

1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Banas 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. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

4. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

- SD 1927** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Aryeh Weinstein
Location: Caranetta Drive
Block 86 Lots 11 & 12
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

A motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler
Abstain: Mr. Rennert

- SD 1930** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Nosiva, LLC
Location: Ridge Avenue & Highgrove Crescent
Block 223 Lots 9.04 & 83
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

A motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler
Abstain: Mr. Rennert

- SP 2059AA** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Tiferes Shmuel Corp
Location: Princewood Ave
Block 429 Lot 26

Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to convert a portion of the existing residence into a synagogue

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. said there was one condition that the applicant would like to be changed. He would like to make sure the parking remains as is to keep the character of the neighborhood. She argued that an extra one or two spaces would not make much of a difference anyway.

Mr. Franklin said they need the parking.

Mrs. Weinstein said the applicant will leave the resolution the way it is. They will work with the engineer on parking.

A motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler

Abstain: Mr. Rennert

- 4. SD 1685** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Dan Reich
Location: Brittany Court
Block 27 Lots 9.05 & 47.01
Minor Subdivision to realign two lots

A motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler

Abstain: Mr. Rennert

- 5. SP 2053** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Bnos Melech of Lakewood
Location: James Street
Block 364 Lot 1
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for addition to existing school and provisions for Phase II construction of a high school and parking facilities

A motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler

Abstain: Mr. Rennert

- 6. SP 1955A** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Nitto Denko
Location: Rutgers Boulevard
Block 1607 Lot 7
Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for Phase 3 building addition

A motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler

Abstain: Mr. Rennert

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. **SP 2057** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Congregation Satmar of Lakewood
Location: Kennedy Boulevard East
Block 174.11 Lot 38.02
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a proposed synagogue

Mrs. Morris stated that this application will be carried to the May 20, 2014 meeting as there is an issue with the notice. The applicant will be re-noticing.

Mr. Jackson spoke to Mr. Gasiorowski, the objecting attorney, and he asked that this be carried to a different meeting as he has a conflict.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq., applicant's attorney, said the notice stated it was for a subdivision as opposed to a site plan. To be safe, they will re-notice. He would like to be heard on May 20, 2014.

Mr. Jackson said there is case law on this and it may or may not be considered a reversible action if the Board does not give a reasonable accommodation to an objector.

2. **SD 1932** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Roger & Claudia Lebedz
Location: 220 Newport Ave
Block 496 Lot 2
Minor Subdivision to create four lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing property totaling 187,321 square feet (4.30 acres) in area known as Lot 2 in Block 496 into four (4) residential lots, designated as proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.04 on the subdivision plan. The site contains an existing two-story dwelling and a detached garage. The existing driveway would be relocated and the existing garage will be removed to create three (3) new residential building lots for future dwellings on proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.03. The existing two-story dwelling will remain on proposed Lot 2.04. The proposed minor subdivision has been designed for all new lots to meet the minimum area requirement for the zone of forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF). Public water and sewer is not available. The Improvement Plan indicates the proposed lots shall be served by individual septic systems and potable wells. The site is situated in the western portion of the Township along the Jackson Township border. Three (3) right-of-ways surround the site, Doria Avenue on the northwest side, Bellevue Avenue on the northeast side, and Newport Avenue on the southeast side. Doria Avenue is an unimproved seventy-five foot (75') right-of-way. Bellevue Avenue is a narrow improved Township Road in good condition with an approximately twenty feet (20') wide pavement width and no existing curb or sidewalk. Bellevue Avenue has an existing right-of-way width of seventy-five feet (75'). Newport Avenue also has an existing right-of-way width of seventy-five feet (75'). It is also a narrow improved Township Road in good condition without curb and sidewalk, having an existing pavement width of about eighteen feet (18'). No road widening or construction of curb and sidewalk is proposed. Except for the existing improvements previously mentioned, the entire tract is wooded. The site

is located on a ridge with most of the land sloping toward the south. The only utilities available appear to be overhead electric. Proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.03 would become new residential building lots and contain areas of just over forty thousand square feet (40,000 SF). Proposed Lot 2.04 would become a new lot for the existing dwelling to remain and contain an area of 67,125 square feet. The lots are situated within the R-40 Single Family Residential Zone. A lot width variance is being requested for proposed Lot 2.04. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 3/4/14 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated February 20, 2014: I. Zoning 1. The parcel is located in the R-40 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 width variance is required: • Minimum Lot Width – Proposed Lot 2.04, 130.79 feet proposed, one hundred fifty feet (150') required – proposed condition. The Board shall take action on the required lot width variance. 3. A design waiver is required for the proposed side lot lines not being at right angles to the street lines. However, the proposed side lot lines have been designed parallel to the surrounding street lines. Therefore, we recommend approval of this design waiver. The Board shall take action on the required design waiver. 4. A design waiver is required to permit a stone driveway for proposed Lot 2.04. We recommend the design waiver be denied and the new driveway for proposed Lot 2.04 be paved. The Board shall take action on the required design waiver. 5. At a minimum, the following design waivers are also required: • Providing curb and sidewalk along the project frontages. • Providing shade trees along the project frontages. The Board shall take action on the required design waivers. 6. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variance. 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. Both Newport and Bellevue Avenues are narrow improved roads. Assuming these roads are classified as "Rural Lanes" RSIS permits a pavement width of only eighteen feet (18') without on-street parking. Furthermore, the configuration of Newport Avenue is along the southeastern edge of the right-of-way and encroaches onto private property. a. As mentioned previously, the existing pavement width of Newport Avenue is only about eighteen feet (18'). If this subdivision is approved, Department of Public Works approval will be required for curbside pickup from proposed Lot 2.04, as well as addressing turnaround capabilities along Newport Avenue. b. As mentioned previously, the existing pavement width for Bellevue Avenue is only about twenty feet (20'). Site access to proposed Lots 2.01 through 2.03 shall be subject to Department of Public Works approval, as well as addressing turnaround capabilities along Bellevue Avenue. 2. A Topographic Survey of Property with tree locations has been submitted. The Notes indicate the property known as part of Lot 2 in Block 496. The Tax Maps show Lot 2 being larger, extending southward beyond the boundary line shown. The applicant's surveyor has indicated to our office that there is a title problem with this southern section of the property. Unless resolved, the Survey and Minor Subdivision should be revised to show a gore to the south of the tract since no adjoining lot has been indicated. Testimony should be provided. The bearing and overall distance of the tract is missing from the Bellevue Avenue frontage. Corrections can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Stray five foot (5') text should be erased from the unimproved right-of-ways on the Survey, Minor Subdivision, and Improvement Plan. The stray five foot (5') text can be erased for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. The Title Boxes of the Survey, Minor Subdivision, and Improvement Plan shall be revised to list Lot 2 as singular. The Title Boxes have been corrected. The second revision date on the Minor Subdivision must be corrected for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. General Note #2

