

The Lakewood Township Committee held a Meeting on Thursday, June 18, 2009 in the Lakewood Municipal Building, at 6:30 PM for the Executive Session and 7:30 PM for the Public Meeting, with the following present:

Mayor..... Robert Singer
Deputy Mayor.....Steven Langert
Committee Members.....Menashe Miller
Raymond Coles
Meir Lichtenstein
Municipal Manager..... Frank Edwards
Municipal Attorneys.....Jan Wouters, Esq.
Municipal Clerk.....Mary Ann Del Mastro

Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act, N.J.S.A. 10:4-6, by Resolution of the Township Committee adopted January 1, 2009 and published in the Asbury Park Press on January 8, 2009.

ROLL CALL

CLOSED SESSION

Resolution No. 2009-194 – Adopted.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG AND PRAYER

ROLL CALL

OPEN SESSION

MOTION TO APPROVE MINUTES OF: 06/04/09

Motion by Mr. Coles, second by Mr. Lichtenstein, and carried, to approve the above Minutes.

MOTION TO APPROVE CLOSED SESSION MINUTES: 06/04/09

Motion by Mr. Coles, second by Mr. Lichtenstein, and carried, to approve the above Closed Session Minutes.

Mayor Singer opened the meeting to the public.

David Drukaroff, 1433 Laurelwood Avenue – Read from a prepared statement with regard to the 2009 Municipal Budget and the School Budget posted in Joyce Blay’s blog.

Mayor Singer answered that the information was incorrect, and asked Mr. Edwards to respond.

Mr. Edwards explained that with regard to the 2009 Budget, starting July 1 which would be the start of the school budget year, by statute the Township does not have to give the school budget any of its' funds for 2009 until August 9th. In the past, the Township gave the money on July 1, or August 1. The Township can no longer afford to do that, so the school board submitted a schedule to the Township, where they expected the Township to pay in the same sequence as in the past. What the Township did instead was have the July 1 payment reduced and the August 1 payment made larger. The school board agreed to that. Basically, the money is actually being divided differently between July and August.

Charlie Cunliffe, 135 Jennifer Drive – Thanked the Committee for putting the Budget on the website. Asked for Sheets 3B1 and 3B2 which is an explanatory Budget message explaining previous years' tax levy, and compares any increase in tax levy from last year to this year, and show's the increase of the tax rate. He stated that was not on the website, and he wanted to know if it is in the Township's budget. He also asked about deferred expenses; exactly what expenses were deferred and what was the total dollar amount of the deferral, and how did the Township plan to pay that deferral back.

Mr. Cunliffe also asked about budget cuts, certain increases and decreases in construction, government body expenses, and legal expenses.

Mr. Edwards explained that the subject pages were not required pages in the budget and therefore were not included. As to deferred expenses, the only thing that has been deferred in this budget was the pension. The Township, along with many other towns, took the fifty percent deferral, as was offered by the State.

Mr. Rieker added that the deferral was just over 1.7 million dollars.

Mayor Singer added that it is his understanding that the state is planning to do the same for next year.

Mr. Edwards continued that the state deferred it, and starting in 2012, each town will be asked to come up with a plan or basically to fund it over fifteen years.

Mr. Cunliffe also thanked Mr. Lichtenstein for having the street lights repaired. As to the addresses of where the graffiti is located: 110 Jennifer Drive, the fence was sprayed with graffiti; 141 Jennifer Drive, the utility pole was sprayed with graffiti; the house at the corner of 1166 McKenzie and Jennifer Drive, has old and new gang graffiti; and the utility box between 135 Jennifer Drive and 1163 McKenzie, that has new graffiti on it.

Noreen Gill, 192 Coventry Drive – Stated that due to the collection rate being down, and people not paying their taxes, the tax rate is expected to go up a little over four cents; three cents out of the four is due to the collection rate being down.

Mayor Singer answered no; to be exact, two cents is for the tax appeal situation, and approximately one cent is because of the collection rate.

Jose Borges – Commented on court matters.

Lynn Celli Lanzaro, 579 Patriots Way – Commented with regard to Seagull Square Shopping Center, and the appointment of Director of the LDC.

_____Zietler, 18 Tova Drive – Suggested a way to build up reserve in the budget is to try to raise money from revenue. Also commented with regard to the Pine River Village project.

