

1. FLAG SALUTE & CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Yechiel Herzl called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Ally Morris 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 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

Mr. Franklin, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Follman, Ms. Zografos, Mr. Garfield

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Martin Truscott, PP, AICP, LEED-GA and Stan Slachetka, PP, AICP of T&M Associates were sworn.

4. 2017 DRAFT MASTER PLAN REVIEW

Mr. Flancbaum said the Township of Lakewood has been reexamining their Master Plan report for the last 12 months or so. The Township set up a Master Plan Advisory Board and that board consisted of several subcommittees. Each subcommittee was tasked with particular items they had to look at. The whole process took about a year, they had many public hearings and about a month ago, a draft master plan report was distributed by T&M Associates who is the Township planner. This draft report has to be reviewed and adopted by the Planning Board. The Planning Board has the opportunity to either adopt the report as presented or they can make revisions, modifications and then that draft report is then going to go the Township Committee for their review and adoption. There is a three step process, first the Master Plan Advisory Board, then the Planning Board and then the Township Committee. The Master Plan is quite voluminous and they have come up with a format that they think will afford the Planning Board an opportunity to look at it in a concise and logically type of way. Tonight, they are going to go through the proposed land use map which is contained with the draft report. In addition to the land use map, there are certain recommendations of the Master Plan Advisory Board for future development patterns. Whenever you look at new development moving forward, you have to look at increased infrastructure, wider roads including main roads and interior streets within developments and there is a whole slew of recommendations that come along with some of these proposed land uses. The Township planner is going to go through the proposed land use and then the public will have an opportunity to speak.

Mr. John Jackson said per the New Jersey Zoning and Land Use Administration book at the hearing, the plan is explained to the public and the public is heard. Usually a copy of the plan is handed out and in this case it has been available online. The planners and/or the members of the Planning Board provide an explanation. The details regarding the hearing are set out in the statute of governing hearings. A verbatim record must be made. Following public comment, the board may then approve the plan or make amendments. If amendments are to be prepared, the hearing should be continued to a date certain which date shall be announced by the chairman. The procedure they are going to follow tonight is they are going to have their planners go through the Master Plan. They have broken it down into several elements following the format of the subcommittee. Tonight they are going to direct their attention to the Housing Density Subcommittee summary report. The public will have an opportunity to make comments and the board will take those comments into account when it gets to a vote. It is difficult for the board to field questions because an individual member of the board does not speak for the entire board. Something might

be important to one member and it may be completely opposed by another member. Everything is taken into account, there are deliberations and then there is a group decision evidenced by a group vote.

Mr. Slachetka said T&M Associates were the ones tasked with preparing the actual Master Plan document based on the work that the Master Plan Committee and its various subcommittees had undertaken. This is a comprehensive Master Plan and it is intended to essentially replace the prior adopted Master Plan of the Township and any Master Plan Reexamination reports that have been prepared subsequent to that last Master Plan. The Master Plan document is an important document from the standpoint of governing land use in the Township in that pursuant to the state's municipal land use law, the land use plan element and the housing plan element of the municipalities establishes the foundation for the council or the committee of the governing body to adopt zoning. In fact, the MLUL says that the Township's zoning ordinance has to be substantially consistent with the land use plan element and the housing plan element of the Master Plan. The Planning Board actually adopts the Master Plan. The governing body does not adopt the Master Plan. Once the Planning Board adopts the Master Plan and its recommendations essentially are embodied in the plan and report, the governing body then is responsible for adopting zoning ordinances, ordinances to the land development regulations of the municipalities that implement the recommendations of the Master Plan. They could decide not to adopt the zoning changes or they could adopt zoning changes that are somewhat different than what is recommended in the Master Plan but they have to do it by an affirmation vote of their full voting membership and they have set forth their reasons in writing for deviating from those recommendations. The Master Plan is also an important document with respect to other land use decisions in the community. The Zoning Board of Adjustment is actually guided by recommendations that are contained in the Master Plan. Therefore, applicants before the Zoning Board may submit an application for a use variance or to request a use which is not permitted in that zone or some other type of variances that is similar in nature and they have to reconcile their request with the goals and objectives, the intents and purposes of the Master Plan of the municipality. So it is a very important document both from the standpoint of governing body actions and in terms of land use policy as well as an important document for the Zoning Board to consider in evaluating requests for the variances to that board and clearly the Planning Board also uses it as a guide in the framework for its various land use development actions in reviewing both development applications as well as setting other land use policies.

Mr. Truscott said he is going to walk through the Housing Density Subcommittee (HDS) report and also aspects of the land use plan recommendations. The HDS met several times and they have reviewed carefully the different neighborhoods and locals of the town and took into consideration prior planning documents. They made a series of recommendations in terms of the land use plan which would eventually turn into zoning districts and they also made some recommendations for changes to the zoning ordinance that affect design. Those are critical to the Master Plan and also the future development of the town so there is not only development recommendations but those affecting design of those developments and those are the aspects where everybody is affected in each way. There were six design recommendations or assumptions the HDS made including all interior streets should have a greater width than the requirements of the RSIS. The Township may have to get a special area and standard for that in order to have a wider street but the HDS felt that was important in terms of better circulation, a significant area of land greater than what is required now be set aside for open spaces, an area in a development on interior streets should be set aside to help facilitate the drop off and pick up of school children with the school buses. That an area be set aside within developments for solid waste containers, a perimeter buffer and deeper setback for new structure is provided along the frontage of major collector and higher volume streets and a landscape buffer between different land uses greater than existing width requirements, should be provided and strictly enforced at the approval stage. The HDS also recommended the incorporation of adequate and timely supportive infrastructure necessary for such zone changes, particularly road, sewer and water infrastructure, and recommends the Planning Board prioritize and integrate infrastructure improvement recommendations in the Master Plan to address needs of the areas of concern. It is also recommended that sufficient additional lands for school site be provided. Going in to more land use plan type of recommendations that the HDS provided, the HDS evaluated 20 locations for changes

in zoning for use and/or development intensity and recommends 12 of those areas to be rezoned and 2 to be studied further. Map LU4 Proposed Land Use on page 53 was displayed to the board.

1. The south-central area of the Cross-Prospect Street Core: R-20/12C to R-75. The area that fronts on Cross Street in the single-family area of the Cross Street-Prospect Street Core as designated in the Smart Growth Plan is recommended to be rezoned to a R-7.5 yield with a mix of lot sizes provided there is a significant setback or buffer along Cross Street. This will allow a lower density than current approvals.
2. West Cross Street, opposite the intersection with Franklin Blvd.: R-40 to R-12B. This property was part of the study area for the Master Plan Amendment of April 8, 2014 that was recommended for R-12B. Current recommendation is to R-10 or R12 density.

There is a correction needed on the proposed land use map as it is shown as R-10B but it should just be R-10. R-10B would allow for duplexes as long as there is a minimum tract size. The density would still be the same.

3. New Hampshire Blvd. south of Route 70 on the south of the B-5 zone district: R-20 to B-5A. Recommendation is consistent with Smart Growth Plan for mixed use highway corridors.

The difference between the B-5 and the B-5A is that it allows a number of residential uses.

4. The area between West Cross Street and Drake Road: R-40 to R-12B. The 2014 Land Use Plan amendment recommended rezoning to R-12B. Current recommendation is to R-10 or R-12 density, single-family only.
5. The south-central area of the Cross-Prospect Street Core - vicinity of Cross Street and Rachel Street: R20/12C to R-7.5. Allow R-7.5 yield.
6. North side of Route 70 west of New Hampshire Boulevard: B-5 and R-12 to B-5A. Would allow multi-family housing.
7. South side of Route 88 (Ocean Avenue) east of South Oakland Street: R-10 to R-7.5. Recommended by the 2007 Reexamination Report.
8. North-central area of Cross-Prospect Street Core: A-1 to RM (multifamily). Recommend change subject to the overall Smart Growth land use plan for the Cross -Prospect St. Core.

