

MEETING MINUTES

**TOWNSHIP OF OCEAN
REDEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

NOVEMBER 13, 2013

6:00 PM

CALL TO ORDER

Roll Call: Joseph Lachawiec Absent Dennis Tredy X Tina Wetter X

FLAG SALUTE

Open Public Meeting Act – Pursuant to the provisions of the New Jersey Open Public Meeting Act, adequate notice of this meeting was properly provided by sending copies of the Notice of Meeting to two newspapers, the Asbury Park Press and the Press of Atlantic City. The Notice was posted at the Office of the Township Clerk and on the bulletin board of the Administration building.

MEETING MINUTES

Motion to approve Meeting Minutes of June 10, 2013 was moved by Deputy Mayor Tredy, seconded by Mayor Wetter.

Roll Call: Tredy: Yes, Wetter: Yes

REGULAR MEETING

NEW BUSINESS

MBI Development Company, Inc

Redevelopment Plan – Block 41, Lots 27, 28, 29.03, 29.07, 30

76 Age Restricted Affordable Units to be known as the Town Center at Waretown Phase II

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed tonight's Redevelopment proposal is from MBI Development Company Inc. The developer has previously received approvals from this agency and also received site plan approval and it is believed, subdivision approval from the Land Use Board/Planning Board.

There was a round of funding available for affordable housing, which was part of an application. Unfortunately, the funding was not available. Since that time, Hurricane Sandy has resulted in another round of funding that has been made available. Due to this project already receiving its preliminary approvals and was ready to move forward, this project was moved up on the list for funding for affordable housing purposes. MBI Development Company Inc. has applied for and received the funding.

MBI Development Company is here for approval from the Redevelopment Agency and then will move to the Planning Board. The plan is slightly different than the one previously approved in that it is actually less units than previously approved.

Vincent D'Elia, D'Elia Law Firm, representing MBI Development Company Inc., is here for a consistency hearing. The purpose of this hearing is to establish the application is consistent with the purpose of intent of the Redevelopment Plan. The Professionals' letters have been reviewed. The

applicant already has a preliminary approval for a site plan for a 100 unit senior affordable housing rental units. This has been previously approved under the current plan. This application is 76 units.

Township Attorney McGuckin swore in the applicant's professionals.

Jay Kruse, Associate Vice President with Dewberry Engineering Inc., currently running the Mt. Laurel, New Jersey office, graduated in 1993 from Pennsylvania University with a bachelor science degree in civil engineering. In 1998, Mr. Kruse obtained a professional engineering license and has been practicing as a professional engineer since that time. Mr. Kruse has served as a consultant for public and private clients for residential, retail, industrial and commercial development throughout the state and also served as a consultant to municipalities as a Zoning, Planning and Township Engineer.

Mr. Kruse will give an overview of the project and the differences between the approved plans and the current plans. The applicant has received approval for 100 units and overall development which included about 1.8 acres of impervious surfaces, including parking areas, landscaping, sidewalk areas and the building itself. The orientation of the previous plan had a driveway off the extension of Memorial Drive, going westward from Route 9 and extending further up into future areas of development northward.

There is internal parking past the building off that internal driveway, which will house parking spaces for the tenants of the age restricted community. In that facet, there were approximately 80 parking spaces for the 100 units, for .8 spaces per unit. That was previously approved when this plan was approved by the Planning Board. That parking requirement has been previously reviewed and approved by the Planning Board.

The applicant is proposing a reduction in the development area and the overall development intensity for the project. The units are now a total of 76. In a smaller footprint, notice the lot area being proposed to develop on basically shrunk from the north to the south. Instead of 3.3 acres of disturbance in development, the applicant is now proposing roughly 2.76 acres. With that reduction also comes a reduction in the units and at least a reduction of impervious surfaces.

Since the applicant is holding that .8 previously approved parking density, the applicant only needs 61 spaces to service the 76 units. The spaces were refigured throughout the development to try to get more spaces internal for internal circulation and fronting along the front of the building, which in this case is going to be more inside. The rear of the building will be on the Memorial Drive area. Both facets and both facades will look similar to frontages.

There is parking on the driveway off the Memorial Drive extension. It is a similar location and design as previously approved. The applicant reduced the impervious area of approximately .33 acres, from 1.88 to 1.35 acres, which helps with the amount of disturbance needed for this development and the overall stormwater management that is needed for the development.

