

**LAKEWOOD PLANNING BOARD
MINUTES
JUNE 21, 2005**

I. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Banas called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Mr. Kielt read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings Act:

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the Ocean County Observer and 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 at least two of the following newspapers: The Asbury Park Press, The Ocean County Observer, or The Tri-Town News at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

II. ROLL CALL: Mr. Long,
Mr. Franklin
Mr. Miller
Mr. Banas
Mrs. Wise
Mrs. Shravzblat
Mr. Dolobowsky
Mr. Ackerman (arrived late).

Also present were Attorney John Jackson
Engineer Maxwell Peters
Planner Stanley Slachetka.

Mr. Banas asked if there were any changes to the agenda.
Mr. Kielt noted there were no changes.

III. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

- 1. SP #1814** (No variances requested)
Applicant: Bais Tova Inc.
Location: Oak Street and Funston Avenue
Block 792, 793 & 794 Lots all
Preliminary and final site plan for proposed school

The attorney was not present. This would be heard later in the meeting.

2. SP #1813 (No variance requested)

Applicant: Shlomo Meyer

Location: Lexington Avenue, north of Fourth Street
Block 118 Lot 12

Preliminary & final site plan - 2,732 square foot, two story retail building

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of a 5,464 square foot two story building for retail use on Lexington Avenue within the B-2 zone. No variances are required for this application. At the technical meeting the issue of ADA accessibility to the second floor of the building was discussed. The uniform construction code states buildings of the height and area proposed do not require ADA access to the second floor. The applicant will be required to provide ADA accessible bathrooms on the first floor of the building. The applicant should provide testimony as to how deliveries to the building will be accommodated. The applicant has indicated a 1' x 21' easement to be provided to lot 11. The easement line must be labeled on the plans. The applicant has indicated that there is an easement detail but it is not apparent on the plan. The applicant shall provide a legal description of the easement for review by the Planning Board Engineer. The applicant shall provide the easement agreement for review by the Planning Board Attorney. The applicant will have to provide outside agency approvals. The remaining comments were minor in nature.

Mr. Slachetka stated that as required, the applicant has submitted an architectural elevation of the proposed building. No off-street parking spaces are proposed and none are required in the B-2 zone. The covered wood porch associated with the residential dwelling on lot 11 extends into lot 12. The plan indicates that an easement is being granted for access and maintenance of this porch. The form of the easement should be approved by the board's attorney prior to filing of the document. The survey description should be reviewed by the board's engineer. A trash enclosure is now shown in the rear of the site for solid waste. A 150 watt light fixture is proposed. Landscaping has been provided around the trash enclosure.

Charles Surmonte, P.E., appearing on behalf of the applicant, was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. There will be on-street deliveries in the front of the building. The easement would be provided as well as the details requested. Mr. Jackson stated that normally an easement is submitted and it has to be satisfactory. Mr. Peters requested in his letter that access and maintenance be provided. It was a resolution compliance issue. Mr. Banas stated that Mr. Surmonte should make his case completely. Mr. Surmonte stated the handicapped accessible ramp would be provided. Mr. Banas asked if it was on the plans. Mr. Surmonte replied that it was not.

Mrs. Shrivatzlat asked if they were agreeing to provide the ramp. Mr. Surmonte replied that the same would be included on the map.

Mr. Banas asked about Mr. Slachetka's comments. Mr. Surmonte replied that they agreed to all the comments from the planner.

Mrs. Shrivatzlat asked what kind of businesses were proposed for the building.

Shlomo Meyer was sworn in. Mr. Meyer stated that the building was not being built by an ultimate user. It was being built for someone who would be renting out the space. Every store would need its own C.O. It would be an enforcement issue with regard to the trash. Mrs. Shravzblat asked if there would be space to handle more dumpsters. Mr. Meyer stated that there would have to be enough space, unless they keep their garbage inside until it is put out. A lot of stores do that.

Mr. Banas asked the size of the trash pad. Mr. Surmonte stated they were proposing 6' x 6' which could be enlarged to 8' x 12' or 8' x 15' if necessary. There is room for 8' x 12'. Mr. Meyer stated this is part of the downtown zone. Mr. Banas stated that Mr. Franklin did indicate that it was five day a week pickup.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Miller and seconded by Mr. Long, the application was hereby approved conditioned upon obtaining the required easement for the side of the property and that the handicapped ramp would be indicated on the plans.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Miller, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mrs. Shravzblat, yes;
Mr. Long, yes; and
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes.

Mr. Ackerman arrived at the meeting.

1. **SP #1814** (No variances requested)
Applicant: Bais Tova Inc.
Location: Oak Street and Funston Avenue
Block 792, 793 & 794 Lots all
Preliminary and final site plan for proposed school

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the Bais Tova School between the unimproved rights-of-way that are Oak Street, Bellinger Street and Funston Avenue within the A-1 zone. No variances are required. The applicant shall provide testimony as to the following: the school's hours of operation, the number of staff, the number of bus trips per day, and the number and age of the students. The applicant has provided site triangle easements at all exit driveways as required. The applicant's engineer shall provide legal descriptions for review and provide a deed restriction for the sight triangle area. The applicant will be required to obtain all outside agency approvals. The planning board should determine if on street parking will be permitted on any of the streets which border the site. The board should determine if a shade tree easement will be required along Bellinger Street.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant should describe the operational characteristics of the facility including the following: the proposed number of students to be educated on site; the anticipated number of school buses visiting the site on a daily basis; the proposed hours of operation; the services that will occur on site; and the use and operation of the pool. The applicant should describe the bus transportation operations to confirm the adequacy of the proposed circulation pattern. The applicant should provide information concerning the improvement of Oak Street and Funston Avenue. The Planning Board will be interested in the party or parties responsible for the improvement of each street, sharing of costs, scope or level of improvements and the time schedule. Given the limited detail submitted for the Phase II pool and school, we would recommend that final approval be limited to Phase I. We recommend that a deed of lot consolidation be filed with the Ocean County Clerk's office. A time schedule should be provided for the phasing plan. The applicant has submitted a NRI and architectural elevations and floor plans. A proposed playground area is shown and details of play equipment are provided on the landscaping plan. At the plan review meeting, the applicant indicated that the parking area or a portion of the parking area would be used for a play area. The applicant should describe this in further detail. Comments of the Shade Tree Commission dated June 1, 2005 should be addressed. All outside agency approvals must be obtained.

