

**CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE**

Chairman Banas called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. with the Pledge of Allegiance and 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.”

ROLL CALL: Mr. Long (arrived late), Mr. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Banas, Mrs. Wise, Mr. Dolobowsky and Mr. Ackerman (arrived late).

Also present were Engineer Max Peters, Planner Stan Slachetka, and Attorney John Jackson.

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

Mr. Dolobowsky stated he was not sworn in. Mr. Jackson swore in Mr. Dolobowsky as a Planning Board Member.

**III. OLD BUSINESS**

**I. SP #1756**

Applicant: Yeshiva Orchos Chaim  
Location: corner of Cedar Bridge Avenue, Oberlin Ave. South & Syracuse Court  
Block 1 600 Lot 12  
Change of use site plan to proposed school  
Clarification of approval resolution

Mr. Penzer stated he provided transcripts to show that the intent was to approve the entire building. At the tech meeting it was discussed, He stated that on page 29 of the transcript dated July 15, 2003 the engineer stated. “it is our understanding that the applicant will *own* the entire site and therefore it is recommended that a condition be placed on future uses.” Mrs. Shravzblat was not present. Page 37 refers to the maximum amount of children for the entire building.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

There would be 450 students. They did not intend to have any other tenants. Mr. Banal stated to go back to lines 15 through 18. Mr. Penzer stated the purpose is that the owner has a right to be there and then he would be gone. Mr. Penzer read lines 7 through 22. It indicated that the entire site would be converted to a school with a maximum of 450 students. Mr. Penzer stated it was the intent but it was not included in the resolution to clarify it. At the tech meeting it was also discussed that the entire building would be used. The inspection department has taken the position that they have granted a C.O. to the entire building. The problem is that it was not included in the resolution. The Tax Assessor asked if the Board could amend the resolution retroactive back to the original date so they could obtain the tax exemption. He thanked Mr. Jackson, for his assistance. Mr. Jackson stated he prepared a resolution which he handed to the members. The resolution was reviewed by the members.

On motion by Mr. Neiman and seconded by Mr. Dolobowsky, the amended resolution was hereby approved.

Mr. Jackson stated he made it an amended resolution. He incorporated by reference the previous resolution and all the prior conditions. He read the new sections of the resolution which amended the original resolution and that it was amended to clarify the original resolution. It was really a ratification of the transcript.

**ROLL CALL:** Mr. Heal, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

Mr. Long arrived at the meeting.

**2. SP #1792**

Applicant: Mesitya Ohr Zarua, Inc.  
Location: Faraday Avenue, west of Cross Street  
Block 508 Lot 5.01  
Change of use site plan to proposed school  
Clarification of approval resolution

Mr. Penzer stated there was an issue with the curb and sidewalks. Mr. Banas stated that on page 42A of the transcript the board took a vote on curbs and sidewalks. Mr. Jackson stated he reviewed the transcript and the transcript is clear. How the vote was done was self explanatory. He had a conversation after the vote and it was determined that the vote may have been confusing. Mr. Banas stated it indicated that the vote would include curbs and sidewalks. Mr. Jackson agreed but felt that some members may have been confused.

Mr. Neiman stated that there was some confusion. He was not 100% sure at the time.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

Mr. Penzer asked if any of the other members were confused since he was. Mr. Jackson felt the board would have the option to consider the issue of curb and sidewalks. Mr. Franklin stated the chairman stated the *vote was to approve the project* with curb and sidewalks. He felt it was clear. That was what the board voted for,

Mr. Neiman asked if the applicant could ask for an amendment to the resolution. Mr. Banas stated that is what happened since Mr. Penzer came forward.

Mr. Banas asked for a motion to consider the request of reopening the matter.

