

Dear Mr. Jung Kim,

In your reviewing the proposal Lakewoods new Master Plan.I am opposed to the adoption of the plan because it will cause many problems that will impact on our way of living.It will cause overcrowding with the population explosion and overtax our water supply ,traffic congestion,township services ,schools,crime etc. please after your reviewing the Lakewood Master plan please deny it.thank you very much .

Mr.Gaetano Catuogno  
91 Foxwood Road  
Lakewood N.J.,08701

Dear Mr.Kim,

I have been a resident of Lakewood for almost four years. In this short time I have seen so many zoning laws violated, ridiculous variances granted, that it boggles the mind. Lakewood is gradually becoming a city or a replica of the Hasidic Community in Brooklyn. The high density town housing is being built without care or forethought for the lack of infrastructure to support them. Some of these communities are being built on Route 9 which is considered a major highway and is no place for townhouses where school buses will be required. It is my understanding that there are state laws which restrict this kind of housing on highly traveled roads and, if so, these laws should be adhered to.

Lakewood has many Active Adult Communities. The seniors that chose to buy houses and live in Lakewood did so because they were of the belief they were going to have a better quality of life then where they formally resided. It has come to our attention that if Lakewood goes the way of the proposed Master Plan we could just throw that belief out the window. Lakewood is slowly but surely, if left in the present governing hands, losing its open spaces, its' wet lands, and its' requested park areas.

Mr. Kim, it is **IMPERATIVE** that, in reviewing this proposed plan, you consider what is best for all residents of Lakewood.

Sincerely,  
Flo LoCastro

Mr. Kim,

We are definitely interested in having input into the revision of the Lakewood master plan making Lakewood a regional center. We are totally opposed to this. Lakewood development is seriously out of control. This situation is out of hand. We think the developers want to do this so our homes can be condemned by eminent domain which is a violation of our constitutional rights. Endangered species are being killed, the forest are being lost forever and our town is being controllled by the few to the detriment of the many.

Sincerely,

Karen and Al Kamm

Mr. Kim,

I am a resident of Lakewood and while driving around the township I see continuous and unrestricted building of multi-family dwellings. I think it is time to realize that Lakewood has reached the saturation point and that further growth will hurt us economically, environmentally, and socially.

Thank you for your time,

Raymond A. Mangin  
16 Summerlawn Drive  
Lakewood, NJ 08701

Dear Mr. Kim,

My name is Christine Abrams. I am a Lakewood resident of 19 years.

About a month ago I became aware of a proposal to designate the town of Lakewood as a Regional Center. I had no idea what that meant at the time. Although I still have trouble understanding all the implications of a Regional Center designation, I have become increasingly upset over what I do understand.

It has been proposed to classify the entire town of Lakewood a PA1 zone. This is greatly disturbing. There are portions of town (I just noticed how often I refer to Lakewood as a town...it is how many residents view Lakewood, and would like to continue to view it, not as a city) that just cannot justify this designation.

I have been trying to research the entire process and read all the supporting documentation. I have been attending all the Planning Board meetings regarding the Master Plan Reexamination. There are many items that concern me.

### **1. The Master Plan Reexamination**

Mr. Stan Slachetka, the planner from T&M Associates, made a comment at the November 9, 2006 Township Committee Meeting and is recorded in the minutes as saying: "Mr. Slachetka added that the Plan Endorsement process does not affect the township's ongoing planning efforts including updating of the Master Plan." My question is this: if the Plan Endorsement was started before the Master Plan Reexamination, and the Master Plan Reexamination is a result of the requirements by OSG, then how can it be said that the Master Plan is not affected by the process?

It is highly suspicious that many changes to the Master Plan, particularly zoning, are the results of the desires of builders and others that would benefit from such changes and a Regional Center designation. These people were stacked on the advisory committee unfairly against the common resident, who really has no idea what is going on, or how the township is changing right under their noses. There are even some members of the advisory committee not part of that group, who felt left out of the loop. I'm sure these comments can be heard in the transcripts of the Planning Board minutes.

