

SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES
December 13, 2017

A special meeting of the Mayor and Council of the Borough of Bradley Beach was held in the Meeting Room, 701 Main Street, Bradley Beach, New Jersey on the above date.

CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Gary Englestad opened the meeting with a salute to the flag.

Sunshine Law

The meeting has been noticed publicly according to the Open Public Meetings Act requirement for the “Annual Notice”, and posted on the official bulletin board.

ROLL CALL 6:30 pm

Present: Council: Weber, Goldfarb, Bonnell
Mayor Engelstad
Borough Attorney Michael DuPont
Municipal Clerk/Administrator Kelly Barrett
Chief Financial Officer Gail Krzyzczuk

TOPIC: REDEVELOPMENT OF MAIN STREET

Mayor Engelstad announced that the purpose of the special meeting was to educate the businesses and property owners on Main Street of the Redevelopment Process. The impact, if any, redevelopment will have on Bradley Beach residents. He assured everyone that eminent domain would not be implemented. He continued, that there have been a number of developers showing interest in Bradley Beach and we want to take control of the process and get ahead of the curve. He turned the meeting over to Jennifer Beahm, Borough Planner to explain the process and encouraged all to participate with questions and comments.

Jennifer Beahm, Borough Planner began that she was asked to take a look at Main Street and provide options regarding Re-Development. She stated there were two options viable for Re-Development: Option #1 Re-Development Plan, a lengthy stringent process meeting the criteria and cumbersome obtaining the designating of an “Area in Need of Re-Development. This options allows for the use of eminent domain and a tax abatement of up to thirty years. Option #2 Re-Development/Rehabilitation Plan, a much lower standard to meet the designation of an “Area in Need of Rehabilitation. Examples of the Rehabilitation Plan criteria: housing stock of fifty years or older, significant tax arrears, and/or sub-standard infrastructure. The Rehabilitation option does NOT allow for the use of eminent domain and a possible five year tax abatement if the governing body chooses to implement. The borough clearly meets the criteria for option two based on the condition of the sewer system. The Rehabilitation process is for the governing body to direct the Planning Board to review, study and finally a report with recommendations of the Rehabilitation Plan. The governing body may or may not accept the recommendations of the Planning Board and proceed with a Rehabilitation Plan. The plan does not supersede the current zoning ordinances, it provides for an overlay of our zoning ordinances. This allows for additional zoning options for developers and may also allow for a zoning overlay for

individual lots. The zoning of individual lots is referred to as spot zoning is not normally permitted and is only permitted in a Rehabilitation Plan. Request for Proposals will be prepared with general guidelines of the Rehabilitation Plan and advertised. Any and all developers interested in the Rehabilitation Plan with our guidelines will respond. It is important for the selected developer to be involved in the early stages of the planning. The RFP process sends a message to developers that the borough is committed to the rehabilitation plan. The plan prepared by the borough gives complete control of the project and the future vision of the borough. The borough has the ability during the RFP process to choose what we want and we are not obligated to choose any developer if we do not agree with their proposal. A public hearing will be held and the plan and developer are discussed.

Mayor Engelstad questioned if the property owners on Main Street have any obligation to participate in the Rehabilitation Plan involving their properties with the developer. Ms. Beahm responded, the developers have no control over the property owners or their decision regarding their property. If the property owners are not interested in working with the developer they have no obligation to do so.

Councilman Weber questioned Ms. Beahm on her knowledge and past experience with the redevelopment/rehabilitation process. Ms. Beahm responded that she has been involved in many redevelopment/rehabilitation plans. She stated my past projects have ranged in size from very large to very small; Bell Labs in Holmdel, Woodbridge, Burlington County. He then questioned the availability of financial assistance to the property owners under the plan, such as low or no interest loans. Ms. Beahm responded that other than offering possible tax abatements the property owners are responsible for financing, façade changes, etc.

William Psiuk, 110 Fifth Avenue, questioned if the borough was still participating in the Regional Contribution Agreement (RCA) and were funds available for improvements. Mayor Engelstad responded NO, the RCA program has expired.

Michael Conoscenti, Cliff Avenue, expressed concerns regarding the Borough underwriting the redevelopment process with a developer. Ms. Beahm responded, the borough does not get involved with the developer obtaining properties. The developer is required to deal with the property owners directly and negotiate an agreement.

Ms. Beahm continued that redevelopment/rehabilitation encourage compliance with the Borough's ordinances. A rehabilitation plan allows the borough to dictate areas that we normally do not have control over, examples of which are, ownership versus rental of the property, additional parking requirements, proof of financial where with all to complete a project..

Jane DeNoble, 612 Third Avenue requested that "tax abatement" be defined. Ms. Beahm responded that tax abatement are typically offered in order for the new plan to get going before the traditional tax obligation kicks in. Tax abatements must be approved by the governing body and usually provide incentives to developers.

