



Clarke Caton Hintz
Architects
Planners
Landscape Architects

Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan Amendment – Planning Incentive Grant Program

Station Place
100 Barrack Street
Trenton NJ 08608
clarkecatonhintz.com
Tel: 609 883 8383
Fax: 609 883 4044

Mannington Township
Salem County, New Jersey

Philip Caton, FAICP
John Hatch, FAIA
George Hibbs, AIA
Brian Slaugh, AICP
Michael Sullivan, AICP

Adopted June 9, 2016

Emeriti
John Clarke, FAIA
Carl Hintz, AICP, ASLA



Clarke Caton Hintz

Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan Amendment – Planning Incentive Grant Program


Mannington Township
Salem County, New Jersey

Adopted June 9, 2016

Prepared for the Mannington Township Joint Land Use Board by

Clarke Caton Hintz

Philip B. Caton, PP, FAICP



NJ PP #1829

Andrea Malcolm, PP, AICP



NJ PP #5319

A signed and sealed version of this report is available at the Mannington Township municipal building.



INTRODUCTION

On July 8, 2010, the Township adopted a Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan in accordance with the criteria for the Planning Incentive Grant program and the State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC) guidelines for developing a Municipal Comprehensive Farmland Plan.

Mannington Township is one of New Jersey's leading agricultural communities. The Township has the State's fourth highest amount of farmland-assessed property, with 75% of its landmass devoted to agriculture. As of November 2015, there were over 9,400 acres of preserved farmland and agriculturally compatible open space in Mannington. All of the preserved farm management units were 50 acres or larger in size.

The 2010 Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan document addressed both the SADC guidelines for developing a Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan and MLUL requirements for a Farmland Preservation Plan element. However, the 2010 plan did not include language regarding a Planning Incentive Grant (PIG) program for Mannington because Mannington had not yet begun a PIG grant program.

This amendment of the Township's 2010 Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan is intended to acknowledge and incorporate the 2015 Mannington Township Municipal Planning Incentive Grant program as part of the Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan. Specifically, the amendment revises Section V, "Future Farmland Preservation Program" of the 2010 Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan, Subsection B "Project Area Summaries" to include a summary of the 2015 Municipal Planning Incentive Grant program, and clarifies and updates Section V, Subsections C and D of regarding minimum eligibility and ranking criteria for farmland preservation as indicated below.

SECTION V. Future Farmland Preservation Program

B. PROJECT AREA SUMMARIES

Mannington Township's success at preserving farmland has historically focused on acquiring easements on the "biggest and the best" farm management units. As the preservation program's success has grown to include over 9,400 acres of preserved lands, the Township's leaders have identified many valuable smaller parcels of land which if developed could fragment the large contiguous base of preserved lands causing detrimental effects to the agricultural industry. These smaller parcels are at a



Clarke Caton Hintz

competitive disadvantage for preservation funding due to heavy ranking criterion for large size and prime soils.

In 2015, Mannington Township added a Planning Incentive Grant (PIG) Program to its municipal farmland preservation program, which was designed specifically to provide an alternative means of funding these “infill” farmland parcels for preservation. The PIG Program focuses on farms between 10 – 50 acres in size, located within the “Mannington Project Area.” which encompasses the entire Township, with the exception of MR, LC, GC and I zoned-areas along the Route 45 corridor. (See accompanying Project Area Target Farm map.).

Each year municipalities must submit an updated Project Area Summary and Planning Incentive Grant Application in order to be eligible for continued funding under the PIG program. These annual summaries supplement the information in the Farmland Preservation Plan Element, during the 10 year master plan reexamination interval, with up to date estimates of easement costs, acreage targets, and acquisition goals.

The 2015 PIG Grant Application (2016 funding cycle) Project Area Summary identified 47 parcels totaling 1,140.45 acres at an estimated easement cost of \$6000.00 per acre. Easement estimates fluctuate widely with the real estate market, and the yearly estimates must not be taken out of context. The Project Area Summary estimates and targets are designed to aid in sound planning for preservation and are not binding in any way upon the municipality or the SADC. The SADC does not accept incremental amendments to the Project Area Summaries, target list, or PIG application during the year. Accordingly, the Project Area Summary and PIG application can be amended to include new farms in the next year’s cycle. Mannington Township’s current PIG application remains unchanged for the SADC PIG 2017 funding cycle.

The 2015 PIG Grant Application and Project Area Summary, and Project Area Target Farm map are appended to this document for reference.

C. MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA COORDINATION

The SADC’s rules at *N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.20* set forth minimum eligibility criteria for all farms participating in farmland preservation programs, including farms preserved through the PIG program. The Township coordinates with the Salem CADB to ensure that farmland preservation applications are consistent with the SADC minimum eligibility criteria. In terms of eligibility criteria pertaining to farm size, the Salem CADB has utilized a 25 acre minimum eligibility requirement in developing its target farm list, whereas the Township’s PIG program targets farms that are 10 – 50 acres in size, as a



Clarke Caton Hintz

way to supplement the SADC and CADB preservation programs which focus on larger farms.

D. MUNICIPAL RANKING CRITERIA TO PRIORITIZE FARMS

With the exception of the 10 – 50 acre size criterion utilized for its PIG program, Mannington relies upon the Salem CADB criteria for ranking farmland preservation applications, including soil quality, percent of tillable acres, boundaries and buffers criterion to protect the integrity of the individual application and/or project area, and the density of preserved farms (and farms within the 8-year program) within one-half mile. In addition to these criteria, the CADB also considers local commitment criterion examining zoning, the absence of growth leading infrastructure, consistency with municipal plans, active participation in the Agricultural Retention and Development Program, and /or the adoption of a Right-To-Farm ordinance and other ordinances that support agriculture.

Salem County Agriculture Development Board Ranking Criteria:

Acreage (5 points):

- 301 or more = 5 points
- 201 to 300 acres = 4 points
- 101 to 200 acres = 3 points
- 51 to 100 acres = 2 points
- 10 to 50 acres = 1 point

Sub Total = _____

Soils (30 points)

- Percent of Prime _____% x .30 = _____ points
- Percent of Statewide _____% x .20 = _____ points
- Percent of Local _____% x .10 = _____ points
- Percent of Other _____% x 0 = _____ points

Sub Total = _____

Tillable (15 points)

- 80 to 100% = 15 points
- 60 to 79% = 10 points
- 40 to 59% = 08 points
- 20 to 39% = 05 points
- 0 to 19% = 01 point

Sub Total = _____



COMPREHENSIVE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLAN AMENDMENT

Clarke Caton Hintz

Boundaries and Buffers (20 points)

| | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Deed restricted farmland | _____ % x .20 = _____ points |
| Deed restricted Wildlife Areas | _____ % x .18 = _____ points |
| Eight year program | _____ % x .13 = _____ points |
| Farmland (Unrestricted) | _____ % x .06 = _____ points |
| Streams & Wetlands | _____ % x .18 = _____ points |
| Parks (limited public access) | _____ % x .14 = _____ points |
| Parks (high public use) | _____ % x .05 = _____ points |
| Military Installations | _____ % x .14 = _____ points |
| Limited Access Highways & RR's | _____ % x .10 = _____ points |
| Public Golf Courses | _____ % x .14 = _____ points |
| Residential Development | _____ % x .00 = _____ 0 points |
| Other | _____ % x .00 = _____ 0 points |

Sub Total = _____

Density (10 points)

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| Preserved farms within 1/2 mile | = 2 points (each) |
| Eight year farms within 1/2 mile | = 1 point (each) |

Sub Total = _____

Local Commitment (10 points)

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Absence of sewer hook-up | = 3 points |
| Township Right to Farm Ordinance | = 4 points |
| Active Municipal Liaison with CADB | = 1 point |
| Previous purchased easements | = 1 point |
| Municipal Financial Support | = 1 point |

Sub Total = _____

Special Consideration (10 points)

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Create a New Project Area | = 5 points |
| Historic Structures | = 1 point |
| Eight year program participation | = 3 points |
| Environment significance | = 1 point |

Sub Total = _____

Exceptions

| | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Non-Severable Exception | = 0 points |
| Additional Non-Severable Exception | = -5 points (Each) |

Sub Total = _____

TOTAL = _____



Municipal Planning Incentive Grant **APPLICATION**

Municipality: Mannington
County: Salem

STATE AGRICULTURE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Farmland Preservation Program Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Program 2016 Planning Round

For information regarding the Planning Incentive Grant Program please reference the following statutes and regulations:

- Agriculture Retention and Development Act – N.J.S.A 4:1C-11, et seq.
- Planning Incentive Grant Statute – N.J.S.A. 4:1C-43.1
- Farmland Preservation Program Regulations – N.J.A.C. 2:76
 - Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Regulations – N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A

For additional questions please contact the SADC at (609) 984-2504.

GRANT ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

All checklist items are required prerequisites for Municipal Planning Incentive Grant eligibility.
See N.J.A.C. 2:76-17.3

- 1. **Establishment of an agricultural advisory committee.**
- 2. **A Municipal Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan developed in accordance with N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.4 and SADC Guidelines for Developing Municipal Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plans**
- 3. **Establishment and maintenance of a dedicated source of funding for farmland preservation, including but not limited to:**
 - A Dedicated Tax
 - Repeated Annual Appropriations
 - Repeated Issuance of Bonded Indebtedness
 - Other (*Please describe*)
- 4. **Adoption of a right-to-farm ordinance** (*attach copy*)

SUBMISSION REQUIREMENT CHECKLIST

All checklist items are required for administrative completeness of this application.
Submissions must be received by the SADC by December 16, 2013.

- 1. **Completed Municipal Planning Incentive Grant application**
 - 2. **If new or amended, a Municipal Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan, that conforms to SADC Guidelines for Developing Municipal Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plans, submitted in both hardcopy and electronic format.**
 - 3. **A Municipal Planning Incentive Grant Project Area Summary Form for each identified project area**
 - 4. **Digital files of the following in an ArcGIS format or best available:**
 - **Project areas**
 - **Targeted farms**
 - **Preserved Farmland**
 - **Farms with municipal, county and/or SADC final approval**
 - **Other deed restricted farmland**
 - **Farms enrolled in an eight-year program**
 - **Other preserved open space compatible with agriculture**
- ArcGIS files are to be drawn in New Jersey State Plane Coordinate System coordinates (feet), projected in the North American Datum of 1983 (NAD83).*
- 5. **Proof of notification to county.** *See N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.6 (b)*
 - 6. **Current agriculture advisory committee member list.**

APPLICATION INFORMATION:

Municipal PIG Administrator (Primary Contact): Donald C. Asay

Address: 491 Route 45

City: Mannington

State: NJ Zip Code: 08079

Email: dasay@manningtontp.com

Phone: 856-935-2359

Fax: 856-935-6557

Project Areas:

For each project area please attach a completed Project Area Summary Form.

Add additional rows as needed.

| Project Area Name | Project Area Aggregate Size (Acres) | Project Area Density (%) | Total # of Targeted Farms | Total Acreage of Targeted Farms | Targeted Farm Soil Productivity (%) | Total Estimated Cost For Targeted Farm Easement Purchase |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| Mannington 1 | 22,627.35 | 41.54% | 47 | 1,140.45 | 77.23% | \$6,842,700 |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Project Area Totals | | | | | | |
| Total Project Area Acreage | | Total # of Targeted Farms | | Total Acreage of Targeted Farms | | Total Estimated Cost |
| 22,627.35 | | 47 | | 1140.45 | | \$6,842,700 |

Preservation Goals:

1. One Year Target: 25 Acres; Number of farms: 1
2. Five Year Target: 125 Acres; Number of farms: 5
3. Ten Year Target: 250 Acres; Number of farms: 10

MUNICIPAL POLICY INFORMATION:

If the answer is YES to the following and the amendment has been made since last year's submittal, please attach a copy of the adopted policy, resolution or ordinance of the Agriculture Advisory Committee or municipal governing body pertaining to the question. A NO answer is acknowledgement that the municipality relies upon SADC policy or regulation.

The word "policy" is intended broadly to include formal and informal policies, guidelines and rules established by the municipality.

Minimum Eligibility Criteria:

Does the municipality have a minimum eligibility criteria or standards policy for solicitation and approval of applications for farmland preservation? *See SADC regulation N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.20*

Yes No

If yes, has the policy been amended since last year's submittal? Yes No

Municipal Ranking Criteria:

Does the municipality have a ranking criteria policy to prioritize farms for preservation funding?
See SADC regulation N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.16 & SADC Policy P-14E

Yes No

If yes, has the policy been amended since last year's submittal? Yes No

Agricultural Labor Housing:

Does the municipality have a policy on agricultural labor housing for preserved farms?

Yes No

If yes, has the policy been amended since last year's submittal? Yes No

House Replacement:

Does the municipality have a policy for replacement of a residence on preserved farmland?

Yes No

If yes, has the policy been amended since last year's submittal? Yes No

Residual Dwelling Site Opportunity Allocation:

Does the municipality have a policy for the allocation of Residual Dwelling Site Opportunities?
See SADC regulation N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.17 and Policy P-28

Yes No

If yes, has the policy been amended since last year's submittal? Yes No

Exemptions:

Does the municipality have a policy for the granting of severable and non-severable exceptions?
See SADC Policy P-29

Yes No

If yes, has the policy been amended since last year's submittal? Yes No

Other Policies:

Does the municipality have other policies related to farmland preservation?

Yes No

If Yes, please list and describe:

FUNDING INFORMATION:

Municipal Funding:

Please check all that apply:

Municipal dedicated open space/farmland preservation tax: \$0.02 / \$100

o Annual revenue generated from dedicated tax: \$43,000

o Annual tax revenue dedicated to farmland preservation: \$43,000

Repeated annual appropriations dedicated to farmland preservation:

Please describe: \$1,000-\$5,000

Repeated Issuance of Bonded Indebtedness:

Please describe:

Other funding sources:

Please describe:

Total annual revenue dedicated to farmland preservation by the municipality: \$44,000 -\$48,000

Installment Purchase Agreements:

If the answer is YES to any of the following, please attach a copy of the adopted AAC policy or resolution explaining the municipal installment purchase program.

Does the municipality permit the use of installment purchase agreements?

Yes No

Does the municipality currently use installment purchase agreements?

Yes No

Installment Purchase Agreements are: *(Please check all that apply)*

Always required

Required on a case by case basis

Available on a voluntary basis

Cost Projections Associated with One, Five and Ten Year Goals: *(see page C for established goals)*

| Year | Acquisition Goal (Acres) | Total Projected Cost | Estimated Local Cost Share | Estimated County Cost Share | Estimated State Cost Share | Other Contributors |
|------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | 25 | \$150,000 | \$30,000 | \$30,000 | \$90,000 | |
| 5 | 125 | \$750,000 | \$150,000 | \$150,000 | \$450,000 | |
| 10 | 250 | \$1,500,000 | \$300,000 | \$300,000 | \$900,000 | |

Estimate of Easement Purchase Cost on All Targeted Farms:

Add additional rows as needed.

| Project Area Name | Acres | Average Easement Price per Acre | Total Estimated Project Cost | Total Estimated Municipal Funding | Total Estimated County Funding | Total Estimated State Funding | Total Estimated Funding from Other Sources |
|-------------------|---------|---------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Mannington 1 | 1140.45 | \$6,000 | \$6,842,700 | \$1,368,540 | \$1,368,540 | \$4,105,620 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Targeted Farm Totals

| Total Acreage | Total Estimated Cost for Targeted Farm Easement Purchase | Total Estimated Municipal Funding | Total Estimated County Funding | Total Estimated State Funding | Total Estimated Funding from Other Sources |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 1140.45 | \$6,842,700 | \$1,368,540 | \$1,368,540 | \$4,105,620 | |

How was the cost of purchasing development easements on the targeted farms determined?