Since there is an indication of impropriety of the advisory committee, the entire Master Plan is suspect. For instance, I had a personal conversation with Mike Sernotti, a member of the advisory committee, at the last Planning Board meeting on Nov. 28, 2006. I asked him when did the rezoning proposals change from 19 to 35 areas...what precipitated that 16 area increase that other advisory members didn't understand either? He told me that the 16 areas were nothing more than "housekeeping." In other words, they were areas that were already built upon (to the max) and the zone needed to be changed to reflect what was already there. In my mind this doesn't make sense. Don't you do housekeeping first? This indicates to me that the first 19 zones were proposals for change that would benefit those who were privy to the changes. This clearly comes into light when you view the proposed change from an R20 zone to an R15 zone of the Kettle Creek headwaters area. This area needs preserving, not rezoning. More is said about this further down.

It is my recommendation that an investigation into the advisory committee be conducted. Minutes should be produced to show discussions that took place, decisions that were made, and votes that were conducted. Correspondence between all parties should be produced. How can we understand the intentions or trust the integrity of the committee when it was so secretive? This information should be part of the same records which are able to be viewed at the Township Clerk's Office. It should be investigated whether or not there were conflicts of interest with the advisory committee members.

## **2. Environment and Open Space**

I would specifically like to address the NRI and the Kettle Creek area, because that is next to where I live.

Kettle Creek is listed as a C2 waterway by the DEP. On every DEP map I viewed that included Kettle Creek, information about this creek comes up as having some kind of important classification. This includes Fig. 7 *Farmland Soils* Prime Farmland (DoeA, DoeB, HboA, KemA, SacB) and "unique importance (AtsA, BerAr, MakAt)" ; Fig. 10 *Groundwater Recharge Areas* Purple – The highest classification, at 16-23" per year ; Fig. 13 *FEMA Flood Hazard Areas* 100 year flood hazard; page 36 lists Kettle Creek at New Hampshire Ave. having Benthic Macroinvertebrates, making it an impaired waterbody in Lakewood; Fig. 14 *Freshwater Wetlands*.

Besides the Kettle Creek area being classified as Coniferous Wooded Wetlands, Mixed Forested Wetlands (Coniferous Dom), and Deciduous Wooded Wetlands, and Mixed Forested Wetland (Deciduous Dom), **I would like to include** Atlantic White Cedar Wetlands.

I conducted a study on Nov. 25, 2006 (and again on Dec. 1, 2006) and found portions of this area to have large quantities of Atlantic White Cedar. Photographs follow along with more information about this tree in a speech I gave to the Planning Board on Nov. 28, 2006, which I also include. A walk through this area also reaffirmed that this would be a perfect area for passive recreation...bike and walking paths, which children can also use for roller blading. Bird watching would also be quite appropriate. This area could be developed similar to that of Ocean County Park, only without the sports fields, because the newly finished sports complex is only about 1 mile away.

This Kettle Creek area was slated for a rezone. The Master Plan Reexamination recommendation #29 under zoning called for this area to be rezoned from an R20 to an R15. Please tell me how a rezone for greater density coincides with the OSG requirement that the township “present a stronger strategy for the preservation of open space” (letter to township dated May 23, 2006 Re: Lakewood Twp. Petition for Initial Plan Endorsement – Consistency Report)? Also, in the same letter page 6 under Open Space and Recreation “The Township does not have an Open Space and Recreation Element that would set forth a comprehensive series of strategies to ensure both broad and neighborhood scale recreational opportunities for all residents.” This is especially true, since the newly built sports fields can only be used by permit. How does an area that screams for protection and open space/passive recreation consideration, get passed over completely?

I’m including my speech that I gave to the Planning Board on Tuesday, Nov. 28, 2006 which identifies how this area got passed over for open space or passive recreation, connecting the sports fields to current neighborhoods. Mr. Banas, the chairman, has not allowed us to name names, but I can tell you that Ralph Zucker of Sommerset Developers, owns a huge chunk of land in that area, and he was on the advisory committee. Also, Rockaway LLC owns land in that area. Rockaway LLC is listed on the Ocean County Tax Assessors office as having a mailing address of 1472 Cedar Row, Lakewood. This property is owned by Chaim (Charles) Silberberg, who was on the advisory committee. A large portion of this land is also owned by the township, but was not considered for open space or passive recreation.

My speech:

“Proposing changing area #29 from an R20 to an R15 may seem like a good idea, especially for those who have investment properties in the area. Large tracts of vacant land rezoned smaller to build upon are certainly more profitable. This tract of land however should not be considered for any further building.

In the background studies for the MPReEx the text instructs the reader to go to the NJDEP website to view the interactive map. Area #29 falls under the DEP's definition of forested wetlands. The DEP considers this area to be at least state threatened or possibly endangered. Regardless of how it's classified, it IS classified. The 1999 MP advisory committee even acknowledges the Environmental and Greenways Commissions' identification of Kettle Creek as a watershed for preservation. It's environmentally sensitive land. Back then, the advisory committee recommended these areas be identified for preservation, and included suggestions by the Greenways Commission. Back then, the advisory committee said the preservation of these lands would "have a positive impact on air and water quality and would contribute to the desirability of Lakewood." Nothing was ever done though, because it took 6 years to get the MP approved!

Today however, the advisory committee doesn't have the same vision it once had. It seems to have ignored everything it said about the Kettle Creek even though nothing has changed physically with the land. So what has changed? It was the make-up of the committee itself. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to view EVERY DEP map and AGREE this area SCREAMS for protection. So why is it suggested it be rezoned? What real estate investors own land in that area? What land has already been raped clear? Ah, but don't worry, CAFRA will take care of it! Well where was CAFRA when Chestnut Estates was built right on top of branches of the creek? The DEP map clearly shows the creek extending into that development.

In addition to the DEP findings, the only other official study I'm aware of was commissioned by the township committee in Dec. 2004. Blocks 1103 and 1104, and blocks 1110-1118 were delineated and found to contain wetlands. These blocks are included in the section labeled #29. They are located in the upper left portion of the zone that extends parallel to Salem St. The findings are identified on this large map I obtained from the township.

An unofficial study was conducted by me and my husband this past Saturday, Nov. 25, 2006. We walked the southern arm of the creek and noted the numerous and magnificent trees in the area. Among these are a particular species called the Atlantic White Cedar. These trees, of which I've included photos and more detailed info on my presentation board, are known to have their hollows under the roots used as winter dens for the Pine Barrens (Timber) Rattlesnake (**John E. Kuser** *Associate Professor, Department of Natural Resources, Cook College, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903* **Tree Planters Notes**, Volume 46, Number 3, Summer 1995. pages 78-85), which is listed as an endangered species in NJ (<http://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/ensp/pdf/end-thrtened/tmbrattler.pdf>). These trees also provide the specialized acidic habitat necessary for the threatened Pine Barrens Tree Frog (<http://www.state.nj.us/dep/fgw/ensp/pdf/end-thrtened/pbtreefrog.pdf>). The tree frog also makes its habitat in lowlands that are carpeted with dense mats of sphagnum moss, of which you can also see photos on my board. Photos of the northern arm, including the delineated portion, are also indicated on my board.

Other than a handful of LARGE LOT single family homes, the rest of the area is undeveloped and owned by the township, a few individuals, and real estate investors. I don't know what was presented for Somerset's new development except I suspect it has something to do with rezoning to R15, hence the suggestion to do so because of "approved development pattern in the area." Other than possibly what Somerset wants to do, there are no R15 lots in the area.

I don't think much can be done with land that is not owned by the township, but what about the land that is? If the 1999 advisory committee's recommendations are upheld, this would be a perfect area for passive recreation...bike and walking paths, connecting the neighborhoods and the sports complex, or, if you notice my pictures, for the boys to build forts. Considering no such objectives were thought of under Community Facilities, and since this current committee didn't even consider Kettle Creek under Environment, you can be the heroes and do what is right for this parcel. Do not allow the zone to change! Once done, more variances will be sought. This board must show good faith to the residents that not all is for naught. You have the authority to recommend parts of this area to be used as open space. It's my hope that you will seriously consider this proposal, instead of the one before you."

Why did it take a resident to point out the obvious about this area? Would this area have been protected or considered had I not gotten up to speak?

You will find a recommendation in the Master Plan Reexamination to deny the rezone and that the Planning Board is requesting the Township Committee conduct a comprehensive study of this area and possibly purchasing land.

I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE IT CLEAR THAT HAD IT NOT BEEN FOR ME, THEY WOULD NOT HAVE CONSIDERED THIS AREA UNDER OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION.

Even in the May 23, 2006 letter the OSG points out on page 6 that the 1999 Master Plan "depicted areas in need of increased protection" and that "no information is provided to indicate the status of the implementation of any municipal actions to better protect the areas identified on this map." As of Nov. 28, 2006, at the Planning Board meeting where #29 under Zoning when the Master Plan was presented, this area was STILL NOT considered, despite the OSG reminding the township it was there. See the 1999 MP map entitled Parks and Recreation Map in which the Kettle Creek area was slated for Potential Greenway Linkage.

What other areas should be considered as connections between neighborhoods or commercial centers that I'm not aware of, but that certain residents may be aware of, because of the **bare minimum notification** to the residents of this town, no one knows what is going on.

This brings me to another point:

### **3. The Township was withholding information**

A. The township advertised by public notice (which the average person does not read, myself included) that all the documents regarding the IPE would be available downtown for public viewing in the clerk's office. Does this mean that all correspondence between the state and the township would be included? If it is supposed to be there, it wasn't. These letters are very important. It shows the resident who is trying to understand this process, the requirements the OSG is imposing on the township, and whether the township is complying with requirements. As a resident, I am greatly disturbed that the township hasn't been able to get its act together regarding this. In a way, we are very fortunate that the actions of the township have caused delay,

because it gave us the opportunity to understand what is going on and contact our neighbors to see what they think.

They do not like this one bit.

Were it not for the OSG website, we would not have seen correspondence back and forth. Comments to the township by the OSG help us explain to you what you in Trenton may not know about Lakewood and/or its residents. The OSG letters to the township demonstrate to us you have more concern for the residents than the township itself does.

In addition, the township waited 2 weeks to put the information up on its website after being asked by Committeeman Cunliffe on Nov. 9<sup>th</sup>. It was on the website only until Nov. 29<sup>th</sup>, when it was taken off and replaced with information about Santa Claus coming to town. After an email I sent to Comm. Cunliffe, the information reappeared on the website, along with the notification that a public meeting would be held on Nov. 16<sup>th</sup>.

**B. The Township Lied to You.** On Nov. 22, 2006, Mr. Slachetka of T&M Associates sent a letter to Ms. Swan Re: Township of Lakewood, Ocean County Plan Endorsement Action Plan Status Report. On page 2 it is stated that a public hearing was conducted on Nov. 16, 2006. **This never occurred.**

About 100 people stood in the upstairs hallway of the municipal building that night waiting to go into the small conference room to speak out against the proposed Plan Endorsement. Mayor Litchenstein spoke to us in the hallway and told us the presentation for the Plan Endorsement was cancelled, there would be no presentation. He said they received a fax the day before granting Lakewood an extension. He stated that there would be no meeting that night on the PE, and that if we were there to speak about it that we should instead go home. He said that perhaps in the future a meeting could be arranged in one of the clubhouses in one of the senior villages. Most of us stayed anyway to make a point, and the meeting was moved downstairs where the room eventually filled to about 150 people. Again, on the record, Litchenstein reiterated the fact that the township was given an extension.

HOWEVER, after obtaining a copy of the fax that was sent to the township on Nov. 15, 2006 and is dated Nov. 8, 2006, there is no indication that a new extension was granted to Lakewood on Nov. 15<sup>th</sup>. That extension does not come until Nov. 22<sup>nd</sup>, thus we do not understand the reason given to us that night of the 16, at the presentation that didn't happen.

I hate to even call it a lie, but that is what it is.

There has not been a new meeting date set yet either.

As a result of fearing we won't be heard, some of our residents contacted you Mr. Kim. We hope that Ms. Swan would join you as well.

**Conclusion**

I have much more I could go over in this letter, but the above items are the things I am most familiar with. As I said, I am still struggling to understand all of this. When talking to my neighbors we all fear the city that Lakewood will become. We fear the loss of our woods, which provide us such joy and improved air quality. We fear the change of historic downtown. We fear the loss of the quality of our water because impervious coverage will not allow enough ground surface recharge. We fear what additional children will do to a school system that is already overburdened and in trouble. We fear not being able to get to the hospital in time because of traffic.

Most of us did not move here because we wanted to live in a city again. We moved here for the TOWN Lakewood once was. We don't mind getting in our cars to go get milk, because we understand that it's a trade off for having large pieces of property. We walk for the enjoyment of it. Walking to go get milk is work, and that's not the kind of walking we want to do, especially on these harrowing roadways.

Please help us keep Lakewood as it currently is.

Respectfully,  
Christine Abrams

Dear Mr. Kim & Ms. Swan,

I am a resident of Lakewood Township and I am OPPOSED to Lakewood changing its regional center designation to a PA1. Presently it is hard enough to travel on Route 9 at all lately. In addition to all the routine every day traffic, Route 9 & Clifton Ave have school bus stops which actually blocks one lane of traffic, while the children get off the buses. While I understand the stopping of buses, the more people in Lakewood would result in more schools and much longer delays while driving on such a major road. Kimball Medical Center resides on Route 9 and also gets a lot of traffic. Bringing in more traffic in the area would make it impossible to get to the hospital, including the ambulances that need to get there. When there is gridlock, there is absolutely no where to even drive around somebody, in an emergency situation. Lakewood has a lot senior villages and I think it is a great concern that ambulances would not be able to drive on a road that has gridlock every day. I am also concerned about the lack of well-head protection programs in our community, as this is our drinking water. More buildings mean more contamination of our drinking waters. Lakewood cannot support such building in our area as we have environmentally sensitive lands such as the Kettle Creek area and it simply cannot support the density of a regional center. We also don't have tree save ordinances in our township and trees are vital to keeping our air clean and filtering out such harmful elements like ozone. The proposed impervious coverage change to 80% is a grievous action upon our land, and does nothing to recharge the aquifer. I personally am not concerned about being able to walk to a store in my area. I don't mind driving there, I moved to my specific area because there are large lots and



many trees. I would hate to see the historic town of Lakewood become a full fledged city.

I believe there are other things to do now that will help alleviate a lot of problems around town that aren't being looked into. Perhaps a jitney bus service which could reduce the amount of individual vehicles downtown would help. In addition, maybe implement a tree save ordinance to preserve nature and the wildlife that lives around them (we tend to forget about the wildlife that surrounds the nature areas). Maybe a moratorium on building until roadway infrastructure can catch up and environmental concerns are addressed. There are many different ideas that can be looked into before changing the regional center status. I hope these options are taken very seriously.

I thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jody Bottone

Good Evening Mr. Kim

I would like to introduce myself to you: My name is Mrs. Noreen Gill a resident of Lakewood for over 34 years. I am writing to you with regard to the proposed Master Plan that is under review by the Lakewood Township Planning Board.

There is a great depth of opposition to the concept of Lakewood becoming a Regional Center. I have attended all of these meetings.

Due to an occupancy limit, there would be at least 800 more if they all could fit in.

We have serious questions with regard to our infrastructure that is and has been in jeopardy for some years, due to the previous building of Townhouses and larger homes, some right now (presently) would like to have 8 bedrooms.

The Builders, are going for high density, they are taking away our pristine woods and there is no protection from contamination to the wellheads. I believe the MUA is supposed to inspect the wellheads, well one might say, WHO ARE THE PEOPLE on the Board of the MUA?

I honestly feel the water supply can be in jeopardy, due to many factors, the census based on the 1999 Master plan has been talked about, well since the 1999 Master Plan and now the re examination of this master plan one must look back to go forward.

In 1999 when the Master Plan was in the stages of development, no one knew APPROXIMATELY how many undocumented people were living in Lakewood, none

the less did we know how many townhouses had basements in them with bdrms, and single homes were with basements with apartments in them,

NOW THEY ESTIMATE 8,000 UNDOCUMENTED MAY BE IN LAKEWOOD, AND now, THE Builders are putting our water supply in jeopardy based on an extreme demand. The woods have disappeared.

The Builders come in and want 8 bdrms homes. **AND WHAT ABOUT THE BASEMENT? WHEN WE ASK, WILL THIS ALSO BE AN APARTMENT, WELL THIS IS A POSSIBILITY,**

I question the water supply if adequate, the knowledge of how many are actually living in Lakewood has not been documented only according to the planner according to the census and believe me when they took the census, they missed plenty of people as they were undocumented and many homes were not allowed to have anyone into the basements to even fill out a form. Even for the inspection dept., locally.

WE HAVE MAJOR CONCERNS HERE IN LAKEWOOD, Many ARE ENVIRONMENTAL, MANY ARE A CONCERN FOR THE WATER THE TREES THE congestion, THIS TOWN CANNOT WITHSTAND an additional 125,000 people, even in the year 2010, WHY BECAUSE THE INFRASTRUCTURE HAS NOT EVER BEEN DEALT WITH, the density keeps going up. I am not against density, I AM AGAINST THE EXTREME DEMAND FOR HIGHER AND HIGHER DENSITY.

I hope you will be able to meet someday with people to know first hand what we are having put forth on this Master Plan, the Zoning Changes, are only beneficial to the Builders, planners, attorneys, etc., we are now loosing the right to try and keep our environment safe and the quality of life and other meaningful aspects that must be needed to live in a sound and environmentally safe community.

We honestly do not need any more parking in the downtown area, we cannot MOVE, we cannot get to our Hospital if an emergency should arrive, Route 9 is a major road to the hospital and Clifton Avenue is a direct link to another road to the Hospital, we do not need more congestion in this town, our side streets, our main roads.

Lakewood should be called the city of Lights without roads to nowhere. Their idea to a new development PUT UP ANOTHER TRAFFIC LIGHT.

PEOPLE ARE TOTALLY UPSET THAT THE TOWN IS IN THE SITUATION OF A RE EXAMINATION OF THE MASTER PLAN AND THE Infrastructure has not been death with for years, we cannot keep adding .

I will also make you aware I was on a Sub Committee to the advisory Board to the Master Plan.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Noreen Gill

Subject: *Request for meeting*

Date: *Tue, 28 Nov 2006 15:44:18 -0500*

>Mr. Jung Kim, PP, AICP, Area Planner, OSG

>My name is William Hobday and I am a resident of Lakewood, NJ. I want to

>let you know that thousands of Lakewood residents are opposed to the

>proposed Master Plan that is under review by the Lakewood Township Planning

>Board.

>

>I am not sure that you know the depth of the opposition to the concept of

>making Lakewood a Regional Center. At each reexamination meeting, we have

>had more than 200 residents in attendance to oppose the 35 proposed zoning

>changes. We are winning some and losing others.

>

>The issue is that the current residents are vulnerable to continued rapid

>growth, even though Lakewood Township does not have adequate infrastructure

>in place to adequately accommodate the need. There is no protection from

>contamination to the wellheads, our water supply is in jeopardy based on

>extreme demand, our pristine woods are evaporating and our roadways are

>clogged with traffic.

>

>Future residents will be crammed into multi-dwelling apartment and townhouse

>complexes where the density is extreme, the roadways are too narrow for

>emergency and public works vehicles to navigate without backing up,

>inadequate off street parking and where dwelling units are being designed

>for up to 8 bedrooms for very large and/or multiple families.

>

>The Southwest and Southeast sectors are mostly occupied by gated

>communities, where people bought their final home, after reviewing the

>existing zoning ordinances. We do not oppose extreme density in the

>downtown area, but as one moves out from the center of town to the outlying

>areas, there needs to be some protection from extreme density.

>

>I believe that a meeting is in order for you to meet with our group of

>residents that oppose this proposed Master Plan. Our numbers are too large

>for all of us to journey to Trenton, so I am inviting you to come to

>Lakewood for us to talk.

>

>Sincerely, Bill Hobday

tel 732-370-3532 cell 732-232-7812

All,

I have been asked to provide additional details and the identity of Mr. Jung Kim, PP, AICP, Area Planner, OSG. I apologize for not making a greater effort to tell you the role that Mr. Kim holds at the NJ State Department of Community Affairs, Office of Smart Growth (OSG). I understand that all of the initials after Mr. Kim's name could be confusing, but be assured that his credentials are solid and very meaningful.

Mr. Kim has a leading role in reviewing all of the relevant information regarding the proposed Lakewood Township Master Plan. After close review, and dealing with all of the data, Mr. Kim will be in a decision making role as to the validity of the proposed Master Plan. He will examine the proposal to determine if Lakewood Township has adequately protected the environment, followed the prescribed guidelines for smart growth and has accounted for the deficiencies in the proposal to date.

I have requested that Mr. Kim travel to Lakewood, in his official capacity, to meet with a large body of people, whose voice might otherwise not be heard. I have also discussed the matter with Mr. Joe Donald, DCA, who suggested that we all ask to be added to the "Interested Persons List" at OSG. This way, we will get a heads up on any and all interactions between the state and Lakewood Township. You can do so by emailing Mr. Jung Kim at [jkim@dca.state.nj.us](mailto:jkim@dca.state.nj.us) or by calling him at 1-609-633-6139.

Although I have not yet received a reply from Mr. Kim, I am sure that it will be forthcoming in the near term.

*Your influence counts! Use it.*

Sincerely, Bill Hobday

-----Original Message-----

**From:** William Hobday [<mailto:billhobday@optonline.net>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 28, 2006 3:44 PM

**To:** 'jkim@dca.state.nj.us'

**Cc:** Alison Lemke ([lemkea@comcast.net](mailto:lemkea@comcast.net)); Christine Abrams ([cabrams755@optonline.net](mailto:cabrams755@optonline.net)); Enrique Percal ([prc625@aol.com](mailto:prc625@aol.com)); Frank Stabile ([fstabile@erols.com](mailto:fstabile@erols.com)); Howard Suckno ([tellme2@msn.com](mailto:tellme2@msn.com)); Janet Scher ([smscher@pol.net](mailto:smscher@pol.net)); Janice Urbsaitis ([cadco@optonline.net](mailto:cadco@optonline.net)); John Langan ([langan1@aol.com](mailto:langan1@aol.com)); Judi-Jack Weber ([njweber1@hotmail.com](mailto:njweber1@hotmail.com)); Larry Simons ([westclark1@aol.com](mailto:westclark1@aol.com)); Mary Margaret Davis ([fairlake810@optonline.net](mailto:fairlake810@optonline.net)); Pat Gatton ([gatton@optonline.net](mailto:gatton@optonline.net)); Pat Hooks ([hooksy8@verizon.net](mailto:hooksy8@verizon.net)); Gerri Ballwanz ([ballwanz@optonline.net](mailto:ballwanz@optonline.net)); Noreen Gill; Don Albonese ([syl2don@optonline.net](mailto:syl2don@optonline.net)); Larry Lazzaro ([lazz1@optonline.net](mailto:lazz1@optonline.net)); Carl Fink ([carlcaf@aol.com](mailto:carlcaf@aol.com)); Emelia Squeo ([esqueo725@optonline.net](mailto:esqueo725@optonline.net)); Gerald Tchir ([gtchir@aol.com](mailto:gtchir@aol.com))

**Subject:** Request for meeting

Mr. Jung Kim, PP, AICP, Area Planner, OSG

My name is William Hobday and I am a resident of Lakewood, NJ. I want to let you know that thousands of Lakewood residents are opposed to the proposed Master Plan that is under review by the Lakewood Township Planning Board.

I am not sure that you know the depth of the opposition to the concept of making Lakewood a Regional Center. At each reexamination meeting, we have had more than 200 residents in attendance to oppose the 35 proposed zoning changes. We are winning some and losing others.

The issue is that the current residents are vulnerable to continued rapid growth, even though Lakewood Township does not have adequate infrastructure in place to adequately accommodate the need. There is no protection from contamination to the wellheads, our water supply is in jeopardy based on extreme demand, our pristine woods are evaporating and our roadways are clogged with traffic.

Future residents will be crammed into multi-dwelling apartment and townhouse complexes where the density is extreme, the roadways are too narrow for emergency and public works vehicles to navigate without backing up, inadequate off street parking and where dwelling units are being designed for up to 8 bedrooms for very large and/or multiple families.

The Southwest and Southeast sectors are mostly occupied by gated communities, where people bought their final home, after reviewing the existing zoning ordinances. We do not oppose extreme density in the downtown area, but as one moves out from the center of town to the outlying areas, there needs to be some protection from extreme density.

I believe that a meeting is in order for you to meet with our group of residents that oppose this proposed Master Plan. Our numbers are too large for all of us to journey to Trenton, so I am inviting you to come to Lakewood for us to talk.

Sincerely, Bill Hobday

tel 732-370-3532 cell 732-232-7812

Eileen Swan / Jung Kim

My husband and I are opposed to Lakewood changing it's regional center designation to a PA1.

Our biggest concern is the volume of motor traffic particularly out of state vehicles which have

become regular fixtures in our small neighborhood. Our neighborhood is small

and wooded with no curbs

or sidewalks, which we happen to enjoy. The problem is that an extremely large percentage of

comuters use the small streets to avoid the traffic congestion on a 2 lane county road. With this

increased volume of traffic I have noticed lack of drive concern for the residents, the children

waiting for bus's and to property in our neighborhood. I can only imagine that this will get worse if

the infrastructures that are not currently stable have to handle the burden of uncontrolled urban

growth.

" It is a very sad state of affairs that while one is grocery shopping that they have to consider if it is

appropriate to purchase things like ice cream, because due to traffic it might melt in the car"

We are also concerned with public safety in a situation of uncontrolled growth. Where are the

resources to support this growth? Water, Enegry Sources, Police, Fire & First Aide, Hospitals and

Schools are these topics after thoughts.

We live in the Kettle Creek area and over the last 5 years we have watched the surrounding

wooded areas become deforested and virtually raped. The quantities of animal road kill has

increased which is a health hazzard along with being unpleasant.

People move to surburbs to have grass and trees and playgrounds, they loose intrest in the

concrete lifestyle, but without serious thought to the environment and

personal health and safety

The Garden State becomes a concrete jungle.

We don't want to see the historic TOWN of Lakewood become a city.

Thank You

Dawn & Julian Cottrell