

**Township of Manalapan**  
120 Route 522 & Taylors Mills Road  
Manalapan, NJ 07726

**Planning Board Minutes**  
**Reorganization and Public Meeting**  
**March 27, 2025**

Chairwoman Kathryn Kwaak called the meeting to order a 7:31pm with the reading of the Open Public Meetings Act. The salute to the flag followed.

Mr. Castronovo read the TV Disclosure Statement and took the Roll Call of the Board.

In attendance at the meeting: Barry Fisher, Todd Brown, John Castronovo, Barry Jacobson  
Chairwoman Kwaak, Jack McNaboe, Chief Hogan, Steve  
Kastell, Nunzio Pollifrone, Pat Givelekian

Absent from meeting: Mayor Nelson

Also present: Ronald Cucchiaro, Esq, Planning Board Attorney  
Jennifer Beahm PE, PP,Board Planner  
Jordan Rizzo, PE Planning Board Engineer  
Nancy McGrath, Board Secretary

**Minutes:**

A Motion was made by Chief Hogan and Seconded by Mr. Pollifrone to approve the minutes from the February 27, 2025 meeting as written and including the transcripts.

Yes: Fisher, Castronovo, Jacobson, Kwaak, McNaboe, Hogan, Pollifrone,  
Givelekian  
No: None  
Absent: Mayor Nelson  
Abstain: None  
Not Eligible: Brown, Kastell

**Resolution**

**PMS1745 – RWF 33 LLC (Skeba)**

Final Site Plan  
Block 74, Lot 23.02 | Hwy 33  
Two warehouse buildings totaling 952,720 +/- SF

A Motion was made by Mr. Jacobson and Seconded by Mr. Fisher to approve the RWF 33, LLC resolution for Final Site Plan with Design Waiver Relief.

Yes: Fisher, Castronovo, Jacobson, Kwaak, McNaboe, Hogan, Kastell,  
Pollifrone, Givelekian  
No: None  
Absent: Mayor Nelson  
Abstain: None  
Not Eligible: Brown

**Applications**

**PMS1931A/PMS193TS - Cardinale & Manalapan Crossing Associates**

Amended Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan  
Minor Technical Subdivision  
Block 66 Lot 8.03 / 162 HWY 33 (Shoprite)  
The amended plan is proposing to eliminate buildings B, C, and D and replace with a New Building B. No Change to Build A, E, F, and G  
Hearing #1 - November 14, 2024  
Hearing #2 - January 23, 2025  
Hearing #3 – February 13, 2025  
Hearing #4 – February 27, 2025

Chairwoman Kwaak stated that the application will be carried, and no testimony will be presented this evening.

Mr. Cucchiaro announced that the application is rescheduled for the Planning Board meeting on April 24, 2025, at 7:30 PM, with no additional notice to property owners required.

**PBE2442 - MSK Manalapan LLC**

Amended Preliminary and Final Site Plan

Block 66, Lot 18.01 – 150 Woodward Road

Expand parking lot and additional stormwater management

Existing parking 395 + 162 additional

Mr. Alfieri, the attorney representing the applicant, provided a brief overview of the project, previously known as Sportika. The property was purchased by the Klatsky family and is now referred to as Multi-Sports Kingdom (MSK). Although his office did not handle the original application, Concept Engineering has been involved with the project from the outset.

Mr. Alfieri further explained that in 2017-2018, there was an approval to convert the outdoor soccer fields into additional parking; however, the parking was never installed. The new owner is requesting approval to build the parking lot with some modifications to the site plan, while remaining aligned with what was originally approved years ago.

Mr. Alfieri called his first witness, Bhaskar Halari, the project's professional engineer from Concept Engineering. After being sworn in, he presented his credentials to the Board, which Chairwoman Kwaak deemed sufficient. Mr. Halari introduced the first exhibit to familiarize the Board with the conditions that are under review.

