


**MEMO**

Date: April 20, 2005

To: Master Plan Committee  
Absecon City Planning Board

From: Robert L. Reid, PP   
Planning Board Planner

Re: Draft Ordinance proposed by City Council to re-zone portion of R-2 District to PSCC District.

As a follow-up to the Planning Board meeting of April 12, 2005, a meeting with representatives of City Council was arranged. On April 19, 2005, I met with City Administrator, Terry Dolan, City Attorney Michael Blee, Esq. and City Planner, Stuart Wiser, PP as directed by the Planning Board. At that meeting I informed the attendees that the Planning Board determined that the portion of proposed ordinance that included expanding the PSCC District into the R-2 District is inconsistent with the Master Plan.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss possible alternatives to the ordinance proposed by the City Council. We discussed the age-restricted developments coming on line, the increased population anticipated and potential impacts on municipal services as the result.

I suggested as a possible alternative to the expansion of the PSCC District a reduction in the required lot area in the R-2 District for age-restricted single-family dwellings. Currently the R-2 District requires a minimum of 10,000 Sq. Ft. lot area with a minimum 75' lot width. I provided all attendees with a copy of a conceptual plan, dated April 8, 2005 (Copy Attached) depicting approximately 80 – 75' X 100' building lots in the 23+/- acre parcel as depicted on the draft revised zoning map prepared by Remington, Vernick and Walberg Engineers, dated March 3, 2005. This density is substantially less than what the PSCC District proposed by City Council. With no density limitations in the proposed PSCC District using the Senior Housing Overlay, 200 to 400 units could be proposed. The actual number of units would be controlled by site coverage, parking requirements, amount of commercial or medical facilities proposed and type of units proposed in the complex. All attendees agreed that the age-restricted single-family alternative more compatible with the existing surrounding land uses.

We also discussed the possibility of expanding the Senior Citizen Overlay, District "A" to the HD-1 Commercial District. This area includes the former drive-in theater site that has been dormant for many years. I mentioned that several board members and residents in the area had suggested the land be banked for our future. We concluded that the Planning Board should continue the Master Plan review process and City Council would

need to consider other options rather than the expansion of the PSCC District into the R-2 District.

On April 19, 2005, Michael Fitzgerald, Esq. Board Attorney forwarded the Planning Board's response to City Council in regards to their draft proposal, the Board does not necessarily believe that age-restricted dwellings would be inappropriate, but rather the type of housing permitted by City Council's proposal is a real concern. The Board also suggested that City Council consider the benefits of retaining the land for the future (Copy Attached). Back on June of 2004 after several meetings of the Absecon Land Use Committee I recommended that existing city owned open lands be reserved for future uses yet to determined (Copy Attached). This committee consisted of representatives of City Council, the Board of Education and the Planning Board. Also, my letter of February 23, 2005 to the Master Plan Committee had suggested that we set aside lands now for future use (Copy Attached).

The ordinance proposed by City Council to allow multi-unit, six (6) story buildings with no limit to density could be adopted by City Council without the Planning Board's endorsement by an affirmative vote of 5 of the 7 council members. The lot area reduction proposal was offered only as a compromise alternative to the multi-unit building proposal proposed by City Council. The public that attended the April 12, 2005 Planning Board meeting had voiced their concern about re-zoning the city owned lands to permit higher densities. They requested that the land be reserved for our future.

It is understood that recommendations made by me or any other professional is subject to the Planning Board's review and adoption of the reexamination of the Master Plan, City Council's review and adoption of the form of the ordinance and most importantly, public participation in the process.