

1. FLAG SALUTE & CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Neiman 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 Asbury Park Press and The Star Ledger, posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood, and published on the Township website at least 48 hours in advance. The public has the right to attend this meeting, and reasonable, comprehensive minutes of this meeting will be available for public inspection. This meeting meets the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL & SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Roll call

Present: Mr. Y Stern, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. B Stern, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Helmreich, Mr. Luwish

Mr. Terence Vogt, P.E., P.P., C.M.E. was sworn.

3. RESOLUTIONS

1. SD 2643 Spruce WL 25 LLC

Spruce St, Washington Ave, Lincoln Ave Block 836, Lot 1
Extension of Minor Subdivision to create two lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve. All were in favor.

2. SD 2639 Sheraton Estates

June St & 14, 16, 20, 22 Farry St Block 1083; 1086.01, Lots 2.12; 7-11
Extension of Minor Subdivision to create eight lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve. All were in favor.

3. SP 2625 1244 Ridge Avenue RE HOLDCO, LLC

1244 & 1250 Ridge Avenue Block 189.03, Lots 169 & 170
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a school

A motion was made and seconded to approve. All were in favor.

4. SD 2665 Brook Road 88, LLC

Brook Road Block 204, Lot 1
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve. All were in favor.

5. SD 2666 Brook Road 88, LLC

Brook Road Block 203, Lots 1-3
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create eight lots

A motion was made and seconded to approve. All were in favor.

4. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **SD 2664 Shaul Halpern**
4, 6, 10 Edgewood Court Block 415, Lots 6-8
Minor Subdivision to create four lots

Mr. Brian Flannery, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed. He introduced exhibits and said we heard the Board's concerns and redesigned for shared parking. We will work everything on the RVE letter out during resolution compliance.

Mr. Vogt said you testified on the variances at the previous hearing?

Mr. Flannery said yes.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public and no one came forward.

Mr. B Stern made a motion to approve.

Mr. Flancbaum seconded.

All were in favor.

Mr. Helmreich left.

2. **SD 2667 The Parke at Lakewood, LLC**
688, 752 Cross Street & 2 Augusta Blvd Block 524; 524.23, Lots 1, 2.03, 77.02; 1
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 129 lots

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant and summarized the application. He referred to the GDP that was previously approved by this Board. A lot of work has happened since then, including litigation and settlements and a lot of tree planting. You will see Phase 1 tonight. We have already been reviewed and approved by CAFRA. One note, the RVE report incorrectly refers to LTMUA but this is NJAW jurisdiction. We are here asking for 58 duplex buildings and the application is fully conforming.

Mr. Brian Flannery, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed. He introduced exhibits and read through the RV report. He spoke about the traffic signals going in around the area and the traffic modifications occurring. There will be 4 stacked parking spaces for each unit, and the community center and retail will have parking as well. He spoke to the limitation on the number of units permitted based on the approved GDP. The CAFRA permit allowed 608 and the UDO allows less, at 3.6 dwelling units per acre.

Mr. Flannery and Mr. Vogt discussed what the GDP "locks" the applicant into. Mr. Flannery referred to 18-1021 that says 3.6 units per acre.

Mr. Y Stern said the starting point of the entrance and exit is here, so we need to really look at that because we won't be able to change that on future phases.

Mr. Flannery said we aren't asking for Phases 2-5, we are just showing for your reference what CAFRA approved. We are only asking for 116 units at this time, which is permitted and is fully conforming. We could have submitted this application without the GDP, but the applicant did it the right way.

Mr. Jackson said this application doesn't come up to the density so it's not an issue to be dealt with now. The later phases will be handled when they are applied for, for they are only shown informationally now. We will cross the density bridge when we get to it.

Mr. B Stern said I disagree. Mr. Flannery is essentially saying the total number of units approved under the GDP is essentially irrelevant. And I think we need to resolve that issue.

Mr. Jackson said that's his opinion, but we don't have to address that now because we are nowhere near the threshold now.

Mr. Flannery said 514 were in the original GDP.

Mr. B Stern said that's much different than the CAFRA 608.

Mr. Neiman said that was 7 years ago, and a lot has changed then. They did provide buffering, and CAFRA approved it at 608.

Mr. Y Stern said respectfully, CAFRA's concerns are different from ours.