Also included in the overall design is circulation for pedestrians and bicyclists. There is internal sidewalks in the interior of the development and along the driveway the applicant is proposing. The applicant is also proposing a connection into the existing shopping center, which provides continuity of the flow of pedestrians through that development and into the housing development. Other areas being proposed are the extension and sidewalk along Memorial Drive. The extension leads westward, providing an overall circulation for pedestrians and bicyclist.

The applicant will provide landscaping throughout the project. The landscaping will be done in accordance with the overall plans that were given to the Planning Board. The applicant is going to be expanding the stormwater management basin that exists. When the Phase I of the development was constructed, there was an infiltration proposed along the eastern border of the proposed site development area. That basin was not sized to handle the Phase II section of the development. What the applicant is proposing to do with the intent of the original approval for the original design was to expand that stormwater management basin to accommodate the stormwater level from the Phase II of the project. The applicant will be expanding that westward along the border of the proposed parking area in the north south border to handle the stormwater management for the development and for future access driveways that lead northward and eastward back into the development. Those driveways are not being proposed now. Those would be constructed at a future time by the developer of future phases and Phase I.

DEP permit requirements include relocating an area in the bottom of the existing infiltration basin out of the facility and create a new vernal pool, which is an open area with water in the bottom during certain times of year, then remains dry. The proposed location is the preservation area, which there has already been discussions with the DEP at the application meeting. The DEP would rather have it located as far away from the development as possible and become more natural and integrated into that preservation area. The appropriate location of that pool is still in the process of being determined, in accordance with the DEP permit.

Stan Slachetka, T&M Engineering discussed the two site plans are at different scales.

James Haley, Principle, Haley Donovan, located in Haddonfield, NJ. Mr. Haley has degrees in Architecture from Temple and Drexel University and 20 years experience in the development, construction and architecture of residential buildings, specifically affordable residential buildings. Mr. Haley has previously been the Director of Architecture of the Ingerman Group. For the past 7 years, Mr. Haley has been the principle of Haley Donovan.

Mr. Haley discussed at the original meetings were comments that the architecture was not reflective of the location. With the reduction in unit count and scale of the building, the redesign of the building came up with an architecture that was more indicative of the Jersey shore. Beyond material changes and scale and proportion changes, the applicant added balconies and vertical bay elements.

Reflective of the site plan, it is best to have two entrances to the building. One along Willow and one at the rear entrance where a majority of the parking is located. There is a large main porch entry element off Willow and an identical porch entrance off the rear parking. Off the porch entrance is a two-entrance airlock vestibule as well as an open two-story lobby, a large community room with warming kitchen that opens on to the rear patio and a large plaza area that will be beautified. The management office is directly off the main Willow Street entrance and additional services, restrooms for use of the community room or entrance lobby and mail center. The applicant designs their senior apartment buildings like hotels. They are furnished like hotels and design the building internally like a small town. The applicant hopes this will become an unofficial senior center within the community.

There will be slate flooring and wood floors throughout and really nice trim and furnishing packages. The community room opens up to a patio. There are hallways that feed off to one and two bedroom apartments. There are 76 apartments total. 70 one bedroom apartments and six two bedroom apartments. The typical apartment has an open kitchen, dining and living area. The entrance area is recessed giving each resident an opportunity to create a personal space at their entrance. Each apartment is adaptable or accessible to the majority of the apartments. All the apartments will be available to wheelchair bound

individuals. The only difference between adaptable and accessible is the use of cabinet modification systems and additions.

The units have a large restroom, mechanical space, closets and a large bedroom. The one bedroom units will have a patio off the bedroom. The two bedroom units have the same large kitchen, dining and living room open areas with a fenced in area, two bedrooms, a full bath and a large amount of closet space and a patio off the bedroom.

The building is designed to feel like two buildings that are lightly connected. That allows for a really nice elevator lobby at the connection and to feed that lobby with natural light. There is a three story porch off the lobby, giving a congregational element for tenants to meet and hang out. The sustainability initiative includes a non-smoking building. A lot of seniors like to smoke. There is a space to smoke outdoors.

The buildings are fully sprinklered and meet all fire codes. All fire ratings are intact beyond existing conditions to meet code. There are egress stairs throughout the community and maintenance facilities. The trash rooms are chutes that make their way vertically through the building. The trash rooms also include recycling.

