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I. INTRODUCTION

Under the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89), Periodic Examination, “the Governing Body shall, at least every 10 years, provide for a general reexamination of its master plan and development regulations by the planning board, which shall prepare and adopt by resolution a report on the findings of such examination, a copy of which report and resolution shall be sent to the County Planning Board”1.

The reexamination report statute requires a multi-step process that must be adhered to in order for the municipal governing body and planning board to exercise these powers lawfully. The reexamination report shall state:

a. The major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last reexamination report.

b. The extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date.

c. The extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies, and objectives forming the basis for the master plan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density and distribution of population and land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of natural resources, energy conservation, collection, disposition, and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in State, county and municipal policies and objectives.

d. The specific changes recommended for the master plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared.

e. The recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment plans adopted pursuant to the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S. 40A:12A-1 et seq., into the land use plan element of the municipal master plan, and recommended changes, if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the municipality.2

The City of Elizabeth adopted a Master Plan in 1990. The 1990 Master Plan was reexamined three times between 1990 and June 2003. In October of 2005, the City of Elizabeth adopted a comprehensive Master Plan including a Housing Plan Element, Land Use Plan Element, Circulation Plan Element and Recycling Plan Element. The City of Elizabeth’s adopted another re-examination in October 2008 and most recently in July 2015. The most recently adopted Element of the Master Plan was the Land Use Element in January 2016.

The 2020 Master Plan Reexamination Report will review and evaluate the 2005 City of Elizabeth Master Plan, 2015 Master Plan Re-examination, and land use development regulations to provide

---

2 Ibid.
a basis for community development that addresses both the recommendations made in the most recent re-examination, as well as current and shifting conditions.

II. MAJOR PROBLEMS, GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PRIOR MASTER PLAN DOCUMENTS

The 2005 Elizabeth Master Plan identified the current major problems through adoption of new Housing Plan, Land Use Plan, Circulation Plan, and Recycling Plan Elements. Some of the key goals of the 2005 Master Plan Land Use Plan Element that pertain to residential issues include to: (2) “Stabilize and improve residential neighborhoods which are threatened by physical deterioration and economic decline”; (6) “rezone areas where density, incompatibility, and non-conforming land uses limit the potential for neighborhood cohesiveness, improvement, and stability”; and (7) “encourage property improvements and enforce building/zoning ordinances”.

The Housing Plan Element, in particular, identifies the major issues faced in the residential sector of Elizabeth. The plan notes that historically the City has largely been a commercial and industrial place of activity, but likewise has provided an affordable place for people to live. The overarching goal of the 2005 Master Plan was to “improve the condition and value of the housing stock of the City so that property values are increased, as well as opportunities for households at all income levels”. The Plan notes that detached and attached single family homes make up 22.5% of the housing stock, two-family comprise 25.2%, and multi-family homes represent 52.2%.

The plan highlights that from 2000-2004, the number of two-family dwellings has increased dramatically as a majority of the increase in housing stock since 2000. This can largely be explained by the Hope VI revitalization at the time of the 2005 Master Plan, which provided special design standards that were developed to encourage urban streetscapes at densities where it was assumed that few or no cars would be required by residents. This ultimately gave way to many of the 2-family structures built, which have been acknowledged for their role in revitalizing portions of the City. It should be noted that parking issues and scarcity were not alleviated at the time of the 2005 Master Plan, and remained a significant concern due to housing density.

The 2016 Land Use Element notes that it was “written to build off of these earlier planning documents, address the present day land use and development issues in the City, and establish a well-designed land use plan for at least the next ten years”. The key goal identified by this Plan was “to increase the open space and space between structures through the amendment of side, front, and rear yard setbacks, and the amount of impervious coverage throughout the city in the long-term”. Additionally, other significant goals include the following:

1. Protect the single family and two family residential zone districts from further encroachment of new mid and high density residential apartment developments;
2. Increase the number of off street parking requirements for all residential projects; The lack of on street parking spaces caused in part by a wave of new residential apartment buildings has resulted in a real negative impact on the quality of life of city’s residents;
3. Need for more supermarkets and pharmacy’s and grocery stores to provide everyday goods and services for the city’s residents;
7. Down zone residential density except within designated redevelopment areas. Aim to become more like a Hoboken or Jersey City, but only in
designated redevelopment areas that can adequately manage the density – Baker Center and Midtown are two examples of where this type of growth can take place.

8. Update the Elizabethport Redevelopment Plan to meet today’s design standards;

11. Continue the modernization of the older warehouse buildings with new state of the art industrial facilities.

The Land Use Element likewise provided a number of goals and objectives organized into specific categories, such as “Residential”, “Industrial”, “School and Community Facility”, “Redevelopment”, “Recreation”, and others. The most important portion of this Plan focused on recommendations to amend the Zoning Ordinance in the City of Elizabeth to restrict or permit additional uses within particular zones and to modify the number of zone districts in the City.

III. EXTENT TO WHICH PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES HAVE BEEN REDUCED OR INCREASED

Zoning ordinances related to the recommended zone changes enumerated in the 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report and 2016 Land Use Element of the Master Plan were adopted by Ordinance No. 4695 on adopted April 12, 2016. This Ordinance made the following changes to Chapter 17.36.010 of the Code of the City of Elizabeth, under the section “Establishment of Zones”:


2. Adopt an amended Zone Map dated March, 2016 as updated to be consistent with the recommendations of the Land Use Plan Element, dated January 08, 2016.

3. Amend Section 17.36.010 of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to remove and delete any reference to the R-2C Zone District;

4. Amend Section 17.36.010 of the Land Development Code- Establishment of Zones - to remove and delete any reference to the C-3A Zone District;

5. Amend Section 17.36.010 of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to remove and delete any reference to the M-3 Zone District;

6. Amend Section 17.36.010 and Section 17.36.160, Schedule IF of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to rename the Professional Office (PO) Zone District to the Office Commercial -1 (OC-1) Zone District;

7. Amend Section 17.36.010 of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to add the Office Commercial -2 (OC-2) Zone District with the following permitted land uses and schedule of bulk requirements;

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Office - Commercial- 2 (OC-2) Zone District is to encourage the mix of office and commercial uses with low intensity residential development within areas depicted on the Zoning Map, last amended March 15, 2016.
8. Amend Section 17.36.010 and amend Schedule C of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to amend and rename the Open Space (OS) zone to the Open Space (O) Zone District and amend the permitted land uses and schedule of bulk requirements as follows:

A. Purpose. As recommended in the Land Use Plan Element of the Master Plan adopted by the Planning Board, the Open Space (OS) Zone District is being split into two separate zone districts. The Open Space (O) Zone District is designed to contain publicly owned open space and separate the publicly owned buildings, land and other institutions into a separate zone district to be known as the Public Space (P) Zone District as depicted on the Zoning Map, last amended March, 2016.

9. Amend Section 17.36.010 of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to amend and rename the Public Space (PS) zone district to the Public (P) Zone District and amend the permitted land uses and schedule of bulk requirements as follows:

A. Purpose. As recommended in the Land Use Plan Element of the Master Plan adopted by the Planning Board, the Open Space (OS) Zone District is being split into two separate zone districts. The Public (P) Zone District is designed to contain publicly owned buildings, land and other institutions and separate the publicly owned lands into a separate zone district to be known as the Open Space (O) Zone District as depicted on the Zoning Map, last amended March, 2016.

10. Amend Section 17.36.010 of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to add the Highway Commercial (HC) Zone District with the following permitted land uses and schedule of bulk requirements;

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Highway Commercial (HC) Zone District is to promote services, retail uses and commercial activity along a major transportation corridor and to limit auto related uses and one and two family homes and apartment uses on the first floor in areas as depicted on the Zoning Map, last amended March, 2016;

11. Amend Section 17.36.010 of the Land Development Code - Establishment of Zones - to add the Transportation (T) Zone District with the following permitted land uses and schedule of bulk requirements;

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Transportation (T) Zone District is to contain all of the publicly owned tracts of land in the City of Elizabeth which are utilized for public transportation. The Transportation Zone District is being created to establish a separate zone for all of the publicly owned street rights-of-way and transportation rights-of-way as depicted on the Zoning Map, last amended March, 2016.”