Within the Cross Street Core, there is quite a bit of public property so they are proposing that the Township provide a park in that area.

Mr. Herzl said no changes are being made to public properties.

Mr. Truscott confirmed, they are recommending a park when development occurs.

9. West Cross Street: R-40 to R-10. Addressed in the 2014 Master Plan Amendment. Current recommendation R-10-R12 density, single-family only.
10. West Cross Street and Maplehurst Avenue: R-40 to R-10. Recommend R-10/R-12 density, single-family only.
11. Chestnut Street area west of New Hampshire: 12-20 to R-10A. Recommend R-10 density subject to evidence that the area is within the approved sewer service area.
12. A-1 and A-2: Create a new zone district (R-40C) that allows for new planned communities on parcels of 100 acres or more at a density of 4.5 units per acre without any age restriction.

There was a prior adoption by the Township to consolidate some of the industrial and other commercial zoning and provide for some support areas for the Airport Zone. North of Oak Street, there are some areas where there are existing affordable housing development that would be expanded in that area. On Pine Street, there is the Pine River Village development which had been zoned for years as M-2 but had been developed under a different scenario, is being recommended for R-20 which was a prior recommendation of one of the Master Plans.

Mr. Slachetka said most of the R-40 area near Kettle Creek is out of the sewer service area. In fact, that area contains mostly municipally owned and privately owned properties that are identified in the conservation plan element as what is called schedule 'A' properties for preservation under the Township's proposed non-contiguous cluster ordinance.

Mr. Truscott said an open space zone and the Crystal Lake Preserve area was consolidated into the Open Space Preservation Area. That area is not within the sewer service area and is owned by the Township.

Mr. Slachetka said the municipally owned properties out of the sewer service area have just recently been put under a conservation easement by the Township Committee permanently preserving those properties from development.

Mr. Truscott said there are no changes to the Cedarbridge Redevelopment Area which consists of the Blueclaws stadium and the commercial development behind that.

Mr. Herzl asked what streets are being widened to accommodate the proposed zoning changes.

Mr. Slachetka said the proposed revisions to the circulation including new streets are outlined in the circulation plan element. In the areas where you have the Cross Street Core, which is the area that is part of the state plan endorsement, that is where there would be significant improvements to infrastructure. The new roads that would be under the Township's jurisdiction the improvements and the addition of those new roads would be paid by developers via off-tract contributions as well as the transportation improvement district which was adopted by the Township Committee so there is a mechanism to fund those improvements necessary for new development.

Mr. Herzl said Cross Street is a County road.

Mr. Slachetka confirmed, it would be under the County's jurisdiction and certainly any new development that takes place would have to obtain their approval and contribute appropriately to any improvements necessary.

Mr. Herzl said Cross Street should be widened and turning lanes should be added before any new development takes place.

Mr. Slachetka agrees. Obviously the Township can only control its own road system. It's also just not about making roads wider but making sure the roads are safe for vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Herzl said they need as many paper streets open as possible in the area.

Mrs. Morris said the recommendations from the subcommittee seem to reference a lot of different changes in the Cross Street area. A lot of the points reference potential recommendations for rezoning to R-10 or R-12 with single family only yet the recommendations in the proposed zoning map show R-10 which would permit duplexes.

Mr. Truscott said that would be more of a clarification for the recommendation.

Mr. Herzl has to hear from the board but he doesn't believe they want duplexes in those areas.

Mr. Slachetka said there were a number of recommendations that came from the Master Plan Committee and the board has the responsibility for actually adopting the Master Plan and making sure that Master Plan is to their liking.

Mr. Herzl asked what interior streets are recommended to be widened and to what width.

Mr. Truscott said they don't have specifics in terms of the widths of the streets. That would be worked out as part of the zoning recommendations.

Mr. Jackson said the board could approve the concept of wider streets. The board could also be more specific and say they should go from 32 ft to 36 ft. It would be up to the governing body to adopt design standards to carry that out.

Mr. Flancbaum said the Master Plan Advisory Board didn't have a number in terms of how wide the street should be but they should certainly be wider than 32 ft. He thinks the closer they get to 40 ft would be better so they could have parking on both sides, they can make sure vehicles can travel comfortably in both lanes, if somebody has to stop for whatever reason then it wouldn't stop the flow of traffic on the entire street.

Mr. Franklin remembers a few years ago they were able to increase it to 32 ft which just about works. If they could get 36 or 38 ft then it would be a lot better.

Mr. Slachetka said they could provide the board with typical cross sections of what a 36 ft wide street would be versus a 40 ft wide street showing travel lanes, parking, bicycle lanes before reviewing the circulation plan element.

Mr. Herzl asked how much land would be set aside for open area. He believes it is currently 5%.

Mr. Truscott said it is more of a conceptual recommendation, they do not have a specific number.

Mr. Herzl asked if that number should be across the board or if it is a bigger development more would be set aside.

Mr. Truscott said there should be some kind of threshold which would generate it.

Mr. Franklin believes it is a bad idea to dedicate areas in a development for solid waste containers. Some of the developments he has worked with have had a lot of problems with that. If the containers are full then people throw their trash next to it and it stinks. The individual cans they have worked with over the years have worked very well.

Mr. Flancbaum agrees with that.

Mr. Herzl said not only should pick up and drop off areas for school children be dedicated on interior streets but on main streets as well, perhaps a wider shoulder or driveway where the buses could go in. The developer does have to widen roads where necessary.

Mr. Follman asked why they would entertain any zone changes before knowing the infrastructure can handle it. They don't know what the County is going to do so why are they even discussing this.

Mr. Truscott said you need a vision of where you are going, where your growth areas are, where areas need to be addressed, where development is going to occur. Without that, they don't know where to widen roads. The one can follow the other.

Mr. Follman said right now they need to widen every road.

Mr. Herzl said even if the zone is changed, this board is not giving any approvals until the roads are widened for safety.

Mr. Follman said that won't work. They were recently told to approve an application without any parking.

Mr. Jackson said the board adopting the constitution of bylaws of the development plan. The board could take two approaches. They could take the approach they are going to cut back growth because they can't handle it or they can say they have demands and the population is growing and it's going to happen whether they plan for it or not so they are going to do the best that they can and they are going to make allowances so that the roads can expand. The board has been very vigilant in not letting people get approvals within the setbacks for the future planning of Route 9. That may happen and it may not happen but their planning is geared toward trying to facilitate that if and when it happens. It is a vision and it is a balancing of interest.

Mr. Slachetka he thinks what is important in crafting a good Master Plan is it provides that linkage between the land use policies and the community facilities and the infrastructure. That is why you have all of those different elements and recommendations. The Master Plan itself provides that balancing of identifying areas where growth is appropriate. In those areas where we don't want to see growth, particular in those environmental sensitive areas where the plan recommends a non-contiguous clustering ordinance to preserve private properties in that area where there is no infrastructure. They have already started to balance out that infrastructure, identifying areas where appropriate for sewers and roads and areas that are not appropriate and crafting the plan accordingly. So it is the board to make the determination for two things. First, is there an appropriate balance between roads and preservation and two, where they have identified areas for growth, are there specific enough recommendations to put in place the implement procedures and mechanisms like a transportation improvement district, contributions for infrastructure that will provide the funding necessary to improve the roads and support the infrastructure that is necessary for growth.

