

Township of Manalapan

Department of Planning & Zoning

120 Route 522 & Taylors Mills Road

Manalapan, NJ 07726

(732) 446-8350

(732) 446-0134 (fax)

Planning Board Minutes

June 13, 2019

The meeting was called to order with the reading of the Open Public Meetings Act by Chairwoman Kathryn Kwaak at 7:30 p.m. followed by the salute to the flag.

Roll Call and Reading of the
TV Disclosure Statement: Acting Secretary, Lisa Nosseir

In attendance at the meeting: John Castronovo, David Kane, Alan Ginsberg,
Kathryn Kwaak, Jack McNaboe, Barry Jacobson,
Richard Hogan, Barry Fisher, Steven Kastell

Absent from the meeting: Todd Brown, Daria D'Agostino

Also present: Ronald Cucchiaro, Planning Board Attorney
Brian Boccanfuso, Planning Board Engineer
Jennifer Beahm, Planning Board Planner
Lisa Nosseir, Recording Secretary

A Motion was made by Chief Hogan, Seconded by Mr. Fisher to have Ms. Nosseir Acting Secretary for the June 13, 2019 meeting.

Yes: Castronovo, Kane, Ginsberg, Kwaak, McNaboe, Jacobson, Hogan,
Fisher, Kastell

No: None

Absent: D'Agostino, Brown

Abstain: None

Mr. Cucchiaro swore in Brian Boccanfuso, Professional Engineer, and Jennifer Beahm, Professional Planner.

Minutes:

A Motion was made by Chief Hogan, Seconded by Mr. Castronovo to approve the Minutes of May 9, 2019 as written.

Yes: Castronovo, Ginsberg, Kwaak, McNaboe, Jacobson, Hogan, Fisher
No: None
Absent: D'Agostino
Abstain: None
Not Eligible: Brown, Kane, Kastell

Resolution: PMS1913 ~ Ori Birnhack
16 Pension Hill Road
Block 14.05 / Lot 71
Minor Subdivision Approval with Ancillary Variance Relief

A Motion was made by Mr. Fisher, Seconded by Mr. McNaboe to approve the Resolution for PMS1913 as written.

Yes: Kane, Kwaak, McNaboe, Jacobson, Hogan, Fisher, Kastell
No: None
Absent: Brown, D'Agostino
Abstain: None
Not Eligible: Castronovo, Ginsberg

Resolution: PPS1903 ~ Samson Annamdevula
22 Crystal Court
Block 8422 / Lot 25
Cemetery Easement

A Motion was made by Mr. Castronovo, Seconded by Mr. Fisher to approve the Resolution for PPS1903 as written.

Yes: Castronovo, Ginsberg, McNaboe, Jacobson, Fisher
No: None
Absent: D'Agostino
Abstain: None
Not Eligible: Brown, Kane, Kwaak, Hogan, Kastell

**Ordinances: Ordinance Number: 2019-11
**An Ordinance of the Township Committee of Manalapan,
County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey, Amending and
Supplementing Chapter 95, "Development Regulations", of
the Code of the Township of Manalapan, Section 95-3.4,
"Certifications and Permits"****

Mr. Cucchiaro reminded the Board that their purpose is to review the Ordinance and determine if it is substantially consistent with the Master Plan. The Board did not have any questions and they agreed the Ordinance is consistent with the Master Plan.

A Motion was made by Mr. Fisher, Seconded by Mr. McNaboe and found that Ordinance 2019-11 is substantially consistent with the Master Plan.

Yes: Castronovo, Kane, Ginsberg, Kwaak, McNaboe, Jacobson, Hogan,
 Fisher, Kastell
No: None
Absent: Brown, D'Agostino
Abstain: None
Not Eligible: None

**Ordinance Number: 2019-12
**An Ordinance of the Township Committee of Manalapan,
County of Monmouth, State of New Jersey, Amending and
Supplementing Chapter 95, "Development Regulations", of
the Code of the Township of Manalapan, Article XII,
"Specification of Documents to be Submitted", Section 95-
12.2 "Requirements"****

The Board found Ordinance 2019-12 to be substantially consistent with the Master Plan. No questions or comments were raised.