- Existing appraisal data
- Appraisal of the entire project area
- Other

If Other, please describe: Midpoint of range of estimated average cost/acre in Salem County (\$4,000 - \$8,000/per acre, per Kris Alexander, Salem CADB)



Municipal Planning Incentive Grant PROJECT AREA SUMMARY FORM

Project Area: Mannington 1
Municipality: Mannington
County: Salem

1. PROJECT AREA INVENTORY: *(See N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.5(a)1)*

- i. **Targeted Farms**
Add additional rows as needed.

| Owner / Farm Name (if known) | Block | Lot | Acres |
|---------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Spina | 1 | 5 | 38.56 |
| Catalano | 2 | 11 | 11.95 |
| Catalano | 3 | 1 | 20.31 |
| Faris | 3 | 4.01 | 14.91 |
| Catalano | 3 | 7 | 49.15 |
| Kiger | 3 | 19 | 28.09 |
| Moore | 4 | 12 | 25.80 |
| Tufts | 4 | 12.01 | 19.92 |
| Holloday | 4 | 14 | 20.54 |
| Van Dover | 4 | 17 | 42.24 |
| Griscom | 5 | 6 | 23.17 |

| | | | |
|-----------|----|-------|-------|
| Starr | 5 | 7 | 19.89 |
| Frahm | 8 | 8 | 15.43 |
| Burkert | 8 | 9 | 10.91 |
| Rahaim | 13 | 1 | 14.34 |
| Mancuso | 15 | 4.02 | 24.22 |
| Hooper | 17 | 15 | 16.05 |
| Johansson | 17 | 28.01 | 23.43 |
| Kroll | 18 | 4 | 30.58 |
| Simpson | 18 | 9 | 36.19 |
| Eddis | 20 | 22 | 28.54 |
| Butler | 20 | 22.01 | 19.17 |
| Allen | 21 | 4 | 10.44 |
| Sloat | 21 | 12 | 49.52 |
| Gaudiosi | 22 | 11 | 15.36 |
| Catalano | 25 | 2 | 28.35 |
| Catalano | 25 | 9 | 45.51 |
| Sparks | 25 | 21 | 16.93 |
| Marano | 28 | 1 | 39.91 |
| Meadows | 28 | 6 | 16.49 |
| Catalano | 28 | 7 | 36.18 |

B

| | | | |
|----------------------|----|-------|-------|
| Messick | 28 | 9 | 13.28 |
| Pierson | 39 | 18 | 26.16 |
| Stecher | 39 | 18.01 | 23.80 |
| Vittori | 39 | 20 | 14.26 |
| Kelley | 40 | 12 | 16.43 |
| Duffy | 40 | 16.04 | 24.01 |
| Colameco | 42 | 1 | 16.66 |
| Frank Frichera Farms | 45 | 5 | 15.19 |
| Ackley | 50 | 8.01 | 12.14 |
| Waddington | 53 | 29 | 12.65 |
| Gaum | 55 | 2 | 42.12 |
| Murphy | 57 | 4 | 34.38 |
| Dare | 57 | 5 | 12.20 |
| Jannetti | 58 | 2 | 40.94 |
| Wyshinski | 58 | 5 | 16.67 |
| Jenkins | 59 | 6 | 26.69 |

Total Acreage of Targeted Farms:

1140.45

ii. Farms with Municipal, County and/or SADC Final Approval:

Add additional rows as needed.

| Owner / Farm Name | Block | Lot | Acres |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Dunham | 20 | 21.01 | 38.56 |

| | | | |
|---------|------|------|--------|
| Mahoney | 40 | 6.02 | 28.35 |
| Moore | 5;21 | 4;8 | 154.49 |

Total Acreage of Farms with Municipal, County or SADC Final Approval: 221.41

iii. Preserved Farmland
Add additional rows as needed.

| Owner / Farm Name | Block | Lot | Acres |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------------------------|---------|
| Barbara, E.&L. | 14 | 7,10,11,19, 14,16,26 | 112.916 |
| Battiano, J. | 23 | 13 | 116.042 |
| Catalano, J. | 2 | 8,12 | 145.111 |
| Culver Farms | 38; 50 | 3, 4; 11, 13, 14.01 | 191.832 |
| D&R Greenway/Carpenter, A. & C. | 39 | 12 | 67.601 |
| D&R Greenway/Carpenter | 38;48 | 14;8 | 177.017 |
| D&R Greenway/Carpenter | 23 | 15 | 26.099 |
| D&R Greenway/Sparks | 62: 64 | 3,4;8 | 139.166 |
| DiGregario, R.S. | 3 | 17,19 | 76.497 |
| Doak, J.&C. | 9;11;12 | 18; 3; 1,2,5, 6 | 160.32 |
| Dolbow, W. Sr. | 42; 45 | 5; 7 | 126.590 |
| Emel, R. D. & I. | 20; 21 | 7,8; 15,16 | 207.370 |
| Emel, D. & I. | 20; 21 | 9; 14 | 52.994 |
| Geck, A. | 4 | 16, 16.01 | 172.376 |
| Greenacre Mannington | 21 | 11 | 94.738 |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------|
| Griscom, A. & R. | 45; 47 | 17; 14, 15 | 108.195 |
| Hancock, W., III (#2) | 50 | 8 | 75.272 |
| Hancock, W. Jr. | 50 | 32 | 107.256 |
| Hancock, W. Jr. (#1) | 50 | 20 | 74.932 |
| Hancock, W. Jr. (#2) | 50 | 18 | 10.205 |
| Hancock, W. Jr. & M. | 23 | 11 | 94.09 |
| Kroll | 19; 20 | 6; 18,21 | 90.624 |
| Myers Family Irrevocable Trust | 40; 18 | 6.01, 6.03; 11 | 109.427 |
| Myers, H. & E. | 4; 24 | 6,7; 14 | 250.680 |
| NJCF/Fichera Farm | 31; 32; 34;35; 36 | 4; 9; 3, 12; 1; 7, 9 | 278.814 |
| Pappas, Z. | 18 | 2 | 151.345 |
| Paruuszski, J. | 15; 18 | 4.01; 8 | 56.669 |
| Richmond, J. & M. | 20; 21 | 2, 2.02; 1 | 94.090 |
| Robinson, S. | 45; 53 | 10, 13, 16; 31 | 147.380 |
| Robinson, Scott & Valerie | 53 | 29.01, 28, 32 | 116.539 |
| Salem Farms Corp #1 | 21 | 5 | 367.645 |
| Salem Farms Corp #2 | 4; 22 | 9; 2, 4, 12 | 279.699 |
| Salem Farms Corp #3 | 23 | 2, 3, 9, 9.01, 10 | 319.4882 |
| Salem Farms Corp #4 | 24 | 5, 7, 17, 18, 19 | 358.800 |
| Salem Farms Corp #5 | 25 | 14 | 125.706 |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|------------|--------------|---------|
| Salem Farms Corp #6 | 23; 24 | 1; 1, 20, 21 | 319.834 |
| Strang, L. & S. | 15; 16 | 1, 2, 3; 5 | 26.080 |
| Tark, E. Jf. & Rauch M. | 53 | 37, 38 | 104.18 |
| Weigel, A. & M. | 53 | 35 | 99.731 |
| Whitaker, J. #1 | 50 | 19 | 32.669 |
| Whitaker, J. #2 | 50 | 14 | 25.986 |
| Wright, G. & R. | 24; 34; 38 | 3; 10; 6 | 129.961 |
| Wright, G. & R. | 50 | 33, 33.02 | 112.750 |

Total Acreage of Preserved Farmland:

5931.708

iv. Other Deed Restricted Farmland

Add additional rows as needed.

| Owner / Farm Name (if known) | Block | Lot | Acres |
|---|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Peterson Estate | 53 | 36 | 240.09 |
| NJDEP | 40 | 18 | 174.54 |
| NJDEP | 1 | 2 | 158.76 |
| NJDEP | 1 | 5.01 | 33.93 |
| Heritage, D. | 3 | 10,11,12 | 122.63 |
| Juska, G & D | 3 | 18, 20 | 67.77 |
| Emel | 16 | 1 | 44.65 |
| NJDEP | 27 | 2 | 38.31 |
| NJDEP | 28 | 8 | 582.91 |

| | | | |
|----------------------------|----|------------|--------|
| NJ Conservation Foundation | 37 | 2 | 182.55 |
| Nociti, L. & S. | 37 | 6 | 3.78 |
| NJDEP | 37 | 6.01 | 45.73 |
| Unknown | 37 | 18,20 | 11.33 |
| NJDEP | 37 | 7 | 136.42 |
| NJDEP | 39 | 21 | 260.82 |
| Brown, C. & V. | 39 | 29 | 11.34 |
| Weldon Estate | 40 | 8 | 164.96 |
| NJDEP | 40 | 8.01, 8.02 | 38.48 |
| McMahon, D. | 40 | 9 | 91.89 |
| NJDEP | 40 | 20.01 | 51.94 |
| DuBois | 40 | 25 | 153.28 |
| NJDEP | 45 | 2 | 68.00 |
| NJDEP | 57 | 1 | 13.23 |
| NJDEP | 64 | 13 | 111.99 |

Total Acreage of Other Deed Restricted Farmland:

2807.12

v. Farms Enrolled in the Eight-year Farmland Preservation Program or Municipally-Approved Farmland Preservation Program

Add additional rows as needed.

| Owner / Farm Name | Block | Lot | Acres |
|--------------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| Fogg | 25 | 13 | 70.94 |
| Battiato | 59 | 6.01 | 70.81 |

| | | | |
|----------|----|---|--------|
| Battiato | 59 | 8 | 163.68 |
|----------|----|---|--------|

Total Acreage of Farms Enrolled in the Eight-year Farmland Preservation Program or Municipally-Approved Farmland Preservation Program: 305.43

vi. Other Preserved Open Space Compatible with Agriculture
Add additional rows as needed using digital file.

| Owner | Block | Lot | Acres | Description of Use |
|-------|--------|---------------|-------|--------------------|
| NJDEP | 27 | 6 | 37.83 | Conservation |
| NJDEP | 28 | 24 | 23.22 | Conservation |
| NJDEP | 29; 30 | 2, 5, 7, 9; 8 | 12.84 | Conservation |
| NJDEP | 50 | 10 | 17.95 | Conservation |
| NJDEP | 58 | 3 | 5.8 | Conservation |
| NJDEP | 59 | 2 | 24.01 | Conservation |
| NJDEP | 64 | 3 | 12.00 | Conservation |
| NJDEP | 65 | 28 | 1.01 | Conservation |

Total Acreage of Other Preserved Open Space Compatible with Agriculture: 134.65

SUM OF ii., iii., iv., v. & vi. ACREAGE (Note: Target Farm acreage (i) excluded) **9400.322**

2. AGGREGATE SIZE OF THE PROJECT AREA: 22627.35 Acres
 (See N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.5(a)2)

3. DENSITY OF THE PROJECT AREA: (See N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.5(a)3)

Density Formula:

(Sum of ii., iii., iv., v. & vi acreage) / (Aggregate size of the Project Area)

$$\text{Density} = 9400.322 / 22627.35 = 41.54 \%$$

4. TARGETED FARM SOIL PRODUCTIVITY: (See N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.5(a)4)

Soil Productivity Formula:

(Total area of important farmland soils on targeted farms) / (Total area of the targeted farms)

$$\text{Soil Productivity} = 880.73 / 1140.45 = 77.23 \%$$

Note:

- Important farmland soils are prime, statewide and unique soils
- Unique soils will only be considered if they are being used for special crops
- Attached is a list of soils considered statewide important only when drained. When these soils are present please confirm the presence of drainage before making soil calculations.

Total area of the targeted farms: 1140.45 acres

Area of prime soils on targeted farms: 545.36 acres; 47.82 % of total area

Area of statewide soils on targeted farms: 313.71 acres; 27.51 % of total area

Area of unique soils on targeted farms: 21.66 acres; 1.90 % of total area

5. ESTIMATE OF EASEMENT PURCHASE COST ON TARGETED FARMS:

(See N.J.A.C. 2:76-17A.5(a)5)

The SADC cost share formula can be found at N.J.A.C. 2:76-6.11(d)

Add additional rows as needed using digital file.

| Municipality | Acres | Estimated Easement Price per Acre | Total Estimated Easement Price | Estimated Municipal Cost Share ___% | Estimated County Cost Share ___% | Estimated State Cost Share ___% | Estimated Cost Share ___% from Other Sources |
|--------------|---------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Mannington | 1140.45 | 6,000 | 6,842,700 | 1,368,540 | 1,368,540 | 4,105,620 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

TOTALS


| Total Acreage | Total Estimated Cost for Targeted Farm Easement Purchase | Total Estimated Municipal Funding | Total Estimated County Funding | Total Estimated State Funding | Total Estimated Funding from Other Sources |
|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| 1140.45 | 6,842,700 | 1,368,540 | 1,368,540 | 4,105,620 | 0 |

6. MULTI-YEAR PLAN TO PURCHASE DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS ON TARGETED FARMS:

(See N.J.A.C.2:76-17A.5(a)6)

| Year | Acres | Estimated Cost | Municipal Funds | County Funds | State Funds | Other Funding Sources | Total Estimated Funding |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 2 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 3 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 4 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 5 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 6 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 7 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 8 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 9 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |
| 10 | 25 | 150,000 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 90,000 | | 150,000 |

S:\Planning Incentive Grant - 2007 rules Municipal\FORMS\Digital Forms\PIG Project Area Summary-Mun.doc



Clarke Caton Hintz

Architecture
 Planning
 Landscape Architecture

Project Area Target Farms, 10 - 50 Acres

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ | 2015 P16 Grant Application



Clarke Caton Hintz

Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan



**Mannington Township
Salem County**



Clarke Caton Hintz

Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan

Adopted by the *Mannington Township Planning Board* on _____, 2010

Philip B. Caton, PP, FAICP
Professional Planning License # 1829

Lisa Y. Specca, PP, AICP
Professional Planning License # 6026



Clarke Caton Hintz

Mannington Township Joint Land Use Board



Joanne Catalano, Chair
Ernest F. Tark, Jr, Mayor
Dante C. Spina, Committeeman
Hubert Layton, Jr. Class II
Donald C. Asay, Class IV
Andrew Buzby, Class IV
David Cadwallader Class IV
Bill Dolbow, Jr Class IV
Rita Shade, Class IV
John Sakewicz 1st Alt
Mary Hancock, 2nd Alt
Sherwood Brown, 3rd Alt
Jessica Lynne Winkers, 4th Alt

Mannington Township Agricultural Advisory Committee

Eric Buzby
John Catalano
David Emel
Dante Spina
Mary Hancock



Rebecca Gower Call, Board Secretary
Michael P. Albano, Esq., Board Attorney
Carl R. Gaskill, PE, PLS, PP, CME, Township Engineer
Philip B. Caton, PP, FAICP, Township Planner



Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| I. MANNINGTON'S AGRICULTURAL LAND BASE | 3 |
| <i>Assessed Farmland Map</i> | <i>4</i> |
| <i>2002 Land Use Land Cover Map.....</i> | <i>5</i> |
| <i>Soils Map.....</i> | <i>7</i> |
| Figure 1: Agricultural Valuable Soils | 8 |
| <i>Important Farmland Soils Map</i> | <i>10</i> |
| Figure 2: Irrigated Acres..... | 11 |
| Figure 3: Hydrogeologic Features..... | 11 |
| <i>Aquifers Map</i> | <i>14</i> |
| Figure 4: Farms by Size..... | 15 |
| Figure 5: Average Farm Size..... | 16 |
| Figure 6: Farmland Assessment Data Mannington and Salem County 2007 | 17 |
| Figure 7: Mannington Farmland Assessment data..... | 17 |
| Figure 8: Salem County Farmland Assessment data | 18 |
| II. MANNINGTON'S AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY..... | 19 |
| Figure 9: Salem County Agricultural Sales, 1987 – 2007 | 20 |
| Figure 10: Salem County Crop Sales, 1987-2007..... | 20 |
| Figure 11: Salem County Livestock Sales | 21 |
| Figure 12: Mannington Production Trends | 22 |
| III. LAND USE PLANNING CONTEXT | 25 |
| <i>State Plan Map (2001)</i> | <i>40</i> |
| <i>CAFRA Jurisdiction Map.....</i> | <i>42</i> |
| Figure 13: Existing Land Use Table | 47 |
| Figure 14: Existing Land Use Chart..... | 48 |
| <i>Existing Land Use Map</i> | <i>49</i> |
| Figure 15: Lot Size Category | 50 |
| <i>Lot Sizes Map.....</i> | <i>51</i> |
| <i>Sewer Service Map.....</i> | <i>52</i> |
| <i>NJDEP Water Service Map</i> | <i>53</i> |
| <i>Zoning Map.....</i> | <i>54</i> |
| IV. MANNINGTON'S FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM | 57 |
| Figure 16: Preserved Farmland | 58 |
| Figure 17: Pending Closings..... | 59 |
| Figure 18: Eight Year Program | 59 |
| <i>Preserved Farmlands, Open Space & ADA Map</i> | <i>60</i> |



Clarke Caton Hintz

| | |
|---|------------|
| <i>Important Bird Area Map</i> | 63 |
| Figure 19: Farmland Preservation Funding Table | 64 |
| V. FUTURE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM | 65 |
| VI. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT | 72 |
| VII. NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION..... | 79 |
| <i>Historic Inventory Map</i> | 88 |
| VIII. INDUSTRY SUSTAINABILITY, RETENTION AND PROMOTION | 89 |
| APPENDIX 1: FARM ASSESSED PROPERTIES LIST | 93 |
| APPENDIX 2: MANNINGTON RIGHT TO FARM ORDINANCE..... | 109 |



INTRODUCTION

Notwithstanding the recent downturn in real estate development activity, farmland in New Jersey continues to disappear at an alarming rate. When we lose farmland, we lose the benefits farmland provides as privately owned open space. Farmlands contribute to our scenic and cultural landscape, provide important wildlife habitat, and provide vital groundwater recharge areas.

These reasons, however, are secondary to the benefit of protecting New Jersey's agricultural industry, a vitally important economic asset. While preserving farmland does not, in and of itself, preserve the industry, such preservation is essential to providing the opportunity for agriculture to exist. In order for New Jersey to sustain a healthy agricultural industry, a critical mass of farmland has to be maintained in appropriate areas. The State Department of Agriculture has established a threshold of 500,000 acres to be preserved if the State is to maintain its agricultural base.

The importance of farmland preservation has been embodied in policy and law at many different levels of government. The State Farmland Preservation Planning Incentive Grant program, created through the Garden State Preservation Trust Act, is the most recent and comprehensive initiative aimed at retaining the future viability of agriculture in the state as urbanization continues to encroach on the farming base.

The Garden State Preservation Trust Act provided a ten year stable source of funding for acquisition and debt service for farmland preservation. As of the end of Fiscal Year 2009, the entire dedication of funds will be needed to pay the debt service on prior borrowings. In November of 2007 state-wide voters approved a referendum authorizing an additional \$200 million in bond financing intended to finance the program until a new permanent source of funding could be developed and approved by the voters. In 2009, state wide voters approved bond financing in the amount of \$400 million for Farmland Preservation, Green Acres, Blue Acres, and Historic Preservation. In the face of the statewide economic downturn and budget shortfall, the Governor has not yet indicated if he will actually raise the funds authorized by the 2009 referendum.

Mannington Township is one of New Jersey's leading agricultural communities. The Township has the State's fourth highest amount of farmland-assessed property, with 75% of its landmass devoted to agriculture. Mannington now ranks third among municipalities in acreage enrolled in farmland preservation. As of May 2010, there were 8,250 acres of preserved land in Mannington including 5,475 acres of preserved farmland and 2,775 acres of preserved open space.



This comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan is intended to meet the criteria for the Planning Incentive Grant program and follow the State Agriculture Development Committee guidelines for developing a Municipal Comprehensive Farmland Plan, adopted May 24, 2007. Farmland Preservations Plans have been specifically authorized as an element of municipal master plans (*N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28.b(13)*) since a 1999 amendment to the Municipal Land Use Law. A Farmland Preservation Plan is required to include:

- *An inventory of farm properties and a map illustrating significant areas of agricultural land;*
- *A statement showing that municipal ordinances support and promote agriculture as a business; and*
- *A plan for preserving as much farmland as possible in the short term by leveraging monies made available through the Farmland Preservation Planning Incentive Grant program which may include option agreements, installment purchases, and donations of permanent development easements, among other techniques*

This document will address both the SADC guidelines for a Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan and MLUL requirements for a Farmland Preservation Plan element.




