

**Heritage Minerals Working Group
MEETING MINUTES
September 17, 2015
Manchester Municipal Complex
Second Floor Conference Room (Room 205)
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 Meeting Notes
 - a. September 3rd Meeting Comments:
 - i. Meeting notes were distributed yesterday (September 16th), so we won't ask for comments yet
 - b. August 20th Meeting Comments:
 - i. Don: Page 2, item D #7 "WG" – who would that be?
 - ii. "WG" stands for unidentified member from Working Group

2. Approval of Meeting Notes previously distributed
 - a. Approval of August 20th minutes – No objections (3:11 PM)
 - i. Al: Does the approval of these minutes have any legal effect?

- ii. Dave: No, just for our own records. We don't have any bylaws. It is just to maintain an accurate record – and we have one set of notes that reflects what has been said.
- b. July 16th – All in favor (3:14PM)
- c. August 6th – All in favor (3:14PM)
- d. June 15th – Minutes were already voted on, but there was a slight addition to the language where a “disclaimer” was appended to the end

Presentations & Discussion:

1. Discussion of Redevelopment Plan Components – John Pagenkopf & Dave Roberts
 - a. Purpose of the discussion is to walk through the “bones” of the redevelopment plan
 - b. Look at outline of redevelopment plan that was done in Berkeley Township – to give an idea of what a finished plan might look like
 - i. Berkeley was a brownfield site, now “Beachwood Plaza”
 - ii. The site is just now being cleaned up
 - iii. The entire area is around 500 acres
 - iv. Focal center of Town Center is about 140 acres
 - v. Some similarities, but nowhere near as large as Heritage Minerals – concepts and mix of types of uses is similar
 - vi. Berkeley is a good template to use based on imagery, initial components
 - c. Dave will discuss what you can expect to see in a Plan
 - i. Dave has started a “boiler plate” of the Plan - the required “front end” and “back end” sections of the Plan.
 - ii. There are mandatory and optional sections – boiler plate sections are Section 7, which are required in every Redevelopment Plan.
 1. Back end has to do with consistency to master plans, affordable housing, etc.
 2. Any properties that need to be acquired and a section on Relocation would also be placed here – none of that applies to this site
 - iii. There are also the “nuts and bolts” sections, which include the development requirements, land uses, parking, bulk standards
 - iv. John has started drafting what it might look like – the idea today is to flush that out a bit more with zoning districts by working on matching regulations to concept.
 - v. Process:
 1. Plan will try to digest information into development plan for the site?
 2. Works the same as a zoning ordinance
 3. Working group functions as an “Advisory Committee”
 4. The role of the governing body is to have the Plan adopted by ordinance
 5. Redevelopment Plan is the same as any other zoning ordinance
 6. Execute redevelopment agreement with property owner
 - a. Provisions where details are worked out about who does what – don't really get to that during the planning phase

7. Resolution by governing body to authorize it to be executed
- d. John walks through basic categories of the Plan
 - i. Table of contents in Berkeley Plan – assigned certain portions to Dave or John for Heritage Minerals Plan, as discussed above.
 - ii. Inserted detail under “VI – Permitted Uses”
 - iii. HTC-MU “Heritage Town Center – Mixed-Use” (placeholder name) – uses we want to introduce in Mixed-Use Town Center
 1. Includes the grocer, pharmacy, park & ride, other uses we’ve talked about previously.
 2. Apartments and condos above retail
 3. Would like to add affordable housing in the town center above retail
 - a. Dave: A lot of activity suddenly regarding Supreme Court decision and deadlines – pressurized period at the end of the year to produce a housing report. This plan is important because this may be one of the areas where higher density affordable housing can be accommodated.
 - b. There would more than likely be a section of the Plan to discuss affordable housing/inclusionary.
 - c. Township would rather see actual units created rather than sending money to a fund that doesn’t really get used.
 - d. Very rare to do deed-restricted affordable – much easier to do affordable housing when you have the density.
 - iv. Heritage Town Center – Multi-family
 1. Maybe Land bays E, F
 2. Similar to Washington Town Center streetscape with apartments or condominiums adjacent to town center
 3. Might expand to include some retail – as a Main Street we might want to make sure we have some retail uses and small shops
 - a. Dave: Allow retail on corners (like corner deli) – focused retail/convenience to residents so it doesn’t dilute center retail
 - v. TC1 through TC4 – additional Town Center – might be core village
 1. HTC-Village
 - a. Land bays L, M, N, O, & P
 - b. Around TC – Alley-loaded neighborhoods, higher density single-family, twin homes
 2. Multi-family
 - a. Land bay H
 - b. Garden apartments on the boulevard
 - c. Parking is linear along street
 - d. Double-loaded driveways
 - e. May not be walkable to Town Center, but is bikeable – a little more auto-oriented than Land bays E & F.
 3. TC-2

