

**TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD
PLANNING BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
Monday, December 28, 2015**

The regular meeting of the Mansfield Township Planning Board was held on the above shown date with the following in attendance: Chairman Scott Preidel, Vice-Chairman Douglas Borgstrom, Arthur Puglia, Robert Higgins, Gary Lippincott, John Kampo, Randy Allen, Attorney Chuck Petrone, Planner Barbara Fegley, and Secretary Ashly Jolly. Douglas Walker was absent.

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Scott Preidel followed by the flag salute and the following opening statement:

The Notice requirements provided for in the Open Public meetings Act have been satisfied. Notice of this meeting was properly given in the annual notice which was adopted by the Mansfield Township Planning Board on February 23, 2015. Said Resolution was published in the Burlington County Times, e-mailed to the Burlington County Times, Trenton Times and Register News, filed with the Clerk of the Township of Mansfield, posted on the official bulletin board at the Municipal Complex, filed with the members of this body, and mailed to each person who has requested copies of the regular meeting schedule and who has prepaid any charge fixed for such service. All the mailing, posting and filing having been accomplished on February 27, 2015.

Chairman Preidel asked if the board was ok with moving the executive session to the end of the meeting. All members agreed. The professionals introduced themselves. Attorney Chuck Petrone and Planner Barbara Fegley.

DISCUSSION: Master Plan Element Update

Mr. Fox, Regional Planning Coordinator for the Burlington County Bridge Commission introduced himself and began discussion of the Master Plan Re-examination Report. It is a statutory requirement that must be done every ten years. Copy of report and resolution of the governing body is sent to the county planning board and the clerk of each adjoining municipality. One of the first things to look at is to review the past conditions (see 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report page 2, letter A.). Next you would review the changing conditions (see 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report page 2, letter B.). There are some objectives and policies to look at such as the adoption of the Right to Farm ordinance, completion of an ERI to assist in environmental planning, providing a mixture of housing types, and relocating the municipal complex (for full list of objectives and policies see 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report page 3).

Mr. Fox continued with discussion of significant changes in assumptions, policies and objectives (see 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report page 3, letter C.). Another change that has been looked at is population at 400 unit zoning build-out which is roughly 1,000 new residents for 2.5 persons per unit (see 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report page 4). Housing conditions were discussed as well as the circulation plan. Mr. Fox said the Township should tag along into the County wide highway master plan.

Conservation of natural resources were discussed. Mr. Fox said the MLUL asks them to look at energy conservation, but there are no major changes. Also, no changes in solid waste management or recycling. Two significant changes for state policies; one being fair share of low and moderate income housing and second, sewer service correlating with the 2001 state plan policy map. County Policies and Municipal Policies were also discussed (see 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report page 5). Mr. Fox asked if there were any questions. **Mr. Borgstrom** asked if the 400 units in the Population and density distribution include the possibly of the 300 TDR numbers? So the 400 is without TDR? **Mr. Fox** said yes there should be no change in the 400 units if TDR gets adopted. **Chairman Preidel** said he does not think the township has done anything regardint historical preservation planning. **Mr. Fox** said he does not think the township has done it yet. The ERI that was done in 2007 identified some historical properties and there could be a need to do more historical preservation if that is what the board wants to do. The main thing is

you want to educate people so they are aware of their historical resources. **Chairman Preidel** said in regards to what Doug was asking, the 400 homes includes all the R-3? **Mr. Fox** said yes, the split is about 100 in R-3, 300 to be sent to TDR if they were all bought out.

Specific changes to recommend were discussed, such as replacing the current goal, objectives, and policies with those from 2010 GAPP Plan, as well as, updating the Land Use Plan element, the farmland preservation plan element, the housing plan element etc. (see 2015 Master Plan Element Update page 6-7 for specifics.). He stated that there are a few zones that are in the plan that no longer exist, so those should be deleted. It is recommended that the township delineate new residential districts for neighborhoods on sewer service such as Mapleton, Four Seasons, and Country Walk. Currently R-1 but we recommend creating an R-7 zone for Mapleton and Four Seasons. Country Walk would be the R-8 zone. C-1 zone should be delineated and purpose statements should be added to districts that do not have them.

