

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING BOARD MEETING
Wednesday, November 2, 2016**

Present:

Chairman Wagenbach	Mr. Giangiulio
Vice Chairman Anderson	Mr. Kieser
Councilman Naidu	Mr. Matias
Ms. Balson-Alvarez	Mr. Zucker
Mr. Brinkerhoff	Mr. Gibbons, Board Attorney
Mr. Drummond	Ms. Kiefer, Board Secretary

Notice of Meeting

Chairman Wagenbach called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m. and stated that adequate notice of this meeting had been provided in accordance with the "Open Public Meetings Act."

2016 Master Plan Reexamination Report

Present: Krzysztof Sadlej, Project Director, **Topology NJ, LLC**

Chairman Wagenbach asked Mr. Sadlej to give an overview of the project including the process by which the report was developed.

Mr. Sadlej presented a short power point summary of the report. He noted this was a reexamination of the 2000 Master Plan and the 2006 Master Plan Reexamination. There had been considerable public involvement including two (2) public meetings. In addition, 67 volunteers had been involved in the various subcommittees which were responsible for generating the final six (6) goals, outcomes and strategies.

Chairman Wagenbach then opened the meeting for public comment and outlined the order in which those comments would be taken. He assured everyone that all comments would be taken.

Councilman Robert Rubino, 84 Prospect Avenue, thanked the volunteers and the Planning Board for their work on the project. He felt that the Parkline Project should be more prominent and could be included in each goal. He added that since the land was available, it should be utilized and that the City should do everything possible to preserve green space.

Eric Mendelsohn, 102 Beechwood Avenue, served on the Land Use Committee and stated that that committee did not generate, edit or vote on the contents of the report. He felt more stringent guidelines were needed to protect residential neighborhoods from the negative impacts of development. He added that transition zones must be kept strong and cited several examples within the report where he felt that stronger, clearer language was required. Mr. Mendelsohn expressed that in his opinion the goals in the 2000 Master Plan and 2006 Reexamination were not given a prominent enough position in the 2016 Reexamination and that those goals were more in line with maintaining the character of Summit. He also provided a printed copy with recommended changes to Topology and to several board members.

Kevin McGoey, 113 Woodland Avenue, served on the Land Use Committee also. He stated that this report seemed contradictory, vague and confusing, adding that the document was "very pro development" and did not protect residential neighborhoods. He cited 25 Deforest Avenue as an example of what happens when there aren't strong guidelines.

Claire Toth, 11 Sunset Avenue, served on the Circulation and Transportation Committee. She noted that there was nothing about public transportation in the report and felt that Objective 1.05 was vague. She also mentioned that the public interaction was very useful and helpful in the process.

Carl Locher, 14 Lenox Avenue, encouraged the development of the Parkline adding that it was an incredible opportunity for the long term.

Andrew Smith, 44 Lowell Avenue, expressed support for the baseball complex, stating that it would generate revenue. He also encouraged development of the Highline project as a way to get residents from East Summit safely to the downtown area. Both projects would involve land that was not currently utilized.

Kenneth Stevenson, 38 Valley Avenue, served on the Land Use Committee and commented that more detail was needed on how to address affordability in light of the current state requirements.

Andrew Meany, 18 Fernwood Avenue, stated that he was in agreement with Mr. Mendelsohn and stated that the "tone" of the report was "way off." He felt it was pro development, vague and did not protect residents. He reiterated that overdevelopment was a prime concern.

Robert Friedrich, 3 Linda Lane, supported the baseball complex and felt that this had been adequately addressed in the document. He added that he thought it was important to note that this complex was in response to residents' comments and large support base.

Mark Yeager, 355 Springfield Avenue, stressed that the downtown was extremely fragile and that the report must strongly support that area (Goal 2). He added that Goal 5 should be clear and specific. He stressed that there is no mention of expanding permitted uses on the 1 floor of downtown.

Tom Nolen, 98 Mountain Avenue, felt that the objectives should be specific and measurable. Mr. Nolen also supported the baseball complex citing revenue, employment opportunities and increased property values as reasons.

Maureen & Jeff Kurek, 68 Park Avenue, John Flack, 15 Carleen Court and Anthony DelRosa, 66 Hartley also voiced support for the baseball complex citing that not only the children but the community as a whole would benefit.

Hearing no further comments from the public, Chairman Wagenbach motioned to close the public comment portion of the meeting permanently. Councilman Naidu seconded the motion and the public comment of the meeting was closed.

Chairman Wagenbach advised the board members that according to state law, the Master Plan must be reexamined at least once every 10 years. If the Board failed to do so, all of the City's development ordinances were presumed to be invalid. He added that November of 2016 was the deadline for approval of this reexamination.

Mr. Brinkerhoff suggested that each board member bring up for discussion two (2) or three (3) issues. He felt that the "wordsmithing" should be left to Mr. Sadlej. Agreement by the board members in principle and concept should be the board members' goal.