Mr. Jackson said Mr. Follman is 100% right. If this board adopts a Master Plan that will provide for growth and allows greater density in different areas and the governing body consistently adopts zoning regulations that allow that then a developer comes in looking for approvals for that density. Then they are complying with the zoning ordinance and it is a by right application and this board is restricted in saying no. The board can't arbitrarily deny an application just because the roads aren't there. So this is the time where they address this but they can't think they are not going to give an approval later. An example is the 5 story office building downtown where the judge said it doesn't matter if there is no parking as the zoning regulations allow for it and the board has to approve it.

Mr. Rennert said when they have an actual plan for certain roads including Cross and Pine Street then that is when they should recommend the zone be changed.

Mr. Jackson said that is a catch 22 though. They have to adopt the vision for the future.

Mr. Rennert said the Township should adopt ordinances once the infrastructure is in place.

Mr. Jackson thinks they could put that in the recommendation but he thinks they will adopt based on framework that the Master Plan provides for the growth of the future but they don't have to follow that.

Mr. Herzl said there is an impact fee in town. He asked if those fees are applied to any zone in town.

Mr. Slachetka said the Transportation Improvement District plan (TID) is divided into six areas. The two areas where the TID has been adopted is the southwestern portion of the town and the area by Oak Street Core.

Mr. Herzl asked why this fee doesn't apply to every part of the town so they will have money for road improvements.

Mr. Slachetka said that is one of the recommendations in the circulation plan element. The reason why those two areas were selected because of the fact that that's where the most growth and the most need for infrastructure was identified. They don't want to ad hoc decision making where the board says they're going to put this zone in place once they have the infrastructure. The board wants to put the burden on the developers, not the municipality. What the plan is supposed to do is put a comprehensive framework for the land use decisions and decisions on infrastructure so they work together. If there are places where that needs to be much more forceful and clear in the planning document then obviously the board can request those changes and make sure that language is in there to their satisfaction.

Mr. Herzl thinks the fees must be universal all over town. Every developer has to give money into the TID.

Mr. Rennert said it is up to the Township Committee to adopt ordinances based on the Master Plan. They need the collector roads to be able to handle the traffic. He asked how this board put something in place ensuring the infrastructure is there when someone comes in with an application.

Mr. Slachetka said under the requirements of the MLUL, if the governing body proposes an ordinance then that ordinance has to be referred to the Planning Board to make a determination as to its consistency with the Master Plan. For example, if the zone changes are adopted and not the TID and the Master Plan recommends that those types of provisions be put in place then when it gets referred to the board, the board has responsibility to identify the fact that it is not consistent with the Master Plan because they don't have the other piece in place. It depends on how explicit and how direct the board is in clarifying to the Township Committee what the intent of this board is on this issue. Clearly, it seems this is an important issue for the board so that language needs to be very clear and give the Township Committee the direction it should be taking in terms of implementing the recommendations of the Master Plan.

Mr. Rennert said then it wouldn't make sense for this board to recommend the zoning changes be made until there is a concrete plan in place.

Mr. Slachetka wouldn't recommend that the board recommend the zoning changes should not be adopted until the infrastructure is actually in place but they can indicate that there should be a plan for that infrastructure in place which would be adopted by the Township before zoning takes place. The different elements in the Master Plan actually spell that out so he is unsure whether they need to substantially change the language but perhaps clarify here or there and make it more forceful. The plan does talk about ensuring there is adequate water capacity, sewer capacity, and the circulation plan talks about the importance of making those connections and establishing a Township wide TID for the payment of that infrastructure.

Mr. Flancbaum said they should be very clear if they choose to implement any of these proposed zoning changes. Whichever particular areas they are considering, they have to make sure the money collected for the improvements go to that specific area. For example, Neiman Road is a very narrow road and there is no doubt that it has to be widened if there is going to be a lot of development in that area so whatever money is collecting from

developers in that area has to go towards improvements in that area if the developers are not going to do the improvements themselves. He is unsure how to accomplish that.

Mr. Slachetka said in the TID, the actual improvements are identified and it is very detailed. Both in terms in the nature of the improvements necessary and the cost. He thinks that language can be included in the land use plan element. The concept with linkage land use decisions with the necessary infrastructure is supported as well as land use decisions that balance growth and preservation opportunities. Those are things that need to be embodied and enunciated very clearly in the Master Plan.

Mr. Jackson said there does seem to be some support in the case law for off-site improvements that are necessitated by traffic generated by the particular site. It is really tricky and it must be done by ordinance. In all fairness, you can't have a developer be responsible to pay for all of the Township woes but it has to be tied into that specific development. He thinks it is naive that they will have future developers solve the problems on Cedarbridge Road or on Route 9 but there can be ordinances that relate to a specific piece of property and it can go to off-tract improvements. The board can try but it is difficult to enforce that.

Mr. Slachetka said that is very important point because the TID ordinance itself doesn't contemplate that developers are paying in its entirety. There is a public share to all of this and if they do make any exemptions or changes as to which areas should be subject to the TID, that just basically changes it to a greater burden on the Township but there is always going to be a Township component to any infrastructure investments that are going to be taking place. The County has a role and responsibility in this as well.

Mr. Rennert recommends that all streets, not just in a development, be widened greater than 32 ft.

Mr. Herzl said they should come up with a number.

Mr. Slachetka said it really varies. They can provide the board with some typical cross sections but the board is not going to suddenly increase right-of-ways and acquire properties if it is not already set forth on the tax maps. The board has to be careful about that.

Mr. Herzl said they are talking about new developments.

Mr. Rennert asked what they envision for the school bus drop off/pick up areas. His understanding is that even a school bus has a cut off on the side of the road, everybody still has to stop.

Mr. Herzl said a circular drive should be provided in every development. There needs to be a designated area so no traffic is stopped.

Mr. Rennert asked if they are talking about main roads as well.

Mr. Herzl believes main roads is more important than in developments. There are kids standing on County Line Road, Route 88 and it is very dangerous.

Mr. Jackson said Route 88 is a State road and County Line Road is a County road so that would have to be designed by them no matter what the Planning Board recommends as they do not have jurisdiction.

Mr. Truscott said they envision more of a cut in on interior streets. It would be more of a designated area within a development. They would really have to work with setbacks of the development as well.

Mr. Slachetka said there was not a specific design. It would vary depending upon the development. He thinks the most important thing is that you want it designed safely and to ensure where the school children are being picked up and dropped off, that there is an opportunity for adequate circulation.

Ms. Zografos said under the motor vehicle law, the only way you are going to stop other cars from circulating, is if you have a barrier or an island. It can't just be a pull over like a city bus.

Mr. Herzl said then it should be into the property with some sort of barrier where the buses could pull over and pick up the kids. Safety comes first.

Mr. Rennert asked if this is being recommended for all developments.

Mr. Herzl said any new development.

Mr. Rennert asked what size development would they implement this.

Mr. Truscott said they could research that.

Mr. Garfield said the county and state own the street from curb to curb and anything beyond that is up to the Township. If the Township wants to widen a road, then they have to work together to do that.

Mr. Rennert asked if there has been any discussion in the Master Plan concerning the difference between synagogues and schools in certain zones.

Mrs. Morris said she did have one specific point she wanted the board to be aware she came across in the Master Plan. It is a vague statement regarding schools which states 'the Planning Board will continue to allow schools as a permitted use throughout Lakewood.

Mr. Rennert asked if they ever received a letter from the Industrial Commission not recommended schools be allowed in the Industrial Park.

Mrs. Morris said there is a certain portion of the Industrial Park that the ordinance was changed to not permit schools in that area. However, that ordinance was overturned recently as it was not noticed correctly. However, this proposed Master Plan shows the reestablishment of that zone. She noticed a few areas on the proposed land use map where the zones are recommended to be changed and that was not specifically pointed out to the board members this evening. She thinks the board should be familiar with everywhere that there are changes being proposed.