Mr. Neiman said right, as long as they aren't asking for variances though...

Mr. Y Stern said my concern is this is one way in and out, so unit count matters.

Mr. Flannery and Mr. Pfeffer said we are working on a secondary access, the GDP had that condition. But we don't need it for this first phase, it will be done with a later phase.

Mr. Pfeffer said we understand your concerns, but we are just here for Phase 1.

Mr. Flannery said Phase 1 in the GDP was 118 units, and this is 116.

Mr. Flancbaum said a lot changes in 7 years, I don't think it makes sense to beat a dead horse now. We can worry about total units once they get to those phases.

Mr. Jackson said I think you're right, and this isn't changing the GDP.

Mr. Vogt said as we get closer to the number, I think John and I both need to look much more closely at the GDP requirements.

Mr. Y Stern asked if there were any other conditions in the GDP resolution.

Mr. Flannery said regarding traffic, it says before a final CO for Phase 1, the Cross Street improvements have to be in place. That refers to 3 lanes, which are already in. And then Phase 2 calls for a traffic signal, and Phase 3 calls for dualization of Cross Street, and Phase 4 the Board reserved the right to require a second means of access to the development.

Mr. Flannery spoke about the 141 on street parking spaces and spread out open space, which were added after meeting with the neighbors. The 41 acre buffer... that's why no one is here (to object).

Mr. Pfeffer spoke about a Planned Unit Development, the goal of which is to have big open spaces. This is what the Board envisioned and approved.

Mr. B Stern asked about a playground.

Mr. Flannery said yes, there is one in each phase.

Mr. Flannery continued through the RVE report's list of submission waivers. DPW approval and plans and profiles will be provided at compliance. He read through the zoning section and how no variances are required. Maximum building coverage, we have 40 acres of a gross area that is treed so we are nowhere near the building coverage. The RVE report calculated it on just this portion. There's no way we would get near that 25% with CAFRA requirements. We are at a little over 3%. Open space, we've already deed restricted. He read the definition for open space in the Ordinance. We have enough grass area to meet that requirement for 50% open space. The backyards, by the Ordinance definition, meets the requirement to be considered open space.

Mr. Y Stern questioned the open space calculations and said we are setting ourselves up for failure in the future on this issue.

The Board asked Mr. Vogt his opinion.

Mr. Neiman said he claims 25% is the 40 acres, and there is plenty of green between the units to account for 25% of the open space for the rest of the development after all of the phases are done.

Mr. Pfeffer said if we have to bring that calculation when we come to Phase 2, we can do that. Obviously for now since the other phases aren't proposed we definitely have more than 50% open space now.

Mr. Neiman said I'm ok getting numbers before Phase 2.

Mr. Vogt said they could provide it before you adopt this resolution. Also, I just looked at the GDP resolution and wanted it on the record, item 3 of the GDP page 9, there's a statement that speaks about pump station, force main, storm sewer, water mains, etc., which the proposed ROW and Cross Street.

Mr. Jackson said I also read the resolution for the GDP. It talks about a specific 500 something units, there is testimony about the density... my preliminary assessment is the GDP sets forth the number of units allowed and limits the number of units. We will have to address that in the future. 556 units. But I don't think that is of consequence right now.

Mr. B Stern said we had traffic testimony ad nauseum and it was based on a certain density, I agree.

Mr. Luwish asked if these will be HOA or public roads.

Mr. Flannery said public, with regular single-family lots. The HOA will maintain any shared or common utilities and drainage and grass. Each phase will have a community building.

Mr. Luwish asked about the shared roof between the duplexes. Is there a way to make it a clear separation between each unit, for future roof replacement?

Mr. Flannery said yes, there will be a fine line on the roof so each person can replace their side on their own.

Mr. Flannery continued through the RVE report. The fencing around the basins, applicant prefers post and rail fence but if the Board wants chain link we will change it. Those are HOA basins.

Mr. Neiman said we just want it safe for kids.

Mr. Flannery said it sounds like the Board wants chain link, we can do chain link. Trash and HVAC, we will show those at plot plan. Soil testing, we had more than 1 per acre done on this property. We feel that is well addressed. Comments 30 and 31, NJAW not MUA. The rest of the comments we will resolve during resolution compliance.

Mr. Pfeffer said is there anything in the report you can't comply with?

Mr. Flannery said no.

