

**Heritage Minerals Working Group
Meeting Agenda
November 5, 2015
Manchester Civic Center
3:00 PM**

Call to Order

1. Roll Call of Working Group Members:
 - Mayor Ken Palmer
 - Donna Markulic, Business Administrator
 - Craig Wallis, Councilman*
 - Jim Vaccaro, Councilman*
 - Lisa Parker, Chief of Police (Lt. Robert Dolan)
 - Al Yodakis, Director of Public Works
 - Don Somerset, Director of Utilities
 - Felicia Finn, Zoning Board
 - Michele Zolezi, Planning Board
 - Dave Trethaway, School Superintendent
 - Blanche Doran, Senior Advisory Committee
 - Marge Camposano, Secretary to Mayor Palmer
- *Council members Wallis, Vaccaro and Fusaro will alternate

2. Redeveloper Representatives Attending:
 - John Pagenkopf
 - Susan Doctorian Kyrillos

3. Staff Attending
 - David Roberts, Township Planner (Maser)
 - Zachary Zeilman, Planner (Maser)

Approval of Minutes:

1. Comments on Previous minutes:
 - a. Meeting Summary for 9/17 has not been distributed yet.
 - b. The Summary of the 10/1 meeting was to be distributed at the 10/15 meeting, which was cancelled, and was distributed via email yesterday (11/4) and in-person today (11/5) instead.
 - c. September 3rd minutes have been tabled; need to be approved
 - i. Don had comments on page 6, as discussed below:
 1. Items 3 and 4 appear incomplete and should be finalized before the Summary is approved:
 - a. Item 3: "Will take a close look with DOT"
 - i. Discussion about Rt 70 – comment from John Ray – becoming more of an active corridor
 - ii. John Ray will outline traffic flows where it is projected with traffic counts

iii. DR read back the following corrections to the Sept. 3 notes:

1. *"xi. Route 70 east of Lakehurst is becoming more of an active corridor..."*
2. *"xi. 2. Route 70 access to the Town Center will be high capacity..."*
3. *"xi. 3. John Rea will take a close look at the intersection design at Route 37 with DOT..."*
4. *"xi. 4. The full intersection with Route 37 will give us a good connection to the state highway system towards the Garden State Parkway..."*

ii. Updates to land bays and September 3rd Summary will be made and recirculated along with September 17th Summary.

- d. JP stated that they were making great strides on writing the redevelopment plan
- e. Last meeting notes were for October 1st, which focused on the fiscal analysis.
- i. Don recommended to approve; no objections – APPROVED.
- f. It was agreed by the WB to table the approval of the meeting summaries for September 3rd and September 17th so that they can be reviewed in conjunction with the map of the land bays that was emailed with the meeting agenda on November 4 and distributed as 11x17 color hard copies prior to this meeting.

Presentations:

1. New Land Bay Map

- a. DR called it a "Framework Plan" for purposes of reference in the redevelopment plan, but it essentially shows the street network, land bays and land uses in the land bays.
- b. DR said that the "Framework Plan" will drive the rest of the Plan once it is approved by the WG for recommendation to the Township Council.
- c. JP explained that some of the land bays have changed numbering and one of the prior letter designations for the land bays was eliminated; He explained the differences between his previous sketch that was reviewed with the WG on Sept. 3 and Sept. 17, and the map by LPDA
 - i. Land bays I, M, and N, which were the peripheral village bays, are now absorbed within Town Center (TC)1-6
 - ii. Other than TC core, the bulk of the pieces haven't changed. New land bay "KK" is now shown on the western side, which is a restricted non-residential land bay.