Scott Kaiser, Toms River – Commented with regard to the Lakewood Airport.

Chaim Friedman, 1715 Princeton Avenue – Commented with regard to the Pine River Village project.

Berel Sasoon, 28 Kelmwoods Avenue – Commented with regard to the Pine River Village project.

Gerry Ballwanz, Governors Road – Commented with regard to the Pine River Village project. Also commented on the Resolution for the award of contract to T & M Associates.

Jim Bamus, Monmouth County – Commented with regard to the Ordinance to dissolve the Airport Authority.

Bill Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane – Commented on the Pine River Village presentation. Also on the Planning Board approval of five duplex units in the area of MLK Drive and Pine Street, which is a congested intersection, as is the nearby intersection of Route 9 and Pine Street. He asked that a traffic survey be conducted to determine if a traffic light is appropriate.

Mr. Miller advised that a letter has been written to the Ocean County Board of Chosen Freeholders by the Planning Board Attorney requesting the County to come in and do a traffic study.

Mr. Miller also asked that the Committee look into when Vine Street will be put through from Cedarbridge Avenue to Pine Street to alleviate a lot of traffic on MLK Drive.

Mr. Hobday also advised that JCPL has added two or three street lights to the intersection of Cross Street and Massachusetts Avenue, and the lights shine into the homes of the people living on Ivy Hill Road. He asked if there was some type of shield that can be placed on those lights.

Mayor Singer advised they will look into it.

Mr. Miller also advised that at the intersection of MLK and Pine Street, Public Works put out the strips for pedestrians. One of the strips ends at a grassy surface. He asked that Public Works put down a concrete pad at that point, to connect the sidewalk to the walkway. He also asked that a crossing guard be assigned to this area.

Pat DeFillipes, 314 Fifth Street – Asked for an explanation of the release of reverter.

Mr. Wouters explained that a reverter is a provision in the Deed when you convey property to a property owner; in this case it was a school, and the condition of the sale is such that if the property is not used for educational purposes within a certain period of time, the property would revert back to the Township, so that you make sure the property is used for its intended purpose. In this particular case, the property was conveyed to the school. The school did in fact build the school. They are building an addition to the school on the property and their lender, in order to fund their money, is requiring that this reverter be released.

Mayor Singer added that the problem is that it is the bank's concern that their mortgage will not be secure.

Seeing no one else wishing to be heard, Mayor Singer closed the meeting to the public.

AMENDMENT TO 2009 MUNICIPAL BUDGET

Mr. Edwards stated that as was mentioned to the Township Committee previously, the Township did not adopt the Budget at the last meeting because the State had not finished their review of all the various Municipal Budgets. The Township did get their review, and did receive verbal approval. The gentlemen who reviewed the Budget for DCA had one technical amendment to the Budget. He did not agree with the way one item was presented from last year, and wanted an adjustment in this year's Budget. The net change is \$4,725.20, and he has before the Township Committee an amendment, and the Clerk also has it. The Township Committee has to make a Motion to adopt the amendment. The Clerk has to read it into the record, and then the Township Committee has to vote on it, and then the Township Committee will vote on the Budget for adoption, as amended.

The Clerk read the amendment to the 2009 Municipal Budget into the record.

Motion by Mr. Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Langert, as to the amendment to the 2009 Municipal Budget.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Mr. Lichtenstein, Mr. Coles, Mr. Miller, Deputy Mayor Langert and Mayor Singer.

Resolution No. 2009-195 – 2009 Municipal Budget Amendment Adopted.

2009 MUNICIPAL BUDGET - FINAL ADOPTION, AS AMENDED.

Motion by Mr. Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Langert.

Deputy Mayor Langert thanked Mr. Edwards for his work on the Municipal Budget.

Deputy Mayor Langert further explained specific line items of the budget, budget cuts and increases, the increased tax rate, and explained that through the collective efforts of the Township Committee, Municipal Manager, Budget Advisory Committee, and Department Heads, and other concerned groups they were able to cut in other areas in order to minimize the effect of forced expenditures.

Mayor Singer advised that he has suggested to the Committee that they start looking at next year's budget in July, not in January. The reason for that is to get the full effect of any changes you make, you need a full year.