references the Outbound and Topographic Survey submitted, along with assumed datum. The benchmark information shown on the Survey should be provided on the Subdivision and also referenced in General Note #2. The benchmark provided can be referenced in General Note #2 with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. The future status of the existing onsite utility poles must be addressed since they would be located on various lots with the subdivision approval. The revised plan indicates the existing utility poles to be relocated. Therefore, testimony should be provided on future electric service to the existing dwelling on proposed Lot 2.04. 7. All lots shall be serviced by individual septic systems and potable wells. Accordingly, approvals will be required from the Ocean County Board of Health. Subdivision approval will also be required from the Ocean County Board of Health to permit the existing well shown for proposed Lot 2.04 and the existing septic system which is not shown for new Lot 2.04 to continue to serve the existing dwelling to remain. These matters can be addressed with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 8. A proposed six foot (6') wide Shade Tree and Utility Easement to Lakewood Township is shown directly behind the existing right-of-ways along Newport and Bellevue Avenues. Although the Doria Avenue right-of-way is unimproved, the Shade Tree and Utility Easement shall be extended along this frontage unless a waiver is granted. Proposed distances on an individual lot basis must be added to the inside of the easements to check the easement areas shown. The proposed distance of 133.67 feet is incorrect. In addition, the proposed skew dimensions along the lot lines must be provided. The corrections can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 9. Sight Triangle Easements have not been provided at the intersections. Proposed Sight Triangle Easements dedicated to the Township have been provided at the intersections. The proposed call outs can be edited for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 10. The Minor Subdivision Plan shows new lot numbers were assigned by the tax assessor's office. If approved, the map shall be signed by the tax assessor. The map shall be signed by the tax assessor prior to filing should approval be granted. 11. The Surveyor's Certification has not been signed since the proposed monuments have not been set. Statement of fact. 12. Soil boring logs and locations must be provided on the Improvement Plan. A two foot (2') separation from seasonal high water table will be required for new lots where basements will be provided. A general note has been added to the Improvement Plan indicating soil borings shall be performed prior to plot plan submission. 13. The Improvement Plan proposes no street trees which are required unless a waiver is granted. 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. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. Our site investigation on 2/19/14 indicates the survey accurately locates the existing trees on-site. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan review. Based on the proposed improvements shown for the new lots, the trees to be removed should be indicated. Tree removal can be addressed with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 14. Testimony is required on the disposition of storm water from the development of new lots. General Note #11 on the Improvement Plan shall be revised to indicate the entire roof runoff from the proposed dwellings shall be connected to drywells. The correction can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 15. Testimony should be provided on proposed site grading. Proposed grading is indicated on the Improvement Plan for the new lots. Proposed grading should be designed to maximize runoff directed to the streets and minimize runoff directed toward adjoining lots. The proposed grading on the Improvement Plan will be reviewed after resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 16. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 17. Construction details must be added to the Improvement Plan. Construction details can 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. Lakewood Department of Public Works; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; e. Ocean County Board of Health; and f. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that variances are requested for minimum lot width. Several design waivers are also requested including the side lot lines not being at right angles, stone driveway on proposed lot 2.04, providing curb and sidewalk along the frontages as well as shade trees.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. on behalf of the applicant stated that this is a minor subdivision to create four conformingly sized lots. There will be a variance needed on the lot with the existing home.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. This is an area where the Planning Board looked to rezone and said to make this an R-40A. This would be in compliance with that. The only variance sought is less than 150 ft of frontage on Newport Avenue for the lot with the existing home. The applicant will meet with the DPW and satisfy them. All items would be satisfied during resolution compliance.

Mr. Banas opened to the public.

Mr. Walter Lucas, Newport Avenue, was sworn in. He stated that the Township paved Newport Avenue and a portion of it is on private property. He is concerned that people will start driving over his neighbor's lawn. He also said there is an additional acre of land that is not shown on the plans.

Mr. Schmuckler made the point that this application is not proposing any new homes on Newport Avenue. There is an existing home on Newport but the proposed homes will be facing Bellevue Avenue. The applicant should not be responsible to fix a public right-of-way.

Mr. Vogt said there is a slight encroachment of the existing Newport Avenue cartway onto the easterly lots. He would not categorize it as driving across lawns but it technically does encroach. They are going to meet with public works on this application and if any improvements are necessary to either frontage for any of these lots, they are going to do so. That will be a condition of approval if the Board acts favorably.

Mr. Franklin said the applicant should have met with Public Works before this meeting.

Mr. Flannery said he tried setting up a meeting. Again, this is for a subdivision approval. They are not asking for permission to build any more units. They will have to meet with DPW before they do that. A title search was done by the surveyor and only four acres came up as opposed to the six that Mr. Lucas claims. Newport Avenue does encroach on private property and the applicant agreed to work with Public Works and the engineer to resolve it. There are four houses that already use that road. The road that was paved and approved by the Township of Lakewood.

Ms. Debbie Erickson, 253 Newport Road, was sworn in. It is her property that has the encroachment. She is concerned that the road is not wide enough. It is tough as it is to fit a bus and a car on the road.

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

Mr. Doyle reiterated that this application is to only allow a minor subdivision for four lots. They will work with Public Works before any homes are built.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Sussman to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 3. SD 1939** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Brava Land, LLC
Location: Rachel Avenue
Block 463 Lot 2
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 9 duplexes

Project Description

The applicant is seeking a Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision approval. The applicant proposes the subdivision of an existing lot to create eighteen (18) proposed lots. The eighteen (18) proposed lots would be developed as zero lot line properties with nine (9) duplex structures. The existing lot is known as Lot 2 in Block 463, and is proposed to be subdivided into proposed Lots 2.01 – 2.18 on the Major Subdivision Plan. The proposed subdivision for the project would include all of Block 463, except for existing Lot 1. Block 463 is an existing 200' X 500', one hundred thousand square foot (100,000 SF) rectangular tract of land surrounded by the unimproved fifty foot (50') right-of-ways of Nussbaum Avenue, Frances Street, Rachel Avenue, and Blanche Street. Existing Lot 1 is a 100' X 100', ten thousand square foot (10,000 SF) square parcel located on the northwest corner of Block 463. Existing Lot 2 accounts for the remainder of the ninety thousand square foot (90,000 SF) property. The site is vacant, completely wooded, and surrounded by woods. The subject property surrounded by four (4) paper streets is located south of Prospect Street, an improved County Road with a sixty-six foot (66') wide right-of-way, in the southwest portion of the Township, west from its intersection with Massachusetts Avenue. Site access would be afforded by the improvement of Nussbaum Avenue between Prospect Street and the site. The existing ninety thousand square foot (90,000 SF) property has five hundred feet (500') of frontage on Nussbaum Avenue which is to the east. Two hundred feet (200') of frontage on Frances Street, this is to the south. Four hundred feet (400') of frontage on Rachel Avenue, this is to the west. Finally, one hundred feet (100') of frontage on Blanche Street, this is to the north. All surrounding streets are unimproved municipal roads with fifty foot (50') wide right-of-ways. The proposed development will improve all surrounding streets. Except for the frontage of existing Lot 1, curb and sidewalk is proposed along the entire frontage of Block 463. Except for the frontage of existing Lot 1, radial dedications are proposed at all other corners of the Block to permit the construction of sidewalk to be within the public right-of-way. Sidewalk is proposed along the westerly side of the section of Nussbaum Avenue being improved between Prospect Street and the site, while curb is proposed on both sides. Proposed storm water management facilities and utilities are associated with this project. The proposed drainage system consists of a conventional storm sewer collection system that collects and directs runoff to underground recharge systems. Proposed sanitary sewer will connect to an existing system in the southerly right-of-way of Prospect Street. Proposed potable water for the subdivision will be extended from an existing main on the south side of Prospect Street. A minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces are proposed for each unit. The subject site is located within the R-M Multi-Family Residential