Mr. Fox discussed a review of the Control of Livestock and Farm Regulations provisions for conformance with the right to farm. Off street parking in downtown Columbus should be reviewed and revise several articles in the housing element and fair share housing plan. Redevelopment Plan Status; none have been adopted to date (see 2015 Master Plan Element Update page 7 letter E.). **Mr. Fox** asked if there were any questions. There were none.

Land Use Plan Element Update

Mr. Fox said this is without TDR. There are eight planning Goals (see 2016 Land Use Plan Element Update page 2) that he recommends the Township to adopt. Next Land Use Objectives were discussed such as protecting natural systems and maintaining open spaces and habitats (see 2016 Land Use Plan Element Update page 2-3). Number 13, page three, talks about transit so that should be removed.

Mr. Fox recommends 8 Zoning District Boundary Changes (see 2016 Land Use Plan Element Update page 4). A proposed zoning map was presented. R-1 would be the TDR sending area district and the R-3, R-7 (Mapleton and Four Seasons) and R-8 (Country Walk) districts. R-2 is the TRD receiving area district.

Mr. Puglia commented that he would like to discuss each point one by one. Such as the affordable housing. He said he would like to see a breakdown of everything. **Mr. Fox** said he agrees and that **Planner Fegley** is working on the affordable housing currently. **Mr. Higgins** said that if the township adopts TDR the number of affordable units could be reduced. **Mr. Fox** said yes it's possible to go from 20 percent set aside to 6 percent.

Mr. Fox discussed the C-1 zone which is the Columbus Village area (the area of redevelopment). In the C-3 zone (Hedding & Georgetown area) we suggest you have the entire tax parcel all within the same zone. R-4 would also contain areas in Columbus Village. It is recommended that the R-1 FLP zone is eliminated. Homestead would become the R-5 zone.

Mayor Higgins asked if they could get a map that shows what is in Farmland Preservation. The map provided is not sufficient in that area. **Mr. Fox** said yes they can do that. **Chairman Preidel** asked if that map could be provided at the meeting in January. **Mr. Fox** said yes.

Mr. Fox discussed the Zoning District Purpose Statement (see 2016 Land Use Plan Update Page 5). Agricultural Uses and districts (see page 5) Township is a right to farm municipality. Farming and agricultural uses is permitted on all undeveloped land. Agriculture disclosure statements should be required for property transfers. Preservation of agriculture TDR sending area district. Agricultural Uses chart was presented (see 2016 Land Use Plan Element Update Page 6). **Mr. Allen** commented that in the R-8, Country Walk, there are 10-12 units in there that are semi attached homes. **Mr. Fox** made note of that.

Residential uses were discussed next (see 2016 Land Use Plan Update page 7). There is a familial accessory unit if a person in your family wants to live on your property that is okay; that may be added as a conditional use in a C-1 zone or C-3 zone. Lodging Uses and Districts (see page 8). There could be a

market for a bed and breakfast so it is suggested that it's added as a conditional use in the R-1 zone, R-4 zone, C-1 zone, or C-3 zone.

Civic Uses (see 2016 Land Use Plan Update page 9-11). In terms of parks and playgrounds, athletic fields, or government buildings, it is recommended that we cut the uses out of C-1, ODL, LI and HI, they are residential uses and take away from the profitable tax ratable base. **Mr. Allen** said regarding Country Walk, in the R-8, there is an EMS station on Fieldcrest and a baseball field, tennis courts, as well as a walking park. **Mr. Fox** made note of that.

Health care uses (see 2016 Land Use Plan Update page 10) **Mr. Fox** the MLUL says that you cannot prevent adult daycare, family child care services, or licensed day care facilities so it is recommended that you add those as permitted uses in your residential zone. Assisted living can be a permitted use in a C-2 zone instead of R-1.

It was suggested to add in the C-1 zone, a conditional use for quasi public (the Grange property). Elementary and Secondary Schools are permitted in the C-1, C-2, C-3, and ODL. It is recommended that the township cut those out.

