

TOWNSHIP OF LOPATCONG
PLANNING BOARD MEETING

May 27, 2015

The meeting of the Planning Board of the Township of Lopatcong was called to order by Chairman VanVliet at 7:00 pm. A silent prayer was offered followed by the Oath of Allegiance.

Chairman VanVliet stated “adequate notice of this meeting has been provided indicating the time and place of the meeting in accordance with Chapter 231 of the Public Laws of 1975 by advertising a Notice in The Star Gazette and The Express Times and by posting a copy on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building.”

Present: Members Belcaro, France, Gural, Hall, Mayor McKay, Vice-Chairman Pryor, Chairman VanVliet. Also present were Engineer Sterbenz and Planner Ritter.

Old Business:

Chairman VanVliet – Has everyone received a copy of the minutes from the last board meeting? Are there any corrections, additions or comments?

Mayor McKay – I have a comment. They’re still long and we should get them more concise in my view. I do make a thank you for now including page numbers and date. That will be helpful in the future. Um, with respect, however to the website pages, um, we had mentioned that we were going to do something about that at the last meeting. Website pages with respect to the Planning Board are behind and I have a couple of sets here I’ll pass down. Okay now, when we look at this page, this is the thing that the public sees, probably the most, that I want to get in touch with Planning Board and as you can see it shows Douglas Steinhardt as Mayor, it’s um, got a lot of people on here that are not on here anymore. Um, it’s, it’s way behind; it shows the wrong attorney. It needs to be updated. In addition, the Planning Board minutes have not been posted to it since July of 2013. Um, so, I would like to make a motion that the Planning Board website be updated and that the minutes and the videos be added to that. That’s my motion.

Chairman VanVliet – I have a motion, do I hear a second.

Member France – Second.

Chairman VanVliet – Discussion. We don’t have direct control over the website though.

Mayor McKay – Yes we do, we just tell them to put it on.

Chairman VanVliet – We requested that they put it on the last meeting.

Mayor McKay – We keep doing it but it doesn’t get on. (Inaudible).

Chairman VanVliet – Okay. That’s all we can do is request, we don’t actually control going on

May 27, 2015

the website and putting it on there as the Planning Board.

Mayor McKay – By virtue of this um, approval we requested formally and we should have it on next time, I hope.

Member France – Well who oversees (inaudible).

Mayor McKay – Um, I believe Beth does.

Secretary Dilts – Do I over see it?

Mayor McKay – The website.

Secretary Dilts – I don't oversee the website.

Mayor McKay - Who oversees the website.

Secretary Dilts – Well Lori is the webmaster.

Mayor McKay – So no one oversees it?

Secretary Dilts – I'm not sure. I'd have to go back and

Mayor McKay – She tells me that you clear everything that goes on there so would you please tell her

Secretary Dilts – Oh yeah I'll send her everything.

Mayor McKay – That would be great.

Chairman VanVliet – Roll call please.

Secretary Dilts – When do you want it to start from? January?

Mayor McKay - I'm sorry. When do I want it to start?

Secretary Dilts – Do you want it to go back to a certain year or

Mayor McKay – I guess 2013 might be fine for now but let's bring it forward.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Mayor I think you mentioned video in your motion.

Mayor McKay – Yeah to the extent we have video.

May 27, 2015

Vice-Chairman Pryor – To the extent we have video.

Secretary Dilts – We just started doing the video before it was just a tape, so.

Member France – Just video if we had it up on our website, is that practical? Video takes a significant amount of space.

Mayor McKay – We have all the minutes of the town council.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – They're on YouTube, they're not on the township website?

Chairman VanVliet – Okay, so, you want to include the video being put on YouTube?

Mayor McKay – The same way it is done for the town council.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay. Any further discussion? Seeing none, Beth roll call please.

AYES: Members Belcaro, France, Gural, Hall, Mayor McKay, Vice-Chairman Pryor, and Chairman VanVliet.

NAYS: None

Chairman VanVliet – Next order of business, under Old Business. Any further discussion on the minutes, hearing none, the minutes will stand as published. Okay moving on further the COAH Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. George if you will handle that for us please.

Mr. Ritter, Planner – Thank you. This evening where the board is, is basically is what we will finish the Housing Element of the Master Plan. I think we're trying to review a little bit this evening those two elements the purpose of which is an amendment to your existing Master Plan and bring them into conformance with a submission we are preparing for the courts in support of the fair share housing obligation of the township. We are putting together the plan and the Fair Share Plan and Housing Element are two of three elements that have to be submitted in the package to the courts. I think we talked about this previously but as you are aware, the courts, several months ago now, basically, what's the best way to put it, lost confidence in COAH and their ability to administer their housing plan for the state and to administer it various townships coming before it for certification and the courts have taken that (inaudible) and they basically have given a window where towns that have fair share housing plans in and before COAH make application to the court for certification and we are coming up on that 30-day period when the towns, if they wish to maintain their certification and protection from Builder's Remedy suits after they make application to the court probably indicating how they are going to meet the housing obligation for what is known as (inaudible) 2014 to 2024 and, so, what we have done is, essentially, the intent that was discussed is to take the exiting plan that's has been pending at COAH for years now and package that along with the proposed amendment to the Fair Share Plan and Housing Element as well as the new Spending Plan and a new obligation that tries to address some of the courts concerns, um, that they had with the original calculated numbers for

