

1. FLAG SALUTE & CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Yechiel Herzl called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Ally Morris read the Certification of Compliance with the NJ Open Public Meetings Act:

“The time, date and location of this meeting was published in the *Asbury Park Press* and posted on the bulletin board in the office of the Township of Lakewood at least 48 hours in advance. The public has the right to attend this meeting, and reasonable comprehensive minutes of this meeting will be available for public inspection. This meeting meets the criteria of the Open Public Meetings Act.”

2. ROLL CALL

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

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

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

4. 2017 DRAFT MASTER PLAN REVIEW

Maps were handed out to the board members including 'Proposed Land Use' revised 9/6/17 prepared by T&M.

Mr. Slachetka said this map is in the Master Plan document which is on file but with the corrections based upon yesterday's discussions.

Mr. Truscott said that is correct, map LU-4.

Mr. Slachetka said this map would replace the existing LU-4 map if the board accepts the changes.

Mr. Truscott said another map before the board is titled 'Current Zoning' which is also a document in the Master Plan. No changes were made to that map.

Mr. Slachetka said that map is identified in the Master Plan as LU-2.

Mr. Truscott said that is correct. The third map in front of the board is titled 'Proposed Land Use Changes'. The proposed land use contains revisions in accordance with the board's comments.

Mr. Slachetka said the proposed land use changes map identifies specific revisions in the existing zoning that would take place assuming that the land use plan was adopted.

Mr. Truscott affirmed, this map was prepared in response to the board's questions last night as they wanted to see how the land use/zoning map would eventually be changed. This is not a document within the Master Plan. This is for illumination and presentation purposes so the board is better informed as to what the proposed changes are. It also illuminates the source of the recommendations in terms of the land use plan changes. The board was especially interested in what changes came from the 2007 Master Plan Re-Examination report so there is a bunch of land use changes based on that.

Said map was labeled B-1.

Mr. Truscott went through the proposed changes:

1. It is part of the open space consolidation of the zone districts they will see more later with the Crystal Lake Preserve and also with the Open Space zone with the town.
2. This is a very small parcel consisting of a NJAW plant.
3. This is part of the Smart Growth core. Existing land uses adjoins multi-family.
4. 2007 Master Plan Re-Examination recommendation.
5. This is just a change in labeling and nothing really changes in terms of the use. The designation will be open space preservation. They are basically consolidating several open space districts into one.
- 6 & 7. The Township Committee adopted an ordinance to update and modernize the boundaries of the commercial areas around the zone to make it more supportive of the airport use. It was adopted but was later nullified due to notice requirements.
8. This change is to recognize existing land use. Mr. Flancbaum said this area is all built out with duplexes. Mr. Truscott affirmed, the zoning map should recognize existing land uses where appropriate.
9. This change is to recognize existing land use.
10. This is a change in labeling only.
11. This zone, along with others, were merged into one new zone and with a different set of uses. Mr. Slachetka said even though they identify them as 6, 7 & 11, essentially that is the entirety of the ABCZ which the Township previously adopted. Mr. Garfield asked what changes are being made to the uses. Mr. Truscott said it is still industrial and commercial type of uses but it mimics what is out there and existing so it really updates and modernizes those uses and merges them into one zone. Mr. Flancbaum said his understanding is the only change is it excludes schools. Mr. Truscott confirmed.
12. This is a small developed area in the downtown.
13. This was one of last night's discussion points. It is located near the Cherry Street area, along Route 88 just west of the County Park.
14. This is a small area in the Oak Street Core and adjoins the existing HD zone. Mr. Slachetka believes these are rear lots that are part of the adjoining business area. He thinks this is intended to rationalize the zoning boundary area.
15. This is part of the Oak Street Core area but this is the preservation part of that so it is zoned to a lower density in that case.
16. This is near the ball field and is being rezoned for lower density.
17. This is part of the Oak Street Core area and is a 2007 recommendation.

18. This is also a 2007 recommendation as well as a 2014 recommendation. Mr. Flancbaum said this area is already built up.

19. The front part is developed but the rear part is vacant.

20. This is an existing land use consisting of apartments.

21. This came up in last night's conversation. It is already built upon so it recognizes existing land use. Mr. Slachetka said there are existing retail uses.

22. This was a recommendation of the Housing Density Subcommittee. It also implements part of the Smart Growth plan because it is part of the highway corridor. Mr. Slachetka said it is in the designated highway node.

23. This was a recommendation of the Housing Density Subcommittee. There are apartments on both sides so the recommendation was to change the zoning to R-10A providing that sewer service was available which they found is the case.

24. This change recognizes existing development.

Mr. Follman asked him to explain the 2007 recommendations.

Mr. Truscott said in 2007, the Planning Board went through a similar process and made some recommendations for rezoning. Mr. Flancbaum said he has counted all but one so far from the 2007 recommendations that are already developed. He doesn't want anyone to think that they are taking 2007 recommendations and now implementing things which were discussed ten years ago but the existing uses are not reflected on the map. Mr. Truscott said there were about 35 recommendations in 2007, the majority of them were not implemented. Mr. Slachetka said there were a few areas not developed which were not recommended by the Master Plan Committee.

25. Change from R-20 to R-20A.

26. This is part of the Oak Street Core/Kettle Creek area so it is going to a lower density to implement the Smart Growth Plan. Mr. Slachetka said those areas including 15, 30, 35, 26 placed outside the sewer service area as part of the discussions with NJDEP that went on during the plan endorsement process. This is also where they have properties in the non-contiguous cluster and also an area where the municipality owns properties outside of the sewer service area were also put into a conservation easement by the Township. Mr. Truscott said 15 is within the sewer service area. Mr. Rennert asked why 15 is being recommended for the change. Mr. Flancbaum said 15 is a park.

27. This is built up already with single family homes. Mr. Follman commented that it is a big jump. Mr. Truscott said the change is to reflect existing land use. Mr. Slachetka said part of the aspect of it is if someone wants to improve their property then instead of having to comply with the R-20 standards, they would have R-7.5 which would be more commensurate of the nature of the development and it would eliminate them from having to come to the Zoning Board for just a simple variance for a shed. Mr. Follman said they could put another house on the property if it is going from R-20 to R-7.5. Mr. Slachetka said the size of the area is very small and it is intended to recognize existing development.

28. This is an existing townhouse development along Chestnut.

29. This is another townhouse development.

30. This is an existing use. Mr. Flancbaum believes these areas consist of Ocean Place, Ocean Pointe and Woodlake Manor.

31. This is partially a 2007 recommendation and then based on the existing zoning, they modified some of those boundaries to make sense.