I. MANNINGTON'S AGRICULTURAL LAND BASE

A. LOCATION AND SIZE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND BASE

Currently, there are 417 farm assessed properties within Mannington Township. Mannington Township continues to figure prominently in Salem County's farming heritage. As of 2008, 75% of Mannington Township qualified for farmland assessment with 18,287 acres farm assessed. Approximately 15 % of Salem County's farmland is located in Mannington Township. The Township ranks fourth in the state among all municipalities in the number of acres of land devoted to agriculture and third in the number of acres enrolled in the farmland preservation program. An inventory of all farm assessed properties within the Township is attached as an Appendix to this document.

Mannington Township not only has significant agricultural resources but also critical environmental resources. The accompanying Land Use/Land Cover map shows the approximate location of active agricultural lands in Mannington and important wetland habitats. Active agricultural land is defined as the number harvested and cropland pastures as reported on annual farmland assessment reports. Woodlands, whether managed for timber or not, and equine acres are not included as active agriculture. The 2008 total of active agricultural land in the Township was 13,005 acres placing Mannington fifth among municipalities in the state.

As of May 2010, there were 8,250 acres of preserved land in Mannington including 5,475 acres of preserved farmland and 2,775 acres of preserved open space representing approximately 34% of the Township's total land area. Another 11% of Mannington's land is covered with water and 16% is characterized as wetlands. Preserved farms account for 42% of the active agricultural land in Mannington. The entirety of Mannington Township is located within the boundaries of the Salem County designated Agricultural Development Area (ADA).



Assessed Farmland

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010



Clarke Caton Hintz

Architects

Planners

Landscape Architects





2002 Land Use Land Cover

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz

Architects

Planners

Landscape Architects





B. DISTRIBUTION OF SOIL TYPES AND THEIR CHARACTERISTICS

Soils are the foundation for all land uses, and are as such very carefully studied and categorized. The Official Soil Series Descriptions (OSD) is a national collection of more than 20,000 detailed soil series descriptions, covering the United States, Territories, Commonwealths, and Island Nations served by USDA-NRCS. The descriptions, in a text format, serve as a national standard.

The soil series is the lowest category of the national soil classification system. They serve mainly as specification for identifying and classifying soils. The descriptions contain soil properties that define the soil series, distinguish it from other soil series, serve as the basis for the placement of that soil series in the soil family, and provide a record of soil properties needed to prepare soil interpretations.¹ The Soil Series map indicating the 18 soil series types and 30 variations found in Mannington may be seen on the following page. Several soils occur more frequently in Mannington Township than others. The most frequently occurring are Alloway and Matapeake series accounting for 33% of all soils.

Alloway Series

The Alloway series accounts for 17% of all soils in Mannington (4,100) acres. The soil series consists of very deep, moderately well drained soils on uplands. Typically, Alloway soils can be found in the form of cultivated silt loams. The permeability is slow and depth to seasonal high water table is between 1.5 and 3.5 feet. Most Alloway soils have been cleared for agriculture. These soils are classified as prime farmland soils.

Matapeake Series

Matapeake soils account for 16 percent of all soils in Mannington (3,990 acres). The series consists of very deep, well drained soils on upland interfluves and side slopes. Permeability ranges from moderate to moderately slow and depth to seasonal high water table is usually greater than 6 feet. Typically Matapeake soils are cultivated and occasionally irrigated. These soils are classified as prime farmland soils.²

¹ http://soils.usda.gov/technical/classification/osd/fact_sheet.html

² Mannington Township ERI, Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission, 2007 page 17.



In addition to official series classification soils are further classified by the USDA-NRCS into eight suitability classes for crop production, and by state and national agricultural agencies into four farmland importance categories.

- Class I soils have few limitations that restrict their use.
- Class II soils have moderate limitations that reduce the choice of plants or that require moderate conservation practices.
- Class III soils have severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require special conservation practices, or both.
- Class IV soils have very severe limitations that reduce the choice of plants, require very careful management, or both.
- Class V soils are not likely to erode but have other limitations, impractical to remove, that limit their use largely to pasture, woodland, or wildlife habitat.
- Class VI soils have severe limitations that make them generally unsuited to cultivation and limit their use largely to pasture, woodland, or wildlife habitat.
- Class VII soils have very severe limitations that make them unsuited to cultivation and that restrict their use largely to pasture, woodland, or wildlife habitat.
- Class VIII soils and landforms have limitations that preclude their use for commercial plants and restrict their use to recreation, wildlife, water supply, or to aesthetic purposes.

Utilizing the crop suitability information, the New Jersey Department of Agriculture has developed a list of Prime Farmland Soils, Soils of Statewide Importance, Unique Farmland Soils. Other soils are not rated. The table below lists the distribution of agriculturally valuable soils.

Figure 1: Agricultural Valuable Soils


| Type | Acres | Percent |
|----------------------|------------------|--------------|
| Prime Farmland | 12,232.14 | 50.5 % |
| Statewide Importance | 3,502.29 | 14.5 % |
| Unique Farmland | 1,958.59 | 8.0 % |
| Other/Water | 6,532.98 | 27 % |
| Total | 24,226.01 | 100 % |



The soils of Mannington Township are exceptional for agriculture with 50.5% classed as prime farmland. Mannington contains largest contiguous areas of prime soils in Salem County. Prime Farmlands include all those soils in Land Capability Class I and selected soils from Land Capability Class II which represent the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producing food, feed, forage, fiber and oilseed crops and is also available for these uses. Prime agricultural soils, especially Class I soils, represent a scarce resource which must be preserved if possible. Medium sized parcels of Class I soils, the very best agricultural soils which exist, are located in the following areas:

- North of Mannington Creek
- North and South of Fenwick Creek
- Both sides of Rt. 540 north of Mannington Meadow

Prime soils are located throughout the entire central and much of the eastern portion of the Township. These areas are only interrupted by poorer soils associated with local creeks, streams, and woodlands. Most of the Townships prime soils are of Class II soils which have very minor limitations for agricultural production. Soils of Statewide Importance are those soils in Land Capability Class II and III that do not meet the criteria for Prime Farmland, but are nearly Prime Farmland and economically produce high yields of crops when treated and managed according to acceptable farming methods. The location of these soils within Mannington Township is illustrated on the Important Farmland Soils Map following.



Important Farmland Soils

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010



Clarke Caton Hintz



Architects

Planners

Landscape Architects



C.1 NUMBER OF IRRIGATED ACRES AND AVAILABLE WATER RESOURCES

Access to water was reported to be a top priority issue by the agricultural advisory committee in Mannington. Based on Farmland Assessment data, Mannington Township has increasing irrigated acreage particularly in field crops and vegetables. As indicated in the table below, the irrigated acreage represented approximately 18% of agricultural acreage by 2007.

Figure 2: Irrigated Acres

| Irrigated Acres in Mannington Township, 2001 – 2007 | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|
| | 2001 | 2005 | 2007 |
| Irrigated Acres | 1,577 | 1,207 | 2,324 |
| Active Agriculture | 13,077 | 12,947 | 12,701 |
| <i>Source: –NJDA Farmland Assessment Surveys</i> | | | |

The fluctuations in the number of irrigated acres reported between 2001 and 2007 are most likely based on a number of factors, including variations in rainfall and temperature, variations in the type and location of crops on individual farms, and inconsistencies in the way data is reported by farmers.

The majority of farms within Mannington Township are dependant on surface water for irrigation. There are 29 water allocation permits issued to farms in Mannington and 1 farm which reports water usage below the 100,000 GRD threshold for permitting. It is becoming increasingly difficult to increase surface water allocations especially in the Upper Salem River; however, other sources are not as restrictive including ground water wells which could be utilized.

C.2 WATER SUPPLY /AQUIFERS

The major hydro-geologic formations which underlie and outcrop in Mannington Township are depicted on the Geology/Hydrology Map. The following table classifies the important aquifers and the extent which they supply water to the Township. Part of western Salem County lies with in Critical Water Area #2; however Mannington is not included in the critical area.

Figure 3: Hydrogeologic Features



| Formation | Description | Hydrologic Characteristics and Importance | Geologic Outcropping Location |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Merchantville Woodbury Confining Unit | Silt , Clay and Quartz, thin layers of sand | Aquifer rank E < 25 gallon/min Not an important water source. | Northwest portion |
| Englishtown | Sand with localized clay beds | Aquifer rank B 251-500 gallon/min capacity Water is fresh, moderately hard, and alkaline. Fe and Mn levels high locally. Generally calcium bicarbonate waters. Salinity increases with depth. | unknown |
| Marshalltown-Wenonah Confining Unit | Silt, Clay, with thin layers of Sand | Aquifer rank E <25 gallon/min Water quality ranges from fair to poor, few wells in this formation | Lower Northwest |
| Mt. Laurel-Wenonah | Sand and Quartz | Aquifer rank C 101-250 gallons/min capacity Water is fresh, moderately hard and alkaline. Locally elevated Fe and Mn levels which may require treatment for domestic use. Major source of water. | Thick band through the center of the township |
| Vincentown | Quartz Sand | Aquifer rank E-B 25-250 gallon/min Water is generally good, elevated Fe and Mn require treatment Second most important water source | Narrow northeast running band. |





Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

Clarke Caton Hintz

| Formation | Description | Hydrologic Characteristics and Importance | Geologic Outcropping Location |
|--------------------|--------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Kirkwood –Cohansey | Quartz, Silt, Sand, Clay | Aquifer rank B-A 251-500 gallon/min Water is fresh, acidic, corrosive, Fe and Mn are elevated requires treatment. | Eastern Portion |

Source: Mannington Township Comprehensive Development Plan, 1978.



Aquifers

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz Architects
Planners
Landscape Architects



D. FARMLAND ASSESSMENT AND CENSUS OF AGRICULTURE STATISTICS AND TRENDS.

D.1 Number of Farms and Farms by Size

As of tax year 2008, Mannington Township had 417 farms and farm-assessed properties, with a total of 18,287 acres devoted to agriculture. As shown in the chart below, nearly 67% of these farms are under 50 acres with 174 farms between 10 – 49 acres (49%) and 104 farms under 10 acres (25%). Similarly, data from the 2007 Census of Agriculture indicates that the majority of farms within Salem County are less than 50 acres in size with 42% between 10 and 49 acres and 20% between 1 – 9 acres. By contrast, Mannington has 11%, more mid sized farms between 50 and 180 acres farms than does the County on the whole. Salem County still has 6% of its farms measuring over 500 acres.

The size of all farm assessed properties is provided in the inventory of all farm assessed properties, attached at the end of this document.

Figure 4: Farms by Size

| Farms by Size, Mannington Township and Salem County | | | | |
|---|-----------------|------|-----------|------|
| Farm Size | Mannington Twp. | | Salem Co. | |
| | # farms | % | # farms | % |
| 1 - 9.99 acres | 104 | 25% | 150 | 20% |
| 10 - 49 acres | 174 | 42% | 318 | 42% |
| 50 - 179.99 acres | 130 | 31% | 152 | 20% |
| 180 - 499 acres | 9 | 2% | 86 | 11% |
| 500 - 999 acres | 0 | 0% | 38 | 5% |
| 1000+ | 0 | 0% | 6 | 0.8% |
| Total | 417 | 100% | 759 | 100% |

Source: Mannington Township Tax Assessment data, November 2007.; 2007 Census of Agriculture (Salem County)



D.2 Average and Median Farm Size

The average size of farm assessed properties in Mannington is 43.16 acres (March 2010). This figure is reduced artificially due to the fact that over 40 parcels which are part of a larger farm management unit with farmland assessment have a separate tax lot and are undersized. The median size of farm assessed properties is 27.45 acres (March 2010). As indicated in the chart below, the average and median farm size in Salem County and in New Jersey has been steadily decreasing over the past several decades. Although similar historical data is not available for Mannington Township, it is likely that the average farm size has similarly decreased over the same time period.

Figure 5: Average Farm Size

| Average and Median Farm Size, Salem Co. and New Jersey, 1987 - 2007 | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | 1987 (acres) | 1992 (acres) | 1997 (acres) | 2002 (acres) | 2007 (acres) |
| Avg. Farm Size, Salem Co. | 124 | 119 | 121 | 123 | 127 |
| Median Farm Size, Salem Co. | n/a | n/a | 21 | 21 | 28 |
| Avg. Farm Size, New Jersey | 99 | 93 | 91 | 81 | 71 |
| Median Farm Size, New Jersey | n/a | n/a | 23 | 22 | 17 |
| <i>Source: U.S.Census of Agriculture, 1987 - 2007</i> | | | | | |

D.3 Cropland Harvested, Pasture, Woodland, Equine, Agricultural Use

As indicated in tables below, cropland harvested acreage represents the largest category of agricultural land use in Mannington, totaling 12,051 acres, and representing 66% of total agricultural use in 2008. Mannington’s active agricultural use (cropland harvested, cropland pastured, and permanent pasture) in 2008 was 13,005 acres, representing 71% of total agricultural use. Woodland acreage represents nearly 30% of the Township’s agricultural land, and equine acres account for less than 1% of agricultural land. The sharp reduction in farmland acreage in the 1990 data is most likely a reporting anomaly.

The production trends for Salem County are very similar to those of Mannington Township. Both have active agriculture on over 70% of the lands with approximately 65% cropland harvested. Mannington has slightly higher woodland acreage and both have less than 1% equine acreage.



Figure 6: Farmland Assessment Data Mannington and Salem County 2007

| 2007 Farmland Assessment Data, Mannington and Salem Co. | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| | Mannington Township | | Salem County | |
| | Acres | Percent | Acres | Percent |
| Cropland Harvested | 12,051 | 66% | 75,890 | 64% |
| Cropland Pastured | 227 | 1.2% | 3,095 | 2.6% |
| Permanent Pasture | 727 | 4% | 8,242 | 7% |
| <i>(Active Agriculture Subtotal)</i> | <i>(13,005)</i> | <i>(71%)</i> | <i>(87,461)</i> | <i>(73%)</i> |
| Woodland | 5,265 | 28.8% | 31,568 | 26% |
| Equine | 17 | .09% | 462 | .4% |
| Total Agriculture Use | 18,287 | 100% | 119,257 | 100% |

Source: SADC Farmland Assessment Summary, 2007

Figure 7: Mannington Farmland Assessment data







Figure 8: Salem County Farmland Assessment data



D.4 Stability of Mannington’s Agricultural Land Base

Mannington and Salem County have shown remarkable stability both in acreage farmed and cropland harvested over the 25 year period. Mannington has lost only 26 acres of farmland and Salem County agriculture has actually grown by 2% during this period. This is in sharp contrast to the State of New Jersey which has experienced over 20% loss in farmland acreage.



II. MANNINGTON'S AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

A. TRENDS IN MARKET VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS SOLD


Agricultural sales data is compiled at the County level every five years as part of the National Census of Agriculture. As shown in the chart below, total agricultural sales in the County have increased by approximately 61% over the past two decades, with the most rapid increase (24%) taking place between 1992 and 1997. Sales of crops, including nursery stock, represent the great majority of agricultural sales in the County and have historically increased in line with total agricultural sales. However, between 1997 and 2002 crops and nursery stock increased more rapidly than overall sales. Unlike most of the state where livestock production has dramatically decreased, livestock sales have only slightly decreased in the County by 4.5% over the last 20 years, although there was a significant increase between 1992 and 1997.

Mannington's location is exceptionally well suited to agriculture within the southwest climate zone of the state. This zone experiences the highest average daily temperatures in the state and has the longest growing season. First frosts come an average of 4 weeks later in the fall and last frosts 4 weeks earlier in the spring. The municipality falls within zone 6 for USDA plant hardiness and experiences slightly less rainfall than the state average of 45 inches.

Mannington Township remains an active, agriculturally viable community. The commodity shift away from livestock and large commercial production which has rapidly changed agriculture in more northern portions of New Jersey has not affected Mannington to the same degree. Farmers, especially young farmers, have a measure of confidence notably absent in more developed areas of the state. Support services, suppliers, and markets are all within reasonable distance to farms and still are considered convenient; although one local business which has historically supported agriculture, Owens Supply, has recently closed. Generally farmers find everything they need to support their business conveniently located and available. For vegetable growers, the main market is the Vineland Produce Auction and most of the grains are trucked to DelMarVa for poultry and to Pennsylvania for livestock.




Figure 9: Salem County Agricultural Sales, 1987 – 2007



Source: U.S Census of Agriculture, 1987 – 2007

Figure 10: Salem County Crop Sales, 1987-2007






All of the major crop commodities have increased in sales volume over the past two decades. Vegetable production increased 55% overall but experienced a dramatic decrease of 23% between 2002 and 2007. During the same interval, grain production increased in sales by 60%. Sales of nursery crops matched that of grain by 1997 and surpassed total grain sales by nearly 3 million dollars in 2007. Nursery sales have seen the greatest increase of any commodity more than quadrupling in the county since 1987.

Although agricultural sales data is not available at the municipal level, examination of increased production trends for selected crops in Mannington show slightly different results. Mannington has increased grain production and decreased nursery crop production.

As previously noted, livestock sales have slightly declined in the County. Sales of milk and dairy products have seen the greatest decline with a 1.4 million dollar decrease since 1987, as illustrated in the chart below. It is interesting to note the 1.3 million dollar increase in dairy production and sales between 2002 and 2007. Beef production has decreased by 13% losing 300,000 dollars in annual revenue. The equine industry has not seen the rapid increases that have characterized other counties in New Jersey. A modest increase in sales of 240,000 dollars was experienced in the county between 2002 and 2007.

Figure 11: Salem County Livestock Sales



Source:



B. CROP/PRODUCTION TRENDS OVER THE LAST 24 YEARS

The crops grown in Mannington like most of Salem County are primarily grains particularly soybeans and vegetables. Soybeans and vegetables account for over 50% of Mannington’s production and give Mannington its intensive agricultural character. Two interesting trends illustrate Mannington’s traditional production agricultural industry: the slight decrease of the dairy industry and decline in the nursery crop industry. These trends are the opposite of statewide trends. New ventures include fruit orchards and poultry production. The increase in sheep production is most likely due to 4H activity.