Mr. Rennert asked if it is possible to get a corrected map before tomorrow night's meeting.

Mr. Herzl asked what other zoning changes are proposed which were not yet discussed.

Mrs. Morris said near the intersection of Route 88 and New Hampshire Avenue. It looks like there is a change to R-M and B-1 from the R-20 zone for a number of properties around that intersection. South of Pine River Village, in the middle of the R-40, there is a change to the R-M. The line between the R-10A and the R-40 zone south of Oak Street looks like it is being adjusted. The B-5A zone on the very south end of the town, south of Route 70. It looks like the B-5A is being expanded further into the R-20 down there. The final one is the appearance of an R-7.5 piece in the middle of downtown where it is currently all R-10.

Mr. Truscott said the changes near Route 88 and New Hampshire was a 2007 Master Plan recommendation. They went through the 2007 Re-examination report and there was a number of unimplemented zoning recommendations and that was one of them. The R-7.5 within the downtown is also another recommendation in the 2007 Reexamination report. He believes he mentioned the R-M in the Oak Street area south of Pine Street. She is correct as to the expansion of the B-5A zone south of Chestnut Street which is also another recommendation in the 2007 Reexamination report.

Mrs. Morris said the last one was the slide of the line between the R-40 and the R-10A right in the middle on the south side of Oak Street.

Mr. Truscott said that is the Oak street preservation area near Kettle Creek. North of Route 88 along New Hampshire, there is R-M that is a multi-family area and also an area north of that, south of Lanes Mill Road, the R-12 and R-M and R-7.5 varies. Again, those are recommendations from the 2007 Reexamination report which were not implemented.

Mr. Slachetka said they would provide the board with an updated map and then specifically identify on that map, the zone changes and the source that the zone changes are coming from.

Mr. Garfield asked about setting aside properties for schools and what the minimum tract size would be.

Mr. Jackson said he is talking about design standards for a school lot. A lot of places have conditional use standards where it's permitted conditionally if you meet the buffer, parking, setbacks. That is certainly something that could be done to tailor requirements for schools. He doesn't believe there is an actual definition for schools.

Mr. Rennert thinks it is very important to have a school as conditional use in certain zones. Some schools have dormitories with different ages. He thinks this needs to be looked at much deeper and how it would affect the neighborhood.

Mr. Jackson said a conditional use is a type of 'D' variance if you don't meet the conditions. If they make something a conditional use and they met all of the conditions then they are permitted. If not, then they must go to the Zoning Board where the standard of proof is they have to show that the site is particularly suited for what is being proposed.

Mr. Franklin said years ago when a school was proposed, you had to have so many acres for so many kids. They changed the ordinance so that a school could be anywhere in town and they tried to build the schools so that you wouldn't have to bus the kids so most of the kids could walk. He thinks for a public schools you need a certain number of acres depending on the amount of children.

Mr. Rennert asked what the board's thoughts are concerning schools being conditional or permitted.

Mrs. Morris said she doesn't know that the exact qualifications should be determined just for the Master Plan but in the same way that there are recommendations that the roads be wider or that there be designated bus areas in new developments, there could be a recommendation that the permitted or the potential conditionally uses of schools and/or shuls should be investigated as to what areas in town they are appropriate for and what those qualifications are. She is unsure that this is the time to determine those exact qualifications.

Mr. Rennert said they do want to get as specific as possible as this document will come back to bite them.

Ms. Zografos said there is a very generic statement, #4 on page 10, which states 'continue to support the development of private schools in the Township of Lakewood'. Ally is saying they could add more language to that which is generic enough that it's a vision as opposed to a specific regulatory directive but give a little bit more direction about what they expect regarding safety of students, serving the public, preserving neighborhoods. She would think a little broader but there is room for additional language with regards to that.

Mrs. Morris said regarding future school sites, the Master Plan states that this board will continue to allow schools as a permitted use throughout Lakewood. The board may want to expand on that.

Ms. Zografos said it is the ordinance which would allow schools to be a permitted use. The board continues to just follow the ordinance but that could also be supplemented. She does believe statement #4 on page 10 is way too broad.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mr. Shlomo Klein was sworn. If the board recommends increase in density but the Township does not adopt it then the applicant would go to the Zoning Board and it would get approved because the Master Plan recommends it be changed. He also reminded the board that they could recommend something be adopted but it is ultimately the Township Committee's decision.

Mr. Frederick Robison, 79 Eagle Ridge Circle, was sworn. He thinks this is a good first draft of a Master Plan. He said a number of municipalities create a draft review committee to be sure the document is pristine before the board votes. He thinks there is a tremendous need for consistency across the document. Certain items need to be clarified or removed. He is very concerned that no time has been spent on the preface, vision statements, background information, characteristics or strategies as that is the foundation of a Master Plan. There are severe contradictions between the Master Plan strategies and the vision statements in the early portions of the document and in the detail in the later portions of the document. The preface indicates that this is a comprehensive plan and that there is optional information provided in it but the optional informational is incomplete, if not selective. For example, there is no statement in this Master Plan indicating how many schools currently exist be it public or private. That has tremendous ramifications on this municipality. After the Master Plan Committee completed its work, the board of directors of the Fairways of Lake Ridge HOA adopted a resolution calling out the Planning Board to consider and adopt a number of recommendations and attached to that was a document called review and comment on the 2017 Master Plan Committee recommendations. It is structured based upon the common elements of a Master Plan. An important recommendation is that a moratorium be established on new construction of tracts of land fronting on, having access to or causing traffic flow to or from Cross Street until Cross Street is widened to a minimum of 3 lanes. This is an opportunity for everyone to pull together and pressure the County into accelerating the widening of that street. He is concerned about a change to the age restriction for cluster housing development. If that is not extremely well defined in a Master Plan then it becomes nothing more than opportunity to in run the established zoning for the area in which it's in. If they are going to have a zoning standard that establishes a permitted use/number of units, that zoning standard should be honored in every respect even if it is a clustered development. Including in the recommendations is that school zones be established. There was a school subcommittee that did not function which he believes for good reason but it is an extremely important topic. He is not opposed to education, the concerns are what schools, being public or private, do to adjacent properties. He thinks it is appropriate to define public and private schools as a conditional use such that the positive and negative criteria need to be considered. It is true the current ordinance permits schools everywhere but he would like to think their elected officials will honor and respect the work this board does in adopt ordinances or amendments to ordinances consistent with the Master Plan. Simply because an ordinance is written one way today does not mean you cannot include a different recommendation in the Master Plan. He thinks conditional use for schools is completely appropriate and it allows the board to address the very concerns which have been raised tonight. They

