

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. B Stern, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Helmreich, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Luwish, Mr. Akerman

Mr. Dave Magno, P.E., P.P., C.M.E. was sworn.

3. RESOLUTIONS

1. SP 2634 Bais Reuven Kamenitz

831 Ridge Avenue

Block 190.04, Lots 8.17 & 8.18

Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a school addition

Mrs. Morris reminded the Board that changes to this draft were made as per public comment that was allowed at the last public hearing.

Mr. Bobby Shea, Esquire, said the notice was not perfected for the public hearing. He said one of the neighbors who lives within 200' was not provided notice. He referred to case law that outlines curative measures for a case such as this. The simple answer is to reopen for another public hearing and bring the experts back.

Mr. Neiman said we feel that notice was sufficient, the certified list was not stale, and everyone on the list was noticed. Everyone was given opportunity to speak at the last meeting as a courtesy, and we changed the resolution based on their input.

Mr. Shea spoke about other Ordinances that may apply in this case and spoke regarding the Board's authority to make the determination on notice perfection.

Mrs. Weinstein spoke against the allegation that her office should have known that this neighbor was not on the list.

Mr. Shea said the tree spacing waiver wasn't on the notice.

Mrs. Weinstein said the notice had the catch-all.

Mr. Magno clarified that it is a 6' fence that was added to the plans.

Mr. Neiman spoke about the condition of limiting the school to 950 students. He confirmed that in his opinion the testimony was limiting on that number, so he is fine with how that is worded in the resolution.

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

2. SD 2650 TDF Investment LLC

1362 Ridge Ave, 1143 East Co Line Rd Block 175.01, Lots 13, 16, 20-22
Minor Subdivision to realign lot lines

Mr. Neiman brought up the idea of bonding for the resolution of the Township owned lot.

Mr. Flannery said they will post a bond for the assessed value of the lot, if they can't get the Township to sell it or grant an easement before the map needs to be filed.

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

3. SD 2663 Jonah M. Rosenbaum

6 & 10 11th Street Block 151, Lots 6 & 7
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

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

4. PUBLIC HEARING

1. 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

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant and summarized the application.

Mr. Robert Curley, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed. He introduced exhibits. He spoke about the unique impacts on the site including environmental impacts and the sewer service area. We will need a Flood Hazard Permit, a Wetlands Permit, and Buffer Averaging from the DEP.

Mr. Neiman questioned if this should go to the DEP first.

Mr. Magno said they have already started the process and that's all that is required by the Submission Checklist in the Ordinance. It's possible they will need to come back for an amendment depending on what the DEP says.

Mr. Curley continued, he showed where the limit of the sewer service area is. The building has to be shown within that service area in order for the DEP to even consider our permits. Those are the constraints on this property, which pushes us towards the variances and waivers we are seeking. He read through the RVE letter's list of variances required. He spoke about the bus loading zone and said they could widen it if needed, but the bus is going to pull up no matter what. Our wall mounted signage is in compliance with the Ordinance. He spoke about the variances as hardship variances and that this is an inherently beneficial use.

Mr. Neiman said for a school our concerns are enough parking. And this can't be rented as a simcha hall because there isn't enough parking. We want drop off to be safe enough. 160 kids is a lot of buses that need to stack on the property and not block Ridge Avenue in this busy area. Are there any comments in the review letter that you can't comply with.

Mr. Curley said we agree to all of the comments in his letter and will comply. He explained the one-way circulation in front of the building and the longer term parking in the rear for teachers. There is a turnaround for emergency vehicles, and that was approved by the Fire Commissioner. The dumpster is in the rear and the garbage truck has circulation space.

Mr. B Stern asked about making the emergency vehicle turnaround bigger.

Mr. Curley said we are at the maximum allowable impervious coverage, and the DEP looks at that as coverage even though it's grass pavers.

Mr. Neiman said a Mesivta this size, even though it's not a variance for parking, it isn't enough parking.

Mr. Pfeffer read from the RVE report regarding the number of students and staff.