A Motion was made by Chief Hogan, Seconded by Mr. Jacobson that Ordinance 2019-12 is substantially consistent with the Master Plan.

Yes: Castronovo, Kane, Ginsberg, Kwaak, McNaboe, Jacobson, Hogan,
 Fisher, Kastell
No: None
Absent: Brown, D'Agostino
Abstain: None
Not Eligible: None

**Applications: PPM1727 ~ Providence Corporation
Lamb Lane ~ Block 74 / Lot 14.02
*Preliminary Major Subdivision***

Peter Licata, Esq. of Sonnenblick, Parker & Selvers represented the applicant this evening. Mr. Licata has three witnesses to testify this evening.

Mr. Cucchiaro swore in John J. Ploskonka, Professional Engineer, Professional Planner. His qualifications were accepted by the Board. Mr. Ploskonka had several exhibits that he was presenting this evening:

Exhibit A1: An aerial map from Monmouth County GIS System

Exhibit A2: An aerial overlay on the subdivision plan

Mr. Ploskonka described the property, Block 74 Lot 14.02, which consists of 84 acres off of Lamb Lane. The property consists mostly of farmland and it is wooded upfront with significant wetlands located along Lamb Lane. There is a stream in the middle coming through which runs down and out as well as a stream running along the backline running along the Gaitway Farm area. There are three streams on the property in total and they are associated with DEP regulations in terms of wetlands and flood hazard area. The Township has a stream corridor buffer that they imply on each of the streams also. As we designed the subdivision, we had to deal with the wetlands, the flood hazard area and the Township stream corridor.

Mr. Ploskonka continued and said the plans that they put together consists of 18 homes on this property. They are designed with a variable lot so that instead of four acre lots, there are lots that are between 1.5 acres up to 15 acres. Mr. Ploskonka referred to sheet 3 of the preliminary subdivision plan and pointed out where Lamb Lane and Smithburg Road are on the plans. The bigger lots are in the back with the high tension wires running through the lots. The variances come into play to do the plan without encroaching on the stream or critical areas of the site.

Mr. Ploskonka said there was another plan that showed four acre lots on the property and that would extend into the JCP&L right of way area and it would be conforming, but it wouldn't provide the environments constraints. The road would be about 1,250 feet longer which would have to be maintained by the Township in the future. Therefore, we clustered it down under the variable lot plan to achieve the current plan. The lot size averaging is permitted in this zone if we have 15 acres or more, which we do. The purpose of the clustering is to protect the environment, conserve open space and to minimize impervious surfaces. One lot is 12 acres, two are 11 acres and one is 8 acres for a total of four large acre lots. We are complying with the Ordinance in all respects, but we do ask

for variances for the front setback. The lots on the new road are within 60' of the right of way. It is a 30' wide roadway and the normal requirements are 100'. The smallest lot is 1.5 acres and the Lamb Lane lots are ½ - 1 acre right across the street from our proposed development. There are plans to improve the road and widen it somewhat based on input from the Township engineer.

Mr. Licata asked Mr. Ploskonka if all wetland areas have been delineated in accordance with the applicable regulations? Mr. Ploskonka said he did obtain from NJDEP a LOI which defines where the wetlands are and where the buffers are. The design is compliant under DEP regulations. We will do a transition area as long we follow the rules. There is a flood hazard area permit of 50' on either side of the stream which we obtained from the DEP. The Township's stream corridor buffer is 100', so that is another constraint on the property.