all agree that Cross Street should be widened to 3 lanes but they should be very specific in that no parking be permitted on Cross Street from Route 9 to the Jackson border. There have already been accidents, two occasions where small children have nearly been run over. They don't need to have another tragedy like that in this good town. Sidewalks also need to also be installed on Cross Street on at least one side from Route 9 to the Jackson border. He said there are many hitchhikers in this town and urged to the board to get them out of the streets. It may be addressed in the future discussions of the traffic study, but the light at Cross Street and Massachusetts Avenue needs to have a left turn signal added. There are a number of proposed changes to the zoning map. He suggests that this board is entitled to a written description of any increase or decrease in the allowable housing units which goes right to the issues of density, circulation. Infrastructure can be a tough issue to address but he thinks the board is entitled to an assessment of the infrastructure requirements of these proposed zoning changes. He has seen a great many Master Plan where the impact on the municipal budget is considered. They need to be thinking of what they are doing in terms of revenue and expenses. He found several more differences in the zoning map which were not mentioned. For example, All County Exteriors has been in this town for decades. It is currently zoned as an industrial property. The proposed zoning map calls for it to be R7.5/10. That would create a viable business in this town as a pre-existing non-conforming use and has the potential of adversely affecting one of the long standing ratables who is crucial to the growth of this town. Some of the zoning of the map show corrections to failed ordinances due to improper notice. He thinks the fact that the ordinance was adopted speaks loud and clear about the intent of the elected officials of this town. IF one or more of these is going to be corrected, that should apply to the R-40B zone as well. The reason for the R-40B zone, which directly affects the Fairways at Lake Ridge, was improved buffering. It did not oppose education in any manner. One page 7, one of the statements in to encourage growth and development in appropriate locations and consistent with established land uses. He thinks the board need to consider the established land uses as they consider the zoning map. There is this open space which is not really open space if you can have housing. They have 3 golf course in this town which have been there for a long time and deserve to be recognized as open space. Related specifically to Eagle Ridge, the state has required in 1997 that many acres be dedicated for tree save areas. Given it is a state requirement, he thinks that it must be included in all of the preservation ordinances that are adopted by the Township. There was concern that there was some sort of state imposed deadline for this work. On August 14th, the state planning commission issued yet another 4 month extension to Lakewood. There is no rush to get this work done properly. Rushing this would guarantee that the plan endorsement that the Township desperately desires will never be granted.

Mr. Rennert would like to understand the plan endorsement and what this does for the Township.

Mr. Slachetka said the Township has received a conditional plan endorsement from the New Jersey State Planning Commission. The plan endorsement involves a review of the Township's planning documents and land use policies by the State Planning Commission as well various State agencies. They reviewed all of the various documents including the Township's Smart Growth Plan. He wouldn't categorize it as a deadline but as part of the conditions of the plan endorsement, there is a planning implement agreement which sets forth certain conditions and actions the Township needs to take as well as the various State agencies.

Mr. Rennert asked why it is important to have the State's endorsement.

Mr. Slachetka said it is important because of the fact that the Township is in fact essentially two thirds within the CAFRA jurisdiction so all the various regulations and requirements that CAFRA has is tied in and basically they absorb or incorporate all the various designations including the center designations, open space, environmentally sensitive areas, areas that are outside of the sewer service area. It basically links the Township's planning documents with the overall land use policies and regulatory framework from CAFRA including imperious coverage, tree save. From the Township's perspective, it is important to have those areas identified for growth such as the cores and the centers identified in the Smart Growth Plan be recognized under the CAFRA jurisdiction so there is not a conflict in the regularly framework between CAFRA and the Township. It is important that the conditions of

the plan endorsement be completed and that once they are completed including the adoption of the Master Plan and the zoning ordinances so there is some level of focus that the governing body has to do to actually adopt the implementation ordinances. Those ordinances are about development but they are also about preservation as well because the DEP is part of that body. The Master Plan is the foundation of all of the Township's zoning ordinances and zone plan.

Mr. Rennert asked what the Township loses if the State never endorses their plan.

Mr. Slachetka said it depends on the area and circumstances. It could be that the regulatory requirements under CAFRA could be overly restricted in certain areas where they have already consistently identified those areas for growth and development. Alternatively, if the Township's land use policies are not aligned with State regulations, the Township may be missing opportunities for preservation. What happens is if those CAFRA regulations begin to be overly restricted in those areas then what they would see is a lot of sub-CAFRA developments to avoid the restrictions of CAFRA regulations. So they would basically be getting piece meal developments that doesn't provide the tree save and the open space that their comprehensive plan is envisioning. There is a substantial public benefit for the Township to get this plan in place and get the ordinances adopted. There is a time line but the Planning Board and Governing Body need to take the time to make sure it gets adequate public input into this process.

Ms. Laurie Leeds was sworn. She said her lot is not shown on the proposed zoning map.

Mrs. Morris said individual parcels are not shown on this map.

Ms. Leeds said the maps show her lot in the conservation easements, comprehensive environmental strategy and she doesn't see it anywhere else. A few years ago, the Township tried to include her lot in a park. She went to the State and determined her lot is within the sewer service area.

Mr. Slachetka said there is no change. Her lot has specifically been excluded in the Smart Growth Plan based on prior actions. It is identified as not being in the conservation easement.

Ms. Leeds said she owns block 444 lot 4 which looks to be designated as a park.

Mr. Truscott said they would look into that.

Mr. Harold Herskowitz, 1496 Cedar Row, was sworn. He said in most towns when they are preparing a Master Plan, do it in order to limit growth, to put a stop to builders overreaching and doing things that are going to hurt the community but in their town, they use this opportunity to give the builders whatever they want and that has to stop. The board cannot do this to the town. He has spoken to several board members who understand that they can just not be building any more. There is no reason they should be building anymore and they can't handle anymore. He is imploring the board to get up and say what is right and what is right is that they need a moratorium on all big developments right now until they can figure out what they are doing with this town. All this talk about improving infrastructure is moot because most of these roads cannot be widened because they already built up against these roads. If the Township is planning on making Route 9 wider, are they going to be taking down the 5 story building they are putting now with 125 apartments that is literally 5 ft away from Route 9. He believes this whole thing is a charade and it is all being done to give certain people in this town what they want. It has to stop because they are going to be killing people. These new LED billboards going up now, other towns don't do that. They don't put LED billboards on small streets where there is tons of traffic where people are going to get killed. He is representing the thousands of people who couldn't come today who are just wiped out from sitting in traffic all day. They have to give people quality of life, they have to help the people. The board doesn't have to worry about

the few builders and if they want to sue the Township, let them do it. Don't worry about the developers, worry about the people.

Mr. Walter Lucas, Newport Avenue, was sworn. He said the traffic on Cross Street is horrendous with all of the schools. He has lived in that area since 1979 and in about 1997, the Fairways was built with 1,000 homes and there was no appreciable notice in traffic. Somewhere in 2005, they changed the zoning to permits schools and that is what did it. From James/Cross to Jackson should be zoned for families. All the people out in that area before him retire and want to move on but because of the zoning, nobody wants to buy but schools which causes all the traffic. There are now over 20 schools in over 50 acres so unless that area is zoned favorably for families, schools are going to keep coming in and creating traffic.

Mr. James Campbell, 6 Rosewood Court, was sworn in. He said he has almost 1,000 signatures from residents of Fairways.

Mrs. Morris said she does have a copy. The board was also provided a copy with a letter from the Fairways HOA as well as some emailed letters from Mr. Flannery. Anything received in regards to do this she did attempt to forward to the board.

Mr. Campbell believes the board wants to stop this but they don't know how. This is very important and he hopes the board will do the best job they can. They can't handle what they currently have and to increase the density, he believes is not what the board wants.

Ms. Carol Suckno, 59 Foxwood Road, was sworn. Cross Street from Massachusetts to the Jackson area, there are old dilapidated houses that have been purchased with no windows where a number of trailers have been put in. He thinks it is time to have an appearance committee. They need someone to address these dilapidated homes and the trailers have to be limited.

Mr. Aaron Hirsch, 146 Mountain View Drive, was sworn. The MP is supposed to be what the people of this town want. He hears about the Chestnut area, Cross Street and wonders where these ideas develop as no one in the local neighborhood wants this. He lives in the Chestnut area and he can ensure the board that none of his neighbors want this zoning change. They are living off a County road and they have probably about two years before they can install a light at Chestnut and New Hampshire. He asked why they are changing zones when they don't have enough infrastructure. He urged the board to wait and see if the fixes they make are sufficient. There is no room to move and it is dangerous. This is not what the people of Lakewood want. They cannot overdo the density and they don't like spending that much time in their cars to go across town.

Mr. Brian Flannery, Jackson, was sworn. He said Mr. Klein argued that all they have to do is put something in the MP and he would go to the Zoning Board and they would approve it. All they have to do is look at the minutes of the meetings and see how many things that were in the old Master Plan that get denied. He also said that the Township Committee can do whatever they want. That is their job. They are elected officials and they're supposed to do what they want. The Planning Board adopts the Master Plan and they put in the Master Plan the things they think are appropriate. It then goes to the governing body and they adopt the ordinances. One example which impacts the ordinances that this board recommended a very long time ago and the Township had a problem with the plan endorsement process and a lot of things that the Township would like to do because his feeling is the governing body see the traffic congestion the same as everyone else. The problem again is traffic congestion and he thinks there are very few people who resent more people coming into Lakewood but they don't want to sit in traffic. If traffic congestion is addressed, he doesn't think the density wouldn't draw the crowds that it has but the Township Committee does their job and it was held up by that plan endorsement process so it was only a few months back that T&M helped the Township to put in place an impact fee. The impact fee gets money from the

developers for every unit approved and that money goes to make traffic improvements that will improve congestion. If a moratorium was put in affect like everybody thinks is the easiest solution, that is not going to solve the problem. There are more houses which would be built, the people coming to Lakewood are going to go to Jackson. Jackson is not going to charge them an impact fee, they are going to send their children to schools in Lakewood and are going to use the infrastructure in Lakewood. Lakewood is a destination where people want to be and people are coming. His opinion is that this board should look at getting the money to improve traffic, roadways, intersections. He did speak with the County engineer and anybody want to go on the First Amendment website where the County engineer was questioned on what they are going to do in Lakewood, they have a traffic study at that point would be done at the end of August. He spoke with the County engineer who does have a draft and he told him they hired an outside traffic consultant for their roadways to see what improvements need to be done and within a month they should have something they can present. Obviously they are going to improve their roads, the state isn't going to improve their roads so they are going to have to work around the State. Route 9 is a disaster and it is really ridiculous the state would leave in the town a size of Lakewood, a major roadways that screws up the traffic. The County will work with them and he has heard they are working with the Township to fix these problems. He disagrees there should be a moratorium on development as the tax payers will be paying for these traffic improvements whether there is more development or not. The impact fees will provide the money. The County gets impact fees from every developer that impacts a County road. That is where the money can come from so that the traffic congestion is lessened rather than worsened. There is a way to limit traffic congestion and you can look at cities all over the US and the world where they have more development and density without having more traffic congestion. He disagrees with comments concerning the adult communities. They are built in an R-40 zone at a density of 4.5 units per acre. That brings more senior citizens into the community which is a good thing but it doesn't allow room for family. The Master Plan draft allows, under certain conditions where the same type of plan development could be implemented for families that are coming to this area so instead of the families having to go to Jackson or squeeze into more attics or basements, it would be proper housing for them. It is his professional recommendation that it is appropriate. He agrees with widening Cross Street, adding sidewalks and eliminating on-street parking. There should be a left turn signal and that is something he would expect in the County report that was due at the end of this month. He specifically spoke to him about that and they said it would address that. From living in Lakewood, he understands how important schools are. You can make recommendations on reasonable standards but when there is an R-40B which doesn't allow schools, in his opinion that is wrong. Golf courses are a nice thing but he doesn't believe they make sense in Lakewood and he thinks you're going to see in Lakewood, like in all of the big cities, that it is not a good utilization of land. This is smart growth. Smart growth is putting development where development is needed and it is discouraging urban sprawl. If the town purchases the golf courses and makes them open space then that is one thing but he doesn't think anybody wants their tax money to go to that. Lakewood is a suburban planning area with cores and nodes and it's because there is that development so when you compare Lakewood to other towns with similar characteristics, you're not going to find towns that discourage density. When he was living in the Cross area in the 90's and he realized when you have the larger lots, the only people coming in are the schools. He tried to get his neighbors to get it changed to R-12 then it would've been families and not the 20 schools mentioned earlier then he may be still living there as the traffic from the schools is horrendous but everybody still says to leave it R-40. Leaving R-40s in Lakewood doesn't make sense. There are areas in Lakewood that are developed as R-40, then it makes sense and it really should be an estate zone. If you have an R-40 that has hodgepodge type development that people are going to sell and move out then you may as well call it the school zone.

Mr. Rennert said that is an important point because a lot of the area where they are looking at higher density is R-40 and R-40 is not getting developed. They are turning into schools and the reason why Cross Street is a mess is because of the schools. That is why it makes sense to make it something that's marketable for residential.

Mr. Flannery agrees. There is an area on Clearstream where it's R-40 and it's all nice R-40 houses. He wouldn't recommend changing that, he would change the name of it. He would call it the estate zone because that's what it

is. The seniors have needs the same as the families have needs but the needs of the two aren't necessarily the same. The families grow, they want their children to live here. Some seniors from a house to here but you have seniors that are living in the neighborhoods as well and their doing all the same things that the seniors in the communities are doing and they're experiencing the growth as well. He hears about the traffic congestion. I don't think Mr. Campbell would care if more people moved to Lakewood if he didn't have to sit in traffic. His solution is a moratorium or no more density but that is not going to solve the problems. What is going to solve the problems is that the roadways get improved. This Master Plan has a lot recommendations for making things better to improve the traffic congestion. He has attended a lot of subcommittee meetings in town and he has heard a lot of people.

Mr. Bob Miller, 117 Skyline Drive, was sworn. He argued that higher density does affect traffic. He believes having a moratorium is the answer and then they can clean up the infrastructure. He doesn't want to see any more people getting killed. Safety comes first. He asked how this board can allow higher growth in this town. He believes there should be a school zone, similar to the Industrial Park, because they don't have the infrastructure all over town to handle all of the buses.

Mr. Elazar Wachs, 31 Aspen Court, was sworn. He said there are thousands of people who are not here who do appreciate the quality of life, of being together, having friends, carpool and it makes it much easier for them. There is affordable housing, they are able to raise their families and do appreciate this quality of life. The infrastructure does have to be worked on and it would be a solution for many problems. If people start moving to Jackson, Howell then it would just increase traffic, less carpools as they would be further apart from each other. The Ridge Avenue neighborhood used to be dangerous to drive after 7pm and it has been improved thanks to this board. This neighborhood was recommended to be R-7.5 and everyone buying in this neighborhood is ok with that and this is what the board has been encouraging in the past. It would also allow the developers to put in the right infrastructure to make it safer.

Mr. David Tichman, 879 Hearthstone Drive, was sworn. The traffic did hire Maser Consulting to create a traffic plan. He said the Township should see that through before discussing all of this extra development. When they moved into the Hearthstone area, they thought it was spacious which is what everybody wanted. Now they are changing the neighborhood to R-7.5 and putting up duplexes.

Ms. Julie Shapiro, 24 Eagle Ridge Circle, was sworn. She bought into the Fairways for quality of life. Mr. Flannery is now telling them that golf courses are not important but it is to her and that's why she moved to Lakewood. On Cross Street, towards Route 9, there are townhouses that people have looked at that have bedrooms in the basement with multiple families in there. That is why kids are going into Cross Street because they don't have enough room to play.

Mr. Howard Suckno, 59 Foxwood Road, was sworn. He said he is sick of people getting up here and telling them how they are supposed to live when they are only in for the money.