May 27, 2015

each community and what, essentially, the housing obligation numbers that COAH put together just before they were disbanded the ones that were in June of 2014 and build a plan off of that addressing those numbers. No one knows how the courts going to judge the plans, quite frankly, nor do we at least, I'm not aware of what they haven't even made in terms of what is or how the fair share obligation for housing should be allocated. This is our approach to it. We assume we will get into the courts; hopefully, they will like everything that we did with no comment. If they don't though, they can come back and we have a time period that of 90 days in which to make adjustments and corrections to the plan as directed by the court and during that time period as long as the courts believe we have a viable plan we'll continue to be protected until the plan would be approved. So, what you're seeing tonight is just one step in that process and we're seeking to update the Fair Share Plan and Housing Element. The third is the Township Council's adoption of the Spending Plan. That plan has not yet been drafted and the reason is, we have not been able to get all the financial data that's on file with COAH for what, essentially, what money is still available in the funds and to develop a plan going forward showing how we will spend and allocate that money to address our needs going forward, so, that's something we still need. We have another 30 days to get that pulled together. Just to give you a little background on each of these – the Housing Element before you is just a document that tries to update some of the demographics in the towns and issues in terms of storing water availability, transportation; it's merely a snapshot or overview on where the town is currently at in terms of population, housing, that type of thing. The Fair Share Plan is really how we intend to address our obligation both past and going forward in terms of how we will actually provide affordable housing or how we have provided affordable housing because part of the plan involves not only the obligation but the credits that have been created to date as well as our meeting our obligation. Starting with the Housing Element and just to give you a little bit of an overview to keep in the back of your mind, um, in June of 2014 COAH had come up with what they believe, the appropriate Third Round obligation for Lopatcong Township and what they came up with at that time was, essentially, a rehabilitation share of zero. The prior round was 56 and the fair share prospective need was 51 for basically an obligation of 107 units. That's the base line for where Round Three are as we see it today. As we go through this, will discuss both our credits and obligations and how we arrived at that and that is really the reason for putting this together. In terms of the housing element, just to give you a little overview of the township and probably most of you know this information generally or read it. As of 2010, the housing stopped in town with about 3,420 units of those 3,136 were occupied and 284 units remained vacant. The population according to the 2010 census was about 8,014. If you compare that back to the 2000 census, the town actually has had substantial growth in population at least in the beginning of this period before the recession. In 2000, the town had a population of 5,765. To give you a sense of where we are population was on a unit basis – owner occupied units are being occupied at a rate of about 2.69 persons. The rental units are about 1.91 persons per unit. In terms of home ownership, the township now stands at about 77%. The county is about 75%. Single family is about 81%. Most of the homes in town are relatively new. In terms just to give you an idea of incomes compared to the county and also value of homes compared to the county as of 2013 basically median income in town is \$76,219.00 that's higher than the county which averages about \$70,912.00. So the town has a little bit higher income on average than the county. In terms of value of the homes, it's slightly turned the other way. The township has a

May 27, 2015

median value of \$266,000; the county has \$271,000. So the housing in town is a little more affordable than your average home in the county. Interestingly enough, the rental rates in town are higher than the county average. In terms of general development in the town as we said we started out in the beginning of 2000 going forward, a very rapid development phase and has not bounced back significantly yet. In terms of job creation, they've been pretty weak; essentially what we've seen was that job creation has dropped. The total number of businesses in town as of 2013 were 33 which generate 582 jobs. The overall employment trend in Lopatcong Township is headed downward. Future business development and job creation will be limited by lack of infrastructure needed to support major commercial or industrial projects. The Highlands Council approved a Lopatcong Highlands Center designation on January 19, 2012. The center covers most of the developed area of the township including the majority of the undeveloped parcels within the ROM South district. In 2013 the Wastewater Management Plan provides for allocation of the balance of the township's sewer capacity to the remaining undeveloped parcels in the center. Public wastewater treatment is provided for by the Town of Phillipsburg which has a treatment capacity of 3.5 MGD. The township's current allocation is 801,000 GPD as per agreements with Phillipsburg. The remaining capacity including the committed flows and the development potential of the Highlands Center is 295,000 GPD. Going forward, probably the biggest obstacle for future development will be the availability of sewer. The balance for use in the Highlands Center is 83,640 GPD.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – George, before you leave that point are you finished on the sewer, I want to ask you a question before you left that part. I don't know, you might of missed it in the Wastewater Management Plan, um, you getting to the 83 by saying the data center is gone right.

Planner Ritter – Right.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Um, there is actually a footnote in there's 20,000 gallons in dispute between Pohat and Lopatcong, so, we can only really specify a range right now. I think you said 83, it be 63/83 in numbers.

Planner Ritter – Yeah.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – That's really never really been, that dispute has never really been resolved.

Planner Ritter – Okay.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – And it is in the Wastewater Management Plan.

Planner Ritter – I'll double check that and get it into the report.

Member Gural – What is the capacity of Phillipsburg?

Planner Ritter – The plan itself and I'm not I got to admit I don't know all the numbers but the

May 27, 2015

plan itself is a maximum of 3.5 million gallons.

Member Gural – And where are they at (inaudible).

Planner Ritter – Well, it is split between several towns. I don't know where they're at.

Member Gural – Okay, so overall it is 7%.

Chairman VanVliet – So they're all allocated through the 3.5.

Member Belcaro – Right now there's only about 2.3 million in actual

Chairman VanVliet – In actual sewage.

Member Belcaro – In actual sewage.

Member Gural – Can we get our cap increased if we have to?

Chairman VanVliet – Not that we know because the allocation has gone to the surrounding townships.

Chairman Pryor – All the townships competing for allocation. They're in the middle of a bunch of improvements now and these improvements in and of themselves don't expand the plant capacity. Physically, it wouldn't be too difficult for them to expand the capacity but in terms of regulatory approvals, the DRBC and other things that's probably the tougher road. I know they would be willing to entertain you know, not everybody wants capacity. Some of the towns feel that's just going to encourage more growth, so.

Planner Ritter – The town still has a fair amount of open land in the center designation as well as the exterior areas within the Planning Area and Preservation Area. But really you're looking at the center designation to maximize those types (inaudible) to encourage development within that area with commercial and industrial rateables, um, but it will have a cap. To take a look at how we net and I think it is easier to lump these two together. In terms of housing our third round obligation which is probably the most important aspect. As we had indicated that the Third Round Obligation/Rehabilitation share was zero. The Third Round Obligation/New Construction was 56 and Prospective Need Obligation 2004 to 2024 was 51 for a total of 107. Against that we have credits and then (inaudible) and what we have looked at is the rehabilitation share, we pointed out COAH today said our number is zero. The township has in the past renovated 12 units so that's a credit of 12. We have prior Cycle for both Lopatcong's senior housing of 40 units. We have inclusionary development at Overlook at 16 units and the remaining prior round obligation of zero. (Inaudible). Lopatcong senior housing which is a surplus area which is six more units. We have supported a special needs housing of group homes (inaudible) and we calculated a bonus. The Supreme Court indicated there is a willingness to still give bonus for rental type houses and we made the assumption that they're going to continue