Figure 12: Mannington Production Trends

| Commodity | 1983 | 1990 | 2001 | 2007 | % Change |
|--|---------|------|---------|------|----------|
| Crops (acres) | | | | | |
| Corn | 1706 | 979 | 2188 | 1895 | + 11 % |
| Grain (oats, wheat, barley, rye, sorghum) | 1651 | 1143 | 2061 | 1986 | +20 % |
| Hay | 814 | 745 | 836 | 1056 | +30 % |
| Peaches | 0 | 0 | 0 | 133 | +100 % |
| Soybeans | 3921 | 3418 | 4289 | 4360 | +11 % |
| Nursery | 158 | 142 | 68 | 89 | - 44% |
| Vegetables | 3425 | 2695 | 2340 | 2471 | - 28% |
| Livestock (Avg. No.) | | | | | |
| Cattle, beef | 542 | 579 | 252 | 194 | -64% |
| Cattle, dairy | 1130 | 843 | 419 | 971 | -14 % |
| Chickens, layers | 181,232 | 81 | 68 | 190 | -99% |
| Chickens, meat | 56 | 0 | 12 | 5 | -91% |
| Equine | 246 | 220 | 191 | 198 | -19 % |
| Swine | 807 | 810 | 682 | 317 | -61 % |
| Sheep | 31 | 105 | 98 | 49 | +58 % |
| Ducks | 19 | 226 | 140,441 | 400 | + 2000 % |
| Fur Animals | 1290 | 1872 | 1016 | 390 | -70 % |

Source: Mannington Township Farmland assessment summaries various years



C. SUPPORT SERVICES WITHIN MARKET REGION

SUPPLIERS

Salem County

Alloway Village Hardware & Feed (Alloway) Equipment, Feed
Bishop Farms (Elmer) Lime, Equipment
Coleman’s Irrigation (Elmer) Irrigation
Coleman’s Feed & Lime (Elmer) Feed, Pesticides
Fred Harz & Son (Elmer) Equipment, Feed
Helena Chemical Co. (Woodstown) Fertilizer, Pesticides, Seed
Joe Richardson Fuel
Lee Tractor Company (Elmer) Equipment
Leslie G. Fogg, Inc. (Salem) Equipment
Owen Supply (Woodstown) Equipment
Pole Tavern Equipment (Elmer) Equipment
Roor’s Farm Supply (Elmer) Equipment, Fertilizer, Pesticides, Seed
Ross Fogg Fuel Oil Co. (Carneys Point) Fuel
Schalick Mills (Elmer) Feed, Supplies
South Jersey Farmers Exchange (Woodstown) Fertilizer, Plastic, Seed
Tractor Supply (Pilesgrove) Equipment, Feed,
Woodstown Ice and Coal (Woodstown) Feed, Hardware
Woodstown Farm Supply (Woodstown) Feed

Regional

Adamo Feed Co, Inc. (Vineland) Feed
Brooks Feed, Hay
Dare’s Feed & Pet Store (Bridgeton) Feed
Farm-Rite (Shiloh) Equipment
Flemington Farm Equipment Co. Equipment
GrowMark (Swedesboro) Fertilizer, Pesticides, Seed
Leslie G. Fogg, Inc. (Bridgeton) Equipment
United Agri Products (Malaga) Fertilizer, Pesticides, Seed

D. RELATED INDUSTRIES

PROCESSORS/DISTRIBUTORS

Salem County

There are no processors in Salem County at this time.



Regional

Albert's Organic Warehouse (Becket)
B & B Poultry Co. (Norma)
Casella Brothers & Sons Inc. (Swedesboro)
Cumberland Dairy (Rosenhayn/Bridgeton)
F & S Produce (Rosenhayn)
Gloucester County Packing Co. (Woodbury)
Grasso Foods (Swedesboro)
Johanna Foods, Inc. (Flemington)
Perdue Farms, Inc. (Bridgeton)
Seabrook Brothers & Sons, Inc. (Seabrook, NJ)
Vineland Produce Auction (Vineland)
Vineland Kosher Poultry, Inc. (Vineland)
Violet (Williamstown)



III. LAND USE PLANNING CONTEXT

A. STATE DEVELOPMENT AND REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

In 1986, the New Jersey Legislature passed the New Jersey State Planning Act, which created the State Planning Commission and required the preparation and adoption of the State Plan. The first State Plan, adopted in 1992, was the product of a statewide planning process, which involved counties and municipalities and formulated a series of policies intended on shaping growth within New Jersey. The first major update and revision of the 1992 State Plan was initiated in 1997 and culminated in the adoption of the second State Plan on March 1, 2001. The policies and objectives set forth in the State Plan include a number of recommendations for promoting and preserving the agricultural industry and farmland. As illustrated below, Mannington's support of agriculture and farmland preservation planning efforts are consistent with the vision, goals, policies and strategies of the 1986 State Planning Act and the 2001 State Plan.

A.1. Statewide Policies

The State Plan contains a series of statewide goals, strategies and policies that are supportive of the Township's effort to preserve rural character and agriculture. The following Statewide policies directly address the need for preservation of agriculture and farmland:

15. *Agriculture*³

Promote and preserve the agricultural industry and retain farmland by coordinating planning and innovative land conservation techniques to protect agricultural viability while accommodating beneficial development and economic growth necessary to enhance agricultural vitality and by educating residents on the benefits and the special needs of agriculture.

Mannington Township is a statewide leader in the preservation of the farmland base. The Township ranks third overall for number of preserved acres. Coordination of the Open Space programs has increased the overall acreage preserved to 8,250. Much of the open space is farmed with wildlife management cropping strategies in place. Mannington has taken the initial planning steps

³ 2001 State Plan, 147 – 160.



toward a TDR land use strategy in order to accommodate development and economic growth which is compatible with agriculture.

Sustainable Agriculture and Comprehensive Planning:

Policy 1 Agricultural Land Retention Program Priorities

Funds for farmland retention should be given priority in the following order, unless a county or municipal farmland preservation plan has been prepared and approved by the State Agriculture Development Committee (in which case, priority shall be based on said plan):

- (1) Rural Planning Area;*
- (2) Fringe and Environmentally Sensitive Planning Areas;*
- (3) Metropolitan and Suburban Planning Areas.*

Mannington is entirely within the rural planning area and the environmentally sensitive planning area.

Policy 2 Preservation of the Agricultural Land Base

Consider the expenditure of public funds for preservation of farmland as an investment in public infrastructure and thereby emphasize the public's interest in maintaining long-term agricultural viability.

Mannington has preserved 34% of its land base.

Policy 3 Coordinated Planning

Coordinate planning efforts of all levels of government to ensure that policies and programs promote agriculture.

Mannington Township together with Salem County and the State of New Jersey have coordinated efforts to protect Mannington's agriculture and sensitive natural resources.

Policy 4 New Development

Plan and locate new development to avoid negative impacts on agriculture.

Mannington is studying a TDR approach to new development.



Policy 5 Creative Planning and Design Techniques

Encourage creative land planning and design through tools such as clustering, phasing and density transfers, purchase and donation of development rights, agricultural enterprise zones and districts and the provision of self-contained community wastewater treatment systems to serve Centers, to accommodate future growth in ways that maintain the viability of agriculture as an industry, while avoiding conflict with agricultural uses.

In 2007 Mannington replaced a cluster option with a mandatory cluster ordinance in the A, Agricultural Zone, CR, Conditional Residential Zone, and C, Conservation zone. This ordinance requires right to farm language be placed in the residential deeds and separate notice to purchasers of lots that farming is a permitted use in the A, CR and C zones and that the open space in the development may be deed restricted for farming use.

The community design principles in the mandatory cluster ordinance require the open space set aside be configured to facilitate continued agricultural use. This includes considerations for locating the farmland/open space on the best soils, prime and statewide important soils, linking the farmland to adjacent tracts containing farming operations, creating contiguous tracts of farmland and/or open space and maximizing the separation of farming operations and residential units.

Mannington requires an agricultural impact statement for all major subdivisions.

Mannington supports the following State Plan policies:

Policy 6 Agricultural Water Needs

Include consideration of the water needs of the agricultural industry in water supply planning at all levels of government.

Agriculture and Economic Development:

Policy 7 Provision of Capital Facilities

Provide adequate capital facilities including grain storage and food processing facilities to enhance agriculture in rural areas.



Policy 8 Access to Capital

Improve access to capital funds, including rural revolving loan funds and rural venture capital networks, operating funds and portfolios that reduce the reliance on land as an asset for collateral or retirement.

Policy 9 Enhancing the Agricultural Industry

Promote economic development that supports the agricultural industry on local, county and statewide levels.

Policy 10 Diversify the Rural Economy

Promote beneficial economic growth that recognizes the need to provide the essential facilities and infrastructure to diversify the rural economy. Provide opportunities for business expansion, off-farm employment, on-farm income generating enterprises such as agricultural-related educational or recreational activities and environmental activities such as leaf composting.

Policy 11 Enhance Agricultural Marketing

Enhance marketing programs to promote the sale of New Jersey agricultural products.

Policy 12 Simplify the Regulatory Process

Adapt the permitting, licensing and land use planning and regulation processes to be sensitive to agricultural needs to enhance the industry and to facilitate new agricultural development.

Policy 13 Local Ordinances and Building Codes Sensitive to Agricultural Use

Promulgate local ordinances and state building code and fee criteria which are sensitive to the special purposes of agricultural construction and seasonal use.

Policy 14 Right to Farm

Coordinate actions of state and local government to encourage the maintenance of agricultural production by protecting farm operations from interference and nuisance actions when recognized methods or practices are applied and to ensure that the numerous social, economic and environmental benefits of agriculture serves the best interests of all citizens in the state.



Mannington has recently revised its Right to Farm Ordinance to mirror the SADC model Ordinance.

Mannington continues to support the following State Plan policies:

Policy 15 Aquaculture

Recognize aquaculture as an agricultural activity.

Agriculture and Environmental Protection:

Policy 16 Promote Agricultural Management Practices

Encourage the use of agricultural management practices to ensure sustainable and profitable farming while protecting natural resources.

Policy 17 Incorporate Agricultural Land in Recycling of Organic Materials

Use appropriate agricultural lands for the recycling of non-farm generated biodegradable and organic materials.

Human Resources:

Policy 18 Housing Supply and Financing

Use federal and State funding to expand the supply of decent, safe and reasonably priced housing that will benefit those employed in agriculture.

Policy 19 Vocational and Technical Training

Create and expand access to training and technical assistance for agriculture and agriculture related businesses.

Policy 20 Agricultural Education

Create and expand agricultural education and leadership opportunities through basic skills training, and vocational and entrepreneurial training on the secondary, county college and university levels.

Policy 21 Encourage Young and First Time Farmers

Coordinate federal, state and local financial incentives and tax and regulatory policies to encourage more individuals to enter the agricultural industry.



Policy 22 Promote the Value of Agriculture

Educate New Jersey residents on the economic and environmental value of sustainable agriculture in New Jersey and its important contribution to the State's quality of life.

Policy 23 Agro-tourism and Eco-tourism

Expand opportunities for agro-tourism and eco-tourism.

A.2. State Planning Areas

The State Plan delineates a series of *planning areas* that are based on the natural and built characteristics of sub-areas within New Jersey. The planning areas are:

- PA1 Metropolitan Planning Area
- PA2 Suburban Planning Area
- PA3 Fringe Planning Area
- PA4 Rural Planning Area
- PA4B Rural/Environmentally Sensitive
- PA5 Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area

The designations are listed in descending order from the most developed condition to the least developed conditions. They also reflect the State's vision for the future development of those areas.

Mannington is located entirely within the PA4 Rural Planning Area and PA5 Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area.

In the Rural Planning Area, the State Plan's intention is to:

- maintain the Environs as large contiguous areas of farmland and other lands;
- revitalize cities and towns;
- accommodate growth in Centers;
- promote a viable agricultural industry;
- protect the character of existing, stable communities; and
- confine programmed sewers and public water services to Centers.

In the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area, the State Plan's intention is to:



- protect environmental resources through the protection of large contiguous areas of land
- accommodate growth in Centers
- protect the character of existing stable communities
- confine programmed sewers and public water services to Centers
- revitalize cities and towns

This section describes how the Mannington’s planning is consistent with each of the State Plan’s Policy Objectives for the Rural Planning Area (PA4) and the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area (PA5).

1. **Land Use:** Enhance economic and agricultural viability and rural character by guiding development and redevelopment into Centers. In the Environs, maintain and enhance agricultural uses, and preserve agricultural and other lands to form large contiguous areas and greenbelts around Centers. Development and redevelopment should use creative land use and design techniques to ensure that it does not conflict with agricultural operations, does not exceed the capacity of natural and built systems, and protects areas where public investments in farmland preservation have been made. Development and redevelopment in the Environs should maintain or enhance the character of the area.

The Township of Mannington has embraced land use policies of agricultural preservation, maintenance of rural character and environmental protection for at least the past three decades. The 1978 Master Plan goals and objectives emphasized the Township’s rural policy in its first goal statement:

“1. Maintain the Township’s rural/agricultural character. Perhaps the most important planning objective for the Township is the maintenance of its rural attributes by encouraging agricultural activities and the protection of natural resources.”(Mannington, 1978, p. 79)

Local land use policy in Mannington Township is driven by the goals and objectives of its master plan and supporting land use ordinances. The 2007 Re-Examination Report identifies the Township’s primary land use goal or policy as the protection of rural character, agriculture and environmental resources. This goal is currently implemented through the Township’s participation in the farmland preservation program, a right to farm ordinance, a mandatory cluster ordinance and an agricultural buffer ordinance. In addition, the Township requires an agricultural impact statement for major site plan and subdivision



applications. The Re-Examination Report further expounds upon the Township's planning policies:

To achieve these important planning goals, the Township has taken a proactive, comprehensive approach to future land use planning. Local land use policies, such as agricultural buffers and right to farm ordinances support and protect agricultural viability. A mandatory cluster ordinance in the agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas, Agricultural District (A), Conditional Residential District (CR) and Conservation District (C), restricts development to limited, core areas of a site. Most significantly, the Township is pursuing a transfer of development rights program that has the potential of directing all future development of the agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands to an area or areas appropriately designated for growth. This latter program is important to local officials and Township residents because it has the potential to achieve the community's land use goals and at the same time protect landowner's equity.

Mannington is participating in the statewide TDR task force to recommend revisions to the state TDR Act and improve participation in the program. Mannington has preserved 8,250 acres of farmland and open space through State, County and non-profit programs

2. **Housing:** Provide for a full range of housing choices primarily in Centers at appropriate densities to accommodate projected growth, recognizing the special locational needs of agricultural employees and minimizing conflicts with agricultural operations. Ensure that housing in general—and in particular affordable, senior citizen, special needs and family housing—is developed with maximum access to a full range of commercial, educational, recreational, health and transportation services and facilities in Centers. Focus multi-family and higher-density, single-family housing in Centers. Any housing in the Environs should be planned and located to maintain or enhance the cultural and scenic qualities and with minimum impacts on agricultural resources.

Mannington Township's Housing goal as stated in the 1978 Master Plan is to ensure an adequate quantity and quality of housing which is responsive to the Township's demand and need for housing. The 2001 Master Plan Reexamination states that the Township Housing Background Study indicated that Mannington's housing stock is almost entirely single family detached units and that a significant number are in need of improvement or replacement. The report recommended that the Land Use Plan ensure a reasonable housing opportunity by encouraging



the development of replacement housing and of higher density housing types in appropriate areas.

The Township is currently studying the possibility of a TDR development plan which would accommodate affordable housing and a variety of housing types in a centers based new village(s). Currently, the Township is operating under Superior Court orders extending the time for submission of a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan to COAH until the coordination of TDR community plans and COAH regulations at the State level is completed.

The Township's mandatory cluster ordinance requires housing to be separated from non-residential land uses and the required open space set asides be coordinated into contiguous blocks of farm land. The Ordinance recommends the open space and farmland set asides be located on the best agricultural soils and requires the continued facilitation of farming operations.

3. **Economic Development:** Promote economic activities within Centers that complement and support the rural and agricultural communities and that provide diversity in the rural economy and opportunities for off-farm income and employment. Encourage tourism related to agriculture and the environment, as well as the historic and rural character of the area. Support appropriate recreational and natural resource-based activities in the Environs. Any economic development in the Environs should be planned and located to maintain or enhance the cultural and scenic qualities and with minimum impacts on agricultural resources.

The Township Master Plan indicates that the level and nature of commercial development permitted in Mannington is an important aspect of the growth policy. The Plan proposes that two commercial districts be developed to allow for some additional commercial development. The first district encompasses the area containing the former shopping center. A variety of commercial uses are permitted in the General Commercial zone. The second commercial district primarily encompasses land owned by Salem Hospital and around the Pointers intersection. Uses permitted in this Limited Commercial (LC) district are professional offices and medical support services. The boundaries of this Limited Commercial district were enlarged in 1984. The Township should investigate the feasibility of adjusting the limits of the LC district to include land which has been developed with professional/medical-related uses.



4. **Transportation:** Maintain and enhance a rural transportation system that links Centers to each other and to the Metropolitan and Suburban Planning Areas. Provide appropriate access of agricultural products to markets, accommodating the size and weight of modern agricultural equipment. In Centers, emphasize the use of public transportation systems and alternatives to private cars where appropriate and feasible, and maximize circulation and mobility options throughout. Support the preservation of general aviation airports as integral parts of the state's transportation system.

The municipality is involved in the SJTPO regional transportation planning process through the County Planning Office.

Even though the Township is primarily rural, it has some of the advantages and opportunities of an urban area, particularly when it comes to mass transit. NJ Transit and the County system provide service to the County's urban region, Philadelphia and Wilmington. The Salem County Work-first New Jersey program is currently studying how it can transport Work-First clients and other transit-dependents to places of employment.

5. **Natural Resource Conservation:** Minimize potential conflicts between development, agricultural practices and sensitive environmental resources. Promote agricultural management practices and other agricultural conservation techniques to protect soil and water resources. Protect and preserve large, contiguous tracts and corridors of recreation, forest or other open space land that protect natural systems and natural resources.

The Mannington Township Master Plan and ordinance reflect the objective of protecting the municipality's natural and agricultural areas. The public and private efforts that have resulted in the creation of several protected wildlife management areas are moving in the direction of creating a contiguous preserved greenway. Open Space protection together with Farmland Preservation efforts at the County and Township level have resulted in the protection of 8,250 acres of land.

6. **Agriculture and Farmland Preservation:** Guide development to ensure the viability of agriculture and the retention of farmland in agricultural areas. Encourage farmland retention and minimize conflicts between agricultural practices and the location of Centers. Ensure the availability of adequate water resources and large, contiguous tracts of land with minimal land-use conflicts. Actively promote more



intensive, new-crop agricultural enterprises and meet the needs of the agricultural industry for intensive packaging, processing, value-added operations, marketing, exporting, and other shipping through development and redevelopment.

In Mannington Township, local officials have assembled a comprehensive body of rural character policies, programs and planning initiatives to achieve its long-standing preservation goals. These include the Township's right to farm ordinance, participation in the NJ Farmland Preservation program, numerous zoning ordinances and the pending transfer of development rights program. Both the farmland preservation program and the TDR program protect farmland equity by offering landowners money for their development rights.

The 2007 Reexamination report made the following recommendation towards Centers based development. **Center Designation: The Township should pursue a center-based pattern for future development to minimize intrusions on the agricultural and environmentally sensitive landscape. Center-based development is important to agricultural viability because it's less consumptive of land and allows for the preservation of large critical masses of farmland. The design of the center is also important for protecting the community's rural landscape. Special attention should be given to the overall vision of the center and its form, function and compatibility with the rural context. Center-based development is a key element of the TDR program, which, if adopted, which would also lead to center designation and Plan Endorsement by the NJ State Planning Commission.**

7. **Recreation:** Provide maximum active and passive recreational and tourism opportunities at the neighborhood and local levels by targeting the acquisition and development of neighborhood and municipal parkland within Centers. Provide regional recreation and tourism opportunities by targeting parkland acquisitions and improvements that enhance large contiguous open space systems and by facilitating alternative recreational and tourism uses of farmland.

Mannington Township is a small rural community containing just over 500 homes. School facilities and preserved natural conservation areas are used to provide recreation areas/facilities to residents (multiple use of facilities).

8. **Redevelopment:** Encourage appropriate redevelopment in existing Centers and existing developed areas that have the potential to become Centers, or in ways that support Center-based development to accommodate growth that would otherwise occur in the Environs. Redevelop with intensities sufficient to support transit, a



broad range of uses, efficient use of infrastructure, and design that enhance public safety, encourage pedestrian activity, reduce dependency on the automobile and maintain the rural character of Centers.

Mannington does not have any significant areas in need of redevelopment.

9. **Historic Preservation:** Encourage the preservation and adaptive reuse of historic or significant buildings, Historic and Cultural Sites, neighborhoods and districts in ways that coordinate historic preservation needs with farmland preservation efforts. Coordinate historic preservation with tourism efforts.

The Township of Mannington has mapped an inventory of 56 historic sites which represents nearly 10% of the residential properties in the community. In addition, a description and photograph of each structure keyed to the map was created as part of the 2007 Township Environmental Resource Inventory.

10. **Public Facilities and Services:** Phase and program for construction as part of a dedicated capital improvement budget or as part of a public/private development agreement the extension or establishment of public facilities and services, particularly wastewater systems, to establish adequate levels of capital facilities and services to support Centers; to protect large contiguous areas of productive farmlands and other open spaces; to protect public investments in farmland preservation programs; and to minimize conflicts between Centers and surrounding farms. Encourage private investments and facilitate public/private partnerships to provide adequate facilities and services, particularly wastewater systems, in Centers. Make community wastewater treatment a feasible and cost-effective alternative.

Township officials have, in their planning processes, responded to this general concept to the degree expected of a rural community. They are, for example, aware of the fiscal consequences of unmanaged growth (suburban sprawl) and have taken steps to avoid these problems. School facilities and preserved natural conservation areas are also used to provide recreation areas/facilities to residents (multiple use of facilities). They participate in inter-municipal shared service agreements in the provision/financing of their court system, trash pickup, and, of course, public sewer and water. They require developers of major subdivisions/site plans to pay their pro-rata share of off-tract improvements.



- II. **Intergovernmental Coordination:** Coordinate efforts of various state agencies, county and municipal governments to ensure that state and local policies and programs support rural economic development, agriculture, and the rural character of the area by examining the effects of financial institution lending, government regulation, taxation and other governmental policies and programs.

In December, 2006, the County of Salem adopted an *Open Space and Farmland Preservation Plan*, which was presented in two volumes: Volume I, *Open Space and Recreation Plan*, and Volume II, *Farmland Preservation Plan*. Both volumes of the Plan identify environmental and agricultural resources in Mannington Township that should be protected and preserved. The Plan specifically recommends that the Mannington Meadows, the Salem River corridor and two farmland preservation project areas be protected.

The D&R Greenway and other non-profit preservation organizations have also targeted properties in the Mannington Meadows that require protected.

The planning policies contained in the 2007 Mannington Township Master Plan Amendment mirror the State Plan planning policies. The adopted density reductions for Mannington Township's three agricultural and residential districts will minimize the impact of future development and permit the preservation and protection of the Township's agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands. This is wholly consistent with the goals and policies of the State Plan.

A.3 State Plan Cross Acceptance Process

From 2004 through 2007, the Township participated with Salem County in the State Plan Cross Acceptance process. The following excerpt from the Salem County Cross Acceptance report summarizes Mannington's consistency with the Vision and the Goals of the NJ State Plan, specific negotiations agenda, and recommendations.

1. Municipal Concurrence with the State Plan Vision Statement

Based on review of the Municipal Master Plan and Ordinance, and discussion with Municipal officials, the goals of the Township are compatible with those contained in the SDRP Vision Statement. Most notably the Township Plan calls for the conservation of environmentally sensitive and agricultural land, and the concentration of development in the area adjoining the Salem City Regional Center.



The Township’s Plan and regulations contain several noteworthy elements that support the “Vision” of the State Plan including:

- The requirement for an environmental impact statement for certain types of development
- An ordinance element requiring developers to pay their fair share of off-tract improvements
- A “Right-to-Farm” ordinance element
- An “Energy Conservation” ordinance element

2. Negotiation Agenda

C-I Steams - The Township does have C-I streams (classification I streams). The identification of these watersheds as C-I Streams must be clarified with the SPC. Also, the Township expressed a major concern with the regulation of permitted uses in the buffer area surrounding C-I watersheds. [Specifically, the Township requested clarification on whether farming will be permitted by the stream having a significant impact and adverse effect on farming, which represents the largest land use in the Township].

Threatened and Endangered Species – The Township maintains several areas under the DEP overlay data that have been identified as habitat area for threatened and endangered species. The Township expressed strong concerns with any restrictions on farming that may be associated with new or proposed regulations resulting from the DEP mapping data.

Preservation of Environs - The need for increased resources and programs and legislation (e.g., Transfer of Development Rights) to assist the Township in its efforts to preserve agricultural lands.

3. The protection, restoration, and integration of natural resources and systems



The Township’s Plan and ordinance reflect the objective of protecting the municipality’s natural and agricultural areas. The public and private efforts that have resulted in the creation of several protected wildlife management areas are moving in the direction of creating a preserved greenway. Farmland preservation efforts at the County and Township level (including the Township’s “Right-To Farm” ordinance element) have made progress in the area of resource protection.



In recognition off the emphasis on protection of natural resources, it may be beneficial for the Township to prepare a conservation plan element for inclusion in the Master Plan. This plan would generally provide for the preservation, conservation, and utilization of natural resource, and would systematically analyze the impact of the other master plan elements on the present and future uses of these resources.

A.4 Plan Endorsement

The State Planning Commission updated the Guidelines for Plan Endorsement in 2007. Achieving Plan Endorsement status is a comprehensive process that results in an official determination that a municipal plan is consistent with the State Plan. The process seeks to coordinate the planning initiatives of the state with local plans. The Office of Smart Growth (OSG) explains that the benefits of obtaining plan endorsement are financial and technical assistance from the State to help implement an endorsed plan. The Township was awarded a 2008 Smart Future Grant to help complete the process of Plan Endorsement. The Municipal Self Assessment is nearing completion.



State Plan (2001)

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz

Architects

Planners


Landscape Architects






B. SPECIAL RESOURCE AREAS/CAFRA

The accompanying CAFRA Map indicates the areas of Mannington Township which fall under the jurisdiction of the Coastal Area Facilities Review Act. CAFRA is one of the legal foundations for the implementation of the federally mandated NJ Coastal Zone Management Program. In general, regulated development activities include any development located within 150 feet of the mean high water line or most landward limit of a beach or dune. CAFRA requires a detailed environmental impact statement as part of a development application.



Source: Coastal Areas Facilities Review Act (CAFRA), New Jersey Pinelands Commission / Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), Bureau of Tidelands, Trenton, NJ. 7/7/1995

This map was developed using New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Geographic Information System digital data, but this secondary product has not been verified by NJDEP and is not state-authorized.



CAFRA Jurisdiction

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz Architects
Planners
Landscape Architects



C. MUNICIPAL MASTER PLAN AND ZONING REGULATIONS

The following excerpt from the 2007 Master Plan Reexamination illustrates Mannington’s planning vision. The protection of its agricultural and environmental resources has been Mannington Township’s primary land use goal since at least the adoption of its 1978 Master Plan. Recent planning studies commissioned by the Township - the Environmental Resource Inventory and the Farmland Preservation Plan Element - highlight the importance of Mannington’s resources and stress the importance of protecting them not only for the local community, but because they are resources of state and national importance.

Until recently, the Township’s land use policies could effectively manage the protection of the its agricultural and environmental resources. The farmland preservation program, right to farm ordinance and lack of development pressure were sufficient to protect agricultural viability and keep environmentally sensitive lands safe from encroaching development. However, recent trends in development applications in the Township and surrounding municipalities provide evidence that this municipality is no longer insulated from development pressure. The Township must be prepared to manage development pressure and new growth.

The State of New Jersey and Mannington Township share a similar vision for the future of Mannington. That vision is a rural, agriculturally productive community with modest-sized center(s) of residential and commercial growth. They also share similar perspectives on how to achieve that goal, the most obvious tool being the transfer of development rights program. The Township’s cluster ordinance and participation in the farmland preservation program are other important tools. ⁴

C.I. Master Plan and Reexamination History

A comprehensive development plan for Mannington Township was completed by the Salem County Planning Staff in 1978. This study included:

- | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Natural Resource Inventory | Demographic Analysis |
| Soils Analysis | Transportation Analysis |
| Water Supply Analysis | Community Facilities Analysis |
| Geologic Analysis | Public Safety Protection Services |

⁴ Township of Mannington Reexamination Report, 2007, page 20.



| | |
|--------------------|---------------------|
| Historic Inventory | Recreation Analysis |
| Economic Analysis | Housing Analysis |

The 2001 Reexamination report was conducted which reiterated the 1978 goals and objectives and made recommendations affecting agriculture. A Conservation Plan Element was recommended. Buffering and screening requirements were recommended where new development adjoins farmland assessed lands.

The 2007 Reexamination Report reviewed the goals and objectives of the 2001 Report. The Report identified several new studies and ordinances adopted by the Township since the 2001 Report which affect agriculture: the 2006 Farmland Preservation Plan, the 2007 Environmental Resource Inventory, 2005 initiation of a TDR Zoning study, 2005 adoption of a right to farm ordinance, 2006 mandatory cluster ordinance, and 2006 agricultural buffer ordinance. The reexamination report also detailed changes in the basis for the Master Plan including new statewide legislation, new programs, and development trends. The 2007 Report made recommendations for Plan revisions and future planning studies including pursuing TDR and centers based development plans, continued farmland preservation, and open space preservation to protect agriculture and sensitive environmental features. Most notably the Report recommended a reduction in the density of the Agricultural, Rural Residential, and Conditional Residential Districts from 60,000 square feet to three acre minimum lot size based on the findings of the farmland preservation plan and the environmental resources inventory as well as identification of increased development pressure.

A Master Plan Amendment adopted July 12, 2007 states that the reduced density better achieves the master plan goal of protecting and preserving the rural character in Mannington. The recommended change to three acre zoning was detailed as a logical and modest progression from the 60,000 square foot lot size developed in the 1970's. While even larger minimum lot sizes were identified as "defensible" in Mannington given the sensitive environmental resources and vast areas of prime farmland, three acre zoning maintains the rural character of the Township and preserves land owner equity.

C.2. Reduced Lot Sizes

Mannington Township's decision to reconsider its zoning densities became a focus of the planning process for its pending transfer of development rights program (TDR). The build-out analysis revealed that the community's zoning, would permit the development of over 5,000 new housing units in the Township. If the Township pursued the TDR program, that number would likely increase to approximately 6,000 houses given the



program's transfer ratio requirements. The Township is also aware that TDR programs can actually accelerate development once the planning and infrastructure is in place in the Receiving Area(s) to accommodate it.

Consequently, faced with development pressure for the first time in its history, Mannington has determined that the magnitude of residential development permitted by the current zoning is incompatible with the core preservation values expressed in the Master and Re-examination Report. For a rural municipality with only 573 dwelling units (2000 census) the prospect of having the housing stock increase by a factor of 10 would fundamentally change the type of community Mannington has historically been and wants to continue to be. The magnitude of the build-out would destroy the Township's rural character and undermine all of its previous efforts to preserve and protect the community's agricultural and environmental resources.

Consequently, density of the zoning districts was changed in 2007 from 60,000 square foot lots to three acres in the Agricultural (A) and Conditional Residential (CR) zones and from two acres to three acres in the Rural Residential (RR) zone.

C.3. Mandatory Cluster Ordinance

Mannington Township revised its zoning in 2006 to replace a cluster option with a mandatory residential cluster ordinance. This ordinance requires housing to be separated from non-residential uses and the required open space set asides be coordinated into contiguous blocks of farmable land. The Ordinance recommends the open space and farmland set asides be located on the best agricultural soils and requires the continued facilitation of farming operations.

C.4. Agricultural Buffers

In 2005 the Township added an ordinance to require that major subdivisions provide 50 foot wide agricultural buffers where the development abuts farmland assessed property or land which is actively farmed but is tax exempt. These buffers must be in addition to the lot area and yard requirements for the lots created. The buffer strip shall be deed restricted against development except for fencing, walls, or drainage facilities and against removal of any screen of trees or hedges so long as the adjacent land is assessed or qualified as farmland or is actively farmed. In addition, the developer may be required at the discretion of the approving authority to plant a screen of evergreen trees no less than 20 feet from the agricultural property line. This screen must be at least six feet in height



when installed and may also require a fence. The Approving Board may require deed restrictions, easements or other legal restrictions or instruments for maintenance of the buffer area and required screening by individual property owners and homeowners associations in order to provide a means of preserving and maintaining the buffer area. The ordinance permits the Township or other designated parties to become involved if the property owner or homeowners association fails to comply with the deed restriction.

C.5. Agricultural Impact Statement

For major site plans an agricultural impact statement must be provided as a completeness item.

D. CURRENT LAND USE TRENDS

Mannington Township is a rural, agricultural township covering 23,919.5 acres of land (37.4 square miles) in the western portion of Salem County. The population of Mannington, 1,559 persons, has dropped slightly over the last two decades, but total housing units have increased slightly over that timeframe to 573. The population density in Mannington, 44.8 persons per square mile, is significantly lower than that of the surrounding communities and is approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ that of Salem County.

D.I. Community Character

The predominant use of land in Mannington Township is agriculture - 77.4% of the land is farmland. The Township has the highest percentage of prime soils in Salem County. Active agricultural production defines much of the landscape and creates a rural atmosphere which the Township has long identified as important to the community's character and future. Significant environmentally important areas concentrated in the western portion of the Township are associated with wetlands, waterways and tidal marshes. Mannington is further defined by an exceptional inventory of historic country homes.

Unlike many rural towns, Mannington does have some commercial and industrial development along the Pennsylvania-Reading Rail line and associated with the Salem County Hospital. NJ Route 45 bisects the central portion of the community connecting Salem City to Woodstown and beyond. Traditional highway commercial development has developed intermittently along the southern portion of this highway corridor. The



accompanying Existing Land Use Map illustrates current land use trends. The following table summarizes existing land use by tax class within the Township:

Figure 13: Existing Land Use Table


| Existing Land Use by Tax Class | | |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| Existing Land Use by Tax Class | Acreage | % of Total Acreage |
| Single Family Detached Residential | 794.31 | 3.30 |
| Farm House | 134.82 | 0.60 |
| Public Property | 1643.04 | 6.90 |
| Public/School | 57.36 | 0.20 |
| Church/Cemetery | 8.68 | 0.04 |
| Commercial/Office | 230.54 | 1.00 |
| Exempt | 50.66 | 0.20 |
| Agricultural & Ag. Commercial | 18336.65 | 77.00 |
| Open Space/Recreation | 185.9 | 0.80 |
| Vacant/Wooded (does not include agriculture) | 1641.19 | 7.00 |
| Industrial | 229.93 | 1.00 |
| Railroad | 41.99 | 0.20 |
| Total | 23,919.5* | 100.00% |
| <i>Sources: 2008 Mannington MOD IV Tax Assessment Records</i> | | |
| <i>* roadways are not included in total acreage</i> | | |


As indicated in the table, agriculture is the largest land use in the Township. Public property and vacant land are a distant second; indicating the success of the Township’s preservation efforts. Single family residential development representing just over 3% of Mannington is the third largest land use followed by commercial/office uses and industrial uses. This pattern represents Mannington’s strong heritage as a rural and agricultural community. The most notable aspect of the existing land use is the large amount of land that is devoted to agricultural uses. Almost 77% of the land in the Township falls into this category.



The chart below illustrates existing land use in the Township, using somewhat broader categories of land use.

Figure 14: Existing Land Use Chart






Legend

Land Use

- Residential Property
- Commercial
- Farm (House)
- Farm (Qualified)
- Industrial
- Open Space
- Public School / School Property
- Church / Cemetery
- Public Property
- Other Exempt
- Railroad
- Vacant

Source: Land Use: NJ Association of County Tax Boards MOD4 (land use) Data for Mannington Township 3/2010

This map was developed using New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Geographic Information System digital data, but this secondary product has not been verified by NJDEP and is not state-authorized.