Mayor Singer further commented that in the past year, Mr. Edward has cautioned the previous Committee's about the overuse of surplus, and was ignored. That is why he has voted against eleven of the last twelve year's budgets. The use of heavy surplus to falsely lower the rate gets you through the election, but leaves the town in the situation they are facing today. The corrective action will not happen overnight; they will have to wean themselves off of using the heavy surpluses, most of which were gained by land sales. Had they been fed in properly, for one time expenses, instead of bonding, etc., they would not be in this difficult financial situation. They have tried to maintain services to the town. Next year may be a bigger challenge, and they may have to take more drastic action. He thanked the Manager, professionals and department heads.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Mr. Lichtenstein, Mr. Coles, Mr. Miller, Deputy Mayor Langert and Mayor Singer.

Resolution No. 2009-196 – 2009 Municipal Budget adopted, as amended.

QUALITY OF LIFE

Mr. Lichtenstein commented with regard to Kent Road. The Engineering Department was to revisit the issue of sidewalk installation, and he was wondering what the status was.

Mr. Day advised that he received a memo from Mr. Edwards requesting that he contact the County to remove the no right turn on red sign at Kent Road and West County Line Road. From the Minutes of the meeting, it was discussed about eliminating the actual right turn lane. He wanted to confirm what exactly the Committee was looking to do.

Mr. Lichtenstein stated that they wanted to create a safe place for pedestrians to walk. The comment that was brought to them was that the pedestrian area for walking was eliminated to make room for the right turn lane. Yet there is a sign that says no right on red. So it does not help move traffic, and the pedestrians have no place to walk. Their goal is to have a safe place for the pedestrians to walk from Buckwald Court to Kent Road, and across County Line Road, because it is very dangerous.

Mr. Day advised there is the one lot on the east side of Kent Road that does not have sidewalk. Looking at the tax maps, the two lots before that, that have sidewalk, before Buckwald Court, both have a nine and a half foot easement to the County which is how those sidewalks were put in. But there is no easement for the last corner lot.

Mr. Day will look at different solutions and report back at the next meeting. The Township Attorney was also requested to write to the property owner, stating that the Township would like to have sidewalks installed on the property and request their permission to do so. The Engineer will identify where the sidewalks would be located and provide the information to the Attorney.

Mr. Lichtenstein commented with regard to the Chestnut Street area. He advised Mr. Franklin about the graffiti; between 135 Jennifer Drive and 1163 McKenzie, the utility box has been marked with graffiti; at 141 Jennifer Drive, the utility pole has been marked with graffiti. There are also two homeowners who have had their property marked with graffiti. He has tried to reach out to them, and in fairness to them, they did, at one point, try to remove the graffiti themselves. He asked if Public Works could at least clean whatever graffiti was painted by gangs that is visible to the street, even though it is a private fence or on the side of a private home; so at least the whole neighborhood gets cleaned up in one shot of the gang markings and they do not come back and try to remark.

Mayor Singer stated that he thought that Inspection has to go out to the homeowners and advise them to clean it up.

Mr. Lichtenstein answered that the gangs went onto someone's property; the Township is not going to summons them.

Mayor Singer continued that the homeowner has the right to go through their homeowner's policy and be reimbursed for that. He believes the Township will get into a very dangerous situation when they go on private property to clean things up. Then any homeowner who has a problem, any thing that happens, they will have the right to say it may be gang related, and request the Township to clean it up. They should contact their homeowner's insurance; it is covered under most insurance policies.

Mr. Lichtenstein further commented that he noticed a lot of green boxes and public type property light poles, around town, at Shop Rite Plaza, West Kennedy Boulevard, that have gang markings on them. He asked that Public Works provide two men to go around town, with paint, on the semi-public property, and cover up the graffiti.

Mayor Singer thought Mr. Lichtenstein was going over-board. If there is gang related graffiti on utility boxes they should call JCPL to come out and clean up their property. The Township pays them hundreds of thousands of dollars in light bills each month; they have some responsibility. If the boxes are owned by either the telephone company, the cable company, or JCPL, it is their responsibility to keep them clean. You have to

identify the number on the poles or boxes, and request the Manager's Office to contact the utility company to correct the problem, and request to be advised when the work will be done. It is the utility company's problem.

Mr. Lichtenstein requested that both the Inspection Department and Police Department, when are driving around town, to provide the information and graffiti location to the Manager's Office.

Mr. Edwards advised that the person who interacts primarily with the utility companies is Al Dineros, the Purchasing Agent, so the information should be provided to him.

Mayor Singer requested Mr. Edwards to advise Mr. Dineros to call JCPL tomorrow, explaining the problems the Township is having with gang related graffiti on some of their poles and boxes in town. The Township would like to know their procedure in how they intend to clean it up, and what is their time frame. Also, you have to identify the owner of the green boxes, and contact them also to keep their equipment clean.

Deputy Mayor Langert advised there is a street sign stating the name of a street, but on the official Township map, there is no such street. He asked who would look into this.

Mr. Edwards advised the information should be provided to Mr. Franklin.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Franklin to look into placing a No Outlet sign on Chelsea Court, as it is a dead end street. The Homeowners Association will mark out the pipes for the sprinkler system prior to the installation of the sign.

Mr. Miller also passed a Thank You note to Mr. Franklin from the residents of Commonwealth Drive for the replacement of the grates.

Mr. Miller also advised that the roadway is coming up near the curbing near 11 Chicanos Drive. He asked that Mr. Franklin look into repaving the area.

At this time, the professionals left the meeting.

PRESENTATIONS

Somerset Development Corporation – Pine River Village

John Phillips, Esq., Attorney for Somerset Development, gave a presentation with regard to the Pine River Village project. He indicated that they had a meeting with the homeowners on May 31st, and the homeowners did circulate a letter subsequent to that meeting to retain counsel, as it was being paid for by Somerset Development. Gary Forstner, Esq., was also present, representing the homeowners.

Mr. Phillips proceeded to give a presentation and provided background information with regard to the project. Originally, the site was to be developed for senior housing. The market for senior housing in New Jersey has changed. When Somerset Development realized that they were having trouble moving the units, and that the project was grinding to a halt, they went to the homeowners and explained the situation, and they proposed splitting the development, with the Township's permission, obviously for a number of different reasons, into two different communities. One, where the existing homes are now, which would remain a senior community, fully age restricted, and the other half of the project would become market rate units. In order to do that, the first thing they had to do was to get the consensus of the homeowners. Under the by-laws and covenants on that property, they needed sixty-seven percent of the homeowners. They now have ninety to ninety-five percent consent, which petition was previously submitted to the Township Committee. The process has moved forward now; the Township Committee has received a legal opinion from Mr. Wouters, that the Township has the ability to remove the deed restriction on this property, and to rezone the property, and amend the redevelopment plan to allow half of this project to be made into a market rate presentation. Mr. Ralph Zucker, Somerset Development, was present, and explained the physical changes (maps were shown) that are being proposed, which have already been explained to the homeowners, with regard to this project. They are before the Township Committee to request the removal of the Deed restriction, and to allow the project to go forward. As Lakewood is struggling with growth, it has always been the policy of Lakewood to adopt Ordinances, etc., to accommodate that growth, and he respectfully requested the Committee's consideration of their request. Nicholas Graviano, the Planner retained by Somerset Development, presented details of the project, together with suitability of this project, and densities, etc., and comparisons between other successful Somerset Development project.

(Due to the amount of static, parts of the recording of the meeting became inaudible from this point on)

Someone advised that packages were presented to the members of the Township Committee, as well as the Clerk, which were duplicates of the slides that were shown during the public presentation, so that the record is complete. The request was made that the Committee consider this request and direct the Attorney to continue to work with them toward effectuating the removal of the age restriction.

Mayor Singer thanked everyone for the presentation. To the attorney representing the homeowners, he asked if the statement that ninety to ninety-two percent of the homeowners were in agreement of this change, was that a correct statement.

Gary Forstner, Esq., representing the residents of Pine River Village, answered that it was a little premature for him to answer. But he is not disagreeing with that statement.

They are just coming on board; they are asking a lot of questions and they have had productive dialog with the Township Attorney and with Mr. Phillips in order to advance the discussions. His responsibility is to objectively look at the proposal with the residents now being represented by counsel, or order to be able to evaluate, not just the general concept, but the specific proposal. He did say that many of the residents, if not most of the residents, and probably the ninety to ninety-five percent that have been represented, are in favor of the concept. But it his responsibility before this matter moves forward, before he encourages the Committee to act, to review the details, and really see how the proposal effects the residents within the development. There have been many misconceptions with regard to the process, not only amongst the residents, but apparently amongst the public at large. This is going to be a work in progress as he sees it. He suspects that the Committee and Mr. Phillips will both agree that the consent of the residents of Pine River Village is a critical component to this process. Before this becomes a done deal, so to speak, it is absolutely critical that they be able to ask many questions, and get many answers, and they have begun that process. They have tentatively scheduled, and he invited all the residents of Pine River Village, out to a meeting so that they can begin a dialog and discuss these issues, on Tuesday evening at 7:30 PM at the clubhouse. To answer the question posed by Mayor Singer, preliminarily he believes that consent is there, but given his new role in this process, he needs to speak with the residents about the details of this proposal before he is able to tell the Committee that he has that consent.

Mayor Singer shared the viewpoint of the Township Committee. They would not be looking at this proposal had it not been for the residents coming to the Committee and saying they were in favor of this type of change. Their main concern is for the residents who live there now, and they want to make sure they have the quality of life that they wanted to have when they moved to Lakewood in an age restricted community. For the Committee to consider Mr. Zucker's proposal, they have to be sure they have the support of the residents. Without their support, by State law, it can not be done. The Committee has to know that they have that support from the residents, for them to look at this, because without that the Committee can not do anything. He is not going to expend their time and money without knowing they have that guarantee.

Deputy Mayor Langert confirmed that they need the consent of sixty-seven percent of the current owners other than the Developer.

Mayor Singer further advised that the Committee will be waiting to hear from the Attorney for the residents. He wants to be assured of the desire of the residents.

Mr. Forstner thanked the Committee, and stated that they appreciated that prospective, and that they share many of the same concerns of both the Committee and the Developer.

Deputy Mayor Langert commented that in order for this project to receive his support, he would like the following concerns addressed. He understands that Somerset Development paid Cedarbridge nine million dollars for the property, and he understands

that they probably based that price on the fact that it was a senior development. He believes that had it been a non-age restricted development, it would not have been nine million, it probably would have been more. He is not comfortable with voting for lifting the age restriction without the Township being remunerated for it. He just wanted to point out that the Attorney hired by the Township, in his conclusion, stated that....."for the reasons set forth herein, so long as the Pine River Village properties are located within a redevelopment area, etc., etc., etc., the Township may adopt an Ordinance consenting to the revision of the deed release, to release this restriction and by Resolution authorize the Township to enter into a redevelopment agreement which will amend the original option agreement. Lastly, if the Township wants to ask for a monetary payment from Somerset, as consideration for these actions, the Township may do so as well." Deputy Mayor Langert continued, that the Attorney is telling the Committee that they may ask, and he is asking Mr. Zucker to remunerate the Township for releasing the deed restriction. He understands that if the market would have been better, they would not be before the Committee with this request for release....it would have been sold, and would have been a successful project. He understands that everyone is in a tough situation, and the Township is also in that tough situation. For the Committee not to keep their fiduciary responsibility to the taxpayers would be wrong in his opinion. So he is asking Mr. Zucker to reconsider his position when coming to the Committee with regard to payment for lifting the Deed restriction. He would also like to see a little more play area for the children who will be living in this development.

(was unable to hear Mr. Zucker's entire response)

Mr. Zucker answered that he appreciates Deputy Mayor's comments, and understands where he is coming from, but if the Township is going to charge them, charge everybody else. If the Township does not charge anybody else, don't balance the budget on their backs.

Mr. Forstner advised that the residents do have a great deal at stake, and they also have been hurt by this market, but even more so, in changing this project, they are going to be subject to bearing responsibility for maintaining, with far fewer people, certain amenities so that this project ultimately works and does not fail. Again, he is not taking a position on this request, but he asks that the Committee keep that in mind.

Mayor Singer stated for the record, and for clarity, the Developer told the Township that they were going to reimburse each individual substantial monies, to the tune of about \$18,000.00.

Mr. Forstner continued that when he talks about the details, that is part of what they need to address.

Mayor Singer again thanked everyone for their discussions and he closed the presentation.

ORDINANCES FOR DISCUSSION: None

Comments from the public will be heard for a limit of one (1) hour. Each speaker will have four (4) minutes and shall be limited to one time at the podium.

CONSENT AGENDA

The items listed below are considered to be routine by the Township of Lakewood and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no formal discussion of these items. If discussion is desired, this item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and will be considered separately.

- 1. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Zach Corporation T/A Plaza Liquors, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44-017- 009.
Resolution No. 2009-197**
- 2. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Jay Prabhu, Inc., T/A Rite Liquors, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44-013- 004.
Resolution No. 2009-198**
- 3. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for S & G Associates Inc., for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44-011-011.
Resolution No. 2009-199**
- 4. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Laketon Associates, Inc., T/A Laketon Inn, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-034-004.
Resolution No. 2009-200**
- 5. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Charlie Brown's of Lakewood, Inc., for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-018- 004.
Resolution No. 2009-201**
- 6. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Country Club Caterers, Inc., T/A Lakewood Country Club, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33- 009-004.
Resolution No. 2009-202**
- 7. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for American Legion Post No. 166, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-31-036-001.
Resolution No. 2009-203**

- | | Matrix/
year |
|---|-------------------------|
| 8. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Woodlake LLC, T/A Woodlake Golf and Country Club, for the 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-029-006.
Resolution No. 2009-204 | |
| 9. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for A Better Liquor Corp. T/A Parkway Liquors, and Brandy's Tavern for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-32-022-009.
Resolution No. 2009-205 | |
| 10. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for ADI Spirits, Inc., T/A Pine Cone Liquors, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44- 023-005.
Resolution No. 2009-206 | |
| 11. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Square Liquors, Inc., T/A Spirits Unlimited, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44-021-004.
Resolution No. 2009-207 | |
| 12. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for VADI Wines Inc., T/A Spirits Unlimited, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44- 006-008.
Resolution No. 2009-208 | |
| 13. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Ruby Tuesday, Inc., for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-012-006.
Resolution No. 2009-209 | |
| 14. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Wines and Liquor R Us, T/A Royal Liquor and Wine, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44-005-010.
Resolution No. 2009-210 | |
| 15. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Ocean Lanes, Inc., T/A Ocean Lanes, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33- 014-008.
Resolution No. 2009-211 | |
| 16. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Student Government Club Association, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-31-044-001.
Resolution No. 2009-212 | |

- 17. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Kokes Fairways LLC, T/A Eagle Ridge Golf Club, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-025-009.
Resolution No. 2009-213**
- 18. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Parsuns Liquors, Inc., T/A Best Liquors, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44- 004-008.
Resolution No. 2009-214**
- 19. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Shoreline 70 Investments, Inc., T/A Vanity Fare Caterers, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-36-045-004.
Resolution No. 2009-215**
- 20. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for KCB Liquors, Inc. T/A Buckingham Liquors, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44- 019-009.
Resolution No. 2009-216**
- 21. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Leiserv Inc., T/A Brunswick Lakewood Lanes/Finnegan's, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-031-006.
Resolution No. 2009-217**
- 22. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Kimball Diner and Restaurant Inc., T/A Chianti Ristorante, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-010-003.
Resolution No. 2009-218**
- 23. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Lakewood Lodge #1432 BPOE, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-31-037-001.
Resolution No. 2009-219**
- 24. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Lakewood Liquor LLC, T/A The Vineyard, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33- 032-014.
Resolution No. 2009-220**
- 25. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Strand Ventures Inc., T/A Strand Theater, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-37- 046-001.
Resolution No. 2009-221**

- 26. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Bacoli Inc., T/A Bacoli Pizza, Pasta and Grill for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-033-003.
Resolution No. 2009-222**
- 27. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Brothers Cantina LLC, T/A Brothers Cantina LLC, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-001-010.
Resolution No. 2009-223**
- 28. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Duvvuru Shalini Reddy, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-035-007.
Resolution No. 2009-224**
- 29. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Parkway Hotel, LLC T/A Hilton Garden Inn, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-36-047-001.
Resolution No. 2009-225**
- 30. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Lakewood Resort Inc, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-33-002-006.
Resolution No. 2009-226**
- 31. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Forresters of America No. 127, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-31-039- 001.
Resolution No. 2009-227**
- 32. Resolution authorizing the Liquor License Renewal for Joseph E. Stephens, Inc. T/A Gerard's Liquor Store West, for the year 2009-2010, License No. 1514-44-033-007.
Resolution No. 2009-228**
- 33. Resolution releasing a Performance Guarantee posted by Joseph Kanarek, in connection with Block 230, Lot 9.
Resolution No. 2009-229**
- 34. Resolution releasing a Performance Guarantee posted by Hoffman Park Associates, in connection with Block 174.11, Lot 36.
Resolution No. 2009-230**
- 35. Resolution authorizing the Cancellation of old outstanding checks appearing on the records of the Municipal Court.
Resolution No. 2009-231**

- 36. **Resolution authorizing Emergency Temporary Appropriations for the period between the beginning of the current fiscal year and the date of the Adoption of the 2009 Budget.
This Resolution was removed from the Consent Agenda.**
- 37. **Resolution designating Lakewood Resource and Referral Center, Inc., as the Authorized Agent to apply on behalf of the Township of Lakewood to the U.S. Administration for Children and Families, Office of Community Services for a grant under The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.
Resolution No. 2009-232**
- 38. **Resolution authorizing Deed of Partial Release of Reverter as to Lenders, Bais Tova, Inc. (Block 792, Lot 1 & Block 793, Lot 1, Block 794, Lot 1)
Resolution No. 2009-233**
- 39. **Resolution granting a Leave of Absence, without pay, to Mamie Morgan, from June 4, 2009 to July 2, 2009.
Resolution No. 2009-234**
- 40. **Resolution authorizing the Award of a Professional Services Contract to T & M Associates, in the amount of \$28,000.00. (Water Quality Mgmt. Plan – NJDEP)
Resolution No. 2009-235**

Motion by Mr. Deputy Mayor Langert, second by Mr. Coles, to approve Resolution Nos. 1 through 40 on the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Edwards advised that Resolution No. 36 is a Emergency Temporary Appropriation that was only needed if the Budget was not adopted. Therefore, No. 36 needs to be removed from the Consent Agenda, and allowed to die.

Deputy Mayor Langert amended his Motion to remove Resolution No. 36, and Mr. Coles amended his second to the Motion.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Mr. Lichtenstein (abstained on Nos. 13, 29 and 32), Mr. Coles (abstained on No. 25), Mr. Miller, Deputy Mayor Langert and Mayor Singer (abstained on Nos. 16 and 17)

Resolution Nos. 2009-197 through 2009-235 – Adopted.

ORDINANCE SECOND READING – None

Mayor Singer announced the meeting of July 2nd will be held early, at 3:30 PM, the reason being that the fireworks will be held that evening.

ORDINANCE FIRST READING (Second reading and Public Hearing 07/02/09)

An Ordinance of the Township of Lakewood, in the County of Ocean, State of New Jersey, dissolving the Lakewood Township Airport Authority, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:5A-20.

Read by title only for first reading.

The above Ordinance was offered by Deputy Mayor Langert, second by Mr. Miller.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Mr. Lichtenstein, Mr. Coles, Mr. Miller, Deputy Mayor Langert and Mayor Singer.

Ordinance No. 2009-29 adopted on first reading. Second reading and public hearing to be held on July 2, 2009.

CORRESPONDENCE

Per attached list of three (3) correspondence items, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

PARKS AND EVENTS CORRESPONDENCE

Per schedule of four (4) items, attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Motion by Mr. Coles, second by Mr. Miller, and carried, to approve the above correspondence and picnic requests.

Deputy Mayor Langert abstained on Correspondence Item No. 3

MOTION TO APPROVE BILL LIST OF: 06/16/09

Motion by Mr. Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Langert, to approve the above Bill List.

On Roll Call – Affirmative: Mr. Lichtenstein, Mr. Coles, Mr. Miller, Deputy Mayor Langert and Mayor Singer.

Bill List approved.

COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE MEMBERS – None

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Coles, second by Deputy Mayor Langert, and carried, to adjourn the meeting. Meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.