

MINUTES
LAKEWOOD MASTER PLAN DENSITY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
JUNE 29, 2017 • 3:00 PM
Mayor's Office • Lakewood Municipal Building

Present:

Avi Verschleiser (AV)
Moshe Gleiberman (MG)
Shalom Landman (SL)
Mike McLaughlin (MMc)
Adam Pfeffer, Esq. (AP)
Stanley Slachetka, PP, AICP – T & M Associates (SS)
Christine Bell – T & M Associates (CB)

The meeting was called for 3:00PM (A. Doyle joined meeting to take notes at approximately 3:15PM and meeting was already underway)

Subcommittee member McLaughlin wished placed on the record that he objects to reviewing individual zoning requests.

Subcommittee member Pfeffer responded that the subcommittee is not just looking at those individual sites on their own, but rather where they are in relation to growth modules and how they fit in with the general vision for that particular area.

Discussion:

- VARIANCES are an issue
 - Planning and Zoning Boards need to be more selective
- Put out a statement for the Master Plan
 - Channel growth
 - Use Logic

SS: SmartGrowth Plan is a guide for development

- Highway Nodes
- Minimize traffic congestion
- Downtown – Redeveloping and Revitalizing Redevelopment
- Cedar Bridge – More of non-residential
- Help incentivize private areas

Discussion:

- Consider visions of individuals
- “growth” is a nebulous term – identify “growth” in the SmartGrowth plan
 - “growth” has already happened-
 - Planning Board and Zoning Board will give decisions without direction

SS: We need to identify fundamentally where growth is supposed to happen

- Plan endorsed by the State Planning Commission
- Conditional Plan
- SmartGrowth plan is incorporated
- Approach (regarding larger scale of developments)

- YES, the Plan was endorsed
 - With Conditions
 - Adopt Master Plan
 - Protective Ordinances
 - Stream – protected areas
 - Non-contiguous clusters to open up space
- It's up to the Master Plan Committee to get all inputs necessary
- REQUIRED- Key Condition
 - Township needs to adopt ordinances
- We should provide our recommendation / opinion with regard to requests that have been made.
 - Don't want to recommend
 - Recommendation would be to adhere to the adopted Master Plan
 - We have an obligation to the State

Mr. Landman arrived at 3:37 PM

- Requests that are not in line with SmartGrowth
- Just say that recommended changes would fit
- If it fits in with SmartGrowth, why wouldn't we pass it on to the Master Plan Committee?
- Master Plan Committee → Township Committee → Ordinances
- Discussion continued regarding the issue of ordinances not having been adopted and variances were the method of obtaining approvals
- Prepare areas of growth to reflect SmartGrowth
- SmartGrowth doesn't establish densities. Master Plan needs to address density.

SS: Need context to be able to understand it.

- Put up stuff that was not enacted
- Go through the list

Discussion referencing Colorized Map (SmartGrowth) cross-referenced by T & M's color coding with list and map of 2017 Requests for Rezoning

- Regarding discussion on 55+ age restricted areas (see **request #17**):
 - Removing age restrictions give an opportunity for younger families to move close to parents
 - Density in 55+ Zoned areas average 2 people per household / 4-1/2 units per acre
 - Look at the number of people per household and the density and the services that are provided to these units (seniors)
 - Senior communities need a certain amount of acreage
 - Take a 100-acre tract that has senior / 55+ restriction that has not been developed yet and create a new district (R-40C)
 - Not looking to rezone areas with existing housing away from age-restricted zoning
- Mixed use
 - Wonderful opportunity for mixed use
 - People living behind strip centers is an ideal situation
 - SS: Some areas already have housing components
 - B5 allows for mixed use
 - Extend this to other areas to allow for mixed use (commercial + residential)
 - Recommend expansion to highway corridors

- In the car dealership area, there are no residential units
- SS: Most of the highway nodes – multifamily is permissible
 - B-5A / B-5



New requests have been received since 6/21/17.

Received a new e-mail from Igud Homosdos (NEW REQUEST)

Asking for consideration for schools

- Status quo for schools
- Parking spots established per classroom not per total rooms in facility
- Parking
- Permitted with conditional use
- Noise Ordinance
- Regarding Schools- what are Zoned R-40 and is Township-owned to develop into a school zone?
 - Take Cross Street, for example. It's becoming another "Oak Street Corridor"
 - If we change R-40s, we'll be shooting ourselves in the foot
 - R-40 is not being changed to eliminate schools
 - Review of Lakewood Township-owned properties map did not provide information of large usable tracts. SS identified the lands that were protected
 - How about also using lands that public schools are located on
 - Public school population is also growing
 - What the Township has available and not constrained and located within the sewer service area is minimal.

GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

- Cross Street
- Township to look to identify areas that could be centralized to locate schools
- Cross Street and James Street – a School Zone?
- Schools are permitted in all zones

REVIEW OF REQUESTS (Cross-referencing T & M assigned numbering of requests)

#17- Adult Communities

No change to Zone

Undeveloped area – take age restriction (out)

Where it's existing and developed – not removing the adult requirement (55+)

Adding option of senior or non-senior

Existing senior developments – stay R-40 - Not touching this

Comment:

- Disagree that Cross Street should be become R-10 & R-12

SS: Consider:

Crafting a Land-Use Plan

Has types of uses and densities

You don't want to zone by variance

You do want development consistency with Master Plan

Zoning has to be consistent with Land-Use Plan
Land-Use map for Township

#6 (FWH – James Street area)

Request for Rezoning of R-40 to R-12B

James Street / Cross Street

Locks schools out of options

Request 6/27/17

Martin Luther King & Pine Street

Request to re-zone R10 to R-7.5

- Already a congested area
- Not included in SmartGrowth area
- All around the property is R-7.5 uses
- Is it in line with SmartGrowth? Yes.
- If it was a 50-acre tract, we could see going through the process of adding it to the Master Plan
 - SS: as part of the Master Plan process, you can adjust small areas
 - Master Plan Committee could recommend to the Board
 - New Land Use Map to rezone the area omitted to R-7.5
- OK with this request

Request 6/23/17

#10 (Drake Road)

Areas of existing schools

Cross Street (R-40 Zone) / Fronts on Drake Road

Allow secondary access

Extension of water and sewer service to area

- Currently R-40
- Requesting R-12B
- SS: NO R-12B zones Exist – Ordinance for criteria exists but no Zone was established
 - Previously said that it didn't fit to rezone to R-12B

Recommendation:

Referenced as #10 on SmartGrowth Plan map

2014 recommended this area as R-12B

SS: Basic Premise to promote new infrastructure activity

R-10 or R-12 would be acceptable

NEUTRAL per the vision of the SmartGrowth Plan

#12

6/23/17

Route 70 (south of Chestnut Street and west of New Hampshire Avenue)

B-5 to R-12

SS: Suggest to rezone to B-5A

T & M have recommended this for B-5A

Committee will follow T & M's recommendation for rezoning to B-5A

Comments:

- Making the Highway Node wider?
- Are they proposing to expand to R-12 area?
- Recommend Mixed Use concept of Highway Core within this area
 - He's asking for more than-
 - Rezone a portion to R-12 (residential)

- **Suggest a letter to Flannery and have T & M look at this request further**

#19

Lanes Mill Road

Request for rezoning from R-20 to B-4 (wholesale business)

- Review of location shows that this area is comprised of private homes
- Not part of SmartGrowth plan

Recommendation:

NO

#_____

Newport / Belleville / Cross Street

Currently R-40

2014 Land Use reflects R-12B

Not in SmartGrowth Plan

- What's the plan for Cross Street
 - Development approvals list was provided by Lakewood Planning Board. This area is not yet developed.
 - Need to speak with Ally to get copies of the Plan approved.

Recommendation:

Pending further review

#15

Burnside Avenue

Requesting rezoning from R-15 to R-10

- A few lots – not in Sewer Service area
- Request to rezone 4 lots to R-10
- Why change it to R-10?
- If it's not in the sewer service area, how much area do they need for adequate septic systems?

#4

Yeshiva

Cross Street / Prospect Street Core
4 Municipally-owned properties
Are some municipally-owned?

#12

Route 70

6 municipally-owned properties

#14

6-7 municipally-owned properties

#15

No Sewer Service

#19

Block 836-837
1 municipally-owned property

Request from Robert Kirschner

R-40 Zone to R-10 Zone

Recommendation:

Was already recommended for rezoning



Comments:

- If there is anything recommended in 2007, is there any reason to NOT recommend them in this Master Plan?
- Once the new Plan is adopted, the old Plan is obsolete
- Overall intent is NOT to increase density. Overall.

The meeting adjourned 5:25 PM

7/1/17

By Anita B. Doyle