

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* and posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood 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. B Stern, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Luwish, Mr. Helmreich

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

3. RESOLUTIONS

1. SD 2645 Miz Construction

15, 17, 23, 25 Edgewood Court Block 414, Lots 13.04, 13.05, 14-16
Minor Subdivision to create 8 lots

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

2. SP 2619 DeAnna Pistola

745 Airport Road Block 1160.01, Lot 232
Minor Site Plan for a parking lot addition

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

3. SD 2642 Prospect Development Group LLC

320 8th Street Block 96, Lot 1
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create 8 lots

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

4. SD 2615 Shaul Halpern

489 Manetta Avenue Block 189.01, Lot 184

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

4. PUBLIC HEARING

1. SP 2630 Hamilton of Lakewood LLC

600, 680 New Hampshire Ave & 1518 Bellinger St Block 855.05, Lots 19, 23, & 25

Concept Plan for a daycare

Mr. Bob Shea, Esquire, appeared on behalf of the applicant and summarized the application. This encompasses three different lots.

Mr. Yair Stern asked if his firm represented the other side of the application at any point.

Mr. Shea said no. There is no conflict between myself and any member of the public. He spoke about a Zoning Board application on which they were approached, but not retained, for services. In my opinion if I had been retained, it would not be a conflict. It's two entirely different applications and two entirely different uses and two entirely different jurisdictional Boards. It had nothing to do with this application.

Mr. Helmreich said this is odd. He asked for Mr. Jackson's opinion.

Mr. Jackson said the rules are very complicated and frankly I don't want to weigh in on this. A conflict would be between them and that person, and it's at their risk and choice to proceed.

Mr. Shea continued, and explained the zone of the property as well as how day cares are permitted uses.

Mr. Neiman said the Ordinance is very vague with respect to parking requirements.

Mr. Shea said the plan before you is conforming for parking.

Mr. B Stern said we've had quite a few day cares and the Ordinances are vague, and one of the things we've used is the state teacher-student ratio requirements to do the math and calculate how much parking is needed.

Mr. Shea said when we submit for a site plan, all of that will be submitted. We have more than enough parking and will get into the details with the state standards when we submit a site plan. This is really to bring this permitted use before you so we can demonstrate there are no variances or waivers needed for this. If you have any feedback, great, but we have indicated here has not triggered any variances or waivers and this would be a matter of right, so to speak.

Mr. Flancbaum questioned what is currently on the corner of South Street and New Hampshire, the aerial shows some striped parking. It looks like an existing commercial use.

Mr. Shea said that is correct. And some of the surrounding properties are commercial as well.

Mr. Y Stern said if the site is currently operating out of compliance, a commercial use in a residential area, that sort of undermines our trust in the applicant. Someone I used to work with runs his health center out of that location. This is what went to the Zoning Board and lost, and is still operating there today.

Mr. Shea said I don't know what's operating there now.

Mr. Shea and Mr. Y Stern debated whether and how these issues impact the current proposal. Mr. Jackson opined that it impacts the applicant's credibility, and maybe creeps in unofficially.

Mr. Shea said we are here to make sure there are no variances or waivers as submitted.

Mr. Neiman said we need to see full plans. We need to know how many classrooms there are, how many children there are... And South Street and Bellinger Street are two neighborhoods where this might be permitted, but those two entrances on South Street and Bellinger, I would close those and only use the one on New Hampshire Avenue. One way in, and one way out. And some type of circulation within the campus. Even though you are conforming, we listen to neighbors. And there have been daycares turned down elsewhere for similar concerns. You are asking for my input, and that is my input. I'm going to listen to the concerns of the neighbors, especially since there are access options on New Hampshire.

Mr. Jackson supported Mr. Neiman's ability to give such feedback.

Mr. B Stern said what we have learned about daycares is it is a peak load. Everyone comes and goes at the same time. Maybe it could be moved back... the more parking and loading, the better. If these cars back up on New Hampshire and block New Hampshire, it's going to be a problem. And have just the in and out on New Hampshire, with as much loading area as possible. That's our feedback.

Mr. Shea said Planning Board can't take into consideration off-site traffic.

Mr. Y Stern said he said the ingress and egress, we can.

Mr. Jackson said and backing up onto New Hampshire is a valid concern.

Mr. Shea said we could do a staggered drop off and pick up, we could agree to that.

Mr. Helmreich said never gonna happen.

Mr. Shea said this is a typical flow and this is the circulation pattern that this Board typically approves.

Mr. B Stern said we are just saying that circulation and parking are important to us.

Mr. Luwish said when you come in from New Hampshire, the first place anyone is going to stop is right there at the building, and that first edge of the loading zone. So it will back up on New Hampshire behind them, and the rest of the loading zone is moot.

Board members voiced agreement.

Mr. Y Stern said there needs to be some teacher spaces but also some drop off spaces for students as well.

Mr. Shea said we do have 30 spots. And based upon what has been presented here, have there been any variances or waivers identified?

Mr. Magno said to that point, this a concept plan without an architectural plan. We don't know if there will be setback variances, how many spaces you need, or whether you will need design waivers.

Mr. Jackson joked, how is the grading design looking?

Mr. Magno said we recommend you go to the County first, and meet with them, and see what they are going to let you do before you come here.

Mr. Shea said I understand. He made comments that he disagrees with that order of operations.

Mr. Neiman said that is our feedback.

Mr. Shea said I would appreciate if the Board could make a determination on this.

Mr. Neiman said we can't do that with the information provided.

Mr. Shea asked details about how close the Board members live to the site and whether there are any conflicts of interest.

The Board agreed that no one lives within 200 feet.

5. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- February 3, 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