Zone District. Therefore, zero lot line duplex housing is a permitted use in the zone district. The surrounding lands are currently vacant. The closest development is a multi-family project along Prospect Street to the east of Nussbaum Avenue. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 4/8/14 Planning Board Plan Review Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated March 27, 2014: I. Waivers A. The following waivers have been requested from the Land Development Checklist: 1. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 2. C14 - Tree Protection Management Plan. We support the granting of the requested Environmental Impact Statement waiver, and the Tree Protection Management Plan waiver for completeness purposes. The site appears to be wooded uplands. An Environmental Impact Statement should be provided prior to scheduling the Public Hearing. A Tree Protection Management Plan should be required prior to any construction. An Environmental Impact Statement was submitted. Testimony was provided that the Tree Protection Management Plan would be addressed during compliance submission should approval be granted. II. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-M, Multi-Family Zone District. Duplex Housing is a permitted use. Zero lot line subdivisions for duplexes are permitted in the Zone. Statements of fact. 2. According to our review of the Major Subdivision Plan and the zone requirements, the following variances are requested for the subdivision approval: • Minimum Lot Area – The combination of proposed Lots 2.01/2.02, 2.09/2.10, and 2.11/2.12 are 9,952 square feet; where ten thousand square feet (10,000 SF) is required. It should be noted that the lot area deficits are being created by the radial right-of-way dedications at the Block corners. Otherwise, these lots would conform to the minimum lot area requirement. The Board shall take action on the requested minimum lot area variances. 3. 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 aeriels and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. III. Review Comments A. General 1. Off-street parking: According to the plans provided, the applicant is proposing a minimum of four (4) off-street parking spaces per unit which is enough to be in compliance with the RSIS and Township standards of four (4) off-street parking spaces required. Testimony shall be provided on the proposed number of bedrooms per unit and whether the basements will be unfinished. This proposed project should be in compliance with Parking Ordinance 2010-62. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony will be provided on the proposed number of bedrooms and whether the basements will be unfinished. 2. The applicant shall confirm that trash and recyclable collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood. The applicant's engineer confirms that the trash and recyclable collection is to be provided by the Township of Lakewood. A note will be added to the plans with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Existing paper streets will be improved for the proposed project. Statement of fact. 4. The proposed lot numbers shall be approved by the Tax Assessor. The Final Plat shall be signed by the Lakewood Tax Assessor. The proposed lot numbers have been approved by the Tax Assessor. The Lakewood Tax Assessor signature is required prior to map filing should approval be granted. 5. In accordance with the requirements in 18-815, a one-time storm water management maintenance fee shall be provided. The fee shall be nine thousand dollars (\$9,000.00), based on eighteen (18) single-family attached dwellings at five hundred dollars (\$500.00) per dwelling. The applicant's engineer indicates the nine thousand dollar (\$9,000.00) storm water management maintenance fee will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. The requirements in 18-821 (Building Uniformity in Residential Developments) shall be addressed. A minimum of four (4) basic house designs shall be provided for this development consisting of between seven (7) and fifteen (15) homes. The applicant's engineer indicates that the requirements of 18-821 will be addressed at the time of building permit should approval be

granted. 7. Per Subsection 18-911 F (2 (a-g)) of the zero lot line ordinance, a written agreement signed by the owner of the property is required, including provisions to address items associated with the use, maintenance, and repair of common areas and facilities associated with the overall property. Said agreement must be filed as part of this application to obtain the zero lot line subdivision approval from Lakewood Township. The applicant's engineer indicates that a written agreement signed by the owner of the property including provisions to address items associated with the use, maintenance, and repair of common areas and facilities associated with the overall property will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. B. Plan Review 1. The Boundary & Topographic Survey provided contains enough topography for the off-site road design of Nussbaum Avenue between the site and Prospect Street. Statement of fact. 2. Based on the currently design, construction of Nussbaum Avenue between the site and Prospect Street will require grading easements from the adjoining property owners in Blocks 445 and 462. The applicant's engineer indicates that grading easements from adjoining property owners in Blocks 445 and 462 for construction of Nussbaum Avenue between the site and Prospect Street will be obtained for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. The proposed use in the General Notes should be revised to nine (9) duplex buildings on eighteen (18) zero lot line properties. The applicant's engineer indicates the proposed use in the General Notes will be revised for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements requires some revisions. The R-M Zone is Multi-Family Residential. The applicant's engineer indicates the Schedule of Bulk Requirements will be revised for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 5. Consistency in the proposed street design layout among plan sheets shall be provided. The applicant's engineer indicates that consistency in the proposed street design layout among plan sheets will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. Nussbaum Avenue between Prospect Street and Blanche Street has been designed to a thirty-two foot (32') pavement width with curb on both sides and sidewalk on just the west side to provide access to the project. The proposed sidewalk shall continue straight along Nussbaum Avenue to a curb ramp at the intersection of Blanche Street. This will prevent the need for a proposed sidewalk easement at the intersection. The proposed curb on the east side of Nussbaum Avenue ends at the curb return with Blanche Street. A pavement taper shall be shown across the intersection. The applicant's engineer indicates that the extension of the proposed sidewalk on Nussbaum Avenue to a curb ramp at the intersection of Blanche Street will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 7. The proposed streets surrounding the Subdivision Block have generally been designed to a pavement width of thirty feet (30'). The proposed pavement half width along the site frontages will be sixteen feet (16'), with a fourteen foot (14') width on the opposite side of the centerline. Curb and sidewalk are proposed along the site frontages, but not on the opposite sides of the street, which is acceptable. Statements of fact. 8. Curb and sidewalk are not proposed along the frontage of existing Lot 1, which is not part of this subdivision project. We concur with this proposed design because a radial dedication would be required at the intersection of Rachel Avenue and Blanche Street to permit proper curb and sidewalk construction. However, we do recommend the proposed curb be lengthened to the property line extensions before the pavement is tapered to provide a twenty-eight foot (28') pavement width. This section of twenty-eight foot (28') pavement width would allow for a future two foot (2') widening on each side of the street when curb is constructed along the frontages of these other properties. The applicant's engineer indicates the proposed curb on the east side of Rachel Street and the south side of Blanche Street will be lengthened to the Lot 1 property line extensions with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 9. Proposed curb is shown on the north side of Blanche Street. We believe this to be

