

I. CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

Chairman Neiman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance and Mr. Kielt 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. Herzl, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Fink, Mr. Neiman, Mr. Akerman, Mr. Banas, Mr. Schmuckler

3. SWEARING IN OF PROFESSIONALS

Mr. Vogt was sworn in.

Mr. Neiman expressed condolences on behalf of all the planning board members to Mr. Banas on the passing of his wife.

Mr. Kielt said there were 2 changes to the agenda. Item #3 SD 1691 and item #6 SP 1925; both applications were not noticed so they cannot be heard. They will be on the agenda for December 1, 2009 and will be noticed for that meeting.

4. PLAN REVIEW ITEMS

1. SD # 1686 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Levi Steiner
Location: Edgewood Court, west of River Avenue
Block 414 Lot 13
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

No one was present representing this applicant, so item #2 was heard.

Mr. Vogt prepared a letter dated August 17, 2009 and is entered in its entirety. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide existing Lot 13 in Block 414, a 100' X 150' fifteen thousand square foot (15,000 SF) lot into two (2) single-family residential lots of 50' X 150',

seven thousand five hundred square feet (7,500 SF) each. An existing two-story dwelling, slated to remain, is located on the westerly side of the property (proposed Lot 13.02). There are two (2) existing garages on the property. The existing garage behind the existing dwelling will remain and the existing garage in the northeast corner of the lot will be removed. A two-story single family dwelling with a building box of 32' X 55' is proposed on proposed Lot 13.01. The lots are situated within the R-10, Residential Zone. The surrounding land uses are predominantly residential. We have the following comments and recommendations: Zoning- The parcels are located in the R-10 Residential District. Single-family dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. Variances are requested for minimum lot area. A minimum lot area of ten thousand square feet (10,000 SF) is required and both proposed Lots 13.01 and 13.02 are proposed to contain seven thousand five hundred square feet (7,500 SF). Variances are requested for minimum lot width. A minimum lot width of seventy-five feet (75') is required and both proposed Lots 13.01 and 13.02 are proposed to be fifty feet (50') wide. Variances are requested for the minimum side yard setbacks on proposed Lot 13.01. A side yard setback of ten feet (10') with an aggregate of twenty-five feet (25') is required and a proposed side yard setback of nine feet (9') with an aggregate of eighteen feet (18') is proposed. A variance for the minimum aggregate of the side yard setbacks is required for proposed Lot 13.02. An aggregate of the side yard setbacks of twenty-five feet (25') is allowed and an aggregate of the side yard setbacks of 24.1' is proposed. The proposed side yard setback of the front easterly corner of the existing dwelling to the proposed property line is 12.0'. The existing side yard setback of the rear westerly corner of the existing dwelling to the existing property line is 12.1'. Dimensioning shall be to the nearest hundredth of a foot to provide the exact amount of the required variance and the proposed setback lines adjusted on the drawings to minimize the extent of the variance. An existing nonconformance will be retained by the existing garage remaining on proposed Lot 13.02. The existing garage is an accessory building requiring minimum rear yard and side yard setbacks of ten feet (10'). The existing rear yard nonconformance of 2.8' and the existing side yard nonconformance of 3.0' are proposed for continuance with this minor subdivision application. The plan contains a note that states "Architectural dimensions of proposed structure are not known at this time". However, the building box (32' X 55') as shown will provide 23.5% coverage for proposed Lot 13.01 which complies with the twenty-five percent (25%) allowable coverage. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances. Review Comments- The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for a single-family dwelling when the number of bedrooms is not specified. The proposed number of off-street parking spaces (driveways) for each lot has not been addressed. However, it appears that the driveways for both proposed lots have room for at least three (3) off-street parking spaces. Testimony shall be provided and dimensioning added to the plan. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. Sidewalk and curbing exists along the entire property frontage. The existing sidewalk and curbing is in poor condition and should be replaced. The appropriate construction details shall be added to the plan, including proposed driveways. Per review of the subdivision plan, it is assumed the existing dwelling unit is served by public water and sewer. An existing water meter is shown. The proposed dwelling unit on proposed Lot 13.01 shows proposed water and sewer connections. Proposed grading information is provided. Building corner and finish floor elevations are shown for the dwellings. More detailed grading information will be necessary for the forthcoming plot plan on proposed Lot 13.01 (if the minor subdivision is approved). Per review of the plans and our 8/14/09 site inspection, stormwater will continue to flow from these properties onto the adjoining lots to the rear of the site. Testimony should be given regarding measures (if any) to offset the anticipated increase in runoff. No shade trees are proposed even though a deciduous tree planting detail is shown. A six foot (6') wide shade tree/utility easement should be provided on the subdivision plan (unless waived by the Board). An existing chain link fence crosses the existing property line between proposed Lot 13.02 and existing Lot 14. The disposition of the fence must be addressed. The

proposed rear property lines must be dimensioned. The signature block indicating the proposed lot numbers have been approved by the Lakewood Township Tax assessor must be signed. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required, including but not limited to setting monuments for the proposed lot line. Should approval be granted, the monuments shown to be set must be in place prior to signing the map for filing with the County. Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: Ocean County Planning Board; Water and Sewer Approvals (prior to occupancy); Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); and all other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Surmonte appeared on behalf of the applicant. He said they have a 15,000 sf lot in the R10 zone to create 2 – 50x150 ft. lots. There is an existing dwelling with 2 garages in the rear. They propose to keep the existing dwelling on the west lot and the garage. Proposed lot 13.01 has a garage in the back of the lot which they will remove and propose a new single family dwelling in line with the existing house to the left. They will be seeking side yard setback variance for the new home and they will show the board that the lots they are asking for are in conformance with the trend of the neighborhood. Mr. Surmonte said he agrees to comply with the technical requirements in the professional's letter.

Mr. Neiman said the board likes to see a tax map of the lots within 200 ft. to see that it is consistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Vogt said an aerial would show the development and Mr. Surmonte agreed.

Mr. Banas said he sees a fence and asked what will happen to it; it is located in the southern end of the property and crosses the 2 lots and Mr. Surmonte said it will be removed and the revised plans will indicate that.

Motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Fink, to advance to meeting of November 17, 2009

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Fink; yes, Mr. Neiman; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Schmuckler; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

2. **SD # 1690** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Chaim Abadi
Location: southwest corner of Central Avenue & Hollywood Avenue
Block 284.18 Lot 3
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Mr. Vogt prepared a letter dated August 20, 2009 and is entered in its entirety. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing 21,225 square foot lot into two (2) proposed residential lots, using the same configuration before consolidation by the tax assessor's office. The existing property, Lot 3, is an existing vacant tract with some large trees on the site and frontages on two (2) streets. Central Avenue borders the property on the north side and is a County Road with a sixty-six foot (66') wide right-of-way. Hollywood Avenue borders the site to the west and is a municipal road with only a forty foot (40') right-of-way in front of the site. The applicant proposes to subdivide the property into two (2) residential lots. Proposed Lot 3.01 will be a corner lot containing 10,565 square feet and have frontages on Central Avenue and Hollywood Avenue. Proposed Lot 3.02 will contain 10,660 square feet and have frontage on Hollywood Avenue. Variances will be required for lot area and lot width on both proposed lots and variances will be required on proposed Lot 3.01 for front yard and rear

yard setbacks. No road dedications and improvements are proposed for Hollywood Avenue. The proposed lots are situated within the R-12, Single-Family Residential Zone. The surrounding land uses are predominantly residential. No construction is proposed with the minor subdivision application. We have the following comments and recommendations: Zoning- The parcels are located in the R-12 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. Per review of the application, Subdivision Map, and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: Minimum Lot Area – twelve thousand square feet (12,000 SF) is required and 10,565 square feet is proposed for New Lot 3.01 and 10,660 square feet is proposed for New Lot 3.02. Minimum Lot Width – ninety feet (90') is required and 70.44' is proposed for New Lot 3.01 and 75.49' is proposed for New Lot 3.02. Minimum Front Yard Setback – thirty feet (30') is required and twenty-five feet (25') is proposed along the Hollywood Avenue frontage of New Lot 3.01. Minimum Rear Yard Setback – twenty feet (20') is required and ten feet (10') is proposed for New Lot 3.01. Per review of the application, Subdivision Map, and the zone requirements, the following waivers are required: Road Widening Dedication – The half right-of-way width of Hollywood Avenue in front of the site is twenty feet (20'), where twenty-five feet (25') is required. Therefore, a five foot (5') wide dedication would be required for compliance. It should be noted that if a waiver from the road widening dedication is not granted, the magnitude of all the variance requests would be increased except for the minimum rear yard setback. The existing right-of-way width of Hollywood Avenue is fifty feet (50') further south of the subject property. Construction of Curb and Sidewalk along Hollywood Avenue – construction of curb and sidewalk for all roads is required and no curb and sidewalk is proposed along the Hollywood Avenue frontage of the property. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances and waivers. Review Comments- The NJ R.S.I.S. requires 2.5 off-street parking spaces for a single-family dwelling when the number of bedrooms is not specified. The parking data on the plan incorrectly lists two (2) off-street parking spaces are required and proposed, while the application lists three (3) off-street parking spaces for the proposed lots are provided. Therefore, the zoning table shall be corrected. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. We note that sidewalk and curbing exists along the property's Central Avenue frontage. No improvements are proposed along the Hollywood Avenue frontage. Waivers have been requested for no road dedications or improvements along the Hollywood Avenue frontage. Per review of the subdivision plan, we note that the proposed lots will be served by public water and sewer supplied by New Jersey American Water Company. The lot numbers should be consistent with the numbers assigned by the Tax Assessor. A proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement is shown along the Hollywood Avenue frontage. No easement is shown along the Central Avenue frontage of the property since a County Sight Triangle Easement is proposed which would preclude any shade tree planting. No shade trees are shown within the proposed six foot (6') wide shade tree/utility easement on the Hollywood Avenue frontage of the subdivision plan. Shade trees should be provided to the satisfaction of the Board (or waiver sought). Bearings, distances, and areas must be provided for the proposed shade tree and utility easements on the proposed individual lots. A proposed Sight Triangle Easement dedicated to Ocean County is depicted at the intersection of Central Avenue and Hollywood Avenue on proposed Lot 3.01. Two (2) existing large trees within the proposed easement and its extension into the right-of-way of Hollywood Avenue should be removed. Existing contour lines are missing within the pavement area of Hollywood Avenue and must be added. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Should approval be granted, the necessary monuments to be set (for the proposed lot line) must be in place prior to signing the map for filing with the County. Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: Ocean County Planning Board; Water and Sewer Approvals (if necessary); Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); and all other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. Chaim Abadi was representing himself and said the application is for a minor subdivision of land that was originally 2 lots from a previous subdivision that was merged by the tax assessor's office. They have no documentation to explain the merge and now they are coming in for a subdivision. The lot is an "L" shaped lot and will be for undersized lots. Mr. Abadi said he read the reports and has no problems meeting the recommendations in the report.