Chairman Wagenbach agreed. At Councilman Naidu's request, the meeting was recessed at 9:05 PM.

Chairman Wagenbach called the meeting back to order at 9:22 PM. He requested that the board members forward all their minor edits to Mr. Sadlej no later than Monday morning, November 7, 2016.

Mr. Giangiulio began the discussion by stating that he felt that there was not enough emphasis on economic development. He also felt that the document could not be limited by being too specific. Finally, he stated that infrastructure had not been discussed in this reexamination.

Mr. Brinkerhoff expressed agreement with the first two points.

In response to Vice Chairman Anderson's question as to how the reexamination should address infrastructure, Mr. Gibbons advised the Board that the Reexamination Report would not address individual ordinances and should not be overly specific. The Master Plan was a land use and zoning document. The Master Plan Reexamination Report could *comment* on other issues however, such as transportation and housing.

Chairman Wagenbach added that the comments on infrastructure in previous documents were still valid even though the subject was not particularly addressed in this document.

As an example, Mr. Matias noted that the sewer system was covered under a previous document. He noted that most of the infrastructure issues were out of the City's control. The resiliency of the power grid was the most important issue cited but that was under JCPL's control.

Councilman Naidu felt that the reexamination should comment on the effect of economic development on the infrastructure and Mr. Matias agreed.

Councilman Naidu also expressed concern about the vagueness of the document. He felt that there should be more specificity particularly in relation to the buffer zones and to Broad Street Corridor.

Vice Chairman Anderson also felt that the boundaries of the downtown area should be defined. He cited 25 Deforest Avenue as a good example of the stress to protect the residential neighborhoods and of how important the buffer zones were. He also felt that there were too many actions and strategies and suggested that some consolidation should take place. Finally, he questioned why the Gateway II ordinance was called out on page 61 when it was recommended that that ordinance be rescinded.

Mr. Zucker supported more specific language in reference to the buffer zones. He cited Objective 1.02 "Review the legislative intent..." and stated that it should be worded to show that that intent was to strengthen the buffer zones. He also felt that there were areas in the City in need of more safety measures.

Mr. Kieser also stated that there were too many actions and strategies. He proposed that Reexamination Report should suggest that the Planning Board create an ongoing subcommittee(s) to deal with prioritizing and implementing them. This subcommittee would also establish means to measure performance.

Mr. Drummond had the following comments: (1) more support for the Parkline, (2) more support for the baseball complex, (3) carefully develop the downtown, (4) respect the buffer zones and (5) funds for public art should not be *required* (page 17).

Mr. Brinkerhoff felt that there should be more support for the baseball complex and that it should be in line with the high level of community support that was expressed. Second, he felt that the Parkline Development should be placed in Objective 3.02 and should be more prominent. Finally he stated that the document should support a balance of residential and commercial concern.

Ms. Balson-Alvarez cited Objective 1.02 (Assess ORC and B Zones...) and reiterated that the buffer zones were extremely important. She felt that the language could be interpreted either way and that the verbiage should be strengthened. She then cited Objective 2.05 (Define the boundaries of downtown) and felt that it was too vague as written. She stated that the "Broad Street Corridor" should be included.

Chairman Wagenbach expressed support for the baseball complex citing the high level of community support. He also noted that the current facilities had safety issues and that other sports (e. g. soccer, football) had recent facility upgrades. He added that the Reexamination Report should not comment on any proposed location for the complex.

Chairman Wagenbach continued by stating he was opposed to specificity in most cases. For example, he disagreed with adding "Broad Street Corridor" to Objective 2.05. He noted that the Reexamination Report was a "plan for a plan."

Chairman Wagenbach felt that the downtown, city wide businesses and tax infrastructure was very fragile and underemphasized in the document but added that development could have an impact on traffic and that that was not clearly stated. Chairman Wagenbach felt that the buffer zones were adequately protected by current zoning ordinances.

Mr. Gibbons noted a minor change in objective 1.01 to which the board agreed.

After discussion about the Appendices, it was decided that recommendations would be removed and that only Goals and Objectives would be included.

Mr. Matias suggested adding a conclusion section to the Reexamination Report recommending the formation of subcommittees to prioritize and monitor the various actions and strategies. It was also agreed that the conclusion should advise the reader that all the aspects of the document were integrated and that the report should be viewed in its totality rather than honing in on one specific section.

Chairman Wagenbach requested that the board members have any further their editorial changes to Mr. Sadlej by Monday morning, November 7, 2016. Mr. Sadlej advised that he would integrate all the comments into the document and have a revised draft available by Monday, November 14, 2016 so that the board members would have ample time to review it prior to the November 21, 2016 meeting. As such, consideration of the 2016 Reexamination Report was continued to that date.

Hearing no further comments from the board members, Chairman Wagenbach asked for a motion to adjourn. Mr. Kieser motioned, Vice Chairman Anderson seconded and the meeting was adjourned at 10:29 PM.

Cyndi Kiefer
Planning Board Secretary