Abraham Penzer, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. The site plan was marked as Exhibit A-1. The architectural rendering was marked as A-2.

Brian Flannery, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. The application is for a school. No variances are required. They have the reports from the professionals. They were proposing a school that would have 33 classrooms. It was a 86,791 square foot school with parking for 200 plus vehicles. There will be 16 buses on a daily basis. The proposed hours of operations will be staggered. They will start at 9 to 9:30 a.m. and end from 5 to 7 p.m. The services that will occur on site are all the services provided in the private schools in the township. The pool is in phase two. The bus transportation operation has been added. The flow of the buses have been added. The buses would enter on Funston, go to the rear of the site and there is stacking on site for 50 buses, and then exit on Oak Street. The entrances are separate. The parking for the faculty and visitors is accessible from Funston. The play area is in phase two. In phase one there is a play area in the northeast corner. It was an area of 80' by 100'. Details are provided on the plans. The Shade Tree recommended additional landscaping as did the board's professionals. They provided additional landscaping in accordance with the board's professionals' comments. Mr. Slachetka stated this was acceptable. Mr. Flannery stated they would obtain the necessary outside agency approvals. There were no exceptions with regard to the engineer's report.

Mr. Penzer stated he advertised for phases one and two. He understood the board's concern regarding what phase two would look like. If the applicant is locking himself into that the building would look exactly like this building and that it would not go beyond the footprint, all the parking is in and the buses, the only difference is the placement of the building. If they go one inch beyond the footprint, they would return. The building would look exactly like the first building. He stated they were ready to tell them what phase two would be like. They were ready to look themselves into that. Mr. Banas stated he was the one that was strongly against about introducing phase two. He indicated at the

technical meeting that he was interested of the safety of the individual students. He stated they were interested in dollars. He felt that there was no equation that was equal to the safety or the costs at future time for construction of the building. Mr. Penzer stated they agreed. Mr. Banas stated the loss may be different down the road. He stated they would follow the plan as outlined from the technical meeting. He saw nothing wrong with the facade of the building or the way it was constructed. He thought it was beautiful. He took issue with Mr. Flannery's statement at the technical meeting where he said it was the most beautiful building in Lakewood simply because he constructed school buildings and he thought his were the best. He suggested that the board only consider phase one. Mr. Penzer stated it would be primary through eighth grade and max out at 875 students.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the buses and their path. Mr. Flannery stated the entrance for the buses is on Funston. Mr. Dolobowsky asked where the children would enter the building. Mr. Flannery stated the buses would come around to the drop off area. Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the area in the back. Mr. Flannery stated it was a separate entrance to basement. Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the play area and how many children there were. Mr. Flannery stated there are 875 children. Mr. Dolobowsky stated that 8,000 square feet is not a huge playground. Mr. Flannery stated that all the children will not be on the playground at the same time. There are other schools where the school itself is the same size. Mr. Dolobowsky understood. He also asked about trees in the play area. Mr. Flannery would review it.

Mrs. Wise asked about the number of children in phase one. Mr. Flannery stated it was 875 students. Mr. Penzer stated that phase two would be a high school. Mrs. Wise asked about the play area and the equipment as well as the surface. Mr. Flannery stated it was playground surface.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

Mr. Flannery stated that at the last meeting there was a provision in the resolution regarding the treatment works approval not needing to be procured prior to the engineer signing off. He requested the same for this project. Mr. Penzer stated they would agree to not obtaining the C.O. until the approval was received. Mr. Miller stated he spoke to Mr. Secare about this and the applicant would be at risk. Mr. Peters recommending granting this request.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the sidewalks not connecting to the internal sidewalks. Mr. Flannery stated they would be connected.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the application was hereby approved as discussed.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Miller, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mrs. Shrivastava, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 3. SD #1473** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Pine Belt NH LLC
Location: corner of New Hampshire Avenue and Route 70
Block 1160.03 Lot 47
Minor subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval to subdivide exiting block 1160.03 lot 47 into 2 new lots. An existing school will remain on proposed lot 47.01. No construction is proposed at this time on new lot 47.02. The property is situated on New Hampshire Avenue in the M-1 zone. A variance will be required for the minimum lot area for lot 47.02, 3.0 acres is required and 2.5 acres is provided. A variance will be required for the front setback for lot 47.01 where 100 feet is required and 92.1 feet is provided which is an existing condition. The applicant should provide testimony as to vehicle access to the site from New Hampshire Avenue and how the subdivision will impact traffic flow on-site. The balance of the comments were minor in nature.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant must present the positive and negative criteria for the requested variances. At the plan review meeting, the applicant indicated that the purpose of the subdivision was to enable the purchase of the leased school facility. A new office building may be constructed on lot 47.02. The proposed subdivision line will bisect the paved area on the north side of proposed lot 47.01. Based on the location of the proposed subdivision line, it appears that the subdivision will have a material impact on the function of the existing school site. The following aspects of the site will be impacted: the access to the school from New Hampshire Avenue, the site circulation, and the off-street parking for the school. In addition, the applicant should discuss the need for screening and buffers between the school and the potential development of the new lot. Based on the above, we recommend that the applicant submit an application for amended site plan approval of the school property in conjunction with the request for the minor subdivision. Alternatively, the board may want to condition subdivision approval on the submission of a site plan application within a reasonable period of time. The plat indicates that a new access easement is proposed on new lot 47.02. Prior to filing of the access easement, the board engineer should review the metes and bounds description of the easement and the board attorney should review the form of the access easement document. Any development of new lot 47.02 will require site plan approval of the Lakewood Township Planning Board.