Existing Land Use

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz ● ● ■
 Architects
 Planners
 Landscape Architects



E. SEWER SERVICE AREAS/ PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY SERVICE AREAS

The Township has two very small sections serviced by regional sewer service and potable water areas. One is in the north west region adjacent to County Ware Building. The second is a small private sewer line extending from Salem City to service the hospital, and a few isolated parcels along the highway Rt. 45. The Township’s sewer and water service areas are depicted in the map on the following page.

F. MANNINGTON’S ZONING

Regardless of zoning, farming is permitted everywhere and subject only to restrictions existent on fowl and swine farms. The ordinance acknowledges six agricultural practices which may be conducted at all times from which any noise, odors, dust or fumes caused by these practices is permitted. Both the surface application of liquid manure and use of carbide guns after sundown and before sunrise do not count as an accepted agricultural practice.


F.I. Lot Size Categories and Distribution

Figure 15: Lot Size Category

| Lot Size Category | acreage | # of Parcels |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------|
| < 1 acre | 163 | 336 |
| 1 acre – 5 acres | 731 | 326 |
| 5 acres – 10 acres | 997 | 135 |
| 10 + acres | 21,486 | 388 |
| Total: | 20,324.45 | 1185 |

Source: MOD IV Data

The distribution of lot sizes in Mannington reveals the agricultural character of the community. The data indicated approximately 50% of the parcels in Mannington are less than 5 acres in size; however, the tax assessor confirms that many of these parcels are part of a larger farm management unit which may be separated from the farm by a roadway.




Legend

Size

- Under 1 Acre
- >1 - <5 Acres
- >5 - <10 Acres
- 10+ Acres

Source: This map was developed using New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Geographic Information System digital data, but this secondary product has not been verified by NJDEP and is not state-authorized.



Lot Sizes

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010


Clarke Caton Hintz

Architects

Planners

Landscape Architects






Legend

Facility Name

- Carneys Point Generating Station
- Carneys Point STP Service Area
- City of Salem STP Service Area
- Clemente Landfill
- DuPont Chambers Works WTP
- Elizabeth Remster School
- Handys Mobile Home Park
- Layton's Well Pit
- Pennsville Sewer Authority STP Service Area
- Salem County Solid Waste Facility
- Woodstown WTF

Source: New Jersey Statewide Sewer Service Area (Version 200910) New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP), Division of Watershed Management (DWM), Bureau of Watershed Regulation (BWR) (signed into adoption on October 11, 2006)

This map was developed using New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Geographic Information System digital data, but this secondary product has not been verified by NJDEP and is not state-authorized.




Sewer Service

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz

Architects
Planners
Landscape Architects




NJDEP Water Service

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz
 Architects
 Planners
 Landscape Architects





Zoning

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz
 Architects
 Planners
 Landscape Architects





F.2. Discussion of Development Pressures

Despite its current sparse population and limited housing stock, Mannington Township, like many rural towns in New Jersey's southern tier, is experiencing increasing development pressure. This pressure is fueled by the dwindling availability of vacant, developable land in northern and central New Jersey and the combined effects of federal and state legislative action to preserve land and water resources in the Highlands and the Pinelands. In addition, since the enactment of the Garden State Preservation Trust Act in 1999 the NJ Farmland Preservation Program has been funded at historically high levels which have enabled it to compete effectively with developers in search of vacant land.

Mannington Township is particularly susceptible to development pressure. It is characterized by relatively large, flat, cleared tracts of land interspersed with scenic stream corridors and riparian meadows. Convenient access to the southern entrances to both the New Jersey Turnpike and Interstate 295 is available through neighboring Carney's Point; in addition, Mannington is less than 15 miles from Wilmington, Delaware across the Delaware Memorial Bridge.

One tangible indicator of the Township's attractiveness to developers is evidenced by the three major subdivision applications, comprising over 90 residential lots, which were filed in Mannington in 2005. These applications alone comprise more than twice the 40 certificates of occupancy issued to new residential units in the Township in the nine years between 2000 and 2008. The market has cooled substantially due to the current economic downturn and none of the approved developments have been built.

In addition to residential development pressure, an interesting new challenge to preserving farmlands has recently developed: large scale solar facilities. Due to favorable state legislation, and financial incentives, New Jersey is becoming a target location for solar energy generating facilities. This new competition for land adds pressure to already stretched resources for preservation efforts. Balanced planning for siting of solar facilities is a new reality municipalities must face. Notwithstanding the new pressure from solar facilities, the Township realizes that the lull in residential development pressure presents an opportunity to continue preserving land and planning for the TDR preservation tool.

F.3. Land Value Trends

The cost of purchasing development rights in recent years has ranged from \$4,500 to \$15,000 per acre. The average cost of an easement in the County in 2007 was approximately \$8,000 an acre, an increase of nearly 55% over the average cost in 2006



and more than double the average cost per acre in the year 2000. With the economic downturn in the housing market these numbers will likely represent a temporary plateau in assessment values. In Mannington, the values ranged from a low of \$1,316 for an easement in 2002 to a high of \$10,500 in 2007.

G. DISCUSSION OF MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL TDR OPPORTUNITIES

The opportunity to utilize TDR as a planning tool is being carefully explored in Mannington due to the Township's strong preservation vision. Because Mannington is rich in both valuable agricultural as well as environmental lands virtually all portions of the municipality are within an acquisition target for different preservation groups. A powerful tool such as TDR will enable the Township to balance all of the various preservation agendas and direct growth to the most appropriate locations while respecting the sensitive environmental lands as well as prime farmland. Critical steps in exercising the TDR option in Mannington include planning for sewer and water utility infrastructure and capacity and identifying the size and location of the receiving area(s). Lack of funding for the development of the TDR program is the most limiting factor to its progress. However, representatives from the Township are participating in the Statewide TDR task force whose goal is to streamline the statewide TDR process and make it more accessible and affordable to municipalities.



IV. MANNINGTON'S FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM

Mannington Township ranks third in the state for number of acres preserved for agriculture with 37 farms totaling 5,475 acres preserved by the State and County Farmland Preservation Programs. There are three additional farms pending closing totaling 298 acres. There are currently four farms enrolled in the eight year program totaling 462 acres.

In addition, 2,775 acres have been preserved as open space through various non-profit groups and the DEP Green Acres Program. Much of this open space acreage is currently farmed.

A. COUNTY AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AREAS.

The location of Salem County's designated Agricultural Development Areas is shown on the following map exhibit. All of the Mannington's land is located within the boundaries of the ADA.

B. FARMLAND PRESERVED TO DATE BY PROGRAM

- B.1. County Easement Purchase:
18 Farms, 1,954 acres preserved.
- B.2. County Planning Incentive Grant
One pending closing, 76 acres.
- B.3. Municipal Planning Incentive Grants:
None to date
- B.4. SADC Direct Easement Purchase:
13 farms 2,444 acres + 2 farms pending closing 221 acres.
- B.5. SADC Fee Simple
3 farms, 426 acres.
- B.6. Non-profit.
1 farm, 279 acres
- B.7. Transfer of Development Rights:
NA



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

Clarke Caton Hintz

Figure 16: Preserved Farmland

| Preserved Farmland | | | | | | |
|--|----------|----------------------|--|----------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| Original Owner | Acres | Block | Lot | Per Acre Total | Type of Acquisition- | Date Of Acquisition |
| Barbara, E. & L. | 112.9160 | 8; 14; 15 | 29; 7,10, 11, 19; 14, 16, 26; | 2,200 | SADC EP | 06/23/06 |
| Battiato, J. | 116.0420 | 23 | 13 | 6,718 | Cty EP | 03/24/06 |
| Catalano, J. | 145.1110 | 2 | 8 & 12 | 3,795 | Cty EP | 06/27/05 |
| Culver, D. & S. #1 | 105.7740 | 38 | 3 | 7,456 | Cty Ep | 02/27/07 |
| Culver, D. & S. #2 | 86.0580 | 38 | 3 | 8,500 | Cty EP | 03/22/07 |
| D&R Greenway/Carpenter | 177.0170 | 38; 48 | 14; 8 | 6,084 | NPG | 06/03/09 |
| D&R Greenway/Sparks | 139.1660 | 62 | 3, 4, 8 | 8,218 | NPG | 06/25/09 |
| Dancer, H. & S./Shermanm M. & N. | 228.0500 | 53 | 36 18; 3; 1, 2, 5 & 6 | 2,282 | SADC FS | 08/05/96 |
| Doak, J. & C. | 157.3120 | 9; 11; 12 | 5; 7 | 2,000 | SADC EP | 12/17/04 |
| Dolbow, W., Sr. | 126.5900 | 42; 45 | 7 & 8; 15 & 16 | 5,598 | Cty EP | 03/24/06 |
| Emel, R. D. & I. | 207.3700 | 20; 21 | 9; 14 | 1,593 | Cty EP | 02/04/00 |
| Emel. D. & I. | 52.9940 | 20; 21 | 16 | 1,611 | Cty EP | 12/14/01 |
| Geck, A. | 172.3760 | 4 | 16 | 2,790 | SADC FS | 12/29/99 |
| Griscom, A. & R. | 108.1950 | 45; 47 | 17; 14 & 15 | 1,900 | Cty EP | 05/15/00 |
| Hancock, W., III #2 | 75.2720 | 50 | 8 | 6,831 | Cty EP | 05/31/07 |
| Hancock, W., Jr. | 107.2560 | 50 | 32 | 3,392 | Cty EP | 03/08/06 |
| Hancock, W., Jr. #1 | 74.9320 | 50 | 20 | 8,151 | Cty EP | 04/07/06 |
| Hancock, W., Jr. #2 | 10.2050 | 50 | 18 | 8,700 | Cty EP | 04/19/07 |
| Hancock, W., Jr. & M. | 38.2370 | 23 | 11 | 5,643 | Cty EP | 05/10/06 |
| Kroll, E. | 90.6240 | 19; 20 | 6; 18, 21 | 1,599 | Cty EP | 08/09/00 |
| Myers Family Irrevocable Trust #1 | 109.4270 | 40; 18 | 6.01 & 6.03; 11 | 5,500 | Cty EP | 04/19/07 |
| Myers Family Irrevocable Trust #2 | 44.9480 | 81 | 1 & 3 | 10,500 | Cty EP | 04/19/07 |
| Myers, H. & E. | 250.6800 | 4; 24 31; 32; 34; | 6 & 7; 14 4; 9; 3 & 12; 1 & 2; 7 & 9 | 1,930 | Cty EP | 12/14/01 |
| NJCF/Fichera Farm | 278.8140 | 35; 36 | | 6,144 | NPG | 04/23/10 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

Clarke Caton Hintz


| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|--------|-------------------|--------|----------|----------|
| Paruszewski, J. | 56.6690 | 15; 18 | 4.01; 8 | 1,500 | SADC EP | 02/11/04 |
| Robinson, S. | 147.3800 | 45; 53 | 10, 13, 16; 31 | 1,482 | Cty EP | 09/18/98 |
| Salem Farms Corp #1 | 367.6450 | 21 | 5 | 7,805 | SADC EP | 12/31/08 |
| Salem Farms Corp #2 | 279.6990 | 4; 22; | 9; 2, 4, 12 | 7,714 | SADC EPO | 12/31/08 |
| Salem Farms Corp #3 | 319.4880 | 23 | 2, 3, 9, 9.01, 10 | 7,972 | SADC EP | 12/31/08 |
| Salem Farms Corp #4 | 358.8000 | 24 | 5, 7, 17, 18, 19 | 7,096 | SADC EP | 12/31/08 |
| Salem Farms Corp #5 | 125.7060 | 25 | 14 | 9,006 | SADC EP | 12/31/08 |
| Salem Farms Corp #6 | 319.8340 | 23; 24 | 1; 1, 20, 21 | 8,432 | SADC EP | 12/31/08 |
| Weigel, A. & M. | 99.7310 | 53 | 35 | 1,316 | SADC EP | 06/26/02 |
| Whitaker, J. #1 | 32.6690 | 50 | 19 | 8,613 | Cty EP | 03/22/07 |
| Whitaker, J. #2 | 25.9860 | 50 | 14 | 10,500 | Cty EP | 03/22/07 |
| Wright, G. & R. | 129.9610 | 24; 34 | 3; 10 | 3,847 | SADC EP | 12/29/05 |
| Wright, G. & R. | 112.7530 | 50 | 33 | 3,687 | SADC EP | 12/29/05 |
| Strang, L. & S. | 26.0800 | 15 | 1, 2 & 3 | 2,317 | SADC FS | 03/22/00 |
| DiGregorio, J. & C. | 1.8800 | 3 | 12 | | SADC EP | 03/28/07 |

Figure 17: Pending Closings

| Pending Closing | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------|-----------|-------------|--|---------|
| Original Owner | Acres | Block | Lot | | Program |
| Tark | 104.18 | 53 | 37,38 | | SADC EP |
| Digregorio | 76.84 | 3 | 17,19 | | Co PIG |
| Richmond | 116.89 | 20, 21,39 | 2&2.02,1,32 | | SADC EP |

Figure 18: Eight Year Program

| Eight Year Program | | | | |
|--------------------|-------|-------|------|---------|
| Owner | Acres | Block | Lot | Program |
| Moore | 152 | 21, 5 | 8,4 | 8 yr |
| Battiato, S | 76 | 59 | 6.01 | 8 yr |
| Fogg, C | 71 | 25 | 13 | 8 yr |
| Battiato, F | 163 | 59 | 8 | 8 yr |



Preserved Farmlands, Open Space & ADA

Mannington Township, Salem County, NJ July 2010

Clarke Caton Hintz

Architects

Planners

Landscape Architects





C. CONSISTENCY WITH SADC STRATEGIC TARGETING PROJECT.

The SADC's Strategic Targeting Project was never adopted but served as a model for the new comprehensive program rules. County comprehensive farmland plans are required to strategically target preservation efforts based primarily on soil quality. Targeting is intended to help prioritize farmland preservation investments on the best quality farmland which is located outside of sewer service areas. The preservation of Prime Soils and Soils of Statewide Importance is the priority of the Strategic Targeting Project. All of the farmland preserved in Mannington Township contains prime and statewide important soils.

The Strategic Targeting Project calls for careful evaluation of information gathered through an extensive outreach commitment as part of a planning process that will result in a coordinated landowner contact effort. Mannington coordinates this outreach effort with Salem County.


D. COORDINATION WITH MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY OPEN SPACE AND FARMLAND PRESERVATION PLANS.

The County Farmland Preservation Plan emphasizes the importance of agriculture to the Salem County economy and quality of life. The Plan cites the Salem County Agriculture Development Board (CADB) belief that a goal of preserving the greatest number of productive farms possible is prudent public policy. Although the CADB will accept applications anywhere in the County's Agriculture Development Areas (ADA), it identifies three project areas for concentrating farmland preservation efforts. Mannington Township is located within 2 of these 3 County project areas: the Mannington Meadows to Seven Starts to Algonkin Lake and the Maskell Mills to Hagerville to Mannington Meadows. The two combined areas include nearly the entire Township of Mannington, with the exception of the RR zoning district to the east and lands west of Route 45. Within these project areas, the specific parcels listed as targets in Salem County's Farmland Preservation Plan generally reflect current applications for preservation. Several of these farms have been permanently protected. In general, the Mannington Township Planning Board, Agricultural Advisory Committee, and the Governing Body do not favor a policy of targeting specific farmland at the local level. The land in Mannington is valuable, almost without exception, to either the Farmland Preservation Program or to Open Space Programs. Because of the voluntary nature of the program and the competition for funding based on State and County ranking criterion, Mannington's leaders are reluctant to steer preservation efforts toward any specific farms.



Mannington Township is a focal point for open space acquisitions as well as farmland preservation due to its important bird habitat and environmental resources in the “meadows”. Currently 2,775 acres have been permanently protected. Mannington coordinates its open space preservation with its farmland preservation in appropriate ways and encourages continued farming activity on all open space lands.

Mannington Township



DRAFT

- Stream
- Lake
- Municipality
- Important Bird Area

Source: NJ Audubon Society, NJDEP, NJDOT, D.V.R.P.C.
This map was developed using New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Geographic Information System digital data, but this secondary product has not been verified by NJDEP and is not state-authorized.

0 0.5 1 Miles

Delaware Valley
Regional Planning Commission
March 2007

Map 14: Mannington Meadows Important Bird Area



E. FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM FUNDING EXPENDED TO DATE.

Mannington uses two main sources of funding for farmland preservation cost share. An annual appropriation of approximately \$5,000 and a two cent preservation and open space tax which the Mannington voters approved in 2006 generates approximately \$43,600 per year. The current balance in the trust fund is \$61,297. The 2009 preservation of the Seabrook farm resulted in a \$400,000 cost share for Mannington which will continue to be paid in installments over the next eight years with interest. To date Mannington has invested \$498,100 in cost share funding including the 2009 and 2010 installments for Seabrook.

As indicated in the table below, the total cost of farmland preserved in Mannington through County easement purchases, and SADC purchases as of March 16, 2010 is estimated at \$29,088,491. The Township’s share of this total is estimated at \$2,447,447 representing approximately 2% of the total cost.

Figure 19: Farmland Preservation Funding Table

| Farmland Preservation Funding Cost Share | | | |
|---|-------------|------------------|--------------|
| State/FED | Salem Co. | Mannington Twp.* | TOTAL |
| \$23,049,207 | \$5,541,190 | \$498,100 | \$29,088,491 |
| 79% | 19% | 2% | 100% |
| <i>Source: SADC Municipal Totals March 16, 2010</i> | | | |
| <i>* Estimated local cost share</i> | | | |

F. MONITORING OF PRESERVED FARMLAND.

The County and State monitor the easements they own and the non-profit groups monitor any easements they own.

G. COORDINATION WITH TDR PROGRAMS

Mannington is currently in the planning stages of a TDR program.



V. FUTURE FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM

A. PRESERVATION GOALS

As previously discussed in Section III, Land Use Planning Context, Mannington's 1978 Master Plan, and the 2007 Re-Examination Report identify the Township's primary land use goal or policy as the protection of rural character, agriculture and environmental resources.