May 27, 2015

to allow that so we calculated a bonus. The remaining obligation basically, 21, I'm sorry, that's 23 units that we have, essentially, have a program in the Third Round obligation and that obligation has been met through, basically, two mechanism's; one, we have a surplus of 12 units which is carried forward and we have the new construction – Sycamore Landing is going under construction and that was our affordable housing project that you approved several years ago that is finally under construction and they're doing the 20% set aside and we'll get 51 units out that project. So, as I stand right now, we have a surplus of 63 units based on the numbers. So, essentially, we believe that the township has met its obligation. It is actually carrying a surplus forward and if there is any dispute about how we calculated the rental bonuses and the court disputes that, we still have the actual surplus. So, actually, going forward for round three, you could argue you do not have an obligation going forward, an actual legal obligation that doesn't necessarily mean that you don't have to create affordable housing (inaudible) show that we've met our obligation. The Spending Plan which is not part of your obligation to approve will address really the cost of administering the project and also the cost of (inaudible) sections that COAH has always carried forward was two things; we would suggest that the township consider expanding the multi-family inclusionary to take over some other sites and also there is an affordability section in the COAH regulations that the courts are going to consider that or not but in COAH part of your ongoing responsibilities to basically have funds set aside to buy down units that will provide rental assistance that are currently in the program. So, that is an overview of where we are. I do think the town is in pretty good shape. I guess I'll try to answer any questions.

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you George. Any questions.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Were any of the COAH numbers you worked with impacted by the Highlands buildout calculations?

Planner Ritter – Yes 51 is part of that process that the Highlands went through to (inaudible) into that to help establish that.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Was that another thing that the court is going to have to sort out?

Planner Ritter – They're going to have to sort it out because how the Highlands meshes with the medium numbers and that type of thing, it is unclear to me how they're going to work that out. That is one of the reasons we put the numbers that COAH developed as a starting point but it is my own opinion that, I find it hard to believe, I should say that the courts are going to they got to find a basis that they can judge the different towns by. I can't imagine that they're going to let each town and each situation try to come up with what their fair share allocation is and I would say the other side is, is that was specifically mandated by the Highlands that in order to finally be certified under the Highlands, that to be consistent with the Master Plan, means you have to have a certified Housing Element; certified plan to meet your COAH obligation. So, the two are linked, I mean you have to, have to address both in terms of the program, so, I think the courts are going to have to struggle with that.

May 27, 2015

Vice-Chairman Pryor – It sounds to me that we have such a surplus from Sycamore Landing that this reconciliation should be covered.

Planner Ritter – I think so. One of the advantages I think you have is if there are disputes either with the court or with the housing advocate over the numbers, we clearly have a surplus of actual real units; units that are being built, not just paper units or bonus units that we came up with. We actually do have a surplus of units. So, I feel we are in pretty good shape and we don't know where the courts are going but I feel pretty confident.

Mayor McKay - The Clymer Village units – the numbers you are using for the number of units in there are those like negotiated numbers? I think the number of units in there are more.

Planner Ritter – The number that we have for Clymer Village, I think was, I think that was, I guess you'd call it a negotiated number but it was the number of units that were age restricted rental units is where we got them.

Mayor McKay – I think there may be more.

Planner Ritter – I'll check but these are the ones that have been carried forward in all the housing developments and fair share plans since Round One so.

Mayor McKay – Yeah, that was one of those pilot programs (inaudible).

Planner Ritter – (Inaudible).

Mayor McKay – I will look into that and let you know.

Planner Ritter – Okay. This should be forwarded to Council for their consideration. Council does not vote on this, it is not their responsibility to prepare it but it is part of the package (inaudible).

Mayor McKay – You also indicated that you needed financial information.

Planner Ritter – Yes, that is one of the things we have to finish. The Spending Plan and that is really tied to the actual; it is actually tied to the monies that are, that the plan currently has in it, how the monies have been spent, what monies you've collected. I have a series of questions that have to be asked – the financial part of it. It is a part of it that has always been filed with COAH that are in the reports that have been filed yearly with COAH indicating the status, the financial status of the fund and we need those numbers as a starting point for the Spending Plan going forward.

Mayor McKay – Those are available.

Planner Ritter – Okay well as long as somebody can get them to me, I'll develop the plan. I, so

May 27, 2015

far, that has not been, I've been trying to get them for quite a while. So far we have not been able to get them.

Mayor McKay – Okay, approximately \$230,000 of COAH money was put into a specialty bank account.

Planner Ritter – Yes, that is the Project Hope. That is the escrow to build two homes.

Mayor McKay – Right.

Planner Ritter – That I'm aware of but what we need is the actual bookkeeping, the bank account information as to what is in the fund, what monies have been collected so that we can actually match our spending plan to what is in the fund.

Mayor McKay – COAH believes that we owe them (inaudible) a lot of money.

Planner Ritter – Yeah, well, I think we still have to have a starting point and I'm not, and I don't know where you are in that negotiation with COAH but I would believe that as a starting point we ought to have at least what's in the fund today as of December 31st, 2014 and then whatever information can be supplied to me going forward and then what happened in the past still has to be resolved but at least we can submit a plan working with the monies we have today. Unfortunately, it appears that other than the affordability section, of the fund, we really don't need a substantial amount of money to fund the projects and you do have already the money set aside for the two housing projects we just talked about. That's still held in reserve to fund those.

Mayor McKay – Yes and I believe some building lots were pledged but not (inaudible).

Planner Ritter – That's right for the two homes.

Mayor McKay – I'll get you the data.

Member Belcaro – Who is responsible for the data?

Secretary Dilts – I think it would be our CFO and our Zoning Official.

Mayor McKay – The CFO has the data. We'll get you that.

Planner Ritter – I just need to get it done and I have a list of criteria, I'll give it to Beth.

Member France – Did you say that has to be set aside to buy down units, you know rental

Planner Ritter – Assistance.

Member France – assistance. Where's that coming from?

May 27, 2015

Planner Ritter – It comes out of the monies that you have; it is a percentage of the monies that you have in the fund. In other words, if we project over so many years that you are going to collect \$100,000, COAH had a requirement that 30% of that be allocated to make units affordable. Again, whether the courts (inaudible) let us reallocate that money, I don't know. We're just following more or less what COAH, the way they had set it up.

Member France – What's our funding source that got into there. Where'd our funds come from?

Planner Ritter – Well, the town has a fee ordinance where they collect money on new construction which a percentage of new construction money goes toward the affordable housing fund and then in the past there were agreements on developments that actually pay against them now which went into the fund, so, it is really money that was collected as part of new growth in the town.

Chairman VanVliet – Any discussion, questions? If not I'll entertain a motion to adopt the Housing Element and the Fair Share Plan.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – I'll make that motion.

Member France – I'll second it.

Chairman VanVliet – Discussion on the motion. Hearing none, roll call Beth.

AYES: Members Belcaro, France, Gural, Hall, Mayor McKay, Vice-Chairman Pryor, Chairman VanVliet.

NAYS: None

Beth you'll send a letter up to Council along with a letter that they can proceed with the funding solution or information I'm sorry.

Secretary Beth – Yes. I understand they won't be able to adopt anything until the Spending Plan together.

Chairman VanVliet – That's fine we do have a deadline on it right George?

Planner Ritter – Yes, yes either by a special meeting of Council or definitely by next meeting.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay.

Secretary Dilts – It would have to be the July meeting I would assume Mayor McKay. Until we get the numbers from everybody for George for the Spending Plan. This will come to our July meeting.

Mayor McKay – Um, we can get the numbers to George tomorrow or the next day.

May 27, 2015

Planner Ritter – It won't take long to put together the plan.

Secretary Dilts – Okay, that means we can do it next week?

Mayor McKay – Yeah, we'll try.

Chairman VanVliet – Okay, moving on next we have Larkin Associates Block 116, Lots 26.01, 27, 27.02 and 28 as a conceptual site plan. Welcome gentlemen.

Ronald Shimanowitz – Thank you. Good evening Mr. Chairman. My name is Ron Shimanowitz from the firm of Hutt & Shimanowitz. I'm here on behalf of Larken Associates. They are the contract purchaser of the site that the chairman just read off the lots and blocks for you. It is about a 16.6 acre site. It has frontage on Rt. 57 and Baltimore Street. We were before you, different counsel representing the developer. I'm new to the application. Happy to be here. Back in the end of March, we began a presentation to you informally to start the, hopefully, a rezoning process, showing you the site and requesting a rezoning from the Highway/Business Zone to, hopefully, a multi-family zone. At that hearing in March, out of the colloquia between the board and the applicant, some comments came out, certain questions came out and since then, we resubmitted to you two plans; what we call Option One/Option Two and what we would like to do tonight, is present those two plans to you. We brought a team with us, as you can see but I promise you that everyone has been instructed to keep it very short but we did want to cover the various disciplines including engineering, planning, traffic, fiscal impact and things like that. We've studied it all but we don't plan to give you an hour of testimony on each we'll keep it very short and sweet for the board's consideration. With that very brief introduction, and with the chair's permission, I'd like to call upon Bob Heibell to start the process. Thank you.

Mr. Heibell – Yes, I was here in March and I just want to briefly go over what I presented at that point, then answer the questions of the board and we have four colleagues of mine that are going to explain. Once again, it is a 16.6 acre tract it is right next to Warren Heights South. It is across the street from Warren Heights North. The current property zone is the HB Highway/Business Zone and what we ask the Planning Board to consider is a rezoning MFR which is the exact same zone as the adjoining property to the west and across the street to the north. It was several reactions at the board and uh, part of that was what could be built on the property within the HB Zone. Although we haven't presented a plan, I prepared an analysis on my opinion as to what could be built and I supplied that information to the applicant's consultants that are here and I've done quite a bit of work in various municipalities including Lopatcong Township and adjacent to the site at the intersection of 57 and Strykers, it's Strykers Plaza. Larken Associates constructed that, at that point, the allowable impervious, and that's the key here, was 70%. I found that usually, if it is a retail center, about 25% of the allowable impervious is actually the building coverage. What happened is, subsequent to that construction, the township actually has lowered the impervious to 50% so it is my opinion that the EO could be 12 ½%. So, based on the 16.6 acre tract, it is my opinion that if a retail center was built there or one story, it had the appropriate driveways, number of parking spaces, etc., the yield would be approximately 90,000 square feet. That's the numbers our consultants have utilized and they got it once again, from my opinion of

May 27, 2015

this. By the way, I applied that to the 70% and I was right on. So 25% of that was the 30,000 square feet. Second, there was a discussion at the board level about leaving a portion of the frontage as within the HB Zone. The minimum lot area within the HB Zone is 2 acres. So one of the two options that is going to be presented is actually going to show two acres within the HB Zone and it will show that that's 800 square feet of retail that could be built and then on the remaining 14.6 acres, 175 units and that's based on the gross density of 12 units per acre. If one were to build no retail on the 16.6 acres, there is a plan; we're going to show you, with 199. These are exactly the same numbers that I had in March except that now there's a plan that shows those numbers. The other aspect was the board suggested that we interconnect an access from this property to the office day care center that's on the northerly portion. We've done that and you'll see that in a minute and of course, connect that also to the Stryker's Plaza Retail Center. So, you'll see that we've done that. So, we have a connection to Baltimore Street. We have a connection to 57 and we have an internal connection to the properties to the east. With that, I think we are going to bring up our next consultant.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Our next consultant is Rob Larsen who is an architect and also a site planner who prepared the concept plan.

Rob Larsen – Okay, let's start off with the first option as Bob describes and what we have here is Option 1 and this reflects 175 units and 8700 square feet of retail. We've provided point of entry on Rt. 57 and another point of access out to Baltimore Street and also Bob mentioned connections to the other part of it here. Um, I'm going to show you the architecture here but we're keeping it with frame no rise, apartments some of them would intend to have garages, some would be the traditional garden apartment flat. We are showing this 8700 square foot piece of retail up along Rt. 57 again, with proper parking and access to the rear and again, this is showing a rec.center also. Option 2 which shows 199 total units, again, as Mr. Heibell pointed out earlier, and then what we've done is, we've just modified that area to add a few more of the apartment buildings, build a recreation center and keep similar the flow of the boulevard entrance up on Rt. 57 access out to Baltimore and still access to the two adjacent centers. What I'm showing here, again, is two or three story build rise wood frame, property parked RSIS standards and can accommodate a variety of units types one and two bedroom as well. For example, and I'm going to be brief, um, if you were to look at the darker brown buildings here, it's going to be the elevation I'm showing on top and if we look at these sort of light brown buildings that is going to be the elevation I'm showing on the bottom. As an example of the possible architecture, this is what I would consider a very difficult but attractive apartment building, three stories and um, $\frac{3}{4}$ quarters of walk up flight units and on the lower part here we are showing a two story produce again looking to add some variety, some apartments that would be available to have a garage, vary the market for a little bit and again, this would reflect the buildings that are around the outside. So, um, again, examples of the actual layouts I'm happy to answer any questions.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – You probably didn't read our Housing Element. I didn't till a day ago but, um, one of our goals here is green buildings and sustainable site development. Is there any discussion of that?

May 27, 2015

Rob Larsen – I can't say I had direct discussion about that; I do know that I leave that really to my client to answer as to the method of construction but, um, now a days these modern codes bring us forward at lot of compliance with the new green standards.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Energy efficiency.

Rob Larsen – Energy efficiency, um, the windows and appliances I believe we already include that much in what we build now and, again, I would let my client speak to that more.

Attorney Shimanowitz – I just also want to add because it didn't come out in the testimony yet on the Option 1 which is 175 units we'd be proposing because they're rental affordable units; we had an in-depth discussion from Mr. Ritter on your housing compliance under affordable housing a 15% set aside would yield 26 affordable units out of the 175. On Option 2, which is all residential, no retail, a 15% set aside of rental affordables would be 30 affordable units. I know that's relevant to you in terms of your earlier discussion.

Rob Larsen – Just to piggy back on that, to make it clear that the concept that I've shown provides the ability to add in numbers that Mr. Shimanowitz just mentioned in the necessary mix that would be provided (inaudible) so the buildings shown can accommodate the necessary affordable (inaudible) that would be required.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Mr. Chairman, unless there are questions of Mr. Larsen, we'll keep moving along. Our next witness is Mr. Richard Reading who is the expert on fiscal impact.

Richard Reading – Good evening, my name is Richard Reading, I'm an economic analyst and consultant and the connection with this matter I've called a Fiscal Impact Analysis. We actually have done one prior for a different plan but then modified it to affect the economic and demographic impact of the three plans that were just presented. The primary analysis was directed towards the mixed use development which is 175 housing units and a small retail component on the highway 8700 square feet. In that plan, um, the market units would be 148 and there will be 27 affordable units. The bedroom mix in the market units 49 one bedroom and 99 two bedrooms. The COAH units are allocated as prescribed by the COAH regulations; minimum are 20% one bedrooms, 60% two bedrooms and 20% three bedrooms. The, um, given the rents for like a market and affordable units the completed project would represent a value of about \$29.7 million dollars and with your 100% assessment rate an assessment of the same. When completed, the mixed use plan would provide employment for 15 employees and have 362 residents. Tax supported costs would be about \$98,000 for the municipality and for municipal tax revenues would be about \$151,000 generating an annual surplus of \$51,000 for the municipality. For the residential units, we used the demographic multipliers prepared by the Center for Policy Research, we used two sets; one is the standards or statewide demographic multipliers for market units and there is a separate set of multiple's for affordable units. The 148 market units would be estimated to generate 13 school children while 27 affordable units would generate 18 school children for a total of 31 public school children. The school children would

May 27, 2015

have an allocated cost of about 301,000. The project would generate school district tax revenue of \$449,000 with an annual revenue surplus of about \$148,000. Overall the market components which is the 8700 square feet of retail and the 148 market units would generate an annual revenue surplus of \$459,000. That's for municipal, school and county purposes. The affordable units because of their lower rents and their lower values, they only generate a tax revenue of \$79,000 and generate costs of \$212,000 so they would generate a deficit of almost \$133,000 a year. The surplus from the market units the \$489,000 would offset the loss from the affordables at \$326,000 per year. Having completed that analysis we also looked at the two options that were discussed. One is an all residential development of 199 rental units – in that situation the number of affordable units would also increase to 30 or 15% of the total and that would generate a surplus somewhat higher overall surplus of \$336,000 compared to \$326,000 with the smaller project and finally, we looked at the all retail use which Mr. Heibell indicated would anticipate a little over 90,000 square feet of retail space that would be a project value of about \$11.3 million dollars and it would generate a surplus revenues but a smaller one \$246,000 overall compared to \$326,000 to \$336,000 for the mixed use for residential alternatives. So, I think that was the essence of the analysis, we did indicating that all three of the potential projects would generate a surplus; the greater surpluses would be generated by the mixed use than the all residential one. Thank you.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – I read your report. I enjoyed it. I think it was a quality analysis. I did have a couple questions on the estimated assessment. It is based on the rental revenue.

Mr. Reading – Correct it is.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – And it's roughly ten times the annual rent?

Mr. Reading – On the residential units it's a capitalization of the net operating income. We assume that of the total rents, 40% - 5% with vacancy and the balance of 35% for the operating expenses, so 60% of the revenue is the net operating income and we capitalize that at 6% which would be the return rate. So, the multiplier there is 120 times rent. On the non-residential, we had assumed a tenth (inaudible) net rental of 8% which gives \$125.00 a foot which then in turn gives the value for the rental.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – A couple things here, this is for my benefit is this how the municipal assessor would come up with the assessment or is this in economics?

Mr. Reading – No this is really, we have two classes of property here; they are both commercial. Apartments are Class 4C and the retail is Class 4A and most assessors will look at that, the value of the property as being derived from the cash flow of that property and the cash flow of the property is the analysis that we did, so, typical assessor approach, is a capitalization of the net operating income; that's a specific method they use rather than construction costs.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – The other question you would expect rents to go up over time and on the other hand this is a rent control entity and I'm wondering how that factored into it?

May 27, 2015

Mr. Reading – As far as I understand, the rent control law and in a rent control community new construction is exempt for a period of twenty years.

Chairman VanVliet – I don't think so.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – What did he say, there was no rent control for twenty years?

Mr. Reading – Most towns that have rent control ordinances, have an exemption.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – I don't think that's the way ours reads.

Mr. Reading – Okay so you have rent control from day one on new construction.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – As I understand it, your free to set a market rate day one and don't go by me, this is my memory, set whatever you want on day one and after that you are under the formula which is I think right now 3% or is drops to 2.8 if what is it, depends on whether you provide heat or not, so um, I'm just bringing that up.

Mr. Reading – Yeah no (inaudible).

Member Hall – (Inaudible) once you put that on the market initially, you can set whatever price you want at that point though, is when you get the 3%.

Mr. Reading – And, there's no vacancy decontrol in that ordinance.

Member Hall – Right.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – There's hardship (inaudible). It's all regulated by a board.

Mr. Reading – And the 3% or the annual increase that is an automatic?

Member Hall – No.

Mr. Reading – It is not a hardship increase.

Member Hall- Correct.

Mr. Reading – Okay. So, you would come in annually and request an increase.

Member Hall – (Inaudible) every month we would just take that rent roll, look at the leases and then at that point if is 3% yearly.

Mr. Reading – And is it, what kind of turnover if there is no vacancy.

May 27, 2015

Member Hall – (Inaudible).

Mr. Reading – Your surcharges and past fees are for taxes and utilities?

Member Hall – Yeah hardship

Mr. Reading – Not hardship just the (inaudible) without doing the whole hardship application.

Member Hall – I'm not sure if we've had anybody come in for that.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – You were the chair but I think you actually have to come before the board.

Member Hall – Yeah.

Mr. Reading – Come before the board but the hardship increase is usually a much, in my experience, is a much more detailed (inaudible).

Member Hall – (Inaudible).

Vice-Chairman Pryor – I guess it did. Would that affect the analysis.

Mr. Reading – The guidance here is set the rents high initially and that way you're protected for the first few years which I don't think my client has done here. I thought the rents were very reasonable.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Having this information now would that affect your analysis at all?

Mr. Reading – Would that, no, no because the fiscal analysis is static and it's not a point in time, this is as if it were built and occupied today. We don't project operating expenses, we don't project tax rates, we don't project, um, operating expenses, we don't project tax rates, we don't project ratios. So, this is as if it were built today, but knowing that you don't have a new construction exemption in your Rent Control Ordinance, then, my recommendation to the client is to set you rents higher for the initial year and, hopefully, you'll achieve them but again, as pointed out, the actual rents will be subject to an annual report and audit, so, setting them higher if you don't achieve them doesn't do any good.

Chairman VanVliet – Any further questions? Thank you.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Next witness is our traffic engineer Jay Trout.

Jay Trout – Good evening, I'm with the traffic engineering firm of McDonough and Ray Associates and we did a brief letter report summarizing some general traffic engineering issues with this property. The main item of course would be the traffic generation impact with the

May 27, 2015

different options would generate. At the top of page three of my letter, we summarized site generated traffic for three zoning scenarios, um, I want to draw your attention to a couple of time periods in that table namely, the weekday pm peak hours which is your weekday afternoon rush hour and then the Saturday, we'll call mid-day shopping hour for the, as of right developments scenario of 90,000 square feet of retail, you would have the potential traffic generation of 560 trips on a weekday, pm peak hour and 819 on a Saturday peak hour. If you then look at Option 1, which is the combination of 175 apartments and 8700 square feet of retail, that weekday pm peak hour number would drop from 560 down to 226 and the Saturday number would drop from 819 down to 270. Option 2, which is just the 199 apartments, that number in a weekday pm peak hour then becomes 123 and on a Saturday, peak hour becomes 104. So, during those two critical peak hours depending on which one you are looking at, you have anywhere from 5 to 1 to 8 to 1 difference in traffic generation with the retail being more intense. Most of the other things would be equal on this property; you could have access to both Baltimore Street and 57 for any type of development. You could interconnect to the other sites with any type of development, you know, all of those good planning features that you see on the plan could be done with any zoning scenario, so, the main point to look at, in terms of traffic, again, is just comparing intensities of the different options.

Member France – With the 90,000 square foot retail, what's the square footage of the adjacent retails area in the strip mall?

Jay Trout – At Strykers Plaza?

Member France – What's the site at?

Jay Trout – About 30,000 square feet and these numbers just to back up were calculated using standard industry rates published by the Institute of Transportation that uses the same numbers we would have to use for any traffic study we did in the state or any NJ DOT application we would do.

Member Belcaro – I have a question, a safety concern on Rt. 57 – there are a lot of accidents at the light on Strykers and 57 – vehicles are traveling (inaudible) and truck onto 22 and, so, I was wondering if you guys considered exiting onto 57 would there be no left turn?

Jay Trout – Yeah that definitely would be a consideration in the detail design about access through the DOT – access permit process. So, then, we would probably go to a right in and right out type driveways especially with the rear access the Baltimore Street, there's no problem with a design like that.

Member Belcaro – Something to consider.

Chairman VanVliet – If we go for the apartment complex, would it actually be necessary to have any driveway connection to 57.

May 27, 2015

Jay Trout - It would not be necessary, you might need some kind of, you would have to look at emergency access and RSIS issues as two means of access but it would not be critical to have that 57 access at all.

Chairman VanVliet – As Mr. Belcaro stated, in that area coming down there, especially, coming with the traffic light if you had a green light going westbound or north on 57, westbound I think it is, they really fly down there. It's coming down

Member Hall – That's what I'm saying they're not going to go slow.

Chairman VanVliet – You don't have an acceleration lane there or anything, so, I could see that it might be necessary for if you have a retail operation there it's just going to be a driveway for the apartments.

Jay Trout – Right and those numbers drop so low that you can send them up to Baltimore Street.

Member France – Okay, I'm just surprised that you may be using standard numbers and all but I'll say for the adjacent space that's 30,000 square feet, so, let's just do three times that

Jay Trout – Right.

Member France – so the 30,000 square feet in my opinion, without counting, doesn't really have much traffic in and out of there at all. So, take that number and multiple it by three, compare it to the numbers you have in this chart

Jay Trout – Right.

Member France – they seem like way out in left field. Because you have hardly any traffic in and out of that 30,000 square foot. I pass it every day there is very few

Jay Trout – Understood and this, you know, isn't an actual, this is an average number. The state makes you use what a typical scenario would be and also the 90,000 allows you to do different tenants that generate higher volumes like you could do a grocery store, you couldn't do that at Strykers Plaza now all of a sudden you are getting up there, you are a significantly different animal, so, that's part of it.

Chairman VanVliet – We getting a little bit ahead of ourselves here with actually determining which driveway we want to have

Vice-Chairman Pryor – In terms accessing and trying to make a left turn, I think that would be (inaudible) situation but you said you're eligible for an access permit what's the next step up an access permit with planning?

Jay Trout – The old retail scenario would probably be the highest permit category it's called a

May 27, 2015

major planning review. So that's the big DOT category. These other scenarios would be just plain major

Vice-Chairman Pryor – I recognize we are not in the site plan phase but I think that would be an issue going forward how that would be handled.

Jay Trout – In terms of

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Whether it is right turn only or

Jay Trout – That's right.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Whether you provide any kind of plan for merging or whatever so

Jay Trout – We could definitely control the access (inaudible).

Vice-Chairman Pryor – trucks too it's 50 miles an hour, it could be tough here.

Engineer Sterbenz – Mr. Chairman, the RSIS has a certain traffic generation (inaudible)

Jay Trout – Looks like we have a three story product – it is actually a hybrid some mid-rise at three and mid-rise at two. I guess you have to break it down.

Chairman VanVliet – Seem to have one, two, three other alternate accesses into other coming, going into where the child care center use to be whatever it was an easy access onto Baltimore Street as opposed to Strykers, the other one would be to Strykers and, obviously, which we may not want to have there but we had at least two viable other accesses there so.

Member France –Actually, that was all retail. Do you have to come on 57 or can it be the Baltimore?

Chairman VanVliet – I think you would probably want to have (inaudible) the shopping center and be able to get to (inaudible) highway.

Jay Trout – I don't think you'd be able to lease it.

Member Hall – If it is a major retail operation (inaudible).

Chairman VanVliet – I think we may be jumping ahead of ourselves here. Any further questions, if not thank you very much.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Next we have Art Bernard who's going to speak a little bit about the affordable housing as well as planning in general for this site.

May 27, 2015

Art Bernard – Good evening, how are you tonight? I had hoped to be here to start a dialogue of while you should all include this site in your housing element and, um, I'm here after you've adopted your housing element. My timing is not great tonight. But, um, I think this could, this discussion may continue and George before I forget, the um, I think I might be able to help you in getting that Spending Plan data that you need. I went through the same thing you went through. I think we might be able to do it. Anyway, for those of you who don't know me, my name is Art Bernard and I'm a licensed profession planner with 40 years of experience in land use and affordable housing. For 8 ½ of those years, I served the council on affordable housing as its deputy director and executive director and in both of those capacities, I developed and supervised COAH's entire work program and wrote the first and second round rules that the courts have approved. Since leaving COAH in 1994, I've worked for some 24 municipalities in various capacities and worked with private sector clients all over the state and served the superior court as a special master on five occasions and I think it is fair to say that a lot of my practice revolves around the affordable housing obligation. Now, Lopatcong has a history of addressing its housing obligation. It had a, when I was still with COAH 20 years ago, the COAH adopted rules that established that Lopatcong had a 1997 to 1999 housing obligation of 56 units and you addressed it. Now, the down side of all this is that those rules that established the 56 units housing obligation were adopted in 1994 and COAH hasn't adopted any rules since. In the interim, COAH has failed to adopt constitutional and complaint rules three times and last year you may have heard of the Fair Share Housing Center they filed a motion with the Supreme Court to enforce the previous order and in March of this year, the court responded by recognizing that COAH no longer is a functioning agency and the court provided time frames for municipalities to address a post 1999 housing obligation and it provided guidance to the lower courts as to how these obligations would be computed by directing the Mount Laurel Judges to use what has been referred to what's the second round methodology. That's the same formula that I used 20 years ago before I left COAH. This same Fair Share Housing Center which is a non-profit has duplicated the second round approach and come up with large fair share numbers throughout the state and they're large for two reasons; they're large because COAH didn't do its job for 20 years and they're large because low and moderate income household, although sometimes, we can talk about them as an obstruction, low and moderate income households are large percentage of the total population. They're roughly 40% of all the households in the state and so Fair Share Housing Center came up with a number for Lopatcong for 345 units. I know that sounds like a big number and alternative approaches are being considered and I agree with George is that we don't really know what the courts are going to do. But I can tell you that the COAH rule proposal that was not adopted was not adopted for a reason and it was not adopted because it wasn't consistent with the courts order to duplicate the second round methodology. I think you are going to expect whether it is 345 or some other number, I think you going to expect that there is going to be a larger housing obligation out there and at some point in time you maybe looking for other sites and I think I hope we can agree that this is a really good one. It is a really good one because (inaudible) it's been designed to accommodate the density. I guess it's probably in the center George.

Planner Ritter – Yes.

May 27, 2015

Art Bernard – It is in the center which is designed to accommodate growth. It is a really good one because it has good road access; it has access to Route 57 which is state highway. It also has frontage on Baltimore Street. It also could have access to Stryker's through the shopping center if you choose to if that's what the board wants and there's a traffic light at the Stryker Road Rt. 57 intersection facilitate traffic movements through the site. So, there are a lot of things going for the site that has multiple access points to distribute traffic and is has excellent access to jobs and shopping opportunities through the state highway and the site is adjacent to compatible land uses. It's just south of the attached housing to the north. It's just east of the attached housing to the west. It's adjacent to shopping. It's adjacent to a medical center which I guess one of the plans shows a tie in to the medical center portion of the property on Stryker Road. It's in close proximity to the medical center, close proximity to the fire department and it's just sound planning to locate attached housing near other attached housing, shopping and medical center and schools and municipal services. In addition, although the site is impacted by a 300 foot buffer associated with a Category 1 stream, which separates it from the apartments to the west, the eastern part of the property is constraint free and can easily accommodate the proposed community. So, I find that the site can be developed in a manner that's consistent with DEP's regulations. So, you know, a lot of the things I've been talking about tonight are actually part of the COAH regulations in terms of what to look for in a site and this site conforms very nicely to those regulations but I think more importantly from a practical standpoint it's just a really good site for additional multi-family housing and additional affordable housing. Any questions?

Chairman VanVliet – Thank you for your presentation.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Um, just to address the question, I think it was Mr. Pryor's question regarding energy efficient construction. We do David Gardner here, one of the principals with Larken. I'd just like him to address that real quick and then we'll sort of tie that all up.

David Gardner – I don't think we would propose to build this with Mead certified or anything but we would certainly do Energy Star on all the appliances and insulation and there is other green technologies but to try to keep this affordable for the market – it is not affordable in terms of the COAH but overall we could (inaudible).

Vice-Chairman Pryor – I guess the other element is lower impact landscaping.

David Gardner – We would work with, if we should get that far and then we'll be happy to work with you all.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – It's one of the goals.

David Gardner – No problem. Cooperation is our middle name.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Mr. Chair, I just wanted to say that thank you for listening to us tonight. You know, this is all informal, not binding on anybody but we really would love to get the process rolling. We are looking for feedback from you what the next step should be. I mean it is

May 27, 2015

a rezoning process so you guys have some things to think about but you could tell we are raring to go. We have a team here, we think we know how to get it done but we respectfully request that the Planning Board to recommend to consider this rezoning. I think it is a good thing for the town.