On motion by Mr. Neiman and seconded by Mr. Ackerman, the application would be reopened to reconsider the curb and sidewalk issue.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Long, no; Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, no; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Banas, no; Mrs. Wise, no; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

Mr. Banas indicated the vote was a tie. Mr. Jackson stated that a tie is not carried, it does not succeed. He *felt this* would protect the board if there was an appeal.

**IV. NEW BUSINESS**

- 1. SD #1458** (Variance requested)  
Applicant: Saul Mizrachi  
Location: Cornelius Street, north of East Seventh Street  
Block 231 Lot 18  
Minor subdivision to create two lots

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking minor subdivision approval for the subdivision of one existing lot into two non-conforming single-family lots along Cornelius Street within the R-7.5 zone. Variances are required for lot area of 7,500 square feet where 6,994 square feet is proposed, lot width of 50 feet where 49 feet is proposed, side yard setback of 7 feet one side where 5 feet is proposed and side yard setback of 15 feet combined where 11 feet is proposed. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the nearby house and lot sizes. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the variances that are required for the minor subdivision.

The applicant is proposing to provide curbing, sidewalk, fire hydrant and a turn around at the end of Cornelius Street. The applicant should provide construction details for all of the above items. The turn around should be constructed to accommodate garbage trucks. The applicant should indicate the top and bottom curb elevations of the proposed curbing. The applicant should indicate the location of the proposed fire hydrant. The applicant should provide the proposed cross-section of the roadway. The applicant should provide a legal description for the turn around.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Mr. Slachetka stated there is a letter dated December 19, 2004 from Nicholas Graviano. The applicant has indicated that six plantings per dwelling unit will be provided at the time of construction. The board should determine if curbing and sidewalks are required. The applicant is providing a shade tree easement along the frontage of both lots. A shade tree per lot will be provided along the street frontage.

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

Brian Flannery, PE, was sworn in and his credentials were accepted. The application is a minor subdivision application. They were deficient in some of the bulk requirements. The side yard setback of 5 feet is due to the lay out of the property. There is 1.7 feet in the front. The side yard setback of 11 feet is also due to the lay out of the property. The street is short. All the variances are minimal in nature and the houses will be consistent with what is in the area. The homes will comply with the R-7.5 requirements. Both reports indicate the curb and sidewalks and the fire hydrant, which were noted on the plans. He asked that the turn around not be required. They would grade it and provide double wide driveways on each lot to provide more parking. Mr. Franklin stated they could wheel the garbage out to East 7<sup>th</sup> Street, then the trucks would not have to go down the street. He wanted the K-turn to be provided. The truck would have to go down twice to pick up the garbage on the street. Mr. Flannery stated the other items would be complied with. The shade tree easement was already added and they would provide the plantings.

Mr. Slachetka asked about the variances. Mr. Flannery stated the variances are minimum and deminimus in nature. The benefits of granting the variances outweigh the deterrent. The houses will be consistent with the area. The relief is negligible. The variances could be granted without any detriment to the zoning plan or zoning ordinance. The project would promote appropriate population densities and efficient use of the land.

Mr. Franklin stated that on garbage days with the K-turn, no cars could be parked on the street.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about off-street parking. Mr. Flannery stated it would be provided in accordance with RSIS standards. It is usually three off-street parking spaces per dwelling.

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

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the application was hereby approved with the variances, curbs, sidewalks, k-turn area, and that a no parking on garbage day sign be installed.

**ROLL CALL:** Mr. Long, no; Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Banas,

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

yes; Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

- 2. SP #1799** (Variance requested)  
Applicant: D.W. Smith Assoc. LLC  
Location: Airport Road, between Cedar Bridge Avenue & Exist 89 Access Road  
Block 1160.01 Lot 263  
Preliminary and final site plan for proposed addition to existing office building