Mr. Ploskonka said we need a variance for the 18 lots for the front setback of 60' whereas it is 100'. There are three lots which require improvable area variances which are lots 3, 5 and 18. We requested three waivers for the steep slopes. We were able to eliminate one of the waivers by revising the plans. We need DEP permits for crossing the wetlands at two locations. The plan is RSIS compliant throughout. We have been to the Board of Health and we have done testing for septic systems. We have appeared before the Environmental Commission and we did a test for pesticides on the property and there was no exceedance of State standards for the pesticides. There was some arsenic on the site that was above State standards. The arsenic testing indicated that this was natural background arsenic that is normal throughout Manalapan. The Fire Bureau felt that the roadway is too long. They would like to have fire protection on the site. There is a plan proposed on the nearby property for the Skeba warehouse. They are going to run water into their site and part of the planning is to take the water from their site and bring it across to provide water service for this property subject to the Township Committee approving the water service. There may be a new requirement that all homes will require sprinklers by the State.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the Town has to extend the water service area just to get the lines for the hydrants and fire suppression there? Mr. Ploskonka said they have to extend it for the water service for the homes, but not for extending the lines for fire protection. Mr. Cucchiaro asked if the proposal is dependent upon the water service being extended to the homes, as well in order for you to extend for the fire service? The plan is conforming without the fire service, but we would prefer both the water service and the fire protection.

Mr. Ploskonka referred to CME's Engineering Review of June 7, 2019. Our planner will address some the items mentioned in the review letter. The project is not phased, it is one phase only. Mr. Rea is available this evening regarding his traffic

report and can testify if necessary. Payment to the Township sidewalk fund would be more appropriate because of the already steep slopes. The contribution is specifically with respect to the frontage on Lamb Lane. Within the development, we plan on doing sidewalks on one side of the street which is consistent with other developments in the area. We would do some widening of the shoulder area.

Mr. Cucchiaro stated that Mr. Ploskonka had said that the project was completely RSIS compliant. For the interior part of the project, are you compliant with the sidewalk requirements for the RSIS? Mr. Cucchiaro swore in Bhaskar Halari, Mr. Ploskonka's colleague who also worked on the project. Mr. Halari said RSIS as a standard depends on the density of a project and we would be considered a low density project. In this type of project, we are allowed to have a 24' wide street with no curbing and no sidewalks. In that aspect, we actually are exceeding those requirements because we are providing 30' road for 95% of the project and we are doing the sidewalk on one side of the street. Mr. Boccanfuso said yes, the project is low density based upon the number of units. He is uncertain whether they meet the rural designation because he believes it is a two acre lot size or higher. If you went with the lot yield plan with the four acres, you would be eligible for that rural designation, however under what is being proposed, Mr. Boccanfuso said he does not believe that the applicant meets that. This is a residential neighborhood street that does call for sidewalks on both sides of the road.

Mr. Ploskonka continued with the items brought up in the engineering report. We went through the items for stormwater management which we will comply with as well as the drywells. We went to the Environmental Commission three times and we will comply with all the DEP requirements. We will meet with the Ms. Spero and update the plans regarding trees and landscaping.

Mr. Boccanfuso spoke about the steep slope disturbance waivers. The plans submitted requested relief from the three different tiers. Any areas of existing slope in excess of 10%, there are percentages of each of three tiers that you could disturb. For example, for slopes of 10-15%, you can disturb up to 40% of the slopes in those areas. Slopes of 15-20% can be disturbed by 10% in those areas. Any slopes over 20% are not permitted to be disturbed at all. The applicant requested relief from each of these three tiers because they exceed the maximum permitted. Upon revising the plans, they found that they actually now comply with two of those three tiers. Mr. Boccanfuso has not seen the revised plans that show compliance. If they can comply, great, but since we haven't seen the plans, it would not be appropriate for the Board to grant relief in the form of a design waiver from that section here tonight. We could defer this matter to Final, should they receive a preliminary approval here tonight. Mr. Cucchiaro said if that is the course that the Board takes if there is going to be positive vote, usually when an applicant comes back on Final, it is something of lesser importance than during

preliminary. Most times an applicant is not seeking relief at Final, they have already received relief at preliminary. If it is going to be deferred to Final, there is nothing unlawful about it, but he wanted to be abundantly clear that the Board is not in any way suggesting that it is going to act favorably upon a waiver at Final, because they haven't seen anything.