32. This is a recommendation of the Housing Density Subcommittee. It is part of the Smart Growth core. Mr. Slachetka said it is consistent with the recommendation made in the 2013 Smart Growth Plan adopted by this board. Mr. Follman asked if it is built up already. Mr. Truscott said no.

33. This is an area discussed last night. This change would make it more consistent with the Housing Density Committee's recommendation so this entire area would be R-10 only allowing single family detaching housing. No duplexes would be permitted.

34. This is a recommendation for that core area to provide for residential development. Mr. Follman asked if it is built up already. Mr. Truscott said no.

35. This is a recommendation in the Smart Growth plan which is also part of the Kettle Creek preservation in that area. Mr. Slachetka said there is a mix of publicly owned and privately owned properties in that area. The publicly owned properties have been placed in a conservation easement and both the public and privately owned properties will be used as schedule A properties in a non-contiguous cluster. To clarify, that is not clustering on that site, those would be in a non-contiguous cluster but would be identified for open space purposes. That area is generally preservation but with a base zoning of R-40 but essentially because it is outside of the sewer service area, the only reasonable and realistic development pattern for that would be used in a non-contiguous cluster as preservation and open space purposes.

36. This is in the Oak Street Core area providing for additional multi-family implementing the Smart Growth plan. It adjoins an existing multi-family area. Mr. Slachetka said there is affordable housing in that area.

37 & 38. These are basically overlay and sets certain design standards the Planning Board had talked about in terms of the types of development with the perimeter buffer to set up some of the standards the Smart Growth plan had called for. Mr. Slachetka said 38 is municipally owned property and it was identified in the Smart Growth plan for park area or at least a portion of that. Mr. Truscott said that is correct. There is a water storage tank there as well.

Mr. Flancbaum said there is a section on James Street discussed which is a transition area between the industrial buildings and duplexes. He didn't see that detailed out.

Mr. Truscott said it is highlighted in yellow on the map. There are about 18 acres there that could possibly provide some kind of transition between the industrial and the R-10 area.

Mr. Flancbaum said there was discussion about a transition area maybe to allow for some sort of multi-family on 12,000 or 15,000 sf lots. He wanted to make it clear because it wasn't on the map.

Mr. Truscott said that would be something the board may consider if they wanted to amend the map to include that area.

Mr. Rennert said there are going to be some corrections needed to this map.

Mr. Garfield asked if there was any assessment as to what infrastructure is needed as well as the cost.

Mr. Slachetka said there is no assessment as to the exact impact on the infrastructure. To do that is not really part of a Master Plan process.

Mr. Garfield believes that is something they should look at.

Mr. Flancbaum wants to speak from the perspective of the Advisory Board which recommended some of these revisions. On-site infrastructure costs are going to be 100% on the developer. Off-site costs are going to be part of the impact fee that the Township is going to be collecting and part of implementing these zoning changes is also implementing the impact fee for each development as it comes before the board for approval. The impact fees are going to be part of the zoning changes.

Mr. Herzl said the impact fee should be included in every zone in Lakewood.

Mr. Slachetka said that is part of the recommendations contained in the circulation plan element and utilities plan element. Justin is correct in that there will be a mechanism to collect appropriate fees for both on-site and off-tract and there is the transportation improvement district which the board is recommending to expand Township wide. As part of the plan endorsement process and also as described in the utility plan element, there has been extensive discussion with NJAW, MUA, the regional sewer authority with regards to the existing and planned capacity for both the water and sewer systems Township wide. That was one of the things which was stressed by the NJDEP as being an important component and that they needed assurances. Both the MUA and NJAW are in process of updating and preparing a 10 year plan for infrastructure that would be necessary for water supply within the Township. So from the standpoint of evaluating the capacity based on the projections of growth and the projections of growth provided to all of the utilities, were based upon the growth projections in the Smart Growth Plan. All of the developers are going to have to pay their fair share for the infrastructure necessary to support the growth of development.

Mr. Follman questioned the cost of that.

Mr. Slachetka said that is where Mr. Truscott was very clear earlier. They do not do a monetary evaluation as it is not possible at this stage. That is going to have to be assessed and everybody is going to have to pay for their fair share. To be able to do such a cost estimate on a site by site basis at this point in advance would be exceptionally costly to the Township.

Mr. Flancbaum said for the Township to do site by site cost analysis is not something the Township is willing to spend public money on. From an infrastructure point of view, as each application comes in, escrow accounts are set up and the developer will actually pay for the independent studies as they come in. Through a developer's agreement, that developer is going to have to pay their fair share. That is typically how it is done because the Township is not going to spend money analyzing how much each developer is going to pay.

Mr. Slachetka said that is exactly how it is done.

Mr. Herzl asked if it is the same process at County level.

Mr. Slachetka confirmed.

Mr. Herzl said the County is collecting impact fees in Lakewood.

Mr. Slachetka said yes, when developments come in, they review it and the developer has to pay their fair share of their infrastructure improvements. As noted, they are represented and identified in the TID. From the standpoint of the Master Plan, he thinks they have done the appropriate and adequate evaluation of the overall capacity and then it is a question of doing the cost evaluation on a site by site basis as development takes place. As Marty has indicated, many of the zone changes appear to reflect the existing development and so none of those zone changes have any impact on infrastructure.

Mr. Garfield said he lives in the Fairways and they were required to reduce their water usage by 10%. He questioned how NJAW and the MUA are going to service all of these areas.

Mr. Flancbaum said as the director of the MUA, they do not service the Fairways development. From the perspective of the MUA, prior to the implementation of the Smart Growth Plan, they have done 10, 20 year projections. He knows NJAW has put in millions of dollars into infrastructure improvements to upgrade treatment capacities, meter reading stations, etc. That is something they have been working with the NJDEP and it is part of this plan to adequately supply new development with water and sewer services. If the capacity is not there, then you can't build.

Mr. Follman asked if the infrastructure will be in before development occurs.

Mr. Herzl said the County is implementing to make turning lanes on Cross Street.

Mr. Slachetka does not know who mentioned that previously but he believes that is the case.

Mr. Garfield said the County is drawing up the plans now.

Mr. Slachetka said as part of the approval process, there is going to be a requirement for certain infrastructure to be in place, certainly the water and sewer. In terms of the road improvements, the way the TID works is there is a plan which identifies a variety of necessary improvements of intersections and roadways. Those improvements, to the extent that they are not a direct obligation as off-tract improvements, the developer will have to do. If they are being funded as part of the regional transportation improvement district, once the funding is in place then those improvements would take place. So there needs to be a certain amount of development activity needed to take place for those improvements. However, the plan does provide for a prioritization of the critical improvements that have to take place first. There is going to be a public share of that so it is not just the developers paying for it.

Mr. Garfield said one of the vision statements points is to promote the protection of the Township's natural resources. He asked how developing Eagle Ridge Golf Course with housing would support that.