Mr. Schmuckler asked how many off street parking spaces will be provided and Mr. Abadi said 4 for each lot.

Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Herzl, to advance to meeting of November 17, 2009

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Fink; yes, Mr. Neiman; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Schmuckler; yes

3. SD # 1691 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Sam Bauman
Location: Lakewood New Egypt Road-west of Pine Circle
Block 261 Lots 3, 3.01
Minor Subdivision to create 3 lots

Carried to December 1, 2009

4. SD # 1692 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: JG Ridge
Location: southeast corner of Leonard Street & Park Avenue
Block 228 Lot 2
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Mr. Vogt prepared a letter dated October 8, 2009 and is entered in its entirety. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing L-shaped 12,346 square foot lot known as Lot 2 in Block 228 into two (2) proposed residential lots. All existing improvements on the property, including a two-story frame dwelling and an existing garage would be removed. Proposed Lot 2.01 would become a 4,846 square foot corner lot fronting on Park Avenue and Leonard Street. Proposed Lot 2.02 would be created as a 50' X 150', 7,500 square foot lot with frontage on Leonard Street. The site is situated within a residential area. Curbing exists along the entire frontage of the property. Sidewalk exists on the Park Avenue frontage, but not the Leonard Street frontage. However, there is existing sidewalk across the adjoining property on Leonard Street and sidewalk is being proposed across the Leonard Street frontage of the site. We have the following comments and recommendations: Zoning - The parcels are located in the R-10 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: Minimum Lot Area (proposed Lots 2.01 and 2.02, 4,846 SF and 7,500 SF are respectively proposed 10,000 SF is required) – proposed conditions. Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lots 2.01 and 2.02, 50 feet is proposed for both, 75 feet is required) – proposed condition. Minimum Front Yard Setback (proposed Lot 2.01, 15 feet is proposed from Leonard Street, 30 feet is required) – proposed condition. Minimum Side Yard Setback (proposed Lots 2.01 and 2.02, 5 feet and 7.5 feet are respectively proposed, 10 feet is required) – proposed

condition. Minimum Aggregate Side Yard Setback (proposed Lot 2.02, 15 feet is proposed, 25 feet is required) – proposed condition. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. Review Comments- The minimum lot width in the zoning table for proposed Lot 2.01 shall be corrected to fifty feet (50'). The definition in the UDO states that lot width is the mean horizontal distance between the side lines measured at right angles to its depth. Based on the proposed footprint shown for proposed Lot 2.01, the lot coverage shall be corrected to twenty-two percent (22%). The percentage is within the allowable coverage. The proposed dwelling on proposed Lot 2.01 will be served by a new driveway from Park Avenue, which provides four (4) parking spaces. The proposed dwelling on proposed Lot 2.02 will be served by a new driveway from Leonard Street, which provides four (4) parking spaces. Testimony should be provided as to whether basements are proposed for either of the new dwellings. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. The plan depicts the existing curbing along the frontage of the entire site, and sidewalk along the Park Avenue frontage. Sidewalk is proposed along the Leonard Street frontage. An existing driveway serving the existing dwelling and garage will be removed along with those structures. Full height curb will replace the driveway cut to be removed and should be noted on the plan. Depressed curb and driveway aprons are proposed for the new driveways. The proposed aprons should extend to the back edge of the sidewalk to insure reinforced six inch (6") thick concrete is installed to the proper locations. The existing concrete is in fair condition and should be replaced at the direction of the Township Engineer. Accordingly, a note shall be added to the plan. According to the plan, the proposed sidewalk along Leonard Street requires the removal of a large diameter tree. However, based our site investigation on 9/25/09, the existing tree appears to be much smaller than designated. The base map may require correction. Preservation of other large existing trees on the site should be addressed. Detectable warning surface must be added to the existing handicapped ramp at the intersection. The appropriate details shall be added to the plan. Existing and proposed grades are provided on the subdivision plan. Additional spot elevations are necessary for the proposed driveways and off-street parking spaces for both lots. Additional grades are required to ensure there are no adverse impacts on adjoining lots. The plan indicates proposed water and sewer connections for proposed Lot 2.02. The plan also indicates that proposed Lot 2.01 shall utilize the existing sewer lateral and water service from the dwelling being removed. Depending on the locations of the services, this may not be feasible since the proposed dwelling is in a different location. In any event, trenching and road repair construction details must be added to the plan. Proposed lot numbers must be assigned by the Tax Assessor and the plat signed by the Tax Assessor. A six foot (6') wide shade tree and utility easement has been provided on the plan for the property's frontage. Bearings, distances, and areas must be provided for the easement. Four (4) shade trees are being provided. A sight triangle easement is proposed for the intersecting streets. Testimony is required as to how the dimensions of the easement were determined. Survey information for the proposed easement must be completed. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: Ocean County Planning Board; Water and Sewer Approvals (if necessary); Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); and all other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. John P. Doyle Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant and said this is an oversized, "L" shaped lot with frontage on Leonard Street and Park Avenue. The applicant seeks to note and use the benefit of having 2 separate street frontages to create a lot which would have a dwelling fronting on Leonard Street and create a second lot that would front on Park Avenue. The lots

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 13, 2009
MEETING**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD
PLAN REVIEW**

provide for the variances and they will provide testimony at the public hearing. He said they can respond to all the comments in the professional's report.

Motion was made by Mr. Herzl, seconded by Mr. Fink, to advance to meeting of November 17, 2009

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Fink; yes, Mr. Neiman; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Schmuckler; yes

Mr. Percal arrived at the meeting

5. **SD # 1693** (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Samuel Greenes
Location: Princewood Avenue & Netherwood Drive
Block 432 Lot 1.03
Minor Subdivision to create 2 lots

Mr. Vogt prepared a letter dated October 5, 2009 and is entered in its entirety. The applicant seeks minor subdivision approval to subdivide an existing (irregular) 17,890 square foot lot known as Lot 1.03 in Block 432 into two (2) proposed residential lots. An existing two-story frame dwelling on the property will remain on proposed Lot 1.05, which will become a 10,342.25 square foot lot fronting Princewood Avenue. Proposed Lot 1.04 would be created as a 7,547.75 square foot lot with frontage on Netherwood Drive. (Plan corrections are required to the proposed lot areas.) The site is situated within a residential area. The improvements to Princewood Avenue end after the property frontage, this includes curb and sidewalk. Netherwood Avenue is not yet constructed along the frontage of Proposed Lot 1.04, but is proposed (including curb and sidewalk) by others. We have the following comments and recommendations: Zoning- The parcels are located in the R-12 Single-Family Residential Zone District. Single-family detached dwellings are a permitted use in the zone. Per review of the Subdivision Map and the zone requirements, the following variances are required: Minimum Lot Area (proposed Lots 1.04 and 1.05, 7,547.75 SF and 10,342.25 SF are respectively proposed, 12,000 SF required) – proposed conditions. Minimum Lot Width (proposed Lot 1.04, 79.45 feet proposed, 90' required) – proposed condition. Minimum Front Yard Setback (proposed Lot 1.04, 20 feet proposed, 30 feet required) – proposed condition. Minimum Rear Yard Setback (proposed Lot 1.05, 10 feet proposed, 20 feet required) – proposed condition. It appears that the 20 foot front yard setback variance requested for proposed Lot 1.04 can be reduced or eliminated by relocating and/or reducing the size of the proposed dwelling footprint. Testimony must be provided to justify why the Board should approve this variance as proposed. The applicant must address the positive and negative criteria in support of the requested variances. At the discretion of the Planning Board, supporting documents may be required at the time of Public Hearing, including but not limited to aerials and/or tax maps of the project area and surroundings to identify the existing character of the area. Review Comments- The existing dwelling on proposed Lot 1.05 will be served from an existing concrete driveway, which provides at least four (4) parking spaces. As indicated on the subdivision plan, four (4) spaces are proposed for the proposed dwelling on Lot 1.04. Testimony should be provided as to whether a basement is proposed for the new dwelling. Parking shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Board. The plan depicts the existing curbing, sidewalk and apron serving the existing dwelling on Lot 1.05 (along Princewood Avenue), all of which are in good condition and do not require repair. Existing and proposed grades are provided on the subdivision plan. Additional spot elevations are necessary for the proposed driveway and off-street parking

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 13, 2009
MEETING**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD
PLAN REVIEW**

spaces for Lot 1.04. Proposed Lot 1.04 is being filled and grading is proposed on adjoining lots; this must be addressed. The plan indicates proposed paving, water, sewerage, sidewalk and curbing along Netherwood Drive, to be installed as part of an “approved plan by others”. The approved plan is referenced on Note #10 of the plan. Testimony must be provided by the applicant’s professionals regarding the timing of this work, and by whom. If this subdivision is approved by the Planning Board, a condition of approval should be included that all necessary road, sidewalk and utility work along the property’s Netherwood Drive frontage must be complete and approved by the Township and other applicable agencies prior to any applications for Certificate of Occupancy for proposed Lot 1.04. Proposed lot numbers must be assigned by the Tax Assessor and the plat signed by the Tax Assessor. A six foot (6’) wide shade tree and utility easement has been provided on the plan for the property’s Netherwood Drive frontage, but not the Princewood Avenue frontage. Shade trees should be provided (unless waived by the Board). Mature trees are indicated on the subdivision plan. Based on available information, several mature trees, including one (1) 32” diameter tree will be removed for the development of Lot 1.04. Compensatory plantings should be provided in accordance with the Township Code (if applicable). Additionally, protective measures around mature trees to remain (e.g., snow fencing at drip lines) should be provided. Compliance with the Map Filing Law is required. At a minimum, monuments or pins are necessary for the proposed lot subdivision line, and at all property corners. Outside agency approvals for this project may include, but are not limited to the following: Ocean County Planning Board; Water and Sewer Approvals (if necessary); Ocean County Soil Conservation District (if necessary); and all other required outside agency approvals.