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for four building additions to an existing office building in two phases along Airport Road in the PS zone. A variance is required for the minimum lot size of 3 acres where 2.92 acres is proposed. The applicant should provide Ocean County approval and New Jersey Turnpike Authority approval for the proposed additions. The applicant shall submit evidence of the NJDEP approval for the special activity waiver for redevelopment to allow the resurfacing of the parking lot area within the wetland buffer. The applicant should revise the trash enclosure so it matches the exterior of the building. The applicant should provide a copy of the wetlands permit that is indicated. The applicant should provide testimony regarding the encroachment into the wetlands buffer by the parking lot. The applicant should provide a minimum of two soil borings within the proposed drywall locations. The board should determine whether a shade tree easement is required along the frontage & Airport Road. The applicant should indicate the proposed contours in the area of the parking lot to be resurfaced. The balance of the comments were minor in detail.

Mr. Slachetka stated a variance is needed for lot area of 3 acres where 2.92 acres is proposed. The lot area was reduced due to an Ocean County right-of-way taking for the Garden State Parkway exit 89 interchange. The applicant requires representation as per the MLUL. Internal illumination is not recommended for *the* proposed sign. The applicant should utilize external illumination. The applicant should discuss what will be stored in the storage garage.

Larry Rothstein, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant.

Nicholas Coppola, P.L.S., was sworn in and his credentials were accepted, Sheet 4 of 5 was marked as Exhibit A- 1, the site plan was marked as A-2. The original building was built in 1971. The original building was built at 4,000 square feet. 2,000 square feet was added in 1980. There is a gravel parking lot that was constructed in 1980, . T h e r e were no wetlands at the time and no buffer requirements. It was fully conforming. They propose to put an addition of offices on the south side of *the* building together with an expansion of their survey department on the northeast corner of the building. There will be an addition that would house an information technology department and graphics. This is an expansion of their business. They added GPS to their survey as well as GIS services. The areas will support expansion of the parking area and they plan on opening an office in Virginia later this year. The total square footage would be 6,200 square feet. They would be phasing. With the size of the property at 2.92 acres, the County of

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Ocean required a 12 foot strip along the frontage of, property for the widening of Airport Road in conjunction with Parkway Exit 89. The County was to convey remnant parcels at the rear of the property to make up the difference. In the transition, that was never done and they were still in litigation with the County on it. The intent of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by this application as it promotes the appropriate use. The variance could be granted without any substantial detriment. In reviewing Mr. Slachetka's report, Mr. Coppola stated that the sign is existing and is a back light. He did not understand why an. externally illuminated sign would be better. The storage garage would house survey equipment and supplies as is currently provided in the shed on the property. In reviewing Mr. Peters' report, Mr. Coppola, stated that the County of Ocean approved the site plan in December of 2004 without conditions. They did receive a letter from New Jersey Turnpike Authority with suggestions for the rear of the property to have a six foot fence and that plans be submitted for drainage calculations. He replied that they were notified as any other owner and. that they have no rights to approve or disapprove this project. They objected to the fence for the benefit of an adjoining property owner. They were more than 1,000 feet away from the Parkway. It was not the Parkway right-of-way. Mr. Banns felt the buffer was up to the Turnpike Authority to establish after the exit was completed. Mr. Coppola stated if it was necessary for an application to repave the parking area, they would recommend that they not pave that portion. It would hold the project up for at least a year. The trash enclosure was placed on the drawing. They provided a chain link enclosure and they will put privacy slats on the gate on the front. Mr. Banns stated there are a lot of trash enclosures in the Industrial Park. Mr. Coppola replied okay. He felt wooden slates would break. The dumpster has been there for 31 years. The owner across the street has six dumpsters with no enclosures. He felt it became a maintenance problem. They provided the wetlands permit which the construction predates the wetlands legislation. They parking lot limits and two soil borings would be provided. Shade tree easements are only required on residential streets. There are no shade tree easements anywhere in the industrial park. There shade trees are set back 50 feet from the curb. There is a drainage easement adjacent to their property. He did not know whose it was since it was put in when Airport Road was made and turned over. Mr. Jackson was not sure if the ownership of the easement would be a problem. Mr. Coppola stated it was not on their property. He stated they would provide items 16 and 17. The low spot in the parking lot is depressed curb. It was part of the original design of the parking lot in 1980. It was a place for storm water to exit. There are no problems in the lot. They would provide spot elevations. The engineers were to meet to discuss the same, Items 1.9 through 23 were okay. Item 24 was not applicable because they were not constructing any depressed curb. Item 25 was okay. If item 26 pertained to the FEMA map they would provide it. Items 27 and 28 were not applicable.

