

PUBLIC MEETING - Thursday, April 7, 2016

There will be a Public Meeting of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Glen Rock on Thursday, April 7, 2016, at 8:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building.

Agenda: (May be subject to change)

1. CALL TO ORDER /ROLL CALL

This meeting is called pursuant to the provisions of the Open Public Meeting Law. This Meeting was included in a list of meeting notices sent to the Bergen Record and advertised in said newspaper in December, posted on the bulletin board in the Municipal Building, and has remained continuously posted as the required notices under the Statue. In addition, a copy of this notice is and has been available to the public and is on file in the office of the Municipal Clerk.

In accordance with the New Jersey State Fire & Safety Code I call your attention to the lighted exit signs. In the event the alarm sounds, move in an orderly manner toward the exit nearest you and leave the building.

Council Member O'Hagan – present
Council Member Surrago – present
Council Member Huisking – present

Council Member Pazan – absent
Council Member Martin – present
Council Member Morieko - present

2. FLAG SALUTE/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Council member Surrago led the Council and audience in the flag salute.

Mr. Snieckus, Borough Planner, commented that they have submitted a proposal to prepare a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. The Housing element is a component of the Master Plan, where we plan for a housing unit that would be affordable. COAH has recently been taken over by the courts to try and determine a fair share amount for communities. In an attempt to be proactive, we are currently in the process of reviewing any vacant land. Additionally, we are starting to update background information. It is safe to say that Glen Rock is participating but needs to be ready once the courts clarify the numbers that are to be established.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

All items listed are considered to be routine and non-controversial by the Borough Council and will be approved by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Council member(s) so request it, in which case the item(s) will be removed from the Consent Agenda and considered in its normal sequence on the agenda. The one motion signifies adoption of all resolutions, received and filed letters, correspondence, reports and approval of applications and minutes.

Resolutions:

1. Resolution for Hazard Mitigation Plan

Resolution No. 107-16

Offered by Council Member Martin

RESOLUTION FOR HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN

WHEREAS the draft plan was provided to each participating jurisdiction and was posted on the County Office of Emergency Management’s website so as to introduce the planning concept and to solicit questions and comments; and to present the Plan and request comments, as required by law, and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Glen Rock:

1. The Bergen County Multi-Jurisdictional *Hazard Mitigation Plan, as submitted to the New Jersey Office of Emergency Management and the Federal Emergency Management Agency on 3/16/2016* by the Bergen County Office of Emergency Management is hereby adopted as an official plan of the Borough of Glen Rock; minor revisions recommended by the Federal Emergency Management Agency and/or the New Jersey Office of Emergency Management may be incorporated without further action.
2. The Glen Rock departments identified in the Plan are hereby directed to pursue implementation of the recommended high priority activities that are assigned to their departments.
3. Any action proposed by the Plan shall be subject to and contingent upon budget approval, if required, which shall be at the discretion of the Borough of Glen Rock, and this resolution shall not be interpreted so as to mandate any such appropriations.
4. The Emergency Management Coordinator is designated to coordinate with other offices and shall periodically report on the activities, accomplishments, and progress, and shall prepare an annual progress report to be submitted to the Bergen County Office of Emergency Management. The status reports shall be submitted on a yearly basis by a predetermined date as agreed upon by all stakeholders.

ROLL CALL:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Council Member O’Hagan –yes | Council Member Pazan - absent |
| Council Member Surrago - yes | Council Member Martin - yes |
| Council Member Huisking - yes | Council Member Morieko - yes |

Motion to accept consent agenda by Council Member Martin

Seconded by Council Member Morieko

ROLL CALL:

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Council Member O’Hagan –yes | Council Member Pazan - absent |
| Council Member Surrago - yes | Council Member Martin - yes |
| Council Member Huisking - yes | Council Member Morieko - yes |

4. Discussion on AR-1 Zone

Mayor Packer commented it was recommended by the Planning Board that this ordinance come back to the Council for second reading. We are not having a second reading tonight; however, this meeting is to hear from the Planner and Engineer, as well as to have any questions answered. The second reading will occur on April 13, 2016 at the next public Council meeting. Tonight's meeting is simply to discuss this zone, not any potential developers. No development exists until there is a zone for it. This zone is in the Master Plan, which suggests there is a need for adult living. It also would increase the tax base.

Mr. Snieckus began by stating this ordinance has designated Block 127, Lots 2, 3 and 4. This ordinance lists single family residences as well as multi-family as permitted uses. Additionally, there is a provision for affordable housing. Some of the other provisions noted in this ordinance include improvements to the side yard setback requirements based upon building height as well as open space requirements, adjustments to the building height and extensive requirements for parking, landscaping and construction.

Council member Huisking asked for clarification that this ordinance allows for multi and/or single family residences.

Mr. Snieckus replied there is a two acre minimum lot size if a multi-family unit is built. The Planning Board was looking to include the existing single family home on this property.

Council member Huisking asked if, in the future, another location wanted to be zoned AR-1 would the 40' front yard setback pertain.

Mr. Snieckus replied another location could request this zone for their property.

Mayor Packer noted that this zone is tied to a specific piece of property. A developer simply cannot come forward with a parcel, they would have to go through a zone change and go through the process.

Council member O'Hagan asked if a developer approached the town to develop another piece of land, legally speaking what are the chances of this same opportunity being offered to them.

Mr. Snieckus replied the town could always be very specific as the location of where they would like to see this type of zoning, even so far as to relate it to the geography of the land. The Borough has the ability to be very specific.

Council member O'Hagan asked what if a resident were to purchase the property next to them to create a two-acre parcel, how would this zone apply to them.

Mr. Snieckus again stated this ordinance is location specific and the mentioned scenario would have to go through a zone change as well as the entire public process.

Mayor Packer asked Mr. Snieckus if the dimensions/restrictions of this ordinance typical of an age

restricted development.

Mr. Snieckus replied the bulk criteria of this ordinance is definitely in line with other municipalities.

Mayor Packer asked if there were any questions/comments from anyone in the audience.

Gino Reina, 461 Prospect Street - Mr. Reina read from the 2002 Master Plan how the need for an age restricted zone came to be. Mr. Reina mentioned in the 2002 Master Plan it stated there would be a 62% increase in this demographic (55+); however in the 2014 Reexamination Report it has the 2010 census stating there was only a 20% increase. Given this new data do we actually “need” an AR-1 zone? Mr. Reina noted it is difficult to make the case for an AR-1 zone simply based on the Master Plan. The forecasted data in the 2002 Master Plan that was established simply do not play out.

Mayor Packer commented the Master Plan mentions we need to find a place for the empty nesters. A benefit to this demographic is that it keeps more people in town and it does help the tax base. Mayor Packer believes the need is still there regardless of what percentage increase occurred in this demographic.

Mr. Snieckus added in the 2014 report it does recognize that approximately 26% of the population is 55+ years of age, which is consistent with neighboring communities that are aging. It would be unfortunate to lose the wealth of knowledge and experience this population contributes.

Joe Connor, 455 Prospect Street - Mr. Connor commented he is not hearing any quantifiable statistics and asked if it is worth changing our town on supposition. It was intimated that people's taxes will go down.

Mayor Packer clarified that it was never intimated that taxes would go down.

Mr. Connor asked who would be the enforcing agent for this complex adding there are quality of life issues to be considered. We're setting a precedent that will be difficult to stop in the future.

Mayor Packer commented the enforcement should fall upon the owner of the development. If someone is living there that should not be, the Borough can absolutely take action.

Mr. Connor stated it sounds like the Borough is now asking us to spy on our neighbors. Mr. Connor argued you can't develop something that is not enforceable.

Mr. Snieckus commented there is a process where by-laws are established for a development which helps to enforce the age restrictions.

Greg Morgan, 451 Prospect Street - Mr. Morgan stated the reason they moved to Glen Rock was for the schools and for the aesthetics of the town. Many people move here to get away from high-density housing. Mr. Morgan agreed the justification for this development is not there. Mr. Morgan expressed concern with a 60-unit development (30 units per acre) with 100 parking spaces and the lack of green space left. Mr. Morgan stated he believes this is one of the issues (stopping this development) that help the new Council members win their election. Mr. Morgan also questioned why a taller building would have a lesser setback than a single family home.

Mr. Connor questioned if the affordable housing portion is new as he has not heard of that restriction for this property.

Mr. Snieckus replied affordable housing has always been part of this ordinance. By permitting affordable housing we would be addressing our obligation.

Council member Morioko also believes 30 units per acre is too dense and as a result she researched neighboring towns. Council member Morioko found that Ridgewood only permits 15-20 units/acre, Hawthorne permits 24/acre (as long as there are 4 acres) and River Vale permits 15/acre. Council member Morioko asked Mr. Snieckus how we came up with 30/units per acre.

Mr. Snieckus replied it was probably related to what the site could bear, what the development would look like. Mr. Snieckus added based on what he saw on the site plan he does not have a problem with this density.

Council member Martin commented she does not see how this particular property will benefit an age-restricted community given its distant proximity to the Central Business District.

Mr. Snieckus could understand this noting it is close in proximity to the County Park.

Council member O'Hagan commented an age-restricted community is much more mobile than a senior citizen community. Council member O'Hagan also commented he is a bit taken aback by the resident comment that we don't know who is going to live there. Seriously?

Council member Huisking made some comments concerning the building height, setbacks, density and enforcement.

Mayor Packer stated in conversations with the Borough Attorney it is shown that the age restriction can be enforced through deed restrictions, the owner enforces it and if they do not the Borough can enforce through a lawsuit.

Gabe Bullaro, Doremus Avenue - Mr. Bullaro believes the age enforcement is not an issue we should be concerned with. Federal statute has an exemption with age discrimination, it is not a protected class. Mr. Bullaro clarified that the ordinance states the AR-1 zone is a minimum of two acres.

Walter Perry, 660 Harristown Road - Mr. Perry clarified the height of the building. Mr. Perry is concerned parking will be an issue at 1.5 spots. Mr. Perry questioned the difference between vacant land vs under-utilized land.

Mr. Snieckus replied this is something the Fair Share Housing Center is looking at, what is the unmet need that is not being addressed by vacant land. Mr. Snieckus commented it is important that the municipality show that they are affirmatively trying to address their affordable housing obligation.

Mr. Morgan thanked the Council for conducting this hearing and urged them to reconsider the density numbers.

5. ADJOURNMENT

**Motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Council member Morieko
Seconded by Council member Huisking
Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.**