

TOWNSHIP OF HAMILTON
MAYS LANDING, NJ 08330
PLANNING BOARD MEETING
September 7, 2017

A meeting of the Township of Hamilton Planning Board was held on the above date with Chairman Richard Cheek presiding. Other members present were Harry Bilicki, Wayne Choyce, Mayor John Kurtz, Harry Rogers, Allan Womelsdorf, Alt I John Percy and Alt II Marla Caldwell. Absent members were David Adams, Charles Cain and Art Schenker.

Compliance with the Open Public Meetings Law was acknowledged.

The following Board Professional was in attendance: Charles Gemmel, Solicitor.

Approval of Minutes: Mr. Kurtz moved, seconded by Mr. Womelsdorf to approve the minutes of the August 17, 2017 meeting as presented. SAID MOTION CARRIED WITH 7 AYES AND 1 ABSTAIN,

Review and possible recommendation – proposed Zoning Amendments (Mays Landing Neighborhood Plan)

Chairman Cheek introduced Phil Sartorio on the proposed Zoning Amendments. Mr. Sartorio – appeared earlier this year with proposed changes and recommendations that were contained in the Mays Landing Neighborhood Plan. Based on the outcome of that discussion he put together a draft of proposed amendments to the ordinance and made note that the Board had annotated copy so you can see what is being added/deleted from the standards of the ordinance.

First boundary, the one being property 745 lot 3; which is an isolated parcel on the west side of Route 50 just as you are approaching the overpass, which is the only general zoning parcel remaining in the area. Rezoning that to be village commercial for it to be consistent with the surrounding area. The second zoning change shown on the second map would be to include Block 809/4&5 which is the two Victorians before you get to traffic light Northside of main street; Block 979 1, 2 3 & 5 which are Paragon and Knebles; Block 980 Lot 1 sugar hill in; block 985 1,2,3 across Atlantic Avenue from Sugar Hill couple smallhouses and a vacant piece; block 986, lots 7,8,9 former gas station, apartment next to it and the parking lot that serves that area, changed to village commercial, Recognizing the commercial character right around that intersection being a continuation so as development moves forward then we would apply commercial standards rather than go through variance process without a clear standard. JK so it wouldn't have to go to zoning, no, unless there are specific reasons. Kneble for any change would, auto repair not permitted in general commercial, still village commercial is of character for the area and 2,3,4,5; 980 Sugar Hill Inn; Block Victorian Discussion ensued regarding Bed and Breakfasts. B&B houses as a permitted use across from Gaskill Park, on Farragut Avenue; add B&B as conditional use to R-22, R-9, the Historic District and along the river and Lenape Lake and to permit all meals.

JK had opportunity to look I would like to see ability to see more bed and breakfast, abbot no longer on register list; so to develop b&b would be great and that if I understand it correctly the houses along Farragut, across from gaskill park, that is residential but they would have the ability to utilize b&b.

PS as far as regulatory changes 1) add bed and breakfast as a conditional use in R9; R22 Zoning. Conditions would be that the property has to be located in historic district or have frontage on either the river or lake Lenape. That would qualify the homes on Farragut, on Lenape property has frontage on Lake or river, and in R9, R22 zone it would qualify 2) the limitations on meals. If in residential either morning or afternoon, not be a full scale commercial operation in a residential area. JK and it has to be owner occupied. Part of general standards for

Sceniors were presented and discussed with regards to owner operators. In putting together the standards I reviewed several forms around the state, Ocean and Monmouth counties are pretty much the standards I am proposing are the standards they use with owner occupied.

HB manage and own? They have to do both. With this change to the lots surrounding the paragon, looking over the map that would be a contiguous from the antique place all the way down? PS yes. All the way down mainstreet, from knebles to antique shop will be village commercial, at least on one side. Where the county buildings are, the park, would not be included.

Across from paragon, what is that zoned R9 that's going to be village commercial, and the old gas station, and next to it and the two houses towards Mays Landing.

