

PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF FANWOOD
Regular Meeting Minutes
September 28, 2016

The Regular Meeting of the Planning Board, scheduled by the time, place and date of the meeting, prominently posted on the bulletin board at Borough Hall, mailed to the Times and the Courier, filed with the Borough Clerk, and mailed to any person requesting same in accordance with the requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act is called to order at 7:30 PM.

Present: Flowers, Jukes, Molenaar, Blechinger, Lysicatos, Keeler,
Steigerwald, Renaud, Sullivan

Absent: Mayor Mahr, Seefeldt, Sherry

Minutes August 31, 2016

Mr. Jukes moved to approve, Ms. Keeler seconded.

Ayes: Jukes, Keeler, Flowers, Lysicatos, Molenaar, Steigerwald.

New Business

Block 97, Lot 1 (fence) 4 Kempshall Terrace, Klos

By a vote of 7 to 1, the board approved the requested 6 foot fence on this corner property. The applicant seeks this fence height variance as a buffer to the noise of Terrill Rd. as well as for security/privacy on this busy street. The applicant expressed a willingness to plant the required vegetative buffer, but because there is a healthy tree that would require removal if the applicant were to place the fence 18 inches off the property line, the board granted a variance from this requirement; allowing the applicant to place the fence on her property line. The applicant will plant a vegetative buffer in the right-of-way between her fence and the sidewalk unless there is municipal/county objection to same.

The motion to approve was made by Jack Molenaar and seconded by Matthew Jukes.

Ayes: Molenaar, Jukes, Flowers, Blechinger, Lysicatos, Keeler
Nays: Steigerwald

Application Carried to October 26, 2016

Block 50, Lot 30 (return to PSEG Tower)
55 North Avenue
Verizon

9/20/16 Memo from Administration re “Areas in Need of Rehabilitation” Proposal

Borough Attorney Diane Dabulis of Rogut McCarthy appeared along with Fanwood Development Director, Liz Jeffery to present the Borough Council proposal to deem much of the South Avenue Corridor as an “area in need of rehabilitation”.

As background information, Ms. Dabulus explained that an Area in Need of Rehabilitation is not the same as an area in Need of Redevelopment. There are many differences but the principle differences are that the Borough cannot condemn properties in an Area in Need of Rehabilitation and cannot provide long term tax abatements. The Area in Need of Rehabilitation is a tool for municipalities to encourage improvement in an area and to promote investment in the community. Ms. Dabulus confirmed that the delineated area satisfies the conditions of the New Jersey Statute for the Area in Need of Rehabilitation (NJSA 40A:12A-13) declaration because :

- a significant portion of the structures there are in a deteriorated or substandard condition
- there is a pattern of vacancy, abandonment or underutilization of properties in the area and
- a significant portion of the infrastructure is over 50 years old, particularly the sewer.

Ms. Jeffery then discussed the property list and accompanying map. The area was created as a positive step in furtherance of the goals and objectives of the newly created Commercial Corridor District zoning overlay. It is basically a tool that the Borough can use to assist investment in the area through the provision of a 5 year tax abatement, should the Borough desire to do so.

Any incentives would be subject to the Borough evaluation of the project and its benefits and would not be as of right.

It was further explained that this designation is NOT a value judgment on the quality of an individual building. The designation is based upon the entire area and the level of vacant, dilapidated or underutilized properties and/or infrastructure, generally.

While not all properties within this Area will take advantage of or require the benefits from the program, the Board agreed that the plan offered was desirable for the sake of zoning consistency and in furtherance of the goals and objectives of the Commercial Corridor District.

Motion to support the recommendation was made by Teresa Keeler, seconded by Mike Lysicatos.

Ayes: Keeler, Lysicatos, Flowers, Blechinger, Molenaar, Juckes, Steigerwald

The board's conclusion will be conveyed to Borough Administration by PB Secretary.

Sandberg v. Planning Board

By unanimous vote the board authorized Robert Renaud, Esq. to respond to the above referenced suit.

Resolutions:

Block 56, Lot 13, 83 LaGrande Avenue, Carbone (fence)

The board unanimously approved the resolution for this application for a six-foot fence on the north and east property lines of their home.

Motion to approve moved by Mr. Molenaar, seconded by Mr. Juckes

Ayes: Molenaar, Juckes, Flowers, Blechinger, Lysicatos, Keeler, Steigerwald

Motion carries

Block 102, Lot 33, 17 Pandick Court, Clarke (bulk)

The board unanimously approved the resolution for side yard and improvement coverage variances as well as variances for the pre-existing rear-yard deck setback of 11 feet and side yard setback of 9'7".

Motion to approve as offered Mr. Juckes, seconded by Ms. Keeler

Ayes: Juckes, Keeler, Flowers, Blechinger, Lysicatos, Molenaar, Steigerwald

Motion carries

Block 64, Lots 6.02, 17-21, 225 La Grande Avenue, Station Square (downtown redevelopment)

The unanimously approved the resolution for the 35-unit townhouse development with 28 market value units and the balance of seven being affordable housing units.

Motion to approve was moved by Mr. Lysicatos and seconded by Mr. Molenaar

Ayes: Lysicatos, Molenaar, Juckes, Flowers, Blechinger, Keeler, Steigerwald.

Motion carried.

Adjournment

Motion made and seconded to adjourn at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Pat Hoynes, Planning Board Secretary