**Exhibit A1** - aerial photo of the existing conditions of the site with property lines superimposed in yellow.

The existing building and the parking area to the west and south is what was built as part of the original approval. On the northwest corner of the site, there is an existing detention pond. The northern portion of the property features a stream with a stream corridor buffer, wetlands, and a floodplain area, that was dedicated to the township as a conservation easement. The current application before the Board today, aims to expand the parking in the turf area located at the southeastern corner of the site by adding 162 spaces to the existing 395 parking spaces.

**Exhibit A2** – aerial of overall site plan showing the proposed new parking in light gray on the aerial.

As a part of this design, in order to meet the stormwater requirement, another stormwater basin was created on the easterly portion of the existing building. This basin will manage runoff from the proposed parking lot and direct it into the existing storm drainage system on the southwesterly side. The runoff will ultimately flow into a large basin that previously collected runoff from the area.

**Exhibit A3** – is an enlargement of site plan of the 162 parking stalls and the stormwater basin.

The applicant proposes installing a crosswalk on the easterly side of Woodward Road. On the exhibit, the green line represents the wetland line on the Stavola property. The required 6x6 concrete pad at the crosswalk's endpoint will encroach into the wetland buffer area, necessitating a DEP permit for construction. The applicant can install all other elements of the crosswalk, including the flashing light and push button, while the concrete pad will be constructed once the necessary DEP permits are in place.

Ms. Beahm inquired why the DEP permits had not been secured, as the crosswalk was part of the agreement outlined in the amended preliminary approval. Mr. Halari explained that the previous owner had not authorized them to proceed with the project. Mr. Alfieri noted that the new owner is willing to apply for the DEP permit but requested that it not be a condition for the parking lot installation approval.

Mr. Cucchiaro clarified that the board was fully within its rights to withhold final approval altogether. The last time the previous owner made an appearance, the Board showed sympathy for the applicant and recognized the community's use of the site. As a result, the Board decided that most of the approval would be preliminary and final, with the exception of the parking lot and the crosswalk, which were left as preliminary to avoid delaying operations. The Board was led to believe, under oath, that the additional improvements would be completed. Mr. Cucchiaro continued by stating historically, the Board has been very open to finding solutions that allow things to move forward while the applicant is working on obtaining the necessary approvals. In summary, it appears the new owner/applicant is seeking final approval for everything, with a focus on getting the parking lot done immediately. The objective is to maintain operations and begin construction on the parking lot, all while pursuing DEP approval for the concrete pad needed to finalize the crosswalk installation. The Board acknowledges this and is willing to take it into account in terms of approval.

Mr. McNaboe asked about the possibility of moving the crosswalk south to avoid the DEP permit approval process. Mr. Rizzo indicated that the crosswalk would then cross over a wider road, including turning lanes, which would complicate the crosswalk relocation and may become more dangerous. Mr. Rizzo also pointed out that another consideration for the Board, while it is reasonable to assume that the DEP might approve, there are no guarantees that they will approve.

Ms. Beahm asked Mr. Halari if an alternative location for the crosswalk was ever considered to avoid the need to get a DEP permit. Mr. Halari commented that since the crosswalk location was part of the preliminary approval, a detailed review of other locations was not conducted. He did personally visit the site just to look at the location and in his opinion, he might only need a buffer waiver or a buffer averaging waiver from the DEP.

Mr. Alfieri proposed a few options so the hearing could move on from the crosswalk discussion. He suggested that the applicant can work with the Board engineer to identify an alternative location for the sidewalk, proceed with the DEP permit, or return in a month, whatever the Board prefers. Mr. Cucchiaro explained if relocation of the crosswalk is necessary, it must be subject to review and approval by the Board engineer and the Township. Given the history of this property in terms of open-ended promises, it is important to determine how much time is needed to identify an alternate location.

Mr. Cucchiaro suggested that the Board could vote to authorize the drafting of a positive resolution, with the condition to resolve the crosswalk location before final approval and memorialization of the resolution. Mr. Alfieri expressed his agreement to that recommendation.

Mr. Halari examined the project map across the street from the applicant's property, noting that there is no road widening and that the wetland buffer line is located further away, making relocation feasible. To move out of the DEP area for the concrete pad, the crosswalk would need to be north of the applicant's detention basin, before the area where the centerline striping begins.