Ray Shea, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. He stated this was a minor subdivision. The intent was to create a lot so the school could take title to their property. The recommendations were well taken with respect to a subsequent site plan approval. A full site plan will be submitted for the new lot. An application is being prepared.

Brian Flannery, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. The application is a minor subdivision to separate the two lots. Both reports indicate the variances required. A variance is needed for minimum lot area. Three acres is required. The new lot will have 2.5 acres. The other variance is the front yard setback on new lot 47.01 where 100 feet is required and 92.1 feet is required. This is an existing condition. From

a negative criteria standpoint, there is no impact. The aspects would be the same if it was conforming. There is no negative impact. The positive impact is that the school could now own the property and not be tenants. The board could grant the variances without any detriments to the zoning plan or zoning ordinance. Access to the site is from the most southerly entrance. The buses would use the entrance and exit onto New Hampshire. Nothing will be changed until something else is developed on site. His office was working on a site plan application for the new lot. Twenty-five parking spaces would be required per the ordinance. The northeasterly corner is a play area. They have provided more than 40 spaces. They would agree to the recommendations from the planner.

Mrs. Shrivastava asked why he indicated there would be no negative impact. Mr. Flannery stated they were asking for a subdivision. There was no negative impact to the subdivision because they could let the school keep renting. They could come in for the same site plan and there would be the same thing. Mr. Shea stated right now it was grass and trees but it will become parking and building. The school will have access to the parking spaces through cross easements. They will have an expanded parking opportunity that they do not enjoy right now. This was a win win situation for both lots. No one is sacrificing anything. The school would own the property that they currently rent. The school is advancing its ability to have expanded parking. Mr. Banas stated that Mr. Flannery stated the parking needed was 25 spaces and there are 40. There is not a need to have more. Mr. Shea stated that for special affairs more parking would be needed. Mr. Flannery stated that nothing on the site would change until they get an approved site plan. Mr. Shea stated that the school right now is a tenant. Pine Belt Chevrolet currently owns the property. The school is asking for the subdivision so they could purchase the land. This application is to accommodate the school. Mrs. Shrivastava stated that Pine Belt is the applicant. Mr. Shea stated he was representing both parties. The subdivision reflects the desire of the school. Mr. Flannery stated he met with the school and that is the line they wanted for the property. Mrs. Shrivastava asked if there was a representative of the school present. Mr. Shea replied that there was not.

Mrs. Wise asked about the circulation of the school buses. Mr. Flannery stated they enter on the most southerly entrance, drive up to the school and drop off the children, and exit. This is what is current. Mrs. Wise asked the number of children now and the number afterwards. Mr. Flannery stated there are 22 classrooms which is about 400 to 500 students. Mrs. Wise asked about the stacking of the buses. Mr. Flannery stated eight to ten buses could be stacked. Mrs. Wise stated she drives by the site everyday and it was difficult to get out onto New Hampshire. Getting in was easier. Mr. Flannery stated that is why they were giving the cross access easement. Mr. Shea stated they would be exiting at the same location. Mr. Flannery stated they could discuss the driveways when they come back for a site plan. The County approved the driveways years ago and they were still in appropriate locations. Mrs. Wise stated the prior use of the building was not a school. Mr. Banas asked if the cross easements were ready. Mr. Shea stated the professionals requested the descriptions which will be supplied. Mr. Banas stated the driveway goes into the other lot completely. Mr. Flannery agreed and it was indicated on the map.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, he closed the public hearing.

Mrs. Shrivastava asked Mr. Banas' opinion on her comments. Mr. Banas felt there was a lot of validity to her question. He felt she had the opportunity to ask questions of the applicant or their representative. Then you have to determine whether or not you agree with the discussion or the answer given and a means by which you could voice your opinion at the vote. If you agree with the arguments and the answers given, you could vote positively. If you disagree, you could vote against it. It has to be something you determine by yourself.

Mr. Jackson asked about the new lot being two and a half acres and the existing lot conforms. Mr. Shea agreed. Mr. Jackson stated there would be cross easements so the school could utilize the exit. Mr. Banas agreed. Mr. Jackson asked if the variance was being sought under C-1 or C-2. Mr. Flannery replied that it would go under C-2 as well as C-1. The use would be beneficial. Mr. Shea stated that if the school wanted a different configuration, he would have applied for that. He could reduce the school which they did not want. Mr. Jackson stated the school would have their own lot. Mr. Shea agreed and then they have the opportunity for a second school and share the same infrastructures if they wanted. Any parking provided would be over-parking for the school. The application as submitted is what the school wanted.

Mr. Banas asked what the little jog was about 300 feet east. Mr. Flannery stated it was part of the building.