The prior 2015 Master Plan Reexamination report largely made recommendations in relation to the impact of zoning within the City. The 2015 Reexamination noted that “Since the 2007 Elizabeth
Master Plan, higher density, multi-family residential developments have been encroaching into the areas that are being proposed here for re-zoning...Increasing the housing density through more units in structure has the potential to change the fabric and character of the City of Elizabeth. New, denser housing that is aimed to replace one- to two-family structures in the City will likely only exacerbate the parking issues identified in the 2005 Master Plan, as well as disturb the density and character of residential zones that allows for a diverse housing stock”.

It likewise highlighted that an objective of “this reexamination report shifts to the promotion of a more general goal to protect specific zones from the encroachment of high-density residential development. The objective is to make the zoning more restrictive to lower density development as a way to preserve the existing one- to two-family dwellings that characterize many of the zones, while preventing larger, high-density buildings from slowly assuming the majority of the housing stock”.

Redevelopment was noted as a means to allow higher densities in specific areas that would not drastically alter the character or certain neighborhoods, as well as locate near public transportation, require specific design standards to reduce impact, and manage parking standards. As a result of the recommended changes to the Zoning Code, many property owners seeking higher density residential uses than permitted by the zoning approached the City with requests to determine if their property could be investigated as an area in need of redevelopment, pursuant to the criteria as listed in the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law ("LRHL"), N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-3. Since 2015, Redevelopment Plans to permit higher residential densities in designated areas that could support such uses were adopted for 5 Redevelopment Areas, including: a) East Broad Street Redevelopment Area; b) 56-78 Murray Street Redevelopment Area; c) Former Elizabeth General Hospital Site (901-931 East Jersey Street) Redevelopment Area; d) Hersh Tower (125 North Broad Street) Redevelopment Area; and e) Bank Street and New Point Road Redevelopment Area.

Additionally, Ordinance No. 4920 was adopted on October 12, 2017. This Ordinance made the following changes to Land Development Code, Chapter 17.36.098, Sections 17.36.100(A),(C),(D), 17.36.099, 17.36.110(A),(D), . and 17.36.120(A)(l):

“Section 17.36.098 “Pedestrian/loading elevators” was created as follows:

A. All residential buildings with ten (10) or more units and are three (3) or more stories in height located within the City of Elizabeth must construct an elevator large enough to house pedestrians and their furniture. This elevator must be electric or hydraulic and meet all applicable building codes.

Section 17.36.100(A) “Lot Dimensions” was repealed and replaced with the following:

A. The following parcel and yard dimensions shall apply to all residential projects except one and two family homes in all permitted zones within the City of Elizabeth.

1) Lot width prevailing, but at no time less than 60 ft.
2) Lot frontage prevailing, but at no time less than 60 ft.
3) Lot depth prevailing, but at no time less than 100 ft.
4) Front Yard Setback Prevailing. If no prevailing exists within the block, then the front yard setback shall be thirty (35') feet.
5) Side Yard Setback. Minimum of 33% of building height, but at no time less than ten (10'). All structures which abut each other must be at least 15' apart, including off-site structures.
6) Rear yard Setback. Thirty-five (35) percent of the lot depth but not less than thirty-five (35) feet. Measured from the rear lot line to the most outward tear building projection. Excluding projections permitted under paragraph B.

7) Requirements specific to corner lots (corner lots shall be considered to have two (2) front yards, one rear yard and one side yard):
   a. Front Yard Setback. Prevailing on both lot frontages.
   b. Interior Side Yard same as 17.36.110 C(2)
   c. Rear Yard Setback same as 17.36.110 C(3)

Section 17.36.100(C) “Lot Dimensions” was repealed and replaced with the following:

C. Lot width and frontage for one- and two-family residential lots in all permitted zones within the City shall be based on the following table:
   (use existing table already in ordinance)

Section 17.36.100(D) “Lot Dimensions” was repealed and replaced with the following:

D. The following requirements for lot dimensions shall apply to all non-residential properties in zones in which the use is permitted within the City.

1) Lot Area. Minimum five thousand (5,000) square feet.
2) Lot Width. Minimum fifty (50) feet.
3) Lot Depth. Minimum one hundred (100) feet.

Section 17.36.099 “Calculation of Prevailing Conditions” was created as follows:

A. To establish prevailing lot widths, frontages, front yard setbacks and rear yard setbacks, the applicant must perform the following.

1. Utilize all existing lots, including the property in question, as per the city tax maps. Proposed lots to be created by the application are not to be included.
2. Include only lots located within the same zone, within the same (entire) block and on both sides of the street as the subject parcel.
3. The prevailing percentile shall be 65%. This is to say that the prevailing lot dimension shall be the lot which constitutes 65% of the neighborhood. Example, if there are 25 lots that meet the criteria of items 17.36.099(a) and 17.36.099(b) and you create a table listing the lots minimum to maximum dimensions, the 16th lot going from low to high is the prevailing lot dimension to utilize.

Section 17.36.110(A)(5) “Yard Dimensions” was repealed and replaced with the following:

5. The following requirements of yard dimensions shall apply to all non-residential properties in all zones within the City, except if that particular zone has its own separate standards.

Section 17.36.110(A) “Yard Dimensions” was repealed and replaced with the following:
A. The following requirements for yard dimensions shall apply to all one and two family residential dwellings in all zones permitted within the City.

Sections 17.36.110(D)(2), -(D)(3), and -(D)(4) “Yard Dimensions” was repealed and replaced with the following:

D. Open space shall be provided as follows:

2. Open space for all residential units except one- and two-family dwellings shall be two hundred (200) square feet per unit. The open space shall have a cap of four thousand (4,000) square feet for buildings over four (4) stories.

3. Open space shall be limited to the following:

   a. Exterior yards, courts, and recreational areas, not devoted to auto usage, with a minimum dimension of twenty (20) feet in width and minimum area of 500 square feet.
   b. “This section is the remain the same”
   c. “This subsection is to be eliminated”

4. A minimum of seventy-five (75) percent of the total required open space is required to be exterior lawn and/or courtyard areas suitable for recreational use.

Sections 17.36.120(A)(1) was repealed and replaced with the following:

A. Height limitations shall be maintained as follows at any time a building or other structure is constructed or altered. A basement which rises not more than four feet above grade shall not count as a story. No occupancy of a basement or half a story shall be permitted in the City for residential purposes in any zone.

1. In the R-1 residential district, buildings shall be limited to three stories. No occupancy for any purposes (office, storage, residential uses, etc.) shall be permitted above the third story. Building height shall be prevailing or if a prevailing does not exist thirty-eight (38) feet. Building height shall be measured by using the average of the existing grades where the future building will be placed (all four corners and 10’ within that area) and the “rooftop” of the structure (peak).”
IV. EXTENT TO WHICH THERE HAVE BEEN SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN ASSUMPTIONS, POLICIES, AND OBJECTIVES

The Planning Board of the City of Elizabeth held a series of Committee Meetings on Thursday, October 3, 2019; November 7, 2019 and December 5, 2019 to discuss drafting revisions to the current Master Plan of the City. Each meeting was organized by specific Ward, in order to better establish the issues and understand the recommendations of smaller communities within Elizabeth as a whole. The meeting held on October 3, 2019 focused on Wards 1 and 2; the meeting held on November 7, 2019 focused on Wards 3 and 4; and the meeting held on December 5, 2019 focused on Wards 5 and 6. All meetings began at 6:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers prior to the start of the regular monthly meetings of the Board. These Committee Meetings were open to the general public to attend, and any person who was interested had the opportunity to address the Committee and its professionals at these Meetings and to ask any questions concerning the update of the Master Plan or any other relevant issue regarding the potential rezoning of any properties in the City. Other meetings were held or correspondences received in order to accommodate additional feedback from each Ward. Based on these meetings, the following feedback was received and has been consolidated below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE V-1. City of Elizabeth 2020 Master Plan Re-examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement and Public Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date: September 27, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location: Ward #6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Frank Mazza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Director of Community Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Pre-existing conditions allowed to rebuild after structure is damaged.
2. 33' wide minimum lot requirement to be imposed.
3. Emphasis on Parking - no reliance on RSIS, utilize standard of 2 spaces per unit
4. Elevator regulations for residential uses.
5. More open space for residential uses required over 5 units.
6. Print Color maps