Mr. Boccanfuso spoke about the 80,000 sq ft requirement and the depth of the seasonal high water table and that basements are only permitted when the depth of the seasonal high water table is 6' or greater. Mr. Ploskonka indicated that they would likely be seeking relief for that. They have not performed soil logs on the properties in the footprint of the homes so we do not know exactly where the water table is. It would not be appropriate at this juncture to consider relief, we would need some more details.

Mr. Boccanfuso addressed the extension of water into the site. The Fire Bureau had concerns regarding fire protection within the site. The applicant would prefer to extend water into the site, not only for fire protection, but also to service the homes. Currently the site is not in the water service areas. In order to get the water service, they would have to apply to the Township Committee for the approval. It would be reviewed by the water utility engineer and they would either be approved or denied. Mr. Boccanfuso asked for confirmation that the applicant will provide a 20' wide shade tree easement and Mr. Ploskonka said yes they will.

Chief Hogan asked what size is the water main that goes into the stream itself? Mr. Halari said it would be an 8" water main, or larger depending upon the requirements for fire protection. Chief Hogan asked if there was any testimony going to be given regarding access off of Smithburg Road, rather than Lamb Lane? Mr. Ploskonka said the client has no property on Smithburg Road.

Mr. McNaboe asked for more clarification regarding the curbing and if it is going to be on both sides. Mr. Ploskonka said yes, both sides will have curb and it will extend out. Mr. McNaboe said there are drainage issues in the Lamb Lanes area. Will your storm basins extend to at least the new road? Mr. Ploskonka said if we need to run drainage from Lamb Lane down to our system, we can do that, or we could flow it directly into the slope down below. The width of Lamb Lane is approximately 20'. The revised plans show a right of way dedication across the frontage. Mr. McNaboe asked if the corner lot close to Smithburg Road is owned by the county? Mr. Ploskonka said there is no access to Smithburg Road from this property. Mr. Ploskonka said the corner property is not part of the tract. The owner of that property is Katherine Tyler.

Chair Kwaak asked if the project is going to be phased? Mr. Ploskonka said he already answered that, this will not be a phased project. She asked about lot 15,

and it appears to be higher than the other homes. Mr. Ploskonka said there is a steep slope in that area and that house is higher than the other lots. The run-off from this site runs in the direction towards the tract and there will be a swale on both sides of that lot.

Mr. Jacobson asked about the 26' wide part of the roadway - by which lots are this larger part located? Mr. Ploskonka pointed out the area on the exhibit and showed that there is a stream. Mr. Jacobson asked is it possible for two cars to pass and Mr. Ploskonka said yes it is possible.

Mr. Kane asked for clarification regarding the sidewalks. Mr. Ploskonka said because this is a rural area, sidewalks on one side of the road are rather typical. Mr. Cucchiaro said the original testimony was that there was no required relief from the RSIS. Mr. Halari's interpretation of the RSIS is that sidewalks are not required and that the fact that they had them on one side of the street actually exceeds RSIS standards, the Board's professionals were not convinced. The issue has been resolved as to whether this plan actually complies with the RSIS or exceeds it, or requires a de minimus exception from the RSIS standards. Mr. Kane said wouldn't be easier to just put it on both sides, that is what I am subtly suggesting to you and I'll leave it there. Mr. Licata addressed Mr. Ploskonka to the extent that relief from putting sidewalks on both side of the road would require a de minimus exception, by providing it on only one side of the road, do you feel that it provides adequate sidewalk for the residents in the subdivision? Mr. Ploskonka said with a dead end street, that is not a problem. Mr. Licata said with respect to one side vs. two sides, could you address the impact on impervious coverage? Mr. Ploskonka said obviously if you put more sidewalk in that is never used, it is more impervious coverage on the site which you don't need. Mr. Licata said given your street length of about 2,600 feet, in round numbers what would be the amount of additional sq ft for the sidewalk on the opposite side? Mr. Ploskonka said probably in excess of 10,000 sq ft of additional impervious coverage.