Thomas Coan, 612 Third Avenue, asked what properties have developers shown interest in. Mayor Engelstad responded the approved Giammano's project, Municipal Property and the row of apartments on Lake Terrace.

Anthony Pagano, owner of UVA's Main Street, questioned why the borough doesn't contact the owners of the sub-par properties on Main Street and make suggestions for improvements rather than getting outside developers involved.

Councilman Weber responded that we are not just talking about ascetics, there are other issues such as the parking problem. He recommended to incorporate into the Rehabilitation Plan a means of transporting people back and forth to the beach. Ms. Beahm agreed, she stated that we are not just talking ascetics, the parking issue may be identified in the rehabilitation plan.

Mike Henderson, 515 Main Street, questioned where the criteria for the rehabilitation designation was located. Ms. Beahm responded that the standards are listed in the Local Re-Development Law 40A:12A.

Michael Conoscenti, Cliff Avenue, questioned what ever became of a Re-Development meeting held five to ten years ago held in the Senior Building. Mayor Engelstad responded it didn't go anywhere, we were grouped together with Asbury Park and Neptune and the purpose was to show that New Jersey Transit was demonstrating that they were working with the communities. He continued, that most recently Neptune Township applied for Transit Village status and used Bradley's station to obtain the designation.

A resident on Main Street questioned if a rehabilitation plan fast tracks development and can a developer help our sub-standard sewer? Ms. Beahm responded, the process is not necessarily fast tracked because once a plan is in place a developer is still required to go before the Planning Board for approval. Our goal is to address the sub-standard sewer through the rehabilitation process.

Councilman Goldfrab questioned, if it would be beneficial for the current owners to be involved in the rehabilitation plan process. Ms. Beahm, responded, I do believe everyone benefits with local input, we live and work here developers will come in and eventually leave.

Thomas Coan, 612 Third Avenue, questioned if tax abatements were granted would they be subsidized by the tax payers in town. Ms. Beahm responded yes, that is why the decision lies with the Mayor and Council.

Jane DeNoble, 612 Third Avenue, questioned if the buildings on Main Street that look bad are being issued violations. Mayor Engelstad responded that today's meeting is to discuss redevelopment. Ms. Beahm responded that currently we are able to enforce violations of safety issues with properties but are limited with ascetics, however a rehabilitation plan may include guidelines/parameters of ascetics.

A resident commented on the redevelopment mistakes made by the surrounding towns. Mayor Engelstad responded that the borough will benefit by learning by other towns past mistakes.

Henry Macho, 209 Third Avenue, expressed concerns that a developer would not include independent businesses such as Vic's in their plan. He continued that the diversity draws people into town. Ms. Beahm commented that the public along with the governing body may be involved in the plan process, however, if the plan allows for retail shop we cannot dictate the type of retail shop.

Nicole Keinlen, business owner Main Street, questioned how we attract the type of business we want in town. Ms. Beahm responded that typically the town will have a business district to address attracting types of business. Mayor Engelstad commented on the importance of the Chamber of Commerce to support such an effort.

Mayor Engelstad wished to confirm, "If a property owner does not want to get involved with a developer they are not obligated to do so". Ms. Beahm responded CORRECT.

Nestor Winter, property/business owner Main Street, stated that he has been in business over 40 years in Bradley Beach and went to Bradley Beach Elementary School. In his opinion the largest problem facing Main Street is the lack of parking for the businesses. His recommendation was for the borough to purchase property for a parking lot which will allow for more parking for the restaurant and stores.

Mayor Engelstad agreed that parking on Main Street is a big issue and will be placed on the February meeting to discuss the options for additional parking.

Councilman Bonnell stated that he has ½ dozen ideas for creating additional parking. He continued that he did not believe the borough would benefit from additional condos on Main Street. In his opinion it would be helpful to the businesses on Main Street to have a small anchor store to draw more people to the area and keeping small businesses solvent.

Mayor Engelstad stated that condos allow for residents to down size and stay in Bradley Beach. Mr. Winters agreed that many people wish to downsize and want to stay in Bradly Beach.

Councilman Goldfarb commented that the plan may want to consider an area for Senior Housing.

A resident commented that he was in favor of Re-Development, he and his wife have lived in Bradley Beach since 1983 and would like to retire here.

Thomas Coan, 612 Third Avenue, stated that he had agreed with Mr. Winters comments, we need to assist the business with parking.

Mayor Engelstad questioned Ms. Beahm on the next step and Ms. Beahm responded that the Planning Board will review, prepare a study and forward recommendations to the governing body.

ON MOTION by Engelstad/Goldfarb to adjourn.

ADJOURN: 8:00 pm

KELLY BARRETT, RMC, CMR
Municipal Clerk