

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

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

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

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

4. CORRESPONDENCE

- **SD 2208 Lakeside Holdings, LLC** - addition of mezzanine to approved office building

Mrs. Morris said the applicant wants to add an interior mezzanine to the approved site plan. The question was whether it was affecting parking requirements.

Mr. Herzl questioned if the mezzanine will require additional parking.

Mr. Magno said the board approved a two story building. As he understands, the applicant proposes a mezzanine on the second floor.

Mr. Joe Kociuba, P.E., P.P. confirmed. It would be a mezzanine above the second story of 1,963 sf which accounts for an additional 6.4 parking spaces for a total of 139 required whereas as 149 is proposed.

Mr. Herzl said they are not creating any new variances.

Mr. Kociuba confirmed.

Mr. Magno concurred.

The board unanimously agreed that this is not a material change to the approval.

5. OAK STREET CORE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT SUBDIVISIONS

- **SD 2292AO JLYG, LLC, Block 1033, Lot 4**

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

- **SD 2293AO MJF Equities, LLC, Block 1034, Lot 6**

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

6. PUBLIC HEARING

1. **SD 2188 Aaron Sperber**
Locust Street Block 1083, Lot 7
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

2. **SP 2240 Lakewood Business, LLC, c/o Daniel Werbler**
640 & 644 Cross Street Block 524, Lots 3.01 & 3.02
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for an office and warehouse building

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

3. **SD 2273 White St Developers, LLC**
110 White Street Block 251, Lot 9.01
Minor Subdivision to create three lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

4. **SD 2142 Congregation Kol Aryeh**
513 Hope Chapel Road Block 24.04, Lot 5
Minor subdivision to create two lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

5. **SP 2242 Congregation Yeshiva Mkor Chaim**
160 Locust Street Block 1081, Lot 9
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a school

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

- 6. SP 2247AA Yeshiva Stolin Karlin**
1640, 1660, 1680 West County Line Road Block 2, Lots 24, 51, & 58
Change of Use/Site Plan Exemption to convert three homes into a school

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated August 1, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Magno said there will be 5 spaces for each converted school building, the project requires waivers from landscaping, lighting and trash/recyclable storage location.

Mr. John Doyle, Esq. said this is a permitted use and seek no bulk variances. The school will consist of 4 classrooms and 1 office so the 5 spaces would conform. They will have 66 children attending from kindergarten to first grade. Parents will not drive and park at the school. Two buses are proposed to pick up and drop off the children. School hours will be 8:30 am to 2:30 pm for the younger children, 4 pm for the older children. There is a comment concerning DPW pickup which they acknowledge and they would make any necessary revisions to the landscaping. The engineer noted in bold that there is only one fenced in area on these properties and that is the only area where recreation will take place.

Mr. Herzl asked what the maximum number of children attending will be.

Mr. Elisha Gottdiener was sworn. The plan is to build a new yeshiva as soon as possible.

Mr. Herzl said they plan on coming back with a full site plan. This is a temporary plan.

Mr. Gottdiener confirmed.

Mr. Herzl asked if they agree to everything in the engineer's review letter.

Mr. Glenn Lines, P.E., P.P. was sworn and confirmed.

Mr. Grunberger asked if there are any trailers.

Mr. Gottdiener said not right now.

Mr. Herzl asked where the school is proposed.

Mr. Lines said they are still working on the plans but most likely one of the houses would have to be demolished to make room for the new school.

Mr. Herzl said everything needs to be fenced off when it is under construction so it is safe for the children.

Mr. Rennert asked if there is sidewalk.

Mr. Lines said there is sidewalk along West County Line Road.

Mr. Grunberger asked if buses would be dropping off on County Line.

Mr. Lines said no, they have already brought a bus out to see how they can traverse the site. That area was paved to connect the two driveways so they know buses can get in and out of the site.

Mr. Rennert asked if it will be right in and right out only.

Mr. Lines said yes.

Mr. Herzl said he received a call from the mayor and he wants every plan to show sidewalks unless it is in the industrial park.