Mrs. Shrivastava was concerned about the school and that Mr. Shea was making representations without anyone from the school present. Mr. Shea stated both he and Mr. Flannery were saying the same thing. Mrs. Shrivastava was not convinced of the benefits of the subdivision.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked where the parking was and how many spaces there were. Mr. Flannery stated there are two areas. One is north of the building which is currently existing and is rows of perpendicular parking to New Hampshire Avenue. The purpose of the subdivision line along that location was to permit the school to have a 24' isle adjacent to the building and 18' head on parking spaces beyond that. In addition, on the southerly side of the building there is an existing parking area which is about 15 spaces. Beyond the building it widens where there are another 20 spaces. Behind the building there is a single row of parking with about 15 spaces. It is well over 40 parking spaces. Mr. Dolobowsky stated the board has seen many applications that straight lines do not make good neighbors, he was reviewing this to see why the property should be jogged. They do not know what will happen in the future. Mr. Shea stated when they come in with the site plan, the cross easements would be present.

Mr. Slachetka stated the intent is to come in with a site plan for both lots and in the application there would be cross easements. Mr. Shea stated that the application would be for the new lots with the cross easements for the old lot. Mr. Slachetka stated if the application is approved, what would happen if Pine Belt changed its mind and sold it to someone who was not interested in cross easements. What would the board have to do to protect itself. Mr. Shea stated that whatever Mr. Jackson deems appropriate would be acceptable. Mr. Jackson stated once the easements are in place, they cannot be taken

back. The subdivision is not effective until the easements are in place. The only person who could rescind the recorded document would be the school. Mr. Shea stated that the school would have the right to use the additional parking. Mr. Banas stated that in the resolution this should be stated very clearly. Mr. Shea stated they would supply all the necessary information.

Mr. Dolobowsky was concerned what will be on the property. If it was another school, there would be no problem. It could be industrial. Mr. Shea stated the zone permits an office building. The application would be for an office building which could be included in the resolution. Mr. Dolobowsky asked if there was language that could be included so there would be no hazardous admissions. It is always easier when the school goes in second. Mr. Shea stated he would agree to include in the resolution that no industrial use would be applied for.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Miller, the application was hereby approved as discussed.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Miller, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mrs. Shrivastava, abstain;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 4. SD #1480** (No variance requested)
Applicant: Mordechia Rozansky
Location: corner of Hope Chapel Road and Hope Hill Lane
Block 11 Lot 3
Minor subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final minor subdivision approval for the creation of two residential lots at the corner of Hope Chapel Road and Hope Hill Lane within the R-15 zone. No variances are required. The Board should determine if shade tree easements are required along the Hope Chapel Road and Hope Hill Lane frontages. The balance of the comments were minor in nature.

Mr. Slachetka stated the proposed lot line between new lots 3.01 and 3.02 is not in compliance with Chapter 17-8.4a in as much that "side lot lines shall be at right angles to straight streets." A design waiver is required. As noted on the plat and in accordance with RSIS, a total of three off-street parking spaces are required for each of the proposed five bedrooms dwellings. The applicant should confirm that sufficient parking will be provided. The balance of the comments were minor in nature.

Abraham Penzer, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant.

Charles Surmonte, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. In reviewing the planner's report, C.1 involves the well and septic design. They did preliminary soil borings. They tested the permeability. They designed the septic fields for four bedroom homes. They placed wells on the property in conformance with State statutes. They investigated adjoining properties to ensure they would not conflict with any required separations. Mr. Penzer asked if he felt if there was adequate separation between the wells and septs. Mr. Surmonte felt that there was. The lot line was discussed as the technical meeting. They proposed a lot line as shown on the plan to create two totally conforming lots with the zoning. There is a second existing driveway that would be closed. They would submit the lot numbers to the Assessor for approval. The street trees would be supplied. The building would be removed. Mr. Slachetka felt that a bond would be required to ensure that the building was torn down at a later date. Mr. Dolobowsky stated that the existing building will sit on both lots. There was some discussion as if it could be left up. What if they want to start building with the house still up. Mr. Penzer stated the building permit would not be issued. Mr. Dolobowsky suggested adding language to the resolution that before building on either lot, the building has to be removed. Mr. Slachetka suggested a time limitation for removal of the building. Mr. Penzer stated the problem is that there are tenants in the building. Mr. Slachetka stated having a building on two lots creates a use variance. Mr. Jackson stated a restriction could be used that the property would not be conveyed until the house was demolished. Mr. Penzer stated he has a problem with the deed restriction. Mr. Slachetka stated he has had similar issues in the past because it was creating a use variance. Mr. Penzer stated if a time limit was used, he would suggest four years.

Mr. Penzer stated that the applicant would have to obtain approvals from other agencies and would agree to the same as part of the approval resolution. Mr. Surmonte stated that if the board requires a shade tree easement, it would be provided. Mr. Banas stated yes and suggested that they work with Mr. Slachetka on it. The board wanted shade trees on streets and they can be down to shrubs near and around the buildings. Mr. Banas asked how many parking spaces were provided for in the driveways. Mr. Surmonte stated they were proposed a one car garage on each building and there was more than enough room for two additional cars on each driveway. There would be a minimum of three off-street spaces for each lot. Mr. Slachetka stated that previously they stated the septic was designed for a four bedroom house, yet the application is for five bedroom homes. Mr. Surmonte stated there is more extensive design that has to go into the septic. He did not think the difference of four to five bedrooms would affect the separation issue. Mr. Penzer stated the applicant would agree to comply to the RSIS for five bedrooms with regard to the septic. They would agree to 190 days to remove the building. Mr. Slachetka stated the approval from outside agencies should be provided prior to filing the map. Mr. Penzer agreed.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about lot 3.02 and the driveway appears to be taking out a 12" tree. He asked if the driveway could be moved to save the tree. Mr. Penzer agreed to the same. Mr. Dolobowsky asked if the distance between the well and septic is met with the neighboring properties. Mr. Surmonte replied they did. Mr. Dolobowsky stated it appears that the septs are uphill from the houses and if it was unusual. Mr. Surmonte stated the septic would be 1' below grade. The septic field itself would drain downhill. There is only so much slope you can have at the top of the septic field. The field on lot 3.02 might appear to have a mound, but it would no more than a two foot mound.