Mr. Peters wanted to see item 28.

Mr. Dolobowsky congratulated them on their expansion. He stated it was one of the best properties on Airport Road. He stated the trash enclosure is in the back of the parking lot and was not visible from the street. The front of it would be visible from the parking lot. He did not

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

feel they needed a trash, enclosure. The property is nicely landscaped. He asked if any of the additions would be lower or higher than the existing building. Mr. Coppola replied no.

Mr. Jackson stated that Mr. Dolobowsky asked if his being on the airport authority created a conflict. He did not think so. He asked the applicant's attorney if he had a problem. Mr. Rothstein did not think that it would be a problem since it was disclosed.

Mr. Bangs 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. Neiman and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the application was hereby approved with the slated dumpster enclosure, leaving the existing sign, granting the variances, not requiring the fencing along the turnpike property and not requiring a shade tree easement,

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

**3, SD #1373A**

(No variance requested)

Applicant:

Cedar Bridge Development Urban Renewal Corp.

Location:

Pine Street, west of New Hampshire Avenue  
Block 961 Lot 2 Final Major Subdivision

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking final major subdivision approval for the subdivision of one existing lot into three parcels plus roadways as approved under the preliminary subdivision along Pine Street, Cedar Bridge Avenue and New Hampshire within the RM-1 zone. No variances are indicated on the plans. The applicant should indicate all easement dedications. The applicant should indicate the sight triangles at the streets. The applicant should provide all signatures required on the plans prior to T & M signing the subdivision. The applicant should provide a copy of the tree save area under the N.TDEF permit.

Mr. Slachctka stated no variances are required. The applicant should discuss how this plan deviates, if at all, from the preliminary subdivision.

Ray Shea, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant. He stated they received the comments from the professionals. There is no deviates. No public hearing is required. The reports are acceptable.

Mr. Neiman asked why they were here. Mr. Jackson stated that the law requires the applicant to appear to ensure that they complied with all the conditions of preliminary approval and the

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

experts have confirmed that.

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

On motion by Mr. Neiman and seconded by Mr. Herzl, the application was hereby approved.

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

**4. SP #1801** (Variance requested)  
Applicant: Yeshivat Keter Torah  
Location: Apollo Road, west of Squankum Road  
Block 104 Lots 57 & 60 Preliminary & Final  
site plan for proposed school

Mr. Peters stated the applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval for the construction of a 2-story elementary school building, gym building, dormitory and high school building along Apollo Road extension within the R-12 zone. The applicant indicates a variance is required for proposed entrance sign's setback. A variance is needed for maximum lot coverage of 25% where 31.7% is proposed. The applicant has provided sufficient parking for the proposed elementary school. However, additional parking will be required for the proposed high school, gym and dormitory buildings. The applicant is seeking preliminary approval for the other buildings but additional information is required to be shown on the plans. The applicant should indicate the locations for the additional parking onsite. The applicant should indicate the ages of the students and number of students. The applicant should indicate the pick up and drop off times. The applicant should address if the students will be bused. The applicant should 'revise the site plans to include all sidewalk, parking and curbing for both phases. The applicant should indicate to whom the drainage easement is dedicated to. The applicant should indicate the location of the pick up and drop off areas. The applicant should address the existing Type E bubbler inlet in the middle of the cul-de-sac. The balance of the comments were minor.