Mr. Castronovo asked why this location was not proposed 8 years ago to avoid the DEP permit process. It was explained that the environmental constraints surfaced in the past year, when the Stavola project across the street went to put in the sidewalk. Mr. McNaboe reminded the Board that the town assumed responsibility for applying for the DEP permit for that section of the sidewalk, with the goal to meet the Knob Hill property so they could add a sidewalk for their residents.

Exhibit A4 - landscape plan. Mr. Halari described the landscape/buffering that will be installed in conjunction with the new parking lot. Additional trees will be planted along the easterly property as well as to the south. Also, there will be landscaping in the parking lot islands and additional landscaping around the detention basin.

Mr. Alfieri noted a minor decrease in the number of parking spaces compared to the existing preliminary approval and the current plan under review by the Board. Mr. Halari explained that to provide access to the proposed detention basin, 12 parking spaces had to be removed, resulting in a total of 557 parking spaces. ADA parking spaces will include ten spaces in the front near the main entrance, plus the existing two on the side of the building. There will be a total of 7 EV spaces to comply with the state requirements.

Mr. Alfieri stated for the record that the 2018 resolution had called for a modified ingress/egress/regress easement. While the original easement is available, no record of the modified easement could be located with the county. He acknowledged that, if it was not completed, the applicant understands they must fulfill that requirement. It was also discussed that while the dedicated left and right turning lanes are striped, additional restriping may be necessary to meet other conditions from the previous approval.

The new lighting poles will be located within the island area of the proposed parking and will be similar to what is in the existing lot.

Mr. Alfieri requested Mr. Halari to elaborate on the signage exhibit (Exhibit A5). The applicant is proposing a larger sign to enhance site identification and vehicle safety. While the sign complies with the ordinance's required area, it exceeds the maximum permitted height. The applicant is suggesting a 5'7" sign, whereas the ordinance allows for a maximum height of 4 feet.

Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. Halari to go into a little more detail regarding the previous variances granted and the current variances. There were several variances previously granted, as well as additional variances noted in both the planner's and engineer's reports. These variances are

largely consistent with those that were approved previously. One variance pertains to the minimum side yard setback for parking, which requires 50 feet but proposes 10 feet. This area is located to the south of the proposed parking lot, near an existing driveway that ends at the property line. The driveway appears to be intended for future access to the neighboring property, meaning the parking would be next to that driveway. Another variance involves the rear parking setback, where 50 feet is required, but a setback of 26.2 feet is proposed on the easterly side. The applicant is also seeking design waiver for the landscaping. They are putting some trees in the island area and additional landscaping along Woodward Road as well as all the shrubs in the islands but cannot meet the total count required due to the size of the building. There is a conservation easement behind the building which limits the applicant on adding trees in the back. The last design waiver is for the parking space size that was previously granted. The additional parking spaces will be 9'x18' whereas 10'x20' is required.

Concept Engineering did provide the Environmental Commission the stormwater management design and it does comply with DEP regulations which was one of their primary concerns. Also, the applicant's team will address any remaining technical comments from the Board Professionals.

Chairwoman Kwaak asked if there were any questions or comments for the Board for this witness.

Ms. Beahm requested that the applicant try to replant as much as possible and would defer to the town forester. She does not think the Board should just grant a blanket waiver for the landscaping. Ms. Beahm also requested that that applicant provide planning testimony for the rear yard setback variance (positive versus negative criteria). She understands the side yard setback is an extension of what was already granted, the rear yard setback is new so there needs to be testimony from a planner for the C variance. Mr. Halari state he is not a licensed planner so he cannot provide the testimony for the planning criteria.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked of Mr. Halari whether, from an engineering standpoint, the additional parking would improve internal site circulation and cut down on cars roaming in search of open spaces. Mr. Halari confirmed this and added that it would also prevent cars from parking offsite on local streets. Mr. Cucchiaro further emphasized that this would alleviate pressure on the surrounding streets.

Mr. Halari also indicated that they are going to plant additional landscaping in the buffer to minimize the encroachment impact to the neighboring property. They will be reallocating landscaping that would typically be required for the parking lot to enhance the buffer. Ms. Beahm commented that she would like to see trees and shrubs to offset the setback variance to enhance the separation between the parking lot and the adjacent property as much as possible. Mr. Alfieri also stated the applicant will collaborate with CME on the landscape plan.

Chief Hogan referenced the January 7<sup>th</sup> 2025 Fire Bureau report and acknowledged the applicant fulfilled at least two of the five items on the report including the mountable curbing and the fire lane striping. He asked what turning radius template was used for the new parking area. Mr. Halari confirmed he used the Manalapan Fire Truck turning radius provided by the town. Chief Hogan mentioned that the original preliminary approval included a requirement for emergency radio coverage throughout the building to assist first responders. Mr. Alfieri responded that the owner could address this matter and assured compliance regardless. Chief Hogan stressed the need to establish a clear timeframe for compliance, as the previous owner failed to meet this requirement.

The Board inquired about the other tenants occupying the building, to which Mr. Alfieri responded that the owner's representative would address those uses. Ms. Beahm raised a concern regarding the uses currently present in the building and suggested that the parking lot expansion could potentially attract additional uses that have not been previously approved by the Board. She also pointed out that the proposed sign includes designated space for other tenants. She further clarified that multiple principal uses are not allowed, and if an additional principal use is introduced, the applicant would likely need to appear before a different board for approval.

Mr. McNaboe said the applicant needs to ensure that the back doors facing the 55+ development are linked to the fire alarm system and strictly used for emergencies. He expressed his concern about preventing the doors from being opened randomly, as this could allow noise to disturb the nearby neighborhood. He also requested that the building's maximum capacity be clearly posted inside. Chief Hogan added that he would like a comprehensive facility plan addressing occupancy compliance to be included in the resolution, stating that he is not prepared to vote on the matter without reviewing such a plan.

The Board requested that designated and clearly marked areas for bus parking be established to prevent buses from spilling over to the assisted living property. There were also concerns about the proposed sign potentially obstructing sightlines for vehicles exiting the facility. Mr. Halari clarified that the sign is positioned 20 feet back from the property line. Ms. Beahm suggested that the applicant remove the 2 tenant panels on the proposed sign in order to have a conforming sign and not need a variance.

Mr. Alfieri introduced the next witness, Mr. Michael Klatsky who is the owner, primary operator and managing member of MSK which was just purchased in October of 2024. Mr. Klatsky stated his family owns and operates other facilities which include Jersey 34 Tennis in Matawan, Monroe Sports Center, and Central Jersey Basketball in Marlboro.

Mr. Alfieri asked Mr. Klatsky to describe the types of activities that currently take place at the facility, as well as those that will continue or expand upon in the future. MSK is primarily a sports facility and it features seven basketball courts and a turf field approximately the size of a full football field. The courts host a wide variety of sports, including basketball, volleyball, badminton, and other activities suitable for court surfaces. The turf field is used for sports such as soccer, football, baseball, softball, and lacrosse. Additionally, the facility can accommodate other events, such as martial arts sessions and dog shows. There will be no outdoor sports activity onsite. Mr. Alfieri inquired about bus activity, to which Mr. Klatsky explained that buses occasionally bring camps for day trips during weekdays. He has not seen buses on weekends for tournaments when parking lots are more crowded. Mr. Cucchiaro confirmed with Mr. Klatsky that when he is referring to camps, he means camps that operate at other locations and not camps that are operating at MSK.

Mr. Klatsky advised the Board he will comply with the Board's request for emergency radio coverage, wire the back door exits with alarms, and will also provide a detailed occupancy plan.

Mr. Cucchiaro asked the applicant to review the tenants that are in the facility currently. Mr. Klatsky explained some tenants existed before the property was acquired.