Mr. Penzer stated they will meet all the septic requirements.

Mrs. Shravzblat asked where the nearest public sewer was. Mr. Surmonte was not sure of the exact location, but it was too far away to bring sewer to the site.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, he closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Long, the application was hereby approved as discussed that the driveway would be relocated to save the tree, they would comply with the map filing law, the house would be removed within 190 days, and other items as discussed.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mrs. Shravzblat, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

Mr. Jackson asked if he could include in the resolution that the demolition of the house would be carried out in the time period with any extensions. Mr. Penzer agreed.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Long, the resolution would include language regarding extensions and demolition of the house.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mrs. Shravzblat, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 5. SP #1714A** (Variance requested)
- Applicant: Garden State Hotel (Hilton Garden Inn, Ruby Tuesday's and Longhorn Steakhouse)
- Location: Route 70 and Garden State Parkway
- | | |
|---------------|------------------|
| Block 1160.07 | Lots 193, 194 |
| Block 1235 | Lots 33, 36 & 44 |
| Block 1241 | Lot 1 |
| Block 1240 | Lot 1 |
| Block 1239 | Lot 1 |
- Preliminary and final site plan

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of one Hotel, two restaurants, and one additional pad site on Route 70, westbound, within the LP zone. A variance will be required for maximum sign area, a maximum of 200 square feet is permitted and the applicant has provided 350 square feet. A variance will be required for minimum sign setback, a setback of 43 feet is required and the applicant has provided 10 feet. The applicant will have to get outside agency approvals. The applicant should comply with the Shade Tree Commission letter of June 1, 2005. The applicant has indicated utility easements on the plan. The applicant shall provide a legal description of the easement for review by the board's engineer and an easement agreement for review by the board's attorney.

Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant needs to address the positive and negative criteria for the requested variances. A traffic engineering investigation was prepared. The application is subject to NJDOT approval. Information regarding the status of all NJDOT approvals should be submitted. The Shade Tree Commission comments should be addressed. A lot consolidation deed should be filed with the Ocean County Clerk's Office. Architectural drawings have been submitted. With regard to the freshwater wetlands, the applicant should discuss the status of any DEP approvals. While there appears to be a surplus of off-street parking based on ordinance standards, we note the parking computation for the pad site is based on a parking requirement for an office or personal service establishment. The site plan shows an apparent drive-through arrow. The board should reserve the right in the future to review the site circulation and parking after the use of the pad site has been determined by the applicant. The proposed drive-through for the pad site is not sufficiently differentiated from the adjoining two-way circulation aisle. There also may be conflicting vehicle movements at the exist of the drive-through aisle. The balance of the comments were minor in nature.

John Paul Doyle, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. He gave a brief history of the applicant. A hotel was an approved use. They tried to create the application without any variances except what were required by a right of way easement. This board previously approved a hotel location at the site of a different nature. They would present testimony.

Stephen Atkins, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. The color rendering of the site plan was marked as Exhibit A-1. The sign drafting was marked as Exhibit A-2. The architectural renderings were marked as Exhibit A-3.1, A-3.2, and A-3.3. Using Exhibit A-1, Mr. Atkins stated was a color rendering of the landscape plan. The areas that are colored represent the site in question. Route 70 is on the south, to the west is a circular element which represents a taking by the State for a future jughandle, and to the east is another cut out, circular area, which represents a future jughandle. The easterly portion of the property is near Shorrock Road. The existing jughandle is shown. The areas shaded in dark green represent the wooded areas to be retained. The northern part of the site has a significant amount of woodland to remain undisturbed. That area also contains some wetlands areas and would stay as part of a conservation area never to be disturbed. The lightly shaded gray represents the parking. The darker brown represents the three buildings. In the center is the proposed Hilton. It was a 100 room hotel. To the east, is a pad which shows the Longhorn Steakhouse. To the west, is another pad which is the proposed location for a Ruby's Tuesday. On the westerly pad,

there is a portion of the pad for which the use has not been determined. The plan shows two access points to the highway and there is in excess of 400 parking spaces that are provided. There is a 100 room hotel, two restaurants and a 3,150 square foot building with no determined use. The project was previously approved as a 600 seat banquet facility and two ninety seat meeting rooms. The new application coincides with the previous approval. What has changed is the internal details and arrangements. The drainage, circulation, driveways, limits of the open space are very similar to what was previously approved. They were proposing a single ID sign which was marked as A-2. This sign would require a variance for 350 square feet where 250 is permitted. The traffic engineer and planner would provide testimony for the sign variance. The sign will be 43 feet in height. The other variance is the separation from the Ruby Tuesday's to the proposed ramp which is being constructed by the NJDOT. This is 83 feet where 100 feet is required. To the best of his knowledge, the application complies to all the other requirements of the Code.

Mr. Doyle stated the unspecified pad site will be for a permitted use. Mr. Atkins agreed. Mr. Atkins stated items one, two and three of the engineer's report were information. Item four indicates the approvals necessary which they would be applying for. Mr. Doyle stated they would comply with the Shade Tree commission letter. Mr. Atkins replied the revised plans submitted reflect the changes. Mr. Doyle stated the easement information would be provided. In reviewing the planner's report, item A, item B.1, B.2, B.3 and B.4 were factual. Items C.2 and C.3 would be provided. Mr. Doyle stated a lot consolidated deed would be provided. Item five was factual. A freshwater wetlands areas as been noted. Mr. Atkins stated he believed the letter of interpretation was provided in the package to the board. Mr. Doyle stated that the proposed drive-through for the pad site can be handled in a simple way. Mr. Atkins felt he could define the difference and protect the vehicles by a double sided curb which would separate the two movements of vehicles. That would be a minor change to the site plan. Mr. Doyle asked about the conflicting vehicles. Mr. Atkins stated that stop signs at the area would prevent conflicting vehicles. Mr. Doyle stated item 9 refers to the solid waste area. Mr. Atkins stated the plans were clarified and corrected to reflect the same. The outside agency approvals would be obtained. He was satisfied that the plan meets the appropriate engineering standards.

Mr. Banas asked Mr. Slachetka about if the changes that Mr. Atkins was suggesting were acceptable. Mr. Slachetka stated that it was hard to tell because there is no use. Double sided curb is fine. He felt there needed to be some level of width. There would have to be some physical separation. Stop signs were okay. He wanted to see some directionals. Mr. Atkins felt that they could consider them and incorporate the same to work something out that would be satisfactory to the board.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the retaining wall in the backup of the parking lot. He was assuming that the parking lot would be above the surrounding area. Mr. Atkins stated that was correct. Mr. Dolobowsky asked what the drop off would be. Mr. Atkins stated it varies from five to six feet. Mr. Dolobowsky asked about a fence. Mr. Atkins stated they have guiderail proposed. Mr. Dolobowsky was concerned about the children. Mr. Atkins stated he could suggest a post and rail fence with turkey wire.

Mr. Banas asked about the sign. He asked if there was a height limit. Mr. Slachetka stated a variance is needed. Mr. Doyle stated that the ordinance height feet is 25 feet and testimony will be provided.

Kenneth Fears, P.E., Traffic Engineer, was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He was familiar with the site and visited it numerous times. He assisted Mr. Flannery on the prior application and the NJDOT access permit application. The site is designed with two driveways each of which will be a two way driveway with a right turn in and right turn out circulation. They are configured so that the driveways approximately align with key or principle circulation elements on the site so as to place the driveways in a logical location. The purpose of having two driveways is to facilitate and ease the movements onto Route 70. By having two points of access, you can get maximum use of the gaps that occur. By doing that you minimize the amount of time that a person has to wait to depart the site. By making that wait shorter and more comfortable you enhance the safety of the driveway operation. Both driveways are on a relatively straight and level portion of the roadway which means they have good site distance. They are oriented at a 90 degree angle and are appropriate distances from other access points and should operate well. In terms of on-site issues, virtually all of the internal intersections are 90 degree intersections with two way flow. The only exception to that was the area with possible multiple conflicts. That was identified as appropriate to control with several stop signs and stop bars. The site has been configured with its anchor being the hotel use and while they will have some food capability, it was primarily continental breakfast for the guests. The restaurant is proposed to be used by the guests so they do not have to leave the site. They treated the three uses as if there was no inter-relation with the other uses. There will be considerable inter-action between the hotel guests and the restaurants. Mr. Doyle stated the parking exceeds the requirements. Mr. Fears stated the parking was looked at relative to the ordinance and the parking is substantially in excess of the parking requirements. They also looked at it in terms of the specific uses and other similar uses that might someday be there. They wanted to look at the overall site and ensure that it worked no matter what restaurants were there. In one part of the report, the restaurants are treated as high turnover restaurants. In another part, they are treated as quality restaurants. A quality restaurant has a longer customer duration. This means more parking demand because the customers were staying longer. There is then less in and out traffic. In looking at the traffic, they were viewed as high turnover restaurants. In each case, they were taking the worse case scenario to ensure that the site functions satisfactory and it does do so. Mr. Doyle stated at the technical review meeting, it was requested to have testimony regarding the parkway. Mr. Fears stated that Shorrock Road is located in the lower right hand corner of Exhibit A-1. Directly opposite Shorrock Road is a portion of the jughandle that is provided for westbound turns on Route 70. The Parkway currently traverses the area on the straight through direction. What is proposed as part of the interchange is a ramp that comes off the parkway and move traffic to Route 70 westbound. There would be another ramp that comes off the parkway north of the site and moves traffic to Shorrock Road and to Route 70 eastbound. There would be a ramp that goes from Route 70 westbound onto the parkway and another connection that uses the existing loop ramp in the southeast quadrant of Route 70 and Shorrock Road to facilitate the movement from Route 70 eastbound onto the parkway. In trying to track down where the project stands and its status, they began with the DOT. The DOT does not know anything about it yet. The Parkway was not sure and referred them to the County. The project is at least ten years in the future. They did not yet begin discussions with DOT. They are looking at concepts. These are the concepts that are planned. They might start construction in seven or eight years which would take awhile. There is other

work that is being done to the west of the parkway. There is a lot that is going on. They looked at the land acquisitions and consolidations that were provided as part of the previous application and they tried to make a good efficient proposal for this project which would nest in between the ramps as they are currently contemplated. Mr. Doyle stated the westerly ramp does not exist which creates the 83 foot setback where 100 feet is required. Mr. Fears agreed. Mr. Doyle stated that the planner's report in C.1 indicates an issue with the loading area. Mr. Fears stated that conditioned is accepted. The proposed changes are accepted to the area creating the possible conflicts. There is a distinct advantage to provided 24 feet because of the signs that might be placed on the isle. Mr. Doyle stated if the ordinance was followed the sign would not be good. Mr. Fears stated there are three maybe four uses that would cater to customers that may not be familiar with the location. There would be repeat customers to the restaurants. You would also get people traveling Route 70 looking for a place to eat that may not know the exact location. Signing is essential to give those people adequate notice and visibility to slow down and signal to enter the site in a safe manner. For this facility, each of the three uses has a need to serve its customer base. To achieve that, you need a certain lettering height to make the sign legible so an approaching person can see it. The signage proposed could comply with the ordinance if you had several free standing signs. One for each of the facilities. That would not be good from a traffic engineering prospective or a planning prospective. It would be unaesthetic. It also creates multiple points of focus for a driver's attention rather than a single point which is safer. If you combine three freestanding signs, it drives the sign height higher. The driver would be able to see the sign 600 feet ahead. The specific sign proposed has some room but if you bear in mind that the tenants could be different in the future, you still need a certain amount of area to ensure that the message gets through. This is how the sign was designed.