in error since it is not yet required at this location. The applicant's engineer indicates that the proposed curb shown on the north side of Blanche Street will be removed with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 10. Proposed Sight Triangle Easements dedicated to the Township should be provided at the street intersections the subdivision. The applicant's engineer indicates that proposed Sight Triangle Easements dedicated to the Township will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 11. Some Drainage Easements to adjoining lots are proposed for the project. Transition manholes are proposed at the right-of-way lines to differentiate private and public storm water management ownership. Statements of fact. 12. The Site Development Plan should have road centerlines and stationing added. The applicant's engineer indicates that road centerline and stationing will be provided on the Site Development Plan with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 13. Four foot (4') wide sidewalk is proposed throughout the development. Unless the proposed sidewalk will be increased to a width of five feet (5'), pedestrian bypass areas shall be designed. The applicant's engineer indicates that pedestrian bypass areas will be addressed with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 14. Proposed curb ramps shall be added to the Site Development Plan at the street intersections. The applicant's engineer indicates that proposed curb ramps will be added to the Site Development Plan with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 15. The Sheet Index should be coordinated with the plan set. The applicant's engineer indicates that the Sheet Index will be coordinated with the plan set for resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. C. Grading 1. Grading is provided on a Grading & Drainage Plan which is Sheet 4 of 15. A storm sewer collection system is proposed to collect runoff and recharge it within three (3) recharge systems. Statements of fact. 2. Road profiles have been designed for all proposed streets. Statement of fact. 3. A detailed review of the grading can be completed during compliance submission; if/when this subdivision is approved. Statement of fact. D. Storm Water Management 1. A proposed storm sewer collection system has been designed to convey storm water runoff into recharge systems. Three (3) proposed recharge systems have been designed, two (2) under private property, and the largest located under the improved Frances Street right-of-way. An overflow bubbler inlet from the proposed recharge systems would be located at the intersection of Rachel Avenue and Frances Street, southwest of the site. Statements of fact. 2. Soils information will need to be provided within the proposed project to confirm the seasonal high water table depth. Permeability testing will need to be done to justify the infiltration rate of eight inches per hour (8"/hr) used in the recharge calculations. Permeability testing associated with the Environmental Impact Statement indicates revisions to the storm water management design will be required with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. A cursory review of the proposed design indicates the improvement of Nussbaum Avenue between Prospect Street and the development has not been totally accounted for. The applicant's engineer indicates the improvement of Nussbaum Avenue between Prospect Street and the development will be totally accounted for with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. Storm sewer profiles have been provided for easement areas. Statement of fact. 5. The Storm Water Management Report and Design will be reviewed in detail during compliance, if/when approved. Statement of fact. E. Landscaping 1. Comprehensive landscaping has been proposed for the project. Shade trees are proposed along the site frontages, buffer and ornamental trees are proposed along the rear property lines, and foundation plantings will be provided for the units. Statements of fact. 2. All proposed Easements shall be added to the Landscaping Plan. All proposed utilities have already been shown. Revisions should be made to avoid planting conflicts. The applicant's engineer indicates that all proposed Easements will be added to the Landscaping Plan and revisions will be made to avoid planting conflicts with resolution compliance submission should

approval be granted. 3. The overall landscape design is subject to review and approval by the Board and should conform to recommendations from the Shade Tree Commission as practicable. The entire site will be cleared for the construction of the project. Compensatory plantings shall be addressed with a Tree Protection Management Plan. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. The applicant's engineer indicates a Tree Protection Management Plan will be provided prior to construction should approval be granted. 4. Landscaping shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted. Statement of fact. F. Lighting 1. Street lighting has been provided for the proposed roads on Sheet 7 of 15. Statement of fact. 2. Proposed street lighting should be adjusted such that pole relocations will not be necessary when future development takes place. The Plan indicates that fifteen (15) Cobra Head, one hundred watt (100W) high pressure sodium pole mounted fixtures are proposed. A detail shows the proposed height of the fixtures to be twenty-five feet (25'). The applicant's engineer indicates that proposed street lighting will be adjusted such that pole relocation will not be necessary when future development takes place. Revisions will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. A point to point diagram has been provided to verify the adequacy of the proposed lighting. Revisions will be necessary with adjustments to the layout. The applicant's engineer indicates that revisions to the point to point diagram per adjustments to the layout will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. It is anticipated that all lighting will be owned and maintained by the Township after installation since all fixtures will be within public right-of-ways. Confirming testimony should be provided regarding street lighting ownership. The applicant's engineer indicates that testimony regarding street lighting ownership will be provided. 5. Lighting shall be reviewed in detail after compliance submission should subdivision approval be granted. Statement of fact. 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. Statements of fact. 2. The proposed sanitary sewer will connect to an existing system in the southerly right-of-way of Prospect Street. The proposed design will be deep enough to provide gravity service to the basements. Statements of fact. 3. Potable water is proposed to be extended from an existing main on the south side of Prospect Street. Statement of fact. 4. The plans state that all other proposed utilities are to be provided underground. Statement of fact. H. Signage 1. Proposed regulatory signage has not been shown on the plans and should be added. Regulatory sign details have been provided. A "No Outlet" sign should be provided at the intersection of Nussbaum Avenue with Prospect Street. The applicant's engineer indicates that regulatory signage and a "No Outlet" sign at the intersection of Nussbaum and Prospect Street will be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. No project identification signs are proposed. Statement of fact. 3. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. The applicant's engineer indicates that all signage proposed that is not approved as part of this application will comply with Township ordinance. I. Environmental 1. Site Description Per review of the site plans, aerial photography, and a site inspection of the property, the site is wooded and vacant. The existing on-site topography slopes to the southwest. There is a ridge between the property and Prospect Street. Statements of fact. 2. Environmental Impact Statement An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) shall be submitted prior to scheduling a Public Hearing for the project. An Environmental Impact Statement was submitted and reviewed. The site has no major areas of environmental concern. However, corrections are required to the EIS and can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Tree Management Prior to construction, a Tree Protection Management Plan in accordance with the current ordinance shall be

submitted. The applicant's engineer indicates that a Tree Protection Management Plan will be submitted should approval be granted. J. Construction Details 1. Construction details are provided on Sheets 14 and 15 of 15. Statement of fact. 2. All proposed construction details must comply with applicable Township or NJDOT standards unless specific relief is requested in the current application (and justification for relief). Details shall be site specific, and use a minimum of Class B concrete. The applicant's engineer indicates that proposed construction details will comply with applicable Township or NJDOT standards. 3. Final review of construction details will take place after compliance submission, if/when this project is approved by the Board. Statement of fact. K. Final Plat (Major Subdivision) 1. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements should be corrected to indicate that the R-M Zone is Multi-Family Residential. The applicant's engineer indicates that the Schedule of Bulk Requirements will be corrected to indicate that the R-M Zone is Multifamily Residential with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. Some provided setback corrections should be made to the Schedule of Bulk Requirements. The applicant's engineer indicates that provided setback corrections will be made to the Schedule of Bulk Requirements with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 3. Proposed Sight Triangle Easements should be provided on the corners of intersecting streets. The applicant's engineer indicates that Sight Triangle Easements will be provided on the corners of intersecting streets with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 4. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 5. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after design revisions are undertaken for the project. Statement of fact. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities. 4. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 5. The Final Plat will be reviewed in detail after design revisions are undertaken for the project. Statement of fact. IV. Regulatory Agency Approvals Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: a. Developers Agreement at the discretion of the Township; b. Township Tree Ordinance; c. Ocean County Planning Board; d. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; and e. All other required outside agency approvals. New Jersey American Water Company will be responsible for constructing potable water and sanitary sewer facilities.

Mr. Vogt said there is a variance for minimum lot area which is extremely minor due to the radial nature of the lot corners.

Mr. Samuel Brown, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. He said this is a conforming application except for the minor lot area variance. The applicant agrees with everything in the engineer's letter.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. They could have made the radius square at the right-of-way but that would have caused problems with the sidewalks so they decided to do a radial right-of-way and that is why they require a variance.