Mr. Slachetka stated a variance is needed for the sign setback of 15.5 feet where 34 feet is required. The applicant should describe the operational characteristics of the facility to include the number of students, the number of buses visiting the site on a daily basis, the hours of operation, services that will occur on site and the amount of students to be housed in the dormitory. The applicant should confirm the height of the proposed sign and provide construction details, including the type of materials to be used to construct the sign. The proposed gymnasium should be moved farther away from the property boundary, closer to the proposed internal cul-de-sac. The applicant should discuss sequencing of their development with the contract of the proposed (by others) extension of Apollo Road that traverses the property.



**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

The applicant should confirm that the road will be extended to the entrance drive by the completion of Phase I. The applicant should provide supplemental buffer landscaping along all property boundaries where buildings and parking are proposed. The applicant should identify and discuss all required approvals from outside agencies. The applicant has satisfied ordinance parking requirements for the school proposed in Phase I; however, the applicant should identify the location of parking for Phase II and the proposed gymnasium. The applicant is requesting preliminary approval for Phase II. The applicant should identify the required parking on the plan or request a variance.

Ray Shea, Esq., appearing on behalf of the applicant.

Charles Surmonte, P.F. and Surveyor, Mordechai Dabbah, 296 Jersey Avenue, Dean, and Sal Santora, Architect, were sworn in. Mr. Surmonte and Mr. Santora reviewed their credentials which were accepted by the Board,

Mr. Shea stated this was a campus proposal for an elementary, high school and dormitory. The board has granted two prior approvals for a scaled down version of this proposal. They were using an existing building. The buildings are now going to be raised and the project will be all new construction. In reviewing the planner's report, there will be 20 to 25 boys per class. Mr. Dabbah stated they now have kindergarten through fifth grade. They anticipate to add one grade each year through high school. They currently have an average of 11 students per class. They currently have seven classrooms. Mr. Shea stated when the project is done, there will be about 240 students. Mrs. Wise stated it will be 250 students. Mr. Shea stated there will be five to six buses per day. The school will operate from 8:45 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. Education will be the only service that occurs on site. There will be 60 to 80 students that will be housed in the dormitory. Mrs. Wise did not think the hours of operation will stop at 5:30 if it is a high school. Mr. Dabbah stated elementary will go to 5:10 and the high school will go to 10:00. Mr. Jackson asked about the ancillary activities. Mr. Dabbah stated graduations dinners, bar mitzvah, and what is normally done at a regular school. The phasing was discussed. Mr. Santoro stated the sign will be about 14 feet going up to 16 feet. It will be made of light weight material possibly wood with structural columns. The building material will be stucco and it would be submitted to the board's engineer for satisfaction and approval. Mr. Surmonte stated the gymnasium was positioned where it was shown because they were trying to reserve that portion adjacent to the curb line for future parking that may be required upon the expansion to the high school dormitory or gymnasium. If the parking adjacent to the gymnasium turns out not to be required, the gymnasium could be shifted as recommended. Mr. Shea stated the other owner in the area is moving forward with the extension of Apollo Road and it will be extended to the entrance drive by the completion of Phase I. The applicant agrees to provide supplemental buffer landscaping as requested. The applicant would work this out with the professionals. Mr. Surmonte stated the only state permit is for permission to modify the required transition area associated with the wetlands to the rear of the property. They have a L01 for about three fourths of the area. The