Brian , P.P., architect, was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He felt that due to the shape of the property was like a mushroom. The property is surrounded on all sides by multiple front yards. The variance is a 83 foot setback to a future parkway ramp. This is as the result of a right of way taking. It was not to Route 70. Most the travelers will come from Route 70 and the variance would not impact the site. The impact is to the future ramp that may or may not happen. The sign variance primary reason is for safety. You want a sign that is adequate enough to be viewed from 600 feet away. He felt the 350 feet being sought is appropriate. In the ordinance, the 200 foot limit is based on properties that have more than 400 feet of frontage. This property has over 800 feet of frontage. In theory, this property could be developed as two separate lots and then you would be allowed to have to separate signs for a total of 400 feet. The sign being proposed is consistent. The sign variance could be granted without detriment to the zoning plan or zoning ordinance. The sign provides one focal point for the motorists. The sign allows motorists to identify the sign while they are driving without taking their attention away from the roadway.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, Mr. Banas closed the public hearing.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Ackerman, the application was hereby approved as discussed to include a safety fence around the retaining wall, granting the variances, and the 24" curb line.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

Mr. Banas did not think the board would get to item #7, SD#1476. Mr. Kielt noted that there was not time restraints on the application. This would appear as the first item on the June 28, 2005 meeting. Mr. Shea agreed to the same. Mr. Jackson stated that application SD #1476 was carried to the June 28, 2005 meeting at 6:00 p.m. No further notice was required of the applicant.

- 6. SP #1790** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Excel Corporate Park II LLC
Location: Prospect Street, east of Cross Street
Block 391 Lot 9
Preliminary and final major site plan for proposed warehouse

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of a 74,400 square foot industrial building along Prospect Street and the access driveway to the Clayton Concrete Plan in the M-1 zone. A variance is required for the minimum lot width where 300 feet is required and 285 feet is proposed. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the access easement. The applicant should provide Ocean County Planning Board approval, treatment works approval and CAFRA approvals. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the proposed uses and the number of employees that are projected. The applicant has provided details of the proposed signage but must show all locations on the plans. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the construction of the offsite improvements. The applicant should provide a legal description of the proposed access easement. The balance of the comments were minor in nature.

Mr. Slachetka stated a front yard setback of 80 feet is provided where a minimum of 50/100 feet is required. Lakewood Township Schedule of General Regulations contains note #6 relating to the front yard setback in the M-1 zone which states "Minimum yard requirements may be reduced by recommendation of the industrial commission with consent of the planning board." Therefore a variance is not required, but the reduction of the front yard setback requires the approval of the planning board. It is our understanding that a recommendation of the Lakewood Industrial Commission has been submitted to the Planning Board Attorney for review. Information concerning the proposed private access road should be provided to the planning board. A copy of the access easement documents should be submitted to the board attorney for review. We recommend that street lighting be provided along this segment of the access road. Landscaping is now

proposed within the median on the west side of the site and is acceptable. As requested, additional landscaping has been provided along Prospect Street on the west side of the loading area access driveway to screen the loading area from Prospect Street. The “call-out” for the number and landscaping species around the flared end section at the east end of the front of the site has been omitted and should be labeled. Architectural elevations and floor plans have been submitted for Planning Board review. The applicant should clarify the circulation within the loading area on the east side of the site. As requested at the plan review meeting, testimony should be provided concerning the retaining wall on the east side of the site.

The project will be subject to approvals from outside agencies.

Francis Accisano, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. He stated the variance was granted by the board to create the lot in conjunction with a minor subdivision. The building conforms with the exception of the 80 foot setback. The board previously granted the variance. The access easement was presented. They will stipulate that they do not have any tenants right now but any use would conform with the land use ordinance. A revised form of access agreement was negotiated and was currently being recorded at the Ocean County Clerk’s Office. A color rendering of the site plan was marked as Exhibit A-1. Mr. Jackson stated the variance for the minimum lot width is that when you come in with a site plan you “reup” the variances. He felt that was the proper procedure. If someone has an undersized lot and wants to build a house, they have to get a variance even if the lot exists.

Brian Flannery, P.E., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. He stated the application is for a 74,400 square foot industrial building. There are about four buildings currently along Prospect Street. A variance is needed for lot width along Prospect Street. The access easement is in place. He felt the variance could be granted without any detriment to the zoning plan or zoning ordinance. There is no way of increasing the lot. The benefits of granting the variance enhance the use of the land. The approvals needed would be provided. He took issue with the CAFRA permit approval because it was not required based on the number of parking spaces. Mr. Banas asked if the CAFRA plan goes with the railroad. Mr. Flannery stated that it is in the CAFRA zone but applications of certain size are exempted. There are no tenants at this point but would be the same uses as the other Excel facilities. The uses would be permitted uses. There is a loading dock and a row of parking. The anticipated a maximum of 30 employees and there are 52 parking spaces provided. The requested details will be provided. Sanitary sewer and water needs to be extended from Prospect Street and is shown on the plans. The legal description for the access easement will be provided. The Shade Tree Commission’s comments were addressed and they would comply with what the board’s requires. They received a letter from the industrial commission. The loading area is on the easterly side. The trucks will come in, back into the loading dock and leave. The retaining wall runs along the easterly side. The highest it gets is 3.9’ and tapers off.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked how much room a tractor trailer needs. Mr. Slachetka stated it could be done with less than 100’. Mr. Dolobowsky felt that the building could be shifted away from the road and buffered more. If not, there is a large black top area that would be used to pile things. This would be viewed from the road. Mr. Flannery felt that 80’

could be used, but the maneuvering would require 100'. Mr. Dolobowsky felt that one trash enclosure was not enough. A recycling enclosure was needed. He wanted to see where 20 dumpsters would be. Mr. Flannery stated the area indicated for the dumpster enclosure is at the end of the loading area. They would expand the area and put in a larger dumpster enclosure. They have additional depth. Mr. Dolobowsky felt that 20 dumpsters were needed. Mr. Flannery stated that this is a warehouse type use which does not generate the same trash as an industrial use. They could designate areas along the back of the building for the same.

Mr. Shiner, 509 Hope Chapel Road, Lakewood, was sworn in. He stated that each tenant has its own trash bin located away from the building. Mr. Dolobowsky stated it needed to be shown on the plan.

Mr. Accisano stated the slab would be removed. Mr. Slachetka wanted some screening. Mr. Flannery stated fencing would be provided.

Mrs. Wise asked about the ingress and egress to the building. Mr. Flannery stated the front of the building would have access for the employees. There is a small office area and the balance is the warehouse. It would be the same entrance.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked what is the build out at the back of the building. Mr. Flannery stated it was a canopy.

Mr. Banas opened the application to the public. Seeing no person wishing to speak for or against the application, he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the mechanical room and the loading docks that are close to it. Mr. Slachetka stated that a bollard would be acceptable.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the application was hereby approved as discussed to include the addition of the pads, the addition of the bollards, and granting the variances.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

IV. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS

1. **SD #1468** (Variance requested)
Applicant: 319 Prospect St. LLC
Location: Prospect Street, west of Massachusetts Avenue
Block 445 Lot 1
Preliminary & final major subdivision - 27 lots

On motion by Mr. Ackerman and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

2. **SD #1470** (Variance requested)
Applicant: MLJR LLC
Location: County Line Road East, between Brook Road & Somerset Avenue
Block 174.04 Lots 54 & 55
Preliminary & final major subdivision - 9 lots

On motion by Mrs. Wise and seconded by Mr. Ackerman, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

3. **SP #1811** (No variances requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Nesivos Ohr Inc.
Location: corner of Oberlin Avenue South & Vassar Avenue
Block 1602 Lot 1
Change of use site plan from existing manufacturing and warehouse to proposed school

On motion by Mr. Ackerman and seconded by Mr. Dolobowsky, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 4. SD #1475** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Sean Kohn for Congregation Bnei Moishe
Location: Shafto Avenue, south of County Line Road
Block 148 Lot 2
Preliminary & final major subdivision - 3 lots

Mr. Kielt stated that this had an approval from the zoning board. Mr. Jackson stated that the resolution should indicate that this approval revokes all previous approvals. If not, then the resolution should state the same. Mr. Dolobowsky felt it should be either/or permitted. Mr. Jackson stated that language would be added that the applicant would proceed under either approval, but not both.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Long, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 5. SD #1446A** (No variance requested)
Applicant: Joseph Gutterman
Location: Miller Road, between Shady Lane & Carasaljo Drive
Block 12.02 Lot 18
Extension of previously approved Minor Subdivision

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 6. SD #1467** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Karl Hanson
Location: Eleventh Street, east of Clifton Avenue
Block 111 Lot 9
Denial of minor subdivision to create two lots

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mr. Long, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 7. SP #1809** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Toyota World of Lakewood
Location: Route 88, east of New Hampshire Avenue
Block 569 Lot 110

Amended site plan to replace existing free standing sign and addition of driveway entry direction signs

On motion by Mrs. Wise and seconded by Mr. Dolobowsky, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 8. SD #1474** (No variance requested)
Applicant: Pine Projects LLC
Location: County Line Road East & Lanes Mill Road, east of Joe Parker Road
Block 187 Lots 53.01 & 53.02

On motion by Mr. Ackerman and seconded by Mr. Dolobowsky, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 9. SD #1472** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Yosef Lipschitz
Location: corner of Vine Avenue & Elm Street
Block 764 Lots 12 & 13
Minor subdivision to re-align two existing lots

On motion by Mrs. Wise and seconded by Mr. Dolobowsky, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 10. SP #1812** (Variance requested)
Applicant: Stratford Holdings 101 LLC
Location: corner of Fourth Street & Monmouth Avenue
Block 128 Lot 7
Preliminary & final site plan for 3,080 square feet addition to existing commercial building

On motion by Mrs. Wise and seconded by Mr. Ackerman, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

SP #1418

Mr. Peters stated that with regard to Elmhurst, LLC, he would like to add the condition that the applicant provide their approval from New Jersey American for the pump station.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the resolution was hereby memorialized as amended.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

SD #1441

Poi Wei

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the minutes of May 17th, May 24th and May 31st were hereby approved.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE

None at this time.

VII. PUBLIC PORTION

None at this time.

Mr. Banas stated they needed to discuss any items with regard to the ordinances. There were no questions.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and Mrs. Wise, a letter would be forwarded to the Committee that they have no objections to the ordinances.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin, yes;
Mr. Banas, yes;
Mrs. Wise, yes;
Mr. Long, yes;
Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and
Mr. Ackerman, yes.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Elaine Anderson
Planning Board Recording Secretary