2. Review of general issues with Redevelopment Plan – John Pagenkopf
 - a. JP had a meeting with the Holiday City HOA group today (11/5) – sent letter to DEP to have a meeting about the remediation work
 - b. The meeting was requested by the HOA.
 - c. JP expressed his commitment that Berkeley communities would not be receiving information before the WG reviewed it.
 - d. Monday Nov 2nd, the Planning Board continued the hearing on the reexamination report to December 7, which puts off review of the redevelopment plan by the Board by one meeting.
 - i. Today JP will review more fiscal detail and broad issues on redevelopment plan that goes to planning board and council.
 - ii. Mayor Palmer wants to meet with the working group separately. The meeting on November 19 would be dedicated for an internal discussion of the WG.
 - iii. It is anticipated that a draft of the plan would be distributed so that the WG can comment at the meeting on December 3rd.
 - iv. December 7th – PB expected to adopt reexamination report addendum
 - v. December 17th – JP anticipates that if the redevelopment plan is recommended to Township Council on December 17, the WG's work would be done.
 - vi. Redevelopment plan heading to PB in January
 1. AY: What action are we expecting at the December Planning Board meeting?
 - a. JP: Looking to have a brief discussion; DR: Planning Board has to make recommendation on the redevelopment plan to the Council as to consistency with the Master Plan and any other comments that they have. It is not required to hold a public hearing at the Planning Board level. The Council will have a public hearing prior to the adoption of the Plan by ordinance.
 - b. DR: The November 19th meeting for just the working group might be good timing – have to get on the PB agenda with revisions to the Reexamination Report Addendum; mostly having to do with the multi-family overlay zone.
 - c. Redevelopment plan is looking to switch zoning from adult community to Town Center
 - d. JP: Will talk about how you all feel about some of the fiscal numbers – we'll have time before the 19th to talk to board secretary if they have room to fit us on their agenda to give the Planning Board a preview of the Town Center Concept.
 - e. Not looking for adoption of the redevelopment plan until

- early next year
 - f. Two possible approaches:
 - i. Ordinance adopting the plan introduced by Council and then referred to Planning Board; or
 - ii. Planning Board review first and then recommend to Council for introduction and adoption.
2. Continued discussion of Fiscal Impact Analysis – John Pagenkopf
- a. We are getting the preliminary results back from October 1st
 - i. There are 6,543 homes proposed and currently 1 million square feet of commercial space and 1 million square feet of industrial space.
 - ii. After the 1st phase, positive fiscal benefit of \$4.5 million dollars per year to the municipality and schools
 - iii. \$3.5 million positive revenue after phase 3; \$7 million revenue every year after phase 4; This is all before the Payment-In-Lieu-of-Taxes (PILOT)
 - b. There will be a lot of discussion with the council about community elements, lake, roads, etc.
 - c. Redevelopment Plan is a zoning document that will serve as an overlay to the current active adult zoning
 - d. If we can't get approval from the State, Hovsons intends to build the active adult community per the settlement agreement.
 - e. Once the Council approves the Plan, they will hopefully designate Hovsons as the Master Developer. Other developers can be pre-approved by the Council as being the responsibility of the Master Developer.
 - f. The redevelopment plan needs to prove to be fiscally positive for the Township, but won't see list of road improvements, schools, etc. in the Redevelopment Plan – that will be part of the Development Agreement
 - i. That said, the Redevelopment Plan is by no means a simple document
 - ii. Numbers with regard to the fiscal benefit are broken down by phase – how can that be absorbed by the market. It is going to take a long time and depends on how long each phase takes. Come to an agreement of how absorption will happen.
 - iii. Property can absorb it, but whether the market can absorb it is another thing; One of benefits to the town will be connection of Route 70 and 37; only so much we can anticipate in the plan; just have to feel ok that community roads and facilities can absorb it
 - g. AY: You said if this didn't work out with DEP, we would go back to original plan?
 - i. JP: All sub-developers will be subject to the Master Developer and the Development Agreement