**PLANNING SQARD MEETING**  
**January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

northeast corner of the property has a LOI application which has been submitted. Mr. Shea stated that any approval needed will be applied for and copied to the board upon receipt. Mr. Shea marked A-1 as the application and the map and A-2 the exhibit of the portion of the site plan for additional parking. Mr. Shea stated the engineer testified that there is a LOI for 3/4 of the site and an application pending for the balance. They cannot consider relocating the gymnasium until they get confirmation that the LOI is approved. The issue with regard to relocating the gymnasium was discussed again. Mr. Shea suggested to leave the gym where it is and when the LOI comes in it could be amended. Mr. Surmonte did not think that the dormitory would require more than a couple of spaces because none of the students will be allowed to have vehicles on site. Seven spaces were provided for any supervised staff for the dormitory. There were 12 spaces that could be built for the gymnasium, which would be associated with the services of the school which should only require an additional space or two not the entire 12 provided for. Mr. Banas asked about the requirements for the parking at a gymnasium. Mr. Slachetka stated he was unsure. Mr. Banas stated that he remembers discussing cul-de-sacs. From the existing cul-de-sac it seems like a long way to the left and then proposing another cul-de-sac on the opposite site. He asked if it was within the distance that you could have a road with a cul-de-sac. Mr. Neiman stated the cul-de-sac is proposed by others. Mr. Dolobowsky stated it was from a previous application that was approved by the board. Mr. Banas wanted to know if it met the standards. Mr. Shea stated it meets the RSJS standards and he does not remember having to request a waiver. It would *not* have any impact on this project.

In reviewing the engineer's report, Mr. Shea stated that one and two were factual. Three was discussed with regarding to the parking. The wetlands permits will be provided when issued. No parking will be provided along the extension of Apollo Road if they are permitted to do the same. Mr. Franklin stated that on a public roadway they would have to request permission to do the same which they probably will receive. Mr. Shea stated they would ask permission for the same. Mr. Franklin stated the board could ask for it. Mr. Shea stated they would consent to the board's request. Items six through nine were previously answered. Mr. Santoro stated that they did not show the sidewalks servicing the buildings is because they did not do the final architectural. They do not know where the entrances and exits to the buildings would be. Once that is determined, the sidewalks would be delineated. All the sidewalks are shown for Phase I. Mr. Surmonte stated the parking will be finalized and added to the plans. There is a drainage easement associated with the Apollo Road subdivision that provides an underground storage system and a point of relief for all the drainage that is accumulated from the Apollo Road subdivision. The point of relief falls in their proposed driveway. The drainage easement is being dedicated to the Township. The access driveway along the western side of lots 61 and 62 will be vacated. They agreed to item 23. The drop off and pick up area is at the front of the building, but the actual drop off will occur at the back end of the cul-de-sac where there is an entry and a waiting area. The end of the pipe associated with the drainage easement terminates in their driveway. They proposed a similar system that has a bubbler type inlet off the northeast corner of the gym building. They were proposing to take the terminus of the existing pipe and provide

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

an overflow pipe so that system would overflow into their system and then bubble out. Mr. Peters did not want the flow to bubble out into the middle of the cul-de-sac.

A video was shown to show what the applicant was proposing to do showing the different buildings and areas of the site.

Mr. Dolobowsky asked about the number of students. Mr. Dabbah stated there would be 20 students per classroom. Mr. Dolobowsky stated there are ten classrooms on the first floor, eight classrooms labeled on the second floor and more rooms that are not labeled, There is room for expansion so there could be more students based on the number of rooms. Mr. Santoro stated there are a total of 32 classrooms shown on the floor plan which they provided more than enough parking for. Mr. Slachetka stated the applicant should not be shy with the number of students now. Mr. Banas stated it should be the total number of classrooms times the number of maximum students per class. Hopefully there will be enough students to fill the building. Mr. Surmonte stated there are ten classes on the first floor, the second floor, as sixteen classrooms there is a high school that would have 80 to 90 students. They were unsure of the number of classrooms in the high whoa! Some of the rooms will not be totally occupied by 20 students. There are rooms for aides, nurses, etc. There might be a library. Mr. Banas stated that you need one parking space per room. The parking issue was discussed as it relates to the number of rooms. Here was sufficient parking for Phase I. Mr. Peters stated that when they return for final approval, the number of classrooms and students have to be clarified. It would be a condition of the preliminary approval,

Mr. Dolobowsky stated that he did not know if he would eliminate parking on Apollo Road, He might limit it to one side of the street. Mr. Banns felt that was better. Mr. Dolobowsky hoped that the gymnasium could be shifted.