Chairman VanVliet – As you are fully aware, we don't do the zoning. You go up to Council for that.

Attorney Shimanowitz – I am well aware of that.

Chairman VanVliet – The only way we would be doing that is if Council requested us to investigate a reexamination of our Master Plan which being what Highlands is, we are in the process of doing that now. We'll have to resubmit that to Highlands. I don't know how long that takes for that but that is the way we would go. I apologize to the gentleman for doing our fair share housing plan now but we were kind of put up against it with the deadlines the Supreme Court has given to us so, I'm sure we can revisit that with this no problem, so. No I, you know, see the merits of this but a lot would depend on when, how our Council wants to go with it but we'd be more than happy to entertain it and we'll take it that way. The mayor sits there if you would like to address him.

Attorney Shimanowitz – Absolutely mayor I think we are more than willing to come into Council and do the same presentation. We are looking for guidance, not necessarily tonight, it would be great to hear some guidance but if we could get some feedback from the town that would be great. We are contract purchasers of the site and that puts us in the situation where it's always nice to know where you are headed. Uncertainty is not great for developers.

Chairman VanVliet – I'm sure you have deadlines.

Attorney Shimanowitz – We have deadlines in our contract so, you know, knowing which way we're headed is very important to us. Um, we gave you a lot tonight to chew on. We hope we answered a lot of the questions that came up in the March meeting. We gave you two options to consider so we'll certainly be in touch. I know your board attorney was not here tonight. I did have one good call with him. I could keep in touch with him but again, any guidance or recommendation as to how to go forward would be greatly appreciated.

Member France – I question for Mr. Heibell was there a presentation on what the retail space would look like if it was full retail?

Chairman VanVliet – No we have nothing.

Mr. Heibell – Actually (inaudible) was a retail plan and I said no but I think I can generate based on my experience how many square feet without providing the plan and that why I analyzed it.

Member France – Why wouldn't you present a plan?

May 27, 2015

Mr. Heibell – Because that not really, quite frankly, what we want to do.

Member France – You don't want to attempt meet the existing lot.

Mr. Heibell – No, no. I mean I'm being frank and I'm being honest with you that I've done enough that I would be very close to the 90,000 square feet if I did a plan.

David Gardner – We've had our challenges even with the 30,000 feet. It's been a constant rotation. That site has not done well for us. It's been a challenge and the rents are very low and we would not be interested in the site as a retail location. We don't think it would fly.

Chairman VanVliet – Then these would strictly be rental units they wouldn't be a co-op style unit like Warren Heights.

David Gardner – Nice rental. I mean we would build them comparable to Warren Heights, you know, that kind of finish. I think we've been around in town long enough we could build pretty nice (inaudible).

Chairman VanVliet – One question I would have would be uh, the COAH units, would they be interspersed throughout the area or are we going to have them all in one building or

Mr. Heibell – No.

Chairman VanVliet – They would be interspersed.

Mr. Heibell – They would be interspersed.

Attorney Shimanowitz – I can certainly have Mr. Bernard speak to it because it is in the COAH rules that he wrote but the general rule in the COAH regulation is for rental affordables that the standard was 15% and for sale affordables it's 20% and that's what we followed.

Chairman VanVliet – Any further questions?

Planner Ritter – (Inaudible).

Engineer Sterbenz – (Inaudible).

Mr. Bernard – That was probably based on the regulations that COAH passed in 2008 that were returned in 2010 and 2010 the appellate division specifically overturned those (inaudible).

Chairman VanVliet – So the regulation as it exists now

Mr. Bernard – The only regulation that has been is a maximum set aside of 20% for sale (inaudible).

May 27, 2015

Chairman VanVliet – Okay. Any other questions? Thank you very much. Thank you for the presentation. We'll try to go as fast as we can and look forward to your cooperation in the future. Thank you very much. Call for public comment – I don't see any public.

Member Hall – (Inaudible).

Member France – (Inaudible).

Mayor McKay – (Inaudible).

Vice-Chairman Pryor – I would dispute that I mean living up in Delaware Crossing I know what I pay in taxes and I know the services I use. You're making money off me.

Member Gural – The other thing is we talked about the sewer capacity it tied up (inaudible) this is going to be 60,000.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – This will be 40 something. If you take 200 units times 225 your get 40 something and that's what they have to go in with on their TWA.

Member Gural – So we're down to 15,000.

Member France – So why would we do this?

Chairman VanVliet - Right.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – George was talking about this before.

Member Hall – Any reserve in sewer capacity was looking for the industrial and commercial.

Member France – Yeah not residential.

Member Hall – Not residential. We purposely didn't want sewers down past Architects uh, you know, Highlands, that development there; we purposely didn't run that, you know, so there was a game plan in mind here on how we want to build out this town and, quite frankly, you know, the taxpayers will get hit and it is intuitive you just know that commercial/industrial that brings in the revenue and it's low impact. Low impact to the taxpayer and it helps the taxpayer out by bringing in more revenue, you know.

Members talking over each other.

Member France – There's no sense to putting ourselves in a corner. Why do that.

Member Hall – I mean short-sided, it's like I understand where they are coming from, what they want to do but keep in mind it is serving their purpose. The other thing is three-bedrooms here.

May 27, 2015

Members talking over each other.

Member Hall – Maybe that’s a good point. Why don’t we wait and see how Sycamore pans out. I mean, I understand they’re in a rush here but we’re not.

Member France – We don’t have to be in a rush. It’s zoned Highway Business.

Member Hall – Let’s see the impact of Sycamore.

Engineer Sterbenz – Sycamore Landing is 247 units.

Member Gural – That’s mixed family no age restrictions or anything?

Engineer Sterbenz – 50 affordables out of 247. Gross Occupancy is January of 2016. Just had a meeting with them on May 11th.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – Well maybe. I’m just keeping an open mind. I’m a little skeptical on ability to attract retail or have retail succeed. There’s been little interest. The P’burg is half empty (inaudible).

Members talking over each other.

Vice-Chairman Pryor – And this came up last meeting. We’re talking about medical and that sort of thing. Coordinated is in competition with St. Luke’s so they’re fighting.

Chairman VanVliet – Let’s adjourn. Motion by Member Belcaro, seconded by Member Hall. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,

Margaret B. Dilts
Planning Board Secretary