

Mr. Neiman asked about the baseball field.

Mr. Alfieri said the field is not needed by the Housing Authority and they are not sure if they will keep it or not unless the Board has a preference. If it is not a baseball field, it would be open space.

Mr. Robert Curley, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He explained that this project is in two separate zones, R-40 and PH-1 and because of that, a variance is required for average minimum dwelling unit size. If the project was only located in the PH-1 zone, that variance would not exist.

Mr. Neiman explained that the parking on Clover Street is very bad and would maybe look to the Township to have no parking on that street on one or both sides.

Mr. Curley said currently there are 42 parking spaces, however, they parallel park along some of the driveway aisles with further restrict the entrance into the facility and there is parking along Clover Street. They are proposing more than three times the parking, 134 parking spaces.

Mr. Schmuckler would also like to see no parking on Clover Street.

Mr. Neiman asked that they try to make that that request to the County.

Mr. Alfieri said they will make a request to the County.

Mr. Curley also said there is access from the current apartments to Cedarbridge Avenue. That access will be eliminated which eliminates a very dangerous situation. An aerial rendering was entered as exhibit A-5. He explained that all of the proposed development is within the PH-1 zone and the variance is a technical variance. He further explained that they are providing more than three times the parking that currently exists. There is also a bus stop nearby.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Banas, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve the application.

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

- 3. SP 1999** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Moshe Lankry
Location: Fourth Street
Block 118 Lot 21

Site Plan for proposed addition to existing restaurant

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of a two-story building addition with unfinished basement to the existing restaurant with second floor apartment to expand the restaurant facilities on the first floor and provide a dining hall on the second floor. The site is located within the downtown section of the Township and fronts on the north side of Fourth Street, east of Clifton Avenue. The 50' X 100' property contains five thousand square feet (5,000 SF) or 0.11 acres. A two-story building with a basement exists on-site. The first floor of the building is utilized as a restaurant for a pizza parlor, and the second floor is utilized as an apartment. The site also contains an existing metal trailer and an existing metal shed, both of which would have to be removed for the proposed addition. The applicant is proposing approximately three thousand seven hundred square feet (3,700 SF) of addition space among the unfinished basement and two (2) floors. The proposed area for the unfinished basement is about one thousand four hundred square feet (1,400 SF). The proposed area for the first floor dining room is just less than one thousand one hundred square feet (1,100 SF). The proposed area for the second floor dining room is a little more than one thousand two hundred square feet (1,200 SF). The site is developed and existing utilities are available to the project. The surrounding lands and roadways are all improved with commercial development. Existing sidewalk and curb front the site. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 4/9/13 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting, and comments from our initial review letter dated February 25, 2013: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. B2 - Topography within 200 feet thereof. 2. B4 - Contours of the area within 200 feet of the site boundaries. 3. B10 - Man-made features within 200 feet thereof. 4. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. The Survey and Site Plan does not show topography within two hundred feet (200') of the site. However, there is more than enough information provided to prepare the design. Therefore, we can support the "B-Site Features" requested waivers. A waiver has been requested from the submission of an Environmental Impact Statement due to the developed nature of the property and surrounding area. We can support the requested waiver from C13. The Board granted the submission waivers. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the B-2, Central Business Zone. Restaurants are permitted uses in the Zone. Statements of fact. 2. All non-residential uses in the B-2 Zone are exempt from parking requirements. Statement of fact. 3. No design waivers or variances are being requested. Statement of fact. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. The proposed building dimensions must be coordinated between the site plan and architectural plan. The site plan and preliminary architectural plans have been coordinated. Field adjustments will be necessary since an addition to an existing building is proposed. 2. The General Notes indicate waste and recyclables from the proposed establishment will be removed by private hauler. However, no trash enclosure is shown. Testimony shall be provided on trash and recyclables. 3. No loading or delivery areas are proposed. Testimony is required regarding future site operations, particularly deliveries for the restaurant use. Testimony shall be provided on future site operations. 4. The site plan shows that an existing ten foot (10') wide access easement is to be modified. The proposed modified access easement is only three feet (3') wide. Testimony is required clarifying the reasons for the existing and proposed access easements, especially since the easements are not dedicated to any parties. It appears the area for the proposed three foot (3') wide modified access easement should be three hundred square feet (300 SF). The proposed three foot (3') wide modified access easement only runs the ninety foot (90') length of the building. Testimony is required on

the access easements. B. Architectural 1. Conceptual architectural floor plans have been provided for the proposed building addition. The proposed building addition includes two-stories and a new unfinished basement area. The site plan indicates the building height is about twenty-seven and a half feet (27.5'). The allowable building height is sixty-five feet (65'). Preliminary architectural plans have been provided indicating an average height of twenty-seven feet, five inches (27'-5"). 2. New restrooms are proposed in the building addition. The General Notes indicate the proposed building shall be served by the existing public sanitary sewer and potable water systems. Plumbing work will be necessary. 3. Testimony should be provided on whether a fire sprinkler system is proposed. Testimony should be provided at the Public Hearing. 4. Testimony should be provided on handicapped accessibility. Testimony is required on the specific uses for the proposed individual floors, as well as the existing building. According to the preliminary architectural plans, at least the first floor will be handicap accessible. 5. The applicant's professionals should provide testimony regarding the facades and treatments of the proposed new building addition. We recommend that renderings be provided for the Board's review and use prior to the public hearing, at a minimum. The preliminary architectural plans provide elevation views. 6. We recommend that the location of proposed HVAC equipment be shown. Said equipment should be adequately screened. The General Notes on the revised plans indicate that HVAC equipment will be located on the roof. The proposed equipment shall be adequately screened. C. Grading 1. No proposed grading plan has been provided. Proposed elevations and contours are required to complete the project design. Proposed elevations and contours have been provided. The applicant's engineer should review the proposed grading with our office prior to submitting for resolution compliance should approval be granted. 2. Per review of the existing elevations and per review of site conditions during our site investigation, we note the proposed addition will trap runoff on adjoining property to the west. A temporary construction/grading easement will be required. The plans note the following: "The contractor shall install pavement/finish grade areas around the building addition and adjacent buildings in a manner which provides positive overland storm water runoff flow away from the buildings. If this cannot be accomplished through land grading only, then a storm water collection system will be installed." The revised plans propose a storm water collection system with a temporary construction easement. The applicant's engineer should review the proposed collection system with our office prior to submitting for resolution compliance should approval be granted. 3. Final grading can be reviewed after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. The applicant's engineer should contact our office prior to finalizing the grading. D. Storm Water Management 1. No storm water management system has been shown or designed for the site. The property is virtually impervious and small, being five thousand square feet (5,000 SF). However, our review indicates that runoff will be trapped off-site by the proposed addition. A storm water collection system will be required. Testimony should be provided on the existing and proposed storm water management conditions. A storm water collection system has been proposed. E. Landscaping 1. Final landscape design (if any) is subject to Board approval and should conform to recommendations from the Township Shade Tree Commission as practicable. Proposed landscaping, if any, shall be to the satisfaction of the Board. F. Lighting 1. There is existing street lighting along Fourth Street. No proposed lighting is depicted on of the plans. Testimony on site lighting should be provided from the applicant's professionals. Testimony should be provided on site lighting. There is existing lighting on the front of the building. G. Utilities 1. The plans state that the proposed building shall be served by the existing public sanitary sewer and potable water systems. Water and sewer approvals will be required from New Jersey American Water since the project is within their franchise area. Additional interior plumbing may be the only work required. H. Signage 1. The Site Plan