Mr. Franklin asked about the garbage. Mr. Surmonte stated the plans show the location towards the gymnasium. It was sheet 2 of 9. Mr. Balsas asked how it was contained. Mr. Surmonte stated the front would be gated. If there was no Phase II, it would have been located in a different area. Mr. Banas suggested he contact Mr. Peters to work the location out. Mr. Dolobowsky suggested including Mr. Franklin on the discussion regarding the location. Mr. Franklin stated they have to consider that the trucks drive in head on.

Mr. Banas suggested having parking on one side of Apollo Road. Mr.

Banas opened the application to the public.

Larry Simons, 7 Schoolhouse Court, Lakewood, was sworn in. He stated he was confused and wanted to know how many parking spaces were in Phase I. Mr. Surmonte replied 34 spaces. Mr. Simons asked parking for the different affairs that would be held. Mr. Surmonte replied the

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

events would be held when the staff was not present. Mr. Shea stated the events would occur during the evening. Mr. Banal stated that during the day the activities that would take place were those normally associated with the educational activities of the students. Mr. Simons asked about the high school students that would drive. Rabbi Dabbah stated the students would not be permitted to drive to school. Mr. Simons asked about the absolute number of classrooms in *Phase 1*. Mr. Surmonte stated for Phase I there would be 26 classrooms. Mr. Simons asked the number of high school students. Mr. Surmonte stated 80 to 90 students. Mr. Simons asked if Bar Mitzvah would occur on the site. Rabbi Dabbah stated that they would occur and explained how it would happen during school, Mr. Simons asked about the parking for the events. Mr. Neiman stated it would be one extra parking spot. Rabbi Dabbah stated the big festival for the Bar Mitzvah, would not occur at the school, just the parents. The private Bar Mitzvah that occurs at the school was described.

A resident was sworn in. She stated that any school that she has ever been to has additional parking for the people that may have to visit the school for various reasons. Mr. Banas understood what she was questioning. Mr. Surmonte stated there are 26 classes which would leave six parking spaces for visitors. Two spaces were handicapped parking spaces.

David Zafrani, 515 Monmouth Avenue, Lakewood, was sworn in. He stated he has a student who will attend the school. He came before the board previously when the temporary structure was approved. He stated the first thing was security and the second was the children so the future generations could survive. He thanked the board.

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

Mr. Shea stated the applicant was worried that he would not be ready by September for the permanent elementary school. The applicant wanted to build the gym out of pre-fab materials on a slab. Until the buildings were completed, they would like to use the gym for classrooms. Mr. Surmonte stated the pre-fab building exterior would be amended to match the exterior of the constructed buildings.

Mr. Neiman asked about the safety of the children during construction. Mr. Surmonte stated that construction entrances and areas would be provided. Mr. Banas stated the requirements for classrooms are the same regardless of what is used to house the classrooms. Mr. Shea agreed but indicated that they were concerned with the actual construction of the building. Mr. Bangs had a different outlook now. He asked if the gym was in Phase I or Phase II. Mr. Surmonte stated it was in Phase II Mr. Banas stated it was a different plan now. The application was to proceed with Phase I. Using the gym did not belong here now. Mr. Shea stated he agreed and reserved the rights to modify the plans with a future application.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2015**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

Mr. Shea he withdraw the request at this time to use the gymnasium for classrooms temporarily.

Mr. Dolobowsky stated the proposed island down the middle of the entrance road may cause the buses not to be able to enter the site. He wanted the resolution to indicate that the applicant could pull the island back if needed for the buses to enter and exit. Mr. Banas stated that Mr. Neiman asked the engineer if the radius on turning around was sufficient to accommodate a type one bus. This should be included in the resolution to permit the applicant to amend the same if warranted Mr. Dolobowsky asked the applicant if they would consider adding additional parking spaces along the entrance. Mr. Shea replied they would.