Ms. Freedman, 318 Forest Avenue, was sworn. She is a young woman raising children in Lakewood and she knows a large majority of people who feel the way she does. She lives in a yeshiva area which is highly dense near Clifton, Madison, Forest and she loves it. She loves having her family, friends nearby. There is nothing like having neighbors nearby having them take their kids off the bus, walk to shops and having everything in close proximity. It is a life they sought and a lot of other people feel the same as most of the developments going up are pre-sold. The developers are building these developments because there is a need. People don't like when there is a differentiation between traffic and density. She thinks her neighborhood is a prime example of how that differentiation happens. If she doesn't have towards Route 9, then she has no traffic congestion. She does think there are a lack of roads, through streets, infrastructure has been undervalued until now. She believes having a moratorium will not stop the traffic issues but it will shrink the life of this town.

Ms. Nechama Goldstein, 31 Kingsfield Drive, was sworn. She is a young mother raising children living in a dense neighborhood but would love to get it out of it, however, the only houses being built are very dense houses. That is not what people want, it is what people are being offered and they are not affordable. Her parents live on 15,000 sf which is a nice density. People have neighbors, can walk to shops, carpool but you still have space, yards, people living on top of you, parking. Someone said nobody wants an R-40 zone, people do want it but if they are giving schools the option before the people can then obviously the schools are going to pay more. People are moving to Toms River and Jackson because they want more land but not because they can't find a house in Lakewood. If investors would stop buying all the houses in Lakewood then there would be plenty of homes for everybody. At times when new house go up, the rental list is many pages long because people don't buy the house to live in, they buy it to rent it out and that is why they have a lack of housing. There is no reason to make less density in places that are already struggling with traffic like Cross Street. If they would make it a no school zone there, she is sure people would be buying houses to live in. Many years ago, the Township sold the land on Oak Street for schools and now behind there they are building houses. It should've been zoned a school area and then they wouldn't have to have schools all over Lakewood.

Ms. Arielle Mizrachi-Schulman, 59 Drake Road, was sworn. She lives in an R-40 and it is a school zone. They have density, schools and traffic. She has lived in Lakewood many years and when you talk about the western corridor, they were all 2 acre zoning which was an estate area but that's not what it was called. Everything has changed so there are for sale at R-40 but nobody is banging down anybody's door because the traffic from the schools is so much. 15,000, 12,000, 10,000 sf are nice sized lots and make nice neighborhoods. The Drake/Neiman Road area has become so congested because of the Cross Street schools. It is not housing causing that. There is traffic once you get to Massachusetts but it's not all the traffic that you have when all of the schools are in session. When the pickup/drop offs are done, you can get down Cross Street fine. She thinks the problem is the western corridor has always been farms and now that has changed. Nobody is looking to build as long as it is R-40 because people want smaller lots. The difference is today, children are not going to schools in the area they live in and that causes a lot of traffic as well. In Brooklyn, everybody comes to a main road to be picked up. She thinks that may be a better solution. The western corridor needs more families on the other side of the railroad tracks instead of schools and if nothing is done, the schools will buy them out.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mr. Rennert said they all know they have a problem with their current infrastructure and there are thousands of more houses that are already approved. He asked how they can get their roads improved now. The only way to do it is to have people in the future paying into a fund which would allow that to happen. The only way that is going to happen is if housing is allowed and infrastructure is put in at the same time.

Mr. Flancbaum said certain clarifications need to be made on the zoning map. He asked that those be corrected and distributed for tomorrow night.

Mr. Rennert would like to see how they came up with recommendations for each zone.

Mr. Jackson said they could vote on it tentatively and have a revised document prepared. He urged the board to make sure the amendments are changed before voting. He thinks they should rule on what they heard tonight or they could wait until tomorrow.

Mr. Rennert would like to wait until tomorrow so he has something written.

Mr. Flancbaum thinks the clarifications on the Master Plan Advisory Board recommendations are simple enough. He personally wasn't aware of recommendations from 2007 which are now on the plan but from what Mr. Truscott was saying, some of these areas are already developed in accordance with those recommendations even though those recommendations were not implemented by the Township. If those areas are already developed with whatever those recommendations were then there is nothing to deliberate.

Mr. Herzl said it is still good to see it on the map.

Mr. Flancbaum said maybe on the map they could make the distinction between the 2007 recommendations and areas that have already been developed in accordance with those recommendations and then the recommendations from 2017.

Mr. Slachetka said at the end of the day, it is important that the board would be voting on the comprehensive Master Plan so rather than voting on it piece meal, he thinks they need a final document that gets approved.

Mr. Flancbaum said the reason they are reviewing the zoning map first is to clarify whatever needs to be clarified and then have that document for tomorrow night so they can move forward.

Mr. Herzl thinks tomorrow first thing then should take a vote about what they went over tonight and then they should go on to the other reports from the other committees.

Ms. Zografos said there are several board members, including herself, who will miss certain meetings. She will not be attending tomorrow night so it may not be appropriate to do any type of voting at that point.

Mr. Jackson knows Mr. Grunberger arrived late but he sees no issue in him voting.

Mrs. Morris said Mr. Hibberson is the only member not in attendance and she would provide him with the recording.

Mr. Jackson said Ms. Zografos won't be here tomorrow so he is unsure whether they want to address what was heard tonight. He is unsure as to what the feeling of the board is as nobody has really made any comment about whether they are on board with the plan as it exists with the minor changes that need to be added.

Mr. Herzl said the board was pretty vocal in saying that they want the infrastructure fixed up, traffic dealt.

Mr. Flancbaum said they should see the corrected document tomorrow night.

Mr. Slachetka said they are not going to be making all the editorial additions by tomorrow.

Mr. Flancbaum said they could look at the corrected map tomorrow and then move on and there may be other aspects of the plan that may make them change their mind later on.

Mr. Jackson said they should list the revisions they want corrected for tomorrow's meeting.

Mr. Franklin said there was discussion about Cherry Street off of Ocean Avenue. There are all small houses over there that is in bad shape and it's R-10 even when it's R-7.5.

Mr. Herzl said most of the area is R-7.5 over there.

Mr. Franklin said right next to it is R-7.5 so it should be changed from R-10.

Mr. Herzl agrees. It was recommended to be changed in the 2007 Master Plan. Everything around it is R-7.5 and that was left out for some reason.

Mr. Rennert said the report should contain somewhere about the amount of schools.

Mr. Truscott said they are going to get into other sections of the Master Plan.

Mr. Follman said they should have a school zone.

Mr. Robison said he only referenced one inconsistency but he found 14 total.

Mr. Jackson said the board is in agreement that the roads should be wider.

Mr. Herzl said the question was what width they would go with.

Mr. Jackson asked if it is the board's consensus to have that as a design standard that the committee would adopt by ordinance.

Mr. Flancbaum said 36 to 40 ft was discussed.

Mr. Jackson asked if that would be something the board would do as a recommendation that when the committee enacts ordinances, the Master Plan recommends that 36 to 40 ft where appropriate should be considered.

Mr. Franklin believes 36 ft would be perfect.

Mr. Rennert thinks it should be a minimum of 36 ft.

Mrs. Morris believes there is a procedural question here. These subcommittee reports are really good for review purposes but what the Planning Board is approving is the Master Plan. She asked where that language is in the Master Plan.

Mr. Jackson said they are advising T&M to amend the Master Plan to put that in there.

Mr. Truscott said it is on page 37.

Mr. Rennert said he recommended earlier that not just interior streets have a greater width, but all streets.

Mr. Herzl said newly developed streets.

Mr. Jackson said that revisions and he thinks in principal, the board can move forward. They will have to take a vote when they get the document in front of them but he thinks the consensus of the board in principal is to make that recommendation. The Master Plan says where appropriate and the governing body should adopt ordinances and try to facilitate a 36 ft wide right-of-way.