Mr. B Stern asked about the road widths.

Mr. Flannery said they are all 32'.

Mr. B Stern asked about the location of the community center, why not in the middle.

Mr. Flannery said putting it on the main road is more of a hazard. It's less than ¼ mile walk for the furthest unit here. And a benefit is additional parking adjacent, at the retail site that won't be used at night.

Mr. Y Stern spoke about how much traffic will be utilizing that entrance road, and how more lanes would be beneficial for 1,000 residents.

Mr. Flannery said we'd need approval from DCA to exceed their requirements.

Mr. Vogt and Mr. Jackson opined they could ask for more than required by RSIS.

Mr. Y Stern said 500 or 1,000 cars trying to get out in an hour, for the first however many feet it is double lanes. Why can't we extend that. Once the houses are built, you won't be able to widen that road.

Mr. Jackson said we can hear from their traffic expert, but also they aren't asking for any variances.

Mr. Flannery said that would be more impervious coverage and CAFRA will say no to that, if it's not required by DCA.

Mr. Y Stern said this seems like a small piece that could greatly improve the function of the overall neighborhood.

Mr. Neiman said do you have to go back to CAFRA for this?

Mr. Flannery said yes. And they will say no.

Mr. Justin Taylor, Traffic Engineer, appeared and was affirmed. He summarized the GDP conditions that are required in relation to Phase 1, and the County's roadway improvements already completed. The access road proposed here will handle the full build-out. We submitted a traffic study for this Phase 1 and will do that for every phase. The signal will operate at a level A. We have also submitted to the County for the whole project since they don't look at it in phases. They are comfortable with the geometry of the intersection as shown. The volume for that shows levels of service of C or D at peak hours for the full build-out. It is approximately 370' of two lanes,

which will store the queueing for the full build out. 25' per car, that's 24 to 30 cars in the two left lanes and 15 cars or so on in the right lane. About 15 cars in each of 3 lanes. And we are working with Conrail to get another point of access.

Mr. Neiman said thank you.

Mr. Luwish asked if there is signage for the development. Like a neighborhood sign.

Mr. Flannery said no.

Mr. Flannery illustrated to the Board where this entrance will be in comparison to the existing Eagle Ridge entrance.

Mr. Taylor said we are coordinating the signals with the County so you won't have to stop at every traffic signal.

Mr. Y Stern said that will limit the left turns out, the number of cars that can fit out until the next traffic light on Cross which will presumably be red.

Mr. Taylor said the County is working to set those offsets correctly. I understand what you're saying and it is being considered with the design. He confirmed the County is aware of Lakewood's unique trip generations and typical high traffic times. The traffic studies for later phases will include the traffic from already approved phases, so they will build on the previous phases.

Mr. Neiman opened to the public.

Mr. Aaron Hirsch appeared and was affirmed. He spoke about the traffic study and parking requirement details that refer to basement apartments, but density ignores the basement apartments. If you include the basement apartments, they are over the permitted density. The community center is not accounted for in the trip generation calculations. It is going to generate traffic, not just from inside the neighborhood. He spoke about the dates of the traffic counts taken. The Ordinance requires parking for the recreation building, and that is not accounted for on the plans. 3 of the documents submitted give different unit counts. The Board should not act on an application where that number is not resolved. There are many approved units in the area that are not accounted for in the traffic studies. There is not enough parking for catering hall and simcha hall and the Board should deed restrict it from those uses.

Mr. Neiman closed to the public.

Mr. B Stern said you said there would be a cross access easement for the retail parking to the shul?

Mr. Pfeffer said yes. We will make sure there is a safe walkway. A majority of the stores won't be open at night.

Mr. Jackson recommended the shul's use be limited, so residents don't park there at all hours or overnight.

Mr. Pfeffer agreed. He made summary closing statements.

Mr. Y Stern asked about the shared duplex parking they've been asking for in other developments.

Mr. B Stern said they are putting the driveways next to each other, so there are a lot of on-street parking spaces.

Mr. Flancbaum said good idea.

Mr. Neiman made a motion to approve, with the cross access easement as discussed.

Mr. Flancbaum seconded.

All were in favor.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- August 11, 2026 – Approved

6. APPROVAL OF BILLS - Approved

7. ADJOURNMENT - Meeting was adjourned with all in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Ally Morris, Planning Board Administrator and Recording Secretary