Mr. Magno said there is a design waiver from a shade tree and utility easement and street trees, and that's reasonable. The County is involved and they will want a larger right-of-way. I'm not sure if the curb is in the correct spot, it may need to be moved back even though it's new. He said he will have 2 conforming bus spaces, staggered that will be for 4 buses. Buffers are supposed to be untouched, or if you touch them you put in landscaping and screening. So does the Board want landscaping on the north side?

Mr. Pfeffer said we have room to put the fence in, but I don't know that we have room for trees.

Mr. Neiman said ok. And there will be no simcha hall.

Mr. Pfeffer said we agree to the condition that there will not be a rentable simcha hall.

Mr. Curley confirmed there will a 6' solid white fence on the north side, the back of the parking spaces.

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

Mr. Pfefer said we might need a 2' variance if the County takes more right-of-way.

Mr. Neiman said that's fine.

Mr. Neiman made a motion to approve, with the 6' fence on the north side up to the back of the parking spaces, and no simcha hall.

Mr. B Stern seconded.

All were in favor.

2. SD 2665 Brook Road BB, LLC
Brook Road Block 204, Lot 1
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant and summarized the application.

Mr. Brian Flannery, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed. He introduced exhibits and read through the RV report. These are oversized lots for the zone. He referenced the Master Plan and Municipal Land Use Law to support the relief requested. We don't want to improve in the wetlands, so we need a design waiver for that. And for the sidewalk, if we extend it all the way it kicks it into Major development. There is sidewalk in front of Creston, but we don't want to do it on Brook Road where it would just run into the wetlands. During resolution compliance we will convince RVE that nothing further is needed from the DEP. Connecting sidewalk for the roll out containers, we don't want to do that. He confirmed they are not proposing stacked parking. Monroe is in wetlands and is a paper street that will remain a paper street.

Mr. Luwish asked about the sidewalk on Brook Road in the wetlands.

Mr. Flannery said the Town could do that, with the right permits. If we put in sidewalk there now, up to the wetlands, it kicks it into Major development classification. If at plot plan the Township Engineer wants sidewalk, it could potentially be done then. He explained what kind of fencing is allowed by Ordinance and where it could be installed.

Mr. Magno explained the stormwater rule for major development and how the applicant is trying to stay under that number by not proposing sidewalk along Brook Road. The County will ask for Brook Road to be improved to the end of their property. If you want 5 parking spaces, that will also become a problem for that threshold. So it all depends on many factors, when it comes back to us for review.

Mr. Neiman said will we have flooding issues because it is being designed this way?

Mr. Magno said no.

Mr. Magno said the grading on the lot on the right goes off-site, they could get an easement or change the design.

Mr. Flannery said we will address that during compliance.

Mr. Luwish asked if this project will hinder future installation of sidewalk on Brook Road.

Mr. Flannery said no.

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

Mr. B Stern made a motion to approve.

Mr. Neiman seconded.

All were in favor.

3. SD 2666 Brook Road BB, LLC

Brook Road

Block 203, Lots 1-3

Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create eight lots

Mr. Adam Pfeffer, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant and summarized the application.

Mr. Brian Flannery, professional engineer and professional planner, appeared and was affirmed. He introduced exhibits and read through the RV report. He referenced the Master Plan and Municipal Land Use Law to support the relief requested. We would satisfy the comment about trash and HVAC at plot plan because these will be custom homes. And we will satisfy all the other comments during compliance.

Mr. Magno said custom homes, so that explains the architectural submission waivers. The radial dedications, we just want those congruent to the existing curb radius. This only affects the two largest lots. Street tree spacing waiver shouldn't be granted, they have room to comply with that. Do you know how you're going to handle drainage easements?

Mr. Flannery said there will be an HOA, and we will figure that out during compliance.

Mr. Magno said the roads exist, and some of the sidewalks and curbs exist. The street lighting is in, right next to the pavement. So on Burnside the pavement needs to be widened and the street lights moved. That's reflected on the plans already.

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

Mr. Neiman made a motion to approve.

Mr. Weiss seconded.

All were in favor.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- July 28, 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