- ii. DR: The idea is that you have one developer with financial capacity and experience to oversee – Township would pre-approve other redevelopers would be sub-developers; would be responsible to agreement under the Master Developer
- iii. DR: One of the key decisions is going to be whether the Plan is superseding or an overlay – based on the Settlement Agreement, the overlay probably make sense, but there are only two choices; a superseding plan replaces the existing zoning and is a bit more complicated; other thing is to what extent you allow deviations from the plan; if they feel strongly about strict adherence to the plan, the plan can prohibit deviations; alternatively, there the plan can allow some variations
- iv. AY: Any tweaks will change the fiscal analysis
- v. DR: Right. We are trying to come up with what we feel comfortable with in the next month
- h. DT: When will we find out about the impact on schools?
 - i. JP: Through the first pass on the fiscal, we found we had a bigger impact on schools than we thought would occur – so we moved some development into different phases
 - ii. JP: In the spring we will start looking at traffic impacts, school impacts, and phases. After this Plan is approved and we have something that works, we can build schools if we need to, road improvements, etc.
 - iii. DR: Has the Township ever had a General Development Plan (GDP)
 - iv. AY: Renaissance had preliminary Site Plan with 1,900 units
 - v. DR: A GDP is used for sites over 100 acres where buildout can take up to 20 years and requires a development agreement, so it would be comparable to a redevelopment plan with a redevelopment agreement; A more developed concept plan that evolves from the Framework Plan might become part of the redevelopment agreement.
 - vi. JP: There is going to be a lot of discussion with the administration on the redevelopment agreement; Can't go to the Zoning Board and get variances from a redevelopment plan
- i. JP: They expect to submit a Master Subdivision Plan for subdivision approval, showing improvements for the 5-mile boulevard and land bays that will most closely resemble the Framework Plan and which is the first piece that establishes land bay sizes, curb cuts, etc.
 - i. The sample redevelopment plan provided to the WG was the Berkeley Town Center Redevelopment Plan.

1. One difference is the size and scale of Heritage is far greater than the Berkeley Town Center site.
- j. JP: Explained the updated Framework Plan. He said they simplified the land uses to cover three types: residential, mixed-use, and non-residential
 - i. Suggested that the redevelopment plan could cap residential development at 6,543 homes (all types)
 - ii. Uses in green residential land bays could be flexible (allow any of the residential uses – single family, townhouses and apartments) so that they could respond to changes in the real estate market.
 - iii. Non-residential would include industrial uses
 - iv. Mixed-use area was expanded up to Colonial Boulevard; would like to include schools, offices, sports facilities, and residential in this area
 1. Expanded to Colonial because there would be some residential component as well
 - v. After the Master Subdivision Plan is approved by the Planning Board; Hovsons may request in the redevelopment agreement that they could proceed with development applications to Planning Board with the need to go to Redevelopment Entity (Council) first; Redevelopment Plan would be part of amended Settlement Agreement; have CAFRA applications as well – checked locally for consistency and permitted uses
 1. CAFRA is going to check that should an application come in locally, it is consistent with the Agreement
 2. If there's an amendment where there might be proposed mixed-use in residential area or higher density, etc., it would be appropriate that the redevelopment agreement would require them to go back to Redevelopment Entity rather than straight to the Planning Board
 3. Density averaging should be done in each phase to make sure it is in line with the Redevelopment Plan and Development Agreement
- k. JP: There are three (3) general uses proposed. Are there any issues/does this work? Can we move ahead with this?
 - i. DR: The big change is extending the mixed-use area up to Colonial Drive. We are contemplating a wide range of uses, but it depends on the size of land bays. TC 1-6 might be a little more restrictive because they are smaller, whereas schools might be feasible on bays A or B. Each land bay needs to be flushed out with requirements in the redevelopment plan;
- l. The redevelopment agreement could be part of Planning Board review checklist