Empty lot between paragon and knebles, that is included in this as it will go to village commercial, we had discussion on parking, paving, what can they do with that lot, right now without going to use variance. Develop a single family resident. Changing it to VC, what can happen, Chairman Cheek

inquired if can Knebles, sugar hill and paragon can come to an agreement and have a joint parking lot, ps they could do share parking, be developed with a facility and shared parking. The Mayor said he has spoken with them. Does he plan on doing anything or is he happy with the agreement he has. PS he has been working to ot use that lot, does it happen, yes but not at the frequency it was happening. Zoning Office has reached out to him, Mr. Boylan and said look you can't park there you have to come up with something better than just a dirt lot. Mayor has had discussion with Knebles, Paragon and Boylan and they are interested in doing something for shared parking. They have cut down on the parking. Right now finances are not there from the original plans from pervious owner as to what was to happen, I believe his position right now is to unable people to park there and let it lay, he really doesn't have the resources right now. If he can come up with something now that it is all commercial down there, and something might happen with Bed & Breakfast, there are excellent places to develop as an extension of Main Street to the beautiful head of the river including Farragut Avenue properties and across from Gaskill Park. I just think that as part of the neighborhood plan, we can move this whole project down the street, extend our main street, beautify the main street, bed and breakfast are needed, there are no lodging places in Hamilton Township and none on the drawing board. JK think it is a good plan, my unfortunately understanding with paragon he is not ready financially to make a commitment of opening it up; if he has to close that lot down with poles or signs to keep people from coming in,he is willingto do that until a plan is worked out either by himself or with Boylan and Knebles. Don't know when that plan will come together, it is getting difficult. Very soon he will have to discontinue parking to become compliant. It is unfortunate; you will see traffic parked down river road. Make it no parking. Larry is looking for a partner to make something happen where they can increase business and share parking.

PS shared parking is an agreement between two people. Agreement with the County supposed to have operational control behind the jail where if you can't provide parking any place else you can license a number of spaces there. The County has put up signs showing parking. RC Knebles, Paragon, Sugar Hill can have the employees park there.

I don't know how far down the road this is, but having village commercial will help this along.

RC concerns of limitations on B&B, so many bedrooms, owner operator be there; if they are going to beautify ab old building, they want to serve breakfast and lunch, let them. Jk constraints put in there for a reason. PS if looking in a commercial area maybe we can restrict those to the residential zones, that it has to be owner occupied. It may be the only b&b on the block and we want to make sure the impact on the adjacent residences ins not that great. There will be some no matter what, but if it is in a residential zone, you want to have owner resident operator.

HRogers, if I read this correctly Morningside Drive could be b&b row. I agree with chairman I believe that anything that falls ounder that category in the commercial zone should not be required to be owner operating. far to restricting. RC if you want to have breakfast and dinner, Two different issues.

HR stand alone question about introduction of b&b into residential areas., HR back to your point I think it is unnecessary and detrimental restrictions to require that these type of establishments be owner occupied in the village commercial zone.

HB stayin in many not owner occupied, ran extremely well.

WC IN residential if owner is living in the building you are more apt to have the building and grounds better maintained than having an absentee landlord.

PS If that is the thought of the Board maybe make that as part of the condition for the residential and strike it from the general standards. R9 and R22

Typicall you have someone living there, may not the owner, they may want to operate one or two, then you are restricting there opportunity. JK That is something that we can change. We have mechanisms in town with Property Maintenance and we are working on that now and explained what they how they plan to handle problems.

PS sense of the board that at least in the commercial it be owner operator restriction in residential only.