### Other Notes from this Ward

1. Change use at police station from C-4 to P
2. C-4 along Elizabeth Ave to C-5
3. C-4 along Broadway to R-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: October 3, 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location: Ward #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name: Nelson Gonzalez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Planning Board Meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommendations

1. Floor area ratios for R-1, R-2 zones. 100% for R-2 and R-3
2. Emphasis on parking
   a. 2 family homes must have side by side 2 car garage
   b. If no garage or if lot is 30' wide, front yard parking can be permitted with the following
**Other Notes from this Ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: October 1, 2019</th>
<th>Name: Nelson Gonzalez (ward #2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Email Correspondence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Challenges with infrastructure, parking, sewer, water, roads from development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developers renovate 1 family homes into 2 family and sell property.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Illegal turning of 2-family into 1-family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lot sizes should be increased and variances approved discretionally.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 1-family homes should require 2 parking spaces provided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Formula for off-street parking should change.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Traffic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Planning Board Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: October 3, 2019</th>
<th>Location: Ward #1</th>
<th>Name: Carlos Torres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Minimum square footage requirement on more buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Waterfront zone along front street to be updated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Hope VI designation to be removed or replaced.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. For buildings that have burned down/destroyed by natural causes, allow to rebuild under pre-existing conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Notes From this Ward**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: November 7, 2019</th>
<th>Location Ward #3</th>
<th>Name: Kevin Kiniery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Currently, non-conforming structures damage by fire cannot be rebuilt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. R-3 to R-3A along West Grand street between Cherry and Chilton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Public Planning Board Meeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date: December 5, 2019</th>
<th>Location: Ward #5</th>
<th>Name: Bill Gallman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 95% prevailing lots.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No variances.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Magnolia Beef zone should be investigated for a change to R-4 zoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Around along Catherine Street, junk yard commercial use/housing should be investigated for re-zoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Area around Broadway &amp; 6th street shipping cars, and 6th to 7th street should be investigated for re-zoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fairmount to Ninth Ave, commercial retail should be investigated for re-zoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Area around New Point Road to 7th should be investigated for a change to R-2 zoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Height of stairs in a single direction in the front yard should be limited.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Other Notes from this Ward</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 25' lots to be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. MRC zone to be modified.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C-2 zone along 7th street should be investigated to be re-zoned to R-2 zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Magnolia Avenue area should be investigated to be re-zoned to R-2 zone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Area around Catherine to Jackson should be investigated for re-zoning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional feedback was received, and the comments are organized below:

Recommendations for the MRC Zone were made by Elberon Development Corporation in a letter dated December 4, 2019 and additional comments were provided below.

1. Outdoor storage permitted in a limited fashion.
2. Parking ratio requirements recommended to be modified to 1 space per every 3,000 to 4,000 square feet of gross building square footage.
3. Higher building height recommended to be permitted.
4. Signage too small, 14' off ground.
5. Airport zone.
6. MRC should be split into two sections, MRC-1 Zone and MRC-2 Zone.
7. 50-55' height building height permitted by ordinance.
8. Higher for roof top appurtenances allowed by ordinance.
9. Shallower building width requirement so a cross dock is avoided.

Based upon the feedback received, the following Section includes recommendations that have been formulated in order to address specific concerns in the City.
V.  SPECIFIC CHANGES RECOMMENDED

This Reexamination Report represents the City’s continuing effort to ensure that its planning policies and land use goals and objectives remain current and represent the issues affecting the City of Elizabeth. The City continues to recognize that the developed character of the community requires a planning response that focuses on supporting the established and historic character of the community, and identifying those areas warranting an upgraded planning and zoning approach to development.

a.  Recommended Changes to the Zoning Districts

i.  MRC-1 and MRC-2 Zone changes – creation of new districts

There are various areas within the city currently zoned as Manufacturing, Research, Commercial (MRC), which have distinctly different contexts. It is recommended that in order to expand the uses of the existing MRC zone, and to respect the distinct contexts of this zone within the city, that two (2) new zoning districts are created to distinguish between the two – the MRC-1 and the MRC-2. The MRC-1 zone would encompass all existing parcels zone MRC, with the exception of the following parcels: Block 2, Lots 74, 280, 281, 282, 855, 856, 857, 858, 859, 865, 864, 862, 867, and 868; and Block 11, Lots 846, 847, 847.A, 848, 849. The MRC-2 zone would encompass those specific lots prescribed above.

Recommendation #1: It is recommended that the MRC zone be eliminated, in order to create the MRC-1 and MRC-2 zones. All existing permitted uses listed on Schedule IA, “Permitted Uses” are recommended for both zones.

Recommendation #2: Additionally, it is recommended that a “Y. Warehousing with wholesale and storage” use be added as a permitted use to the MRC-1 zone and listed on Schedule IA, “Permitted Uses”. Wholesale and storage use shall not include distribution center use, standalone outdoor storage or parking facilities, and cross-dock warehousing.

ii.  Bulk Standards for the New MRC-1 Zone

In addition to the recommendation to create the MRC-1 zone out of the standards of the existing MRC zone district, it is recommended that the City study the existing bulk standards of the MRC zone to determine if any changes are necessary, and at a minimum, that the following additional considerations be made to the bulk standards for the MRC-1 zone.

1. Outdoor storage

With the recommendation that warehousing with wholesale and storage use be added as a permitted use in the MRC-1 zone, it is likewise
importantly, it is important to explore minimal accessory outdoor storage in conjunction with such types of land use. Generally, outdoor storage is difficult to regulate and enforce. However, particular standards may help to protect wholesale and storage sites from being overrun by outdoor storage. It is recommended that outdoor storage be permitted as an accessory use, under the following standards: incidental storage of materials (i.e. trash and recyclables removal) and short-term storage of equipment related to the permitted use out of doors shall be shielded from any adjacent public streets or residential areas by fencing, landscaping, or other appropriate measures up to 10 feet in height and shall not be within the existing or required yard areas facing the street or streets. The outdoor storage of materials which are used as part of the everyday business operations or manufactured or processed as part of the business operation shall be prohibited. All other materials shall be stored within the building.

Recommendation #1: It is recommended that subsection “C” of Section 17.36.030, “Supplementary regulations.” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code” be amended to add the following provisions:

“4. Outdoor Storage for Wholesale and Storage Uses in the MRC-1 Zone.

a. Incidental storage of materials (i.e. trash and recyclables removal) and short-term storage of equipment related to the permitted use out of doors shall be shielded from any adjacent public streets or residential areas by fencing, landscaping, or other appropriate measures up to 10 feet in height and shall not be within the existing or required yard areas facing the street or streets.

b. The outdoor storage of materials which are used as part of the everyday business operations or manufactured or processed as part of the business operation shall be prohibited. All other materials shall be stored within the building.

c. The outdoor storage of any vehicles in disrepair and/or without current registration shall be prohibited.”

2. Lot Width for Cross Dock

Cross docking is a logistical strategy for some warehousing, storage, and distribution uses, where products and materials are unloaded from one inbound source such as a truck or railcar, and then immediately moved onto outbound transportation with as little storage time as possible. In order to create safe and efficient circulation and to permit cross-docking in safe and appropriate locations throughout the City, it is recommended that certain building standards for cross-dock warehouses be created.
**Recommendation #2:** It is recommended that a new subsection “C” of Section 17.36.120, “Principal building regulations” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code” be added as follows:

“C. No cross-docking warehouse, storage, or distribution center uses or structures may be permitted except as follows:

1. The minimum building width shall be 100 feet.”

### iii. Minimum Lot Width and Prevailing Lot Width 33’ wide lots

“Table No. 1” under Section 17.36.100, “Lot dimensions”, Subsection “C” provides the requirements for minimum lot widths in each Ward for one- and two-family residential uses. In order to preserve the character of many neighborhoods, as well as allow for lot widths that are able to accommodate contemporary one- and two-family homes with appropriate area for driveway parking, it is recommended that the City reevaluate the minimum lot width requirements. In order to enforce any updated requirements, but likewise make considerations for existing conditions, it is also recommended that the provisions under Section 17.36.099, “Calculation of prevailing conditions” be amended.

**Recommendation #1:** It is recommended that “Table No. 1” under Section 17.36.100, “Lot dimensions”, Subsection “C” is amended as follows:

C. Lot width and frontage for one- and two-family residential lots in all permitted zones within the city shall be based on the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table No. 1 (Amended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zone</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All listed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All listed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, the Section related to the table labeled as “Conditions of Table #1” should be amended as follows and all other existing sections shall remain the same:

“The prevailing lot width (A) is the benchmark width for all zones in the city.

Conditions of Table #1:

(A) To meet the prevailing lot width requirement ninety-five (95) percent of all existing lot widths must be less than or equal to the listed lot dimension.
(B) Standard lot width shall be utilized when no prevailing lot width can be established.”

“The prevailing lot dimension shall be a dimension which exists for ninety-five (95) percent of all existing lots. To further explain, ninety-five (95) percent of all compatible structures must exhibit a dimension which equals or is less than the setback established for the proposed application.”

Recommendation #2: It is recommended that Section 17.36.099, “Calculation of prevailing conditions”, Subsection -A.3.” is amended from currently allowing 65% prevailing lot width to a new standard of 95%, to read as follows:

“3. The prevailing percentile shall be ninety-five (95) percent. This is to say that the prevailing lot dimension shall be the lot which constitutes ninety (95) percent of the neighborhood. Example, if there are twenty-five (25) lots that meet the criteria of subsections 17.36.099.A. and 17.36.099.B. and you create a table listing the lots minimum to maximum dimensions, the 24th lot going from low to high is the prevailing lot dimension to utilize.”

iv. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Standards in Specific Residential Zones

It is recommended that Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Standards are added to the bulk requirements in the R-2 and R-3 Zone Districts, in order to control building size and mass in relation to lot area. In conjunction with other permitted bulk standards of these zones, a requirement of a maximum FAR of 1.1 is recommended.

Recommendation #1: It is recommended that Subsection “G.1” of Section 17.36.110, “Yard dimensions” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code” be amended as follows:
“1. Principal Buildings and Structures. All non-residential lots shall have a minimum floor area ratio (FAR) of eleven (11) percent.”

Recommendation #2: It is recommended that a new subsection “3” under Subsection “G” of Section 17.36.110, “Yard dimensions” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code” be added as follows:

“3. Principal Buildings and Structures. All residential lots in the R-2 and R-3 Zone Districts shall have a minimum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.1. There is no FAR for the remaining residential zones within the city.”

v. Changes to Permitted Uses in the C-4 Zone

The lot areas and existing characteristics of development patterns in the C-4 zone district do not warrant some of the permitted non-residential uses, such as “X. Selected commercial and light manufacture” and “Y. Warehousing and storage”. These existing permitted uses are recommended to be eliminated from C-4 zone as denoted on Schedule IA, “Permitted Uses” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code”.

Recommendation: The existing permitted uses of “X. Selected commercial and light manufacture” and “Y. Warehousing and storage” listed on Schedule IA, “Permitted Uses” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code” are recommended to be eliminated from C-4 zone.

vi. Changes to Permitted Uses in the C-1 Zone

The existing characteristics of development patterns in the C-1 zone district do not warrant some of the permitted mid- to high-density residential uses, such as “F. Garden apartments”, “G. Multifamily apartments”, and “H. Elevator apartments”. These existing permitted uses are recommended to be eliminated from C-1 zone as denoted on Schedule IA, “Permitted Uses” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code”.

Recommendation: The existing permitted uses of “F. Garden apartments”, “G. Multifamily apartments”, and “H. Elevator apartments” listed on Schedule IA, “Permitted Uses” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code” are recommended to be eliminated from C-1 zone.
a. Recommended Zoning Changes to Specific Properties and Areas by Ward Feedback

i. Ward #2:

1. C-4 Zone in Ward #2 along Rahway Avenue:

It is recommended that the C-4 Zone District in Ward #2 along Rahway Avenue be studied to determine the appropriate permitted uses in the district. Currently, the zone is comprised of development ranging from smaller commercial uses and multi-tenant commercial buildings, to single-family residential uses. Currently, the C-4 zone does not permit single-family or two-family dwellings, which are prevalent in this neighborhood, and particularly within the C-4 zone of Ward #2. It is recommended that these residential uses be added as a conditional use for the C-4 zone.

If it is determined that this recommendation would be better served or executed by the creation of a new zone, it is further recommended that it the corridor be studied to determine the appropriate uses and bulk standards. Additionally, before an additional zone district is created, other areas of the city with similar development patterns should be studied to determine the applicability of such a zone city-wide to avoid a zone district confined a singular corridor.

Recommendation: It is recommended that under Schedule III, “Conditional Uses” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code”, new subsection “P” be added to permit single family and two-family residential uses in C-4 zone as follows:

“P. Single-family and two-family residential uses shall be permitted in the C-4 Districts, provided that the following conditions are maintained:
1. Principal building height shall be limited to shall be limited to three stories and 35 feet.”

ii. Ward #3:

1. **R-3 Zone along West Grand street between Cherry and Chilton**

The R-3 and R-3A Zone Districts permit largely the same residential uses, with the exception that the R-3 zone permits multi-family and garden apartments, whereas the R-3A zone does not. The properties along the south side of West Grand Street are largely one- and two-family residential dwellings, in contrast to the larger multi-family buildings surrounding them on the north side of West Grand and to the rear of them. It order to preserve the character and scale of the neighborhood and these residential uses, it is recommended that the City study this area in more detail and if determined appropriate, that these properties as designated below be re-zoned from R-3 to R-3A.

![Southern side of West Grand Street between Chilton Street and Cherry Street](image)

**Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Recommended Zoning</th>
<th>Extents</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>Frontage along southern side of West Grand Street extending from Chilton Street to Cherry Street</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>111, 112, 113, 1748, 1742, 1743, 1744, 1745, 1746, 1749, 1750, 1751, 1752, 1753, 1755, 1756,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii. Ward #5:

1. C-2 Zone Along Magnolia Avenue from Catherine Street to Jackson Avenue

The area along Magnolia Avenue between Catherine Street and Jackson Avenue is currently zoned C-2. The existing development patterns along the street show that the western side of Magnolia Avenue is largely developed as non-residential, whereas the eastern side is almost entirely residential.
In order to promote more compatible land uses both along this corridor and in the surrounding area to the east in the R-3A zone, it is recommended that the City study this area in more detail and if determined appropriate, that these properties as designated below be re-zoned from C-2 to R-4.

**Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Recommended Zoning</th>
<th>Extents</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Frontage along Magnolia Avenue extending from Catherine Street to Spring Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>387, 390, 1193, 1236, 1237, 1238, 1239, 1240, 1241, 1242, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1248.A, 1248.B, 1250, 1250.A, 1252, 1377, 1379, 1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Frontage along E. Grand Street and Oak Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>384, 492, 493, 495, 496, 497, 1372, 1373, 1383, 1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2</td>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Frontage along Magnolia Avenue extending from Catherine Street to Jackson Avenue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>202, 203, 718, 719, 720, 721, 859, 860, 863, 865, 870, 871, 872, 873, 874, 875, 876, 877, 878, 887, 888, 889, 890, 892, 893, 894, 895, 896, 897, 898, 899, 901, 902, 905, 906, 907, 908, 909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. **R-3A Zone from New Point Road to 7th Street**

The area along between New Point Road and 7th Street is currently zoned R-3A. The area is bordered in its southeastern portion by the R-2 Zone, in the neighborhood surrounding the John Marshall School. The character of the R-3A zoned area is largely one- and two-family residential uses, similar to that of the area zoned R-2. In order to preserve the character and scale of the neighborhood, it is recommended that the City study this area in more detail and if determined appropriate, that these properties as designated below be re-zoned from R-3A to R-2.

**Recommendation:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Recommended Zoning</th>
<th>Extents</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>SE Corner of Bond Street and E 6th Street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>880, 881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>SW Corner of Bond Street and E 6th Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>893, 894, 895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>SW and SE Corner of Magnolia Avenue and E 6th Street</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>763, 820, 821, 822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage along South Park Street extending from E 6th Street to E 7th Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage along Magnolia Avenue extending from E 6th Street to E 7th Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontage along Bond Street North of E 6th Street</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140 |
| 1224, 1225, 1226 1227, 1316, 1317, 1318, 1319, 1320 |
iv. Ward #6:

1. Zoning for the City of Elizabeth Police Station

The Elizabeth Police Station and Law Enforcement and Justice Complex is currently zoned C-4. However, it would more appropriately be zoned under the Public (P) zone.
**Recommendation:** It is recommended that Block 9, Lot 320, otherwise known as the Elizabeth Police Station and Law Enforcement and Justice Complex be re-zoned from C-4 to P.

2. **C-4 Zone along Elizabeth Avenue between Bridge Street and Prospect Street**

   The area along Elizabeth Avenue between Bridge Street and Prospect Street is currently zoned C-4. It is surrounded by the C-5 zone to the north and the HC zone to the south. While the C-5 zone permits higher intensity commercial uses than the C-4 zone, the C-4 zone is situated as a transition to the even more intense HC zone.

   **Recommendation:**

   It is recommended that, in order to create a better commercial transition area, the City study this area in more detail and if determined appropriate, that these properties in the C-4 zone along Elizabeth Avenue be re-zoned from C-4 to C-5.

3. **C-4 Zone along Livingston Street and Broadway**

   The area along Livingston Street and Broadway, between 6th Street and 7th Street is currently zoned C-4. The entirety of properties to the west and southwest of the zone are zoned R-3A, and the C-4 zone continues to the east of Broadway. In order to promote similar land uses and residential uses neighboring one another, it is recommended that the City study this area in more detail and if determined appropriate, that these properties in the C-4 zone along Livingston Street and Broadway be re-zoned from C-4 to R-3A.
c. **Recommended Changes to Provisions of the Land Use Code**

i. **Height of Outdoor Stairs**

*Recommendation*: It is recommended that a new subsection “I” under Section 17.36.030, “Supplementary regulations” of Subchapter 17.36, “Zoning Districts Generally” of Title 17, “Land Development Code”, be added as follows:

“I. Maximum Height of Outdoor Stairs.

1. Stairs utilized to access the primary entrance of a residential use shall have a vertical height limit of 5 feet (60 inches) between landings or floor levels for a flight of stairs.
2. If the distance between floor levels exceed 60 inches, the flight of stairs requires a level landing in-between to break up the flight of stairs.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Zoning</th>
<th>Recommended Zoning</th>
<th>Extents</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>R-3A</td>
<td>Frontages along Livingston Street and Broadway</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>69, 70, 72, 750, 751, 752, 753, 754, 755, 756, 757, 759, 760, 761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii. **Changes to Land Use Code Administrative Sections**

The City of Elizabeth fee schedule for development applications was last revised in 2010 by Ord. No. 4149. In order to ensure fees are appropriately valued, it is recommended that the table be updated. This update may include the raising of certain fees, and likewise should consider the addition of fees for specific variance relief, such as a per space fee for parking space variances.

*Recommendation:* It is recommended that a subsection “C” under Section 17.52.020, “Municipal fees for applications for development” of Subchapter 17.52, “Fees” of Title 17, “Land Development Code”, be amended.

iii. **Correction of a Typographical Error in Section 17.36.100, “Lot Dimensions”**

Currently Section 17.36.100.A.7-b and -c provide that:

“7. Requirements specific to corner lots (corner lots shall be considered to have two (2) front yards, one rear yard and one side yard):

b. Interior side yard same as subsection 17.36.100.C.2
c. Rear yard setback same as subsection 17.36.100.C.3”.

*Recommendation:* It is recommended that this section be amended as follows:

“b. Interior side yard same as subsection 17.36.100.A.2
c. Rear yard setback same as subsection 17.36.100.A.3”.

d. **Recommended Changes to Parking Standards**

i. **Changes to Parking Standards for Residential Uses**

It has long since been established that due to the conjunction of existing development and the nature and increase of development within the City in recent years, that many residents and business owners have identified parking problems. While the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) govern the minimum parking standards for all residential units per Table I of Section 17.40.040, “Number of parking and loading spaces required”, it has been suggested by members of the governing body, community, and City professionals that even more strict parking standards are utilized to not only alleviate the existing parking issues, but to prevent additional problems in the future by ensuring ample parking.

*Recommendation:* It is recommended that the City submit a set of residential parking standards to the Site Improvement Advisory Board,
known as “Special Area Standards”, that include a requirement for 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit, regardless of unit size or number of bedrooms, to be reviewed for their consideration. If accepted, it is recommended that an Ordinance setting forth such standards be prepared and adopted by the City.

ii. Changes to Parking Standards for Industrial, Manufacturing, and Warehousing Uses

The number of required parking spaces is set forth in Table I of Section 17.40.040, “Number of parking and loading spaces required” of Title 17, “Land Development Code”. Currently, uses identified as “Industrial, manufacturing, warehousing, wholesale, distribution and selected commercial (use groups X-CC)” require “1 ground level space per each 1,400 square feet of site area”. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), Trip Generation Manual, 4th Edition, provides analysis on trip generation and parking generation for various uses based upon data produced nationwide. For warehousing type uses, the ITE recommends parking ratios of 0.5 per 1,000 square feet of floor area and 1.0 space per employee. It is recommended that parking standards for these uses be adjusted in the City in order to avoid excess parking and impervious coverage.

Recommendation: It is recommended that “Table I”, under subsection “A” of Section 17.40.040, “Number of parking and loading spaces required” of Title 17, “Land Development Code”, be amended as follows:

| Industrial, manufacturing, warehousing, wholesale, distribution and selected commercial (use groups X-CC) | 1 ground level space per each 2,000 square feet of site area plus 1.0 space per employee. The number of spaces to be installed at any time is to be based on a current and valid parking management plan approved by the zoning administrator and a final site plan approved by the approving authority. |

iii. Off-Street Parking Design for One- and Two-Family Residential Uses

In order to promote off-street parking for one- and two-Family residential uses, particularly on sites that are constrained by lot size or lot width, specific provisions to allow certain parking design conditions should be promoted. While these residential uses generally provide parking in the form of driveways in between the building and the property line, or as garages, smaller lots are often unable to accommodate even these types of parking design.
Recommendation: It is recommended that a new subsection be added to Section 17.40, “Off-Street Parking and Loading Regulations” of Title 17, “Land Development Code” be added as follows:

“17.40.60 Off-Street Parking Design for Residential Zones

A. This section shall apply to one- and two-family residential uses meeting the following conditions:
1. Lot width is 30 feet wide or less.
2. The structure does not exist or is not proposed to have an attached garage.
3. The structure exists or is proposed to have a 20 foot front yard setback.
B. Front yard parking shall be permitted, provided that existing or proposed driveway meets the following design standards:
1. The driveway does not block sidewalks on entrance to dwelling unit.
2. The driveway is a minimum of 18 feet in length.
3. The driveway is a maximum of 10 feet in width.

e. Recommended Changes to the Zoning Map

The zoning map was last adopted as of September 2016. Per the establishment of new areas in need of redevelopment within the City and other recommended updates, the following recommendations relate to an update to the Zoning Map.

i. Minor Design Changes

In order to make the map more legible and easier to use, as well as more aesthetically pleasing, this updated version of the map has been modified largely in its color scheme. This is a minor design change and is not a substantive change to the map.

ii. Ward Lines on the Existing Zone Map

The Elizabeth Zoning Code is unique in that while Zone Districts designations are consistent City-wide, specific provisions relate to what is permissible in each area designated on the map currently as a “ward”. However, the City likewise utilizes Wards as political districts that change from time to time, and therefore, the lines on the zoning map are both different in function and independent of these changes. It is recommended that the Zoning Map be revised to denote “ward lines” as “district lines” from here forward.

Recommendation: It is recommendation that the zone map be updated to depict the lines on the Zoning Map currently labeled as “Ward Lines” as “District Lines”.
iii. **Specific Changes to Block 13, Lot 1729**

The current zoning map depicts the “Elizabeth Towers”, a senior housing building located at Block 13, Lot 1729, otherwise known as 301-329 W Grand Street, in the Public “P” Zone. This was changed by way of the zoning map adopted in September 2016. Prior to the adoption of that map, the property was in the C-2 Zone, as depicted on the February 2000 Zoning Map (shown below).

A brief history on the background of this change relates back to the January 8, 2016 Land Use Plan Element, which recommended that “the OS district be revised and split into “O” and “P” for Open Space and Public Space (publicly owned buildings, land, and other institutions).” Previously, the Open Space “OS” Zone included recreational and public facilities, and this change to create a differentiated Public zone resulted in the rezoning of a number of public facilities, which were captured in the adopted September 2016 Zoning Map.

However, Block 13, Lot 1729, which is developed with the Elizabeth Towers senior housing building, is not a publicly owned lot, nor publicly owned institution. It appears that in the September 2016 Zoning Map, this change was made inadvertently and represents an error. Therefore, it is recommended that the zoning map be amended to revert this parcel back to the C-2 zone that it was previously designated as (shown below).
iv. Route 9 – Renaissance Hotel Property in the HC Zone District

There appears to be an error on the existing zone map, which depicts a portion of the Renaissance Hotel, which is located primarily in the Highway Commercial (HC) Zone, as having a portion of its surface parking lot in the southernmost end of the parcel located in the Open Space (O) Zone. The O Zone comprises the “Coakley Circle” park at the corner of Neck Lane and Coakley Circle. The portion of the Renaissance Hotel parcel that is erroneously zoned “O” is indicated in the graphic below.
Recommendation: It is recommended that the minor change be made to the zone map to correct the portion of the Renaissance Hotel that should be is located in the HC zone and should be depicted as such on the Official Zone Map of the City.

v. Redevelopment Areas Adopted Since the 2016 Zoning Map

It is recommended that the Zoning Map be revised to include the properties that have been deemed to be an area in need of redevelopment since the last Zoning Map was adopted in 2016. Statutorily, it is a requirement to update the zoning map to reflect these areas on the City Zoning Map. The updated areas include: (1) 56-78 Murray Street Redevelopment Area, adopted by City Council Resolution dated February 23, 2016; (2) Amended Baker Center (1029-1061 Newark Ave) Redevelopment Area, adopted by City Council Resolution dated November 22, 2016; (3) Former Elizabeth General Hospital Redevelopment Area, adopted by City Council Resolution dated February 14, 2017; (4) Magnolia Avenue Redevelopment Area, adopted by City Council Resolution dated February 14, 2017; (5) 125 North Broad Street (Hersh Tower) Redevelopment Area, adopted by City Council Resolution dated December 12, 2017; and (6) North Ave East/Spring Street/Woodruff Lane - Ward 5 Redevelopment Area, adopted by City Council Resolution dated May 22, 2018.

Additionally, the numbering reflected on the map is recommended to be updated and to include a corresponding legend to include the names of these areas.

The redevelopment areas depicted on the map should include the following:

1. Kapkowski Road Redevelopment Area
2. Elizabethport Waterfront Redevelopment Area (39-55 Pine St)
3. Midtown Redevelopment Area
4. Seapor Industrial Center Redevelopment Area
5. Elizabethport Phase II Redevelopment Area
6. Elizabethport Redevelopment Area
7. Trumbull Street Redevelopment Area
8. South Front Street (Borne Chemical) Redevelopment Area
9. Baker Center Redevelopment Area
10. York Street Redevelopment Area
11. Oakwood Plaza Redevelopment Area
12. Morris Ave (University Corridor) Redevelopment Area
13. Henry Street Redevelopment Area
14. South Second Street Redevelopment Area
15. 56-78 Murray Street Redevelopment Area
16. Amended Baker Center (1029-1061 Newark Ave) Redevelopment Area
18. Former Elizabeth General Hospital Redevelopment Area  
19. Magnolia Avenue Redevelopment Area  
20. 125 North Broad Street (Hersh Tower) Redevelopment Area  
21. North Ave East/Spring Street/Woodruff Lane - Ward 5 Redevelopment Area

VI. REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Prior to the last reexamine of the Master Plan, the following fourteen (14) areas were designated in need of redevelopment by the City:

1) Kapkowski Road Redevelopment Area  
2) Elizabethport Phase II Redevelopment Area  
3) Elizabethport Waterfront Redevelopment Area  
4) Elizabethport Redevelopment Area  
5) Midtown Elizabeth Redevelopment Area  
6) Oakwood Plaza Redevelopment Area  
7) Seaport Industrial Center Redevelopment Area  
8) South Front Street Redevelopment Area  
9) Trumbull Street Redevelopment Area  
10) York Street Redevelopment Area  
11) Baker Center (Durant) Redevelopment Area  
12) Henry Street Redevelopment Area  
13) Morris Avenue Redevelopment Area  
14) South Second Street Redevelopment Area

Since the adoption of the 2015 Partial Master Plan Reexamination, the City of Elizabeth Planning has adopted the following nine (9) Redevelopment Studies and designated these as areas in need of redevelopment:

1) East Broad Street Redevelopment Area (Amended)  
2) 56-78 Murray Street Redevelopment Area  
3) 1029-1061 Newark Ave Redevelopment Area  
4) Former Elizabeth General Hospital Site (901-931 East Jersey Street) Redevelopment Area  
5) Magnolia Avenue Redevelopment Area  
6) Hersh Tower (125 North Broad Street) Redevelopment Area  
7) Meadow Street/Spring Street/North Avenue/Woodruff Lane Redevelopment Area  
8) 61-99 West Grand Street Redevelopment Area  
9) Bank Street and New Point Road Redevelopment Area

The following section provides a detailed description of the administrative history and characteristics of each Redevelopment Area.
1. **East Broad Street Redevelopment Area (Amended)**
   Preliminary Investigation Report dated September 16, 2016, Amended January 12, 2017
   Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated November 2, 2017
   Adopted by Council Resolution dated December 12, 2017

---

Table VI-1. East Broad Street Redevelopment Area (Amended)
Redevelopment Area
Tax Information and Addresses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1130-1146 Chestnut Street</td>
<td>35,302 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>PT 1148-1150 Chestnut Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>1107-1109 Chestnut Street</td>
<td>3,478 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1111 Chestnut Street</td>
<td>3,478 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1113-1115 Chestnut Street</td>
<td>6,375 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>1139-1141 Chestnut Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1143-1145 Chestnut Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>140 East Broad St./310 Jefferson Ave.</td>
<td>25,098 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>1142-1148 East Broad Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>1150 East Broad Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1166-74 &amp; 1186-1236 East Broad St.</td>
<td>95,011 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>253.A</td>
<td>1176-1184 East Broad Street</td>
<td>10,941 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>457.A</td>
<td>Rear 311-315 Jefferson Avenue</td>
<td>2,149 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>302-304 Madison Avenue</td>
<td>4,901 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>306-312 Madison Avenue</td>
<td>11,125 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>880.A</td>
<td>1110 Magnolia Avenue</td>
<td>3,708 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>880.B</td>
<td>1112 Magnolia Avenue</td>
<td>3,411 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1291</td>
<td>430-432 Walnut Street</td>
<td>6,250 ft2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1292</td>
<td>R 430-432 PT 434 Walnut Street</td>
<td>7,830 ft2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1293</td>
<td>PT 434-438 Walnut Street</td>
<td>11,660 ft2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Subsequently, in a letter dated August 28, 2017, the Director of Planning and Community Development requested that City Council authorize the Planning Board to conduct a study to determine if 430-432 Walnut Street (Tax Account No. 12-1291), R 430-432 PT 434 Walnut Street (Tax Account No. 12-1292), and PT 434-438 Walnut Street (Tax Account No. 12-1293) should be added to the East Broad Street Redevelopment area. Thus, the resulting Redevelopment area consisted of twenty-one (21) properties as follows: 12-213, 12-217, 12-223, 12-224, 12-225, 12-232 (including 12-230), 12-233, 12-246, 12-249, 12-250, 12-253, 12-253.A, 12-457.A, 12-604, 12-605, 12-880.A, 12-880.B, 12-1291, 12-1292, and 12-1293. The Study was amended dated September 25, 2017, and adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated November 2, 2017, and by Council Resolution dated December 12, 2017.

The East Broad Street Redevelopment Study Area consists of those properties along the south side of East Broad Street and extends from this intersection of the New Jersey Transit Railroad Line, East Broad Street, and the Central Railroad of New Jersey tracks at its westernmost extent; along East Broad Street to Linden Street and to the corner of Linden Street and Magnolia Ave and down Magnolia Ave to the corner of Jefferson Ave and Magnolia at its northernmost extent; down Jefferson Ave and east down Chestnut Street - including only some properties on the corner of Madison Ave and Chestnut St and Jackson Ave and Chestnut St – for the easternmost extent. The southern extent is bounded by the railroad tracks of the Central Railroad of New Jersey. Finally, the northern section of the Study Area consists of three (3) parcels that are bounded by railroad tracks of the Central Railroad of New Jersey to the west, Walnut Street to the east, a property with the tax account number 12-923 to the south, and by a property with tax account number 12-1294 to the north. The Study Area is directly to the northeast of the Midtown Business District.

**Purpose:** The East Broad Street Redevelopment Plan is located within walking distance of Midtown Elizabeth and many transportation hubs. The study area is South East of Morris avenue, an arterial highway in Elizabeth. Much of the area is located in the MRC Zone District. In the 2016 Master Plan Re-exam, some parcels were rezoned from MRC to Commercial Zone Districts. Surrounding the study area are commercial uses with some residential parcels scattered. Many of the parcels and streets within the study area exhibit deterioration and excessive land coverage. Five (5) parcels are vacant and seven (7) parcels are abandoned. There are a variety of deleterious uses within the study area and the pedestrian and street network are also in disrepair.

**Redevelopment Plan:** A Redevelopment Plan prepared for the East Broad Street Redevelopment Area is dated May 18, 2017, and was adopted by Ordinance No. 4874, dated June 28, 2017.
2. 56-78 Murray Street Redevelopment Area
Preliminary Investigation Report dated June 16, 2016
Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated September 1, 2016
Adopted by Council Resolution dated June 27, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>56-78 Murray Street</td>
<td>1.6 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area:** The Redevelopment Area is comprised of a single parcel located at 56-78 Murray Street (Tax Account No. 6-652). The parcel is a triangular shape and 1.6 +/- acres. It is bounded by the Elizabeth River to the west, railroad tracks to the East and Murray Street to the north. The parcel is located in the C-5 zone. The parcel is currently underdeveloped and vacant with a locked fence around it. The study area is located immediately south of the Midtown Business District of Elizabeth.

**Purpose:** The purpose of the redevelopment study is to amend the Midtown Redevelopment Plan to include the parcel at 56-78 Murray Street. The parcel is located at the southern portion of the limits of the Midtown Redevelopment Plan. The purpose of the Midtown Redevelopment Plan is to “realize the maximum potential for commercial and residential development in the key ‘center city’ area”. Residential and Commercial uses are permitted, and the plan specifically calls for senior housing, office and service jobs and amenities for residents.

**Redevelopment Plan:** A Redevelopment Plan prepared for 56-78 Murray Street (Block 6, Lot 652) is dated July 20, 2017 was and adopted by City Council Ordinance No. 4898, dated September 27, 2017.
3. **1029-1061 Newark Avenue Redevelopment Area**  
**Preliminary Investigation Report dated June 16, 2016**  
*Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated July 7, 2016*  
*Adopted by Council Resolution dated November 9, 2016*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>1029-1061 Newark Avenue</td>
<td>6.43 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Area:** The Redevelopment Area is comprised of a single parcel located at 1029-1061 Newark Avenue, known as Tax Account No. 11-850. The property consists of approximately 6.43 +/- acres, with 441 feet of frontage along Newark Avenue to the west and includes the intersection with Virginia Street with approximately 696 feet of frontage just south of the Virginia Street right of way on the Elizabeth side. The northern edge of the study area runs along the border of the cities of Newark and Elizabeth. The adjacent parcel in the City of Newark is known as Block 50, Lot 3773. This parcel is controlled by the same owner, KCW Associates and is bisected by the municipal boundary line between the City of Elizabeth and the City of Newark, but the site is contiguous otherwise. Without Lot 3773 in Newark, Lot 850 in Elizabeth does not have direct access to Virginia Avenue. The eastern portion of the site is bounded by the NJ Transit rail line.

**Purpose:** In 2014, the City designated 829-961 Newark Avenue (11-847), 827-907 Newark Avenue (11-847A), 1001-1013 Newark Avenue (11-848), 1015-1027 Newark Avenue (11-849), and 1029-1061 Newark Avenue (11-850) ("Baker Center Redevelopment Study") as an area in
need of redevelopment that would permit the use of eminent domain. Additionally, this area was amended on January 13, 2015. Subsequently, the City had identified that warehousing would be a good use 1029-1061 Newark Avenue and sought to move forward in redeveloping 1029-1061 Newark Avenue. This required a new redevelopment study and plan individually for 1029-1061 Newark Avenue, and the Study was authorized without the powers of condemnation. The creation of the 1029-1061 Newark Avenue Redevelopment Area effectively separated it from the Amended Baker Center Redevelopment Area, and reduced the Amended Baker Center Redevelopment Area to four (4) parcels.

There is one 36,000+ square foot building at the rear of the site. The parcel is in the MRC zone and is surrounded by R-3 uses across the railroad line and at the eastern edge of the area, C-2 uses to the northwest and open space uses as well. The variety of the surrounding zones provide an opportunity to develop the area into a central resource to the community.

**Redevelopment Plan:** A Redevelopment Plan prepared for 1029-1061 Newark Avenue (Block 11, Lot 850) is dated April 6, 2018, and was adopted by Ordinance No. 5014, approved May 9, 2018.

4. **Former Elizabeth General Hospital Site (901-931 East Jersey Street) Redevelopment Area**
   - Preliminary Investigation Report dated December 14, 2016
   - Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated February 2, 2017
   - Adopted by Council Resolution dated February 14, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>901-931 East Jersey Street</td>
<td>5.75 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area: The former Elizabeth General Hospital Site is located at Tax Account No. 7-312 and consisting of 5.75 +/- acres. The Redevelopment Area is a full city block with 420 feet of frontage on both East Jersey Street and Lafayette Street and 630 feet of frontage on Reid Street and Jaques Street. The property is developed with two buildings fronting on East Jersey Street and a five-story parking garage fronting on Lafayette Street. The rear of the buildings on East Jersey Street are in the process of being demolished. The parcel is in the R-3 Zone District and is two blocks east of the Route 1 corridor. In September 2017, ownership was transferred to Jersey Walk Condominium Association.

Purpose: The Redevelopment Plan aims to provide new residential development in a manner that does not encroach on existing homes. The plan shall provide for the appropriate density and infrastructure in accordance with the Elizabeth Master Plan. The parcel is envisioned as a mixed-use residential project with open space, retail and an attractive pedestrian environment. Multi-family residential and retail are permitted principal uses in the Redevelopment Plan.

Redevelopment Plan: A Redevelopment Plan prepared for the Former Elizabeth General Hospital Site (Block 7, Lot 312 - 901-931 East Jersey Street) is dated March 28, 2017 and revised April 7, 2017, and was adopted by Ordinance No. 4830, approved April 26, 2017.

5. Magnolia Avenue Redevelopment Area
   Preliminary Investigation Report dated December 14, 2016
   Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated February 2, 2017
   Adopted by Council Resolution dated February 14, 2017

   **Table VI-5. Magnolia Avenue Redevelopment Area Tax Information and Addresses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1180</td>
<td>854-910 Magnolia Avenue</td>
<td>2.21 +/- acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>859-867 Magnolia Avenue</td>
<td>0.29 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area: The Redevelopment Area is comprised of two parcels located at 854-910 Magnolia Avenue (Tax Account No. 8-1180) and 859-867 Magnolia Avenue (Tax Account No. 8-1210). Lot 1180 is located on the southern side of Magnolia Ave and is about 2.21+/- acres. Lot 1210 is located directly across the street on the northern side of Magnolia Avenue and is approximately 0.29+/- acres, for a total study area of 2.5+/- acres. The larger parcel at Lot 1180 is an empty lot with vegetation and has been cleared of any buildings since September 2009. The township of Hillside issued approvals in 2013 to develop a warehouse at lot 1180. The warehouse was to be used with the existing surface parking lot across the street on lot 1210. Google Map imagery shows Lot 1180 still unimproved. Tax records from the County show ownership of both parcels were transferred from 888 Magnolia Avenue LLC to Lot 1180 Associates LLC in 2018.

Purpose: The Redevelopment Area is located in the underlying MRC zone. There are residential properties immediately surrounding Lot 1210. Around Lot 1180 are Commercial and Industrial uses that appear to be encroaching on the parcel. Due to discontinuance of use, the study area has been host to criminal activity. It is in the interest of the safety, health and welfare of the community that the study area be redeveloped after years of vacancy.

Redevelopment Plan: A Redevelopment Plan prepared for Magnolia Avenue (Block 8, Lot 1180 - 854-910 Magnolia Avenue & Block 8, Lot 1210 - 859-867 Magnolia Avenue) is dated May 10, 2017, and was adopted by Ordinance No. 4875, approved June 28, 2017.

6. Hersh Tower (125 North Broad Street) Redevelopment Area
Preliminary Investigation Report dated October, 2017
Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated December 7, 2017
Adopted by Council Resolution dated December 12, 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>125 North Broad Street</td>
<td>0.16+/- acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area: The Redevelopment Area is comprised of a single parcel located at 125 North Broad Street (Tax Account No. 9-83), which is 0.16 acres. The site was developed with the Hersh Tower building, a 14-story building with approximately 73 feet of frontage on Broad Street, and approximately 97 feet of frontage on E. Grand Street. The parcel is located in the C-5 Commercial zone and surrounded by properties with the same zoning. The parcel is located in the Historic District of Midtown Elizabeth.

Purpose: The study area is centrally located in Downtown Elizabeth with close proximity to transportation hubs and various academic and government buildings. The building is important to Downtown and is listed on the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places. The building has experienced periods of vacancy since the 1980s and remains uninhabited on upper floors today.

Redevelopment Plan: A Redevelopment Plan prepared for Hersh Tower (Block 9, Lot 83 - 125 North Broad Street) is dated January 2018, and was adopted by Ordinance No. 4979, approved February 28, 2018.

7. Meadow Street/Spring Street/North Avenue/Woodruff Lane Redevelopment Area
Preliminary Investigation Report dated March 22, 2018
Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated May 3, 2018
Adopted by Council Resolution dated May 22, 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1299.A</td>
<td>729 - 763 Meadow Street</td>
<td>3.63 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1699.D</td>
<td>703 &amp; R 703 - 727 Spring Street</td>
<td>0.08 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1699.C</td>
<td>705 - 725 Spring Street</td>
<td>1.60 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1308.J</td>
<td>850 North Avenue East</td>
<td>0.69 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1308.K</td>
<td>R 850 - R 878 North Avenue East</td>
<td>1.40 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1308.L</td>
<td>852 - 864 North Avenue East</td>
<td>0.35 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1308.M</td>
<td>864 - 878 North Avenue East</td>
<td>0.34 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1308.N</td>
<td>880 North Avenue East</td>
<td>0.51 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1308.O</td>
<td>882-888 North Avenue East</td>
<td>2.32 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1308.P</td>
<td>890 - 900 North Avenue East</td>
<td>1.29 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1699.B</td>
<td>901-949 Woodruff Lane</td>
<td>4.67 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1864</td>
<td>863 - 871 Woodruff Lane</td>
<td>3.83 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1865</td>
<td>873 - 889 Woodruff Lane</td>
<td>1.03 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

service repair businesses and outdoor storage of materials. The surrounding neighborhood has historically been and continues to be comprised of Industrial and Commercial uses.

**Purpose:** The 2016 Master Plan references future growth in the study area. Two parcels in the western portion of the study area were added to the Highway Commercial (HC) zone along Route 9 while the remainder of the area is in the MRC zone. The study area is mostly impervious coverage where the Master Plan calls for more open space between structures. Some parcels within the study area remain vacant or inaccessible from the right-of-way. Redevelopment will create better pedestrian and traffic circulation. The area is almost entirely impervious coverage and six (6) of the sites in the study area have been listed with DEP as “Active Site with Confirmed Contamination” with ongoing remediation.

8. **61-99 West Grand Street Redevelopment Area**
   *Preliminary Investigation Report dated November 9, 2018*
   Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated January 3, 2019
   Adopted by Council Resolution dated January 22, 2019

| Table VI-8. 61-99 West Grand Street Redevelopment Area Tax Information and Addresses |
|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Block | Lot | Address | Area |
| 6 | 1589 | 61-99 West Grand Street | 2.377+/- acres. |

**Area:** 61-99 West Grand Street (Tax Account No. 6-1589) is a corner lot with approximately 683 feet of frontage on West Grand Street and approximately 167 feet of frontage on Cherry Street. The parcel is 2.377 +/- acres. There is a one-story structure with several attached garages along the northern edge of the property line. The property is utilized as the Union County Division of
Motor Vehicles with office and garage space. The remainder of the area is used as a surface parking lot and the site is entirely covered with impervious material. The property is located within the R-3 Multi-family Residential Zone. The property is bounded by the Elizabeth River to the east and railroad tracks to the north. There are commercial uses to the east of the property and residential uses to the west.

Purpose: The current office and garage use of the property are incompatible with the zoning of the parcel. The 2016 Master Plan calls for a reduction in incompatible uses especially between residential, commercial and industrial areas. There exists a faulty arrangement of parking and circulation on the site. The surface parking lot is in minor disrepair which may indicate maintenance issues.

9. **Bank Street and New Point Road Redevelopment Area**  
**Preliminary Investigation Report dated March 15, 2019**  
Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated April 4, 2019  
Adopted by Planning Board Resolution dated April 23, 2019

<p>| Table VI-9. Bank Street and New Point Road Redevelopment Area Tax Information and Addresses |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30-34 Bank Street</td>
<td>0.1992 +/- acres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>731-735 New Point Road</td>
<td>0.1683 +/- acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area: The Redevelopment is comprised of two (2) non-contiguous parcels located at 30-34 Bank Street (Tax Account No. 7-48) and 731-735 New Point Road (Tax Account No. 7-562), with respective lot areas of 0.199 acres and 0.168 acres. Both properties are located in the R-2 Two-Family Residential Zone District and are City owned. 30-34 Bank Street is a corner lot with frontage on Cross Street and Bank Street. 731-735 New Point Road is a corner lot with frontage along New Point Road and Bank Street. The primary uses surrounding the study area are residential and commercial. Both parcels are currently undeveloped.
**Purpose:** The goal of the plan is to encourage development of the vacant and underutilized parcels within the study area to create a safe and vibrant pedestrian environment. Multi-family apartments are permitted in the plan while lower density housing is permitted in the R-2 zone. The 2005 Master Plan acknowledges a need for rental housing at a variety of income levels.

**Redevelopment Plan:** A Redevelopment Plan prepared for Bank Street and New Point Road, 30-34 Bank Street (Block 7, Lot 48) and 731-735 New Point Road (Block 7, Lot 562) is dated May 28, 2019, and was adopted by Ordinance No. 5186, approved August 28, 2019.