- Boundless Fitness occupies approximately 3000 square feet and provides supplemental fitness training, focusing on strength and conditioning for athletes. It runs independently, and while they generate revenue, MSK is not involved in their pricing or business operations they only rent space.
- Physical Therapy
- Arcade of about 15 machines
- Pro Shop – sells apparel and custom uniforms
- Learning Center – after school enrichment focusing on STEM activities.
- Wonder Food – Not prepared food, just frozen to be re-heated.

Mr. Klatsky said as far as he knows the tenants in the building have gotten approvals from Mr. Boccanfuso, the Zoning Officer. Mr. Cucchiaro reminded the applicant that the approvals were not from the Planning Board so there was never any discussion as to impact on parking, hours of operation and how it meshed with other operations on the site.

The Board requested that the applicant compile a detailed list of all current tenants in the building and how much space they are using. This will enable the Board to assess whether the use is permissible and evaluate its impact on parking requirements. Also, the Board needs to know whether or not their traffic engineer considered the additional uses when conducting the traffic analysis.

There was discussion that the learning center/homeschool that was there under the previous owner was issued a notice of violation for operating without approvals. Mr. Klatsky said the pro shop is now occupying the space where the homeschool operated.

Mr. Rizzo confirmed with Mr. Klatsky that they will not put up any outdoor basketball nets or pickle ball courts in the outside lots. As far as hours of operation and lighting, Mr. Alfieri asked to table that discussion until they get a better understanding of the activities that are going on at the facility.

The Board asked about the other facilities the family owns. Mr. Klatsky responded that Monroe was a build-from-scratch project, while Jersey 34 was an acquisition. Jersey Basketball, was originally a gymnastics facility and they retrofitted to a basketball center. Mr. Klatsky was not personally involved with the other facilities as far as obtaining permits or approvals for the co-tenants. He believes his father handled that aspect of the businesses.

The Board asked if the proposed signage is intended for the current tenants. Mr. Klatsky said the idea is to put the key tenants on the sign and there are no intentions to divide the sign into numerous smaller sections to display all the tenants in the building.

The Board asked about the presence of delivery trucks at the facility. Mr. Klatsky explained that none of the tenants receive large shipments, and if a small truck does arrive, it would be during daytime hours. According to Mr. Klatsky, parking issues primarily occur on weekends during tournaments, as tenants and the sports facility have differing peak hours. When asked about managing parking and traffic during tournaments, he explained that not all teams arrive simultaneously. In the seven-court facility, there are typically 14 teams playing and 14 teams waiting, amounting to approximately 280 cars at a time. However, there are occasions when vehicle congestion exceeds capacity, underscoring the necessity for additional parking. Mr. Cucchiaro suggested that the applicant have his traffic engineer take actual counts at this facility if a tournament occurs before their next meeting.

Following a ten-minute break, the meeting reconvened at 9:33 PM. Mr. Alfieri requested that the applicant's hearing be carried to May 8th, allowing the traffic engineer sufficient time to analyze peak weekends and update the traffic data. Additionally, the applicant requires more time to address fire safety concerns, including determining maximum capacity, which necessitates input from an architect.

Mr. Cucchiaro officially announced that this application will be carried to the May 8<sup>th</sup> 2025 meeting beginning at 7:30pm and there will no further notice to property owners

**Correspondence** – Chairwoman Kwaak reminded the board members to complete their financial disclosure statement.

**Non-Agenda Items** – No one from the public came forward to discuss any non-agenda items.

Chairwoman Kwaak announced the next meeting is Thursday, April 10, 2025 at 7:30pm

**Executive Session** – Ms. McGrath read the resolution authorizing the Executive Session to discuss Toll vs. Manalapan Planning Board. The Board will not reconvene in Public and will adjourn directly from Executive Session.

A Motion was made by Mr. McNaboe and Seconded by Chief Hogan to enter into Executive Session. The resolution will take place immediately. \*Mr. Brown recused himself from this discussion.

Yes:	Fisher, Castronovo, Jacobson, Kwaak, McNaboe, Hogan, Kastell, Pollifrone, Givelekian
No:	None
Absent:	Mayor Nelson
Abstain:	Brown
Not Eligible:	None

Nancy McGrath  
Recording Secretary