Ms. Beahm said when you are talking about minimizing coverage, Mr. Ploskonka can you explain to me the need for this cul de sac bump-out between lot 15 and 16, because it really is just there to give frontage to lots as opposed to any necessity whatsoever. You said you don't want to put sidewalk because you don't want to add coverage, but I don't understand the need for that cul de sac bulb, and there is not cul de sac. What is the purpose of it other than to give frontage to the two lots? I'd rather see sidewalk over excess frontage and that little bulb there has no purpose. Mr. Ploskonka said the big picture is not just the bulb, it's the variable lot plan vs. the yield plan. Ms. Beahm said there is no need for that other than for you to add frontage to those two lots unnecessarily. That cul de sac bulb adds pavement and coverage. Let's eliminate the bulb and add the sidewalk that

we want. Mr. Ploskonka said no one uses the sidewalk, they walk in the street. It is part of the design of the subdivision. We don't want to create more variances, we want to minimize the variance. Ms. Beahm said you are seeking a waiver for the sidewalks. Chair Kwaak asked on the plans, it appears that there is a sidewalk on both sides where the lines end, is that already sidewalk? Mr. Halari said the line on the other side is the right of way, not sidewalk.

Mr. Cucchiaro said the other areas of town that you have referred to Mr. Ploskonka that are not served by sidewalks, were they constructed before or after the adoption of the RSIS? Mr. Ploskonka said they were constructed around 1997 and he does not recall if sidewalks were required by the RSIS at that time. Mr. Cucchiaro said if you do need relief and it is from 50% of the sidewalk requirement, whether they would believe that this is a waiver or a de minimus exception because that implicates the jurisdiction of the Board to grant relief.

Mr. Fisher asked if the width of the road is wide enough for two vehicles to pass, correct? Mr. Ploskonka said the width of the road is 30' for 2,600 ft, except for 200 feet where there are no houses. Mr. Fisher asked if vehicles would be able to park in the street and still have vehicles pass? Mr. Ploskonka said he believes so. Mr. Fisher said if a child is walking in the street and there is a car parked, the child will walk around that car and go in the middle of the street rather than the sidewalk. Mr. Ploskonka said the child has the option of walking on the side of the street where there is sidewalk. Mr. Ploskonka said that if the Board wants sidewalks on both sides of the street, we can do it except for the cross area of 200' because of the DEP requirements. Mr. Fisher asked how wide will the driveways be? Mr. Ploskonka said usually they are 15' - 20' depending on what the customers wants. Mr. Fisher asked if the detention basin will have a fence around? Mr. Ploskonka said the detention basin doesn't have a fence around it. Mr. Ploskonka said he will work with Ms. Spero regarding the trees.

Mr. Kastell asked about the plans and there seem to be different layouts of the development. Mr. Kastell said on the plans there is well and septic depicted. Are you proposing well and septic if the water line is not run down to the community, and if not, they will have city water? Mr. Ploskonka said the septic will be there but there are no sewers nearby. We would prefer to have city water extended, but if we can't, we will have to do wells. Mr. McNaboe said the Fire Bureau was not thrilled that there was no hydrants here. This was a compromise for our fire prevention bureau. Mr. Kastell said they could have done it just for the fire and not plumb the houses, it does say on the plans that there would be wells. Mr. Boccanfuso said that even if they were just to extend for fire protection, they would still need approval. They can't just extend it because it is not in the water service area.