Mr. Franklin asked about the drainage.

Mr. Flannery said there will be three recharge systems. Two of them will be on private property and will be maintained by the property owners while the other and larger recharge system will

be located under the improved Frances Street right-of-way and will be maintained by Public Works.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Sussman, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

- 4. SD 1937** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Lakewood Investments, LLC
Location: Williams Street
Block 420 Lot 21.01, 21.02, 23 & 24
Minor Subdivision to create 7 lots

Project Description

The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide four (4) existing lots totaling sixty thousand square feet (60,000 SF) in area known as Lots 21.01, 21.02, 23, and 24 in Block 420 into seven (7) new lots. The existing rectangular tract has four hundred feet (400') of road frontage and is one hundred fifty feet (150') deep. The subdivision proposes to provide for three (3) duplex buildings on six (6), five thousand square feet (5,000 SF) zero lot line properties, and a remainder vacant lot of thirty thousand square feet (30,000 SF). The proposed lots are designated as Lots 21.03 through 21.06, 23.01, 24.01, and 24.02 on the subdivision plan. Proposed Lot 23.01 will be the thirty thousand square foot (30,000 SF) remainder vacant lot. Proposed Lots 21.03 through 21.06, and proposed Lots 24.01 and 24.02 will contain the three (3) duplex buildings on the five thousand square foot (5,000 SF) zero lot line properties. The site contains three (3) existing one-story dwellings and a shed. The plan indicates that all existing dwellings and appurtenant features within the subdivision are to be removed. The site is on a ridge, with most of it sloping westerly toward Williams Street. The tract has some large trees which have not been located on the survey. Based on the survey, it does appear the existing dwellings are serviced by individual septic systems and potable wells. The site is situated in the west central portion of the Township on the east side of Williams Street, north of Prospect Street. The existing right-of-way width of Williams Street is sixty-six feet (66') with a pavement width of forty feet (40'). Williams Street is a municipal paved road with numerous patches, curbing in fair condition exists along the property frontage, but sidewalk does not. Overhead electric exists on the west side of the street. The area to the west of Williams Street is predominantly residential. The area to the east of the site is Hospital Support Zone. The lots are situated within the R-7.5 Single Family Residential Zone. We have the following comments and recommendations per testimony provided at the 3/18/14 Planning Board Meeting and comments from our initial review letter dated February 24, 2014: I. Zoning 1. The site is situated within the R-7.5, Single-Family Residential Zone District. "Single-Family and Two-Family Housing, with a minimum lot area of seven thousand five hundred square feet (7,500 SF) for single-family and ten thousand square feet (10,000 SF) for two-family structures" are listed as permitted uses. Zero lot line subdivisions for duplexes are permitted in the Zone. Statements of fact. 2. Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following waivers are required: • Construction of sidewalk along the site frontage. • Planting of shade trees along the site frontage. The applicant's engineer indicates that sidewalk and shade trees will be provided. Accordingly, Plan Note #9 shall be eliminated. II. Review Comments 1. A Boundary and Topographic Survey of the property has been provided. The following revisions should be provided: a. Individual lot areas. b. The addition of Lot 21.02 to the Legal Description. c.

Horizontal datum. d. Signs. e. Mailboxes. A revised Survey has been submitted. Lot 21.02 shall be added to Course #3 of the Legal Description. The curb elevations just to the south of the northern circular driveway appear to be reversed. Corrections can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 2. During our site investigation on 2/20/14 we noted some large trees of significance located on the site. These large trees have not been indicated on the survey. The applicant's engineer indicates that large trees of significance on the site will be located and shown prior to the time of Plot Plan submission should approval be granted. 3. The General Notes must be edited. General Note #3 does not correctly indicate the proposed use. Clarifying testimony should be provided. 4. The Schedule of Bulk Requirements must be edited to provide zero lot line zoning. The following corrections shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted: a. The provided lot area for new Lot 23.01 shall be thirty thousand square feet (30,000 SF), such that none of the zero lot line properties will be undersized. b. The required minimum lot width for zero lot line properties shall be twenty-five feet (25'). c. The provided minimum lot width for the zero lot line properties shall be 33.33 feet. d. The provided minimum lot width for the combination of zero lot line properties is not sixty-six feet (66'). e. The provided aggregate side yard setback for the combination of zero lot line properties is fifteen feet (15'). f. The recent passage of Ordinance 2014-12 has amended the Maximum Building Coverage in the R-7.5 Zone to thirty-five percent (35%). Therefore, variances are no longer required and the Schedule of Bulk Requirements shall be amended accordingly. 5. The proposed lot width for new Lot 23.01 shall be revised to two hundred feet (200') and the lot area to thirty thousand square feet (30,000 SF) to insure all the zero lot line properties will meet the minimum area requirements. The plan dimension widths for proposed Lot 23.01 may not exceed 200.00 feet and the area may not exceed thirty thousand square feet (30,000 SF) to insure all the zero lot line properties comply with minimum area requirements. The corrections can be provided with a resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 6. The plan indicates that four (4) off-street parking spaces will be provided per dwelling. The plan also indicates that four (4) off-street parking spaces are required per dwelling. Since Williams Street is heavily traveled and the proposed lots are relatively deep, we recommend the applicant consider circular driveways to eliminate backing out onto the street. Parking should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board and comply with ordinance 2010-62. Testimony shall be provided on the proposed parking configuration. 7. Seasonal high water table information will be required should basements be proposed for the future dwellings on Lots 21.03 through 21.06, 24.01, and 24.02. The applicant's engineer indicates that seasonal high water table information will be provided prior to the time of Plot Plan submission. 8. The Zoning Map shall be corrected to conform to the Re-Zoning of Blocks 420, 420.01, and 421. A copy of "Figure 1: Proposed Re-Zoning Blocks 420, 420.01, and 421" can be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 9. A proposed ten foot (10') wide shade tree and utility easement is shown on the subdivision plan dedicated to Lakewood Township. Survey data with easement areas to the hundredth of a foot for the proposed individual lots have been completed. The 200.02 foot dimension shall be revised to two hundred feet (200') with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 10. The concrete curb which is in fair condition along Williams Street will require replacement in most locations because of the proposed improvements necessary. Unless a waiver is granted, concrete sidewalk should be proposed along Williams Street. A five foot (5') width should be provided unless pedestrian passing lanes are proposed. An Improvement Plan shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 11. Testimony should be provided as to whether the proposed subdivision will be serviced by potable water and sanitary sewer. The project is within the franchise area of New Jersey American Water Company. A water main may already exist in front of the site, as our site investigation on 2/19/14 noted a

utility trench on the east side of the pavement. Based on the sanitary sewer manhole locations shown on the survey, sanitary sewer would have to be extended to the project. The applicant's engineer indicates that New Jersey American Water Company will provide water and sewer services. 12. Should proposed utility connections on Williams Street disturb more than twenty percent (20%) of the road length in front of the site, an overlay would be required. Our observations note a half width roadway reconstruction is needed. Accordingly, a construction note shall be included on an Improvement Plan provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 13. Ocean County Board of Health approval will be required for the abandonment of the existing wells and septic systems on the site. The applicant's engineer indicates that Ocean County Board of Health approval for the abandonment of the existing wells and septic systems on the site will be obtained prior to the time of Plot Plan submittal. 14. Proposed lot numbers must be approved by the tax assessor's office. Proposed lot numbers have been approved by the tax assessor's office. The map shall be signed by the tax assessor prior to filing should approval be granted. 15. Unless a waiver is granted, shade trees should be proposed within the shade tree and utility easement for the project. 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. This development, if approved must comply with the Township Tree Ordinance at time of Plot Plan Review for the proposed lots. The applicant's engineer indicates that shade trees will be provided. The Board should provide landscaping recommendations, if any. 16. Proposed grading must be provided on an Improvement Plan. Coordination of proposed grading is necessary because of the numerous lots proposed. An Improvement Plan with a proposed grading scheme shall be provided with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 17. Storm water management from development of proposed Lots 21.03 through 21.06, 24.01, and 24.02 must be addressed. It is anticipated that the project will be major development since it is expected that over a quarter acre of impervious surface will be added. Storm water management must be addressed with resolution compliance submission should approval be granted. 18. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Statement of fact. 19. An Improvement Plan must be provided to include grading, drainage, and construction details as required. This Improvement Plan may be provided during compliance if approval is given. The applicant's engineer indicates that an Improvement Plan including grading, drainage, and construction details will 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; b. Ocean County Planning Board; c. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; d. Ocean County Board of Health; and e. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated there are no variances requested. The applicant is also now providing the shade trees and sidewalks so no design waivers are required.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.E. was sworn in. This is a conforming minor subdivision application to create three duplex structures.

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

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Sussman to approve.
Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Banas, Mr. Sussman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Rennert

5. **SP 2062** (No Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Ruach Hatorah Inc
Location: Ridge Avenue
Block 189.03 Lot 35
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for school campus with dormitory and residential units

Project Description

The applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval under the Township's "Campus Ordinance" for the construction of a three-story 34,231 sf school building, and a finished basement. School facilities are identified as proposed in the finished basement and first floor of the school building. The architectural plans appear to identify (148) dormitory units (i.e., beds) with supporting bathroom and shower/bathing facilities on the second and third buildings of the school structure. Towards the rear of the site, eighty-four (84) apartment units are identified in four (4) proposed three-story multi-family building clusters. As noted on the site plans, the proposed school would be located at the front of the parcel, which would be served by several parking areas along a "U-shaped" access along the property's Ridge Avenue frontage. A two-way drive would be extended from the easterly Ridge Avenue entrance towards the rear of the property, where the apartments are proposed as four (4) building clusters. Parking is provided for the dormitory units as well (towards the rear of the site). The proposed project is located on the south side of Ridge Avenue, between its intersections with Lanes Mill Road and New Hampshire Avenue. Ridge Avenue is a paved street with variable cartway and ROW widths as depicted on the site plans, survey and tax maps. Sidewalk and curbing do not exist along the property frontage. As depicted on the site plans, curbing (only) is proposed along the frontage, at the edge of proposed widening of the Ridge Avenue roadway to accommodate ingress and egress to the site. Per the site plans, potable water service is proposed from an existing water main within Ridge Avenue. Sanitary sewer service is proposed by connecting off-site to what is depicted as sewer "Under Construction" within Grandview Avenue. As depicted on the survey, the property contains a 1-story dwelling, gravel access drives, a garage and shed, all of which will be removed. The remainder of the property is predominantly wooded. Properties surrounding the site appear to be predominantly low-density residential.

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. C4 - Location of existing wells and proposed septic systems. 5. C13 - Environmental Impact Statement. 6. C14 - Tree Protection Management Plan. 7. C15 - Landscaping The Survey and Site Plan show enough topography 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. Per review of available data (including NJDEP GIS mapping of the area), the undeveloped portion property appears to consist of wooded uplands with no wetlands. Therefore, we support the requested waiver from C13. The existing property is completely wooded. Therefore, a Tree Protection Management Plan must be provided as a condition of approval to comply with the Township's Tree Ordinance. We do not support the waiver request for Landscaping. At a minimum, landscape plans including proposed perimeter buffer per subsection 18-803 of the UDO should be provided prior to the public hearing. At the discretion of the Board and/or Shade Tree Commission, additional landscaping may be required as a condition of Board approval, if/when forthcoming.

II. Zoning 1. The parcels are located in the R-20 Residential District. Private schools are a permitted use in the zone, subject to the requirements of Section 18-906. As indicated previously, the applicant is requesting that the

project be heard under the requirements of the Township's Planned Education Campus (UDO Subsection 18-902-H6). 2. Per the UDO, a Planned Educational Campus is defined as follows: An educational campus of an institution of higher education that offers a regular educational program that is substantially-equivalent to that of an accredited institution and that contains housing and accessory uses proportionate to the educational facilities intended for faculty and students who will attend or staff the institution's educational facilities and that is adjoining to or within five hundred (500) feet of faculty and student housing so as to create a unified campus setting. The land and all structures including dwelling units shall be owned by the educational institution or a wholly-owned educational entity. The occupancy of the residential uses in the facility should be limited to by students, faculty or staff of the educational institution, by persons directly associated with the educational institution, and or by their immediate families. The applicant's professionals must be prepared to provide testimony to demonstrate compliance with this project's compliance with the Township's 'Campus Ordinance'. 3. Per review of the Site Plan and the bulk requirements of the campus ordinance, no bulk variances are being requested, nor appear necessary for the proposed project. 4. In accordance with UDO subsection 18-902-H6.e(8), perimeter buffers must be provided adjoining residential areas. Buffer must be provided (or relief sought). 5. A design waiver has been required from providing lighting (at this time). We recommend waiver of the requirement for public hearing purposes. However, lighting designs for the school/dormitories, apartments and parking areas will be required during compliance review, if/when Board approval is granted. 6. A design waiver is necessary from providing sidewalk along the property's Ridge Avenue frontage. 7. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of any variances that may be required. III. Review Comments A. Site Plan/Circulation/Parking 1. As indicated previously, two (2) access drives are proposed from Ridge Avenue. One drive, designated 'Roadway A' would extend past the east side of the school building, and provide a loop-shape access drive to the apartments and associated off-street parking (as well as ten (10) off-street spaces proposed east of the school building). 2. One drive, designated 'Roadway B' is proposed from the southerly entrance, and would terminate near the southwest corner of the school building. 3. As noted on the site plans, the applicant's engineer estimates at least (127) off-street parking spaces necessary per UDO requirements from the school and the proposed apartment units. The number of proposed off-street spaces (209) includes (12) proposed handicap accessible spaces. Seventy-two (72) spaces are proposed around the school building, with the remaining (137) spaces proposed in the vicinity of the apartment units. As such, proposed off-street parking appears to exceed Campus Ordinance and School off-street parking requirements. 4. Testimony should be provided by the applicant's professionals as to the maximum number of students and teachers/staff anticipated at the site. 5. Per review of the site plans, all interior access drives are 24-feet wide, and can accommodate two-way traffic. A circulation plan will be required during compliance, if/when Board approval is granted, to confirm access for the largest vehicles anticipated to access the school/dormitory and apartment uses. 6. Road widening tapers are not currently depicted for the proposed entrance/exits. Said areas would be designed during compliance review, if/when approval is granted. 7. Sight triangles must be provided for both proposed access driveways. 8. An un-dimensioned trash enclosure is depicted at the terminus of roadway 'B', near the southwest corner of the school. Testimony should be provided whether DPW or private pickup is necessary. The proposed waste receptacle area shall be screened and designed in accordance with Section 18-809E of the UDO. 9. Coordination between the final site plans and final architectural plans will be required for the proposed school and apartment/dormitory buildings. 10. All necessary signage should be completed on the site plan, such handicap signage and directional signage. 11. Any proposed sidewalk along the site frontage shall be five feet (5') wide, unless pedestrian bypass areas are

designed. B. Architectural 1. Architectural plans have been provided for the proposed school. The set includes floor plans and a building elevation. The proposed building includes three (3) floors and a finished basement. Excluding the finished basement, we calculate that 34,231 of space is proposed on three (3) floors. As noted on the floor plans, the basement would include a 3,346 sf dining room and 955 sf kitchen. 2. The proposed school building height must be identified on the architectural (Elevation Plan). 3. The architectural elevation drawing must be revised to identify the finished basement as identified on the floor plans. 4. Floor plans and elevations are provided for the proposed dormitory apartment units, and are generally well-prepared. However, the proposed height of the apartment buildings must be identified to be less than the 65 foot height allowed in the Campus Ordinance for student dormitory structures on common property. 5. Seasonal high water table information is required to substantiate the proposed basement floor elevation for the proposed school/dormitory building. 6. As noted on the proposed architectural plans, the basement is finished and provides the use of the basement space. 7. Testimony should be provided as to whether sprinkler systems are proposed for the school/dormitory and/or apartment units. 8. We recommend that the location of proposed HVAC equipment be shown for all buildings. Said equipment should be adequately screened. C. Grading 1. Per review of the proposed grading plan, the design concept is feasible, and generally well-prepared for an initial design submission. Additionally, profiles have been provided for all of the proposed access drives. However, the following remaining information is necessary to complete the design: a. Additional proposed elevations for accessible routes and the handicap parking spaces to insure slope compliance. b. Additional proposed elevations provided at control points, such as building landings, curb corners, and curb returns. c. A retaining wall is proposed along the westerly (side) and rear property lines. d. Additional spot elevations will be needed in parking areas to complete the design. 2. The final grading design will be addressed during compliance review if/when approval is granted. D. Storm Water Management 1. The stormwater design is depicted on Site Plan Sheet 4, and includes a series of underground recharge/collection pipe systems and trenches. Additionally, recharge trenches are proposed to serve the two (2) apartment building clusters proposed towards the rear of the site. 2. The proposed project is large enough to qualify as major development and must meet the requirements of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Storm Water Management Rules (NJAC 7:8). Per review of the schematic design, it is feasible and can be finalized during compliance review if/when board approval is granted. 3. Seasonal high water table information is required to justify the proposed depth of the storm water recharge system. The results of Soil Logs should be provided to indicate that a two foot (2') separation will be maintained from the seasonal high water table elevations to the bottoms of the recharge beds. 4. The Drainage Calculations should indicate a permeability rate to be used for the proposed recharge system. Permeability testing results must be provided to justify the design. 4. A design is required for the storm water collection piping for the roof of the proposed school/dormitory building, as well as the two interior apartment building clusters. 6. Predevelopment and Post Development Drainage Area Maps were provided for the review of the design. 7. A Storm Water Management Facilities Maintenance Plan must be provided. Confirming testimony shall be provided that the operation and maintenance of the proposed storm water management system will be the responsibility of the applicant. This plan can be provided during compliance review if/when Board approval is granted. E. Landscaping and Lighting 1. As indicated previously, Lighting and Landscaping designs have not been provided at this time. 2. We have no objection to a detailed lighting design being deferred until compliance review (if/when forthcoming). 3. As indicated previously, we recommend that a Landscaping Plan be provided prior to the forthcoming public hearing. At a minimum, addressing applicable UDO perimeter buffer requirements should be addressed, as well as

additional landscaping (if any) provided to the satisfaction of the Planning Board and/or Shade Tree Commission. 4. We recommend all proposed sight triangles, utilities, and easements be added to the plan to prevent any planting conflicts. 5. A detailed review of the landscape design will be undertaken when plan revisions are submitted. 6. As evidenced per a site inspection of the property, a significant amount of vegetation within the interior must be cleared to construct the proposed project, most of which is unavoidable. Final grading will be reviewed during compliance (if/when approval is granted) to minimize clearing where practicable, and to provide measures such as snow fencing along limits of disturbance intended to remain. F. Utilities 1. The plans indicate the site will be served by public water service (from Ridge Avenue) and public sewer (from Grandview Avenue). As such, Lakewood Township MUA approval is necessary. 2. Outside agency approval from the Ocean County Health Department is necessary for removal or abandonment of existing septic systems or wells within the property. 3. Fire hydrants (if proposed) should be indicated on the plans (or as directed by the Township Fire Official). G. Traffic 1. Traffic information should be provided for the Board's consideration. At a minimum, a summary traffic generation report should be provided prior to the Public Hearing to quantify potential traffic generation from the school and apartments using industry standards (e.g., ITE manual trip generation rates), and potential traffic impacts (if any). Testimony from a qualified traffic consultant may be advisable at the forthcoming public hearing. 2. Testimony should be provided as to whether significant pedestrian traffic (from offsite) is anticipated for the school. H. Signage 1. No signage information is provided. A full signage package for free-standing and building-mounted signs identified on the site plans (requiring relief by the Board) must be provided for review and approval as part of the site plan application. 2. All signage proposed that is not reviewed and approved as part of this site plan application, if any, shall comply with Township ordinance. I. Environmental 1. A waiver from preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was requested for this project. To assess the site for environmental concerns, our office performed a limited natural resources search of the property and surroundings using NJ Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Geographic Information Mapping (GIS) system data, including review of aerial photography and various environmental constraints data assembled and published by the NJDEP. Data layers were reviewed to evaluate potential environmental issues associated with development of this property. Testimony should be provided on any known areas of environmental concern that exist within the property. 2. The existing property is wooded. A Tree Protection Management Plan must be provided as a condition of approval to comply with the Township's Tree Ordinance. 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. 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. Lakewood Township MUA (water and sewer service); c. Township Tree Ordinance (as applicable); d. Ocean County Planning Board; e. Ocean County Soil Conservation District; f. Ocean County Board of Health (existing well and septic, if any); and g. All other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Vogt stated that no variances are being requested.

Mrs. Miriam Weinstein, Esq. on behalf of the applicant. This is a post high school facility so they meet the definition of a institutional higher learning facility. They offer an educational program that is substantially-equivalent to that of an accredited institution. The facilities provided are a

dormitory for the young, unmarried men when they first arrived at the Yeshiva. When the men get married, they provide apartments for the couple and children. None of these units can be or will be sold but all will be owned by the Yeshiva. The school facility, the dormitory and apartments are all within a unified campus style setting as required by the ordinance. Hence, the project does qualify under the definition of Planning Educational Campus. The Yeshiva currently has 80 students including 50 unmarried men and 30 married men. The Yeshiva intends to grow but only to a maximum of 232 students. There would be up to 84 married men and 148 single men. The faculty would consist of up to a maximum of 10 at any given time including teachers and other staff. The basements will be strictly for storage and there will be absolutely no rentals of the basements.

Mr. Brian Flannery, P.E., P.P. was sworn in. Design waivers are being requested for the buffers on both sides of the property. The applicant is proposing an 8 ft vinyl fence with landscaping that would be added during compliance. With respect to parking, they provided 209 parking spaces which is 82 more than required by the ordinance. The applicant would meet with Public Works to satisfy them. The landscaping and lighting would be satisfied during compliance if the Board acts favorably as well as the other items in the report.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if the current Yeshiva allows their students to drive.

Mrs. Weinstein said the unmarried students are not allowed to drive but the married students can.

Mr. Abe Auerbach was sworn in. He said there are no buses. The students typically live on campus.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if the students have vehicles.

Mrs. Weinstein said the boys that live in the dormitory are not permitted to have vehicles. Only the married students are permitted. She pointed out that they are providing 82 more parking spaces than what is required by ordinance. There may be students that will break the policy at times, but again they provided more than enough parking.

Mr. Schmuckler said there will be a lot of children on the campus. He asked about a playground.

Mr. Auerbach said there will be adequate play area for the children. They positioned the area so it would be away from the roads and neighbors.

Mr. Schmuckler would like to see the area fenced off as well as some benches.

Mr. Auerbach agrees with that.

Mr. Schmuckler also said they need to figure out a safe way for the children to walk to that area.

Mr. Flannery agrees.

Mr. Vogt said it will be worked out during compliance.

Mr. John Rea, traffic engineer, was sworn in. They went out and conducted a traffic study during peak hour traffic counts at the intersection of Ridge Avenue and County Line Road. They made some very conservative projections for peak hour traffic flow from the Yeshiva estimating 94 total driveway movements during the afternoon peak hour. Based on their projections, they do not think it will be very high because so many of the students are going to live on the campus and walk to the school. Level Service C conditions are projected at the driveways to Ridge Avenue. The County wanted to make sure that they had a good level of service.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if there will be sidewalks on the portion of Ridge Avenue fronting their property.

Mr. Auerbach said yes.

Mr. Banas opened to the public.

Mr. Craig Theibult was sworn in. He is concerned about the additional traffic this project will cause. He would like to see a deceleration lane on Ridge Avenue. He is also concerned about the parking. He wants to make sure there will be no parking on Ridge Avenue. The area is not properly sewered. He hopes that there will be some consideration that they would put sewer here.

Mr. Vogt said the applicant is bringing over sewer from Grandview Avenue.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct. They would have to go to the MUA for approval. It appears, without any extraordinary cost, that sewer will pick up the neighbors as well.

Mr. Theibult would like to see the sidewalks extended all the way up to Lanes Mill Road and down to New Hampshire Avenue for safety. He is concerned that there is no landscaping plan proposed. He also does not see any kind of measure for drainage.

Mr. Vogt said a number of recharge systems are proposed.

Mr. Flannery said that is correct. There are comments in the engineer's report about items that need to be addressed on that. The items will be satisfied during compliance. The recharge and the stormwater management will satisfy the state requirements. There are reductions that are required as part of that so that the drainage after development will reduce the peak flows prior to development.

Mr. Vogt said they do not meet state standards yet. The final design would be required to comply. Since this is a private facility, the applicant will have to provide and utilize a stormwater maintenance plan for all those systems.

Mr. Flannery said that Mr. Theibult is correct, landscaping plans are required and they would be provided during compliance.

Mr. Jackson said the landscaping plan is an element that should be vetted at a public hearing when you have adjoining neighbors who are concerned about the landscaping and what impact it will have on them. He wants to make sure the neighbors would have an opportunity to comment on it.

Mr. Flannery said the Shade Tree Commission recommended that there should be a landscaping plan. Terry knows what the Board and the Shade Tree commission feels is an appropriate landscaping plan and they are agreeing that they would provide that plan.

Mr. Auerbach said he would be happy to sit with the neighbors and talk about the landscaping. He wants to make the neighbors are happy and provide adequate buffering. They would also try to preserve as many trees as possible.

Mr. Jackson suggested that a landscaping plan be drawn up before the adoption of the resolution so the neighbors would have a chance to comment on it.

Mr. Schmuckler would like to discuss what should be on the plan now as they are all here. He recommended that a temporary fence be put up at the clearing limits so no trees are cleared by mistake.

Mr. Vogt agrees with that and perhaps should be a condition of approval. Snow fences should be in place to preserve the mature vegetation intended to remain prior to site disturbance.

Mr. Schmuckler suggested foundation plans, shade trees along Ridge Avenue, if possible. He would like to see a pretty plan.

Mrs. Cynthia Theibult, 1250 Ridge Avenue, was sworn in. She wants to make sure there is enough privacy between her and the Yeshiva. She would like a privacy fence be put up and to try and keep as many of the existing trees as possible.

Mr. Rennert asked about having the bus stop on the campus property.

Mr. Flannery said it probably isn't a good idea because it is a Board of Education bus. The other option would have it stopped in the Ridge Avenue right-of-way and that would be subject to the County engineer. They could suggest to the County engineer that there be a bump out in the right-of-way but it can't be guaranteed.

Mr. Rennert asked why it isn't a good option for the bus stop to be on the Yeshiva property.

Mr. Flannery said it would be a bus for other parts of the area. So you would have kids that aren't part of the campus on the campus property.

Mr. Rennert would like to make sure the students can safely get on and off the buses.

Mr. Schmuckler said you don't want to take the bus too far away from the regular lanes because the cars need to be able to see the red lights and stop sign. He would like to make sure there is a safe spot for the kids to stand and wait for the bus.

Mr. Flannery agrees with that.

Mr. Auerbach said they are widening Ridge Avenue so there will be an extra 8 to 10 ft where the bus can pull over.

Mr. Franklin asked about garbage collection.

Mr. Flannery said they have to meet with DPW.

Mrs. Bas-sheva Ephram, 1513 Long Beach Avenue, was sworn in. She said these apartments are small so they are not anticipating having many children in these apartments. She does not think the concern has to be so great.

Mr. Banas closed to the public.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if there will be a rented or catering hall in the main building. If so, the parking will not be sufficient.

Mr. Auerbach said they are definitely not renting it to outside parties. If there is a small party, it would only be for the staff and/or students use only.

Mr. Schmuckler asked if parking is allowed on Ridge Avenue.

Mr. Auerbach said no.

Mr. Schmuckler said that as part of their request to the County is that there should be no parking on Ridge Avenue in front of the site.

Mr. Banas re-opened to the public.

Mr. Theibult asked if there will be tractor trailers coming into the site.

Mr. Auerbach said no, there would be smaller food trucks.

Mrs. Weinstein said it is really just a cafeteria.

Mr. Banas closed to the public.

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

6. CORRESPONDENCE

- **SD 1564** – Major Subdivision amended approval request for re-aligned roadway

Mrs. Morris announced that this item is being carried and re-noticed.

- **SD 1944** - Block 417, Lots 1, 2, & 22 - subdivision of Lakewood Township owned property (near Henry Street)

Mrs. Morris announced that this item is being carried to a further date.

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