Mr. Truscott said it is basically finding a balance between development and protection of natural resources. What the Smart Growth Plan called for is a balance in terms of providing for compact development so that you would provide new growth in appropriate locations rather than sprawl development. That is how this plan protects the natural resources. Any kind of development will involve some clearing of land and you always want to provide for some kind of growth but you want to do it in a reasonable, beneficial manner and the compact development provides a mixture of uses as appropriate so that people don't have to travel and are nearby services is a way of protecting natural resources.

Mr. Garfield asked if they studied the amount of increased traffic.

Mr. Truscott said not as part of this Master Plan process in terms of specific traffic study.

Mr. Flancbaum said the board is ultimately going to move a motion to adopt the entire plan once they have a completed document in front of them. This zoning map is one aspect of the Master Plan and it is his understanding that they are basically going to have an acknowledgment of this is either the zoning map they would be utilizing for now and then they would move forward to review the rest of the Master Plan. They are not really going to vote but just basically acknowledging that this is the base map and then they are moving forward.

Ms. Kimberly Bennet said the board can make a motion to adopt these changes in the meantime until an entire plan is adopted as a whole to acknowledge the changes and accept what has already been proposed and that there may be additional changes throughout these discussions before the entire Master Plan a whole is adopted.

Mr. Shlomo Klein asked to speak before the board makes a motion.

Mr. Flancbaum said there was a deception that they brought up on James Street that had R-10A which allows for duplexes on 10,000 sf. He wants to clarify they spoke about duplexes on 12,000, not 10,000 sf. He wants to ensure that is incorporated into this map.

Mr. Rennert believes they should have a revised map before the board.

Mr. Flancbaum only knows of this item.

Mr. Slachetka said his understanding is it would really just be an acceptance as being part of the draft Master Plan and that it was a corrected and clear version of the proposed zoning which would be part of the draft and ultimately voted on next week.

Mr. Flancbaum said if there is additional information presented to them then they could consider it next week.

Ms. Bennet said the board could make a motion now and supplement it later if they get any additional information or they could table it and vote on it as a whole.

Mr. Rennert asked if they are voting on the whole land use element or just the map.

Ms. Bennet said just the map. It would just be an acceptance and acknowledgement of these changes.

Mr. Grunberger asked if there was an explanation for each one of these changes.

Mr. Herzl said yes, before he arrived.

Mr. Grunberger does not feel comfortable voting until he has a full understanding of what these changes are.

The board decided to continue without voting on the proposed zoning map.

Mr. Truscott said the next recommendations came from the Senior Community Needs Subcommittee. He can't speak to this report as he did not attend any of the meetings. The report provided is in the appendix within the Master Plan. Two of the recommendations were included in the Master Plan. Some of the criteria evaluated included:

1. Municipal Services provided to and for Age Restricted Communities.
2. Emergency services and equipment within close proximity to Age Restricted Communities.

3. The quality of Healthcare Facilities, Senior Services and Social Services.
4. The availability of local and long distant mass transportation.
5. Availability of shopping, houses of worship, restaurants, and entertainment facilities in close proximity to Age Restricted Communities.
6. The general quality of life for seniors that reside in Age Restricted Communities.

Specific Concerns and Recommendations:

1. **Reimbursement for Snow/Ice Remediation:** Lakewood Township has a policy to reimburse Age Restricted Communities for Snow/Ice Remediation at the cost that it would have incurred by the Township to conduct the remediation. This is often much less than what Age Restricted Communities actually pay for Snow/Ice remediation services. The subcommittee recommends the Township enter into an agreement with Age Restricted Communities that would allow the community to select a contractor to perform the work but have the contractor bill the Township directly rather than the Age Restricted Community. The Township would get to negotiate a price and payment schedule for Snow/Ice Remediation with the contractor based on a scope of service and rules established by the Age Restricted Community that is served.

Mr. Herzl asked what the difference would be as the Township is paying regardless. Mr. Truscott said it sounds like they want to eliminate going through the Township as it would be more efficient and cost effective. Mr. Rennert asked why isn't the recommendation that the Township choose the contractor if the Township is negotiating with the contractor. It says that someone else is allowed to choose who the Township negotiates with. Mr. Franklin said these are private roads. They took the cost of the snowstorm factoring in the mileage covered and rated the costs then they gave the same credits to the development for however many miles they had and what it cost them. Mr. Flancbaum said he believes the Fairways negotiates their own prices as do other adult communities for snow and ice remediation. The Township reimburses the adult community for the cost of what it would have cost the Township to remediate the snow and ice but many times it costs the Fairways a lot more than what it would have cost the Township. So this report recommends the Township reimburse the Fairways for their actual cost. Mr. Herzl asked why the Township would negotiate the price as opposed to the adult community. Mr. Flancbaum said that is part of the recommendation that instead of the adult community negotiating the price, the Township would actually negotiate the price with the contractor so it is a give and take for both parties and hopefully negotiate a better price. Mr. Rennert doesn't understand if the adult community is picking the contractor, how can they ask the Township to now negotiate with that contractor. Mr. Flancbaum said this was based on practices of surrounding municipalities so it wasn't like this committee reinvented the wheel. Mr. Rennert questioned how the Township could negotiate the best prices. Mr. Herzl believes the Township should have some input in negotiating to get the best price.

2. **Effect of Overdevelopment on Emergency Services:** Over-development is a major concern. This concern focuses on both the impact of density on traffic and other quality of life issues (including the "character of the town" and the loss of open space). Increased roadway congestion impacts access of medical personnel to Age Restricted Communities and movement of patients to medical facilities. Emergency evacuation is a related concern. Despite emergency response times being cited as "good" the subcommittee recommends emergency responders to be in more close proximity to Age Restricted Communities and recommends deeding 1536 Mass Ave for an Emergency Response Annex.

Mr. Herzl asked what is currently on that property. Mr. Truscott believes it is vacant public land. They did include that as a recommendation within the community facilities plan.

3. **Incompatible Development:** A secondary but related issue to overdevelopment is incompatible development around Age Restricted Communities. Properties that abut the Fairways has been and is a major issue with residents. The subcommittee finds that there is an absolute need to protect Age Restricted Communities from some uses on properties that abut Age Restricted Communities, particularly that schools should not be permitted abutting uses. The subcommittee recommends strengthening Ordinance 2015-35 where schools are a not-permitted use and make variances and waivers not permitted for Zone R-40.