Mr. John P. Doyle Esq. appeared on behalf of the applicant. He said this is an oversized lot and there is an existing house which fronts on Princewood Avenue but the lot runs beyond the existing house and is a double frontage lot- it runs back to Netherwood Drive. Netherwood Drive is not an existing improved street but there is an existing approval that has been granted that will result in its’ improvement. If that were not to happen, than this applicant would have to do what the other applicant is required to do. The timing schedule needs to be part of the condition of the resolution if it is approved and they acknowledge that. They are seeking to have a separate lot that comes close to meeting the requirements of the ordinance and the will prove the merits variances at the public meeting with testimony.

Mr. Banas asked what Mr. Doyle meant by “almost coming close to the variances” and Mr. Doyle said the testimony of the planner will speak for itself and this is in an R12 area where 12,000 sf is the requirement but in this area it was a cluster area where most of the lots are 8,000 sf.-the lots in question here are 7,000+ and 10,000+ sf and they believe their proofs will be shown at the public hearing that is consistent with the area.

Mr. Neiman said because it is neighborhood, the board is going to ask to see the different lot sizes in that neighborhood. Mr. Doyle said they will comply.

Motion was made by Mr. Akerman, seconded by Mr. Schmuckler, to advance to meeting of November 17, 2009

ROLL CALL: Mr. Herzl; yes, Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Fink; yes, Mr. Neiman; yes, Mr. Akerman; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Schmuckler; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

Item #1 was heard next.

6. SP # 1925 (Variance Requested)
Applicant: Yeshiva Keter Torah
Location: Squankum Road, north of Apollo
Block 104 Lots 13 & 54
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan for proposed high school

Carried to December 1, 2009

5. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

1. Community Vision and Smart Growth Plan

Mr. Neiman said planning boards are required by the State Planning Commission to look at the different areas of the Township and together with the community, come up with a vision on what is the best plan to develop those areas. In Lakewood, there are about 1,000 acres of undeveloped land- a lot of it is very sensitive-wetlands, etc. and some areas for growth. Together with the town planners and the residents, they are to come up with some type of smart growth plan for the areas that are still left.

Mr. Slachetka appeared from T&M Associates. He said this was a special opportunity that many communities do not have often and that is to take a step back and take an opportunity to establish a vision for the future for their communities. He said they will be talking about some of the issues and concerns with regards to growth and what they anticipate what will be happening within the next 10-20 years and they will get a sense of the urgency and the need to prepare a plan that addresses that growth while having the opportunity to preserve important natural resources within Lakewood Township. Lakewood is a steward of many of the regional environmental resources in the Ocean County and they also need to accommodate new growth and development in a way that is "smart growth" and sustainable growth. This is a moment the public has to set the future vision of Lakewood Township in how they live and work in this community together over the next 20 years.

Mr. Slachetka set up a screen and said the smart growth plan is posted on the township web site and it has all the maps and information and copies are available in the township offices. The planning board will be voting on or modifying or rejecting the vision statement of the smart growth plan. Ultimately the Township Committee will vote on this in 2 days at their meeting to adopt this but they are looking at the public for input as well. Smart growth is defined as a variety of different land uses; a compact cluster community design, walk able neighborhoods, a distinctive attractive community offering a sense of place, which offers the ability to live and work and interact with other members of the community. It also includes open space, farmland preservation and scenic resource preservation. Future development is strengthened and directed towards communities where there is existing infrastructure. There are a variety of transportation options and he will talk about how this plan provides for an enhanced road network and opportunities for pedestrian and bicycle linkages as well as mass transit opportunities. There were 4 vision workshops that built up to this plan as well as tonight and also on Thursday there will be another opportunity and ultimately all the plans and ordinances and other types of enactments that are necessary to implement the plan all will have opportunities for meaningful public input. Whatever decisions are made have to be fiscally

responsible and supported with the resources available. They also have a range of housing choice and opportunity which is fundamental in terms of smart growth and what it is intended to do is to further focus Lakewood Township into a smart growth approach moving forward over the course of the next 10-20 years.

Mr. Slachetka had some displays for the public to view: one was an aerial photograph of Lakewood which they cut out the surrounding municipalities and he said they used it as a foundation and base for all their mapping. He said nearly 2/3 of Lakewood's land area is under the jurisdiction of NJDEP Coastal Area Facility Review Act (CAFRA) and the smart growth plan that is adopted within that 2/3 area. The township also contains one of the largest urban enterprise zones (UEZ) in the state and it covers the 2 industrial parks as well as the highway corridors and the airport so Lakewood plays an important employment role for the region.

Mr. Slachetka said what the residents of Lakewood have been experiencing is a significant amount of growth. Lakewood is approximately 25 square miles in total area and Ocean County is 636 square miles and the State is overall is a little less than 7500 square miles. The current population of Lakewood is 86,770 right now and that compares to 565,000 in Ocean County and 8.6 million in the State. The township is a relatively developed community and the average household size is 3.2 and the average family size is 3.9 bases on 1987 data and he suspects that is certain areas (block by block) that family size is significantly higher. Right now there are about 28,000 housing units which include about 8,000 within the senior communities. Over time there have been significant trends that have taken place over the last decade; in 1980 the population was 38,000 but if you look at the progression over the decades it went from 38,000 to 45,000 between 1980-1990 which is an increase of 7,000; between 1990-2000 you went from 45,000 to 60,000 which is an increase of 15,000, and then from 2000-2007 it went from 60,000 to almost 87,000 which is an increase of 27,000 in that 7-8 year period. Mr. Slachetka said he anticipates within the next decade-to the 2010 census, that there will be a 30,000 increase in population from 2000-2010. Lakewood has been sustaining a 50% growth increase over the last several decades. Lakewood birthrates are the most substantial contributor to the population growth; looking at 2005 the birthrate was 44.4 births per 1,000 and that is 4 xs as high as the statewide average and 25% as high as any other community in the State. In 2005, births to Lakewood women was 3,000 (with corresponding 697 deaths) making the net natural increase of 2,300. In 1999, the number of births were 1,700; in 2000-1,900; in 2001-2,200; 2002-2,300. Each year over the course of that decade there has been an increase in the number of births by several hundred and they anticipate it is closer to 3,500+ now per year. In the decade between 1999-2008 there were about 4,800 new housing units given C/O's and if you look at it in terms of housing needs Mr. Slachetka believes it is not keeping pace with the population growth.

Mr. Slachetka said if you look at the figures, you are looking at reasonably an increase in population of 50,000 between 2010-2020 and another 80,000 between 2020-2030 and this vision plan is for a 20 year horizon and given that level of growth, to satisfy the housing needs you would need an additional 26,000 housing units which is a doubling of the existing housing stock. In the short term there needs to be a plan and policy put in place to support the housing, public services, community services, parks & recreation, infrastructure, road network, etc. to support and sustain the community over that period of time and it must be done in a way that is smart and sustainable. You cannot develop every inch of Lakewood and you can't preserve every inch either but they are trying to develop a way to balance it.

Mr. Slachetka said there is map in the plan that shows the existing land use in Lakewood and showed a display to the public. He said Lakewood is a fairly developed community-there are only a few areas that exist that will be able to support any new growth and development. Mr.

Slachetka said they identified 3-4 opportunities for growth that must be balanced with preservation. The Cedar Bridge Re-Development Area is one area; the areas north and south of Oak Street; the Cross and Prospect Street, west of Massachusetts Ave which forms a triangle; the downtown and along highway corridors which might provide opportunities for new re-development activities. He said outside of those areas, they fall into 2 categories: they are already developed with residential or commercial and there are other areas that are targeted for preservation because of their importance as a natural resource and environmental sensitivity. Mr. Slachetka read some passages of the adopted re-examination of the Master Plan and said the idea is to encourage growth and development in appropriate areas and consistent with existing land uses; smart growth and planning principles, improve the function of the Route 9 corridor, strengthen the downtown area, provide sufficient educational and recreational facilities, provide housing to meet the needs of the population and promote the protection of natural resources.

Mr. Slachetka said the smart growth plan as shown in figure 3.1 has several components; the downtown regional center, the Cedar Bridge Re-development area which is proposed as a town center, around Oak Street and the Cross- Massachusetts-Prospect Street triangle which they are looking to revitalize it consistent with smart growth planning principles. In addition there are also the 2 industrial parks recognized as a concept in the State plan.