There are seven different types of Commercial Uses and Districts (see 2016 Land Use Plan Update pages 11-15). In terms of bands and real estate we will mostly be focusing on C-1, C-2, C-3, or industrial ODL, LI, HI. Recommend that you do not allow banks and credit unions in the C-3 and the ODL zones. It is also recommended that drive-thrus be added to the C-2, LI, and HI. We suggest adding outdoor seating wherever there is a restaurant for a conditional use and restaurant delivery as a accessory use in all the zones that allow restaurants. (see 2016 Land Use Plan Update page 12).

Personal Household services are permitted in the C-1 and C-2 zone, but a few changes are suggested (see 2016 Land Use Plan Update page 13). The township may want to consider allowing funeral parlors in the C-1 zone. Pet care that is not veterinary care could also be added into the C-1 zone.

For Recreational Uses the only changes recommended are for fine arts, martial arts, and driving schools to be permitted in the C-1 and C-2 zone. Commercial Uses for retail and sales (see Land Use Plan Update page 14). Antiques and art dealers were added to the C-1 zones as well as bakeries, Computer and Tech stores, and delicatessens.

Office Uses and Districts – Two types: 1. Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services. 2. Administrative and Support Services. Currently it's recommended adding offices uses to the C-1 zone. Veterinary services is a conditional use in the C-2 highway commercial zone (see Land Use Plan Update page 16).

Industrial Uses – 8 types: 1. Heavy Manufacturing (non-food), 2. Construction, 3. Information, 4. Food Manufacturing, 5. Light Manufacturing (Non-Food), 6. Transportation and Warehousing, 7. Utility and Waste Management Services, and 8. Wholesale Trade.

Industrial Uses – Construction Contractors are permitted in the HI zone, however it is recommended to add them to the LI zone as well. Informational Uses are recommended for C-2 and C-3 zones. These would be data processing, internet, motion picture and television/music production and distribution.

Industrial Uses- Food Manufacturing it is recommended that food services businesses; contractors that put together meals for institutional uses should be added to the LI zone. Also it is recommended to have microbreweries in the C-1, C-2, and C-3 zones.

Mr. Lippincott asked a question regarding where the sewer line would run, if it is put in. **Mr. Fox** said that he needs to look further into that.

Transportation & Warehousing Uses, the township may want to look at the existing C-2 zone and the proximity of exit 7 on the turnpike, you may want to have an area that allows light industrial zones or warehousing in that area as well. **Mr. Allen** said that if someone would like to put a warehouse in that zone they could go to the zoning board for a variance. **Attorney Petrone** said as long as they meet their burden under MLUL than yes, they could get approval from the board. **Mr. Fox** said they are looking at areas along

Mansfield Road West and Mansfield Road East. It has been brought to our attention that someone may want to build warehousing in that area. The board may want to consider from Mansfield Road East where there are several large properties of more than 10 acres in size previously known as the Promenade, where realistically large retail development will not be coming unless there is sewer. Light Industrial Warehousing are looking at those properties. **Chairman Preidel** asked if that could be a conditional use from a certain point north. **Mr. Fox** said, yes. **Mr. Borgstrom** said it's the ODL out there in the 295 interchange, maybe that is where we want to direct the heavy warehousing in addition to the C-2 area we talked about. **Mr. Fox** said that would be for light industrial uses, warehouses, and whole sale trade.

Mr. Preidel asked what his recommendation was for the Agricultural Uses. **Mr. Fox** said that the uses would be maintained in the R-1, R-2, and R-3 zone as well as, in the commercials and industrial zones. **Chairman Preidel** said that Mr. Fox would be back in January with a map of FLD on it, Turnpike what was delineated, and a map of the credits. We would adopt in January the Re-Examination report. **Mr. Fox** said yes, we will have the hearing January. **Mr. Fox** said if you change the zoning by ordinance you have to notify the people, but the planning documents you do not have too. **Chairman Preidel** said that he would like to do it all on one night.

MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTION 2015-10-04:

PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD RESOLUTION NO. 2015-10-04

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANSFIELD UNDERTAKING A PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION OF A SINGLE PARCEL LOCATED IN THE COLUMBUS VILLAGE SECTION OF THE TOWNSHIP AND DETERMINING WHETHER SUCH PARCEL SATISFIES THE CRITERIA AS AN "AREAS IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT" AS SET FORTH IN THE LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING LAW, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A

WHEREAS, the Township of Mansfield, is authorized by the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1, et seq. (the "Act"), to determine whether certain parcels of land in the Township constitute areas in need of redevelopment;

WHEREAS, the Township has established a general boundary area within the Township that merits evaluation to determine if the parcels located in this area would qualify as Areas in Need of Redevelopment under the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Township Committee has directed the Planning Board to perform an additional preliminary investigation of a single parcel (the "Study Area") located in the Columbus Village section of the Township to determine whether such parcel would qualify as Areas in Need of Redevelopment under the Act; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has performed a preliminary investigation of the Study Area parcel identified by the Township Committee in order to determine whether such parcels would qualify as Areas in Need of Redevelopment under the Act; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield as follows:

1. **PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION OF STUDY AREA.** The Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield has conducted an investigation pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 and has determined that certain parcel in the Study Area does satisfy the criteria set forth in the Act, including N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5, to be designated as an area in need of redevelopment.

2. **MAP TO BE PREPARED.** The Planning Board has prepared a map showing the boundaries of the proposed redevelopment areas and the location of the parcel contained therein.

3. **PUBLIC HEARING.** On October 26, 2015, the Planning Board, after giving due notice of the proposed boundaries of the Study Area and the date of the Public Hearing to any persons who are interested in or would be affected by a determination that all or a portion of the parcels of land within the Study Area is a redevelopment area, held a Public Hearing and heard from all persons interested in or would be affected by a determination that all or a portion of the Study Area is a redevelopment area. All objections to the determination by the Planning Board have been received and considered by the Planning Board and are made part of the public record.

4. **PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS.** After conducting its investigation, preparing a map and conducting a public hearing at which all objections to the designations have been received and considered, recommends that the Township Committee include the single parcel identified in the September 2015 Determination of Redevelopment Needs Study and Determination of Rehabilitation Needs Study, prepared by Edward E. Fox, III, AICP, PP, Regional Planning Coordinator (attached hereto as Exhibit A), as Areas in Need of Redevelopment and Areas in Need of Rehabilitation.

5. **SEVERABILITY.** If any part of this Resolution shall be deemed invalid, such parts shall be severed and the invalidity thereby shall not affect the remaining parts of this Resolution.

6. **AVAILABILITY OF THIS RESOLUTION.** A copy of this Resolution shall be available for public inspection at the Office of the Planning Board of the Township of Mansfield.

7. **EFFECTIVE DATE.** This Resolution shall take effect immediately.

A motion was offered by **Mr. Borgstrom** and was seconded by **Mayor Higgins** to memorialize the resolution. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Kampo, Higgins, Allen

NAY: None **ABSTAIN:** Puglia, Lippincott **ABSENT:** Walker

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

October 12, 2015 – A motion was offered by **Mr. Borgstrom** and was seconded by **Chairman Preidel** to approve the minutes. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Kampo, Allen, Lippincott

NAY: None **ABSTAIN:** Puglia, Higgins, **ABSENT:** Walker

October 26, 2015 – A motion was offered by **Mr. Borgstrom** and was seconded by **Chairman Preidel** to approve the minutes. Motion carried on a roll call vote recorded as follows:

AYE: Preidel, Borgstrom, Kampo, Allen, Lippincott

NAY: None **ABSTAIN:** Puglia, Higgins, **ABSENT:** Walker

There were no further comments from the board, so **Chairman Preidel** opened the meeting to the public. There was no public comment.

A motion was offered by **Mr. Borgstrom** and was seconded by **Chairman Preidel** to adjourn the meeting. All ayes. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date Approved:

Ashley Jolly, Planning Board Secretary