Mr. Franklin said right now with the 32 ft wide, it is so easy to pass with the buses and the cars so it will work really well with that extra couple of feet.

Mr. Jackson asked if the board is in consensus that a significant area of land in new developments should be set aside for open space purposes for use by all residents.

Mr. Herzl said it should depend upon the size of the development. Right now it is 5% but they should suggest another number.

Mr. Rennert thinks it has to be tiered because you don't want someone who is only putting up one or two duplexes to have to set aside open space. He thinks 25 units where it starts now may be a little too much. Perhaps if they had something tiered starting at 15 you can have a tot lot. The ordinance talks about giving land toward public use when it is 25 units or more. It doesn't necessarily say that it has to be a clubhouse or a shul for that. To get away with the ordinance, it could just be open space. When they reach a certain number of units, he thinks there should be a requirement for a clubhouse.

Mr. Jackson said what the Master Plan says about it is the vision. It says the PB believes it would be appropriate for there to be additional open space and for the committee when adopting regulations to maximize the amount of open space on lots and tier the amount of open space based upon the size of the development. Then the governing body can exercise their judgment but that vision is put in the Master Plan.

Mr. Rennert said it should not just be open space. He is trying to get to a clubhouse but he is unsure as to what point.

Mr. Jackson asked if it would be sufficient for the Master Plan to say additional open space should be encouraged in a tiered approach or developments of more than a number of homes rather than outline whether it's an acre per 10 acres.

Mr. Truscott agrees, he doesn't think they want to tie the committee's hands. You want to give them the latitude to express their opinion, vision and recommendation but you are not tying them down to specific numbers.

Mr. Jackson asked if the board is satisfied with that approach.

Mr. Flancbaum said he has been going through this process for the last year. This Master Plan is not going to have all the detail of ordinances in it. The ordinances will have those details.

Mr. Rennert asked how open space could translate into a clubhouse.

Mr. Flancbaum said open space is not a clubhouse.

Mr. Rennert said their ordinance only says open space so right now someone could be a 100 unit development, give 5% for open space and he fulfilled his requirements.

Mr. Jackson said maybe it is sufficient to say that the Master Plan encourages that there be sufficient open space for developments of multiple units and don't clarify it more than that because he is unsure if it is feasible here to say the percentages and the numbers.

Mr. Flancbaum agrees. It is something that ultimately will be put into an ordinance and then would come back here.

Mr. Jackson asked if the board is agreement that they want to see more open space, clubhouses, amenities, common areas for developments greater than 20 units.

Mr. Rennert said if it's 20 units then open space is fine but when you reach 50 maybe you need a clubhouse. You can't look at a common area that a 100 unit development needs as the same way you look at a development with 20 units.

Mr. Jackson agrees but he is trying to get to a consensus so they can move on.

Mr. Franklin asked why they don't look to see how many of these developments do have clubhouses because a lot of them did it because the developer wanted to do it for the people moving in.

Mr. Herzl believes they used to base it off 25 units.

Mrs. Morris said at this point they want to increase the requirement, look at it on a tier basis and maybe start at a lower threshold.

Mr. Jackson said the Master Plan will say but it is not going to specify numbers. When the committee wants to adopt an ordinance and it comes here then they can decide if it is consistent or not consistent with what they envision.

Mr. Rennert said if someone builds 25 houses in an area with shuls already then there is no need for the clubhouse.

Mr. Jackson said the next recommendation is an area dedicated in a development on interior streets for pickup/drop off of school children. He believes the board was in general agreement that it is important.

Mr. Herzl said they should add any main roads as well.

Mr. Jackson said that could be a design standard for subdivisions.

Mr. Rennert asked how many units would be required to put a bus drop off.

Mr. Jackson believes a major subdivision.

Mr. Truscott said they are talking about interior streets too so they would have to be able to create a street.

Mr. Jackson said any multi-family or 5 lot subdivision because that is where you are likely to have that situation.

Mr. Rennert doesn't see the practicality of this.

Mrs. Morris said they don't need to nail down the specifics at this point.

Mr. Jackson said perhaps the Master Plan could say where feasible, the governing body should adopt ordinances to provide for drop off locations for school children. The next recommendation is an area is dedicated in a development for the location of solid waste containers.

Mr. Flancbaum said they are not in favor of the solid waste containers but that isn't to say there shouldn't be a dedicated place for the garbage cans.

Mr. Jackson said they should be careful that is not interpreted to exclude multi-family like condos or townhouses.

Mr. Rennert said he lives in Lakewood Commons and it is only practical to have dumpsters.

Mr. Herzl believes they should leave it up to Public Works as to what they feel is more beneficial to that area.

Mr. Jackson said the board is not eliminating dumpsters but where appropriate, the design standards could call for dumpsters for multi-family.

Mr. Herzl said it has to go to DPW to be approved.

Mr. Flancbaum said prior to coming to the Planning Board.

Mr. Jackson said the next is a perimeter buffer and deeper setback for new structures is provided along the frontage of major collector and higher volume streets.

Mr. Herzl said that is only for residential. They need a frontage for commercial.

Mr. Flancbaum said the background on that is that when you drive down Cross Street, there are 1,100 houses in the Fairways and you can't see them from the street. The same type of standard should be applied to all major developments where you have larger setbacks from the street, better landscaping buffers, better berms built up so when you drive down the street you can't really tell there are 300 houses in the back.

Mr. Jackson said the governing body should look to adopt ordinances to have greater setbacks to have more greenscape for residential. The next item is a landscape buffer between different land uses.

Mr. Herzl said he thinks they have to implement what they have right now. Right now it's 50 ft and they are granting waivers.

Mr. Jackson said the board just wants to emphasize to enforce the existing regulations. They don't see a need to increase them just to discourage waivers.

Mr. Rennert said the subcommittee also recommended the incorporation of adequate and timely supportive infrastructure necessary for zone changes.

Mr. Herzl said the impact fees have to be in all zones so they have money for the roads.

Mr. Jackson said perhaps the Master Plan could say that the zoning regulations should be amended to incorporate impact fees for infrastructure for all major developments. He asked if the board wants to include site plans with retail.

Mr. Herzl thinks for any developments.

Mr. Jackson suggested any development greater than a minor subdivision.

Mrs. Morris believes the TID already lays that out. They just have to establish the fee amounts for the other remaining districts.

Mr. Jackson said that is the governing body's job but they need direction in the Master Plan and that the Master Plan calls for this. The board's consensus is that it should call for fees to be allocated to all development that is not

minor subdivision to assist with infrastructure. Concerning the changing in zones, he asked if the board wants to see the map before they address it.

The board was in agreement they would like to see a corrected map first.

Mr. Jackson said he knows there were some discrepancies but he asked if the board is satisfied generally with the changes.

Mr. Rennert said he didn't hear rationale for the philosophy yet. The board wants to see the infrastructure to go in.

Mr. Jackson said south-central area of the Cross-Prospect Street Core: R-20/12C to R-7.5.

Mr. Rennert wants to see what is built there now and what is in the area. He doesn't understand how it fits in.

Mr. Herzl said he needs to explain how it fits into the area. The board wants to it to be put on record the reasoning for each zone change.

Mr. Jackson said this is all tentative anyway. The board is going to have to take a completed document and vote on that plan but it has to be on file 10 days before hand.

Mr. Slachetka said moving forward, they should be speaking to the document itself rather than the subcommittee reports. They can refer to the subcommittee reports as necessary to provide the justification of specific recommendations when they go through each one of the elements of the Master Plan. The focus has to be on the language of the Master Plan.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary