

UNLOCKING POTENTIAL IN PLACES YOU LOVE

Planning Report #3

DATE: April 18, 2024

TO: Zoning Board, Township of Cranford

FROM: Greer Patras, PP

Justin Cutroneo, AICP

APPLICANT: J. Tan & M. Tog, LLC

ATTORNEY: Gary Goodman, Esq.

SUBJECT: APPLICATION ZBA-23-017

545A & 547-549 LEXINGTON AVENUE

BLOCK 457, LOTS 8-9

D(1) USE VARIANCE - BIFURCATED APPLICATION

The purpose of this report is to provide the Zoning Board with guidance in its evaluation of Application ZBA-23-017, submitted by J. Tan & M. Tog, LLC ("the Applicant"), and to supplement our April 4, 2024 Planning Report #2. The Applicant proposes to clear the Site and construct an age-restricted townhouse development. The Applicant seeks to bifurcate the application and only requests d(1) use variance approval at this time.

On April 8, 2024, the Applicant participated in their first public hearing, where the Zoning Board expressed concern regarding missing and conflicting information. The Applicant intends to return to the Board for their second public hearing on May 20, 2024, and to facilitate the Board's review, we recommend the Applicant provide revised plans to address the following critical issues:

- 1. Affordable Housing: At the hearing, testimony was provided that this is "an affordable housing project" and done to "advance the township's affordable housing"; however, it doesn't meet the minimum affordable housing requirements required by the Township, and the design and treatment of the affordable housing units are subpar compared to the market rate units. The total number of market-rate units and affordable units fluctuated during the course of the hearing. The Applicant stated intent to revisit compliance and equity, especially as it relates to size, access, elevators, and parking. The plans should be provided to show this. See sections IV.A.3 and IV.C.3-4 from our Planning Report #2 for more comments.
- 2. Off-Site Driveway: At the hearing, the Board Professionals agreed that the driveway serving an offsite use should be subdivided from the proposed lot. Setbacks for the townhouses and calculations for density should not use this area to which they have no right or access to. If an off-site driveway is going to be included in this application, a use variance for this additional use may be required. See sections IV.A.1, IV.B.4, and IV.C.9 from our Planning Report #2 for more comments.
- 3. <u>Intensity + Bulk Variances:</u> Although no density requirement is applicable to this zone and application, the proposed use and density is much denser and more intense than what this

Page 1 of 2 e hello@topology.is w http://topology.is p 973 370 3000

- property and zone is programmed for. Additionally, several bulk variances would be required which should be considered and is a relevant part of site suitability. See sections IV.A.1-2 from our Planning Report #2 for more comments.
- 4. <u>Parking:</u> The parking allotment and location for affordable housing and guests doesn't seem to meet the minimum requirement from RSIS and is unclear on the plans. See section IV.C.3 from our Planning Report #2 for more comments.

Any revised plans should include bubbles for all changes and be supplemented with a response letter that outlines all changes made to the plans. If you have any further questions regarding this application, please feel free to contact our office.

Sincerely,

Greer Patras, AICP, PP

Board Planner