- i. JP: Having a maximum number of units occurring in Phase 1 allows us to wrap our heads around a big project and be fiscally positive. He would be comfortable with cap of 6,543 residential units.
- ii. Planning Board shouldn't be able to make decision on variations because it would have to go back through traffic, fiscal, schools, etc.
- iii. DR: One thing we may talk about on 19th is to what extent the governing body wants to act as a filter for the Planning Board – the Governing Body always knows, sees numbers, etc. as part of agreement before it goes to the Planning Board
- iv. DR: The redevelopment plan will list all of the uses that we could see in each land use area and their bulk standards (residential, non-residential, mixed-use)
 1. Width of a buffer between residential and non-residential – going to have to re-write because we have mixed-uses
 - a. Want to make sure it is controlled in Redevelopment Plan so it is not affected by standards for the rest of the Township
 2. JP: Parking standards – may refer back to Township standards in certain areas. For us to come up with for every use is overkill
 3. DR: Redevelopment plans are required to state the relationship of redevelopment plan to master plan and zoning regulations.
 4. It is possible that the Township won't have standards appropriate for a Town Center development for things like parking layouts (may want behind building, close to sidewalk, less space, etc).
 - a. Somethings can default to underlying zoning (definitions)
 5. Signage will be in Redevelopment Plan
 - a. JP: Want certain type of monument signage identifying neighborhoods and sub-neighborhoods
 6. JP will meet with DR next week to review tasks line by line.
 7. DR: There will likely be a combination of standards in the Plan and those that default to Township standards; want to find an appropriate mix for phase 1 and look at Redevelopment Plan as separate zoning document
 8. DR: Don't want to move forward without being comfortable that the Plan will be fiscally positive for the Township.
 9. After planning document is approved, shifts to Development Agreement

10. DR: If we agree on zoning, setbacks, overall standards, open space, signage in the redevelopment plan, the phasing and other implementation mechanisms will be in the redevelopment agreement. The Plan will be released to the Planning Board, but the WG needs to be comfortable in what it means in terms of build-out.
 - a. DS: Correct, would be tough to recommend plan without knowing build-out; We have not getting any of that here to consider and there must have been some sort of buildout analysis to be able to generate fiscal impact
 - b. JP: Working group is not being asked to gauge that now (fiscally positive) because all of that could change if/when the Governing Body makes any changes
 - c. Plan is worthless without a redevelopment agreement
 - d. A framework of what it might look like, types of uses, etc. is a tremendous help for the Governing Body to see.
 - e. DR: We are not done after this, but need the redevelopment agreement. It is possible that the Council won't want to take on a PILOT.
 - f. DR: We are anticipating (will talk more specifically on the 19th) what that actually means in terms of build-out so we understand and can recommend in good-conscience. Might have cap on it based on FAR, land, etc, which is what generates the fiscal analysis
 - g. Have to do Plan first before we do the build-out by the 17th
11. DR: Wasn't much discussion about Heritage at Planning Board meeting on the 2nd ; Don't expect to change language in Addendum about Heritage – have to plan to give them heads up – The Redevelopment Plan that they see will be the Plan with which the WG has agreed to recommend.
12. AY: Haven't seen financial analysis, lots of other caveats; need to be clear with the Planning Board on that – that we are just looking at it as a whole
13. JP: Like “Conditions” on a Site Plan application (will approve IF) – What is the demarcation line between Redevelopment Plan and Development Agreement?

14. JP: Hovsons will want to be able to flip uses in first phase and not be too specific if end users might want to change things. That will change where things are built and ultimately impact the fiscal.
 15. AY: Council was under the impression that we would be digging a lot deeper into this, so we need them to know what we've actually looked at.
 16. DS: Hovsons can present numbers that aren't hard numbers so that we feel comfortable with general parameters.
 17. JP: Trying to make sure that the Redevelopment Plan doesn't get bogged down in the numbers
 18. JP: On the 19th we could come back and give more detail on the fiscal and then you can have private meeting with the mayor
 19. DR: We have two different concerns – The Working Group wants to have some predictability and some level of consistency knowing that there isn't an information vacuum; John doesn't want to get the Plan too involved with numbers
 20. JV: Have you reached out to nationals on land bays? Might give more confidence if we know who is interested in building what.
 - a. JP: I will bring that next time
- m. Meeting Nov 19th – John will come in with fiscal and then have our own discussion
- i. Take a look at minutes for Sept 17th and today
 - ii. What you will expect to see in draft redevelopment plan
 - iii. Schedule

Discussion:

1. Next Meeting: November 19, 2015
2. Topic: Draft Manchester Heritage Town Center Redevelopment Plan

Adjournment: 4:35 PM