- a. Twin homes with 2-story living, more conventional and wider with a front garage
- b. Felicia: Very difficult to sell and resell. Can be problematic down the line when the owners don't maintain the same styles if there is no association
 - i. Bad perception of "duplex"
 - ii. Dave: Wonder if we could have condominium associations. Who takes care of the common elements?
 - iii. Felicia: Communities where association fee is minimal and maintain roofs, yards, etc.
 - iv. John: If they're offset, it is clear who takes care of what
 - v. I think we need to think about fee simple and possible additional association fees
 - vi. Keep Redevelopment Plan flexible, but with controls about how it's going to be maintained and who is going to be responsible or how it will be subdivided.
 1. At Site Plan stage, Planning Board gets into maintenance.
 - vii. When there are streets around the land bays, it would be creating new tax blocks and parcels with Planned-Unit Development "PUD".
 - viii. JP: Our intention with the Fiscal Plan is that there be enough revenue to add more common supplies, employees, etc. as needed instead of HOAs.
 1. Felicia: Would only need the associations in the townhomes.
4. John: One of the earlier steps would be to do subdivisions along the boulevard.
 - a. Land bays would be subdivisions for different developers
 - b. Then come up with curb cuts, etc.
 - c. Set forth broad brush in the Redevelopment Plan of requirements and standards that would be applied when each Final Site Plan for Subdivisions come in
 - d. Dave: Has the Township has had a general development plan come in on a large site?
 - e. Al: No. Maybe Renaissance site
 - f. Planning Board is going to be the critical body to put the Redevelopment Plan into place.
 - g. HT-1 & HT-2 – flexibility to create HOAs for improvements if desired.
- vi. Townhome Districts (HT-1 & HT-2)
 1. Can rename the zoning districts if we want.

2. Introduce 2 different types of townhomes.
3. Felicia: Will they be fee simple or part of a condo association?
 - a. John: Imagine they would be fee simple
4. Scenario 1 (HT-1):
 - a. Homes would have alleys in one scenario; public street; 20 ft width; 10 ft setback
 - b. Tighter, compact neighborhood (higher-density) and smaller townhomes
 - c. Don't want over-generous rear yards
 - d. Lot sizes will be smaller because we want more communal open space
 - e. Dave: in this example: garage in back, conversion space in front first floor; 2nd story kitchen, living; 3rd floor bedrooms
5. Scenario 2 (HT-2):
 - a. Conventional townhome with front garages and backyards
 - b. HT-2 – did not introduce alleys because larger townhomes that are more conventional on slightly larger lots
 - c. 20 foot setback
 - d. Min. width 22 feet; thinking of variety of 22-26 ft. widths
“Master Down” townhomes – Master bedroom and most living space on the first floor – targeted to empty-nester buyers
 - i. Need 28 ft to have bedroom next to living room
 - e. Single car park garage, walk into den, walk up to second floor
 - f. All slab
 - g. Ryan Homes is building these in Toms River
6. Will develop different standards for both types of townhomes.
7. Felicia: How many townhomes are you thinking?
 - a. Page 3, HT-1 1200 lot size (townhome 1); HT-2 (1600)
 - b. HT-1 zone – no more than 8 units per building
 - c. HT-2 zone – no more than 6 units per building
 - d. Maybe land bay G which is 25 acres could be HT-1 townhomes – might yield 100 townhomes
 - e. Neighborhood sizes range from 25 to 40-45 acres
 - f. Felicia: Worried that there might be too many townhomes for resale
 - g. John: Thinking of 4 different types of townhomes with 4 different price points that would attract different demographics.
 - i. 500 townhomes age-targeted 20ft
 - ii. 500 22ft wide with conventional rear yards and driveways
 - iii. 500 20ft townhomes, alley-loaded – different demographics
 - iv. 500 Same 20ft townhomes front-loaded

- h. Dave: Looking at 100-150 townhouses per land bay
- i. John: Set cap to number of townhomes that would be permitted per land bay. Our fiscal analysis is going to tell us this, as well as what is absorbable in the market.
- j. John: Each phase and land bay will intentionally introduce diversity of homes so we're not overloading the schools and not oversaturating the market
- k. Felicia: Is Hovnanian going to advertise this like crazy? There has to be an enormous ad campaign to attract all of these people
 - i. John: No, the Township wouldn't be responsible for that. This would be 2,000 townhomes built over a period of 15 years.
- l. John: In South Riding, Manassas, VA – comparable community
 - i. You drive in and see trailers from Ryan, Toll Brothers, K. Hov that are marketing.
 - ii. Would like to see building in the Town Center where developers (local and national) rent a space so buyers get a taste of urban feel.
 - iii. Bring buyers into a sales center and will brought to models of different homes.
 - iv. Builders I've talked to see no problem in getting people here – it's not the Township's responsibility.
 - v. Builders will be marketing, but competing.
- vii. HSF (Heritage Single-Family) 5, 8, 10 –
 1. Small lots for small houses
 2. Could be front-loaded
 3. Might resemble one-story home in an adult community
 4. "5" – 5,000 sf lot; "8" – 8,000 sf lot; "10" - 10,000 sf lot
 5. JP: Didn't see anything in Manchester ordinance that fit – each zone would be unique
 6. HSF-5:
 - a. Homes similar to village homes in Robbinsville on 45 ft lots; higher density
 7. HSF-8 &10:
 - a. Geared toward different types of houses
 - b. H-10 – min 55 ft lot
 - c. Need to look at definitions for corner lots – make sure some of the standards do reflect back to existing ordinances.
 - d. Could reproduce some existing ordinances into redevelopment area.
- viii. H, H-Z – Highway Commercial
 1. Might be more consistent with Rt. 37 zoning districts

- ix. Light industrial in land bay to the west – might be consistent with something else in Manchester
- x. Eco-Center Zone
 - 1. Will include provisions for restrooms, bicycle paths
- xi. John: Add graphic land bays P, O, L, M, F – Town Center – different color – a little more unique to Manchester and Ocean County as a village, like Robbinsville.
 - 1. J,A, H – typical suburban neighborhoods; don't need as much control
 - 2. B – More suburban
 - 3. H – Garden apartments, multi-family
- e. Plan Requirements (Dave Roberts)
 - i. Page 1 – Relationships to land use, other plans – Why it's important
 - 1. Land Use
 - a. In Redevelopment Plan there are 2 options: supersede or overlay.
 - b. How we use existing zoning standards would be introduced here.
 - c. Decide whether existing zoning be replaced or added onto.
 - i. The least complicated is to have an overlay – may have to be dependent on redevelopment agreement.
 - ii. Overlay means old zoning is still there.
 - 2. Master Plans
 - a. Adjacent municipalities
 - 1. Berkeley, Lakehurst
 - b. County Plan
 - 1. Most counties haven't updated their plans in a long time, but needs to be looked at and acknowledged
 - 2. Route 37 Plan – no official status, but should be factored in
 - c. State Redevelopment Plan
 - ii. Amendments
 - 1. It is common to amend Redevelopment Plans.
 - 2. Many times the details are not anticipated until after the Redevelopment Agreement.
 - iii. Certificate of Completion and Compliance
 - 1. After the project is complete, the Township signs off on engineering and planning standpoint.
 - 2. Effectively project is finished with respect to redevelopment agreement – constraints go away and it becomes like other real estate.

Next Steps:

- 1. Next Meeting (2 weeks): October 1, 2015
 - a. Topics: Fiscal Impact Analysis; Types of homes and how many
- 2. 2nd meeting in October look at draft of full document

- a. John: Intentionally wanted to get the non-Town Center ordinances out to you because many of you have experience on the Planning Board and can give feedback on what has worked and what hasn't to make appropriate adjustments – avoid trouble that you've had in Manchester in the past
- b. Dave: When you get a chance, take a look at the example plan and mark what you like and what you don't like – will be focusing on that over the next couple of meetings. Has to work fiscally for the Township as well – how it functions economically will refine the plan and be the "checks and balances"
- c. Don: Not sure if John is ready to circulate a land bay plan, but it would be helpful to have one. We have been referencing things without a plan.
 - i. John: All conceptual at this point. In a couple of weeks will try to circulate something

Adjournment: 4:32 pm