Mr. Lines said sidewalks are shown.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Ms. Noreen Gill, 192 Coventry Drive, was sworn. She asked if it is septic or public sewer.
Mr. Lines said septic. There is no sewer in the general area.

Mr. Herzl said there is a comment stating that no well or septic system was shown on the plan.

Mr. Lines said they didn't locate them on the plan. There are three individual septic systems for the individual homes.

Mr. Herzl said that is all subject to the county health department.

Mr. Lines said that is correct but the flow for these 66 students is less than if these homes were occupied by people taking showers, cooking meals, etc.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Follman, Mr. Garfield

- 7. SD 2175 Yechezkel Piotrovski**
30 Gudz Road Block 11.30, Lot 13
Minor Subdivision to create four lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

- 8. SD 2279 Mordechai Eichorn**
Sylvan Court Block 411, Lot 18.02
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create four lots

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

- 9. SD 2281 Avenue of the States, LLC**
Avenue of the States Block 961, Lot 2.04
Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create two lots

A review letter prepared by Remington, Vernick & Vena Engineers dated September 14, 2017 was entered as an exhibit.

Mr. Magno said no variances are requested. A design waiver is required for proposing a non-radial side line from Avenue of the States. A design waiver is required from providing street trees along the project frontages.

Mr. Kevin Murphy, P.E., P.L.S. was sworn. Their intention concerning the non-radial side line was to parallel the northerly property to square the lot off. Another question which came up was why the jog in the property and that is due to the number of properties with questionable title in the Cedarbridge Campus and this jog basically is to avoid impacting any of those areas with questionable title. There was also a question with regards to the CAFRA permit and it is his understanding the CAFRA permit was secured a number of years and due to the permit extension act, as long as construction continues on the campus, the permit is still valid.

Mr. Magno questioned the monitoring well.

Mr. Murphy said their surveyors discovered a monitoring well which is on Township property. They will investigate why that was set and who it was set for but they don't have that information at this time. Concerning the sanitary sewer man hole, the manhole was installed as part of the improvements through the Avenue of the States as a stub manhole which will act basically as a clean out when the proposed site plan comes before the board, they would address any issues which may arise.

Mr. Herzl asked if they agree to all of the other conditions in the engineer's review letter.

Mr. Murphy confirmed.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public, seeing no one come forward, he closed to the public.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the application.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Flancabaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Follman, Mr. Garfield

- 10. SD 2282 Albert Street Holdings, LLC**
Towers Street & Pine Street Blocks 830.11, Lot 2
Amended Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision to create forty-two single family homes ("Somerset Run")

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

- 11. SP 2248 Aharon Mansour**
512 Chestnut Street Block 1087, Lot 20
Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a restaurant and office building

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

- 12. SP 2244 Khal Meor Chaim**
270 Miller Road Block 9, Lot 3.01 & 6
Amended Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan for a synagogue

A motion was made and seconded to carry the application to the October 17, 2017 meeting.

7. 2017 MASTER PLAN

Mr. Flancbaum said they have had four meetings with public comment. He thinks anything they do or any zone changes recommended should be subject to the dualization of Cross Street, Massachusetts Avenue and Pine Street.

Mr. Herzl said also Route 9.

Mr. Follman asked if that is enforceable.

Mr. Jackson said the Master Plan and resolution would state the recommendations for that corridor are contingent and subject to and shall not take effect until these streets have been widened and improved. He sees no reason why that cannot be enforceable.

Mr. Truscott read from the Master Plan 'Work with the State of New Jersey and other interested parties to explore opportunities to widen US Route 9 south of Main Street (n.b., the New Jersey Department of Transportation has indicated that it does not currently have funds to support this effort, nor does it anticipate that it will have such funds in the foreseeable future).'

Mr. Follman said they are wasting their time with this Master Plan if that is the case.

Mr. Jackson spoke with Mayor Coles recently and he indicated that he is in discussions with the DOT and is optimistic. The board can make the recommendations contingent upon that.

Mr. Franklin said he was the mayor in 1969. The big topic of the year was the widening of Route 9. They had a meeting in the old municipal building with Howell Township, Toms River Township and the State. When they left that meeting, everybody was under the assumption that Route 9 was going to be widened from the northern part of Howell Township down through Toms River and this is how far they have gotten. The Howell Township portion was widened but when you get to the Lakewood border after you reach the lake, nothing was done all the way to Toms River.

Mr. Follman said they have been working on widening Route 9 for over 50 years and now the State is saying they do not have the funds. He questioned how there could be any optimism.

Mr. Jackson said that is why they would have a provision making the changes subject to.

Mr. Herzl said if it doesn't get widened within the next 10 years then there will be no approvals.

Mr. Jackson said the Master Plan doesn't make the change until the road is actually widened.

Mr. Flancbaum said that small portion of the Master Plan would never be implemented if that is the case.

Mr. Follman wants to make sure no zone changes will take effect until all of those roads previously mentioned are improved.

Mr. Jackson thinks the motion was only for those areas on those roads.

Mr. Flancbaum didn't make a motion, he was just making a comment. One of the last large undeveloped areas is the southwest portion of town which is the Cross Street/Massachusetts Avenue corridor also called the triangle. His comment was that any zone changes proposed in those areas should not take effect until those roads are dualized into 3 or 4 lanes starting from Route 9 west.

Mr. Garfield said these are all County roads. He urged the board to reach out to the County for help.

Mr. Herzl said if the County doesn't widen these roads then the zoning changes do not take effect. He spoke to the mayor and confirmed the impact fee will be implemented for every zone so there should be funds to do any road improvements that have to be done.

Mr. Rennert asked if that is part of the Master Plan.

Mr. Herzl said it was one of their recommendations.

Mr. Truscott confirmed.

Mr. Follman questioned the Master Plan process. He believes they should be solving any issues they currently have now before approving any more density.

Mr. Flancbaum said there are areas in the Master Plan which discuss more open space in town, recreation, circulation.

Mr. Follman asked if T&M was hired to find where density fits or if they can handle additional density.

Mr. Truscott said the Master Plan is a comprehensive document to address all different aspects of the municipality as far as planning, circulation, parks and recreation, utility services. They are not starting from a blank state, you have to start from existing land use and the way the town is built, the street grid currently in existence and current zoning ordinances in effect. The genesis of this was the Smart Growth Plan adopted in 2009 and amended in 2013. That set up a framework for growth and development in the town instead of a series of cores and nodes which are built into the land use plan which is part of the Master Plan. Those cores and nodes are the areas, as the town grows, would absorb the growth of the town and envisioned to be compact areas of development so people could live, work and shop all within the same area.

Mr. Follman asked if that is because you can't drive anywhere.

Mr. Truscott said no, that is the way it should be so people wouldn't have to get into their cars and add to the existing traffic already on the road.

Mr. Follman asked if they can't get anywhere now, why they would go with more density to fix that problem.

Mr. Truscott said the town is growing.

Mr. Follman questioned why the town is growing. It comes to a point where you need to stop having kids or get a bigger house.

Mr. Jackson said he is making important points and from his questions, he is presuming he is taking a certain view of what the direction should be. The board has to decide which direction they should go in. There is data that says the Township is growing and there is vacant land. How does that get developed? One way may be to embrace that and to allow for people to have children and places to live in Lakewood.

Mr. Follman said they need roads before they have growth.

Mr. Jackson said that is the board's choice.

Mr. Follman asked how many additional households they are talking about.

Mr. Truscott doesn't have a specific number.

Mr. Slachetka said the 2013 Smart Growth Plan had projections for population growth and the number of housing. For this Master Plan, they decided to evaluate the balancing growth and there is going to be many places within the Township where they are going to be taking both municipally owned properties as well as privately owned that are identified outside of the sewer service area and has limited growth, would reduce growth or will be preserved for open space purposes. The idea here is they know there is going to be a substantial amount of growth in the Township, regardless if the board votes on this Master Plan. There is growth occurring right now and the idea here when you're looking at the Smart Growth Plan and when you're looking at a comprehensive plan, is to balance that growth with preservation and it's more about the distribution of where that growth and activity and the type of growth that occurs in those cores and nodes. If you look at the 2013 Smart Growth Plan, you can see that the nature of the development balances out between residential and retail, public services within close proximity and identifying those areas where open spaces need to be preserved and apply for opportunity for new growth and development that is a little bit more smart than has occurred. That Smart Growth plan is referenced in this Master Plan. He agrees that it is important to support that anticipated growth and development where it is projected to take place and provide the infrastructure to support it. There is a transportation improvement district in the southwestern portion of the Township right now where the Cross Street core is. They have proposed and encouraged the Township to extend that, and the board has accepted the recommendation, throughout the Township. The Smart Growth plan and circulation plan in this Master Plan applies an extensive dialogue and discussion about the need for new roads within developments. There was a lot of discussion with regards to a grid. That is the embodiment of the Smart Growth plan, the way the grid is structured and to apply those improvements on roads that carry a substantial amount of traffic. Provide those interconnections where they are not there now between the north and south connections to divert as much traffic as they can off of Route 9. This is a re-examination of the prior Master Plan and as indicated, there are identifications of problems and concerns that have risen since the last Master Plan was adopted and those recommendations and changes are presented within the various elements within the Master Plan. The idea is to create a balanced approach, make sure they have the infrastructure to support that before they start implementing a substantial amount of new growth in that area.

Mr. Follman said he agrees that as of right now, where they stand with the roads they currently have, this town cannot handle anymore density.

Mr. Slachetka said he is saying that in those areas which they have been identified as cores and nodes and know they want to support new growth and development, they definitely do need the infrastructure.

Mr. Follman said it should apply to the entire town. He asked if they were asked to provide additional density.

Mr. Slachetka said no, they were charged to reexamine the last Master Plan, 2013 Master Plan, work with the subcommittees and take their recommendations, incorporate it into a draft and present that to the Planning Board for action. There was no agenda to find places for density. It is a question of what the right plan is and what the right use is. The plan is implemented over time, they are developing a strategy to support the vision embodied with this plan. The board may disagree with the vision and they have every right to do so but his recommendation is the Master Plan provides a fairly well balances approach. If anyone reads this Master Plan, they will see there is as much talk about preservation, community facilities, supporting infrastructure, circulation improvements. They have been talking about circulation improvements for the past decade that need to be implemented.

Mr. Follman said there is no improvement in roadways and there is no way to handle the density. That should be a key point in the Master Plan.

Mr. Slachetka said those areas where substantial growth is proposed...

Mr. Follman interrupted and questioned why they aren't dealing with the issues they have now.

Mr. Slachetka understands but the idea is to get a circulation plan in place which talks about density. That provides the foundation and support for the ordinances and the transportation improvement district. First you have to establish the foundation for the planning framework and talk about the circulation improvements necessary. That is what they did in the Smart Growth plan, they established those needed improvements and the transportation improvement district is based on what was discussed in the 2013 Smart Growth plan. A substantial amount of the Township is not being changed in terms of zoning. Those areas are still going to have growth and there still needs to be circulation improvements made without any further revisions in the zone plan. This Master Plan provides the foundation for a Township as it identifies the improvements needed throughout the Township and not just in a certain portion.

Mr. Follman said they have been talking about widening Route 9 for over 50 years.

Mr. Slachetka said if you look at the zone plan, there are no changes along Route 9.

Mr. Follman said density is not the answer.

Mr. Slachetka said they need to have a plan in place that directs the growth and creates those parallel routes outside of Route 9 and provide those mixed use developments so they can have shopping services in proximity.

Mr. Follman said it doesn't work in this town. He could live on one side of the town, his child's school is on the other side or his relatives.

Mr. Slachetka said no planning is not the answer. Planning is important to be able to address the problems they have had in the past and now. If they implement a plan where they create places for people to shop within walking distances of their neighborhoods then that will ultimately create the greatest relief in the future. Doing nothing and

not changes the land use plan now does not solve the problem. No plan doesn't constitute no growth. No planning will only exacerbate the problem.

Mr. Follman argued but density fixes the problem.

Mr. Slachetka said in specific areas. It has to be well designed. It can't be the kind of growth where you have a continuation of residential patterns.

Mr. Follman questioned where all of these kids are going to school.

Mr. Slachetka said the Smart Growth plan talks about having residential, schools, open spaces.

Mr. Follman said that doesn't work because kids have to go to certain schools which could be on the other side of town.

Mr. Slachetka said they are the policy makers and at some point they have to go with their conscious and what they think is the most appropriate plan for the community. He is presenting his perspective as a land use planning professional. Frankly, if some of these plans or approaches have been implemented 5 or 10 years ago they may be in a better spot then they are now. That is why he is encouraging as a planning professional to take action now that will at least minimize the ongoing issues. This has been vetted, reviewed, discussed, and modified for the better part of a decade. The problem didn't change in the ordinances and now the board has an opportunity to do that. The board is not going to make traffic vanish tomorrow. Doing nothing is not going to solve the problem and the board can disagree with that but the board has to make that decision. His professional opinion is they need a balanced approach, an approach that is focused on the elements within the Smart Growth plan and implement the vision as a community. The idea here is to get a plan and the ordinances in place to do that.

Mr. Jackson said the board should deliberate and determine where they want to go from here.

Mr. Garfield questioned how they can properly grow when they don't know when certain state and county roads are being improved.

Mr. Herzl said any changes would be subject to those improvements.

Mr. Rennert asked what are some of the recommendations which weren't implemented in the Master Plan which they felt could help the town.

Mr. Slachetka said it is a long process and you are dealing with a lot of different entities and bodies. Essentially, he thinks the ideas embodied within the 2013 Smart Growth plan where they have identified cores and nodes for development. In those areas where there is new growth and development they need to the proper planning in place including pedestrian, bike lanes, shopping in proximity to residences which takes cars off of the roads, parks and open spaces. They have heard from the public that being able to walk to their neighbors and interact that way is very important and the most successful neighborhoods in Lakewood is where communities are not separated from each other but where they live and work and shop in proximity.

Mr. Rennert asked if he knows of a specific community in Lakewood where that takes place.

Mr. Slachetka thinks the board has a better idea of where that would be.

Mr. Rennert said it is very difficult for a neighborhood to work on its own in Lakewood. The reason is, each child may get on a different bus and go to a different school. The schools are not chosen based on where someone lives. He asked if there is something within this Master Plan that makes that work.

Mr. Slachetka knows there was a discussion for the need of evaluating an area to designate as a school zone. In the 2013 Smart Growth plan, they talked about areas where schools should be in proximity to residential neighborhoods as well as parks to provide opportunities for recreation and to ultimately create a community. The board has to understand that there are a lot of other layers that take place in terms of regulations with regards to schools and they don't want to encroach on anyone's rights with regards to religious freedom. They did talk about the idea of creating some conditions or at least evaluating schools and school locations. That is a discussion that needs to develop from this Master Plan document.

Mr. Rennert asked if this plan works if that premise doesn't hold true in Lakewood that people do have a transverse town.

Mr. Slachetka said he has to understand that some of the problems they have are already implemented into the land use distribution within the Township and adopting this Master Plan is not going to solve those problems overnight. They need to look at the future growth and how they avoid problems and issues of concern with regards to adequate open space, ensuring the roadways are adequate. They have heard conversations concerning schools and he would suggest the principles and concepts that are presented in a way that represents the communities concerns and establishes a vision moving forward. What ultimately happens and what can't happen here in Lakewood or any community is put this on a shelf, it is going to have to be an ongoing discussion, the governing body would have to take action, and this board would have a continuing role in reviewing applications and determine how those applications embody the principles the board wants to see implemented.

Mr. Rennert said those principles are not going to stand true in Lakewood. He asked if there could be a plan that addresses how someone on the east side of town gets to the west side.

Mr. Slachetka thinks there is going to be difficulties they will be facing and the board does not just want to throw up their hands and say there is nothing they can do. They have to keep on working on it and it is important to have a vision and believes the board has done a good job in articulating that vision. They may disagree on the rate of growth which needs to take place but what they have said, they need something better and this plan says that. This plan points out those issues and concerns which need to be addressed in some way. The board is not going to solve everything but they need to have a statement that says they need infrastructure, open space, transportation improvement district, good planning and to find those alternative routes to Route 9.

Mr. Rennert asked if the Master Plan should not just point out those issues but also suggest what they can do to improve those issues, specifically circulation.

Mr. Slachetka said it does.

Mr. Rennert doesn't see anything which addresses that.

Mr. Slachetka said there has been recommendations by the transportation subcommittee and are articulated on pages 182 and 183. All of those objectives are there including providing a Township wide transportation improvement district. There is not any municipality in the state that has focused on and created such an extensive

transportation improvement district. The board should be proud that this is something that consists in the Master Plan. There is a downtown circulation plan, another transportation study being done to look at these things, they have been working with the County and NJDOT on these regional studies, they have talked about what is under their control which is the local road networks. They are saying a lot of important sophisticated things from a transportation perspective and trying to create a broader network of roads. He understands the traffic is bad now but the board has to figure out what they can do and what is in their control and where they can start attacking the problem. Regardless of where they fall on density, the traffic issues are as important and need to be addressed. Even if they don't change the zoning at all, there is still going to be new development and that development is going to have to go somewhere.

Mr. Rennert questioned where density should be postponed until the items on pages 182 and 183 are implemented.

Mr. Slachetka said the board really needs to express the urgency of getting these things done and establish what the priorities are and hold the people who implement these plans responsible.

Mr. Rennert is pro-density as he grew up in Brooklyn but it works because there is a grid and until there is a circulation plan in place that works in Lakewood, he is struggling.

Mr. Slachetka understands. He considers Lakewood a suburban community that is rapidly growing and sometimes it is very difficult to get those kinds of transit opportunities like they have in the city. He thinks from a practical perspective, the idea of creating that shopping, services, schools and facilities within a walking neighborhood is probably going to be the most impactful thing in the short term and try to get the big picture stuff in place. The state plan sort of embodies the idea of compact center based type of development. It doesn't work everywhere, there are some places where they have existing development patterns and it is hard to retrofit. But there are places he has seen areas where they have shopping centers retrofitted into mixed use kinds of communities. It is not a perfect fit for Lakewood and he is not suggesting it solves everything but he does think it bring opportunities. What is important about that node approach is that it is a driving force for that non-contiguous clustering that provides for preserving those areas where you do have significant environmental resources and sensitivities to be able to preserve those land and balance out the growth.

Mr. Rennert asked if it is possible to calculate what the increase in density and traffic would be based on this plan. He understands it won't be a precise number.

Mr. Slachetka said it is very difficult as there are so many variables associated. There are certain areas in the Township where there will be a substantial decrease in density and there are some areas which will remain unchanged and they have taken steps to reduce the amount of units in the zone. In the Cross Street Core, comparing the Smart Growth plan and the plan proposed now, there is actually a reduction of the number of residential units.

Mr. Rennert isn't looking for an exact number but an approximation.

Mr. Slachetka said there was similar discussion during the 2013 Smart Growth Plan and for them to do that would have been a pretty substantial analysis. A substantial amount of the zone plan is not changing and there are other areas in the zone plan where they actually eliminating or reducing density. There are higher densities being proposed in the southwestern corner but that is actually relative comparable to what was recommended in 2014.

Mr. Rennert feels there is a lack in data as well as a lack of a concrete circulation plan. He needs to see how a child is going to travel from the north side of town to the south side of town.

Mr. Slachetka said it would be a substantial and costly effort to get to that level of specificity. They can keep studying this but it's not changing the growth taking place right now. The Master Plan is a living document and there are opportunities to amend, study and evaluate. There are recommendations in this plan to study where there should be a school zone but the board needs to make some decisions and soon. They have to put themselves on a path for smarter, better growth and the infrastructure is tied and connected to development growth in a phased and prioritized way but they need a starting place to get to that level.

Mr. Jackson said there is a requirement that the Master Plan be updated every 10 years at some point the board does have to make a decision.

Mr. Rennert expressed the need to look into each neighborhood, see what the zones are and thoroughly research permitted uses in each zone, particularly schools and shuls.