Mr. Neiman asked what was being approved tonight. Mr. Shea stated they were requesting preliminary approval for everything that was shown, on the plans.

On motion by Mr. Dolobowsky and seconded by Mrs. Wise, the application was hereby approved as discussed including 13 parking spaces, adjustment of the island and the radius.

Mr. Jackson stated the number of students and classrooms would be as shown on the plans as Phase I. Mr. Shea requested that the resolution include the 600 students for the total of both phases. The gym would be left where shown on the plans. The parking on Apollo Road would be on the north side. The trash removal and pick up would be as submitted and approved by the planning board engineer and Mr. Franklin along with Mr. Surmonte. No students would drive to school. The dormitory would house 80 to 90 students. The activities would be those as discussed. The 13 spaces were per exhibit A.2. Pulling back the island and the radius. The sidewalks would be determined by the architecturals.

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

**V. MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS**

**1. SD #1461** (No variance requested)  
Applicant: Iorio Construction  
Location: Vassar Avenue, east of Oberlin Avenue  
South  
Block 1602 Lot 8  
Minor subdivision to create two lots

**SP #1798** (No variance requested)  
Applicant: Iorio Construction  
Location: Vassar Avenue, east of Oberlin Avenue  
South Block 1602 Lot 8.02  
Preliminary and final site plan for 39,000 square foot warehouse

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING  
January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD  
REGULAR MEETING**

On motion by Mr. Franklin and seconded by Mr. Dolobowsky, the resolutions were hereby memorialized,

ROLL CALL: Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Baines, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

**2. SP #1796** (No variance requested)  
Applicant: Georgian Court University  
Location: Lakewood Avenue & Ninth Street Block 44 Lot 1  
Preliminary and final site plan for parking lot addition

On motion by Mr. Franklin and seconded by Mr. Herzl, the resolution was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL: Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, yes; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

On motion by Mr. Long and seconded by Mr. Neiman, the action of the reorganization meeting was hereby memorialized.

ROLL CALL, Mr. Long, yes; Mr. Herzl, yes; Mr. Franklin, yes; Mr. Neiman, yes; Mr. Banas, yes; Mrs. Wise, yes; Mr. Dolobowsky, abstain; and Mr. Ackerman, yes.

**VI. APPROVAL OF MINUTES** None.

**VII. APPROVAL OF BILLS**

On motion by Mr. Neiman and seconded by Mr. Ackerman, the submitted bills were hereby approved for payment.

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

**VIII. PUBLIC PORTION**

Mr. Reichman stated he owns 126 Forest Drive which was a very unique property. He was represented by Mr. Penzer. He has a 250 x 100 lot. Mr. Kiert stated that this was a pending application, but the attorney requested that it be tabled because the owner was trying to work

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING**  
**January 18, 2005**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD**  
**REGULAR MEETING**

something out with the neighbors. He was trying to explain it in a different light than what is shown. He felt it was getting confused. It was a lot with two houses and pre-dates zoning. Being a landlord was not an easy thing. He stated the submitted plans showed a flagpole lot. He stated condition was existing. Mr. Franklin stated he was making an application and he felt he should go through a plan review. Mr. Kielt stated they do as informal inquiry and he explained the same but it is scheduled for a meeting. He suggested that Mr. Reichman meet with him to go over what he was trying to do. Mr. Reichman would do the same.

Chris Abrahms, 755 Coral, Avenue, Lakewood, asked if the board saw a program on NJN entitled Race for Open Space which was a documentary. She asked if the board could watch it if a copy of it was provided. The members would watch the same if provided individual copies. Mr. Banas suggested making one copy available that the board could share.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in Favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Elaine Anderson  
Planning Board Recording Secretary