

**MINUTES**  
**LAKEWOOD MASTER PLAN DENSITY SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING**  
JUNE 21, 2017 • 4:00 PM  
Room 18 • Lakewood Municipal Building

Present:

Justin Flancbaum, Presiding (JF)  
Avi Verschleiser (AV)  
Moshe Gleiberman (MG)  
Shalom Landman (SL)  
Mike McLaughlin (MMc)  
Adam Pfeffer, Esq. (AP)  
Martin P. Truscott, PP, AICP, LEED-GA T & M (MT)  
Stanley Slachetka, PP, AICP – T & M Associates (SS)

The meeting was called to order at 4:25 PM

A brief review was made of maps and overlays that were provided as aids in this meeting. Color coded legends reflected areas where requested zoning changes have been recommended and implemented.

Review was made of SmartGrowth notes

- Indication of those that have been developed
- What is still vacant within SmartGrowth notes

There still remain large undeveloped tracts in the Township. They are significant. These were also to be reviewed for comment to the Master Plan Committee.

The subcommittee sees THE MASTER Plan as a 10-year program for development. Impression is that Lakewood is a growing town.

Mr. Truscott provided the overview of development activity:

- In 2007 the Lakewood Planning Board went through an extensive process regarding Zoning
  - 35 Zoning requests were considered
  - 6 of the 35 were denied
  - The remaining 29 were approved (legend on working map coded yellow)
- The working map provided reflects
  - Those that were recommended and not implemented
  - Two were implemented and rezoned
    - Crystal Lakes
    - Oak Street
  - The remaining 29 were not implemented

Mr. Pfeffer's summary of events:

- The ordinances were not adopted to enact those recommended for rezoning
  - Now the applications are coming in and citing the recommended zoning
    - Forces the application to go to Zoning Board for variance from existing zoning
- Now we have a hodge-podge of things going on because ordinances were not enacted.

JF: Now the State is breathing down the Township's neck to have ordinances adopted and enacted.

- State is looking for a Re-examination Report
- Ordinances need to be adopted before the end of the year

MT:

- Referencing the Legend on the maps provided as visual aids
  - Green areas = recommended but not implemented (27)
  - Yellow areas = for further study (2 implemented)
- Map #2 – new map
  - Zoning Map updated 2007
    - Zone Changes - rezoned by the Township Committee (yellow)
      - Some have been overturned in Court
        - ABCD Zone was overturned (flaw in noticing)- Now it will go back to the original zoning
    - Oak Street Corridor is the only overlap
      - Adopted piece-by-piece
    - Example # 19 was R-12 Rezoned to R-10A
      - Uses within the Zone have also updated

Are there criteria to ask for re-zoning?

T & M is the Planner

- Township takes the request
- Request is sent to T & M Associates for Review
- T & M will take a look of how it will fit
- A review will be made of the infrastructure
- Planner returns to the Township and provides the review results
- Planning Board ultimately decides on the premises being presented

Larger undeveloped tracts are easier to be re-zoned.

Ref: 2014 Zoning Recommendation Map

- Master Plan amendment was adopted by the Planning Board
- Most of the areas rezoned are R-40
- Township did do a series of ordinance changes – did it in pieces
- Changes were adopted
- Someone challenged the Rezoning Map
- All thrown out because the Reexamination Report was not comprehensive

What's happening is that within areas of land undeveloped land – large swathes of land – schools are being developed. Neighborhoods are looking like house... house ... school... house... house.. school. Residents are pressured to allow reduced lots by threats that schools will be developed on acquired lands.

General Discussion:

- Why do we need so many individual schools all interspersed within all of the zones?
- Township should allow for a better traffic flow
- Why can't we recommend something good – allow roads to be built to accommodate the traffic patterns? (Discussion continued on schools and the locking-out of homeowners trying to purchase land for residential uses. Schools seem to have the ability to buy at higher prices more easily)
- It should be spread out

- We can adjust roadways to accommodate traffic
- There should be schools everywhere
- Circulation around schools should be improved
  - Dedicated pick-up / drop-off areas

Stan Slachetka arrived at 4:58PM

Discussion referencing Map #2:

2014 Map was turned back because reexamination was limited to a specific area and was not considered a comprehensive reexamination.

AP handed out copies of requests made for rezoning for use as visual aids

- We should be able to look at requests and compare them to the adopted SmartGrowth plan

Map #3- SmartGrowth plan for Overlay of

- Town Center- Downtown
- Cedarbridge Development area
- Oak Street
- Critical Cross/Prospect Street core with proposed commercial/multi-family
- Highway Nodes (Commercial and residential uses in accordance with SmartGrowth principles)

Stan Slachetka (SS): As specific proposals came up, they were reviewed

- Asked for individual evaluation
- Want to meld the requests

Questions:

- Have we had a chance to do the overlay?
  - SS: Need to talk about densities. Two-step process



## **Requests: Cross-referencing the 2013 SmartGrowth Plan**

JF: We should go through the requests

### **Request dated: 2/8/17**

Block 1243 through 1247 and 1248.17 through 1248.24  
New Hampshire Avenue / Locust Street South of Route 70  
Request to rezone to B5A from R20 consistent to Highway Node  
2 acre; 200' lot width

**Recommended**

---

### **Request dated 3/28/16**

Block 1051 Lots 30 & 56  
Downtown Regional Center  
**Consistent and Recommended** - Already development in the area

---

### **Request dated 3/28/17**

Block 548, Lots 46, 52, 57, 58, 59, 61 & 276  
Currently R-10 Zone / Downtown Regional Center  
Requests rezoning to B-1 (Neighborhood business) along Route 88 with remaining area to be rezoned R-7.5  
(A Doyle lad left the room to obtain Zoning Ordinance copies to assist with discussion- missing notes on this request )

---

### **Request dated 5/5/17**

Block 251. 03, Lots 20, 20.01, 20.02, 20.03 and 31  
Currently R-40  
Requesting rezoning to R-12B  
The area around this is zoned R-12B

- R-40 Zones have become an issue right now with residents – currently 1 acres required and now requesting 12,000 SF lots
- R-12B allows for 2-family houses with a minimum of 3 acres
- Suggest single family on R-12 or R-10
- Not for duplexes
- Need 15 acres for this zone

Comment:

- Push-pull with the residents
- Reason why there needs to be more development in this area
- Sufficient density
- 53 duplexes could fit on 15 acres = 106 families
- R-12 doesn't allow for duplexes
- R-12B DOES allow for duplexes
- Every decision made by the Master Plan affects another area

**Recommendation:**

**Do not accept this request**

- R-12B – Keep out for this area R-12 is OK
- Single Family
- Make this for all R-40 neighborhoods

---

**Request dated 6/28/16**

Block 150.04, Lot 19

Twelfth Street in area of Squankum Road

Request Rezoning from R-10 to R-7.5

Comment:

- Squankum Road is zoned R-10
- It's not all R-10
- The property in question is not butting up to existing R-7.5
- Stay Neutral?
- Need clarification for Lakewood Planning Board referencing inconsistency on the newest Zoning Map
- If it's all R-10, what would the Committee consider?

**Recommendation:**

**Stay neutral with clarification on the Zone**

Note: R-12B was created but never enacted

---

**Request dated 6/2/17**

Blocks 457, 458, 466, 467, 468, 469 (Cross and Prospect Core)

Request for rezoning to R7.5

Existing

Comment:

- Duplexes are permitted in all zones but R-10
- AP: Zone was created but no longer valid
- Already have approvals for 3 apartment buildings + school + campus + parking
- Problem is – if they don't get the R-7.5, they will continue
  - We don't have to recommend R-7.5
- Suggest R-10B (12,000SF Lots + allowing duplexes)
- R-12B doesn't exist in this
- The approval that they have will be bad for this area
- SS Referenced the SmartGrowth plan which shows single family for this area in general
  - Concentrate development in those cores
  - Conforms with SmartGrowth plan
  - Requesting 7.5 will curb density somewhat
- Might want to consider (for this area)
  - High density residential development with substantial setbacks
    - Aesthetic – reduce the appearance of crowding by taking backyards off the thoroughfares
  - Want something that fits in with Fairways
  - Maybe a mix with 7.5
  - Don't allow them to develop right to the street

- Would agree to R-7.5 with substantial setbacks
- Special situation where they already have approvals for a more dense project.

\*\* County has committed to doing a study to dualize Cross Street \*\*

---

**Request dated 6/9/17**

Block 440, Lots 6, 7.01, 7.02

Cross and Prospect Street Core

Approximately 20 acres

Request to be rezoned B-2 (Central Business)

Comment:

- R-20 - 12C allows for Single Family Residential w/ cluster
- SmartGrowth
  - Possible retail
- The intent is to allow shopping services to serve the new residential community (reduction of traffic congestion in other existing shopping corridors)
- As it stands today, it would be as bad as putting up 269 apartments
- Don't make it a B-2 Zone
- Under the current zone what would be the density on ½ acre?
  - "cluster" means concentrated to one portion of the site allowing for more open space / wooded areas/ playgrounds
- R-20 = 36 units
- R20-12 Cluster
  - In accordance with R-20
  - What would be the minimum tract size?
  - Is it in line with SmartGrowth?
    - Technically, not practically
  - R-20 yield; cluster down to R-12

**Recommendation:**

**Want to look at this again.**

---

**Request dated 6/2/17**

Block 189

North Oakland and Cherry Street

Citing the 2007 reexamination of the Master Plan adopted by the Lakewood Planning Board

Request for Rezoning to R-7.5 from R-10

**Comment:**

**Is it in alignment with 2007?**

---

**Request dated 6/2/17**

Block 508.02 Lot 5

Asking for rezoning from A-1 (Agricultural) to Single Family

Comment:

- There is no longer a need for Agricultural Zone
- SS: There is a unique aspect to this property.
  - There was litigation on this which included deed restrictions to 2-acres
    - Won litigation
    - Deed restriction remains
    - Reaffirmed 2-acre zoning
- What is the down side?
- Needs to be taken out of the A-1 Zone
  - It's deed-restricted no matter what
    - Test case

**Recommendation:**

**Not consistent with 2007**

**Not consistent with SmartGrowth**

**2-acre Estate Zone unless the Township Committee deems otherwise**

**Safer to keep as-is**

**Traffic Issues**

**No**

---

**Request dated 6/9/17**

Blocks 474, 475, 476, 482, 483, 484 & 487

A-1 Zone

Request to be rezoned RM Zone (Multi-Family Residential)

Comment:

- Eliminate A-1 Zone
- Area has duplexes and townhouse development on both sides
- All in this area are being built or have been approved

Recommendation:

- Allow for Mixed use overlay
- Allow for some retail component
- Recommend high density
- Duplexes
- POINT OUT:
  - Close to half of the front of Prospect street has been developed with residential
  - Retail should be brought to the rear of that tract
    - Need to assure street connections to get to the retail component
  - Form a base code for street requirements
  - Create buffer
  - Move intensity of development away from Cross Street
  - Ask Ally for all development approvals to come up with a specific plan for this area
    - Last real opportunity to plan this area for planned mixed use
- **REQUEST IS CONSISTENT WITH SMARTGROWTH – YES**

---

**Request dated 6/9/17**

Burnside Avenue

Blocks 199-202 and p/o Blocks 190, 190.04 & 190.05

Existing R-15 Zone

Request for re-zoning to R-10 (single family residential)

Comment:

- SmartGrowth: outside of SmartGrowth
- Problem with C-1 corridor (wetlands/stream)
- Is it within a sewer service area?
  - Looks like it is on the edge of a sewer service area
  - If outside – it would be definitely a NO
  - If inside the sewer service area it would be OK

Results: Wait for further research on Sewer Service to the area.

---

**Request dated 6/9/17**

Request to rezone R-40 to R-20 – general Zone request

Non-age-restricted communities

Comment:

- SmartGrowth compliance
- Wants to open up adult communities' Zone to eliminate age restrictions
- Doesn't increase density if you allow and eliminate age restriction
- Develop as-is
  - R-10 (Single Family- Detached) NO PROBLEM
    - Needs to be considered with the Eagle Ridge development
      - History of the development of Eagle Ridge residential plan for age restricted development
        - Seeing it as Single Family detached housing
  - This is part of the GDMS Holdings project

Result:

General Rezoning to allow removal of age restrictions –

Look at the town overall, not this specific project

- They are asking to remove restrictions and keep the same yield
- Is there a philosophical agreement regarding the 55 + over restrictions?
  - Pine River / Somerset Walk





NOTES:

- Draft Report
- Get overlay
- 2007/2014 Overlay Implemented vs not implemented
- List recommendations
- Current status
- Conformity with SmartGrowth plan
- July 6<sup>th</sup> is Public Meeting
- Seek feedback from Township
- Large Open Areas
  - Not part of SmartGrowth
  - Also Oak Street
- Get list from Ally (Approved Projects)
- Talk about Zoning ideas
- Discuss additional Mixed-use areas
  - Setbacks
  - Parks
- Where schools are currently approved
  - Setbacks
  - “curb appeal”
  - Consider school pick-up and drop-off
- A-1 Zoning issue
  - There are only small areas
- There has already been recommendations for re-zoning of some areas
  - O/T - Sunset Avenue (NJAWC property to match up)
  - Open Space Pine and Vine Avenues
- Revisit Prospect Street
- Revisit Drake Road
- Revisit R40 Zones

Adjourned 7:06 PM

Dated: June 29, 2017

by Anita B. Doyle

*Note: This meeting was not mechanically recorded.*