Mr. Garfield said it is important to reach out to the state and county and get a regional plan in place.

Mr. Flancbaum made a motion to approve the Master Plan as presented, however, no zone changes should take place until the infrastructure is in place particularly the Massachusetts Avenue and Pine Street areas. Also, the Cross Street area slated to be changed to R-7.5 should only allow single family detached housing. Motion failed.

The majority of the board feel more comfortable changing the Cross Street area to R-12.

Mr. Rennert questioned when roads would be improved as the zone changes.

Mr. Slachetka said applicants would have to contribute their fair share as part of a development application.

Mr. Follman said all R-7.5 zones should be changed to R-12 allowing only single family housing.

Mr. Slachetka would not recommend doing that as there is existing development in those areas. The only places recommended to be changed to R-7.5 other than Cross were where there was prior development approvals and existing development patterns.

Mr. Follman said anything proposed at a higher density than R-12 should be changed to R-12 with single family only.

Mrs. Morris said R-12 permits single family only.

Mr. Follman made a motion to adopt the Master Plan as proposed with the condition that no rezones are put into effect prior to the necessary infrastructure improvements discussed, in addition, any proposed rezones to a density higher than R-12 should be changed to proposed rezone R-12 single family detached homes only. Motion failed.

Mr. Rennert asked whether that includes business and commercial zones as well.

Mr. Flancbaum recommended to only change the areas by the Cross Street triangle which are slated to be changed to R-7.5 to R-12 conditioned upon the infrastructure improvements are installed first.

Mr. Franklin suggested to hold off on a vote, he is unsure what they are even approving. He asked that the planner revise the map per the board's recommendations.

Mr. Jackson agrees, the motion does propose a lot of radical changes and the board doesn't really know what the consequences would be.

Mr. Rennert made a motion for the township planner to prepare a map based on the board's recommendation as well as making schools with dormitories a conditional use. Motion failed.

Mr. Flancbaum made a motion to accept the Master Plan with the following changes: R-7.5 should be changed to R-12 in the Cross Street area, any R-10 zoning along the Cross Street going west should be changed to R-12 conditioned upon the infrastructure being installed. Motion failed.

Mr. Franklin made a motion that the township planner revise the map per the board's recommendations, seconded by Mr. Flancbaum.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Rennert, Mr. Follman, Mr. Garfield

No: Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Ms. Zografos

Motion failed.

Mr. Rennert wants to clarify that anything within the Cross Street area should be changed to R-12. Any shuls with catering facilities and schools with dormitories, the township should look to make those a condition use in residential zones.

Mr. Jackson said the conditions would have to be defined by ordinance. They can take it a step further and say conditional use to make it compatible with the zone. The governing body would then address all of the requirements. If an applicant comes in and doesn't meet those requirements then they would need to go to the zoning board.

Mr. Rennert suggests that the Planning Board, Zoning Board and Committee should have regular meetings discussing any issues which may arise.

Mr. Jackson said there is already a process for that.

Mr. Rennert said it is important that there is ongoing discussion between the boards.

Mr. Franklin said a committee member should be present at their meetings.

Mr. Follman asked if the B-5A zone along Chestnut allows duplexes. If so, he would like them removed.

Mr. Slachetka knows that multi-family is permitted as a conditional use.

Mr. Rennert said his recommendation pertaining to schools and shuls being a conditional use doesn't have to be included in the Master Plan but he would like it sent to the Committee as a separate recommendation.

Mr. Slachetka said if the board agrees with it then he prefers to have it in the Master Plan as it forms a foundation for zoning.

A motion was made by Mr. Rennert, seconded by Mr. Follman to direct the township planner to revise the plan including the changes discussed.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Grunberger, Mr. Flancbaum, Mr. Herzl, Mr. Rennert, Ms. Zografos, Mr. Garfield

- 8. PUBLIC PORTION**
- 9. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
- 10. APPROVAL OF BILLS**
- 11. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

The Township audio recording malfunctioned. These minutes were transcribed using another audio source and were completed to the best of my ability. Please excuse any errors and/or omissions.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary