

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA  
FEBRUARY 20, 2024**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER** by Mary Canesi, Municipal Clerk. This meeting has been properly advertised in the Press of Atlantic City on Saturday, January 6, 2024, and in accordance with Public Law 1975, Chapter 231.

**FLAG SALUTE**

**COUNCIL ROLL CALL:**

Bucci, Carfagno, Dewees, Polistina, Notaro, Smith; Leeds

**MAYOR:** Chau

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – February 6, 2024

**MAYOR’S REPORT**

**CITY ENGINEER’S REPORT**

**PUBLIC SESSION/FIVE MINUTES PER SPEAKER**

**RESOLUTIONS**

- 52-2024**      Memorialize Resignation of Public Works Laborer
- 53-2024**      Acceptance of the Losap Point System and Qualifiers for Members of the Northfield Volunteer Fire Co. #1
- 54-2024**      Authorizing Refund of Zoning Permit Fees
- 55-2024**      Authorizing DeBlasio and Associates, Consulting Engineers, and Planners, to Proceed with Drafting a Geotechnical Report, a Requirement for the Construction of a Pole Barn at the Public Works Garage
- 56-2024**      Promotion to Inspections Department Supervisor
- 57-2024**      Authorizing Refund of Overpayment of Property Taxes
- 58-2024**      Resolution of the City of Northfield, County of Atlantic Opposing Assembly Bill No. 4/Senate Bill No. 50, Which Proposes to Overhaul the Fair Housing Act (“FHA”) in a Way that Imposes Unrealistic Obligations with Unrealistic Deadlines Based Upon Onerous Standards
- 59-2024**      To Approve an Application for Use of Facilities

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA  
FEBRUARY 20, 2024**

**ORDINANCES**

- 2-2024**      Calendar Year 2024 An Ordinance To Exceed The Municipal Budget Appropriation Limits And To Establish A Cap Bank (N.J.S.A. 40a: 4-45.14)  
*2<sup>nd</sup> Reading / Public Hearing / Final Consideration*  
*Published in the Press of AC 02/27/2024*
- 3-2024**      Amending the Municipal Code to Establish a New Chapter 46, Entitled “Municipal Buildings”, and Establishing and Identifying Restricted Areas to Safeguard Records and Property  
*Introduction / No Public Input / Published in the Press of AC 2/27/2024*  
*2<sup>nd</sup> Reading / Public Hearing / Final Consideration 03/12/2024*

**PAYMENT OF BILLS**      \$ 2,565,917.09

**MEETING NOTICES**

City Council Budget Workshop	February 22 <sup>nd</sup> March 7 <sup>th</sup>	4pm 4pm
City Council	March 12 <sup>th</sup>	6pm Work Session Regular Session immediately following

**ADJOURNMENT**

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD  
RESOLUTION NO. 52-2024**

**MEMORIALIZE RESIGNATION OF PUBLIC WORKS LABORER**

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Resolution 38-2023, the Common Council of the City of Northfield approved the hiring of Nicholas Dunn for the position of Public Works Laborer commencing January 18, 2023; and

**WHEREAS**, on February 2, 2024, Nicholas Dunn submitted his notice of resignation to Superintendent of Public Works Vitale with an effective date of February 9, 2024.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Governing Body of the City of Northfield does hereby acknowledge and memorialize the resignation of Nicholas Dunn from the position of Public Works Laborer; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that Nicholas Dunn's last day of work was February 9, 2024.

I, Mary Canesi, Municipal Clerk of the City of Northfield, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at a regular meeting of the City Council of Northfield, held this 20<sup>th</sup> day of February 2024.

---

Mary Canesi, RMC, Municipal Clerk

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD, NJ  
RESOLUTION NO. 53-2024**

**ACCEPTANCE OF THE LOSAP POINT SYSTEM AND QUALIFIERS FOR  
MEMBERS OF THE NORTHFIELD VOLUNTEER FIRE CO. #1**

**WHEREAS**, by Ordinance 13-2001, Northfield Volunteer Fire Co. #1 Length of Service Awards Program Act (LOSAP) for the City of Northfield was created pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:14-183 et seq.; and

**WHEREAS**, the following member of the Northfield Volunteer Fire Co. #1 has met his LOSAP requirements for his 22<sup>nd</sup> YEAR for the period November 1, 2022, through October 31, 2023: Donald M. Morey; and

**WHEREAS**, the following member has qualified for his 21<sup>st</sup> YEAR: Bruce Cummings; and

**WHEREAS**, the following member has qualified for his 20<sup>th</sup> YEAR: Scott Goodman; and

**WHEREAS**, the following member has qualified for his 19<sup>th</sup> YEAR: Kevin Morey; and

**WHEREAS**, the following member has qualified for his 17<sup>th</sup> YEAR: Brian Flaherty; and

**WHEREAS**, the following member has qualified for his 13<sup>th</sup> YEAR Eric Shenkus; and

**WHEREAS**, the following member has qualified for his 8<sup>th</sup> YEAR: Mike Wallace; and

**WHEREAS**, the following members have qualified for their 4<sup>th</sup> YEAR: William Leeds and Bruce Cummings, Jr.; and

**WHEREAS**, the following members have qualified for their 4<sup>th</sup> YEAR: Kirk Kerlin and Cindy Badger; and

**WHEREAS**, the following members have qualified for their 1<sup>st</sup> YEAR: Josh Kirby, Stephen Plettner, and Ryan Clark.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Common Council of the City of Northfield that the qualifiers are accepted as presented in this Resolution, and that the aforementioned members have met the necessary requirements for the year November 1, 2022, through October 31, 2023.

I, MARY CANESI, Municipal Clerk of the City of Northfield, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at a Regular Meeting of the Common Council of the City of Northfield, held this 20th day of February 2024.

---

Mary Canesi, RMC, Municipal Clerk

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD, NJ  
RESOLUTION NO. 54-2024**

**AUTHORIZING REFUND OF ZONING PERMIT FEES**

**WHEREAS**, the owner of block 144 Lot 11 applied for and was issued a Zoning permit for placement of a POD unit on his property at 811 Shore Road, Northfield, and

**WHEREAS**, the owner of block 144 Lot 11 has submitted a request to cancel the Zoning permit for placement of a POD unit, and has requested a refund of applicable fees collected by the City of Northfield, and

**WHEREAS**, the Zoning Officer did collect fees in the amount of \$50.00 for the permit that has been canceled.

**NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED** that the Common Council of the City of Northfield authorizes the refund of \$50.00 to Timothy Joo, 811 Shore Road, Northfield NJ 08225.

I, Mary Canesi, Municipal Clerk of the City of Northfield do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at a Regular Meeting of the Common Council of the City of Northfield, held this 20<sup>th</sup> day of February 2024.

---

Mary Canesi, RMC, Municipal Clerk

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD, NJ  
RESOLUTION NO. 55-2024**

**AUTHORIZING DEBLASIO AND ASSOCIATES CONSULTING  
ENGINEERS AND PLANNERS TO PROCEED WITH DRAFTING A  
GEOTECHNICAL REPORT, A REQUIREMENT FOR THE  
CONSTRUCTION OF A POLE BARN AT THE PUBLIC WORKS  
GARAGE**

**WHEREAS**, DeBlasio and Associates Consulting Engineers and Planners have submitted expenditure requests outlining professional engineering services that will be provided to the City of Northfield; and

**WHEREAS**, copies of said expenditure requests have been provided to the Common Council of the City of Northfield for their review; and

**WHEREAS**, the Common Council has deemed it appropriate to authorize the expenditure of these monies as follows:

<u>Project Description</u>	<u>Estimated Purchase Order Amount</u>
Engineering services – to prepare a geotechnical report as a prerequisite for the construction of a Pole Barn at the Public Works garage; cost estimate is between \$4,300.00 and \$4,600.00	
<b>Not to Exceed</b>	<b>\$4,600.00</b>

**WHEREAS**, certification of funds has been received from the Municipal Finance Officer.

**THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED** by the Common Council of the City of Northfield that this Project is approved as submitted by DeBlasio and Associates Consulting Engineers and Planners.

I, Mary Canesi, Municipal Clerk of the City of Northfield, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at a Regular Meeting of the Common Council of the City of Northfield held this 20<sup>th</sup> day of February 2024.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary Canesi, RMC, Municipal Clerk

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD, NJ  
RESOLUTION NO. 56-2024**

**PROMOTION TO INSPECTIONS DEPARTMENT SUPERVISOR**

**WHEREAS**, Jessica Caramma was hired by the City of Northfield on October 24, 2018, as a substitute Adult School Crossing Guard, and has been continuously employed by the City of Northfield since that date; and

**WHEREAS**, Jessica Caramma was appointed to the position of full-time Technical Assistant to the Construction Official, pursuant to Resolution No. 65-2022, effective February 23, 2022; and

**WHEREAS**, there is a need to fill the position of Inspections Department Supervisor; and

**WHEREAS**, Jessica Caramma is the only full-time employee in the Inspections Department; and

**WHEREAS**, Jessica Caramma has the necessary knowledge, skills, and abilities for the position of Inspections Department Supervisor; and

**WHEREAS**, it is the recommendation of Inspections Department City Council Chairman Tom Polistina and Business Administrator Mary Canesi that Ms. Caramma be promoted to the position of Inspections Supervisor, effective February 21, 2024, at a salary of \$45,500.00 per annum; and

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Common Council of the City of Northfield that Jessica Caramma shall be promoted to the position of Inspections Department Supervisor for the City of Northfield, at a rate of pay of \$45,500.00 per annum, effective February 21, 2024.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the terms and conditions of employment for the Inspections Department Supervisor shall be governed by the Agreement between the City of Northfield, and the Government Workers Union, Local No. 410 for Supervisory Employees.

I, MARY CANESI, Municipal Clerk of the City of Northfield, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at the Regular Meeting of the Common Council of the Council of Northfield, held this 20<sup>th</sup> day of February 2024.

---

Mary Canesi, RMC, Municipal Clerk





**CITY OF NORTHFIELD, NJ  
RESOLUTION NO. 58-2024**

**RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF NORTHFIELD, COUNTY OF  
ATLANTIC OPPOSING ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 4/SENATE BILL NO. 50,  
WHICH PROPOSES TO OVERHAUL THE FAIR HOUSING ACT  
("FHA") IN A WAY THAT IMPOSES UNREALISTIC OBLIGATIONS  
WITH UNREALISTIC DEADLINES BASED UPON ONEROUS  
STANDARDS**

**Mount Laurel II**

**WHEREAS**, in 1983, the Supreme Court decided a landmark case, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel II; and

**WHEREAS**, Mount Laurel II and its progeny generated substantial litigation culminating in the enactment of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act in 1985 ("FHA"); and

**The Fair Housing Act of 1985**

**WHEREAS**, the Legislature enacted the FHA to restore home rule, to bring the fair share numbers back to reality and to reduce the burdens of Mount Laurel compliance; and

**WHEREAS**, more specifically, the FHA sought *to restore home rule* by imposing a moratorium on the builder's remedy and by providing an administrative process that municipalities could voluntarily pursue wherein they would be insulated from developers seeking builder's remedies to try to compel them to capitulate their zoning demands; and

**WHEREAS**, the FHA sought *to bring the fair share numbers back to reality* by among other things defining the prospective need as the need "based on development and growth which is reasonably likely to occur" and by calling for the fair share to be adjusted to a number lower than the fair share formula generated if the municipality lacked sufficient land to satisfy the obligation generated by the fair share formula; and

**WHEREAS**, the FHA sought *to reduce the burdens on municipalities* by prohibiting any requirement for municipalities to expend their own resources to comply; and

## **The New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing**

**WHEREAS**, the FHA created COAH and conferred “primary jurisdiction” on COAH to administer the FHA and to implement the affordable housing policies of our State; and

**WHEREAS**, all acknowledge -- even Fair Share Housing Center (“FSHC”) -- that COAH functioned just fine in Rounds 1 and 2; and

**WHEREAS**, COAH did not adopt valid regulations for Round 3 despite multiple efforts to do so and made no efforts to cure the bottleneck the third time COAH voted 3-3 on Round 3 regulations; and

### **Mount Laurel IV**

**WHEREAS**, in 2015, the Supreme Court issued a decision, commonly referred to as Mount Laurel IV, in response to a motion to transfer the responsibilities of COAH back to the courts in light of COAH’s failure to adopt valid regulations; and

**WHEREAS**, in Mount Laurel IV, the Supreme Court returned the task of implementing the doctrine back to the Courts because COAH had failed to do its job and made no effort to cure the roadblock when it voted 3-3 on the third iteration of Round 3 regulations; and

**WHEREAS**, notwithstanding the foregoing, the Court emphasized that it preferred the administrative remedy created by the FHA to a judicial one and hoped that COAH would be effective so that towns could comply once again through the administrative process created by the FHA; and

**WHEREAS**, the Court process proved to be far more expensive than the COAH process and was ill-suited for resolving comprehensive planning disputes over affordable housing matters; and

**WHEREAS**, the Round 3 process was a disaster with judges pressing municipalities to comply before even establishing the obligations with which they must comply; and

**WHEREAS**, ultimately, on March 8, 2018, after a 41-day trial in Mercer County, Judge Jacobson issued an opinion in which she set forth a fair share methodology; and

**WHEREAS**, in that trial and in various other instances throughout the state, FSHC took the position that the Statewide obligation should exceed 300,000 to be addressed between 2015 and 2025; and

**WHEREAS**, municipalities, through Dr. Robert Powell, presented evidence that, in a best-case scenario, the State could only absorb less than 40,000 affordable units and thus argued that FSHC's calculations was not grounded in reality whatsoever; and

**WHEREAS**, the Court, having been constrained by the Supreme Court to prescriptively utilize a formula from 1993, ultimately concluded that the Statewide obligation to be constructed between 2015-2025 was roughly 153,000 units; and

### **The 354 Settlements with FSHC**

**WHEREAS**, FSHC reports that it entered 354 settlements in Round 3; and

**WHEREAS**, many municipalities are reeling under the burden of satisfying their obligations under those settlements entered between 2015 and 2023; and

**WHEREAS**, many of those Round 3 settlements will result in development during the Round 4 period; and

**WHEREAS**, Round 4 is set to begin on July 1, 2025, and there is no comprehensive analysis on the impacts of the 354 Round 3 settlements and over-zoning described above; and

**WHEREAS**, indeed, the A4/S50 Bill fails to consider the impact from affordable housing projects that were approved during the Third Round, but are still not yet under construction, as said projects, as well as additional future projects, will impact legitimate public concerns like infrastructure, the environment, schools, traffic, parking and open space; and

**WHEREAS**, the Round 3 process destroyed the balance achieved by the Fair Housing Act in 1985; and

### **A-4/S-50**

**WHEREAS**, on December 19, 2023, against the above backdrop, the Housing Committee of the Assembly (a) unveiled the Legislation (A-4) – a detailed 69-page bill that the Chairwoman of the Housing Committee announced had been worked on for a long time; and (b) scheduled the bill for a vote at a hearing scheduled less than 24 hours later; and

**WHEREAS**, on December 19, 2023, the Administrative Office of the Courts wrote to the Legislature and made clear that it could not structure the bill in the manner set forth in the proposed legislation; and

**WHEREAS**, notwithstanding the foregoing, on December 20, 2023, the Housing Committee voted the bill out of the Committee and announced that the bill

needed to be ready for signing by the Governor before the end of the lame duck session on January 8, 2024; and

**WHEREAS**, the perception that the Legislature designed was to adopt the bill before the public had an opportunity to review it and provide meaningful comment was as real as it was unmistakable; and

**WHEREAS**, consequently, the Legislature did not ram the bill through in the lame duck session; and

**WHEREAS**, instead, on January 29, 2024, the Housing Committee of the Assembly met to consider a new version of A-4 and voted to release it out of the Committee; and

**WHEREAS**, on February 8, 2024, as a result of comments, letters and resolutions challenging this new version of A-4, the Appropriations Committee of the Assembly announced a number of changes to the Bill; and

**WHEREAS**, one witness likened the summary presented to the public at the February 8, 2024, Appropriations meeting to that of an auctioneer; and

**WHEREAS**, the Appropriations Committee voted the bill out of the Committee at its February 8, 2024, meeting before the public had an opportunity to even see the changes, much less process their significance and comment on them; and

**WHEREAS**, the bill has been improved marginally as it has evolved from its initial version in December of 2023 to the current version voted out of the Appropriations Committee of the Assembly on February 8, 2024; and

**WHEREAS**, despite elimination of just some of the gross excesses of the prior version of the bill, the current bill released after the February 8, 2024, Appropriations Committee meeting is still severely flawed; and

**WHEREAS**, the Bill still creates a judicial entity made up of 3-7 retired Mount Laurel judges called “The Program”, which, unlike COAH, is not comprised of an equal number of municipal and housing representatives, and is not made up of an equal number of Republicans and Democrats, thereby depriving the citizens of our State of the carefully crafted COAH Board that included a diversity of interests and that was the centerpiece of the FHA adopted in 1985; and

**WHEREAS**, the Bill still does not require the promulgation of affordable housing obligations, or the adoption of substantive regulations, in a way that utilizes an open and transparent process that COAH used and that gave all interested parties an opportunity to comment and receive COAH’s response to their comments; and

**WHEREAS**, as detailed below, the bill creates a patently unreasonable responsibility on municipalities by imposing an obligation on them to create a realistic opportunity for satisfaction of a fair share that is itself unrealistic; and

**WHEREAS**, the current version still details the methodology to be used for determining the fair share numbers of municipalities in Round 4 and in subsequent rounds; and

**WHEREAS**, the current version still presumes that 40 percent of all new households will qualify as low or moderate; and

**WHEREAS**, the current version still calls for the determination of the prospective need by subtracting the number of households reported in the 2010 Decennial Census from the number of households reported in the 2020 Decennial Census and multiplying that figure by 40 percent; and

**WHEREAS**, we calculate the statewide need number to be 84,690 based upon the formula set forth in the bill; and

**WHEREAS**, the current version of the Bill calls for 84,690 to be adjusted by the number of conversions and demolitions; and

**WHEREAS**, the statewide fair share would be increased from 84,690 to 96,780, if we assume the same number of demolitions and conversions used by Judge Jacobson in her formula for Round 3 that will apply in Round 4; and

**WHEREAS**, we can estimate the obligation of each municipality if we assume that the same percentage of the regional need in Round 3 for each municipality applies in Round 4; and

**WHEREAS**, we have widely distributed our estimates and invited input after acknowledging that we have done the best we can to formulate estimates in very limited time; and

**WHEREAS**, other than an analysis of the allocation factors by an expert for the American Planning Association (Creigh Rahenkamp) who identified problems with the allocation factors, nobody has accepted our invitation to review and comment on our rough estimates; and

**WHEREAS**, to the contrary, the Executive Director of Fair Share Housing Center testified that he did not have a calculation of the fair share numbers; and

**WHEREAS**, more importantly, no committee of the Assembly or Senate has identified the fair share obligations municipalities should expect based upon the formula set forth in the bill; and

**WHEREAS**, the 96,780 fair share number estimated for Round 4 compares to the roughly 211,000 COs issued between 2010 and 2020; and

**WHEREAS**, the 96,780 fair share number divided by 211,000 COs equals roughly 46 percent (45.867 percent to be more precise); and

**WHEREAS**, all municipalities should be able to cure any violations of the prohibition against exclusionary zoning with inclusionary zoning; and

**WHEREAS**, traditional inclusionary zoning ordinances generally require no more than 20 percent of the units to be affordable; and

**WHEREAS**, it is mathematically impossible to satisfy a 46 percent problem with a 20 percent solution and, therefore, the number generated by the statutory formula is patently excessive; and

**WHEREAS**, while this mathematical error conceptually may have existed at COAH, COAH utilized its discretion to reduce the statewide number to roughly 5,000 units per year in Rounds 1-2 (or lower for prospective need in its attempted regulations in 2014); and

**WHEREAS**, in addition, COAH's Round 2 regulations had flexible standards, Regional Contribution Agreements (RCAs), an achievable bonus structure, waivers and other flexible standards to further mitigate the problem; and

**WHEREAS**, had COAH not mitigated the problem, it is likely that the regulations would have been challenged by municipalities; and

**WHEREAS**, as detailed below, the Bill still fails to account for the enormous burdens on municipalities to comply with their Round 3 obligations before imposing very substantial additional burdens on those 354 municipalities for Round 4; and

**WHEREAS**, a representative of FSHC testified that it has entered into 354 settlements and that it would furnish those settlements to the Housing Committee, which it has failed to do; and

**WHEREAS**, we have pressed FSHC to advise how much development will take place in Round 4 as a result of municipalities implementing the 354 settlements reached in Round 3; and

**WHEREAS**, Adam Gordon on behalf of FSHC has indicated he doesn't know the answer to this question and no committee of the Assembly or Senate has even hinted at what the answer might be; and

**WHEREAS**, the Bill requires municipalities to create a realistic opportunity for satisfaction of a fair share without taking into account how many affordable units can realistically be achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning (where generally one out of every five units must be affordable); and

**WHEREAS**, we also sought to ascertain how many affordable units could be realistically achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning by urging the Legislature to do a market study since the strength of the housing market will determine the number of market units that can reasonably be anticipated that are essential to generating one affordable unit for every four market units constructed; and

**WHEREAS**, the Legislature has not furnished a market study in response to our repeated emphasis on the need for one to ascertain how many affordable units could be realistically achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning; and

**WHEREAS**, as explained below, the bill dilutes the protections to which a municipality is currently entitled as it seeks to comply voluntarily and even after it secures approval of its affordable housing plan; and

**WHEREAS**, current laws preserve a municipality's immunity in the absence of proof that the municipality is "determined to be constitutionally noncompliant", the proposed bill does not give municipalities seeking to comply voluntarily the same measure of protection the Supreme Court deemed appropriate; and

**WHEREAS** A4/S50 subjects municipalities to litigation not only as they seek approval of their Housing Element and Fair Share Plans, but also even after they secure approval of those plans; and

**WHEREAS**, more specifically, A4/S50 provides municipalities a "compliance certification" if the municipality secures approval of its affordable housing plan; however, that certification does not prevent an interested party from "alleging that, despite the issuance of compliance certification, a municipality's fair share obligation, fair share plan, housing element, or ordinances implementing the fair share plan or housing element are in violation of the Mount Laurel doctrine"; and

**WHEREAS, the Bill suffers from a myriad of additional flaws; and**

**WHEREAS**, under current laws, a municipality would have a right to rely on the fair share number that COAH provides; however, under the new bill a municipality would only have a presumption of validity that the number the DCA provides to the municipality is appropriate and FSHC, a deep pocketed developer or any other interested party could seek to overcome that presumption through litigation; and

**WHEREAS**, the A4/S50 Bill replaces a straightforward system by which a municipality could secure bonus credits up to a 25 percent cap with a highly complicated system for securing bonuses with many conditions attached to various forms of bonus.; and

**WHEREAS**, the Legislature previously capped the fair share of any municipality down to 1,000 in recognition that any obligation above 1,000 would be “onerous”; A4/S50 applies the 1,000-unit cap only to a component of the municipality’s fair share -- the prospective need – and authorizes the imposition of an obligation that is onerous; and

**WHEREAS**, the A4/S50 Bill creates unfair requirements and ambiguity when it comes to the Vacant Land Adjustment process, which could lead to municipalities that lack sufficient vacant land being required to produce more affordable housing units than is practical; and

**WHEREAS**, the A4/S50 Bill includes many other provisions and changes to the FHA that are impractical and devoid of any consideration of the burdens created by the statute; and

**WHEREAS**, as a result of the facts set forth above, a bill that boasts of its effectiveness in reducing costs and litigation will clearly have the exact opposite effect; and

**WHEREAS**, in addition to all the concerns expressed above, a bill that so radically changes the affordable housing laws of our state still needs considerable work; and

**WHEREAS**, indeed, as the following facts demonstrate, the Legislature has yet to do the most fundamental due diligence before enacting a statute with such broad ramifications;

1. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the fair share obligations the bill, if enacted, would impose on the public;
2. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the obligations that municipalities will satisfy in Round 4 from the 354 settlements achieved in Round 3 before heaping substantial additional burdens on them for Round 4;
3. The Legislature has not and cannot inform the public of the number of affordable units that can realistically be achieved through traditional inclusionary zoning while imposing obligations on municipalities to create a realistic opportunity for a fair share that far exceeds any number a municipality can realistically achieve through inclusionary zoning; and



**WHEREAS**, as a result of the pronounced lack of due diligence, the bill will likely force taxes to increase dramatically and will foster serious overdevelopment creating unreasonable burdens on our schools, public services, roads, sewer and water infrastructure; and

**WHEREAS**, the Legislature clearly can and should upgrade the affordable housing policies of our State; however, the current Version of A4 is not the answer and the most fundamental diligence can and should be exercised before adopting such a bill.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that for all of the above reasons, the Common Council of the City of Northfield objects to and opposes Assembly Bill No. 4/Senate Bill No. 50, and requests that the bill be tabled, re-written and re-introduced in way that imposes achievable obligations and facilitates the ability of the municipality to satisfy its obligations.

A certified copy of this resolution shall be sent to the Legislators in the State Assembly and Senate representing our District immediately.

I, MARY CANESI, Municipal Clerk of the City of Northfield, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at a Regular Meeting of the Common Council of the City of Northfield, held this 20th day of February 2024.

---

Mary Canesi, RMC, Municipal Clerk

**CITY OF NORTHFIELD, NJ  
RESOLUTION NO. 59-2024**

**TO APPROVE AN APPLICATION FOR USE OF FACILITIES**

**WHEREAS**, on behalf of 'Sportz Farm Foundation – Academic and Athletic Resources', Ms Brittany Tavares has properly submitted an Application for Use of Facilities for the 2024 season requesting use of City of Northfield athletic fields, for a football camp/tournament for ages 7-13 as follows:

<p><u>The City of Northfield Football Field</u> Wednesday - Friday, from March 27th – March 29th 7:30am -4:30pm</p>
---

**WHEREAS**, the Football Field restroom facilities are operational on a weather-dependent, seasonal basis and are currently closed for the season; and

**WHEREAS**, Sportz Farm Foundation must provide port-o-pots at their own expense until such time as restroom facilities are open for the season; and

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Common Council of the City of Northfield hereby approves the Application for Use of Facilities presented by Ms Brittany Tavares on behalf of Sportz Farm Foundation, subject to the full execution of the Use of Facilities Agreement, and compliance with its terms and conditions, the terms and conditions of this Resolution and the current Use of Facilities Guidelines and the representations made in the subject Applications for Use of Facilities.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the football field is presently open to the public, however, the decision to open and or close the facilities to the public for use shall be solely at the discretion of the City of Northfield; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, the approval granted pursuant to this Resolution may be rescinded at any time at the sole discretion of the City of Northfield.

I, MARY CANESI, Municipal Clerk of the City of Northfield, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted at a Regular Meeting of the Common Council of the City of Northfield, held this 20th day of February 2024.

---

Mary Canesi, RMC, Municipal Clerk



CITY OF NORTHFIELD
Application for Use of Facilities
(Other than Use of Birch Grove Park Center)

Name and Address of Organization:

Sportz Farm Foundation, Academic and Athletic Resources

Tell Us Who You Are / Description and Purpose of Organization: The purpose of this camp / tournament is to teach kids that being an athlete and an academic scholar can excel you throughout life.

Is the Group a Not-For-Profit Organization? [checked] Yes [ ] No

Do Participants Pay a Fee for Your Sport / Event? [checked] Yes [ ] No

If Yes, How Much? \$ 600 per: [ ] Person [ ] Day [ ] Season per team (other)

Name of Applicant / Responsible Party: Brittany Tavares Title/Affiliation: Team Manager

Home Address: 880 N Virginia Ave, Apt G, Atlantic City NJ 08401

Telephone: (H) [redacted] (C) [redacted] (W) [redacted]

Name and Location of Facility(ies) Being Requested: Cardinals Football Field

For the Following Purpose: Football Camp / Tournament

on the Following Date(s): March 27th - March 29th

Specify Hours of Use: From: 7:30a To: 4:30p Are Field Lights Requested\*? No

\*If Yes, Provide Dates / Times for Requested Light Use: N/A

LIGHT USE FEE APPLIES IN ACCORDANCE WITH CHAPTER 250-3 OF THE CITY OF NORTHFIELD MUNICIPAL CODE

# of Participants per Date: 20 teams # of Participants who are Northfield Residents: 0

Will Juveniles be Present? Yes [checked] No [ ] If Yes, What Ages? 7 yrs - 13 yrs

Have You Applied to Other Municipalities for Use of their Facilities for this Event? [checked] Yes [ ] No

If Yes, Name of Municipality/ies: Atlantic City Dolphins Field

Date/s and Disposition of Request/s: Chelsea Soccer, Atlantic City

Applicant has received a copy of the City of Northfield Use of Facilities Guidelines, Use of Facilities Agreement and City of Northfield "Protection and Safe Treatment of Minors" Policy and agrees to abide by and comply with the terms of the Guidelines, Policy, and Agreement. Applicant further acknowledges that IF THE INTENDED USE IS FOR ANY ATHLETIC FIELD, s/he must obtain from the Municipal Clerk's Office the date/time of the Council Meeting at which the Application will be considered, and attendance at same is required in order for the Application to be heard.

NO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES PERMITTED

APPLICANT: [Signature] M DATE: 02.14.2024
Signature: Tavares Brittany 306@gmail.com

Note: The City of Northfield has the right, in its sole discretion, to deny, limit, or revoke the use of requested facility(ies) when in the opinion of the City of Northfield the use presents a risk of unreasonable injury to persons or damage to property of the City of Northfield or others.

# ENGINEER'S REPORT

# DEBLASIO & ASSOCIATES

CONSULTING ENGINEERS AND PLANNERS

4701 NEW JERSEY AVENUE • WILDWOOD, NJ 08260

PHONE: 609-854-3311 • FAX: 609-854-4323

## Engineer's Report

**To:** Mayor & Council  
City of Northfield

**From:** Marc DeBlasio, P.E., P.P., C.M.E.  
City Engineer

**Cc:** Mary Canesi, Clerk (via email)  
Dawn Stollenwerk, CFO (via email)  
Qwin Vitale, Superintendent of Public Works (via email)

**Date:** February 20, 2024

### **Grant Applications**

1. FY2024 NJDCA Local Recreation Improvement Grant (LRIG)
  - The New Jersey Department of Community Affairs has announced that they are accepting LRIG applications and the submission deadline is February 27, 2024.
2. USDA Water and Waste Disposal-Predevelopment Planning Grant (PPG)
  - USDA is requesting updated financial information from the City to finalize their evaluation.

### **Engineering**

1. Drainage Issue at 2320 Cedarbridge Road:
  - On February 9, Marc DeBlasio met with Qwin Vitale to assess drainage issues at 2320 Cedarbridge Road.
  - It was determined that the property lies at a low point within the drainage area.
  - Recommended short term solutions include constructing an earthen berm at the driveway and cleaning and inspecting storm sewer inlets and pipe.
  - Long term solutions include evaluating the storm sewer system and installing larger pipes and/or drainage facilities, and the installation of curbing along the roadway.

2. Geotechnical Study for Department of Public Works Pole Barn:

- Our office submitted a proposal via email on February 6, 2014 to prepare the report. Upon authorization from the City, we are prepared to start work immediately.

3. Sidewalk Ordinance

- DeBlasio and Associates was asked to review and make revisions to the sidewalk ordinance. Upon further discussion with the City, a proposal will be forthcoming.