

## 1. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Neiman called the meeting to order at 6:18 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. Advance written Notice has been filed with the Township Clerk for purpose of public inspection and, a copy of this Agenda has been mailed, faxed or delivered to the following newspapers: *The Asbury Park Press*, and *The Tri-Town News* at least 48 hours in advance. This meeting meets all the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

## 2. ROLL CALL

Mr. Franklin, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler, Mr. Follman, Mr. Rennert were present.

## 3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Jeff Staiger, Mr. Stan Slachetka, and Mr. Bruce Klein were sworn in.

## 4. SMART GROWTH PLAN PRESENTATION BY T&M ASSOCIATES

Mr. Neiman provided a brief overview of the intent of tonight’s meeting. He stated that the growth of Lakewood has to be addressed from within the Township, as well as the fact that the State was requiring it to be addressed. They (the State) required a five-point plan from the Township, addressing transportation, traffic, water and sewer, growth, etc. Additionally, Stan Slachetka and his team at T&M Associates have worked on this plan for a long time, and looked at all the roads that could be improved and opened up, areas with the potential to be developed or redeveloped, water, sewer, traffic, transportation, and have to the best of their abilities presented us with a plan today. Mr. Neiman indicated that this plan may still be dissected and tweaked. Once the Planning Board approves this plan it will go to the State for review and implementation. A key component to this plan is impact fees, which are essential for the required road improvements. Additionally, funds from the State would become available for traffic improvements associated with the approval of this plan.

Mr. Neiman reiterated that the Town is growing, and people want to live here. We have to address this growth and we have to do it smartly. Input from the community is valuable and appreciated, and we are here to work with the Town, State, everyone. Mr. Neiman then called Mr. Slachetka to discuss the changes that have been included in the plan since the Board last reviewed the Smart Growth Plan in September of 2012.

Mr. Slachetka introduced himself. He explained that this is a proposed adoption of the Smart Growth Plan, as part of the Master Plan of the Township of Lakewood. This would revise and supplement the Township’s existing Master Plan. In accordance with that, there is another document titled Master Plan Reexamination Report that accompanies the Smart Growth Plan,

which notes the changes that have occurred in the Township, primarily the various planning activities that revolve around the State Plan endorsement application that the Twp made and the envisioning process that accompanied that which ultimately led to the original adoption by the Twp Committee of the 2009 version of the Smart Growth Plan as the overall vision plan for the Township. This Smart Growth Plan essentially is the same plan, with some modifications which we will discuss tonight, that was adopted by the Twp Committee as part of the State Plan Endorsement Application process. The third document provided by T&M and is part of the consideration of the Board this evening is identified as the 2013 Smart Growth Plan Background Tables. This provides some information as to the projections of population growth and housing growth in the Township. It is for informational purposes.

Mr. Slachetka stated that The Smart Growth Plan is now dated June 2013. Each of these three documents has been on file pursuant to the requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law as an amendment to the Township's Master Plan. The 2013 version has been revised since the prior public meeting in September of 2012, at which public comments were received as well as recommendations from the Board for additional information to be incorporated into the plan. Specific issues to be addressed were infrastructure (traffic and improvements), as well as further information on the non-contiguous clustering provision. Mr. Slachetka stated that he was going to focus on those changes tonight.

Mr. Slachetka referenced a presentation board, which is a blow-up of Figure 3.1 on page 9 of the Smart Growth Plan, which highlights the concepts of the Plan.

Mr. Slachetka explained that the idea of a Smart Growth Plan is to channel development into compact, mixed-use communities in those areas that are appropriate for growth and development where infrastructure exists or can be improved to support that growth and population. In addition, various green areas (on the Exhibit) in the Township are identified for open space preservation and public parks and recreation, both existing and proposed. Approximately a third of the Township has been identified for such uses.

The first change to the Plan was to add additional information and update facts and figures in Section 2 of the Plan. T&M included the 2010 census information, which was not available when they prepared the original Plan in 2009. They also included a table based on an analysis of the development potential of each of the areas for development in the Township (Table 2.3).

Mr. Slachetka continued to discuss the Township's continued population growth and anticipated continuation of the same, stating that there is an absolute need to provide new housing and a range of housing types to support that anticipated growth. That population growth also needs shopping, services, parks and recreation, to support it.

In the long run, a further gap in the need for housing is anticipated, and after the next decade or two the Township will have to assess where they are at that time and discuss alternatives and further changes to accommodate the population growth.

This plan addresses the anticipated growth while at the same time protecting and preserving lands for open space.

Mr. Slachetka stated that based on the growth and development and standard traffic engineering methodologies, they evaluated the anticipated traffic impacts. Mr. Bruce Klein from T&M is a traffic engineer who is available to answer any specific questions with regards to the traffic improvements.

The fundamental revision to the Smart Growth Plan is in Section 6, which addresses the Transportation Strategy. There are several components to this strategy. First, a blow-up of Figure 6.1, page 24, was presented, which is an illustration of existing traffic counts and also the anticipated traffic counts. Mr. Slachetka highlighted the fact that even without the Smart Growth Plan, the anticipated traffic counts will still increase based on current zoning provisions and available land. However, the ability to address those traffic increases in a smart way with advanced planning is minimal without the mechanisms and framework provided in the Smart Growth Plan. So the Smart Growth Plan is an essential tool to deal with the existing traffic problems and also future growth. Mr. Slachetka identified the information contained on the graphic, which is self-explanatory.

Mr. Slachetka indicated that Mr. Klein was involved in identifying circulation patterns and areas for improvement based on these traffic counts. Mr. Slachetka stated that, first, specific improvements are highlighted: new traffic lights, new roads, additional north-south routes to provide alternatives to Route 9, additional east-west routes. These are key points to mitigating traffic problems. Secondly, the land use plan that is proposed, which is concentrated, mixed-use communities (rather than sprawling development), is important to reducing traffic problems. Biking and walking within small communities, rather than driving cars across town for services, will help alleviate traffic problems. So it's really a two-part process. This also means that development designs should provide for biking and walking pathways in order to provide alternatives to vehicular traffic. Also, public transit options such as bussing should be enhanced.

With regards to specific improvements, Mr. Slachetka presented Figure 6.2 on page 25 of the Plan. He highlighted some of the key traffic improvements: intersection improvements along Route 9, specifically a signalized intersection at Oak Street and a new roadway connector which will connect Route 9 and Vine Street. One of the key improvements is a new completed north-south connection of Vine Street, specifically including the Route 70 intersection. Mr. Schmuckler intervened for clarification, and Mr. Slachetka corrected his statement to say that he was referencing the Vermont Avenue and Route 70 intersection, and that Vermont Avenue would be improved to connect up to Pine Street. Vine Street would be connected to that portion of Vermont, which would connect at the north end to Clover Street, which in turn would connect up to Route 88. Mr. Slachetka highlighted the importance of this new route.

Mr. Schmuckler questioned Mr. Slachetka regarding the building located in the middle of Vine Street near Spruce, and asked what was happening there. Mr. Slachetka said it's preferable to move to relocate that facility out of the right-of-way. Clearly they are not intending to create problems for one specific property owner, however ideally for the Township overall this route is essential. A connection from Route 70 to 88 is necessary, and in this Plan they are showing the most ideal route.

The other route Mr. Slachetka highlighted is a north-south connector road between Oak Street and Pine Street. Mr. Schmuckler asked what current right-of-way that road would run along,

and Mr. Slachetka clarified that it would use part of the Charity Tull right-of-way. Mr. Slachetka explained this route is important because it is not only an alternate north-south route, but it is also a connection from the Oak Street Core into the Cedarbridge Towne Center. This design would provide for a buffer to the existing residential neighborhood by moving the roadway to the west side of the right-of-way and also would provide a bike pathway.

Mr. Schmuckler questioned the width of the existing right-of-way and the proposed roadway improvements. Mr. Slachetka clarified that they are looking at an 85' right-of-way, which would require an additional 35' from the western properties, where the Township currently owns many of the properties. He opined again that this connection is critical.

Further improvements are proposed with regards to east-west connections, including a light at Oak Street and Route 9, also signalization at some key intersections as well as intersection improvements to increase capacity particularly in the area of the Cross-Prospect Core. Mr. Slachetka opined that the anticipated growth in association with the Smart Growth Plan can be accommodated by these improvements, and the existing conditions along Route 9 can be improved upon.

Mr. Slachetka pointed out that the circulation plan also includes Figure 6.3, which identifies various improvements that are being implemented in the down town area.

With regards to who pays for these improvements, Mr. Slachetka indicated that specific new development applications would have the responsibility of improving roadways that immediately adjoins the development. This is typical and has always been the case. A portion of the Charity Tull connector is anticipated to be installed by developers. The other important aspect of this Plan is that it would provide the foundation and rationale for the Township to adopt an impact fee ordinance, so that development that takes place pursuant to this plan would not only be responsible for financially supporting the improvements adjoining and serving their properties, but also would require them to pay for their fair share of regional traffic improvements that are necessary for the overall implementation of the Smart Growth Plan. It is critical that this Plan be adopted in order to support the traffic improvements that are needed throughout the town even without the Smart Growth Plan.

Mr. Schmuckler questioned Mr. Slachetka as to why there was no reference to impact fees in the Smart Growth Plan. Mr. Slachetka indicated that if the Board was interested in some specific language with regards to impact fees, it is something that could be added to the Plan. He agreed that it's important for the Board's specific concerns to be included in the Master Plan because that is how the Board communicates its concerns to the governing body. This Plan can't be specific towards costs, but can certainly lay the groundwork to outline why impact fees should be implemented.

Mr. Slachetka testified that New Jersey American Water, the Lakewood Township MUA, and the Ocean County Utilities Authority all confirmed that the sewer and water infrastructure necessary to support the Plan is in place and/or planned for, and that those entities are using the Plan as a guide for future development.

Mr. Slachetka stated that one last change to the Plan is that they added an additional paragraph to clarify the non-contiguous clustering provision, and if the Board has concern about any

specific areas that are included in the provision they can certainly discuss those areas. An important thing to note is that non-contiguous clustering is supported by the State and by CAFRA as a viable way to support growth while also preserving open space. This provides for large contiguous preservation areas rather than sparse scatterings of preserved trees.

Mr. Schmuckler inquired as to the Schedule A properties, which includes open space areas, environmentally sensitive features like wetlands and flood plains. He voiced concerns over giving building "credits" for lands that are otherwise unuseable anyway. Mr. Slachetka clarified that the intent is not to give "credit" for those properties, but rather to give "credit" for preserving *useable* properties that are in the areas immediately surrounding environmentally sensitive properties. It is logical to further protect sensitive areas by not developing close to them, as well as to cluster preserved areas into larger tracts. The Plan does not intend to increase development intensity above what would be built without the non-contiguous clustering provision. Essentially, total development potential of subject properties would be assessed (which doesn't include development of unuseable/sensitive/wet land), and then a certain amount of useable land would be preserved and the total development would then be consolidated onto a smaller portion of land. Mr. Schmuckler opined that the Plan is not specific on this subject and it should be clarified to not give credit for otherwise unuseable land. Mr. Slachetka agreed that clarifying language should be added.

Mr. Neiman inquired as to how to ensure that preserved land which was already used as "credit" for clustering was not used again later in the future. Mr. Slachetka distinguished between the "buying and selling of credits" which is typically done under a "transfer of development rights program." However, in this case we are talking about a single applicant or a partnership. There is no sale or keeping track of "credits." Deed restriction of properties, or a conservation easement, would be required on the open space areas for preservation. Filed maps would note this. Mr. Schmuckler opined that this should be outlined in the Plan. Mr. Slachetka agreed it should be specified.

Mr. Neiman thanked Mr. Slachetka, and opened to the public for comments. He requested that questions be specific to the Plan and that the public try to limit their comments to 2 minutes.

Bill Hobday of 30 Schoolhouse Lane appeared and requested a color copy of the plan. Mr. Neiman provided him with an extra copy. Mr. Hobday indicated he would comment after he reviewed the plan.

Jorge Esmart of 410 East 7<sup>th</sup> Street appeared to comment that the Plan doesn't cover all areas of the Township, like New York Avenue and Ridge Avenue in the area where he lives. Mr. Esmart had some questions regarding septic, sewer, grading, and tree removal in association with new development adjacent to his property. Mr. Neiman indicated that the Smart Growth Plan aims to prevent future problems such as these in the areas highlighted by the Plan. Mr. Neiman referred Mr. Esmart to alternate agencies for assistance as his complaints do not fall under jurisdiction of the Smart Growth Plan or the Planning Board. Mr. Esmart opined that the traffic in the area needs to be alleviated as well. Mr. Slachetka indicated that these areas were not part of this evaluation because they are fully-developed areas in the down town area. In the long term, the Township will have to come up with a specific plan for traffic in the Downtown

Regional Center. Mr. Neiman asked Mr. Staiger if he had any suggestions on departments for Mr. Esmart to contact for assistance. Mr. Staiger recommended the Ocean County Board of Health regarding septic questions and New Jersey American Water regarding sewer connections. Mr. Schmuckler asked Mr. Staiger to confirm that if there were an easement, it would be recorded on the filed subdivision map and if there were an agreement it would be referenced in the resolution. Mr. Staiger agreed. Mr. Franklin stated that the subject is in the minutes of the approval. Mr. Staiger offered to coordinate with Mr. Esmart after the meeting or at a later date.

Elliott Schwartz appeared on behalf of New Jersey American Water to offer his personal assistance to Mr. Esmart. He also stated that his company is working with the planners and the developers to meet the growing needs of the community.

Richard Friedman, who lives in the Fairways, appeared before the Board. He stated concerns about existing traffic on Route 9 and Cross Street, and concerns regarding increased traffic when the Cross and Prospect Street Core is developed. Mr. Klein stated that there are several improvements highlighted in that area, including road widening, additional signalization, etc. Mr. Friedman asked if the improvements would be in place prior to development, and Mr. Klein stated that they would be developed in tandem. Mr. Slachetka stated that an aim of the Plan is to install the most key improvements prior to further land development, possibly with funding from the state. Mr. Schmuckler asked Mr. Friedman how he travels in the area of Cross. Mr. Friedman says he goes to the end of Cross and makes a left on East Veterans, towards the Wawa, then a right to go north, past the school on Hope Chapel. Mr. Schmuckler asked Mr. Klein to consider traffic upgrades up beyond Prospect, further west along Cross Street.

Mr. Stafford-Smith, from West Cross Street, appeared to suggest a dead-end at West Cross Street and the railroad. He suggested an alternate route down Faraday Avenue to 571. He stated that the traffic on Cross is unbearable. Mr. Slachetka referenced an aerial photo for reference. Mr. Neiman asked for clarification on where Cross Street becomes West Cross Street, and Mr. Stafford-Smith indicated that it was where it crossed James Street. He continued to discuss dead-ending West Cross Street at James Street, and stated that the drainage is terrible in the area. Mr. Neiman inquired as to the water and fire hydrant service on Cross Street, which Mr. Stafford-Smith had discussed at a prior public hearing. Mr. Stafford-Smith indicated that he had spoken with Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schwartz, and other people from New Jersey American Water Company have been pursuing a plan to provide service to the area. Mr. Klein responded that dead-ending Cross Street is unlikely. It is a County road and it is unrealistic to dead-end it. Mr. Neiman voiced agreement, but clarified that Mr. Stafford-Smith is accurate as to the terrible conditions of Cross and stated that significant improvements are required. Mr. Slachetka stated that working jointly with the County is required for any roads under their jurisdiction. Mr. Neiman stated that additional improvements west of the Cross and Prospect Street intersection should be included in the Plan.

Avi Hersh of 501 Spruce Street appeared to ask questions in relation to the Oak Street Core and traffic in the area. He stated that there is a yellow color on the Spruce Street map that is labeled "residential," which is unclear because that area is already residential. He said there is no interest in zone changes in the area. The area is currently R-40. Mr. Schmuckler clarified that it is R-40/20 Cluster. Mr. Hersh stated that he understands the population is growing, but this is already zoned residential so this plan doesn't specify what, if any, changes are proposed

in the area. Mr. Neiman reminded Mr. Slachetka that at the meeting in September there were many neighbors from the Spruce Street area who voiced concerns about the Oak Street Core. Mr. Neiman said let's look south of Oak Street for zone changes, as opposed to north of Oak Street around Spruce Street which is primarily already developed. Mr. Hersh said by including the Spruce Street area you are making the Oak Street Core contiguous with the Cedarbridge Towne Center. Mr. Slachetka responded that the inclusion of the area labeled "residential" is important because when going before the State Planning Commission, certain criteria and standards must be met in order to call this a Core. We are providing a range of housing opportunities in the Core, and this "residential" area is separated from others labeled "multi-family" and other higher density areas. He stated that if the Board is concerned specifically about this, the more appropriate approach would be to provide more specific language in the plan that clarifies the intent of the yellow "residential" label is to provide lower density development. Mr. Neiman stated it should stay as R-40/20, fine to keep it as part of the Core, but it should be specifically labeled to remain R-40/20. Mr. Schmuckler stated that by keeping it on the Core, however, you are allowing non-contiguous clustering to go in there. Mr. Slachetka corrected him that any non-contiguous clustering Ordinance in the future would outline specifically the boundaries for non-contiguous clustering properties and it could exclude this area. The Board should put specific language in the plan that states this should be a low-density area and it should not be a "Schedule B" property. Mr. Slachetka strongly recommended against removing this area from the Smart Growth Plan because by pulling pieces out of the Core it is no longer a Core. Mr. Schmuckler stated that the Oak Street Core is connected to the Cedarbridge Core and the entire area north of Oak Street in the Oak Street Core should be removed. Mr. Slachetka stated that one of the appeals to the State is that the two Cores work together symbiotically. Mr. Schmuckler said that when he met with the State they failed to communicate that, and that the Board is going to separate the two cores and see what the State says. Mr. Hersh asked about the traffic study included in the plan and voiced objections to how the study was done and the accuracy of the numbers, indicating that most traffic occurs in the morning and not much traffic happens at night. He complained that there are no new outlets or capacity proposed. Mr. Klein clarified the calculations obtained in the study, and stated that new signalizations and improvements in the area will alleviate some of the traffic problems and improve capacity. Mr. Hersh then questioned how these improvements will be paid for, and will it be by the impact fees. Mr. Slachetka again stated that there is a traffic problem now, there will be further development regardless of the Smart Growth Plan, and that the aim of the Smart Growth Plan is to outline a framework for how to accommodate that growth. Mr. Neiman again said to leave the Spruce Street area out.

Mr. Schmuckler listed several traffic improvements that he thinks should be included in the plan, including a light at Martin Luther and Pine, and Arlington needs to be cut through. Also an emphasis needs to be put on no on-street parking to help pedestrian safety, congestion, and safer driving. Mr. Klein agreed. Mr. Schmuckler stated there should be no parking on Pine Street. Mr. Hersh said there is a synagogue there and people have to park on the street. Mr. Schmuckler said then the synagogue should have its own parking. Mr. Slachetka reiterated that the design of the Charity Tull thoroughway is exactly what they should be considering for the roads in the area, including bike paths and pedestrian paths.

Mr. Hersh stated his final question was where money was coming from for these improvements, and that impact fees should be the primary focus of the plan and should be outlined more specifically with calculations that show impact fees are in adequate amounts. Mr. Slachetka

stated that information is not typically included in planning documents like this. Mr. Hersh also said that improving Vine all the way to Pine isn't going to happen because of the existing building in the right-of-way and wetlands in the area. Mr. Slachetka stated that there is an application by the Township before the DEP to punch Vine Street all the way through and he thinks it's going to get approved.

Martin Shapiro of 611 Spruce Street, appeared and suggested that we should fix the current traffic problems now and then afterwards talk about future development. Mr. Neiman reiterated that there are no funds right now to do street improvements on this scale. This Plan will allow for impact fees and funding from the State. This is how we are fixing the problem. There is an attraction to live specifically in this town, unlike other towns, and we have to have a plan to address the growth that we know is going to happen. Mr. Shapiro said that he and his neighbors bought on Spruce Street because it's beautiful and in his opinion multi-family is ugly, and they want to live nicely instead of in a ghetto.

Sally Wells on Vine Street appeared and asked about the time frame associated with adopting and implementing this Plan. Mr. Slachetka replied that before the end of the year the State will likely have approved the Plan, after which the governing body can begin to introduce new ordinances in the middle of next year. The impact fee ordinance could be put in place prior to that, which is important for improving the local roads where we won't have State or County assistance. Mr. Schmuckler stated that it is crucial for the impact fee ordinance to be done first. Mr. Franklin stated that the infrastructure has to be started before development starts, and some roadwork will have to be bonded. The Township will have to pay for some of this. This problem needs to be fixed.

Rachel Benstein on Vine Street, south of Oak Street, appeared to suggest that Vine will never go through to Pine because of the highschool that sits at Spruce, Vine, and Washington. There has to be an alternative. Her suggestion was to have Washington widened or re-stripped for left-hand and right-hand turns. Also, Vine and Oak corner is a disaster especially for students at the bus stop. A light should be put up at this intersection. She referenced several new schools that are being constructed in the area, which will significantly increase traffic and there shouldn't be any further development because it will intensify the problem. Mr. Schmuckler agreed that a traffic light should be installed at the intersection of Oak and Vine. He asked Mrs. Benstein what she would like to see developed in the vacant land behind her property and she responded that she would like single-family and not multi-family. Mr. Schmuckler stated that for the record, her house is mapped for mixed use in the Smart Growth Plan and she could end up with a supermarket next door. He stated that she has rights too.

Elliot Zaks of 260 Spruce Street appeared to state that he wants his area out of the Smart Growth Plan. Mr. Neiman clarified that the entire town is in the Smart Growth Plan, and what he should be requesting is to be removed from the Oak Street Core. Mr. Zaks agreed. He also indicated that "residential" is a vague term that can be construed to allow higher density housing by nature of the Smart Growth Plan facilitating growth and density overall. Additionally, Mr. Zaks stated that mixed use and multi-family as indicated on the plan around Mrs. Benstein's property is too intense. At minimum, R-12 should be maintained in the area south of Oak Street.



Sam Rabinowitz of South Lake Drive appeared to state that if we don't have a plan for growth, the growth is still going to happen. People live in rented basements because there are not enough available housing units. This progression and growth occurred regardless of the fact that there wasn't more building. It didn't stop the population growth. These people have to live somewhere. We have to do something, and we have to be smart about it. What you can do is say this is where we want growth and this is how we want it, and lay out infrastructure and a plan for improvements and impact fees.

Bill Hobday reappeared before the Board. He opined that the Smart Growth Plan is mostly residential and there should be more of a balance with commercial. Schools are moving into the Industrial Park which should be bringing in money to the Township. We need to bring in industry and commercial, the big-bucks stores that would increase retail and pay us a lot of revenue. Mr. Neiman stated that the Cores call for mixed use, which includes retail. Mr. Schmuckler stated that it calls for commercial as well. Also, we are out of space and should start expanding up, especially considering that a lot of people walk to church, synagogue, school, etc, so they need to be in a concentrated area. Mr. Hobday also stated that the town isn't going to get funding from the state and should be realistic about that. He stated the Township should provide incentives to get ratables and commercial businesses in the town.

Mr. Slachetka added that the background tables predict non-residential development as well, and the idea is to create a balance between the residential and the non-residential.

Noreen Gill of 192 Coventry Drive appeared before the Board and stated that the Planning Board is giving out too many variances and that the Township Ordinances are horrible. She stated that smart growth is a joke and that we cater to developers and planners, and she discussed traffic congestion in various areas. She demanded more homes, more fire hydrants, more EMS, more schools, and for her taxes to go down.

Harold Herskowitz of 1496 Cedar Row appeared before the Board to state that this is a sham and it's not smart growth. The first part of a smart growth plan should be to fix up dilapidated areas first, like Route 88, downtown, Ridge Avenue, Fourth Street. On top of that, we are giving away the Cedarbridge area that is supposed to bring in money, to townhouses which end up costing the town money. The Board's responsibility is to those who live here now, not to those who want to live here in the future. Mr. Malia, acting as Board attorney, redirected Mr. Herskowitz and reminded him that the purpose of this public portion is for questions and perhaps suggestions regarding the Smart Growth Plan, not accusations directed to the Board.

Angie Felton of Read Place appeared before the Board to state that there has been enough growth and no more houses should be built. The Township needs commercial buildings like Target, Boscov that bring in taxes and income. There aren't shops to cater to certain ethnic groups in this town.

Nechama Vassar of 827 Coral Ave appeared before the Board. She commented that there should have been more transparency about this meeting and the Plan. She also commented that there should have been more effort in making sure the public understands what the Plan is. Lastly, in the Oak Street Core there are areas that call for 20 housing units per acre and that sounds like we are going to have people living on top of each other. Mrs. Vassar also referenced an approval for a school next to her house. Mr. Schmuckler stated that he would like

this Plan to repeal the Campus Ordinance and re-write it with proper buffering requirements. Mr. Slachetka stated this could be a recommendation independent of the Smart Growth Plan.

Mr. Slachetka stated as a reminder that the Smart Growth Plan has gone through a number of public hearings and it has been revised and edited along the way and has had extensive public outreach.

Larry Avrin from the Fairways appeared to go on record requesting that no changes be made to Ordinances as part of the adoption of the 2013 revision to the Smart Growth Plan that would bypass any Boards or usurp the powers of any Board, or permit any developers to bypass Board approval for any project. Mr. Neiman asked Mrs. Morris if there were any way for this bypass to happen. Mrs. Morris confirmed that no ordinances would be approved as part of this Plan, they would come before the Committee individually, and additionally that she knows of no projects that could get approval without appearing before a Board. Mr. Slachetka confirmed that would not be allowed by law.

Bezalel Choen from Albert Avenue appeared and stated Charity Tull is a paper street in his back yard. The high density proposed in that area is not smart or a plan. He lives in a certain type of neighborhood and wants it to stay like that. Mr. Neiman stated that it is helpful to have neighbors come out and state this when there are development projects in the area. If no one is voicing concern, we don't know what you want. He commended Mr. Choen for voicing his concern and confirmed that the Boards try to genuinely listen to the neighbor's opinions.

Mr. Schmuckler pointed out that growth can only go into open areas, and that there needs to be growth some place. The point of this plan is to do it the best we can, by including traffic improvements, impact fees, walking paths, bike paths, etc.

Avi Hersh appeared again to ask if there would be any further hearings on this and Mr. Neiman stated he hoped not. Mr. Hersh stated if so then it should be properly advertised in a local newspaper. It was only on the Lakewood Scoop yesterday and not ten days ago like it was supposed to be. Mr. Neiman stated that the legal requirement is to be in the Asbury Park Press or the Tri-Town News and it was.

Joshua Schwartzman of Spruce Street asked why there were not certified mailings to the property owners. Every single property owner where these roads are highlighted for improvements should have been noticed. Kennedy Boulevard doesn't go through, Towers Street doesn't go through, there's many streets that don't go through. Is there a reason for this? Mr. Neiman stated that part of this Plan is to improve transportation and opening certain roads. Mr. Schmuckler asked when Mr. Schwartzman arrived at the meeting because this was discussed already. Mr. Schwartzman says everything is poor planning and other cities have normal roads. Mr. Schmuckler stated this was already addressed.

Mr. Neiman reminded Mr. Schwartzman to tie things up because the meeting will only go until 9 and the Board members have comments to make as well. The public made objections to this statement.

Brian Flannery of Atlantic Avenue appeared and stated that he submitted a written request to have the area where the B6 zone is incorporated into this Plan. He understands that not every

zone needs to be in the Plan, but he thought, especially in light of the fact that the Township owns land there, and this will impact the coverage and development of that land, that if it was associated with the Cedarbridge Center it would be more appropriate. Mr. Schmuckler asked where the B-6 zone is, and Mr. Flannery stated that it is across the street from the stadium and it is listed as a support zone. As such it would make sense to incorporate it into the plan. Mr. Schmuckler joked that it should be included, but only for commercial and not residential. Mr. Flannery thanked the Board for their time that has gone into this Plan, and pointed out that when this Plan was first presented to the public there were a lot more people there and clearly with the small turn-out tonight they have satisfied a lot of people with the changes they have made. Mr. Flannery opined that the worst thing to do would be to have no plan approved.

Geri Ballwanz of Governor's Road appeared and stated that the Planning Board had all of this information for a public hearing that was supposed to be scheduled for June 11<sup>th</sup>. If the Planning Board had all of these documents, why were they not put on the website at that time? Granted, Mr. Slachetka pointed out that they met the legal requirements for the 10 day notice. Mrs. Morris replied that the information has in fact been on the website ever since it was received from T&M, which was well in advance of the June 11<sup>th</sup> meeting. Ms. Ballwanz disagreed. She also stated there should have been more communication between the Committee and the Boards and Stan Slachetka, because the Township sold off numerous acres of land adjacent to Charity Tull Avenue so there's goes the 85' wide right-of-way. She also stated that the Planning Board approved something at the meeting last night regarding Serenity Estates to disjoint the open space from the homeowners. Non-contiguous clustering ordinances need to be carefully written so these crazy little things don't occur. She also had comments regarding the sewer service map that includes all these wetlands and preservation areas, but sewers aren't needed there. Ms. Ballwanz stated that there were townhouses approved along the railroads very close to the tracks so there's no way we are going to be using trains. There's no provision for buffering. It seems like we have all these plans but no one is following them. She stated that there was an approval for a zoning change for a property behind the Exxon on Route 70, and now they can put mixed use there which could be all residential but this is supposed to be a highway node. She questioned two projections in the background tables that were provided. She stated it seemed like with no smart growth plan we will only have 153,000 people but under smart growth we will have 220,000. She referenced the sewer map again as well and stated things are included in there that don't have to be. In the Downtown Regional Center there is a yellow area that is a little league field that is going to be paved for a parking lot, but the drainage is terrible there.

Mr. Neiman closed the meeting to the public. He thanked the public for the input they provided.

Mr. Schmuckler spoke again about impact fees and stated that the Plan needs to be explicit about including them, and that there should be no exception or ways around providing these fees for each development. Mr. Slachetka stated he agrees, however having language regarding specific dollar amounts isn't appropriate for this type of plan and should be under the purview of the governing body. Mr. Neiman again stressed the importance of being explicit about impact fees as part of this plan. Mr. Klein responded that usually impact fees and the determination for those costs are usually a stand-alone additional study. Mr. Slachetka said the Plan should reference the requirement for such a document.

Mr. Neiman stated that the Oak Street Core is essential. Pine Street, Oak Street, Washington Street traffic needs to be a focus of this study. North of Oak Street, there should be no zone changes. That area can stand as a separation from the Cedarbridge Towne Center and the Core south of Oak Street. Allowing townhouses and mixed uses in the area is not appropriate and the traffic is going to be too bad.

Mr. Slachetka stated that by concentrating development in some areas we are able to preserve other open space areas and that is the goal of smart growth and the Smart Growth Plan. He stated that the more taken out of or adjusted in the Core, the less of a Core it is.

Mr. Neiman reiterated that touching Oak Street or changing it at all is not desirable.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the areas highlighted on the map north of Oak Street. In the north east there was discussion about the Charity Tull collector road. The way to get the infrastructure put in place where we want it, this plan will allow control of development of that road. By removing it from the Core, that connector road goes away. Also we will have much less opportunities for clustering and preservation of open space.

Mr. Schmuckler replied that he lives in the Oak Street Core. He drives to work, his wife drives to work, and his gets take 3 different busses to different places across town. Having a supermarket right down the street isn't going to significantly reduce their impact on traffic.

Mr. Slachetka suggested that in specific areas they can request to identify specific densities or single-family residential, and that they can re-affirm the R-40/20 Cluster Zone they can do so.

A motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by to approve this plan with the following changes: north of Oak Street, there should be no changes to the zone at all. South of Oak Street, aside from the part along Route 9, should be totally rezoned to R-10, which allows duplexes and single-family houses. No townhouses, multi-family, mixed use, no variances, R-10. Impact Fees should be included specifically, making sure there are no exceptions to providing them. The following roads need to be improved, looked at, and included in this plan: West Cross Street, Arlington should go through, Martin Luther and Pine and Forest Park should be signalized. Vine Street is crucial. Cedarbridge and Clover Road, going north and south, need to be included. Clover and Route 88 as well. Clover Road, Pine Street should have no parking at all. Any main artery can't have parking on the street. Non-contiguous clustering should be clarified that wetlands and non-useable lands are not credited for clustering in other areas. Any multi-family development should require a 50 foot buffer to the properties around it.

Mr. Slachetka commented that the Board can make any actions they'd like, however he guarantees that essentially you've eliminated the Oak Street Core from the Plan and have therefore substantially jeopardized the mechanism for how we were going to get the improvements needed, as well as jeopardized some of the ways we structured open space, particularly along the Kettle Creek and was critical.

Mr. Neiman stated they spoke with people at the state level and they understood that these changes might be coming and they were fine with it.

Mr. Slachetka reiterated that the higher density in the Oak Street core was the trade-off and incentive for protecting the areas around the Kettle Creek and therefore you've removed the mechanism for preserving those areas.

Mr. Franklin seconded the motion.

Affirmative: Mr. Franklin, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Schmuckler

Abstain: Mr. Follman

Negative: Mr. Rennert

**5. PUBLIC PORTION**

**6. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted  
Sarah L. Forsyth  
Planning Board Recording Secretary