Mr. Slachetka went through each area briefly. He said the maps are drafts and there is opportunity to adjust and tweak along the way based on input from the community and interaction with the state agencies. The idea in terms of the downtown regional center is to implement the approaches they have talked about previously such as providing for a diversity of services, retail shops and restaurants, a variety of housing types, making it pedestrian friendly, doing traffic circulation improvements, providing sufficient parking, looking at redevelopment opportunities (Franklin Street), looking for a comprehensive economic development plan for the downtown and looking at the potential for sustainable design and greener buildings. The next area of development is the Cedar Bridge Town Center. Originally it was approved as a corporate office park and it was targeted by the Office of Smart Growth who said they did not want it to be a single use area; they want it to promote smart growth. They decided it needed to be a mixed use center with a combination of residential and non residential uses and look at the opportunity to build upon the existing ball field. The land use plan is a large area of open space in the northwestern portion which is targeted for preservation and the remaining area which builds upon the existing road network there would be a mix of uses including a mixed use core and a linkage to a parkway and boulevard down to the Oak Street core providing access into this mixed use center which would have a town green anchored on 2 ends by public uses and on either side having a mixed use. Ultimately there would be a location to have some kind of transportation to the downtown and these types of areas would alleviate the burden of the existing road network. The idea is to bring that compact community form with a mix of uses with preservation. He also suggested the possibility of a municipal complex to serve this area of the township. The Oak Street core would have a parkway and boulevard to connect into the Cedar Bridge Re-development to this existing community and other residential neighborhoods so the services and shopping can be available to a wide variety of individuals. There would also be a new municipal park with active recreation. There is existing school sites and proposed school sites (in gray area) and approved affordable housing and a very large tract of open space to be preserved adjoining the Kettle Creek.

The next core is the Cross and Massachusetts and Prospect triangle. He showed a map and said it was similar concept but they had some additional concerns. They wanted to ensure that they had a transition of uses to move from lower density to more mixed used and multi family

residential to the north along Prospect Street. Between these 2 uses the idea would be to have a centrally located new community park that would provide different recreational activities and would adjoin the existing public uses that are currently there (the shooting range, etc.) There would also be a proposed buffer area to buffer Cross Street from the proposed mixed use areas and there is an opportunity for single family or some smaller scale retail at the corner of Massachusetts and Cross Street. The idea is that this would be a part of a potential transit orientated district if there would be a new station (passenger rail) based on the development of the Middlesex Ocean Monmouth Rail Line (MOM). Mr. Slachetka said the map that is in the report showed areas for potential school sites (private school) that would be used and developed as part of the overall development of the various mixed use, single and multifamily residential area and the concept is to have them be developed adjacent to the park so there can be some sharing of the recreation uses but based on input and further evaluation, the idea is there is a lot of people who own private property in this area and you can't really zone or mandate for schools, so they try to look at those school sites as overlays. The idea would be to have provisions that would encourage the clustering of those schools which will be needed in the area.

The other two areas Mr. Slachetka talked about were the 2 industrial areas- The Lakewood Industrial Park and campus and the idea is to continue these as the future economic growth and development and encourage green building design in the future. The final concept is the smart growth corridors which is not formally recognized in the state plan but the idea is to promote infill development and redevelopment using the non contiguous clustering ordinance as a way to move development into these corridors and include transit stops designed in to encourage transit.

Mr. Slachetka said balancing this all out has to be a concurrent policy that promotes preservation and that has 4 components- existing park and open space (1/3 of town is currently open space) and it is intended to add almost 1,000 acres to the current inventory. They need to have additional plans and ordinances to have an open space and recreation plan element, a conservation plan element in the Master Plan, a riparian corridor protection plan and ordinance for stream corridor protection, water conservation plan and ordinance and a well head protection ordinance to protect the existing water resources. Some of the open space is private resources such as golf courses; Lake Shenandoah which is a county facility, Pine Park is a township facility along with John Patrick Park and smaller township parks. They hope to add the 2 parks in the Oak Street core and the Cross Street core and to protect the areas around Cedar Bridge Redevelopment area and Lake Shenandoah. They also want to add acreage to the green acres site and preserve the area around Kettle Creek and to the east along with the Crystal Lake Preserve which currently does not have any formal protection in place and the idea would be through the non contiguous clustering to preserve that. The NJDEP has been working with Mr. Slachetka on establishing these ideas and plans to concentrate them into large contiguous tracts and preserve the areas that are priority in terms of habitat and natural resource protection. He said they have a non contiguous clustering ordinance to enhance densities and promote growth in the Oak Street core, Cross street core, along the highway corridors so it is done in a smart growth approach and the areas that are to be preserved are preserved as open space. Mr. Slachetka showed those areas on the map as schedule A properties where were both municipally owned and privately owned.

Mr. Slachetka said the last piece in the puzzle is looking at the transportation network and they have both a township wide and a specific targeted approach to the downtown. They are trying to fill in the pieces of the road network within the community to take a burden off the townships highway system (north and south) and to distribute the traffic in a variety of different ways. The

township has acquired a series of buses and there is going to be an improved local transit through bus rider ship, they talked about the MOM station, and as these cores are developed they will be looking at other for transportation that is not oriented towards single occupancy vehicles. They also looked at each core being some sort of transit link within the community and looked at ways to enhance and promote pedestrian activity and create bicycle routes throughout the township. The Township Committee has already adopted a variety of different improvements to enhance circulation in the downtown and to provide parking opportunities and options. At some point in the future they will be looking at a multi model approach to tie in the bus station and a new rail line as a regional transportation hub within the township. They need an infrastructure strategy to support the growth. Currently most of the township is within a sewer service area and there have been modifications made by the DEP and the county is currently working on a regional wastewater quality management plan and the township is fully participating in that and ultimately they want to close the gaps in service where there is existing development to allow for sanitary sewer and are looking to preserve areas that are identified for preservation such as the Shorrock Street area, Crystal Lake Preserve, area in Cedar Bridge, portions of Kettle Creek and to take those out of the sewer service area. He said there will be ongoing discussions and dialogue with DEP, the county and the utilities authorities and the LKMUA has jurisdiction for the eastern part of the town and NJAWCO has jurisdiction for the western and ultimately wastewater is treated at the regional sewage plant run by the county utility authority and all those agencies will have to have discussion with the township in developing a strategy to serve the infrastructure needs as new growth is developed.

Mr. Neiman asked if there were any attorneys present representing anyone that has any questions and no one came forward. Mr. Neiman asked the audience to limit their comments and try not to be repetitious.

Mr. Neiman opened this portion to the public.

Mr. Jackson recommended that Committeeman Miller recuse himself from this procedure because the Township Committee will have to deal with this and he will be dealing with it in the capacity of a committeeman it would not be appropriate for him to sit in the planning board at this time.

Moshe Zev Weisberg, chairman of the Lakewood Development Corp. He lived in Lakewood as an infant and came back in 1972 and has been living here over 35 years. He talked about the rapid growth of Lakewood and said he has served on both Master Plan committees and said as a town we have failed over the last 10-15 years to do our job and have not been able to come together on a unified vision of what this town should look like and as a result we have gridlock and random disjointed development that people look at and say who every approved this and the fault of that is because everyone took a maximalistic approach that they wanted it their way or no way and we were never able to get together as a town to plan the future growth of this town. He said it is a godsend that we have the opportunity now to look at the big picture. He said the LDC met this afternoon and passed a resolution that said they urge the adoption and submission of the smart growth plan.

Joseph Kahn, 407 Ashley Avenue. He was asking if there is need for 26,000 units to be built and where are the plans because the need for additional housing does not go far enough-there will be a lot of preservation of open space and maybe they should look for more land for development in this plan.

Moshe Geller had some questions. He doesn't understand firstly how you are making a considerable investment in the downtown because when he sees the downtown it is shrinking a disappearing and becoming an illegal haven for aliens. Many stores have moved out of the downtown area and they are moving out to different areas where they feel that their customers find a safer and more pleasurable shopping experience. Before we invest a considerable amount of money in improving the downtown they should look at the downtown and what it is today and what it has become. He is also wondering about this plan and the transportation hub in the Cross Street Massachusetts area and asked if they are planning on putting a bus station with parking facilities or by eminent domain taking people's lands or by zoning take away the rights of properties that people have and bought it to develop a certain way and somehow are going to take away that right. Are you going to make people invest more money to give green zones so their land will be able to be used for the purpose in which they bought it?

David Ransom, 154 Enclave Boulevard. He said he is here to object to the plan, specifically the Cross Street Prospect core triangle because across the street from there are 2 adult communities. They came here to get away from the noise and the adult communities are nice and well maintained and quiet. Across the street, that site is basically wooded and the plans call for taking out all the woods except for the middle, which you won't see, and put in things that the residents of an adult community came here to avoid-a bus depot, schools, multi family housing. With this plan you are chasing them out. The adult communities pay the town's tax base and they don't bring a school population that you have to use infrastructure to increase the towns' tax burden so the retirement communities in Lakewood are successful and they should continue that in a way that helps the town and not make it a clash with the future. Multi family housing will disrupt the community across the street and it is wrong. He said they are also putting the cart before the horse. He listened to this long presentation and at the end there was something about busing and the people in his neighborhood don't need the buses, and he does not think the buses need to be there and there is no room on Route 9-tonight there will be traffic on Route 9 so forget about adding all those housing units. Housing units on this triangle will go directly to Route 9. In other cities where they had the same problem, they put the cart before the horse and said figure out the traffic problems later and it doesn't work. Route 9 has to be fixed and proposed and planned before anything can be planned about additional housing.

Aaron Rottenberg said he has been living in Lakewood for about 30 years. He has 7 children and he is looking at the future and he realizes there is no room for them to live and he highly endorses this plan of looking into the future and providing growth for the future generations and at the same time taking into account leaving open space and having them enjoy not living in the city but in a more open spaced type of area.

Joe DeFalco, 38 Oakmont Road. He said one statistic that comes out of this presentation is that the growth and population is the orthodox community. One of the problems that he has is that the orthodox leadership has planted a seed of hatred towards the Jewish community; they want to co exist and share in their growth and his living standards and asked them to give him that opportunity- look at that triangle and make some good honest fair decisions that allow them to join together. He has a home in the Catskills so he knows about orthodox Jewish communities and has a daughter in Monsey and has been a Sabbath goer for years. He said it doesn't take much to sit down, look at what is around and bring about harmony.

George Holsten, 159 Skyline Drive. He said the study said the expected population by the year 2030 is 230,000 which is over 9,000 people per square mile and that is not growth-that is an impossibility- you could not live, you could not move. In the year 2020 it will be over 5,000 people and it is one of the highly dense populations now in Ocean County and how are you

going to allow this growth to continue. They should be looking at ways to slow the growth not live with the growth and need to look at increasing the size of housing lots to make the growth slow down.

Eli Schwab, 147 Liberty Drive. He said he is here to strongly endorse the plan and thinks it is for the good of the township and says if anything he is being affected negatively because he has land that looks like it is going to be preserved and although he may stand to lose he sees that the township is doing something which was lacking and the planning that they were lacking until now they are finally getting to do something about it.

Mike Mandel, a resident of Lakewood for the last 13 years and also the facility manager for Oorah and currently their offices are on Swarthmore and they are employing over 100 people and they need to double and triple that and their facility and with this Smart Growth plan they would be able to do it on their current property. They hire mostly within Lakewood and strongly approve this plan and would like to increase the size of their operation to ½ million square feet and employ 300-400 people and would like to keep it in Lakewood.

Chris Abrams, 755 Coral Avenue. She has 5 questions she would like answers for. Mr. Jackson asked Stan to sit by the table with a microphone so he can answer. Mrs. Abrams asked him when were the results or summary of the 4 vision workshops posted on the township website so that residents who were unable to participate could have seen what transpired and Mr. Slachetka said he did not know the exact date that they were published but in essence this report is the summary of all 4. She asked if any of the prior ones were posted and Mr. Slachetka said he would have Vanessa check that out and get that information but said there were minutes or a summary posted at one point for 1 or 2 of the visioning sessions and Mrs. Abrams asked if that was on the township website and Mr. Slachetka he is not sure if it was on the township website or available in the clerk's office. Mrs. Abrams said currently there is nothing there right now except the notice that appeared on October 1st for this plan, so there is nothing to go back and see where the entire summary was and the comments were from the public and compare it to the final product that was published on the 1st. Mrs. Abrams then asked about the non-contiguous cluster ordinance and if it was in place yet and Mr. Slachetka said no, it would have to be adopted. She asked if the township has all the rest of the technical ordinances to support this plan's idea of centers and cores and Mr. Slachetka said no, all these plans are going to be a part of something that the township gets approval (a plan endorsement approval) and there will be a very specific action plan (planning implementation agenda) which would require and provide identified time limits in which the township would be required to adopt these ordinances and it would also be required as part of the CAFRA consistency determination by the NJDEP, so these ordinances and a good portion of the plans would have to be put in place. She asked if OSG has a problem with that being that they don't have these ordinances in place so when they go in front of the SPC they have a better standing with them and Mr. Slachetka said there is a mechanism where this can be a part of this implementation agenda and there are certain things that they will have to do and it will be clear what has to take place prior to plan endorsement and DEP will weigh in as well. Mr. Slachetka said the township is fully committed to all of these and they couldn't get plan endorsement if they didn't do this. Mrs. Abrams said the Township Committee has been known to take a really long time to pass ordinances and said they are still waiting for well head protection, tree save ordinance, so that is her concern. Mr. Slachetka said there are specific time frames for all of the things in the plan endorsement and the township will not be given any wiggle room unless there are other circumstances that would allow it. Mrs. Abrams said since this is Lakewood's plan, in the past OSG has not always agreed with what has been presented to it and asked if there were currently any obstacles that the township is facing with OSG and DEP and are they 100% confident that this plan is going to be approved by the state and Mr. Slachetka said there is obviously some interaction with DEP

and OSG with regard to input and they have been getting a lot of input from both agencies during the many years they have been working on this and it is already reflected in this plan and there may be some tweaking here and there but the fundamental work they are presenting in this vision plan is something that DEP & OSG generally support. Mrs. Abrams said going back to the non contiguous clustering, she asked him to re explain it and possibly give an example and Mr. Slachetka said it is a circumstance where 2 properties exist but are not contiguous to each other, one would be on one side of the township and one on the other side. One property, schedule A, may be in an area that is environmentally sensitive or adjoining an environmentally sensitive area, and that property may be publicly or privately owned. The schedule B property, which is on the other side of the township, may be an area that is specifically targeted for growth (such as one of the cores, or one of the corridors, etc.) so as part of the non contiguous clustering, those 2 separate properties would be able to be considered as a single tract for approval and development, both at the Planning Board level, and if it is in CAFRA jurisdiction, as part of the CAFRA review process where the schedule A property would be specifically identified for open space preservation, and schedule B property would be the area where the development activity form would take place. There would be a bonus or some other incentive to encourage the property owner in schedule B to partner with the property owner in schedule A to do this non contiguous clustering. Over time, it would allow the town to direct development to areas where they want it to occur and specifically preserve the other areas. Mrs. Abrams said they are basing this on something that does not even exist yet (ordinance) and Mr. Slachetka said an ordinance would have to be adopted or they won't be able to move forward. Mrs. Abrams said she appeared before about Kettle Creek and he knows where she stands on that and said she likes what they have done to preserve Kettle Creek but would rather they change the wording from "potential" preservation area to make it more permanent and doable. She would hope that around that area they could have more passive recreation rather than fields and things that would need permission to use them. She then spoke about the boulevard parkway that is planned and asked what is its' width, is it going to have cars, is it just pedestrian, etc. and Mr. Slachetka said it is a combination and it is called a "smart street" and it is both for cars, pedestrians and bicyclist in a setting where there is a buffer area on either side. He doesn't have the specifics or the designed standards for that but the concept is that it would like the proposed park he talked about with the 2 communities (Oak Street and Cedar Bridge Center). He also said the part of Kettle Creek is targeted for passive recreation use. Mrs. Abrams asked how large is this parkway going to be and Mr. Slachetka said the actual width has not yet been determined yet but they would need to ensure that there is sufficient buffer width on either side of the roadway and enough width to have a lane on either side, a center median and then sufficiently sized bikeways on either side. He said they will also have public input when that process is designed. Mrs. Abrams said she liked the Kettle Creek concept and the parkway thing and Mr. Neiman said it was about 15minutes and she said she is done with her questions but she is not crazy about the mixed used and the commercial at the end of what would be Oak & Vine and she thought that whole area of Oak Street was supposed to be more for the schools and affordable housing.

Meir Grunhut, vice president of Astor Chocolate. He said in 1996 they moved their company from Brooklyn to Lakewood and have expanded since then to employ 200+ employees and they are at a point where they need to expand and have bought the adjacent lot but are having a difficult time to get it approved because of the current laws. With the new master plan, it would enable them to remain in Lakewood and keep the 200+ jobs and hopes it is approved.

Yosef Posen, executive director of Lakewood Cheder and Bais Faiga schools, over 3,200 children. He lives on County Line and Somerset and he approves of this plan because driving down Somerset and E 7th and seeing the middle school and the high school and the vast

amount of acres that they have for their school and we are sitting in town very overcrowded. This plan will take those schools out the main stream of downtown and bring them further out of Lakewood on green acres where the kids can enjoy the fresh air and grow and do well.

Eli Mitnick, 22 E. 6th Street. He asked if there is going to be separate bike lanes or are they going to be on the edge of the road and Mr. Slachetka said they have not established an actual design so it has not been set yet. Mr. Mitnick said for safety reasons, they should have separate bike lanes and said it is a shame that the township does not give young men and women proper housing with children in the basement and thinks smart growth is a good idea because it gives the youth an opportunity to live the American dream.

Chani Jacobowitz, 245 North Crest Place. She echoed what Rabbi Mitnick said she feels that she should speak up for her neighbors and friends who are home with their young children and say they would like to live in normal housing and have enough room for themselves and their children in an area that is planned and has parks. She said she supports the plan for that reason and that it accommodates all things like growth and preservation and she appreciates all the effort that was put into the plan.

Marilyn Fontanetta, 1188B Clydebank Court. She printed the report and did her best to understand what it was saying. She said it was made more difficult for the average citizen to understand by the fact that there were terms that were not defined and are not common such as center and cores, node, infill delineated, infill development and redevelopment, particularly redevelopment opportunities and she would like to know what exactly they mean by that, what do they envision and Mr. Slachetka said the township has identified an area targeted for redevelopment by Franklin Street and what they mean by re development it is opportunities for private property owners to take existing properties and to either reconstruct or do something different so it is redevelopment rather than new development. She asked if it would be on a voluntary basis or would they consider using the right of eminent domain and Mr. Slachetka said the plan does not propose any use of eminent domain. She also asked about the term "sustainable growth" and said it is hard for her to imagine because what they are proposing is, in a town that already has 3x the population, to double the housing stock and it seems that isn't sustainable, that eventually you will just run out of land to develop. Mr. Slachetka clarified that and said the number 26,000 that you would need for housing would be based on a straight mathematical projection based on population but there are limits to that, it is not realistic to accept that there will be a total of 26,000 new housing units and what the ultimate number is will be based upon the land limitations and infrastructure capacity limitations. She said in the beginning of the report he talked about the principles of smart growth and #9 listed is "predictable, fair and cost effective development decisions" and she feels the decisions made in this plan were not fair to the large segment of senior citizens. The enormous expansion that she envisions will be not benefit them since they are not seeking employment, not job owners, they don't have children in schools, yet they will suffer the negative impacts of this enormous population expansion. The traffic will get worse and the air pollution will also get worse and many senior citizens suffer from chronic illnesses such as emphysema, asthma and COPD which is made worse by air pollution. They are also concerned that their taxes will go up as a result of the enormous cost associated with building roads, parks, schools and other infrastructure which will benefit the new citizens and she thinks consideration should go first to the people who already live in Lakewood rather than consideration to the needs of those who may move here in the future. All in all she feels that it is a very unfair application of the decision making practice with regards to the segment of senior citizens and said many seniors chose to retire to Lakewood as a place to escape the problems of the congested areas like NYC where they came from. She said their quality of life is being greatly eroded by the large influx of

people and cars. What she sees in the traffic plans do not begin to scratch the surface of solving what is already a bad traffic situation that will only get worse if the population is 2½ x the current population and the infrastructure remains the same.

Bill Hobday, 30 Schoolhouse Lane. He said he moved to Lakewood in 2000 and is a member of a gated community and since that time he thought in 2000 that the infrastructure was lacking and when he looks back on those days he says boy it was great. Today when you are going to leave the community it is a real decision as how long it will take to get there and if he gets there is there a place to park. Growth is change but smart growth doesn't necessarily mean rapid growth and a plan to come together properly allows for a nudge here and a move there and try things and develop one area and see how that went and you take your mistakes and successes and apply that to the next area and hopefully as you go down the road with this plan you will get to a great design. To him, that triangle of Prospect St. and Cross St. is a sensitive area and he can't see developing that or if he had to develop it, it would be the very last on the list. Planners tend to spread out and when out is finished, you got to go up. He thinks a smart plan is to say let's not go out at the same time, where will our children live, and their children live. That is what happened to Mt. Laurel but the idea here is what about the next generations? They can't live here, there won't be a tree left or a square inch of property left so we really have to get smart about how we develop and expand and we have to be friendly to the neighbors in the south that take their water out of the same aquifer that we do. As we squeeze the population is we have to make subtle judgements about where the schools should be and how will we make their future better than ours, but when we squeeze them into these small environments he wonders if that is the right thing to do. He would think that smart growth is taking a downtown area and starting to really look at what we can build up and looking at the areas that are around that are more rural in nature and less densely populated and preserve it for our children and their children and they will need a place to go and if we take every inch now there is nothing to preserve for them. The county hasn't been very nice with their little county roads and we have tripled the population and we are still trying to get by on these little county roads but we are so squeezed now that we better start thinking about how better .we can plan for public transportation, how better to conserve our natural resources and how better we can save that land for the next generation. If we don't do that we are robbing that opportunity that we had from our children.

Yanky Braunstein, 186 Ridge Avenue. He said the biggest concern people have is the transportation improvements and he is wondering if there is any guarantees that before all the changes will happen after there are some transportation improvements in Lakewood and Mr. Slachetka said if this is to be done correctly it has to be phased in so the improvements are there to support the growth and that will have to take place. One of the agencies that reviews their plans is the NJDOT and they are active in terms of their improvements with Route 9 and other planning documents the township has adopted. Mr. Braunstein asked if it was going to be done in a gradual manner and the development takes place and Mr. Slachetka said yes and said this plan is intended to be implemented over a 20 year period. Mr. Braunstein said as a father with 3 kids he commended the plan because it is hard constantly taking the kids back and forth and the planning for transportation actually helps the kids go places and go to school easier without the parents having to take them and he thinks it is beneficial for the town. He said he is a business owner in Lakewood and he constantly meet people who want to keep their business in Lakewood and expand and bring their businesses in Lakewood and there is a big problem is there are not that many jobs in Lakewood. The industrial park is closed for development and this new smart plan will let the industrial park be developed and new business center being built and it is jobs for our kids and grandkids and it will help this town, especially if you pass this think in a time of recession when other companies will see there are towns that are not pro

growth and Lakewood is being a pro growth town and it is attractive to businesses and be beneficial to this town and he thinks it is a great plan.

Noreen Gill, 192 Coventry Drive. She is a resident of Lakewood for 37 years and said when she moved here she loved it- it was like living in the country with the roads and everything. In 1984 she saw an impact and she tracked the development of Lakewood since then, street by street and community by community. We never thought it would be to be where it is now. She was at the vision meetings and sat next to Mr. Kotler and they discussed several things and they have the same visions as far as Cedar Bridge and it wasn't a door, it wasn't a corporate park, it was shopping centers, an ice skating rink, a bowling alley, fine restaurants, outlets, something that would bring money into Lakewood and she doesn't know what his plan was at the time and if he really felt that this was to be a corporate park. One of the things that she was frightened of is when she heard numbers being thrown out and her first question was can we sustain this- the water, firehouses, police, roads, schools, books for the children, etc. The roads are not there, and we have been complaining for the last 10 years about the roads. It took her 15 minutes to go 2 blocks (from Kennedy Blvd. to the light on Clifton Ave.) and she said Somerset Development has caused this. She asked if you put a cluster of housing together and schools and everything that those people are not going to leave that community? They're going out to Route 9, and there has to be a better system put in place before this plan goes through, we cannot get to our hospital and as far as the map that was shown, the triangle portion, she is not seeing any purple on that (schools)- there is 3 schools on that map. If she lived in those communities and woke up in the morning, do you think she would be happy to see school buses and additional traffic and lights and more pollution? That area should be left as open space. They went to Trenton and they suggested that that area and the State wanted it and a committeeman said recently that in one area the State wanted preservation, the reply was "that is our land; they are not going to tell us what to do with it". She said the best place for schools in out at Oak Street-there is enough land out there, there is the John Patrick field-it is the best possible location for a school. There is beautiful school there now and they have a soccer field, they have everything at their fingertips-why do you think this is so great to turn around and put anymore congestion to a road that has not been developed. She said this is bad for the community. Do you think these people who live in the Enclave are happy? If she lived there here house would be on the market so fast and she would high tail it out of Lakewood like you wouldn't believe. Downtown was redone with the brickwork and it was done with funds and the concern was to get those apartments out of there and out from above the businesses. What has happened now is if you drive through town you see people hanging out of windows, garbage all over the place, grafitti, and she is embarrassed to say she lives in Lakewood. She pays high taxes and she lives in a condo where the slumlords get \$1800.00 for a 2 bedroom and no one speaks English. She said there is housing available right now but you have to get rid of the slumlords too.

Yaakov Schwartz, 159 Forest Park Circle. He works in administration in Chemed health and he witnesses the tremendous growth in the town and he appreciates the smart growth plan and understand the need for a smart plan for the community. He also understands living in a more congested type of housing area and appreciates the thought of at least 1,000 square acres of preserved land. He thinks it should be commended.

Chaim Englander, 10 Kew Gardens Drive. He was at 2 of the meetings in the public school building and some of his inputs were implemented. He is living in Lakewood for 11 years and support the smart growth plan and hopes it gets approved.

Jerome Safner, 1188B Clydebank Court. He asked how they plan to pay for this smart growth plan and said it seems that most residents in Lakewood will not benefit from the plan but will

have a big burden of paying for it with increased taxes. Mr. Slachetka said over time there will be private and public sources of funding for different aspects. If they do receive plan endorsement they will be put on priority lists to support the kinds of improvements that promote smart growth but he does not know the individual funding sources are at this stage. Mr. Safner asked again where are we going to get the money for it and who is going to pay for it. Mr. Slachetka said right now Lakewood is growing and they get a variety of funding from different sources, private and public. He said what is the cost if you don't have a plan and said it is critical to be able to maximize the use of infrastructure to be able to have buildings that are green buildings and sustainable buildings. There will be a variety of ways if you have a plan, you will be saving money over time and if you do not plan that is when you will have the expenses. Mr. Safner said it seems to him that the average resident in Lakewood will not benefit from this plan but will have to pay for it in taxes.

Moshe Mueller, 127 Autumn Road. He said he lived in Lakewood all his life and is also a small business owner for the last 15 years in the downtown. He has a lot to say about this plan but does have pity for the people of Lakewood and it has been a long night and said he supports this plan.

Shalom Landman, 107 Forest Park Circle. He said he is under director of NJ Hand and a 15 year resident of Lakewood. He attended the community vision workshops and one thing stands out in his mind and he hears it again tonight and said the question here is not to build or not to build, that is happening regardless, the question is do we allow it and bury our heads in the sand and allow it to continue as it has been or do we say it is time to get smart about it and put it in a methodical process where we can foresee the future and plan it out. He believes this is the truth and he does support this plan in any plan you are going to find people who are not happy with certain segments of it and tonight he heard from some about one section of town but you cannot please all the people all the time. Overall he thinks this is a good plan, a sensible plan and a necessary plan and he wants to address the concerns of specific people. He thinks that one of the elements of this plan is to provide for key roads that will take the burden off of Route 9. To find alternative routes, like the parkway route and other vital key roadways that can provide an outlet for cars to leave Route 9 and find a way around town is an answer. The expansion of Vine Street has helped him greatly. Approving this smart growth plan does not mandate that people should go ahead and develop tomorrow; it is just setting a course for the future and if we don't do this, the failure to adopt a plan it is a continuation of the years we have had.

Walter Baldwin, 712 Albert Avenue. He has lived here for 25 years. His backyard is the Oak St. core. He asked about parkway exit 89-when that was originally planned, it was supposed to be 4 way accesses and asked if anything has been done since then. They are promoting the Blue Claws and people from Lacey can't get to the game and can't get home. There is no way from Route 88 there is no from Route 70 or from Cedar Bridge, it is completely north and south and it doesn't work. Mr. Slachetka said the plan does call for improvement to that for a full interchange. Mr. Baldwin said everything he read in the plan seems quite vague as far as the environment goes and we keep saying Lakewood is doing so much but most of the parks in Lakewood are county parks, they are not Lakewood parks. The new recreation park is for baseball and soccer and he can't go kite fly. He thinks one of the flaws is there is no definite statements about the environment except they are going to propose plan, build a park, have the Kettle Creek area, but there is nothing there telling him what they are doing or how you are doing it or when you are going to do it. He asked if there was any protection in this plan for unfinished projects; he knows the economy has it downturn but there are 3 projects in the Oak Corridor right now that is incomplete- the roadways are done with gravel, not paved, sewer

pipes sticking up out of the air, dirt piles. Pine Street has unfinished projects which is an eyesore- it floods and dirt runs down the streets- the roads are not completely patched and fixed and asked if there is anything in this structure that is going to protect the environment. Mr. Slachetka said the people who got their approvals have their development rights under the MLUL and are required to post bond. None of that is affected or changed with regards to this plan. Mr. Baldwin said the only thing that he sees that is strung together is more affordable housing and said he believes we already met and matched or exceeded the quota set by the State of New Jersey. It is not a matter of growth but sustaining. Let's get off taking down the woods and building more houses. The affordable housing they are putting in looks better than the house he and his wife bought 25 years ago and it costs less than the house he lives in and they are getting a tax break and his taxes keep going up. The last question is the Oak Street core- this is his backyard and said he is at the highest spot in Ocean County except for the Lacey mountains down by Forked River. This area feeds the Barnegat Bay; it feeds the Kettle Creek which feeds the Barnegat Bay. Down by Albert Avenue-that is the headwaters of Kettle Creek and we have to conserve our environment, there are over 40 species of birds that people have documented in those woods and the EPA has agreed that the cooper's hawk lives there and they are on the semi-endangered list. He has beach heather growing naturally in his backyard which is also on the protected list. Everything they keep saying – there were 2 pieces out of 3 that were given away for \$1.00 for that 10-14 acres that was supposed to become affordable housing. When the town gave those parcels away, they were given a 2 year limit for those pieces to be developed and they weren't and they were supposed to be reverted back to the town and it is still listed as affordable housing. He said they also have in there for schools and asked if they were private schools so again it is public land that is being used for private stuff and he does not go along with that. He is an American citizen and he lives here and he pays his taxes and said it is an environmentally sensitive area. Everything that is listed has the key phrase-residential and enough is enough. His last question is if any of this is actually for a public vote because this is a major change here.

Joe Violante, 65 Sunrise Ct. He said many good things have been stated tonight and there were many good points by most everybody. He thinks the smart plan has some good parts to it but he doesn't think it is really a totally smart plan. There are issues there that are very laudable: bringing together the central area for children to go to school is an extremely important factor because they need to consolidate areas where children can play, and be educated. It is not as good to have schools on every block or every other block. There is an issue with regard to individuals needing a place to live but we have created a nightmare with the town allowing 4 families to live in a 2 family house and that is what we are trying to solve today by taking steps to deal with that. This is all necessary but he thinks what we are faced with is the problems that we are trying to solve today are not going to go away, they are going to be there in the town as long as the method of living exists the same way and said we have to try accommodate both living conditions that are going to be appropriate for small areas and also to allow people to have their own dream of owning a home but he doesn't think that is possible to have that dream when you are going to create problems in the future-you are faced with that extensive growth that you put on the charts. That growth has created the problem that we have today and we need to provide a good solid plan that will allow for the community to grow but yet not become overcrowded or in 20 years the young ones in this room will look back and say-boy did we blow it when we had the opportunity to deal with it the correct way.

Chuck Kirsh, 164 Skyline Drive. He moved here 10 years ago into the Fairways and the surrounding area was quite beautiful and he was told that the triangle area would remain open space. Now it looks like there is commercial growth and residential use that is planned as smart growth for that area. Route 9 has been a disaster yet they keep building on Route 9 between 70

and Lakewood and putting in row houses by Seagull Square and keep building. God forbid we should ever have to had a emergency evacuation, he thinks people would be killing themselves trying to get out of here, yet what we are going to do with this smart growth is increase the density all around-infrastructure is going by the boards-you put more people into that triangle and they will be floating out onto 9, onto New Hampshire, onto Massachusetts and it is going to be incredible. He thinks you have to look at this with some common sense and reduce some of this area and the more trees you take down affect the environment and what about the water and sewers and he thinks there has to be a lot more thought going into this smart growth.

Coreen DiSegni, 132 Skyline Drive. She came with several of her neighbors who all are against the growth on Cross Street and she concurs with Mr. Hobday and Mrs. Gill with the same reasons why we are against this plot of land being used.

Gerry Ballwanz, Governors Road. She has sever questions. She asked about the non contiguous clustering growth ordinance and said she guesses it still has to be worked out as to how the private owners in schedule A would be compensated in some way by the development that would be increased in density in schedule B and asked if this is a type of special hybrid of transfer of development rights and Mr. Slachetka said no it is not a TDR program it specifically takes 2 non contiguous parcels and treating them as one with the development being directed to one parcel and away from the other. She asked about the private owner that would be in schedule A such as there is a lot of acres (90) off of Clearstream Road that is adjacent to the Ocean County Park, Pine Park and the golf course, that is an area that is listed as preservation and that is in private hands, how would that person be possibly be compensated for keeping those 90 acres as one contiguous preserved area and Mr. Slachetka would be a private contractual arrangement between the property owner in schedule B and the property owner in schedule A and it would be the benefit that the property owner in schedule B could accrue from tying up that schedule A property as open space and making it part of their development. Mrs. Ballwanz asked what happens if there is no ordinance adopted in Lakewood, or there will be so many loopholes that it is ineffective, how will that affect the attempt the preservation for preservation and Mr. Slachetka said it has to be worked out because it is part of the overall plan and it would be required to be part of the fabric, the DEP specifically specified as an approach and option for preservation and an alternative to the township having to go out and acquire privately owned parcels for open space. With the help of the OSG and the DEP he believes they can craft an ordinance that is effective without any loopholes. Mrs. Ballwanz asked if she heard him say this will be a model ordinance used for the first time in the State of New Jersey and Mr. Slachetka said if they can put this in place and it works well, it could be a model and thinks it encouraging that other communities may find it as a model and a tool to preserve open space throughout the State of New Jersey. She said the idea of compact growth and clustering the development onto smaller lots and considering what he was just talking about with the birthrate in Lakewood and the having smaller or compact lots, is that really what is going to be good for the benefit of all of the large families that are going to be living close together very tight with very small lots and what impact is that going to have on a family with 8 children or more and Mr. Slachetka the large lot zoning works against you because you end up devouring more land than actually preserving and he thinks the idea here is to do it in a balanced approach and he meant housing and shopping and services within close proximity when he means compact communities. Parks and recreation has to be part of the planning process for compact communities as well. Mrs. Ballwanz said some of the seniors have concerns about the cost to the taxpayers and one infrastructure that would be costly would be the building of more fire houses and she did not see any of those on any plans. She attended all the 4 visioning workshops in 2008 and at the end of that (in August) his firm had online the amended redevelopment plan for Cedar Bridge and the large intent of this was that Cedar Bridge was

supposed to be non residential-it said there were a few things about all the entertainment and restaurants and retail and have other uses rather than the use of a corporate park and very few people had said anything about the residential component and the new map (for Cedar Bridge) she sees they are taking away a lot of the places where people are going to be able to work and are taking away the economic growth by putting a lot of multifamily. She asked how many multi family units are proposed for all that brown area and Mr. Slachetka said he does not have a number they have identified this as a basic land use plan. He agreed and said originally they identified Cedar Bridge as a corporate park and that was rejected by OSG, then they projected it as a non residential as part of a larger multi model core organized around New Hampshire to line to link in with residential and the feedback they got back was they wanted a more compact core which is a true mixed use community. She said she thinks there is way too much multifamily residential and mixed use for the Cedar Bridge that is going to take away from the locations for the economic growth and sustainability for Lakewood and she came across another map for Cedar Bridge Town Center with Sterns Assoc. LLC and asked if Mr. Stern was in the front row (he was) and said she is curious about because this town center plan was on a website page saying it was from January 2007 and they referred to the hockey stadium planned and she wanted to know where this 750 dwelling units of residential plan came from when that wasn't even supposed to be in any plan prior to recently-she said this plan is very similar to the plan that we now see from T&M except T&M has a little more residential and there is no guide as to what the buildings are on Mr. Sterns rendering. She doesn't know what was happening behind the scenes prior to 2007 when the visioning workshops were in 2008.

Hershel Herskowitz, Cedar Row. He is not here to say whether he supports or don't support this plan. If he was able to prove without a shadow of a doubt that by doing this plan we would all turn into flesh eating zombie and die because of it, I am sure the plan would go through no matter what he said so it doesn't matter what he says. He is only here to express his opinion as to what smart growth is and he doesn't feel at this point talking about this type of growth is smart growth and feels by leaving parts of our town to rot and fall into disrepair and turn into a home for drug dealers, money launderers and all these things without having a plan on repairing that part first and just going ahead and building without any idea of what to do about repairing our town as it is now is not what you call smart growth.

Abe Penzer is here representing himself and said he has done more development and creative work in Lakewood than any other person with his appearances before the boards for over 35 years. He can talk about 60 years of growth and change. He is very proud to live in Lakewood. He is the happiest man that this plan finally comes before you. He has been attacked that he is changing the zoning and planning on an ad hoc basis and people have schemes of what they want for Lakewood and he turns them down and the fact is everybody wants to come to Lakewood and they have come up with many ideas that can be very harmful to us. We need to have a plan to follow and this is the first major effort that quantifies things. The state sent mandates (C1 stream) in an ad hoc basis and we never had anything in an orderly fashion to grow. The seniors have been protected and are protected by Mr. Fink, Mr. Franklin and Mr. Banas-they sit here every meeting and make sure the seniors are taken care of. There is a police firing range it that triangle and they train the swat teams there and there are people who ride the 4 wheelers illegally and many people can get hurt and said thank god there is a plan now and it provides a very big buffer for the Enclave and others as well. He thinks the natural resources are protected for the first time and he is impressed that we have quantified 9 centers. The CLP was supposed to be developed and Cathy Stillwell fought and today that area is protected. He is delighted that 188 acres are going to be open space and he said this is the best thing that can happen and he urges the board to adopt it.

Brian Flannery, 590 Atlantic Avenue. He said he moved here in the 70's and since he has been in town every time a plan gets approved people stand up and say our quality of life is going to be destroyed. There is a lot of good things that go on in Lakewood and if you look at the negative you will find it but if you look for the positive, it is there. This plan is exactly what it says it is, it is a smart growth plan and the people expressing their concerns he doesn't think read the plan because it addresses transportation, infrastructure and provides area for all types of development-schools and all the things we need in this community and he appreciates the time and said it is a great plan and gives us the direction we need.

Aaron Mueller, 156 Chateau Drive. He stressed 2 points; the downtown traffic is terrible and one of the things that Cedar Bridge Development will have is a mixture of residential and outlets and you won't have to travel in your car to go to a restaurant, grocery, etc. so he thinks smart plan is a great plan and you can have affordable residential area mixed with shops etc. and recreational he thinks it is a great plan.

Sam Flancbaum, 110 Franklin Boulevard. He said he lived here over 50 years and Mr. Slachetka and his presentation articulated the uniqueness of Lakewood and how and why this smart growth plan is smart for Lakewood. Because of what this municipality had developed into and what it is becoming, we need this plan, it makes sense and it is long overdue. Some of the earlier smart growth experiments were the senior communities and despite early resistance to that development, most of them have turned out to be a big success. These communities provided an opportunity for housing and lifestyle for people to come and live in Lakewood from all over the northeast. What is presented here tonight is a well thought out comprehensive vision for the future of Lakewood and it provides opportunity to the Lakewood community for housing, business and to all the citizens of Lakewood.

Donna Geller, 1276 Shetland Drive. She said in providing affordable housing for new residents you might be making housing unaffordable for seniors who have to pay for the infrastructure. It really disturbed her when one gentleman who said higher taxes might force him to sell his home and he would have to leave town; a faction of the audience silently clapped and smiled. There seems to be 2 factions in this audience tonight and it is a shame that it cannot be more bipartisan. A gentleman mentioned something about parks and how we do need park space and she thought just imagine New York City without Central Park.

Mordechai Eichorn, 8 Evian Court. He said a lot has been said tonight but as an owner of Lakewood's largest real estate company he said no one has denied that at the end of the day, this town has seen explosion and the population has grown incredibly and based on that the #1 priority is we have to provide housing for them and based on this plan we will provide that and it will make housing more affordable. It will also provide for a safe and convenient accommodation for shopping and other commercial sites in town. The Cedar Bridge location is the #1 spot they could have chosen in terms of infrastructure and based on that he strongly support this smart growth.

Adeline Birdy from Monmouth County (8 Sycamore Lane, Rumson). She said she discovered this area and the industrial park about a month ago and said her and her husband were interested in starting a business in this area because of the access off the parkway and she didn't even know about this project until this morning in the paper. She said it was originally zoned DA-1 and said it is a sports arena, entertainment, theater, things like that and asked if that zoning is changing because a new person hoping to start a business would need to know that because it may affect her and what does it involve when you have to change something-it sounds like a major change now. Mr. Slachetka said it is a designated re-development area and

there is a plan that would have to be amended to show that change. She asked if it is amended, could other areas that are zoned for specific purposes be amended as well in that neighborhood and Mr. Slachetka said the industrial park area is not being recommended to change and she asked if Cedar Bridge was considered part of that industrial park and he said no, it is separate and has a different designation. Will the traffic from the houses restrict access to her new business because she would like to know before she invests in that area and asked if there has been major traffic studies done and Mr. Slachetka said no but the bottom line is they will still get to her businesses. There will be sufficient infrastructure and roadwork to access the new development.

Helen Fertitta, 18 Ivy Hill Road. She said she is happy they are having a smart plan but she thinks one the smart things they have to consider is that until something is done about Route 9, we are not going anywhere. She also borders on Cross Street and that triangle and she thinks before they do any approving, you really have to look into that area. Cross Street is already becoming a roadway evidence by the fact that on Cross and Prospect they have already put up a traffic light and people are using that now to avoid using Route 9. Cross Street is already getting heavy traffic and she urges them to reconsider any planning for that triangle area.

Barry Abelman from the Office of Smart Growth (19 Ripplebull Way, Belle Mead). He wanted to commend the township on its planning efforts and everyone on their public comments. It is helpful to him to see all the things beneath the surface. He wanted to give people a greater understanding about the process. There were questions about Cedar Bridge that were brought up- it wasn't the plan that said they wanted this to be mixed use development- it was the OSG where they looked at the initial plans and were looking for consistency with the State Plan and one of the key components is they require mixed use development, they want it all together so that you don't have to get into your car and go out to Route 9, go to the mall, come back onto Route 9 and then go to your home. They want you to be able to live, work and play all in the same place; that will ease traffic and those are the key tenants of what smart growth are. Process wise, there are some things that will become plan implementation items and the way the process works is right now you have submitted an initial plan but you are working tonight on passing this on to the governing body for Thursday but this initial plan will be submitted to our office and then we and the other state agencies will look at and review all the plans for consistency with the State Plan. They will be taking a look at the plan as a whole and all the ordinances whether everything they need to be in place to determine consistency; if things aren't consistent they will develop an action plan and a memorandum of understanding between the State and Lakewood so Lakewood will know exactly what else needs to be addressed and what needs to happen before endorsement. Subsequent to endorsement there will be other things post endorsement so that you will be able to get to that implementation phase as well as seeking CAFRA center from the DEP and that is a separate process to plan endorsement. There are processes to get to the end and he hopes that addresses some of the concerns that were raised. He left his card if anyone has further questions, they can contact him.

Seeing no one else, this portion was closed to the public.

Mr. Neiman thanked Mr. Slachetka for his presentation and his efforts. He said all the concerns and requests for amendments were valid concerns and input. One person said a plan like this should have been implemented 20 years ago, unfortunately it wasn't but it was presented today and there are large tracts that can be developed and protected and said this plan looked at both and protected sensitive parts and land that can be developed smart and properly with the natural growth happening in the community. One thing they did not look at was fire houses which was mentioned but transportation was looked at. Mr. Neiman asked Mr. Jackson if as a

planning board they are supposed to recommend this to continue moving along to the Township Committee then the State agencies will look at the plan. He asked the members for their thoughts or remarks before they vote. Mr. Jackson said this would be the opportunity for the planning board to make a recommendation or make suggestions to the Township Committee and make the resolution whether they were in favor of it or not.

Mr. Banas said he would like to second Mr. Neiman's comments on the conduct of the audience today- they were exemplary. He recalled years ago he was told that we will have a train in Lakewood and we are still waiting and will probably wait another 20 years. This is a slow process and in reality we started the process of trying to develop plans of this nature some 5-8 years ago and it has taken us until now and we have developed the town with a haphazard sort of way and we now reap the benefits of that. We are in trouble and we do need a definite plan. He would suggest that we recommend to the municipality that we support this smart growth plan that was presented without too many changes.

Mr. Fink said he agreed the presentation was excellent and also will back the smart growth but in conjunction with that he does feel that the Cross and Massachusetts triangle must be protected and thinks that the seniors and their comments are valid. There definitely is a distinction of the seniors and Lakewood and being a senior and living on the Cross and Mass border line he sees where the seniors are coming from and would urge that the Township Committee re-visit the area of Mass and Cross and try to protect the senior developments at all cost. Building is not going to stop but that area right now in the 4 years he has been living there has become a raceway-Cross Street is a nightmare, Mass is a nightmare and he thinks the infrastructure must be built down there allow the building and development of the future properties.

Mr. Franklin said the only thing he is disappointed in is there wasn't more industrial areas put in this plan. The people are going to need help paying their taxes and industrial areas pick up that extra buck that you need. When he started on the committee in 1967 they had just started the industrial program and they were 2/3 vacant and 1/3 developed and they tried to direct things so they could get enough industry in to keep the tax rate low and he thinks they have gotten way away from that and it will hurt the people. Another thing about the smart growth area when you put 780 families in a tight area you have to have ball fields and play areas for them-we don't need these tot lots like we have been putting in, we need something for the older people and there is only a few in town right now.

Mr. Schmuckler agreed with Mr. Franklin on the ball fields. The young children will get older and the tot lots are not for them. He also spoke about the transportation upgrades and said you can't stop growth but you can accommodate growth and work with growth and that is what the smart plan is doing. What need to happen is the Township Committee has to find ways to make this happen money wise and the transportation upgrades need to happen before the process goes on. The end result will be a tremendously good result for Lakewood.

Mr. Percal said he would like to join his colleagues in expressing how pleased he is with the presentation. He feels an ease that nothing is set in stone have confidence that if problems arise that will require changes and adaptations they will be handled accordingly. He is pleased with what he heard tonight and will give his support.

Mr. Jackson clarified a comment from a board member and Mr. Abelman. He said what the standard is his office would review this to make certain that is was consistent with the States smart growth plan.

Mr. Neiman said what he got from the comments from the board is that they seem to be in of favor of recommending this to the Township Committee.

Motion was made by Mr. Banas, seconded by Mr. Percal, to recommend the Smart Growth Plan to the Township Committee

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Fink; yes, Mr. Neiman; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Schmuckler; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

6. CORRESPONDENCE

-None at this time

7. PUBLIC PORTION

-None at this time

8. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Minutes from September 15, 2009 Planning Board Meeting

Motion was made by Mr. Franklin, seconded by Mr. Fink, to approve

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Fink; yes, Mr. Neiman; yes, Mr. Banas; abstain, Mr. Schmuckler; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

9. APPROVAL OF BILLS

Motion was made by Mr. Schmuckler, seconded by Mr. Fink, to approve

ROLL CALL: Mr. Franklin; yes, Mr. Fink; yes, Mr. Neiman; yes, Mr. Banas; yes, Mr. Schmuckler; yes, Mr. Percal; yes

Mr. Jackson asked if he was instructed to direct a letter to the Township Committee advising them that the planning board unanimously recommended the adoption of the smart growth plan and the board said yes.

10. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was hereby adjourned. All were in favor.

**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
OCTOBER 13, 2009
MEETING**

**TOWNSHIP OF LAKEWOOD
PLAN REVIEW**

**submitted
Johnson
Board Recording Secretary**

Respectfully

**Chris
Planning**