proposes no freestanding or building mounted signage. The preliminary architectural plans show the existing building mounted signage. I. Environmental 1. No Tree Protection Management Plan is required. There are only two (2) existing small trees on-site. Compliance with the Township Tree Ordinance will not be required. J. Construction Details 1. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township and/or applicable standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. A detailed review of construction details will occur during compliance review; if/when this application is approved. Final construction details will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission should approval be 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. Ocean County Planning Board; and c. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Follman stepped down for this application.

Mr. Moshe Lankry was sworn in.
Mr. Michael Gellar, P.E., P.P. was sworn in.

Mr. Gellar explained the site. He said there is currently a metal shed used for storage which will be removed to make way for the addition. An addition of 3,700 SF to the rear and easterly side of the store is being proposed. The first floor dining room would be an expansion of about 1,100 SF. The second story would be a dining room with a total of 1,200 SF. They have agreed to all the comments in the engineer's report.

Mr. Lankry stated that right now trash is being picked up from a dumpster in the back of the lot that is used by a number of stores. The garbage truck comes early in the morning through the Ocean County parking lot. There is nobody there at that time. That would remain the same. For recycling, they are currently using the yellow cans. In some point in the future, they will probably build a pad similar to the trash which would serve all those other stores.

Mr. Gellar said an easement is being requested along the easterly and rear side of the property to continue for access to the stores.

Mr. Lankry said there is currently a driveway where deliveries take place.

Mr. Gellar explained that there is no requirement for this sized building to have a sprinkler system. All the cooking areas do have fire suppression above them. HVAC equipment on the roof will be screened. They will meet with the engineer concerning grading and drainage. No landscaping is proposed as this is an entirely developed site. All other conditions can be met.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Banas to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler

4. SD 1883 (Variance Requested)

Applicant: Boneh Builders LLC
Location: East Kennedy Boulevard
Block 174 Lots 17, 18, 50
Major Subdivision to create thirteen lots

Mr. Jackson announced that this project will be carried to the June 11th meeting. No further notices required.

5. **SP 2001** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Manley Performance Products Inc
Location: Swarthmore Avenue
Block 1606 Lot 13
Site Plan for proposed building addition

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval for expansion of the existing building in two (2) phases. Phase 1 would add 8,329 square feet of one-story manufacturing space to the rear of the existing building. Phase 2 would add 3,678 square feet of one-story administrative space to the front of the existing building. Virtually all of the site improvements would be constructed in Phase 1 of the project. The existing facility is located at 1960 Swarthmore Avenue within the Lakewood Industrial Park. According to the revised site plan, off-street parking will be expanded to ninety (90) proposed spaces. Four (4) of the proposed spaces will be handicapped, all being van accessible. The site plan also indicates that eighty-six (86) off-street parking spaces are required. Based on the parking requirements of one (1) space per employee on maximum shift plus twenty (20) spaces for executives, this would allow for a total maximum shift of sixty-six (66) employees. Proposed parking spaces will be a minimum of 9' X 18'. Access to the site will be provided by an existing driveway from Swarthmore Avenue. The tract consists of a rectangular 300' X 436' lot, which is three (3) acres in area. The site is developed with a one-story metal building that manufacturers performance auto parts. There is a small wooded area on the northwest edge of the property. The property generally slopes downwards from the existing building. No freshwater wetlands or state open waters exist on-site or within three hundred feet (300') of the tract. The site fronts the northwest side of Swarthmore Avenue, between the intersections of the Rutgers University Boulevard loop road. Access to the site is from Swarthmore Avenue which is an improved municipal road having a sixty foot (60') wide right-of-way with a forty foot (40') wide existing pavement width. Municipally supplied water and sewer services are already serving the site. The existing land behind the site, Lot 9, is wooded. Otherwise, surrounding lands are all improved with large commercial and industrial land uses. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 4/9/13 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting, and comments from our initial review letter dated March 21, 2013: 1. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the M-1, Industrial Zone. Per Section 18-903M of the UDO, manufacturing is an allowed permitted use. Statements of fact. 2. Per review of the site plans and application, the following variance is required: • Minimum Front Yard Setback – A thirty-five foot (35') front yard setback is proposed, whereas a fifty foot (50') front yard setback is required, proposed condition. The Board shall take action on the requested variance. 3. Per review of the site plans and application, the following design waivers are required: • From Section 18-807C.3., of the UDO, which requires that off-street parking areas shall be paved. A gravel parking area for sixteen (16) spaces is

proposed behind the rear building addition. The Board shall take action on the required design waiver to allow an off-street gravel parking area instead of a paved parking area. • Providing sidewalk along the project frontage. It should be noted that there is no existing sidewalk along Swarthmore Avenue in the vicinity of this project which is in the Industrial Park. The Board shall take action on whether to waive sidewalk construction along the project frontage. • Providing a shade tree and utility easement along the Swarthmore Avenue project frontage. There are existing shade trees across the project frontage and the trees are significantly setback from the right-of-way. The Board shall take action on whether to waive requiring a shade tree and utility easement along the project frontage. 4. The revised plans request an additional waiver from providing design calculations and proposed drainage facilities. We recommend that drainage calculations addressing storm water management be provided as a condition of approval, if site plan approval is granted. 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 horizontal datum and a vertical bench mark shall be provided. This information may be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. The General Notes on the Cover Sheet require editing. This information may be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Per Section 18-903M.6.c., of the UDO, for industrial buildings having over fifty thousand square feet (50,000 SF) of floor area one (1) parking space shall be provided for each employee on the maximum work shift, plus twenty (20) spaces for executives. According to our review of the site plans, the number of required parking spaces will allow for a maximum shift of sixty-six (66) employees. Testimony should be provided on the work shifts. Our site investigations noted the existing parking to be insufficient with on-street parking occurring in front of the building on Swarthmore Avenue. The applicant's engineer indicates that the current maximum shift, the day shift, has sixty-three (63) employees with nineteen (19) executives and administrative personnel, for a total of eighty-two (82) people. Therefore, eighty-two (82) off-street spaces are required for their operation. Ninety (90) off-street parking spaces are proposed. Testimony should be provided on the anticipated increase of employees associated with the proposed additions. 4. Detectable warning surface shall be added to all existing and proposed curb ramps. The proposed detectable warning surface can be added to the plans for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. The proposed off-street parking has been designed with all perpendicular spaces. Therefore, a minimum aisle width of twenty-four feet (24') is required. The plans shall be revised to provide the necessary aisle widths. Aisle widths of twenty-four feet (24') are a common standard for perpendicular parking spaces. This is based on AASHTO standards of a turning radius of twenty-four feet (24') for large sized cars and twenty-one feet (21') for medium sized cars. Therefore, the proposed sixteen (16) space parking row shall be moved two feet (2') southwesterly. This will increase the proposed twenty-two foot (22') aisle width to twenty-four feet (24') while only decreasing the thirty foot (30') aisle width to twenty-eight feet (28'). The thirty-eight foot (38') wide proposed gravel parking area which is only providing a twenty foot (20') aisle width must be increased to an overall width of forty-two feet (42') in order to provide a twenty-four foot (24') wide aisle. 6. There are two (2) existing loading areas on the southwest side of the building which will remain. The area closest to the street consists of a two (2) bay loading dock. The second area further from the street is an at grade loading area. Testimony should be provided on loading/unloading for the site. The applicant's engineer indicates that typically raw materials are unloaded at the delivery area further from the street and finished products are loaded at the delivery area closest to the street. 7. A 12' X 15' refuse area is proposed at the rear of the site. The refuse area is enclosed, but no screening has been provided. Furthermore, accessibility to the refuse

area will be poor if vehicles are parked on-site. Testimony should be provided on collection of trash and recyclable material. The waste receptacle area should be designed in accordance with Section 18-809E., of the UDO. The applicant's engineer indicates the refuse area will contain both trash and recyclable material which will be picked up by a private carter. We recommend the proposed location be revised to improve accessibility. 8. The aggregate side yard setback is actually larger than the figure provided in the Zone Requirements, the value should be corrected. The provided aggregate side yard setback shall be 155.47 feet based on the proposed dimensions shown. 9. An 18' X 18' storage shed is proposed in the western corner of the property. The proposed location meets the accessory side and rear yard setbacks. Testimony should be provided on the use of the shed, which will apparently replace the existing shed shown to be removed on the Demolition Plan. The applicant's engineer indicates the proposed shed will be utilized to store bins of metals, typically shavings that are created from the machining operations. The materials would be stored for recycling. 10. Proposed dimensions should be completed for the rear building addition. This information can be provided with resolution compliance submission, if approved, when architectural plans progress beyond the preliminary stage. 11. All existing and proposed building access points should be added to the site plan since they impact the design. This information can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 12. No sight triangles associated with the site access have been indicated and should be added. A Sight Triangle Easement according to AASHTO standards has been added at the site access. Should approval be granted, a deed of easement and description shall be provided to the Board Solicitor and Engineer for review and approval prior to filing with the County. 13. Our site investigation notes the existing parking lot has undergone significant settlement and runoff puddles at many locations. Corrective action should be considered. The applicant's engineer proposes no corrective action.

B. Architectural

1. The preliminary architectural plan should be advanced to show existing and proposed building dimensions and square footages. This information can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted.
2. The plan shows a proposed production area for the rear addition. The plan also shows a proposed office area and storage area for the front addition. Testimony should be provided on the proposed floor area usage. The applicant's engineer indicates that the applicant manufactures performance automobile engine parts primarily through machining of raw metals. The rear Phase 1 expansion would serve to provide additional area for machines and storage. The Phase 2 expansion at the front of the building would serve to add both administrative office and storage areas, primarily to relieve current overcrowding in the administrative area.
3. The south elevation is missing a door which is on the floor plan. Revised architectural plans can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted.
4. The existing building has metal siding. Metal siding is proposed for the additions with the exception of the proposed office area which shows decorative concrete masonry. 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. The applicant's engineer indicates that both expansions will match the existing façade and treatments, both in materials and colors.
5. The site plan shows all existing and proposed ground mounted HVAC equipment. Adequate screening of the equipment should be considered. The applicant's engineer indicates that no additional screening of this equipment is proposed since it is on the side of the building adjacent to an existing industrial use.

C. Grading

1. The existing contour lines shall be completed and corrected. Some of the existing contour lines run through existing curb and on the wrong side of existing spot elevations. The existing information can be provided with resolution compliance submission

should approval be granted. 2. Spot elevations should be added to handicapped parking areas to insure slope compliance. The spot elevations can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Proposed spot elevations should be completed and proposed high points added for us to complete our grading review. The proposed spot elevations can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. A review of final grading revisions will be performed during compliance if/when approval is granted. Final grading can be addressed during compliance review should approval be granted.

D. Storm Water Management 1. The proposed additions alone will add over twelve thousand square feet (12,000 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. Storm water management can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. Utility & Drainage Note #3 must be revised. While we have not attempted to determine if less than one (1) acre of disturbance will occur, it is clear that more than a quarter acre of new impervious surface will be created. The project is not exempt from providing storm water management. The note can be eliminated with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Proposed roof downspouts are shown for the building additions. An underground roof leader drainage system must be designed. The underground roof leader drainage design can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. A storm water management design, report, and maintenance manual shall be provided in accordance with NJ Stormwater Rule (NJAC 7:8) and Township standards. This information can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted.