Mr. Cucchiaro swore in James W. Higgins, Professional Planner. Mr. Higgins reviewed the plans, visited the site and reviewed the reports. Mr. Higgins said what is being requested in terms of variance are a relaxation of the zones requirement for 100' front yard setback to 60' for each of the 18 building lots. A variance would be needed for lot 3 for minimum improvable area; instead of being 20,000 sq ft, the minimum improvable area would be 18,719 sq ft. The improvable area for lot 5 would be 17,924 sq ft and for lot 18 it would be 15,798 sq ft. A waiver would be necessary for disturbance of the 20% slope and John suggested that I might not think that the waiver is not necessary. He doesn't think it is worth an argument. In Ms. Beahm's report, for slopes greater than 20%, only where disturbance is essential to reasonable use of the property is the percent that is permitted. If that is the case, the only area that is being disturbed is the area that is essential for the access to the property.

Ms. Beahm said that she would request that the slope issue is deferred to Final because she has 67% of slopes between 10%-15% disturbed and she has almost 15% of slopes between 15%-20% disturbed. Mr. Boccanfuso concurs but he needs to see the revised plans. Mr. Licata said they do not object to this request.

Mr. Higgins said there is a yield map that has been submitted that is fully conforming in terms of variance relief that shows 18 lots that could be constructed on this site. The applicant has proposed the lot averaging alternative where smaller lots are permitted provided that the average lot size is four acres on the site. What is being proposed by the applicant is consistent with the ordinance in terms of the intensity of the use and the number of lots. It will get the homes out from under the JCP&L high tension wires. It is important to have the houses as far away as possible from the environmentally sensitive areas.

The Board took a ten minute break before questioning Mr. Higgins.

Once the Board returned to the dais at 9:12 pm, Mr. Cucchiaro asked for clarification on a number of matters. He stated one of the applicant's arguments was to preserve the environmentally sensitive areas. His statement for Mr. Higgins was, for the environmentally sensitive areas, you could never develop on those areas. Mr. Higgins responded by saying this layout significantly reduces the possibility that homeowners may in the future encroach upon those areas.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked Mr. Higgins to explain what he meant during his testimony regarding public development. Mr. Higgins said it is to encourage the appropriate and efficient expenditure of public funds by coordination. If you were to develop the yield plan with an additional 1,250 linear feet of road, the Township is going to have to spend money maintaining it, therefore that is an expenditure of public funds. Ms. Beahm says she understands what he is saying, but it is a bit of a

stretch. That goal talks about the expenditure of public funds to advance the goals of zoning. The fact that you are reducing the amount of coverage, is a benefit but it is insignificant. Mr. Higgins said the idea is to help municipalities be able to afford developments that they are approving.

Ms. Beahm said to Mr. Higgins that he did not discuss the fact that lot 17 is less than 1 ½ acres. Mr. Higgins said the applicant has represented that they are going to change the plans so that lot 17 is at least 1.5 acres. Mr. Licata said we are not seeking a variance for the lot area. The lots on either side are substantially oversized, so they are going to adjust the lot lines.

Mr. Boccanfuso said there was discussion about eliminating the bump out in the road. He would take no exception to that being eliminated and a variance being granted for lot frontage, if necessary for lots 15 and 16.

Mr. Kane noted that some of the lots are massive. He is concerned that someday someone is going to try to subdivide these large lots. Is there a way to be a prohibition that says you cannot subdivide? Mr. Cucchiaro said they could come back and part of their record would be this subdivision and why we granted relief and that future boards will have to take that into account. Mr. Cucchiaro said you really can't prohibit future subdivisions. This application is being approved based upon certain density and all of that would be taken into account if someone tried to present a future subdivision because it could completely undermine the rationale if this Board grants an approval. Mr. Cucchiaro asked Mr. Licata if there would be any objection to recording the resolution so that it is in the chain of title. Mr. Licata had no objection. Mr. Kane noted lots 11 and 12 look like monstrosities. Are the homeowners supposed to care for that whole lot? Are they obligated to take care of all that? Mr. Ploskonka said lot 11 is 11.46 acres and lot 12 is 15.3 acres. These could actually be mini farms, such as a horse farm. The power lines do run through these lots. The homeowner would have to maintain the entire lot.