Mr. Rennert asked what is currently in that ordinance. Mrs. Morris believes that is the R-40B ordinance which was overturned. Mr. Truscott said for notice reasons. Mr. Flancbaum said this matter was deliberated extensively between the subcommittee members and also at the public hearings. The campus across the street was discussed which is no longer included in this zoning map. Some of the issues they have, particular the Fairways, with some of the schools that are adjacent to their property. There were concerns as to some of the boys venturing onto private property, into people's back yards. This subcommittee was split on this and a consensus was not reached as to what should happen adjacent to these senior communities, whether or not schools should be permitted or not permitted. There were some that said it is beneficial for schools to be adjacent to senior communities and some said it is detrimental. A big issue was you do have school children, whether it is elementary or high school, venturing onto private property. That is a problem the Township has to deal with. They do have existing schools there and there has to be better enforcement. Mr. Herzl said perhaps a larger buffer zone. Mr. Flancbaum said trees don't really work because boys can walk through the trees. He wants the board to understand that it is a real concern. Mr. Follman said that is why they should have a school zone.

4. **Quality of Senior Life:** This Subcommittee feels that there is greater opportunity to more aggressively involve the senior population in the life of its community. The Lake Carasaljo recreation area is severely underutilized by seniors, however no recommendation was given to improve senior's desire to use this facility. Recommendations were provided for the following:
 - a. Lakewood Downtown. The appearance of Clifton Avenue storefronts and the perception of a less-than-senior-friendly downtown is a deterrent to active participation in civic events such as School Board or other meetings and entertainment such as offered at the Strand Theater. Steps should be taken to develop a more senior-friendly environment with restaurants, coffee shops that offer dining opportunities around the Strand Theater that are available before and after theater hours.
 - b. The Lakewood branch of the Ocean County Library is underutilized by the senior population. While the Brick library is 3 miles closer than Lakewood's library to most Age Restricted Communities, seniors in the Shorrocks corridor indicate they would use the Lakewood library if its facilities and parking were expanded.

Mr. Rennert asked if there are any specific recommendations for around Lake Carasaljo or the downtown to restrict certain uses to make it friendlier for the seniors or is it just a general statement that Lake Carasaljo is underutilized. Mr. Truscott believes it is just a general statement and opinion. It crosses several different elements. It could be part of the recreation plan element to provide some activities that would be more senior friendly. Mr. Herzl said right now by Lake Carasaljo, it may be hard for seniors to walk down to the lake because the cars go all the way down. They have to be more considerate to the seniors, perhaps make different traffic patterns going down to the lake.

Parks & Open Space Subcommittee Summary Report

The Parks and Open Space Subcommittee was formed to assist the Lakewood Master Plan Advisory Committee in the identification of existing parks, open space, and recreational opportunities within Lakewood Township, and to provide recommendations for enhancements. As a result of its meetings and discussions, the Parks and Open Space Subcommittee identified the following recommended actions to the Advisory Committee:

1. Lakewood needs to better maintain the recreational facilities that are present, including improvements to pavement and walkways, field maintenance and striping, and to stationary sports equipment such as basketball nets. Costs analyses may help identify priority areas.
2. Lakewood should secure funding for both existing and new/proposed recreational facilities. This can be accomplished by practice of the following policies:
 - a. Establishment of a recreation trust fund;
 - b. Requiring a recreation fee for each new building permit processed (for example, \$25 per building permit);
 - c. Establishing a line item in the budget for the maintenance/repair/replacement of facilities at each park in the Township; and,
 - d. Performing routine monitoring of available funds.
3. Ensure that all existing recreational facilities are adequately serving the needs of residents in the area. The Township should examine its parks to ensure that all parks/fields are being utilized to their maximum potential. All usage permits for parks/fields located in Lakewood need to be issued in and by Lakewood.
4. Consider establishing a Recreation Commission to help oversee Parks and Open Spaces.
5. Post the condition of parks on the Township website (for example, "Out of Order," "Under Repair," "Good," "Better," or "Best").
6. Encourage the establishment of a recreational "Suggestion Box" on the Township Website.
7. Allow electronic scheduling on the Township's website to reserve parks and open space facilities, where relevant.
8. Encourage an "Adopt A Park" program for groups and sponsors.
9. Consider converting and/or preserving the Kennedy Boulevard right of way for parkland. This includes the portion of the right of way east from Squankum Road in the west to the municipal boundary with Brick and Howell in the east.
10. Identify park needs within close proximity to new and proposed residential developments, including at the following locations:
 - a. Cross and Prospect Triangle: Identify Township-owned properties for potential parkland
 - b. Drake/White/Cross area
 - c. James Street area
 - d. Oak Street Corridor: More recreational space is needed. Additionally, vacating the right of way in certain areas is necessary before proposed pocket/linear parks can be completed.

Mr. Rennert asked how many parks does Lakewood have and what that percentage is.

Mr. Truscott does not have a specific number but he believes the percentage of land preserved for parks and open space is about 25%.

Mr. Herzl asked if it is up to the Township Committee to adopt ordinances accordingly.

Mr. Truscott said the Planning Board can support these recommendations so they add a little weight to it.

Mr. Herzl asked if ordinances must be passed by the Township to put these recommendations into affect.

Mr. Truscott said for the most part, a lot of it is operational and administrative.

Mr. Flancbaum said most of these recommendations are not ordinance related, they are really best practice items when you have the amount of parks they have in town. You drive past parks and you see basketball nets all ripped up, simple things the Township could do to enhance the quality of the parks and encourage people to utilize them as they happen to have a lot of beautiful parks. When it comes to scheduling sporting events, there are various groups that play soccer, football, field hockey in the parks. They actually have a representative of a group that said he has about 700 boys that he schedules sporting activities for every year and that is why there is a recommendation to schedule things on the website.

Mrs. Morris thinks one thing that was repeated often at the subcommittee meetings was the lack of staff and available funding to adequately maintain the facilities they have now, let alone expand potentially in the future. One idea focused on, aside from new development which may be required to build more parks or open space in accordance with the ordinance, the possibility of enacting a new fee that would be attached to, for example, every building permit coming in that would go into a parks and recreation management fund or something along those lines.

Mr. Truscott said the potential future use of the Kennedy Boulevard right-of-way was also discussed. The Township is still considering how to address that whether it be for circulation, for recreation or both.

Mr. Flancbaum said that is going to come up in the transportation report also. That is the unimproved portion of Kennedy Boulevard from Squankum Road east of the Brick border. There is currently a 120 ft right-of-way where this report and the transportation report discourages vacating any portion but instead to improve the right-of-way to increase traffic flow and also to utilize whatever is left, perhaps similar to Lake Carasaljo including bike paths, walking paths, additional playgrounds.

Mr. Garfield said there is a right-of-way running from Lakewood to Point Pleasant. It is wide enough where a section of it could be used for parks.

Transportation Subcommittee Summary Report

The Transportation Subcommittee was formed to assist the Lakewood Master Plan Advisory Committee in the assessment of transportation and circulation issues, and to provide recommendations relative to the transportation and circulation element of the Master Plan. The subcommittee conducted several meetings, including a public outreach meeting held on November 22, 2016.

The table below outlines the problems/concerns and accompanying recommended solutions that the Transportation Subcommittee identified regarding roadways.

	<u>Problem/Concern</u>	<u>Recommended Solution</u>
1	School Bus Traffic: Loading and unloading of students from vehicles in the roadway restricts the free flow of traffic.	1. Increase setbacks for schools to allow on-site drop off/pick up areas. 2. Require on-site student loading areas. 3. Consider re-zoning emerging artery roads (e.g. County Line Road, E. Kennedy Blvd.) with the HD-6/7 designation to protect future widening opportunities.
2	Coordination with Ocean County Regarding County Roads	1. Increase communication with the County Engineer to coordinate Ocean County road improvements with Township concerns. 2. The Township Committee should appoint a

		liaison or designate one of the planning bodies to interface with Ocean County officials at least annually to review the planned and needed road improvements.
3	Traffic Flow: Traffic flow in the Downtown area is stymied.	Evaluate the appropriateness of implementing one-way streets in the Downtown (including Main Street to 14th Street, and Lakewood Avenue to Monmouth/Princeton Avenues).
4	Traffic Congestion: There is congestion at the intersection of Route 88 and Clifton Avenue.	Continue to work with the County and the State to resolve traffic problems.
5	Connectivity: Vine Street and Arlington Avenues are not well connected.	Examine roads throughout the Township that can be connected as through streets.
6	Traffic Volumes on Route 9 (River Road)	Consider the feasibility of connecting Sunset Road to Massachusetts Avenue through the Industrial Park to reduce traffic volumes.
7	Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS): Given the unique issues in Lakewood, there is a need for wider streets to accommodate buses and other vehicles on streets that often have parking on both sides	All new developments should require road widths that exceed the RSIS standards.
8	Transportation Improvement District (TID)	Implement the Transportation Improvement District (TID) throughout the town to fund circulation improvements.
9	Connector Roads: Additional connections needed.	Explore additional north-south connector roads, including the possibility of a vehicular or pedestrian bridge over Lake Carasaljo.

Other actions the Transportation Subcommittee recommended that are not mentioned above include the following:

1. Parking

- a. Pave the existing unimproved parking area at the former Little League site to provide additional needed parking.
- b. Create a fund dedicated for parking development and mandate contributions to this fund where variance from a parking requirement is requested for development in the Downtown area.
- c. Evaluate the current Township parking requirements for offices, schools, and houses of worship and other quasi-public uses to identify potential improvements.

2. Mass Transit

- a. Acquire grant funding to increase shuttle bus service.
- b. Endorse the reestablishment of rail service in Lakewood Township through the MOM (Monmouth Ocean Middlesex) Line Passenger Rail service.
- c. Increase transfer routes and service frequency for mass transit options.

3. Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation

- a. Bicycle paths are encouraged where traffic and bikes can be separated.
- b. Evaluate the appropriateness of converting the Kennedy Boulevard East right of way to trail uses in order to improve the town's circulation network and facilities. The potential future uses include:

full or partial road, a multi-segment trail; a greenway, a utility corridor, or any combination of the above.

- c. Sidewalks should be maintained, improved, and supplemented, where appropriate.
- d. The Township should pursue Safe Routes to Schools grant opportunities for improvements to sidewalks in and around school areas.

Mr. Herzl recommends that the Township not vacate any paper streets and they should try to develop as many streets as possible.

Mr. Truscott said there is a circulation plan element with the Master Plan document which has an inventory of all the roads and assessment of different issues and recommendations.

Mr. Flancbaum said this report has a recommendation for a bridge over Lake Carasaljo. He personally doesn't like that idea.

Mr. Truscott thinks the NJDEP may have a problem with it too.

Downtown Subcommittee Summary Report

The Downtown Subcommittee advised the Advisory Committee of pertinent issues relating to the downtown business district of Lakewood. The subcommittee met on September 19, 2016, and February 27, 2017. Members of the public attended both meetings.

The table below outlines the problems/concerns and accompanying recommended solutions that the Downtown Subcommittee identified.

	<u>Problem/Concern</u>	<u>Recommended Solution</u>
1	“Old School” Look: Many of the buildings in the downtown are older style structures and require some modernization, contemporary features, and updates.	Create plan to encourage downtown beautification, including identifying potential grants for remodeling and/or façade improvements, and tax abatements for new construction.
2	Latest Technology: It is important for a business area to have access to the latest in communication technology to conduct its business and for customers shopping in the downtown. Verizon FIOS is currently not available.	Advocate the installation of current technology in the downtown.
3	No Parking Downtown Ordinance: Some areas of the downtown have a severe deficiency in available parking spaces. The B-2 zone district does not require off-street parking for new businesses.	Limit the “No Parking Required” ordinance to the first two stories/floors. Additional stories/floors should be subject to regular parking requirements.
4	Traffic and Bottlenecks: Traffic congestion and bottlenecks are limitations to growth and need to be addressed to spur economic activity. The major downtown circulation area are:	Implement the following traffic and parking improvements: A. A one-way street grid, where feasible. B. Angled parking on Clifton Avenue above 4 th Street.

	A. Clifton Avenue and Main Street B. Clifton Ave Southbound to 5 th St C. South Clifton northbound D. Various portions of 4 th and 2 nd	C. Improvements to the traffic pattern and lane configuration at the intersection of Clifton Avenue and Route 88/Main St. D. Two-sided parking on all streets (including, 1 st , 4 th and 5 th). E. Designated delivery zones at the end of blocks to enable temporary delivery parking.
5	Additional Parking: Parking for customers is always an issue in the Downtown area.	
6	Parking Enforcement: This has been a long debate, with pros and cons on both side.	Continuous, proper, and friendly enforcement would be optimum and is recommended.

The Downtown Subcommittee also offers the following additional recommendations and solutions based on input received from the public after the February meeting:

1. Maintain Town Square as a public space for public gatherings, shows, festivals, and other events, while enabling temporary parking on selected occasions and as necessary.
2. Encourage the development of alleyways in order to alleviate congestion resulting from deliveries on heavily trafficked business streets, where possible.
3. Consider relocating the municipal building to Cedar Bridge Avenue.
4. Consider developing a parking structure in the downtown.
5. Investigate existing parking areas and identify opportunities for increased parking.
6. Evaluate the appropriateness of implementing a Business Improvement District (BID) as a tool for commercial revitalization.
7. Review and evaluate municipal off-street parking requirements to ensure that they are up-to-date and properly address parking generation of applicable land uses.

Mr. Herzl opened to the public.

Mr. Frederick Robison was sworn. He said last night there were deliberations on the zoning map and the Township Attorney had asked him for some additional information on what appeared to be some issues that had not been addressed or possibly missed:

1. The tract of land on which All County Exteriors has been located for decades has been in an M-1 zone. The proposed map shows it to be in a R-10 zone. To the best of my knowledge the landowner did not make any request to have this property rezoned. It is surrounded by the Fairways at Lake Ridge on three sides and Cross Street on the fourth side. There is no apparent reason or justification to create a “pre-existing non-confirming use” for one of the long standing commercial properties in Lakewood. In addition creating a new R-10 zone adjacent to an existing R-40 zone is directly contradictory to the vision statement and land use strategies contained in the draft Master Plan.
2. The area commonly referred to as “The Masters” which is the final section of the Fairways at Lake Ridge, is shown on the proposed map as an R-10 zone. There are no open lots. If the intent of the Board is to properly define established areas then the Masters should be R-40C.
3. Related to # 2, the remainder of the Fairways at Lake Ridge should be changed from R-40 to R-40C to reflect the major subdivision approval.

4. Related to # 3, the same major subdivision approval for the Fairways clustered housing development relied on open space calculations that included the original 18 holes of the Eagle Ridge Golf Course. As such if the Planning Board is going to consistently establish zones that reflect the actual use then the golf course should not have any residential zone designation.
5. Related to #4, there is a section in the draft Master Plan called “Non-Municipal Park, Recreation and Open Space Areas” (P. 63). All three of the golf courses and the Blueclaws Stadium should be included in this section and there should be a comparable ROS (Recreation & Open Space) zone.
6. The former Lakewood Municipal Landfill is not identified as a unique zone. The adopted ordinance and resulting 99-year lease stipulates that it must remain a golf course for 30 years after the methane gas testing is completed. This testing is still ongoing. Because of the landfill closure requirements, and the ongoing presence of methane gas the landfill should be its own, unique zone. It cannot be any sort of residential zone.
7. Augusta Boulevard is a private road owned by the Fairways at Lake Ridge Homeowners Association. Its use as a public roadway is conditioned upon the filed deed restriction that the Eagle Ridge Golf Course remain in place. The use of a private road for public purposes should be at least footnoted on a zoning map.
8. If the Planning Board is going to utilize the Master Plan process to correct the deficiencies that led to prior zoning ordinances being declared null and void then the same standard should be applied to what was the R-40B zone. In this case two corrections are needed. First, the zone deserves to be reinstated. Second the map needs to reflect the original purpose and intent of the ordinance. Eagle Ridge Golf Course was never intended to be part of the R-40B zone. The zone was created for three reasons. The first reason is to re-establish the buffer lost as a result of the sewer line construction that did not occur along Cross Street. Second, it was to permanently prevent another proposal to construct three five story dormitories within 75 feet of multiple Fairways homes. Third it was to prevent the expansion of one or more existing private schools where unsupervised dormitories exist which results in young men trespassing into the Fairways and creating noise during all hours of the night. NOTE: The Fairways never objected to an in-kind replacement of the existing dilapidated home which is serving as a school. It should also be noted that other tax-exempt structures owned by the same party have been “red tagged” for illegal use.
9. Five other differences between the current zoning map and the proposed zoning map were identified by the Planning Administrator. If these changes reflect an “as built” area then the changes are prudent. If there has been no development then a 2007 recommendation is insufficient justification to change the zoning. What was pertinent and appropriate in 2007 is not necessarily pertinent and appropriate in 2017. (Please recall that when zoning changes are made through a Master Plan update there is no obligation to notify the affected property owners. All changes to a zone resulting from a Master Plan adoption should be done with great care.)

The zone numbers that appear on the final zoning map are really an end result or final product. The detailed description of each zone that is contained in the Master Plan, and ultimately the amended Unified Development Ordinance is, potentially, more important than the map.

10. The term “non-family households” is used (P. 4) but not defined. This and other terms deserve to be clearly defined since the definitions have a direct impact on what is a permitted or conditional use in a

zone. It is quite common to include an appendix containing a list of definitions, most of which can be taken from the existing Uniform Development Ordinance. A Master Plan cannot be considered complete or comprehensive without a set of definitions.

11. The first bullet in the Vision Statement (P. 7) states: *“Encourage growth and development in appropriate locations and consistent with established land uses.”* The third statement under “Land Use Strategies” states “Preserve and protect existing viable residential neighborhoods.” These two statements must correlate extremely closely with any changes to the zoning map. As such every proposed zoning change should be evaluated using the criteria outlined in the statements. As such:
 - A. The proposed increase in density west of the Hearthstone neighborhood is incompatible. Access to/from Cross Street is not permitted. As a result, having only one point of access for a high-density zone is inadvisable not to mention unsafe. The remaining point of access would, in all likelihood adversely impact the Hearthstone neighborhood. (Rule of thumb: Never create a difference greater than one when adjusting the zoning of vacant land that is adjacent to an established neighborhood.)The Hearthstone neighborhood is zoned R-12. The proposed change takes the vacant land from R-20 to R-7.5
12. Per the vision statement related to protecting existing, established neighborhoods, the wording of the zoning descriptions should be changed to reflect the fact that schools are a conditional use. This does not prevent schools from being constructed. It does require the school to address the positive and negative criteria which is to say there must be some consideration of the impact on the adjacent properties and surrounding neighborhood. Making this change helps to align the zoning description with the vision statement and land use strategies. (Presumably the Township Committee will honor the work and the decisions of the planning board.)
13. Related to #12 above, Table LU-1: Existing Land Use is based on outdated Mod IV information. Lakewood just completed a comprehensive property revaluation. The table contained on page 14 of the draft indicates there are 85 private school parcels yet we know there are more than 125 private schools in Lakewood. Just as the description of the zones must be accurate, so too should all of the background data be as accurate as possible. (The table shows that there are more “charitable parcels” than schools.)

Mr. Robison said the State passed a statute established in the Lakewood School Transportation Authority which provided a significant amount of money for the transportation of students in this town. That statute also required the construction of sidewalks. Regardless, what they think about the statute, the reality is it only last for 3 years. If the requirement of building sidewalks is not met then the State may not continue funding. He thinks the construction of sidewalks needs to become a higher priority for safety and finance. Deed restricted tree save areas are a function of the CAFRA permit. If they are going to do a full and complete job of recognizing preservation areas there are sanctuaries in animal habitats on Eagle Ridge Golf course that are recognized by the US Fish & Wildlife Service and the NJ Audubon Society. They were established by the prior owner but they exist. In Mr. Franklin's day there was a detailed formula that was used to reimburse the age restricted communities for ice and snow removal. All of the age restricted community land owners paid the same property tax rate that everyone else pays and then they seek reimbursement for the municipal service that the municipality is not providing. In recent years that has gotten to the point where the reimbursement rate is far less than it should be based upon the formula that he used in his day. There are portions of that formula that are now not used. In many respects, the seniors, a fixed income community, are paying twice for snow and ice removal. They are talking about roadways as there is additional work done on the sidewalks and driveways and they do understand that is the homeowner's responsibility. The fundamental point is equity and Mr. Flancbaum is correct in that this matter has been resolved successfully in

adjacent towns. The emergency service need on 1536 Massachusetts Avenue has to be a very high priority before their insurance rates go up.

Mr. Elliot Zaks, 260 Spruce Street, was sworn. In the Master Plan itself, there is a new zone proposed called a R-40A which was not shown on the proposed zoning map. In the Master Plan, it lists all of the new zones proposed but the existing zone of R-40/R-20C is not included in that list. Within the Township itself, the R-40/R-20C is only in three areas. One of them is in the surrounding area on the change of #36 to an R-M zone. Existing over there is the affordable housing, Lakewood Commons, which is a cluster. However, they are adding on a lot more space to that to be townhouses. If you look at the map, what is being proposed, is backing up to all the existing schools which he strongly recommends not to do as there should be some sort of buffer. Townhouses right behind their wedding halls isn't the smartest idea. He suggests the change to R-M should be only on the affordable housing and not expanded greatly. It would also help in terms of traffic as that whole Washington Avenue area is backed up all day. Change #34 is to R-10A which he presumes they are trying to mirror going up across the street in the Oak Street Corridor. He would strongly recommend against that as they are providing a lot more townhouses next to R-40 which would either be schools or single family. The only other part of the R-40/20C which is where he lives, the area around #36, if they want to propose to a new zone of R-40A that would probably be the right place to do it because it would actually be a true R-40.

Mr. Shlomo Klein was sworn. He said there were recommendations to vacate some paper streets but the chairman has previously testified against doing that. The Oak Street Corridor they should vacate for parks, open space but when it came to Kennedy Boulevard, it was recommended that they not vacate the road as it is 120 ft wide and they should have it for parks and open space. The same solution should be done for the Oak Street Core area. He asked why there is no recommendation that when the Township wants to sell an undersized or oversized lot, they do not turn it into a tot lot as they do not have enough in the Township. Next to Oak Street Corridor, the Township is selling a lot. He asked why they don't take that lot and create a park as there aren't enough parks in that area of town. Before doing a private sale, the Township should look into using that property as open space. There is no recommendation concerning sidewalks. He knows there is a traffic problem and it is not being solved. He doesn't understand how the solution for traffic is to make higher density. There are no recommendations in the Master Plan to actually pursue the Township to install sidewalks as it is a part of transportation. The main entrance on the Oak Street Corridor has no sidewalks on either side. The Planning Board approved that development and it is misconstruction. When you improve a road, you should have to install sidewalks on both sides not just on the project's frontages. He said none of the zoning changes were explained as to who requested it and why is it recommended. He said it is the developer's recommendations to increase density. He said recommendation #32 is based on an approval for faculty housing. He believes it is alarming that a reason was not given for each zoning change. He is not against higher density per say but he wants the board to leave themselves negotiation power as far as getting roads improved. He gave a few examples including Hearthstone and Chestnut.

Ms. Carol Suckno, 59 Foxwood Road, was sworn. She said the seniors request that the board reinstate zone R-40 behind Rosewood Drive. The library is something that the seniors use a lot and several years ago they were able to get a delivery truck to bring books to their development. The service was since stopped, most likely due to financial reasons, but she requested that they look into reinstating that service.

Mr. Herzl said the library is run by the County so they would recommend they provide additional services for the senior community.

Ms. Suckno said they also had a mail truck which came once a week where people could buy stamps and people could hand them packages. That is also a much needed service.

Mr. Truscott said those recommendations are in the Master Plan, one about the possibility of a satellite library in the southeast or southwest part of the Township.

Mr. Harold Herskowitz, 1496 Cedar Row, was sworn. He said most of the parks in Lakewood are inaccessible walking wise. On his way home yesterday he noticed there is a large empty lot on Route 9 and 4th Street which had a sign for future townhouses or a bank but he noticed there were at least 40 kids playing on this empty lot.

Mr. Herzl said it is a private lot.

Mr. Herskowitz understands. There is no place for children to play or gather. In other towns wherever they have a cluster of homes, there is a small open space. The board is allowing developments with 100 homes with literally a postage sized stamped lot with a very inferior, small playground and absolutely no place to play. A few months ago the Township gave away one of the only open spaces in this entire area which is a basketball court by Monmouth and 4th. The new owner said he promised to build a recreation center one day. The idea of making Clifton Avenue into a one-way street with diagonal parking is ludicrous. The idea of diagonal parking came up about 10 years ago when the town was still drivable but to do it now would be insane. The only way they are going to improve the downtown is to turn it into a business improvement district and have a commission that enforces everything from signage, types of stores, types of buildings. There needs to be a commission of people who are knowledgeable and understand what a downtown is supposed to look like and that commission has to have full control. He has been trying to get the downtown fixed up for 17 years. He built his building, invested in other businesses which failed because the downtown is a disaster. He is working hard to bring businesses that are going to create a nice atmosphere into the downtown and those businesses are being taken and brought to strip malls on the other side of town. Every development being built is costing the tax payers money. They need a full moratorium now.

Mr. Mark Hurst, Strawberry Lane, was sworn. He believes the impact fee is useless as they are just collecting what amounts to an extra tax from a developer and it is going to be put into some sort of fund and it really won't accomplish anything other than to have more money to spend whatever the Township wants to spend it on.

Mr. Herzl said the impact fee can only be used for upgrading infrastructure.

Mr. Hurst believes it would be more useful for the board to enforce the developers to make the improvements on the spot as they already have the capitol resources in place and then the Township wouldn't have to take the money and bid it out. The Township should make the developers spend the money up front, improve the town while the development is being made and they will end up in a better situation now. It doesn't seem to him that there hasn't been any sort of planning going on for the last 20 years and they now have the town they deserve rather than the town they want.

Mr. Brian Flannery, 257 East Pleasant Grove Road, Jackson, was sworn. Zoning change #32 mentioned earlier was approved by this board and it is more than a campus. It is within the Prospect/Cross core which was slated for development. The Hearthstone zoning change was a recommendation in the 2007 Master Plan. When you look around Hearthstone, there are 8,000 sf lots so it is his testimony that is an appropriate recommendation. There were recommendations from Mr. Robison who is a professional and has advocated for the seniors. He is now going to advocate for the other groups. The 13 items listed in his report are mostly his opinion and not inconsistencies. Item #1 states all county exteriors is shown in an R-10. The first draft that came out showed it in the R-10 and the August 24th map doesn't show it clearly but it doesn't show it changing the zone and his interpretation of the map is it is still in the M-1 that it was in. #2 his interpretation is if you look at the map, it is not changing, it is still in the same M-1 that it is in. #3 said Lakewood does not have an R-40C zone, #4 said the Eagle Ridge Golf Course was mandated by the Fairways development which is not the case. The State allowed 80% impervious coverage and that development, without the golf course, is in the neighborhood of 30% impervious coverage. Per Lakewood

ordinance, you need 50% open space and by the Lakewood ordinance definition, that standalone has more than 50% open space. #5 said that all non-municipal golf courses should be listed as open space. That is taking somebody's property and listing it as open space which in his opinion is not an appropriate use. The golf course has always been its own separate private piece of property which pays taxes and to take that and make it open space would be inappropriate. #6 the municipal landfill right now is a golf course that is paying taxes and the golf course is an R-40 zone which it is currently in and the map doesn't show it to be changed and it shouldn't because the R-40 zone allows golf courses and that's what that is. #7 He doesn't think the Master Plan should concern itself with listing all the private roads in town. #8 There were several ordinances overturned that he didn't hear the Planning Board say they were going to put back in 2014 in the Cross/Drake area there were ordinances that proposed duplexes. On County Line Road, there was an ordinance that allowed retail development. Nobody said across the board, any of them that were overturned for notice issued, where going to be reinstated.

Mr. Herzl asked what an R-40B is.

Mr. Flannery said it was an ordinance adopted which did not allow schools and it was around this development. Rob gives his reasons for it and one of the reasons was political pressure because the seniors didn't want schools. Everybody wants a school zone but not in their backyard. There is the need for the schools, some people want more housing, the need to fix the roads and getting money for that so it's a balancing act. He praised the Planning Board for taking this on. #8 says the Fairways never objected to schools. He did an application for a school and it probably wasn't the Fairways but it may have been people from the Fairways that filed an appeal against it. The Zoning Board approved it and it got appealed in court. #9 the board should look at each 2007 recommendation and if they still make sense then do it or if they need to be adjusted then do that but to just dismiss them because no development has occurred and there is a reason no development occurred because the Township was negotiating with the State on the plan endorsement process. #11 everybody's idea of an appropriate location is different. Mr. Robison's idea of appropriate locations are not going to where it's going to have any impact on the seniors, other peoples definitions certainly relate to the Smart Growth plan that shows where development should occur. #12 the basic thought process on conditional uses is that Planning Board is not going to balance the benefits and the detriments as well as the Zoning Board would by raising it to another level.

Mr. Herzl said even if it is not a conditional use, it is legal to build a school in the zone but if it doesn't make sense then they are not approving it.

Mr. Flannery said the logic behind making it a conditional use is that the Planning Board is going to give variances and approve developments which are inappropriate. That is not true as this board has denied applications in the past. There is a perception that nobody in Lakewood pays taxes, everything that gets submitted is approved and they get repeated over and over again and people think they are facts. #13 if these are wrong then T&M should fix it. That addresses Mr. Robison's report. After attending last night's meeting, it sounded like the board wanted to go through the land use items recommended. There were several items not recommended and he thinks part of that is because either the recommendation wasn't flexible enough or it wasn't understood.

Mr. Herzl said they would hear those changes next meeting.

Mr. Jim Campbell, 6 Rosewood Court, was sworn. He believes the general public thinks they have had enough growth. All the money goes to the developers and they are left with the result of that. He urged the board to limit growth in this town.

Mr. Sam Nebenzahl, 22 Esti Circle, was sworn. The property he lives on is deed restricted A-1. When they initially bought the property, they met with the board and at that time they were assured the property was deed restricted.

Mr. Herzl believes only a judge can overturn a deed restriction.

Mrs. Morris doesn't believe any changes are proposed in that area.

Mr. Nebenzahl said there was a proposal on page 255 but there was a recommendation to deny it.

Mrs. Morris said then the proposed zoning map does not show a change.

Mr. Nebenzahl said that is correct. He just wants the board to be aware there are many neighbors who do not want the zone changed.

Mr. Abe Horowitz, 740 Somerset Avenue, was sworn. He lives on East 7th Street and to the north is R-7.5 zoning, to the south is R-12. He asked that the board recommend the whole block be changed to R-7.5.

Mr. Herzl said they would be addressing any other issues at the next meeting. Tonight, public comment is only what was discussed at this meeting.

Mr. Aaron Hirsch, 146 Mountain View Drive, was sworn. He believes 99% of this town has no clue what they are doing. There is a state law which requires if there is a zone change, then the neighbors need to be notified.

Mr. Herzl believes when the Master Plan Committee meets it gets advertised in the newspaper.

Mr. Hirsch said all of these subcommittees did not have these zone changes and he doesn't understand how they got in the Master Plan. It was not notified to anyone at any of those meetings. The board is supposed to be implementing a Master Plan and no one in this town knows what is going on. He only found out last night that is neighborhood is being changed.

Mr. Herzl asked where he lives.

Mr. Hirsch lives in the Chestnut neighborhood. He can't take New Hampshire/ Route 9 during the day and they just built a shopping center on his corner which made traffic horrendous. He spoke with the County and they said it will be at least two years before they install a light at Chestnut and New Hampshire. He said the Master Plan needs to be available to the public.

Mrs. Morris said the Master Plan along with all of the proposed maps are available on the Township website.

Ms. Patty Robison, 79 Eagle Ridge Circle, was sworn. She hopes the board will take into consideration what more dense housing will do. They need to fix what's wrong with Lakewood and they need to work on it now. She has spoken about the townhouses built on Cross Street near Route 9 with one exit in and out and there is only one set of those townhouses being occupied currently. When all of those houses are occupied, there is going to be no way for those people to get in and out. They talk about expanding Cross Street but there is no way to widen Cross Street right there. The decks for those townhouses are about 50 ft from the road.

Mr. Herzl closed to the public.

Mr. Grunberger asked if T&M could look into the intersection of Spruce and Route 9 as there is a lot of congestion.

Mr. Truscott said as part of the Master Plan process, they do not do a design but they can make general recommendations.

Mr. Klein asked where on the Township website the Master Plan documents can be found.

Mrs. Morris said under Departments, Planning/Engineering, Pending Planning Board Applications.

Mr. Herzl said anything seen by this board is available online.

5. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Sarah L. Forsyth
Planning Board Recording Secretary