E. Landscaping 1. A landscape plan should be provided for the project. The revised plans propose just five (5) new Bayberry plantings to replace existing shrubbery to be removed for parking expansion. We recommend additional landscaping be proposed for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. Landscaping shall be to the satisfaction of the Board. F. Lighting 1. The proposed height of the building mounted lights has not been indicated. Based on the Luminaire Schedule it is not clear whether the wattage will be two hundred fifty (250) or two hundred ninety (290). This discrepancy can be rectified with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. An existing pole mounted light that will be in a proposed parking area is shown to be relocated to a landscape island. The status of another existing pole mounted light that will be in a proposed parking area has not been indicated. Our site investigation notes the existing light poles to be in poor condition. Corrections can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Additional lighting may be necessary in portions of the site, and can be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. A point to point diagram will be required to determine the adequacy of the lighting and compliance with the ordinance. A point to point lighting diagram shall be provided with resolution compliance submission if/when approval is granted.

G. Utilities 1. Testimony should be provided regarding proposed fire protection measures. The existing building has a fire service. Testimony should be provided on expansion into the proposed additions. H. Signage 1. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with the Township Ordinance. The applicant's engineer indicates that no new or revised signage is proposed. I. Environmental 1. Site Summary Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the tract is mostly developed with the exception of a wooded area on the northwest edge of the property. The property generally slopes downwards from the building. No freshwater wetlands or state open waters exist on-site or within three hundred feet (300') of the tract. To assess the site for environmental concerns, a natural

resources search of the property and surroundings was completed using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to whether there are any known areas of environmental concern (i.e. fuel tanks, fuel spills, etc.) that exist within the property. The applicant's engineer indicates that there are no known areas of environmental concern that exist on this property. 2. Environmental Impact Statement An Environmental Impact Statement has been submitted. The report must be revised as it mixes in information from another project. The report has been revised. 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 the Tree Replacement Plan provided. Corrections to the Tree Replacement Plan can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details will be reviewed after revisions are submitted for the project. Final construction details will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 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; and h. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mrs. Morris stated that she did receive correspondence from the Lakewood Industrial Commission and they have no objection to the application as proposed.

Mr. Vogt said there is a variance for front yard setback as well as design waivers including parking, sidewalk along the frontage and shade tree and utilities easements.

Mr. Ian Borden, P.P., was sworn in. The applicant is proposing to do two expansions to the existing building. Phase I will be an expansion to the rear of the building which is slightly more than 8,000 SF. That expansion will expand the manufacturing capability. Phase II will be approx. 3,000 SF one-story administrative space to the front of the building. Phase I is to expand the number of machines which manufactures performance auto parts. It is not proposing the number of employees. Currently the site contains 86 parking spaces which is a combination of paved and gravel spaces. In order to accommodate the rear expansion they will be shifting the parking and as a result they will be adding 4 parking spaces for a total of 90 spaces. There is currently a trash enclosure in the back and they are proposing a container consistent with the ordinance. All pick up will be by a private company. There is currently an 18' x 18' storage shed in the rear of the property which will be relocated. He stated that they are requesting a front yard setback variance. The Board had indicated that they would like approval from the Lakewood Industrial Commission concerning that variance which has been obtained. He explained the design waivers requested. There is currently gravel parking at the rear of the property which is primarily overflow parking for a shift change. That is proposed to remain gravel. A waiver for sidewalk along the property frontage has been requested as none of the properties in the industrial park has sidewalk. A waiver for shade tree and utility easement is also requested. There are a few trees along the frontage and they would like to not disturb those trees. He also noted that a site triangle easement has been provided. An easement is also suggested but it

only encroaches onto the property by less than a foot so it seems like a lot of effort for such a small piece for an existing use.

Mr. Vogt asked how they will ensure that adequate site access is going to be there. What would be proposed in lieu of an easement?

Mr. Borden again said it is such a small area that he would just propose it as a note on the site plan. He would defer to the Board on that.

Mr. Banas said the Board would like to see one.

Mr. Borden stated the driveway in the rear of the building will be a two way drive of 20' which is not an ordinance standard which is strictly for employee use.

Mr. Vogt asked what the largest size vehicle he anticipates using that driveway.

Mr. Borden said an SUV.

Mr. Franklin said that area in the back should be paved as well as a 24' lane.

Mr. Borden reiterated that the only vehicles in the back are employee vehicles. There will be no trucks back there. The existing gravel area has been there for 15 years and they prefer not to pave that area as it will be an additional expense.

Mr. Vogt asked if that back area can be designated as employee parking only.

Mr. Borden said they can do that.

Mr. Vogt said that would eliminate the need for a 24' lane width. The issue with the gravel parking is the Board's discretion.

Mr. Neiman and other Board members said they would like to see it paved, especially since it's such a narrow lane.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Banas, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve the application.

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

6. **SD 1885** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Nathan & Miriam Zelikovitz
Location: Hope Chapel and Garfield Avenue
Block 7 Lots 1.01, 2, & 3
Minor Subdivision to create two lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing property containing twenty-three thousand square feet (23,000 SF) into two (2) new residential lots. The existing 0.528 acre site consists of Lots 1.01, 2, and 3 in Block 7. The subdivision proposes to provide new Lot 1.02 for an existing two-story single family dwelling and new Lot 1.03 which may be developed with a future single family dwelling. The site is situated in the northwest portion of the Township. The existing property has frontage on three (3) roads, Garfield Street to the south, Van Buren Avenue North to the west, and Hope Chapel Road to the north. Garfield Street and Van Buren Avenue North are Township Roads, while Hope Chapel Road is a County Highway. The Township Roads are improved and both have fifty foot (50') right-of-ways. The County Highway is a well traveled improved road with a variable width right-of-way. The half right-of-way width of Hope Chapel Road in front of the site is twenty-five feet (25'). Sidewalk exists across the Garfield Street frontage. Otherwise, no curb and sidewalk exist across the frontages of the tract. The site contains a two-story dwelling and a shed with the driveway accessing Garfield Street. This existing dwelling would remain on proposed Lot 1.02. The revised plan shows proposed Lot 1.02 would become a corner lot on Garfield Street and Van Buren Avenue North, having an area of 10,952 square feet. Proposed Lot 1.03 would become a corner lot on Van Buren Avenue North and Hope Chapel Road, having an area of 11,952 square feet. Public sewer is not available. Public water terminates on Garfield Street in front of the existing dwelling. The lots are situated within the R-15 Single Family Residential Zone. As presently configured, lot area variances are being requested for proposed Lots 1.02 and 1.03. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 4/9/13 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated March 25, 2013: I. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-15 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single Family Detached Housing is a permitted use in the zone. Statements of fact. 2. Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following lot area variances are required: • Minimum Lot Area – Proposed Lots 1.02 and 1.03, eleven thousand square feet (11,000 SF) and twelve thousand square feet (12,000 SF) respectively, fifteen thousand square feet (15,000 SF) required – proposed condition. Radial dedications have been proposed at the intersections. Therefore, the proposed areas have been slightly reduced to 10,952 square feet and 11,952 square feet respectively. The Board shall take action on the required lot area variances. 3. Since minimum lot area variances are already being considered, we recommend radial dedications be provided at the right-of-way intersections to eliminate the need for sidewalk easements. The proposed dedications would slightly reduce the proposed lot areas. The radial dedications have been proposed. A stray sidewalk easement dimension along Garfield Street from an earlier version of the plan should be erased. 4. The survey provided does not provide information on the height of the wood deck for the existing two-story dwelling. Therefore, a rear yard setback variance for the deck on proposed Lot 1.02 may be required with this subdivision request. The revised survey shows the elevation of the existing wood deck to be 53.0. Based on the existing contour lines, the deck height just exceeds three feet (3'). Using the plan dimensions the existing wood deck for the two-story dwelling is approximately 17.9 feet from the proposed subdivision line on the plan. A minimum rear yard setback of twenty feet (20') is required. Therefore, the Board shall take on the required rear yard setback variance. 5. The survey and minor subdivision indicate an existing shed straddling the property line between the site and the neighboring lot to the east on Garfield Street. The shed must either be removed or relocated. Should the shed be relocated, accessory structure setbacks must be met or a variance sought. The revised plan indicates the current location of the shed, which scales approximately three feet (3') from the side property line. The future status of the shed has not been indicated. Should the shed remain, a side yard setback variance would be required for an

accessory structure since a side yard setback of ten feet (10') is required. The Board shall take action on the required variance should the shed remain. 6. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents will be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. II. Review Comments 1. A Boundary and Topographic Survey has been submitted. However, information is missing which will impact the proposed Minor Subdivision and design of an Improvement Plan which will be required by the County and Township. In accordance with our site investigation, the survey should be updated to include at a minimum the following information: a. Elevation and dimensions of the wood deck. b. Dimensions of the shed. c. Location of the fence along the eastern property line. d. Sidewalk on Garfield Street. e. Water main, valve, and blow-off in Garfield Street. f. Signs. g. Utility poles. h. Large trees in the Van Buren Avenue North right-of-way which could impact proposed sidewalk location. i. Horizontal datum. A revised Survey has been submitted showing most of the above required information. The Survey can be perfected for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. The survey shows the aforementioned shed straddling the property line between the site and the neighboring lot. The future status of the shed must be addressed on the Minor Subdivision Plan. The revised Survey shows the current location of the shed. The future status of the shed must still be addressed as it impacts the required variances. 3. The application is proposing an eight foot (8') wide right-of-way easement to the County along Hope Chapel Road. This is consistent with the neighboring property. Should a dedication be required, the proposed lot area and front setback of new Lot 1.03 will be impacted. Should a dedication be required by the County, any approval from the Township Planning Board would be void. 4. Based on the proposed location of the sidewalk along Hope Chapel Road, a Sidewalk Easement will be required. The Sidewalk Easement can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. An Improvement Plan will be required for the Minor Subdivision. The Minor Subdivision Plan proposes road improvements across the project frontages as follows: a. A half pavement width of eighteen feet (18') from the right-of-way centerline of Hope Chapel Road. b. A half pavement width of fourteen feet (14') from the right-of-way centerline of Van Buren Avenue North. c. A half pavement width of nineteen feet (19') from the right-of-way centerline of Garfield Street. The existing pavement on Garfield Street is offset toward the north side of the right-of-way. The half pavement width proposed for the subdivision will provide an overall road width of about twenty-eight feet (28'). The Improvement Plan shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. Four foot (4') wide sidewalk is proposed along the project frontages. Accordingly, pedestrian bypass areas will need to be designed. The pedestrian bypass areas can be provided on the Improvement Plan to be submitted for resolution compliance should approval be granted. 7. Testimony should be provided on whether a basement is to be proposed for the future dwelling on new Lot 1.03. If so, seasonal high water table information should be provided. The seasonal high water table information can be provided with plot plan submittal should approval be granted. 8. New lot numbers should be assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. The map shall be signed prior to filing, should approval be granted. 9. Unless a waiver is sought, the locations of the proposed shade trees should be added to the plans. 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 the property to be mostly cleared. Existing trees should be located within the Van Buren Avenue North right-of-way since their locations will impact the future sidewalk. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree

Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review for proposed Lot 1.03. The revised Survey and Minor Subdivision indicate the location and sizes of the existing trees located within the Van Buren Avenue North right-of-way. The Board should consider a sidewalk easement along the Van Buren Avenue North project frontage to permit sidewalk construction without removal of the trees. Proposed shade trees along with the shade tree and utility easement should be shifted behind any proposed sidewalk easement. 10. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development of proposed Lot 1.03. Any future plot plan shall address storm water management. 11. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading for new Lot 1.03. Proposed site grading shall be included on the Improvement Plan to be submitted for resolution compliance should subdivision approval be granted. 12. An existing water main that can service the existing dwelling on proposed Lot 1.02 terminates in Garfield Street. Testimony should be provided on whether public water will be extended to proposed Lot 1.03. The project is within the New Jersey American Water Company franchise area. Any proposed public water main extension shall be included on the Improvement Plan to be submitted for resolution compliance should subdivision approval be granted. 13. No sanitary sewer manholes were observed in the vicinity. Confirming testimony should be provided that the project will be serviced by individual septic systems approved by the Ocean County Board of Health. Testimony on sanitary sewer availability should be provided. 14. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 15. An Improvement Plan must be provided to include grading and construction details as required. This Improvement Plan may be provided during compliance if approval is given. Conditions imposed by any approvals will impact the Improvement Plan. Therefore, the Improvement Plan with layout, grading, drainage, and construction details may be provided with resolution compliance submission should 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 Board of Health; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated there is a variance requested for minimum lot area.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. on behalf of the applicant stated that the applicant is actually decreasing the number of lots from 3 to 2. The lots conform to many of the neighboring lots. Access to these lots will be only from Van Buren Avenue and not Hope Chapel Road which will help from a safety perspective.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P., was sworn in. He rendering several drawings as exhibits including A-1 which is a colored rendering of the minor subdivision map, A-2 is the Percal Map which shows the proposed property in red and the non-conforming in the area in blue. He said there will be two new lots, one lot will be 12,000 SF and has an existing home on it and the 11,000 SF lot would only have access to Van Buren Avenue. Additional right-of-way dedication will be provided. Drywells, sidewalks will be provided. All the comments in the engineer's review letter can be met.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein also said the applicant would like to request the variance for the accessory shed.

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

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

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

- 7. SP 2010** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Mikvah Taharah
Location: New Hampshire Avenue
Block 1160.03 Lot 47.02
Site Plan for a proposed mikvah/spa

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval for the construction of an Mikvah/Spa facility along with site improvements, on the subject premises. A one-story, 22,404 sf block building is proposed (as depicted on the architectural drawings). The project site consists of Lot 47.02 in Block 1160.03, in an M-1 (Industrial) zone. The site is in the southeastern portion of the Township, on the east side of New Hampshire Avenue. According to the site plans, the property abuts the Talmud Torah Bais Avrohom facility (Lot 47.02) to the south, and the access drive to what appears to be a commercial storage facility to the north. According to the survey submitted, the property is 2.51 acres in size, and predominantly-wooded (except for the existing parking area associated with the Talmud Torah Bais Avrohom facility). The site is currently vacant and wooded. Per the topographic survey, the land is virtually-flat, with site slopes averaging 1% or less. Site access is proposed via a circular access drive from New Hampshire Avenue. The drive is a proposed 20-foot wide paved, one-way aisle leading to eighty-one (81) on-site angle-parking spaces (including 4 handicap accessible spaces) as depicted on the site plans. Separate ingress and egress are provided as illustrated on the site plans. Proposed storm water management facilities and utilities consist of on-site inlets and collection piping leading to an underground recharge system consisting of 210 recharge chambers. Proposed gas, electric, water and sewer services are depicted on the Utility Plan. We have the following comments and recommendations: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested (or appear necessary): 1. B2 - Topography within 200 feet thereof (50 feet provided). 2. B10 - Man-made features within 200 feet of the site (50 feet provided). 3. C10 - Shade Trees (none provided). 4. C13 – Environmental Impact Statement We support the above-referenced waivers. The applicant will be required to comply with the Township Tree Protection Ordinance as a conditional of Board approval (if/when granted). Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to comply with these recommendations. I. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the M-1 Industrial District. Facilities for on-site provision of health and human services, including but not limited to spas and 'like' facilities are permitted in the zone. 2. A variance has been requested for front yard setback. A front yard setback of sixty-one (61') feet is proposed from New Hampshire Avenue, whereas (up to) a 100-foot setback is required. 3. A variance has been requested for rear yard setback. A rear yard setback of twenty-three (23') feet is proposed from New Hampshire Avenue, whereas a 30-foot setback is required. 4. The site plans correctly note a pre-existing variance for lot size (2.5 acres provided, minimum 3 acres required). 5. As indicated previously, eighty-one (81) parking spaces are proposed, including four (4) handicap accessible spaces. The number of spaces appears to be reasonable based on the size of the proposed facility as identified on the architectural plans. The applicant should provide testimony as to whether the adjacent religious facility could provide as-needed overflow parking to support the use. 5. The applicant must

address the positive and negative criteria in support of the required variances. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. As noted previously, Site access is proposed via a circular access drive from New Hampshire Avenue. The drive is a proposed 20-foot wide paved, one-way aisle leading to eighty-one (81) on-site angle-parking spaces (including 4 handicap accessible spaces) as depicted on the site plans. Separate ingress and egress are provided as illustrated on the site plans. 2. The site plans depict Chestnut Street as existing across from the proposed facility entrance. This should be corrected to Lisa Robyn Circle. 3. The proposed circulation appears to be generally well-prepared. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, a circulation plan will be provided during compliance review, if/when approval is granted, to ensure adequate ingress and egress for the largest vehicles that will access the site. 4. The site plans indicate that the northerly edge of the existing parking and access area will be removed to construct the building as located. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, testimony will be provided to confirm that the remaining parking and access area will be adequate to serve the existing Talmud facility. 5. Proposed signage depicted on the plans includes stop and 'do not enter' signs at the New Hampshire Avenue ingress and egress areas, and is adequate as proposed. Per Note #15 on the Site Plans, traffic direction arrows, fire lane markings, etc. shall be provided in conformance with Township Engineering and Fire Department requirements. We recommend that final signage and markings be provided as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. Per communications with the applicant, the applicant agrees to comply. 6. As depicted on the site plans, sidewalk is proposed along the northern, eastern and western building facades. No sidewalk is depicted along the property frontage, which is consistent with surrounding uses in the area. 7. Four (4) handicapped accessible spaces are provided near the front entrance, with appropriate markings and signage. 8. As noted on the site plans, trash and recyclables will be picked up by a private hauler. A refuse enclosure is proposed near the building, in the southeast corner of the parking area. 9. Curbing is proposed within the interior of the parking and access area. 10. Sight Triangle Easements are depicted at the facility entrance and exits. Additionally, a 7-foot widening easement is proposed. These easements will be dedicated to Ocean County. The entrance/exit design and easements are subject to Ocean County approval. B. Architectural 1. Conceptual Architectural Plans (designated 'Phase I') were submitted for review. Per review of the submitted plans, the proposed building will be one-story with no basement. The building will be constructed with block as depicted, with a façade sign proposed above the main entrance. 2. The exterior dimensions of the architectural plans do not match the building footprint as depicted on the site plans. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the footprint as depicted on the site plans is accurate. Revisions to the architectural drawings will be provided as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. . Per communications with the applicant, the applicant agrees to comply. 3. We recommend that (scaled) renderings be provided for the board's review and use at the public hearing, consistent with the building footprint as depicted on the site plans. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, renderings will be provided at the hearing. 4. Testimony should confirm if a sprinkler fire suppression system is proposed. As noted previously, the applicant will be subject to fire code review as a condition of approval, if/when granted. 5. Testimony should be provided as to where HVAC equipment is proposed for the building and how the equipment will be adequately screened. 6. As depicted on the architectural plans, HVAC equipment will be roof-mounted. Per the preliminary roof design, most or all of the equipment will be recessed behind the roof peak. Based on the design and surroundings, the screening that will be provided by the roof appears to be adequate. C. Grading 1. Grading design information is provided on Sheet #9, and is generally well-prepared. As indicated previously, the site is virtually-flat in its current condition. 2. A review of the final

grading plan will be performed during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. As indicated previously, proposed storm water management facilities and utilities consists of on-site inlets and collection piping leading to an underground recharge system consisting of 210 recharge chambers. The design as presented is feasible, and generally well-prepared. 2. We recommend the installation of additional stormwater collection inlets and piping near the facility entrance and within the front parking area to promote adequate surface drainage. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to provide additional collection drainage as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. 3. The Grading and Drainage Plan depicts two (2) roof leader mainfolds proposed underground, connecting to the underground recharge system that is proposed underneath the proposed parking area. We support this design concept as presented. The final architectural plans will provide the final roof leaders and connection points to this system as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. Per communications with the applicant, the applicant agrees to comply. 4. Preliminary collection and recharge stormwater calculations are provided in the stormwater report. The applicant/owner will be responsible for maintenance of the stormwater collection and recharge system. As stated previously, the proposed underground recharge system is feasible as presented. Final design will be performed as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. Per communications with the applicant, the applicant agrees to comply. 5. Test pits and permeability information are necessary to verify on-site permeability and ground water conditions. This information will be provided as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. Per communications with the applicant, the applicant agrees to comply. 6. The project is classified as "major development" per the NJ Stormwater Rule and Township ordinance. Therefore, a Stormwater Maintenance Plan is required for operation of the proposed stormwater system. This Plan will be provided as a condition of Board approval, if/when granted. Per communications with the applicant, the applicant agrees to comply. E. Landscaping 1. Landscaping (and a detailed on-site tree survey) has been provided on the Landscaping and Tree Management Plan (Sheet 9). As proposed, ornamental trees and shrubs are proposed within the proposed parking islands. A continuous row of Leland Cyresses is proposed as buffer from the parking area along the rear property line. Additionally, solid vinyl fencing is proposed behind the building, and north of the parking lot to provide additional screening in those areas. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to comply. 2. We recommend consideration of foundation plantings along the building façade (similar to what is as depicted on the architectural plans) as feasible between the proposed building and sidewalk areas. 3. The final landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations (if any) from the Shade Tree Commission as practicable. The applicant agrees to comply. F. Lighting 1. Lighting has been provided for the building and parking area as depicted on the Lighting Plan (Sheet 6). The design is well-prepared as presented. Design information for building mounted and pole mounted fixtures is provided on this plan as well. A pole foundation detail is provided on Sheet 7 of the plans. 2. Minor revisions to the building-mounted lighting may be necessary along the building's east façade to lessen spillover onto the adjacent property. 3. The final lighting design shall be reviewed during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. Per communications with the applicant's professionals, the applicant agrees to comply. G. Utilities 1. As indicated previously, proposed gas, electric, water and sewer services are depicted on the Utility Plan. Water and sewer will be provided by the Lakewood Township MUA (LTMUA). All other services will be constructed underground. 2. Locations of proposed utilities in plan view are clearly depicted on the Utility Plan (Sheet 4). Supporting design information, including sewer profiles and construction details are also provided on the site plans. Information as

depicted is more than adequate for Site Plan approval purposes. 3. The applicant will obtain applicable utility approvals (LTMUA, gas, electric, other) as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming. H. Signage 1. Other than the façade signage proposed at the entrance, only traffic and handicap parking is proposed on the current design plans. 2. 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, the applicant agrees to comply. I. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site investigation of the property, the majority of the tract is wooded in its current condition. 2. Environmental Impact Statement To assess the site for environmental concerns, a natural resources search of the property and surroundings was completed using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. No environmentally-sensitive areas exist per available mapping. 3. Tree Management Plan As indicated previously, a detailed tree survey and Tree Management Plan have been provided. The applicant will comply with the plan, and the Tree Protection ordinance requirements as a condition of Board approval (if/when granted). J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 8 and 9 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. Final review of construction details will take place during compliance (if/when approval is granted). IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement (if required, at the discretion of the Township); b. Lakewood Township MUA; c. Township Tree Ordinance; d. Fire Commissioners; e. Ocean County Planning Board; f. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and g. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Abraham Penzer, Esq. said there is a tremendous need for this mikvha/spa and if approved they would like to start building right away. Everything is agreed to in the engineer's review. There will be 62 rooms and 14 employees. There are 80 parking spaces.

Mr. William Stevens, P.E., P.P., was sworn in.

Mr. Vogt indicated that they support the requested waivers including topography, man-made features, shade trees and EIS.

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

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are requested for front yard and rear yard setback. Also, the pre-existing lot size is 2.5 acres which is under the 3 acre minimum.

Mr. Stevens said there is nothing they can do about the minimum lot size, it is a pre-existing variance. They are requesting a variance for front yard setback and side yard setback.

Mr. Neiman is concerned about the ingress and egress on New Hampshire Avenue.

Mr. Stevens said there will be no left turn allowed in or out of the mikvah.

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

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

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

- 8. SP 2016AA** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Mesivta Ohr Chaim Meir
Location: West Cross Street
Block 494 Lot 54

Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to convert existing accessory building into a school, existing home to remain as residence

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Site Plan Exemption/Change of Use approval for conversion of an existing storage building in the rear of the site into a proposed school building with two (2) classrooms and an office. An existing two-story dwelling would remain in the front of the site. No site plan improvements are proposed with this request. An existing paved access driveway with a bus turnaround loop is shown in the front of the site. An existing stone drive along with an existing stone parking lot is shown for access and parking to the future school building. The site is located on the southwest side of West Cross Street, about three hundred feet (300') east of Maplehurst Avenue. West Cross Street is a County Highway with no curb and sidewalk. The property is irregular in shape, and contains 2.00 acres in area. The site is currently surrounded primarily by low density residential development and farm uses.

I. Zoning 1. The property is located in the R-40 Single Family Residential Zone. Private schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906 of the UDO. 2. Per review of the Site Plan and the zone requirements, a waiver is required from the buffer requirements. The existing building to be converted into a proposed school is 19.2 feet from the side property line. A twenty foot (20') buffer is required. Furthermore, an existing stone drive which traverses Lots 54 and 55 also invades this twenty foot (20') buffer area. 3. Per review of the Site Plan, the following design waivers are required for proposed project:

- Providing sidewalk and curb along the West Cross Street frontage of the site.
- Providing a paved parking area.
- Providing landscaping.
- Providing shade trees and a shade tree and utility easement across the site frontage.
- Providing site lighting.
- Providing topography.
- Providing proposed grading.

II. Review Comments 1. Testimony should be provided giving a general description of the proposed site activities. Testimony should include the anticipated number of students, teachers, cars, and buses. 2. An existing two thousand four hundred square foot (2,400 SF) building is proposed to be converted into a school building. The plan indicates two (2) classrooms and an office will be provided. 3. Our site investigation indicates that certain features of the Change of Use Site Plan are not accurate. The existing paved driveway loop has radial corners which are not shown. The paved area of parking for the existing dwelling is larger than indicated on the plan and can actually accommodate four (4) vehicles. 4. The Change of Use Site Plan has not included topography or tree locations. Our site investigation noted substantial relief and large trees on the site. The right-of-way of West Cross Street is listed as fifty-five feet (55'). Based on the tax maps and our knowledge of the area, the value appears to be correct. 5. The Site Plan and aerial mapping shows an existing stone driveway traversing the site and adjoining Lot

55. Existing and/or proposed easements have not been indicated for the driveway. 6. A General Notes state that solid waste and recycling is to be collected from an onsite dumpster by the Township. No trash enclosure has been indicated on the Site Plan. Onsite collection from the Township must be approved by the Department of Public Works. 7. The provided lot width is less than shown in the Zoning Requirements. However, the actual lot width is large enough to meet the standard for the zone. 8. The provided aggregate side yards in the Zoning Requirements shall be corrected to 59.3 feet. 9. Off-street parking shall be clarified in the Zoning Requirements. Per UDO requirements (18-906) an off-street parking space shall be provided for each classroom and office. Also, the number of off-street parking spaces for the residential dwelling must be included. The plan indicates a total of eight (8) off-street parking spaces are being proposed. 10. The areas for off-street parking are large enough to accommodate minimum parking space sizes of 9'x18'. However, no consideration for handicap accessible parking has been provided and is required. Parking should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 11. A waiver is required from landscaping since the plan indicates no landscaping is proposed. Testimony should be provided on existing landscaping. Landscaping shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. 12. A waiver is required from site lighting. No site lighting is proposed. Testimony should be provided regarding any existing or proposed security lighting associated with the proposed use. 13. The existing paved and stone access driveway is too narrow for two-way traffic and must be widened. Approval will be required from Ocean County since West Cross Street is a County Highway. 14. The existing one-way paved loop drive must be accurately shown with radial corners. A circulation plan will be required to determine whether widening is necessary for the buses. 15. The General Notes indicate water supply by individual well and sewer disposal by individual septic. An existing well is shown on the plan near the dwelling to remain. Otherwise, no other existing and/or proposed wells and septic systems are shown. The Ocean County Board of Health must approve the use of any existing or proposed wells and septic systems. 16. Testimony shall be provided on existing utilities and whether HVAC is already provided to the storage building being converted to a school building. Existing overhead electric on the site has not been shown. 17. No storm water management is proposed and may not be necessary depending upon the nature of improvements that may be required. 18. No free standing signage and/or building mounted signage are proposed. 19. Building setback lines shall be added to the plan. 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 (as applicable); b. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if applicable); e. Ocean County Board of Health; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. stated the applicant is seeking a change of use approval to convert the structure on the rear of the property to a school. The residence at the front of the property will remain. This application does not require any variances. This is for a boy's high school with 35 students in two classes. In the next few years the students will grow to approximately 37 to 40 students in three classes. The maximum number of classes is four with approximately 25 students per class. This is a temporary solution for the next few years. The applicant is purchasing the adjacent lot and they will be back before the Board with a full site plan application for a new school building.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. He said they will satisfy the engineer's comments including widening the circular driveway.

Mrs. Weinstein said that there is no dormitory. The students will come in by bus.

Mr. Flannery reiterated that the circular driveway will be widened to accommodate busing. Hedges in the front will also need to be maintained. There is only a need for one bus.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public.

Mr. Greg Stafford-Smith, 1200 Cross Street, was sworn in. He stated that there are three schools in the area of Cross Street with no water, sewer or fire. He stated he had no objection to this application. He implored the Board to pay strict attention to this area.

Seeing no one further, Mr. Neiman closed to the public.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the application.

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

6. CORRESPONDENCE

1. **SP 2009AA** (No Variance Requested)

Applicant: Masoras Avos Inc

Location: Congress Street
Block 536 Lot 10

Requested exemption from site plan for second story building addition

Mrs. Morris said this application complies with site plan exemption except for size.

Mr. Penzer, Esq. Said they are putting a second floor addition onto an existing building. There is more than enough parking and no variances are being requested.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., was sworn in. He said the existing school has 16 classrooms and 7 offices. The addition will have 10 classrooms, a multi-purpose room and a shul. There will be 41 parking spaces which is above the requirements.

Mr. Schmuckler asked about a rentable hall.

Mr. Penzer said no, there won't be.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Follman to approve the application.

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

2. **SP 2014AA** (No Variance Requested)

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MAY 21, 2013**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD
PUBLIC HEARING MEETING**

Applicant: Bais Yaakov High School
Location: James Street
Block 342; 343; 319 Lot 1-8; 1-7; 1 & 3
Requested exemption from site plan for one-story building additions

Mrs. Morris said this application complies with site plan exemption except for size.

Mr. Penzer stated that they are adding a few classrooms and a kitchen. There is more than enough parking.

Mr. William Stevens, P.E.,P.P. was sworn in. He stated that the applicant is putting two small additions to the rear of the building which will house four new classrooms as well as a storage room. There are currently 64 parking spaces which is well in excess of the requirements. There are not encroaching on any wetlands for either addition.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Herzl to approve the application.

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

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