Mr. Castronovo said he didn't hear any discussion about monuments. Mr. Ploskonka said in the last few years, we have been putting up signs at the borders of the environmentally sensitive area indicating that the Environmental Commission says no disturbance in these areas. It will be shown on their final surveys that these areas are wetlands. We could put monuments. Mr. Cucchiaro said a condition of approval that whatever the monument is, it is subject to the review and approval of the Board's professionals.

Mr. Kastell asked if there was any thought put into placing the detention basin on lot 11 or 12? Mr. Ploskonka pointed out where the detention basin is proposed due to the natural way the water flows, as opposed to a higher elevation.

Mr. Licata said Mr. Rea is available for questions regarding his traffic impact report if necessary.

Chairwoman Kwaak opened the floor to the public for questions regarding the application.

Mr. Cucchiaro swore in Ralph Adonizio, 101 Lamb Lane. He said he heard reference that there is no access through Smithburg Road, but yet this land has been farmed for many years and no one is accessing it through Lamb Lane. Why not consider accessing the development the way the farmers access it instead of Lamb Lane? Mr. Ploskonka said the property owner does not own any of the land that fronts on Lamb Lane. The JCP&L right of way runs into Lamb Lane and the power company has a roadway coming in that they use and that the farmer uses from Smithburg Road. There is no legal access for this property to Smithburg Road. Mr. Adonizio asked about the water service. Is there chance that the existing residents would be offered the same? Mr. Ploskonka said we have to make an application to the Mayor and Council to bring water in and service the homes. We would bring the hydrant up to Lamb Lane and we would have to include your land in that application and how many other neighbors do want that service. Mr. Adonizio asked how do we prevent the future land owners from removing all the trees that back up to Lamb Lane? Mr. Ploskonka said there is a large fine if you go into the wetlands based on DEP regulations. Mr. Ploskonka showed Mr. Adonizio where the wetlands are located on the exhibit. Mr. Adonizio said Lamb Lane floods terribly and in fact part of the street has caved in. Mr. Ploskonka said he is going to meet the engineer at the site and we will go over where the problems are and see how we can bring drainage to the area. Mr. Adonizio asked if the road is going to be widened, how do we minimize taking down trees? Mr. Ploskonka said tree removal will be kept to a minimum.

Chairwoman Kwaak said she is uncomfortable voting on this application because there are unanswered questions. The Board was in agreement that there are too many pending items at this time. She requested that the applicant address all pending items and come back. Mr. Cucchiaro said with regard to the items that are pending, how much time do you need to resolve this matter. Mr. Ploskonka asked for a list of what items are pending. Mr. Cucchiaro said the steep slope issue, the bulb, lot 17. Mr. Halari said they need two weeks. Mr. McNaboe asked when do they anticipate going to Township Committee to ask about the water service area and Mr. Ploskonka said within the next two weeks. Chief Hogan said there are two Fire Bureau reports, but not an approval yet regarding the fire hydrant review. Mr. Ploskonka said he submitted a map to Mr. Lennox showing the extension of the water line from Skeba to Lamb Lane and he will discuss it with him. Mr. Cucchiaro said tying up these loose ends will not be substantial, and he recommends placing this application first on July 11, 2019. Mr. Cucchiaro

announced that application of PPM1727, Providence Corporation will be carried to the July 11, 2019 at 7:30. There will be no further notice to property owners. Interested parties can see the resubmitted plans through the Planning Office.

Chairwoman Kwaak opened the floor to any non-agenda items; seeing none, it was closed. She added that the next meeting will be June 27, 2019 and there are a number of pending applications at this time.

Adjournment

A Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Jacobson and agreed to by all.

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa Urso-Nosseir
Recording Secretary

A recorded CD or DVD of the meeting is available for purchase by contacting the Planning Board Office.