Serving of meals in commercial zones no restrictions for serving meals, Jk so they could do dinner too? It is a commercial operation. In residential zone do you want the restrictions to remain, AW is the purpose of the restrictions to get people to go out to the community for dinner and support some local restaurants. HR typically on that scale it is pretty unlikely you would have establishment serving lunch and dinner. You might see secret super dinner, as far as bed and breakfast you put the restrictions on, you don't gain anything. RC doesn't see a problem, why handcuff them, if they are going to have a dinner for their guests or some kind of something, let them do it. JK can that happen in residential. PS

DO you want that that restriction is only be proposed tin residential zone.

If I have a b&b you get up, you want breakfast. If someone wants lunch or dinner, guests are there to enjoy themselves.

WC look at sugar hill as an example. Is is a b&b and they have an open restaurant included. If you open it up for all three meals in a bed and breakfast, you open up the opportunity for a restaurant operation in a residential zone. HR they will be restricted by parking.

PS or say in Residential zone meals provided for guests only. WC if you llk at b&b in commercial they should have the same freedoms as sugar hill, it gives them and opportunity to expand the use of the property. PS that was the intention in the commercial zone not to have the meal restriction.

HR so if you add those words for guests only, now you are putting a residential

AW the villagae commercial can do what they want and do not have these restritions and the residential area is where you want owner operator, restrict meals, amount of bedrooms, different operation other than b&b

JK You are opening up the restriction to be uniform all across the Board.

PS in a residential area, any meals served limited to guests only. Type of meal is up to operator.

Owner occupancy and meal limitations will apply in residential zone only. That way you have that control.

Page 7 of 8 – restrictions or standards saying it should have a maximum of 4 guests rooms, that's a limitation of guests rooms, not a minimum. Just pointing it out some of the older homes only have two or max 3. It can't become ah otel

Guests rooms tied to parking, natural limitations. If property not big enough to support parking for 4 guests rooms it doesn't happen. Parking has to support how many quests rooms they have.

AW not cheap, but what about a slum lord and they fit every criteria going down, do they pass the state requirements for the State.

Think of the strutures in town that would qualify, firt of all on the river or on the lake, Nothing along Gaskill park that qualifies for that, up the hill, nothing qu;alifies, go towards McDonalds nothing qualifieds. You have river road, Lenape avenue and morningside drive. PS it has to be in the historic district pg 2 item 1 under bed and breakfast subject property must be located in Mays Landing historic districtor have frontage on

HRogers – ref Tunney place, if goal to turn into b&b get 6 or 7 rooms out of that, would he be able to get share parking behind jail, he would have to get site plan approval and it is up to the board.

IF that request was made it would be dealt with at that time.

RC going back to that property from what I understand it is a halfway house. PS no it was a sober lving environment, but not being used for that now. RC because of that zone, would it be considered a boarding house that is not allowed. PS tough call.

If he wants to bring in another sobe does it fall under boarding house PS no because addiction is considered a disability, if it is one of the things considered to be a disability under the law, same thing as if the Atr would buy it and move some of their clients in there, we have to treet it as a residential structure. It would not be considered a Boarding House. RC if methodone clinic wants to move, if they want to move to vc and they have parking and criteria, we allow professional offices for professional use, it would be allowed.

Discussion ensued with regards to limiting it to 30 day stay and different scenarios regarding a stay and it was decided to keep in the limit of 30 days.

Question rose regarding page 2 of 8 crossed out paragraph rather than get into specialty shops allowing for retail stores and shops in putting this together looked into other towns with fairly successful historic districts, encouraging business use they really don't have many restrictions, it seemed limiting but you are saying K covers everything retail commercial.

Mr. Sartorio continued with review of his memo of 8/22/17 Section B with regards to permitted usage; Section C regarding area and bulk requirements: Section D regarding parking requirements as outlined.

Take a look at it and make a recommendation to the board. BS when this goes forward, whoever the developer is will have to comply over time.

BS wayne brought up fact of sugar hill, they wanted a liquor license, there was a 1900 foot rule in the township Mr. Boylan bought that and wanted to get that liquor license, ordinance had to be changed. Parago obvious and obviously parking and the dockside has created a lot more seats, that whole area needs to be looked at.

Great idea couple months ago, issue is allowing commercial dumpster's in front yard, on site. You are not beautifying the area. The Rescue Squad has one sitting on route 50 and there are others. I hope you pursue that. JK seems like the time to do it.

Glad to see addressing the much needed issues.

Rg comment I am in agreement with everything you talked about, did have questions, we can change impervious from 50% to 75% and I would assume we have to go to the Pinelands. If people want to make a change they would have to go to Pinelands. We can make the change on Township level PS said they would still have to meet standards of retention and runoff it is a matter of how they would accomplish that, surface run off through swales, or directed into some form of rain garden, retention basin that is supposed to evaporate in 72hours, that is what we see most frequently. Underground storage is something that could be done.

Egg Harbor city, not auto parts store on Philadelphia Avenue, it is all underground storage, even though they are redevelopment plot, Some of our recent development has gone with the swale and underground storage, an option people are looking at more and more

One of the applicants came to workshop regarding Volcanic Eruptions property underground retention is the only choice they have. Lidle Supermarket is doing. RC Paragon going to be able to park enough cars would be underground. Initial outlay very expensive and then we have to see what site design allows. Have to go through review. RC. It would have to approved by

8:24 Another thought when you see what goes into establishing an ordinance, the city of Houston has no Zoning Ordinance. The whole city, they can have a chicken shack next to a high class establishment and they are very proud of it. Some studies have been done, typically when you have things like this storm you have problems. .

Mr. Choyce moved, seconded by Mr. Rogers to close public portion, with all members voting aye.

Mr. Bilicki, moved, seconded by Mr. Choyce to recommend the proposed ordinance with proposed changes to Township Committee as it is s found to be consistent with our Master Plan, with all members voting "aye"

8: 26 Complete Streets Policy – Referral from Township Committee – Discussion and possible recommendation.

Mr. Sartorio remarked that when he left the meeting of the Board earlier this summer, the Board had asked for 3 additional pieces of additional information: #1 what other non-shore communities have adopted complete streets policy; #2 how does it work in scoring points in grants through DOT and #3 how much money if any have these communities received.

Mr. Sartorio reviewed his memo of September 5, 2017 that was presented to the Board. As far as other non-coastal communities he referred to the Rutgers Voorhees compilation of Complete Streets throughout the state. As of June 2016, there were 130 communities, including Egg Harbor City, Hammonton and Buena Borough here in Atlantic County, but also a couple other townships in South Jersey that share some characteristics with Hamilton which are Monroe in Gloucester County, Pemberton and Vineland. He further remarked that similarly in the fact that they are partially effected by the Pinelands, Pemberton and Monroe Township also have Forest Areas and Regional Growth Areas, maybe not to the extent we have, but they still have to deal with a mix of Pineland restrictions and limitations on development.

As far as impact of DOT funding, he took a couple facts from DOT application guides for grants. It does show Complete Streets Policy as one of the selection criteria for safe streets to transit program, , safe routes to schools and transportation and alternative bikeway grants. Those are four where having this policy points towards your score when it comes to evaluation.

Other non-coastal communities received funding: Egg Harbor City got almost three-quarter of a million dollars for bikeway along Philadelphia Avenue out to the Lake. Since they have adopted their policy they have gotten another \$750, 000, they got money for the walkways and the bridge to their new community school which had to be developed and they got \$275, 000 in safe streets to transits for sidewalks and curbs from McDonalds' on White Horse Police around in front to the train station. They have done fairly well. In talking with their engineer he said one of the reasons they adopted the policy was that those points helped them to get to that level where their proposal ranked better than somebody else. There are situations where it has helped in securing the funding.

The Complete Streets Policy is a guideline, it says that we will look and consider improvements, but if not practical, cost prohibited or for whatever reason to do something that it won't be done,

Chairman Cheek referred to page 4, the applicant should identify existing transit services for proposed project: It seems as if the applicant has to have a project in mind to apply for grant money. Chairman Cheek asked what project we had in mind.

Mr. Sartorio stated that as of right now we don't have any but having this policy in place it may be that in a year or two you may want to do some improvements such as additional sidewalks to get to a bus stop. In the grand scheme is there any wish list.

Mr. Bilicki questioned why don't we choose from the pedestrian plan that we put together years ago for pedestrian and bike paths. . PS even from that the bike pedestrian route from 13th. Street down, have some proposals out there, nothing that the township level has put forward in the last several years for anything. We have filed for pedestrian grants, we tried for safe routes to school a couple of times, one was to do a paved walkway from Underhill Park property so folks that live in Meadowbrook Condos could walk to the 3rd Street pedestrian so they don't have to walk on beaten up fields to walk into town from there.

Mr. Choyce remarked that at one time there was a proposal for sidewalk on the North side of 3rd Street from Route 50 to Shaner School but because of about of square footage of impervious coverage it was cost prohibited to do the job. Mr. Sartorio remarked that we did one for sidewalks along the open space at Cologne Avenue and Route 40, from entrance of Oakcrest to the school property, subsequent to that application that didn't get approved, DOT has put sidewalks in along that area.

Mayor Kurtz commented that this item came before Committee, it was presented by Mr. Guishard. The Committee looked at it and some of the comments were that some of the committee felt they had to act on it that night. After discussion, it did come before this Board, because Committee wanted to make sure that the redevelopment plan and things that are in place that include bike paths, walkways and other things that are part of the redevelopment plan and did we need to adopt this Complete Streets as part of the whole plan. It came before us to hash this out. Mayor Kurtz added that he doesn't see too much right now that changes that, and questioned Phil what he sees in it that we should be part of it and if he thinks it is a good program, needs more encouragement. . Mr. Sartorio thinks it puts down in writing, continues into the future so that operationally whenever we are dealing with improvements or changes to any Township streets or when this Board is looking at the development of a new street, we look at it and says does it make sense to make sure it has some level of pedestrian way and/or bike path at this location. If it doesn't make sense, fine, you looked at and evaluated it. Same thing as Public Works and Township Engineer when they are looking at the street program is it a simple project that is not a major reconstruction, is it existing wide enough where maybe we could put a bike lane in here, if it is what is the extra cost of the paint. Or if a major project, cost factor wise, is it of value to the township to do when you are rebuilding this roadway to do the extras, the curbing, the sidewalks, etc.

Mr. Percy asked if Park Road would have fallen in to this. It was a much needed project. You would have to look at it. If it is going to cost too much, doesn't make sense you don't have population to support, unsafe situation, certain things are laid out in the proposed resolution that says these are the exceptions....there would be other exception in the future.

Jp they got money around transit center go back to Park Road which was a classic rebuild of that whole system, complete streets would have added curb from one end to the other for safety purpose. There should have been some sidewalks also. They have been walking on that street for years and years but it is still not a safe passage way for people to do that. Would there be funds, PS it might have qualified.

JK I think I want to know if applicants coming before the planning board and this goes back to committee and it is adopted would applicants coming before the planning board would they be required to go along and incur more financial expense to live up to what is in that. Mr. Sartorio

remarked if the Board looks at the application and says it doesn't make sense to do it here then we don't do it.

Mr. Rogers commented that he finds it disturbing, the guidelines exist, common sense the boards have used (Zoning and Planning) for every project we look at. Once we adopt these guidelines they are not guidelines they become hurdles to overcome, if they can be overcome. Take a look at the Park Road project, curbs would have pushed that project into the stratosphere, it wouldn't have gotten done. It would have been grand and glorious but we lose our autonomy as a board and a municipal entity to make decision to give us the greatest benefit and we find ourselves tied into guidelines. It increase the reaches of the state into the community with "maybe we will give you some money nobody tells you how many points, Are you going to get a bunch of dough but is this the reason. Rogers really objects to adopting these guidelines, it increases the reaches of the state into our local automaity and we get these things done now without these mandatory guidlelines.

Ma;yor Kurtz added Solicitor Bob Sandman comment was that down the road if this was adopted it could open up a liability issue in the sense that you adopted the guideline, but the Planning Board chose not to use them for some reason and a suit was filed and the guidelines were there and we failed to use them would create a liability.

RC – Mr. Gemmel was not here, his associated spoke of liability as well as maintenance liability not let alone that we gave a waiver or whatever. Mr. Cheek also remarked about Egg Harbor getting three-quarter of a million dollar and who much did the have to kick it. We have no project on the books We have nothing on the

JK Bob point if you have guidelines and not sticking to them creates a liability that is not good. It is almost like it would also be better to mandate and you would have to follow but to have option of not doing it is a liability.

Cheek and Rogers feels it discourages people. Rogers agrees with Mayor's comments and relayed that he work with Coast guard issues guidelines it just more heavy handed government reaching in to do your everyday business and if we have an option to not subject ourselves to these things and use our discretions to go on a case by case basis.

HB I think this board does a good job making sure sidewalks are put in, largely to the hard work of Jack Percy, and I feel comfortable with the developments that have come before me and we have done a very good job doing that. I don't think we have ever had a aplicaton where we considered having bike path. Maybe we should start to consider it, maybe we don't need a guideline to tell us that, when the applicantions do come in, maybe we should think about that. Mr. Rogers remarked that we can always refer to guidlelines that already exist,. Mr. Bilicki continued that maybe we could plant the seed when developers come in. It is something we should be mindful of, perhaps it something we should consider when these developments do come in and if practical.

RC I agree and when Guerro I said jogging path because of his recreation obligation. Bike path could be part of recreation obligation that the developer has to pay. Mr. Percy reviewed the older developments of Misty Pines and Hamilton Pointe and their path that was designed to connect the two communities. It was proposed by the Planning Board. It was designed exactly for that, had to go from development safely all the way around to the recreation facility.

Last applicant, by Oakcrest, pinelands wouldn't let them development 200 feet buffer. A lot of the roads are county road, s that would be nice if they had a complete streets policy, would that fall on the county or be part of county and municipality. Mr. Sartorio remarked that the county would be county responsibility and the county master plan is suggesting that they should be adopting a complete street policy, the master plan that we reviewed earlier this year, it is part of their internal recommendations. We are only responsible for our streets and what happens or occurs on them.

HR from county there are 23 mass majority lie along the beach , which are heavily pedestrian oriented. We are not. Project with improvements to the gas or electric company making improvements, had it been mandated put sidewalks literally out in the woods, we had the ability to look and say it doesn't make a whole lot of sense out there. I think we came to a really good decision., a bus stop was included and in the way of the bike path that runs past the property. We have the ability to consider these things, please let's not be mandated to do this.

Mr. Cheek asked Mr. Gemmel for his opnion on liability.

Mr. Gemml have any comments, sometimes asked by clients how do I usually casually say don't get out of bed in the morning. Living life creates potential liabilities. Bob Sandman and my partner Bob Merenich spend a lot more time in the litigation area and you could point to examples where you set the standards, you don't enforce the standards and somebody is going to sue you because of

that, I don't want to say that that doesn't happen but also at the same time courts give municipalities a fair amount of discretion in the government decisions they make the courts are not there to say well if I was the councilman, I would have voted different. I don't disagree with bs and bm but I guess I put it in a little different perspective, you can't say well we can't make any decisions because if we do someone might sue us over that decision, you still have to govern and in governing every once in a while you are going to create the liability, Just the nature of the liability system we deal with. I agree, probably not as strong with Mr. Sandman and Mr. Merenich but I can't disagree creating standards and ignoring standards having the potential of creating a liability.

Chairman any other discussion. There being none, Chairman opened to Public Comment.

Committeeman Guishard stated that the this is being interpreted as opposed to at least from what his interpretation is. He is on the SJTPO and it consists of the counties and towns and this idea of complete streets has been discussed there and and has been adopted by many communities. It is not a requirement, that is his uyou don't have to do anything, it is a set of guidelines. It helps to design and improve the design of the sidewalks and streets, there are a number of places where we can use some of them. For example we are trying to look and see how we might be able get a bike path. It turns out that one of the things you need to do is to conduct an audit of the area where you may want a path. Again looking at that, having a discussion about it and talking about how that path would go through town and it was pointed out that many people there on the Green Team felt unsafe walking downtown. He was surprised at that and asked them why would they feel unsafe, but they felt unsafe downtown. He continued that you would take a survey to make it attractive, not just make it safe but to make it attractive for people who come downtown, perhaps fencing, better signage, people have a lot of things that could be done and the intent is to do this in coordination with NHP but the Complete Streets policy is one of things that we would look at to establish that plan. It is a set of guidelines, good engineering principles so that complete streets not only accommodate automobiles, but school kids, pedestrians and other uses. It is not a requirement, as he understands it, it doesn't tell you that you have to do anything, you can decide if there is a project being built, you can say I would like you to look at complete streets and comeback and tell us what might be applicable. As far as our solicitors comments, to avoid liability, don't get out of bed it is very true. . It is something to help us do a better job. I got a call from someone who lived on Harding Highway complaining that there are sidewalks on one side of the street, the side where the houses are vacant and nothing on their side of the street. That is because the county is rebuilding, county not putting anything new just rebuilding, if we had the complete streets policy before, it would probably be on both sides. It helps you and helps the developers.

Mr. Guishard continued that the County is thinking about adopting complete streets, and he is trying to get SJTPO for all counties. Cumberland has adopted. It is a resolution; it says that we as a township believe in adopting a policy that accommodates bicycles, pedestrian as well as cars. It is just common sense. He sees no downside to it. Spoke to other communities and there seems to be no downside to it.

Mrs. Caldwell remarked that she doesn't see where it actually says that it is just something to look at to which Mr. Guishard remarked that there is nothing in there that requires us to do a thing, Mrs. Caldwell further remarked that it doesn't say that. Mr. Guishard remarked that he felt if it was a requirement, it would have to say it. It is not a program, then eventually to get a bike path through we then use complete streets guidelines and we would get credit for having a resolution. That is all you need to do to show you have adopted complete streets.

Mr. Womelsdorf added that he feels these are just rules that various agencies use to select their projects, this is not to say for the complete street, this is not what we were looking at to say yes or no, it is people who approve grants and projects and things and they state yes, if you have this we will give you a little bit of credit for it.

Mr. Guishard feels it is good common sense Mr. Guishard said he could have someone do a presentation on this. Cross County Connection is paid by DOT and ultimately through the federal government and they offer assistance and they can come and give us a presentation, we could do during a township meeting or here, it may help to explain it. If he thought it would costs us a lot of money or liability, he wouldn't suggest. It just says we as a community are attempting to doing what we can to engineer our streets to accommodate everyone. If you like we could set up something up and have someone do a presentation if you think that would help.

Mayor Kurtz remarked if that was going to happen that it could be at the Committee level. The consensus I thought that night was to send it to Planning Board because we felt there were other things already implemented to address these issues, bicycle paths, sidewalks, everything we had to do. Comment then was made about by adopting guidelines and not sticking to them it could present possible liability, everyone has different view on that but that was made by our Solicitor, Mr. Sandman.

Chairman Cheek feels if we join then the state will say well you are part of the complete streets so you have to do this. Mr. Cheek further remarked that if it is all common sense, we have common sense, we bend when we have to bend, firm when we have to be firm.

Mr. Rogers remarked that if a developer with whatever size project comes into town, they bring their presentation with all these elements included because they are going to see that or do it or request variance not to do it, raises the bar for people who want to come into our community and development.

Mr. Womelsdorf we already have things in ordinance for sidewalks, how many do we get that look for waivers, you give them a waiver for no sidewalk, they come in and say you guys gave them a waiver, we are exposed to that already. I don't think that says we should pour all over, doesn't always make sense, now potentially adding guidelines that they may not be familiar with because they are guidelines; we want out to address these guidelines and if they are truly guidelines the developer says you want me to do this, I need to spend more money, I am not going to do it. It is a guideline so where does it get us. I am not sure of the benefit of the program and before adopt more information to see the presentation, dig out my material for exactly what they are, I thought we put that to bed a while ago. Before I say yes, I need to see the benefits to us and what exactly is the impact to developers coming to our town and what are we doing and what does it mean to say it is a guideline. We already have things in place.

Mr. Guishard said he would set up a presentation if so desired.

Mr. Cheek the Township gets so much for recreation from developer, goes into recreation trust fund. Now will this go into the bike path fund...is the developer going to develop a bike path to nowhere or pay another fee. We are developer friendly to bring people in, this is another hurdle. I come in with where if he comes here and has to put up with this and this and decides to go to another township..

RG it is something you can require or not, if I am not explain it well again, I don't see the downside. It is a resolution it says what we are striving to do. That helps and if we try to get grants we have it where it says we are part of complete streets.

Mr. Womelsdorf moved, seconded by Mr. Percy to close public comment with all members voting in favor.

Based on recommendation go back to committee we already looked at this, other choice to decide PB wants to see some kind of presentation.

JP ultimately have to make decision and we have members of TC on this board and they can readily discern some of the feelings, but have the presentation at that level rather than this level.

JK we have enough control on the planning board to deal with things internally but a further review by committee and a form of presentation . this is how we feel but

Mr. Womelsdorf forced to say one or the other, I would say no, however, being of an open mind and be as inclusive as I can and be reasonably educated if the TC had a presentation to get to that meeting to see that presentation, then I would be willing to get to the meeting and make public comment necessary at the time if there is something there that moved me. Our own recommendation from this board is we don't see any benefit; it is up to you guys to decide.

Send it back we are not wholly in favor, we think we have enough control right now
HB would like to see the presentation as well. In order to keep a fair and open mind, see presentation, see liability and see legal I ask questions they need to regarding liability and hear it first hand.

If they saw presentation it may not have come to us.

HB tc should see this presentation.

JK rg is this a presentation someone from there would come and do that. It did not have before someone would come, they did not a come, it was brought by Mr. Guishard so presentation never came to committee in the first place.

Wc cannot support based on information we have, and we feel we have enough control.

When it comes back to committee that Rodney will make comment there is a presentation that can explain this process.

Recommendation made by Mr. Rogers and seconded by Mr. Choyce that the Board refer the matter back to Township Committee stating that we don't see the benefit of adopting these guidelines at this time.

RG it is a resolution to adopt complete streets policy that the Board has reviewed and maybe a presentation will clarify it.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON THE ABOVE MOTION:

AYE – (7) Caldwell, Choyce, Kurtz, Rogers, Womelsdorf, Percy, Cheek

NAY: (0) None

ABSTAIN: (1) Bilicki

MOTION CARRIED: 7-0-1

Chairman open to Public Comment:

Mr. Guishard remarked that it is a resolution to adopt Complete Streets policy that the Board has reviewed and maybe a presentation will clarify it. Reference to the Resolution that was presented at a previous meeting.

Mr. Bilicki motion to close public comment, seconded by Mr. Choyce. with all members voting in favor.

Executive Session: None

Adjournment: Mr. Percy moved, seconded by Mr. Bilicki to adjourn with all members voting "aye".

Respectfully submitted,

Mary A. Lisitski
Planning Board Secretary

These minutes have been electronically recorded.