The second floor plan is mostly one bedrooms. The two bedrooms are on the ends. A communal laundry is off the elevator. There's a bridge overlooking the lobby area. There is a small fitness center and a lounge, which feed onto a patio that overlooks the rear plaza.

The third floor plan is more of the same. There will be a nice elevator core, mostly one bedrooms with an oversized two bedroom and a patio off the elevator core. The ends of the building are broken down to two stories so they quietly break down the scale to meet the neighboring community.

The leasing space and management office will be served by a full-time member. There will also be a full-time maintenance person on site. The buildings will be well maintained and well observed throughout the day.

The Willow Street elevation shows an aerial view within the site. Willow Street will be able to handle all of the handicap accessibility. The handicap ramp is concealed within the court, which is a really nice feature. The ramps are folded into the porch set up, showing a nice gradual entrance process, whether a person is wheelchair bound or able bodied. The base of the building is wrapped in brick. The water table brings the brick up to the first course, with a series of siding applications of yellow and white.

The Memorial Drive elevations show a nice three story center meeting hall, with a beautiful cupola on top. From Memorial Drive, the two masses are linked with a three story covered porch that feeds into the elevator floor, which provides a good amount of natural light into the center court. There is a traditional use of materials consistent with the plan.

The roof is made of traditional materials, with architectural fiberglass shingles throughout the majority of the building. There are two different sidings. The building has Energy Star windows and doors. This building will have a strict Energy Star application, which involves high-efficiency mechanical systems, a thermal envelope that is high value throughout, as well as moisture migration and building ceiling thermal bypass checklist applications. There will be Energy Star lighting and appliances. The entire building will be designed and reviewed by a third party certifier that will prove this building is at least 30% more efficient than the typical building.

The building will have a major sustainability initiative that is provided to all projects. That starts with construction. The applicant uses panels and trusses. All materials are recycled. The developer has been successful using as much as 70% recycle content in the construction process. Beyond that, the developer does recycle contact carpets, organic paints and uses resilient floorings that are less harmful to the environment. The developer uses ventilation systems. The building is very energy efficient and sustainable.

Lara Schwager, Ingerman Development Principal for five years. All funding has been received and is in place for the project. The majority of the project is funded through the CDBG block grant money related to Sandy. About \$9 million is coming from that money, which is allowing this project to move forward. Ingerman is a development company and a management company. The benefit is Ingerman is there from development through management and lease compliance. Ingerman is not a merchant builder. Ingerman holds and owns all its properties.

Ingerman will have a manager's office with an onsite manager five days a week, depending on the need. There will be a maintenance office with a maintenance manager on site and will have a person that will clean the carpets and landscape. A lot of that work is contracted out. There will be on-call maintenance 24 hours-a-day. If there is an emergency, there will be a number the residents can call. If it is a true emergency, someone is available to come out 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Ingerman handles all the compliance for the communities. There is an entire Ingerman division that ensures the residents who buy and lease are properly qualified and meet the required standard in order for the Township to file with COAH. Ingerman will give the Township the reporting needed to file with COAH. Ingerman insures all residents have credit and criminal background checks. Ingerman qualifies the residents according to their income levels. COAH verifies the income as well.

Jim Oris, T&M Engineering, discussed the T&M review letter dated November 12, 2013, regarding planning consistency and other issues in the review. The first page is a summary of the application and reiterates that this application was previously heard before the Redevelopment Committee and was deemed consistent with the Redevelopment Plan in place at that time. The applicant also was in front of the Planning Board and received site plan approval for the 100 units.

Page two of the review letter is a recap regarding the project description and master planning elements.

Stan Slachetka, T&M Associates, Township Planner, for Redevelopment Committee, discussed his review letter with regard to the planning comments and consistencies. Mr. Slachetka discussed a technical correction. The first page correctly identifies the project as a 76 unit project. In a few other places, the review memo incorrectly identifies the project as 79 units. This project had received prior approval from the Committee as to its consistency with the Redevelopment Plan that was in place at the time as well as receiving site plan approval by the Planning Board. This site, on this location, has been identified in the Town Center Plan in the Township's Affordable Housing Plan as a location for a multifamily, senior affordable project.

Over the course of the last decade, or close to a decade, this has been a site that has been identified as being a critical site in the Town Center Plan and as part of Township's overall affordable housing plans as well. As you are aware, the Township Committee adopted an amendment to the Waretown Town Center Redevelopment Plan and specifically adopted the TC Town Center District of the Redevelopment Plan in April of this year. This site is located within the TC District and therefore the Amended Redevelopment

Plan is the plan that currently governs any revisions or amendments to the proposed project. T&M Associate's review is all in the context of that new plan and not the prior plan.

T&M Associates found the plan as proposed and as revised from the prior approvals to be generally consistent with the TC Town Center District Redevelopment Plan. There are a few specific exceptions or areas of nonconformity that are highlighted in the review memo. Basically the four key ones are the proposed project is for a three-story building and the plan permits 2 ½ stories. Parking is located 17 feet from the property line, while the plan requires 25 feet. That is primarily a technical issue. What is being proposed in terms of the north out access way, which is identified as Willow Street on the applicant's plan, is not proposed as a public right-of-way. It actually is part of the applicant's site. It had been previously approved as a parking area for the project.

With the reduction in the scale of the project, the number of parking spaces has also been reduced. The applicant also removed some of the parking spaces from that parking lot area which is constituting what the Willow Street area was to the rear of the building, to the center of the "block", which makes it more consistent with the concepts of the streets and the street typology in the Town Center Plan. That 17 feet, if in fact that was a public right-of-way, would not be a nonconformity. It is just a technical nonconformity.

Mr. Slachetka will discuss a little bit about some nonconformities on Willow Street and Memorial Drive. The parking, as noted, is not being provided pursuant to RSIS standards, which is required in the plan. The Township has heard from the applicant with regard to their parking requirements being tied to the nature of the units, the prior approvals and essentially their being consistent in maintaining that parking ratio as part of the proposed project. Mr. Slachetka does not see it as being a critical issue.

The requirement in the Redevelopment Plan is for a 2 ½ story structure. When the Township adopted the Redevelopment Plan, the Township adopted a form-based code for the area. The Township identified certain building types that would be distributed throughout the Town Center. In this specific location there are what we call "C type" buildings. Essentially C-type buildings are multifamily buildings. The project, as proposed, is completely consistent with that C-type building, with the exception of the three stories.

This is a multifamily senior project. It is receiving federal funding and low income tax credits. The idea of a three story structure provides for a more compact development form, organized and consistent with a general block structure approach and the general approach to C-type buildings that are proposed in the plan. Despite the building being a 3 story building versus a 2 ½ story building, that is minor nonconformity in the context of the overall plan. The architectural design attempt has been to reduce the mass of the building, particularly at the end points that would make it more conforming and consistent with the intent of the plan.

On page 5, the Township also identifies the lot standards that are currently in the plan. This all has to do with the site and area being in a form based approach. Focusing on that form based approach is the relationship of the buildings to the lot dimensions. The project conforms to the lot standard requirements. The two points just made, regarding the exception of the parking set back line as being 17 feet versus 25 feet and the 3 story building versus 2 ½ story building.

The L shaped building and the way the building is oriented on the site, in relationship to Memorial Drive and its relationship to Willow Street, which essentially tries to emulate a streetscape in the plan, is exactly what the Township is trying to implement throughout the Town Center, where buildings are oriented

towards the street, close to the street, creating an attractive and interesting streetscape and the building maintaining that relationship with the street edge, and moving that parking within the interior of blocks. Essentially this becomes a block with Willow Street and Memorial Drive. The building orientation, layout and architectural design are substantially consistent with the concepts in the Town Center Plan.

The general intent of the plan has to emulate Jersey Shore type architectural styles and changes in certain areas of the building façade. All are consistent with the concepts in the Town Center Plan. Certain aspects will be addressed in more detail when the applicant is before the Planning Board. T&M Associates is focusing on the general consistency with the Redevelopment Plan.

The circulation and parking intent has been to restructure what had been the prior onsite parking area to emulate a street that would be consistent with the standards and parameters within the Town Center Plan. There is a table on Page 6 of the plan which identifies the level of consistency of the plan to the standards of the project in comparison to the Redevelopment Plan. The Township identified the various standards that are set forth in the plan. The plan as noted, creates a street typology, under different categories of streets that are identified for different locations within the plan. Both Memorial Drive and Willow Street would be what we call road type C. There are standards and also a cross section for that type of street. Essentially that is a residential connector street. It is the smallest of different categories of streets within the Town Center Plan. It contemplates a 65 foot wide right-of-way, sidewalks and pedestrian access waves on both sides of the street. Parking provided on the street would be parallel parking.

The right of way is consistent with the plan. It is a 60 foot right-of-way. Sidewalks are only being proposed on one side of the street. This project only fronts on one side of the street on the north side of Memorial Drive. To the east of the site, there are sidewalks that are provided to a certain point in other areas of Memorial. Along a substantial part of the Shop Rite frontage, where the berm is behind the loading area, there are not sidewalks there. The applicant is proposing a sidewalk on the north side of Memorial on its side of the project as well as extending that sidewalk down to a certain extent to the east along the Shop Rite frontage but not along the entire length of the frontage. They are doing more sidewalk than they would normally be required to do pursuant to the Redevelopment Plan.

T&M Associates' comments regarding the sidewalk location is that it should be separated a bit from the curb line to allow for a planting strip along the sidewalk. The width of the sidewalk area is proposed to be 10 feet. That 10 feet is identified because the overall development is going to be a more intensive mixed-use development. This location is not going to be as critical. The idea is to get people off the street right-of-way and allow for pedestrian access along Memorial Drive and to park and recreation areas that would be further to the east. The sidewalk width is not as critical in this location. It is technically a nonconformity to the standards in the plan.

Parking is supposed to be on both sides of the road. In this instance, no parking is proposed on Memorial Drive. There is no parallel parking in any other location of Memorial Drive. The cartway width is about 24 feet with no parking. From the standpoint of consistency and the nature of this project, it is not a critical issue or concern. Technically it is a nonconformity.

Regarding Willow Street, normally there would be a 60 foot right-of-way and parallel parking on both sides. In this instance this is a modification from the previously approved parking, which had 90 degree parking. Scott Taylor and Stan Slachetka reviewed the plan and made recommendation to the applicant that the number of spaces required could not be limited to just parallel parking. As a compromised approach in this specific instance, the angled parking will be an appropriate approach at this location. It is not the ideal situation. It's not something the Township would recommend in other parts of the plan.

Given the nature of the project, the low-income senior project, the nature of the prior approvals in terms of the Township approvals and discussions and negotiations with DEP under CAFRA approvals, this is a reasonable and acceptable compromise in this specific and unique circumstance.

The applicant does not include sidewalks on both sides. This is an issue and key concern for Mr. Slachetka. There are sidewalks that are proposed between the parking area and proposed building development. The sidewalks are a little narrower than 10 feet. The recommendation is for increasing the width of those sidewalks. The review report also makes a recommendation for the applicant to work with the Shop Rite developer to provide a dedicated pedestrian and bike path on the eastern side of the parking lot between the parking area and the basin with a fence between the walkway and the basin. There are pedestrian and bicycle access safety issues, with the fact that the property to the west is going to be a forest preservation area as part of the DEP approvals for the overall Shop Rite development and for Willows.

There will be no possibility to provide for a north-south street connection as originally contemplated in the current version of the Redevelopment Plan. This Willows Street connection is the only manner in which pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles will be able to make that north-south connection between Memorial Drive and Volunteer Way. That is very important. Memorial Drive is also a potential access way for the recreation areas to the west of this property. As you go down Memorial Drive, there is additional residential development, particularly the Tradewinds development at the end of Memorial Drive. A lot of the pedestrian circulation taking place within the Town Center area is going to be coming through here. There clearly needs to be an easement for that pedestrian, vehicular and bicycle movement. The Township really needs to ensure the safety and attractiveness of that north south connection. Bicyclists can go past the parking areas and decide to use the street edge. From a site design perspective, there are some concerns about that. That is not the ideal situation and circumstance.

Deputy Mayor Tredy discussed there is already a connection.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the connection does go through the shopping center area. There is going to be residential neighborhood and mixed use development that will be developed to the north of that area. That will be the internal neighborhood street for that development. Ideally, the Township would not like to see bicyclists and pedestrians walking north-south through the shopping center. People driving will want to make that short cut through there. It was contemplated that connection would make the further connection to the north as part of the street network of the project.

Jim Oris, T&M Engineering, discussed it is important to have these connections. The applicant has indicated they are willing to work with the Township and provide a layout that would be satisfactory to meet the intent of that access.

Lara Schwager discussed Ingerman has always shown a sidewalk on the plan that would go along the frontage of the property. The property line ends at the edge of the parking. At the moment, the applicant does not have rights to construction sidewalks on properties that the applicant does not own. The applicant has proposed a sidewalk along the frontage of the building that would connect across and down through the two buildings. This sidewalk was approved on this plan. The applicant's original approval had a sidewalk that came down along the entrance. The applicant will work with the Township regarding the width of the sidewalk. Before site plan is submitted for approval, the applicant will meet with Stan, Jim and Scott to figure out the right configuration. It is agreed that there needs to be a sidewalk and pedestrian connection.

Mr. Slachetka discussed that is acceptable. The point is the applicant recognizes the importance and need of the access within the development. It's also providing safe access for pedestrians through the whole Waretown Town Center.

Mr. Oris discussed Willow Street will be contained within an easement, which will guarantee access for the general public. It will be on private property and will be maintained by the property owner. The easement will guarantee access for through traffic, pedestrian traffic, parking and the light.

Mr. Slachetka discussed the Township will definitely need to have a full right of way to the north of the facility. The applicant had prior approvals and the Township is working to make this more consistent with the concepts within the Redevelopment Plan. That area will be designed in accordance with the Town Center standards and cross sections. One of the recommendations was where the sidewalk connections will be placed and moved in a manner that will allow them to continue on northward into the new streets. The applicant is willing to work with the Township on that.

With the exceptions of the identified nonconformities, the Township found that the overall project, in terms of building types, size, layout and design is consistent with the Town Center Plan. The nonconformities are basically there because of the prior approvals and the fact there are certain standards and requirements that have to be met with regards to federal funding as well as CAFRA approvals. None of those substantially undermine the overall consistency of the project with the Redevelopment Plan. The Governing Body, acting as the Redevelopment Entity, does not have the authority to grant exceptions in this context. However the Redevelopment Committee does have the authority to recommend to the Planning Board or provide an opinion of perspective to the Planning Board with regards to the viewpoint on those nonconformities and the overall consistency of the Redevelopment Plan. The Planning Board can take that into consideration and act accordingly on any requests for deviations from the plan that the applicant has made.

None of the deviations are so substantial that they would require an amendment to the Redevelopment Plan. The applicant is not proposing new uses that would not be contemplated. The applicant is not proposing a complete building type and form that would not be contemplated under the Redevelopment Plan. The Redevelopment Plan itself will need to be revised to reflect the street layout in this area. The Township provided a map that shows a proposed block structure and street layout that recognizes this development as well as the areas identified as forest preservation. That change would be required regardless of what the Committee does on this application with regards to consistency. The Township does not think that is something that relates specifically to this application. The plan will have to be fine tuned. When the street layout was put together, the Township did not have all the information about the forest preservation area. The overall concept will not change at all. The north south connection has always been recognized as part of the redevelopment plan. Further to the north and west will have to be changed to recognize the forest preservation area before any other applicant comes for those areas more north of the site. It will not affect this specific project.

The applicant also submitted a supplemental request for a proposed monument sign that would be located near the intersection of Memorial Drive and Route 9 adjoining the front plaza area on the Shop Rite site. That monument sign would identify the Willows project with a directional arrow that will point to Willows. The Shop Rite development is in a different Redevelopment Plan area in the Route 9 Phase I Redevelopment Plan area, governed by the standards of that plan. That plan allows for three monument signs, one for each street frontage. There are no monuments currently on Memorial Drive so that would be allowed. The architectural style has to be compatible with the overall development in the project area. It is the Township's opinion that the architectural style of the sign is consistent and compatible.

An inconsistency is only one of the three monument signs is permitted with panels that identify the various tenants in the project. The Shop Rite development already has a monument sign at its main entrance which has panels. That feature of the plan, recognizing those individual tenants, would not be consistent with the standards.

Ms. Schwager discussed what is being requested is a two-part sign. Because it is part of the application, the developer can't give the Township a sign that only shows part of it and not the other part of it. The developer agreed with the property owner that both pieces of the sign would be presented tonight. It is part of the application because the developer is asking for the Willows sign to be on it. The developer has requested that not only the Willows directional sign be on it but also retail tenant signs. The retail frontage is all internal and not external.

Deputy Mayor Tredy discussed not liking that signage at all.

Ms. Schwager discussed Ingerman is not here tonight to have that discussion. The developer would like to preserve the location of that sign so that the Willows directional sign could be put on it. If the developer wishes to do something more, they can come back and request it.

Mr. Slachetka discussed rather than lock in a specific location, the applicant should come before the Planning Board for the sign request. The specific location and a full review can be undertaken of that proposed sign. The concept of having a directional sign is okay. Whether or not it is exactly at the right location or whether it should be lowered due to not having tenant signs on it, should be an actual application before the board.

Ms. Schwager requested the Committee agree that a directional sign along the corner of Route 9 and Memorial Drive is consistent with the plan and that Ingerman will work with T&M Associates and Taylor Design Group to design the sign.

Deputy Mayor Tredy discussed that is reasonable.

Scott Taylor discussed the developer is performing work on that adjacent lot. That lot itself will have to be part of the Planning Board application as well.

Ms. Schwager discussed this lot is part of the Planning Board application because of the expansion of the basin. There is an entrance sign required in the plan, but because no one can see that coming off Route 9, the developer wants to have a directional sign to get back there. Ingerman is asking tonight if a directional sign in that location under the different zone is consistent because the ground is allowed to have that type of monument sign in that location. Ingerman is asking that the sign be consistent and will work with you on the shape and size of it.

Mr. Taylor discussed that would actually need a formal Planning Board action.

Mr. Oris discussed there were just a few other engineering-related items. T&M Associates reviewed the plans and reviewed the approach of the stormwater management and find that the representations are reasonable and can be a part of a full review with regard to the future Planning Board application if the Redevelopment Committee moves to carry this application forward. Additionally, there are environmental issues and approvals that would have to be resolved at some point and coordinated with the DEP. A meeting will need to take place to coordinate such items as the location of the vernal pool and

the Township's future plans for recreation and Township owned property. The applicant is willing to participate in that meeting.

Ms. Schwager discussed Ingerman had preapplication meetings and are in the review process for a CAFRA permit. The location of the vernal pond was requested originally in the prior application. In the original approved application, there is a proposed piece that will serve as a vernal and retention pool. It was requested the vernal pond be moved as far away from the development as possible. Jim Oris and Stan Slachetka are looking to have a much broader discussion with CAFRA. The CAFRA permit has to move forward and get approved by February 2014. Ingerman is willing to have a meeting with CAFRA and the engineers to discuss the location of the vernal pool. If the CAFRA permit can get issued, the vernal pool can be moved around until construction begins.

Mr. Slachetka discussed having informal conversations with representatives of NJDEP and CAFRA regarding the need for the overall approval of the Town Center. The DEP has been made aware of the vernal pool location issue and the context of how that may or may not impact other elements of the Town Center Plan. The Township and the DEP have indicated they would agree to further discussions with the Township on a more comprehensive solution to the CAFRA and regulatory issues that relate to the implementation of the Town Center.

Mr. Taylor discussed an error on the November 13, 2013 Taylor Design report. The second paragraph of Item #1, third sentence states "the applicant plans to construct 76 100 units". This should be 76 units. The Redevelopment Entity has been deferring more of the technical review comments to the Planning Board. The applicant has done a nice job modifying the site design. Due to the fact it is an affordable project, the road configuration is not ideal. Ingerman's agreement to work with the streetscape with additional plantings and pedestrian connections, can be attractive. Architect Haley gave testimony with good changes for an affordable project. It is all siding and brick with no ethos component to the project. Ingerman has done a nice job with the dormer elements and other forms to break up the façade. It is a rather long building. Ingerman did a nice job creating shadow lines and variations of materials and forms for that. Mr. Taylor suggested proposing divided, internal grills. A lot of other projects have incorporated that. It gives it a nice residential feel.

Mr. Haley discussed preferring a more traditional form. Two over two would be more consistent.

Mr. Taylor discussed Ingerman has made an effort with light yellow and white colors to stay in a seashore motif. A lot of the mainland homes are not quite that light. The scale on the mass of that structure might be able to be reduced a bit if some tans and slightly more muted tones were introduced.

Mr. Haley likes the yellow and white but discussed that a color study could be done.

Mr. Taylor discussed the rest of the comments on the report can be deferred to the Planning Board.

Ms. Schwager discussed Item #9 on Page 3 of the Taylor Design report. Ingerman will not be building any bus shelter or the like. There are covered porches for Ocean County Transportation to pick up senior residents. NJ Transit will not come off Route 9 into the housing.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Motion to open Public Comment was moved by Deputy Mayor Tredy, seconded by Mayor Wetter.
Roll Call: Tredy: Yes, Wetter: Yes

Nick Mackres, Mackres Family LLC, 535 Route 9, Waretown, discussed this is a great project and should move forward quickly. This town can use something like this. It will be good for all people in the town. Mr. Mackres inquired if the project is bigger than 3.7 acres.

Mr. Haley discussed 2.76 acres.

Mr. Mackres discussed 76 units over 2.76 acres is 25 units an acre.

Mr. Mackres discussed the height restrictions. In the past, it was 2.5 stories. Now it has been lifted to three stories. That is inconsistent with the plan. The previous person could not be heard because of inconsistencies. The applicant mentioned hotels. Mr. Mackres has no issue with that either. The Redevelopment Plan used to say nautical theme. That is people's personal discretion, what a nautical theme is. Mr. Mackres inquired where is the landscape plan.

Ms. Schwager discussed the landscape plan was submitted.

Mr. Mackres inquired about a Township Planner.

Ms. Schwager discussed previously having Planning Board approval and the application was also previously deemed consistent with the plan. All that testimony was done already.

Mr. Mackres discussed not having any issues with this, just pointing it out. Mr. Mackres requested the Committee vote this through. Mr. Mackres would love to see it. It is not a competition. Mr. Mackres hopes it is great and hopes it goes through.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed Mr. Slachetka mentioned 27 half units per acre density. Please address that as far as to the consistency of this project with the Redevelopment Plan in this area of the municipality, in this part of the Redevelopment zone.

Mr. Slachetka discussed as indicated before, historically this had been identified for a multifamily senior affordable housing project. In fact, actually specifically, the plan had identified this for 100 units, which was consistent with what had previously been approved. This is somewhat less in terms of the total number of units. The tract size was reduced a bit.

Ms. Schwager discussed the tract size could have been made bigger. Ingerman made it as tight as possible. There was no reason to make it any bigger.

Mr. Slachetka discussed this project needs to be looked at in the context that this is Phase II of the overall development, which includes some of the tree protection areas. This area has always been contemplated within the confines of the plan as a higher density, multifamily residential component.

Township Attorney McGuckin discussed, "as compared to other areas in the Redevelopment Zone, which did not provide for that same density".

Mr. Slachetka discussed the important thing to note is that what we have is adopted as a form based code. The Township is looking in terms of the distribution of densities. It is really more of the distribution of specific housing types, from single family detached to multifamily to a mixed of multifamily and nonresidential or mixed use development and townhouses. If you look at the plan, the idea of the plan is to provide for a diversity and a variety of different housing types and different building forms throughout the Town Center. It is carefully planned out and focused on concentrating on some of the key areas near the mixed use Main Street that constitutes Volunteer Way. This is in close proximity to that.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if it is Mr. Slachetka's professional opinion that the plan that has been presented to the Redevelopment Agency tonight is in general consistency with the TC Town Center District Redevelopment Plan adopted by the Committee.

Mr. Slachetka discussed, yes it is.

Township Attorney McGuckin inquired if Mr. Taylor agrees with that.

Mr. Taylor discussed yes he would agree. Especially being mindful of the testimony that was provided earlier. This is a project that is 100% affordable unit. There is not a mark or a component to this. The courts provide guidance to municipalities about not creating cost generative elements in conjunction with affordable projects. Based on that there has been a good design presented. It's been modified and it is generally consistent with the Redevelopment Plan as presented and as agreed to tonight.

Motion to close Public Comment was moved by Deputy Mayor Tredy, seconded by Mayor Wetter.
Roll Call: Tredy: Yes, Wetter: Yes

Township Attorney McGuckin addressed the issue of having heard the testimony from the applicant and the public. The Redevelopment Committee would determine if the application is consistent with the Township's Redevelopment Plan, and if it is, it would be sent to the Planning Board for their review, in accordance with the ordinance.

A motion of approval of the application and sending the application to the Planning Board, having found the application consistent with the Redevelopment Plan was moved by Deputy Mayor Tredy, seconded by Mayor Wetter.

Roll Call: Tredy: Yes, Wetter: Yes

Adjournment

Motion to adjourn was moved by Deputy Mayor Tredy, seconded by Mayor Wetter.
Roll Call: Tredy: Yes, Wetter: Yes

Signed and Submitted:

Diane B. Ambrosio, RMC
Township Clerk

Date