To achieve these important planning goals, the Township has taken a proactive, comprehensive approach to future land use planning. Local land use policies, such as agricultural buffers and right to farm ordinances support and protect agricultural viability. A mandatory cluster ordinance in the agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas, Agricultural District (A), Conditional Residential District (CR) and Conservation District (C), restricts development to limited, core areas of a site. Most significantly, the Township is pursuing a transfer of development rights program that has the potential of directing all future development of the agricultural and environmentally sensitive lands to an area or areas appropriately designated for growth. This latter program is important to local officials and Township residents because it has the potential to achieve the community's land use goals and at the same time protect landowner's equity. In addition, funding for preservation through TDR is provided by the private market not with public tax dollars.

B. PROJECT AREA SUMMARIES

Mannington has historically used the County designated ADA within Mannington Township as its Project Area.

C. MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY MINIMUM ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA COORDINATION

The Salem CADB utilizes the criteria and program guidelines adopted by the SADC as the basis in making its recommendations on farmland applications. These criteria include the requirements that a farm qualifies for farmland assessment and that the farm is located in an Agricultural Development Area. Farms are then ranked on the basis of their size, soil quality, percent of tillable acres, boundaries and buffers criterion to protect the integrity of the individual application and/or project area, and the density of preserved farms (and farms within the 8-year program) within one-half mile. In addition to these criteria, the CADB also considers local commitment criterion examining zoning, the absence of growth leading infrastructure, consistency with municipal plans, active participation in the



Agricultural Retention and Development Program, and /or the adoption of a Right-To-Farm ordinance and other ordinances that support agriculture. Mannington does not have additional local criteria.

D. MUNICIPAL RANKING CRITERIA TO PRIORITIZE FARMS

Mannington relies upon the Salem CADB ranking criterion for size and quality of farmland.

Salem County Agriculture Development Board

Ranking Criteria

Acreage (5 points):

301 or more = 5 points

201 to 300 acres = 4 points

101 to 200 acres = 3 points

51 to 100 acres = 2 points

10 to 50 acres = 1 point

Sub Total = _____

Soils (30 points)

Percent of Prime _____% x .30 = _____ points

Percent of Statewide _____% x .20 = _____ points

Percent of Local _____% x .10 = _____ points

Percent of Other _____% x 0 = _____ points

Sub Total = _____

Tillable (15 points)

80 to 100% = 15 points

60 to 79% = 10 points

40 to 59% = 08 points

20 to 39% = 05 points

0 to 19% = 01 point

Sub Total = _____

Boundaries and Buffers (20 points)

Deed restricted farmland _____% x .20 = _____ points

Deed restricted Wildlife Areas _____% x .18 = _____ points

Eight year program _____% x .13 = _____ points

Farmland (Unrestricted) _____% x .06 = _____ points

Streams & Wetlands _____% x .18 = _____ points

Parks (limited public access) _____% x .14 = _____ points

Parks (high public use) _____% x .05 = _____ points



Military Installations _____% x .14 = _____ points
 Limited Access Highways & RR's _____% x .10 = _____ points
 Public Golf Courses _____% x .14 = _____ points
 Residential Development _____% x .00 = 0 points
 Other _____% x .00 = 0 points
Sub Total = _____

Density (10 points)
 Preserved farms within ½ mile = 2 points (each)
 Eight year farms within ½ mile = 1 point (each)
Sub Total = _____

2
 Salem County Agriculture Development Board
 Ranking Criteria
 Page 2

Local Commitment (10 points)
 Absence of sewer hook-up = 3 points
 Township Right to Farm Ordinance = 4 points
 Active Municipal Liaison with CADB = 1 point
 Previous purchased easements = 1 point
 Municipal Financial Support = 1 point
Sub Total = _____

Special Consideration (10 points)
 Create a New Project Area = 5 points
 Historic Structures = 1 point
 Eight year program participation = 3 points
 Environment significance = 1 point
Sub Total = _____

Exceptions
 Non-Severable Exception = -0 points
 Additional Non-Severable Exception = -5 points (Each)
Sub Total = _____
TOTAL = _____



E. MUNICIPAL POLICY RELATED TO FARMLAND PRESERVATION APPLICATIONS

Mannington relies upon the standard SADC policies and regulations and has no additional criterion.

E.1. Approval of Housing Opportunities

- a. Overall housing opportunities permitted: One residence per farm.
- b. House replacement: A house can be built to replace a residence existing at the time the farm is approved, but only with the approval of the CADB.
- c. Residential Dwelling Site Opportunity Allocation: One Residential Dwelling Site Opportunity for every 100 acres if there is no exiting residence on the farm.

E.2. Division of the Premises

The Township would only allow division of the premises if it were found to be for an agricultural purpose by the CADB and the SADC, per the language in the deed of easement.

E.3. Approval of Exceptions

- a. Severable exceptions: Areas that would allow an additional residence are not allowed. In certain cases the Township may approve them, but they are generally not allowed.
- b. Non-severable exceptions: Non-severable exceptions around existing structures are generally allowed and encouraged.

F. FUNDING PLAN

F.1. Description of Municipal Funding Sources

Mannington uses two main sources of funding for farmland preservation cost share. An annual appropriation of approximately \$5,000 and a two cent preservation and open space tax which the Mannington voters approved in 2006 generates approximately \$43,600 per year. The current balance in the trust fund is \$61,297. The 2009 preservation of the



Seabrook farm resulted in a \$400,000 cost share for Mannington which will continue to be paid in installments over the next eight years with interest. To date Mannington has invested \$498,100 in cost share funding including the 2009 and 2010 installments for Seabrook. The total cost of farmland preserved in Mannington through County easement purchases, and SADC purchases as of March 16, 2010 is estimated at \$29,088,491. The Township's share of this total is estimated at \$2,447,447 representing approximately 2% of the total cost.

F.2. Financial Policies Related to Cost Share Requirements

Salem County Freeholders ask for a 2% cost share from Mannington Township for Farmland Preservation Easements.

F.3. Installment Purchase

An Installment Purchase Agreement (IPA) is an innovative arrangement that allows Salem County to acquire development rights by providing biannual payments to the landowner for a period of time (typically 20 to 30 years). The property owner receives the purchase price over time as well as interest on the unpaid, negotiated balance. IPAs provide important benefits to the buyer (County, State, or municipality) in that the smaller payments permit limited funding to be spread over a greater number of transactions, thus increasing the rate at which the County can acquire development rights before they are lost forever. Deferral of payment over time will permit the County to increase the overall number of purchases and is especially helpful for preservation of larger tracts and in those areas where rising easement prices make preservation in the future more prohibitive. For the landowner, receiving the income from the sale in installments may provide financial management or tax incentives. Deferring receipt of the sale price may allow sellers to defer capital gains tax. During that deferment, they receive tax-exempt interest every six months on the full sale price of the easement. The agreement of sale will set forth the basic terms of the IPA, including a minimum interest rate. Once the seller enters into a sale agreement, that interest rate is locked in as a minimum interest rate. Interest payments are made to the seller based on the rate contained in the sale agreement, or if the market rate increases between the time the offer is made and the day of closing, the rate based on the market immediately prior to closing. In August 2007, the County Freeholders passed a resolution making the use of Installment Purchase Agreements the standard policy when the County acquires or is a partner in acquiring development rights. This does not mean that all partners are required to use IPAs, but when the County is a partner to such



agreements, landowners will need to understand and agree to an IPA for the County's portion.⁵

G. FARMLAND PRESERVATION PROGRAM ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES

G.1. Municipal Staff /Consulting Resources

Mannington has an administrative staff with a good understanding of farmland preservation and its procedures. Mannington uses the professional planning services of Clarke Caton Hintz, P.C. for developing its Farmland Preservation and Agricultural elements to its Master Plan.

G.2. Legal support

Mannington's municipal attorney has experience with farmland preservation program specifics and easement restrictions.

G.3. Database development

Mannington utilizes the Planning Consulting Services of Clarke Caton Hintz to supply GIS support mapping for planning initiatives.

H. FACTORS LIMITING FARMLAND PRESERVATION IMPLEMENTATION

H.1. Funding

The single greatest problem facing the Salem CADB is a lack of sufficient funding to meet increasing demand. Funding is the single most critical limiting factor in reaching the County's goals, followed by limited staffing resources.

H.2. Project Costs/ Land Value

The cost of purchasing development rights in recent years has ranged from \$4,500 to \$15,000 per acre. The average cost of an easement in the County in 2007 was approximately \$8,000 an acre, an increase of nearly 55% over the average cost in 2006 and more than double the average cost per acre in the year 2000. With the economic downturn in the housing market these numbers will likely represent a temporary plateau in assessment values

⁵ Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan, page 6-12.



H.3. Land Supply

Mannington has over 18,000 acres of agriculturally assessed land.

H.4. Landowner interest

This has been a limiting factor. The Mannington Agricultural Advisory Committee indicates that many farmers especially young farmers need to keep their options flexible. The Farmland Preservation and Open Space deed restrictions in some cases are seen as too limiting. In addition, land value appraisals in Salem have been historically lower than expected. The Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan also includes the following limitations:

- Slow pace of the farmland preservation program in approving appraisals
- Restrictions in the farmland preservation program, such as impervious surface limits, management practice controls, and inflexibility that prevents farmland owners to adapt to changes in the agricultural industry.
- Landowner liability, if forced to allow public access on trails or to water bodies.
- Ability to engage in secondary businesses and the compatibility of these enterprises with the state's Farmland Preservation program
- Downzoning and potential loss of equity
- State initiatives, such as the Highlands and Pinelands, that limit future land use and impact landowner equity.
- Local officials who lack understanding about the provisions of the right to farm ordinances. One example cited was variances in farm buffer zones that resulted in adjacent development negatively impacting farm operations.

H.5. Administrative resources

Mannington devotes considerable resources to the program.



VI. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

A. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The 2008 New Jersey Department of Agriculture Economic Development Strategy outlines ways the Department can assist farmers in all commodity areas with marketing, information, quality control, animal health, and youth development in the industry. Mannington farmers directly benefit from the following NJ Department of Agriculture's Economic Development Strategies:

A.1 Jersey Fresh/ Jersey Grown

Maintain an interactive directory of community farmers markets on the department's website and continue to offer community farmers market lists for publication in local papers.

The year 2007 saw the continuation of the *Jersey Grown* quality-grading program promotion of Christmas Trees. The upgraded retail nursery and garden center listing on the *Jersey Grown* website features an interactive search feature to assist consumers to locate garden centers and nurseries by county, town, business name or product.

Continue to assist in linking growers with organic food processors, retailers, animal feed suppliers and all other handlers to help identify new market opportunities and take advantage of the growing demand for processed food products made from organic ingredients.

The marketing and distribution of fresh and frozen grass-fed and organic grass-fed livestock products throughout the state will be supported.

Expand the number of farmers markets that currently offer fresh meat products.

Continue to develop and promote livestock sales at several locations throughout the State and enhance support for the sale of market lambs and 4-H animals.

Continue to support the New Jersey Junior Breeders' Fund loan program which is helping future generations of agricultural education/FFA students and 4-H members to continue to advance the breeding of purebred livestock and the production quality of grade livestock.



A.2 Jersey Organic

The Department provides New Jersey farmers and processors access to a quality organic certification program. Farmers who are transitioning to organic production now have the ability to market their products under the new Department “Transitional Sustainable” label, which is not available under the NOP program. In doing so, New Jersey farmers will not have to wait the required 36-month “free of prohibited materials” to realize increased prices this niche market supports.

Over the last several years the Department received USDA funds to help offset the costs of organic certification. In 2008, the Department will continue to promote and administer cost sharing of organic certification fees for eligible operations, preparing informational brochures and fact sheets, and fully integrating organics into the Department’s promotional programs.

Encourage integration of the marketing of the *Jersey Organic* brand along side of the *Jersey Fresh* promotional program. Represent *the Jersey Organic* brand at national produce industry trade shows and promote the availability of organic products and the use of the *Jersey Organic* promotional brand to wholesalers and retailers.

A.3 Jersey Bred

Work with horse owners to assure awareness of disease threats and animal safety. Continue working to protect the health of horses from the immediate threat of devastating and economically damaging diseases.

Work to implement the recommendations of the Department’s “Focus on New Jersey’s Horse Racing Industry” report and seek to augment purse values, increase track attendance, and improve the industry’s supportive infrastructure.

Promote and create general awareness of the development of Equine AMP (Agricultural Management Practices) to allow for increased right-to-farm protection for New Jersey’s equine industry.

A.4 Jersey Fresh Wine

Promote products from the newly established “Jersey Coastal Plain” American Viticulture Area.



Support the wine industry’s effort to expand its number of eligible retail outlets and also the ability to sell their wines at farmer’s markets.

A.5 Agri-tourism

Continue to develop and promote the “visitnjfarms.org” website.

Coordinate an Agri-Tourism symposium to address common opportunities and challenges and to provide some basic tourism and hospitality industry training. Work with Rutgers Cooperative Extension to develop and implement this training.

Conduct tourism industry outreach activities for agri-tourism operators.

Promote listings in the N.J. Office of Travel & Tourism’s “Calendar of Events”.

Promote participation in “The 2007 New Jersey Governor’s Conference on Tourism”.

Promote the use of the “Tourism Cooperative Grant Program” to organizations representing various facets of the New Jersey’s agri-tourism industry.

Continue to review, comment, and support work towards the adoption of agri-tourism Agricultural Management Practices (AMP’s) as proposed by the State Agriculture Development Committee. Compliance with the agri-tourism AMP’s will aid grower protection under the Right to Farm Act.

B. AGRICULTURAL TRENDS

B.1 Quality of Life

Agriculture continues to be a vibrant economic engine in Salem County. According to the 1997 Census of Agriculture Salem County farms contributed over 79 million dollars to Salem County’s economy from agricultural products and related support industry sales. New ventures such as direct marketing, and agri-tourism could help farmers boost the bottom line diversify operations.

The SADC is currently working to create an Agricultural Management Practice to define and protect agri-tourism activities through the Right to Farm Act. As agriculture evolves to meet the demands of a changing population, market regulations and management practices must be updated to correspond to the new practices.



Mannington’s regulatory policy has historically been favorable to new agricultural ventures and the agricultural advisory committee members agree that the municipality is very supportive of the needs of agriculture.

B.2 Emerging Opportunities

Value Added

In order to increase profitability of farm products many farmers are processing, packaging, or promoting the agricultural raw materials into a more convenient or specialty products and marketing them directly to the public. This trend may involve conversion of agricultural buildings or construction of new facilities, parking areas and customer sales areas.

Organic and Community Supported Agriculture

The consumer market has been changing toward increased demand for safe, wholesome, sustainable, and local foods. In addition, the organic industry is one of the fastest growing segments in the agricultural industry. Mannington farmers can respond to the new markets by increasing the amount of product sold directly from the farm stand through community supported programs which prepare a “share” of the harvest each week for a prepaid seasonal fee, and pick your own, or farm stand operations. Organic farming operations must create compost from leaves, manures, or other organic waste products to provide the nutrients their crops need to flourish. This practice is often misunderstood as “dumping”. Educational materials regarding all farm management practices should be provided to the citizens through the Township website or in tax bill mailings to remind the non-farming neighbors, especially new neighbors, of the needs and special circumstances found on and associated with farms.

Alternative Energy

Recent NJ Legislation has clarified the limits for on farm generation of alternative energy, both on preserved farms and on unrestricted farmland. NJ farmers can augment their agricultural income and fend off the ever present risks associated with agriculture due to weather, insect, pests, diseases, and the unpredictability of the market. Solar, wind and biomass energy generating facilities are protected by right to farm within statutorily set limits of up to 1% of farm acreage on preserved farms and up to 10% of the farm acreage on unrestricted farms without losing preferential taxation under farmland assessment.

Grass Fed, Free Range, Cage Free Livestock

The traditional livestock agriculture has been shrinking over the past decades in Mannington, but an increasing demand for locally grown sustainable meat should help to



increase profitability of livestock production in the future. The challenges associated with local meat production are remote location and limited number of processing facilities, regulations against on farm slaughter and processing, low demand for large amounts of product, and cost of feed.

Ethnic Markets

There is a growing demand for specialty crops especially those favored by customers still well connected to their ethnic heritage. Identification of the demographics in the region coupled with innovative marketing techniques could help farmers capitalize on this opportunity.

Direct Marketing

Salem County farmers market some of their agricultural products directly to the customer. The 2007 Census of Agriculture lists direct sales of agricultural products for Salem County at \$1,173,000 out of a total agricultural sales figure of \$79,962,000. Salem County residents possibly take for granted the farm stands which open every summer supplying us with Jersey Fresh fruits and vegetables, flowers and baked goods Direct marketing continues to provide an opportunity for increased profitability as well as diversity to NJ farmers. The municipality can assist by creating a positive business environment free of overly burdensome regulations and costly fees for building permits.

B.3. Economic Challenges

Labor

One of the challenges to some of the more profitable segments of agriculture such as nursery crops and fresh market produce is that most of the product is picked or planted by hand. Farmers increasingly report it difficult if not impossible to locate enough dependable, consistent, American workers for daily labor making them rely upon foreign workers. The US Department of Labor survey in 1995 identified 94% of the labor market as Mexican in nationality. The workers were most often younger than 35, almost exclusively male, spoke Spanish as their primary language, and 85% were illiterate in all languages. Farm laborers generally fall into two categories: day labor brought in and managed by a crew leader and migrant labor that lives on the farm seasonally. Both types of labor pools have their challenges. Farmers who contract foreign families directly to contract for labor must process all of the paperwork, pay for round trip transportation, provide housing, food and sanitary facilities. Farmers who employ a crew leader to find overseas workers, process their paperwork and transport them to the farm on a daily basis are still responsible for daily verification of immigration documents and social security numbers for all workers. In some cases crew leaders are unethical subjecting the farmer



to labor shortages due to Immigration and Naturalization Service inspections and possible deportation of workers. Managing labor on farms is time consuming and heavily regulated. Many regulations change every year making it costly to keep up to date on the current regulations. NJ Farm Bureau and the Rutgers Cooperative Extension Service offer courses every spring to give growers opportunity to learn the current regulations.

Access to Capital

Many farm operators need seasonal loans in order to manage cash flow. The most commonly used lender is First Pioneer Farm Credit. Mannington farmers use the Bridgeton office. One challenge to borrowing operating or acquisition funds is collateral. Most often the farm real estate is used as collateral for loans. An issue which has troubled farmers in NJ is the impact on lending practices when municipalities “down zone” to manage growth. At the larger lot sizes development potential is reduced and the value against which a grower can borrow is likewise reduced, thereby increasing interest rates and often reducing flexibility in loan terms. Mannington hopes to eliminate the need to down zone to manage growth through the TDR program.

Nuisance Claims and Trespass

Farmer can spend costly stressed filled hours away from the business of farming dealing with complaints and damage from neighbors. When a dispute arises between a farmer and a neighbor due to an objection to common farm site activities such as dust, noise, or smells, the farmer enjoys protection from frivolous lawsuits through the Right to Farm (RTF) Act. If a formal complaint is filed, before the action can be taken to the courts, the County Agriculture Development Board has been empowered to hear and mediate the case. The Board must determine if the farmer is conducting common farm site activities and if the practice complies with adopted Agricultural Management Practices or Site Specific management practices. In essence, the RTF Act protects responsible farmers. Even though these protections are in place irreplaceable time can be lost during the busy growing season. In general the agricultural advisory committee indicates most Mannington citizens are friendly to farmers and appreciate their efforts. They report very few conflicts in this largely agricultural township.

Flexible Land Use Regulations

Mannington has a municipal Right to Farm Ordinance which closely mirrors the SADC model and the Township has a long history of allowing and encouraging agriculture. The right-to-farm ordinance is attached to this document. Mannington’s site plan regulations and building permit fees should be evaluated to determine if any regulatory flexibility can be implemented for agriculture.



Agricultural Representation

Mannington farmers have been actively involved in many agricultural organizations and leadership positions. Andy Buzby is the chairman of the County Agricultural Development Board. David Schaeffer, who lives in Mannington and operates an agricultural business (contract spraying) also serves on the Board. Jimmy Catalano lives in Pilesgrove Township but owns and farms ground in Mannington also serves. The Mannington Governing Body and Planning Board have historically had and still have farmer representation.



VII. NATURAL RESOURCE CONSERVATION

A. NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION COORDINATION

A number of local organizations exist to support agriculture through natural resource conservation. Among these are the Cumberland-Salem Soil Conservation District, and Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension of Salem County. In addition, the USDA Farm Service Agency and the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service provide financial and technical assistance to Salem County farmers through a wide variety of programs. All of these organizations play a key role in keeping Salem County agriculture a viable and economically sound industry.⁶

A.1. Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)

The USDA Farm Service Agency and Natural Resources Conservation Service offers assistance through the Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP), Wildlife Habitat Incentives Program (WHIP), the Wetland Reserve Program, and the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). These programs assist farmers to install conservation practices, establish wildlife habitat, and adopt best management practices. In addition, the Environmental Quality Incentives Program helps livestock farmers address animal waste management on their farms. EQIP also offers assistance with energy conservation planning and practices. Both the FSA and NRCS do extensive outreach to “get the word out” to farmers about program details and deadlines.

A.2. Soil Conservation Districts

The Cumberland-Salem Conservation District provides assistance with agricultural conservation planning, including the development of conservation management plans using best management practices (BMPs) for soil erosion and sediment control, water quality improvement, and non-point source pollution control. The Conservation District can also help farmers secure water use allocations, better manage irrigation water and stormwater and provides guidance concerning the application of organic materials (animal waste, leaves, grass clippings, food processing waste and sludge) on agricultural lands.

⁶ Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan, Natural Resource Conservation Section

**B. NATURAL RESOURCE PROTECTION PROGRAMS****B.1. SADC Soil and Water Conservation Programs**

State Agricultural Development Committee provides cost-sharing grants to landowners in the permanent or eight-year preservation programs to fund approved soil and water conservation. These projects not only protect soil and water resources, but increase productivity and profitability for the farmer. Projects in Mannington include the installation of wells and main line for irrigation, trickle irrigation projects, center pivot irrigation systems, water impoundment reservoirs, sod waterways, and land shaping and grading projects to improve drainage.

B.2. NJDEP Landowner Incentive Program

The NJ DEP offers a Landowner Incentive Program (LIP) that encourages the establishment of native grassland habitat. The LIP provides private landowners with financial and technical assistance. It is a cost-share program where applicants are required to provide a minimum of 25 percent of the program's total cost. Projects must be maintained for at least five years with documented measurable results. Eligibility for funds include private landowners as well as individuals, non-profit organizations and corporations with a documented long-term lease on private property (possessing a minimum of five years remaining on their lease agreement). In addition, applicants will be required to implement a project as outlined in the management agreement. Applicants must also be willing to sign a project agreement and management plan with the Division of Fish and Wildlife.⁷

B.3. US Forest Service Stewardship Program

The US Forest Stewardship Program is an additional source of preservation for forested lands on active farm properties that may not qualify under the other programs. The United States Forest Service sponsors the Forest Stewardship Program. This program supports landowners whose property has a woodland management plan that recognizes and manages the wetlands, wildlife, aesthetics, soil and water in addition to the woodlands on the property. This program, when fully funded, offers landowners costshare initiatives to allow the landowners to fully follow the guidelines in their woodland management plan. In New Jersey, the state farmland tax program and the U.S. Forest Service program have merged to allow one planning document for the landowner where the stewardship plan

⁷ Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan, Natural Resource Conservation Section



meets the state tax code and eliminates conflicts between the two. Increasing enrollment of landowners in this merged state-federal program will ensure increased protection of the natural resources for an extended period; the minimum is a ten-year management plan. This does not ensure preservation of the land in perpetuity, but it does allow recognition of the importance of the land value and stewardship of the property for a longer period of time.⁸

C. WATER RESOURCES

C.1. Supply Characteristics

Mannington Township lies entirely within the Salem River Watershed. The Salem River Watershed is the largest watershed in Salem County covering 115 square miles and 13 of the County's 15 municipalities. Salem County contains 5 aquifers that supply ground water for domestic and industrial users. Two major aquifers provide water in excess of 500 gallons per minute: (1) the Potomac-Raritan-Magothy (PRM), which outcrops in the northwestern portion of the County, and (2) the Cohansey Sands, which outcrops over most of the eastern area of the County. Three minor aquifers supply water between 100 and 500 gallons per minute: (1) the Mount Laurel and Wenonah Sands, which outcrop northeast from Salem City near Mannington, (2) the Vincentown Sands, which outcrops northeast from Lower Alloways Creek, and (3) the Kirkwood Sands, which outcrops west from Woodstown.

Protection of the fresh water supply is of critical importance in land use planning and for agriculture, particularly in rural areas, which rely on groundwater from relatively shallow wells. State and County policies strongly support planning for water quality purposes.

C.2. Agricultural Demand and Supply limitations

Mannington's Agricultural Advisory Committee listed access to water the second most critical farming issue after access to land. The amount of land that requires irrigation has increased by more than a third (37%) over the ten years in Salem County. Water allocation is a serious issue for farmers throughout the County. Some farmers irrigate their crops with water pumped from surface water bodies. Comments received through the public workshops revealed the agricultural community's concern about two particular actions taken by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (N.J. DEP) that affect Salem County. Proposed new rules change the procedures for granting water allocation

⁸ Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan, Conservation of Natural Resources Section



permits. The new rules are requesting that agricultural producers submit more information and more definitively describe their water use which is expected to increase the costs of these water allocation permits for agricultural products. At the public comment sessions farmers testified that they were shouldering an unfair percentage of the fee increase and that developers were not paying their fair share. Also, the N.J. DEP has designated Salem County as an emergency drinking water supply source for the state in its state Water Supply Plan. According to the plan, Salem County is an emergency drinking water supply source for the western metropolitan areas during drought conditions. If water is piped out of the county, farmers are concerned that there will not be enough water to maintain their farms, jeopardizing their livelihood.⁹

C.3. Conservation and Allocation Strategies

Continued protection of the open lands which allow infiltration of rainwater into ground water is perhaps the best conservation strategy for water quality. The Salem County Open Space Preservation Plan details stream corridor buffering and other conservation strategies including: Stream corridor protection ordinances, agricultural water access impact review for residential subdivisions, parity between the development community and agriculture for diversion permits, granting priority water access to farmers who implement conservation practices and /or preserve their land.

The Natural Resource Conservation Service has a “river friendly” program that awards certificates to farmers who manage their farms to protect and enhance water resources. According to the NRCS newsletter *Farm and Field* (Fall 2006, p. 1), “River friendly farms reduce soil erosion so sediment does not enter waterways, reduce fertilizer to minimum amounts needed to prevent leaching into water, provide essential vegetative habitat along water bodies to help protect aquatic organisms, apply pesticide and other control methods at appropriate times based on crop need, and irrigate crops only when necessary to help conserve water.”¹⁰

D. WASTE MANAGEMENT PLANNING

The Mannington Township Agricultural Advisory Committee discussed the challenges farmers face from waste management and recycling. One of the foremost issues is the inability to recycle agricultural plastic used for trickle irrigation purposes. Mannington’s growers produced 2,417 acres of vegetables in 2007 most of it using black plastic mulch and trickle irrigation. The fees for disposal in the landfill are over 150 dollars a dumpster

⁹ Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan, Natural Resources Conservation Section

¹⁰ Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan, Natural Resources Conservation Section



load and even relatively small operations may require 10 or more dumpsters to dispose of the plastic at the end of the growing season. Some of the farmers have tried experimental “degradable” plastic but have been dissatisfied with the poor durability and performance of the product. The County landfill initiated a plastic recycling program for a few years but disbanded it citing dirty plastic difficulties.

E. ENERGY CONSERVATION PLANNING

E.1. Alternative Energy Generating Facilities

Alternative energy generating facilities such as solar, photovoltaic, wind and biomass facilities are not permitted uses in any zone district in the Township. However, there is rapidly increasing demand for large “grid scale” facilities to be located on open land. New Jersey ranks second after California in the siting of alternative energy facilities in an effort to reduce reliance upon fossil fuels, particularly coal, and nuclear energy. However, the potential conflicts associated with large scale facilities in the nation’s most densely populated state should not be underestimated. It is the intent of this Farmland Preservation Plan Element to identify potential conflicts and set policy for the eventual siting of alternative energy generating facilities. The approving Board may rely upon these policies when analyzing and considering any applications for such uses.

New Legislation. The New Jersey Legislature has been active recently in legislating to facilitate the production of alternative forms of energy. The following three new statutes in particular have substantially changed the way alternative energy can be developed in New Jersey;

1. Industrial Zones. The Municipal Land Use Law, NJSA 40:55D-66.11, was amended March 31, 2009 by P.L. 2009 c. 35 to pre-empt local zoning authority and to permit, by right, solar, photovoltaic, and wind electrical generating facilities in every industrial district of a municipality. To be eligible for this permitted use, a tract must be a minimum size of 20 contiguous acres and entirely under one owner.

2. Inherently Beneficial Use. The Municipal Land Use Law, NJSA 40:55D-4 &7, was also amended by P.L. 2009 c. 146 to define inherently beneficial uses and to include solar, wind and photovoltaic energy generating facilities in the definition.

“Inherently beneficial use” means a use which is universally considered of value to the community because it fundamentally serves the public good and promotes the general



welfare. Such a use includes, but is not limited to, a hospital, school, child care center, group home, or a wind, solar or photovoltaic energy facility or structure.”

Inherently beneficial uses are assumed to serve the zoning purpose of promoting the general welfare and therefore presumptively satisfy the positive criterion for grant of a use variance pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70d. In addition, for an inherently beneficial use, the enhanced burden of proof with regard to the “negative” criteria does not apply; instead, the positive and negative criteria are to be balanced and the relief granted providing there is no substantial detriment to the public good.

3. Wind, Solar, and Biomass on Farms. P.L. 2009 c. 213, signed in to law on January 16, 2009, modifies several laws regarding alternative energy and preserved farms, commercial farms, right to farm, and farmland assessment.

The State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC) with assistance from the Board of Public Utilities (BPU) must adopt rules identifying standards for siting alternative energy generating facilities on preserved farms. A maximum of 1% of the preserved farmland may be dedicated to alternative energy generation.

The Right to Farm Act has been amended to permit and protect up to 10 acres or 2 megawatts (2MW) maximum production of electricity on commercial farms not subject to farmland preservation, provided the acreage of the electrical facility does not exceed a ratio of 1 acre of energy facility to 5 acres of agricultural acres, or approximately 17% of the farmland. In addition, farms developing electrical facilities not exceeding these limits will remain eligible for farmland assessment for the entire farm including the area under the electric generating facility.

E.2. Standards for Siting Alternative Energy Generating Facilities

There are essentially three types of energy generating facilities for which siting standards must be developed: residential scale facilities generating no more than 10 kilowatts of electricity, farm scale facilities under 10 acres in size and generating no more than 2 megawatts of electricity and grid scale facilities producing greater than 2 megawatts of electricity. Siting standards must be tailored to the intensity of each type of facility.

Residential scale facilities are easily accommodated within the standard setbacks of a residential lot and should not typically generate the need for buffering. Farm scale facilities up to ten acres in size may require buffering from adjacent residential uses and zones. Grid scale solar facilities, large ground mounted photovoltaic facilities generating



greater than 2 megawatts of electricity may be very large in size often exceeding 100 acres in size. The scale of these facilities will generate the need for buffering, setback, coverage, site maintenance, and locational standards.

In addition, grid scale facilities may require the siting of new or expanded electrical substations, transformers and bundled overhead wires. They may out compete agriculture for prime farmland causing an interruption in the contiguity of agricultural lands. The facilities are often fenced for security purposes and effective screening in exposed or hillside locations may be impractical. The facilities are quiet; requiring little maintenance, and typically no municipal services. The State of New Jersey provides substantial financial incentives and has recently eliminated much of the risk associated with investing in grid scale solar facilities. This action, coupled with related legislation has captured the attention of large nationwide investors and created a solar “gold rush” in New Jersey.

Balancing the positive and negative consequences of siting alternative energy generating facilities is key when considering their location, scale, and impacts. One consideration of grid scale facilities is their positive tax ratable with little or no associated municipal services. A down-side to such development is the competition created for active agricultural land, especially for solar facilities which are relatively consumptive of land.

The prospect of siting renewable energy facilities within the Township must be integrated with Mannington’s unique status as a municipality with a strong agricultural industry, low population density, a virtual absence of conventional residential subdivisions which would otherwise interfere with farming operations, and one of the highest totals of preserved lands, 8,250 acres, of any municipality in NJ.

Notwithstanding the inherently beneficial use qualification conveyed by the 2009 statutory change to the Municipal Land Use Law described above, renewable energy facilities still require use variances within Mannington; consequently, they must satisfy the so-called negative criteria.

The following policies are intended to guide the Land Use Board in considering any such applications for renewable energy facilities and in applying the negative criteria:

1. In order to promote a policy of utilizing the most suitable lands within the Township’s agricultural district for farming, grid-scale renewable energy facilities should not be located on lots with greater than 75% prime agricultural soils.



2. In order to support the goal of providing for large contiguous tracts of farmland within the Township’s agricultural district, grid-scale renewable energy facilities should not be located on lots which are adjacent to preserved farmland.
3. In order to minimize conflicts between residential use and farming activities, grid scale renewable energy facilities should be located on tracts which have been previously approved for residential subdivision and which subdivision approvals would be abandoned in the event the energy facility is approved.
4. In order to retain the rural appearance of the Township’s agricultural district as opposed to the industrial appearance of electric generating facilities, any grid-scale renewable energy facilities which are approved should provide sufficient land area and landscape material around the perimeter of the developed area to provide an effective year-round screen of the view of the facilities from adjacent public or private roads and residences.

The policies set forth above are not intended to thwart all applications for renewable energy facilities in Mannington Township. Rather, they are intended to advise prospective developers of such facilities how the goals of Mannington Township’s Master Plan and those of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan can be balanced with the public interest in facilitating the development of renewable energy production.

F. OUTREACH AND INCENTIVES

Mannington Township is home to one of the most important breeding grounds and stopovers for migratory waterfowl and shorebirds. This area is known locally as the “Meadows” and consists of tidal riparian lands and agricultural lands modeled as potential grassland habitat by the NJ DEP Landscape Project. A grassland restoration plan has been developed for the Important Bird Area (IBA) as much of the littoral zone is dominated by common reed *Phragmites australis*. Other threats to the IBA noted by the South Jersey Bayshore Coalition include development pressure, hydrological alterations, runoff from agricultural operations, and a growing population of non indigenous mute swans which outcompete native bird for food sources.

The Mannington Meadows is formed by the Salem River on its northern and western boundaries and is composed of wetlands, agricultural lands and rural development. The site contains possibly the largest wild rice stand in New Jersey and contains the Mannington Meadows Natural Heritage Macrosite. Designated by the NJ DEP, Natural



Heritage Priority Sites are considered the State's most significant natural areas.¹¹ The accompanying map on page 68 illustrates the important bird area.

The NJ Audubon Society hosted a work day to begin implementation of the grassland restoration project. Volunteers were invited to attend April 27, 2010 at Fort Elfborg-Salem Rd., in Salem NJ from 10am to 1:00pm to help restore the migratory habitat.

F.1 South Jersey Bayshore Coalition

The South Jersey Bayshore Coalition is a group of 17 non-profit organizations working together to protect the Bayshore along the southwest coast of New Jersey. The Mannington Meadows figures prominently in the Coalition's preservation agenda. The Coalition has identified five key issues:

- Promote sustainable agriculture
- Preserve cultural and Historic Heritage
- Preserve Wildlife Habitat
- Protect ground and surface water quality/quantity
- Promote economic revitalization that is compatible

F.2 Mannington's Historic Inventory

In addition to containing rich agricultural acreage and some of the most important wildlife habitat in the state, Mannington also has a remarkable inventory of historic homes. Nearly 10% of the entire housing stock in the community is included in the inventory. The map on the following page illustrates the location of the historic sites.

¹¹ www.njaudubon.org/SectionIBBA/IBBAsiteGuide

Mannington Township


DRAFT

9 Historic Resource
Stream
Lake
Municipality

Source: NJDEP, NJDOT, DVRPC
This map was developed using New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection Geographic Information System digital data, but this secondary product has not been verified by NJDEP and is not state-authorized.

0 0.5 1 Miles
Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission
March 2007

Map 17: Historic Inventory





VIII. INDUSTRY SUSTAINABILITY, RETENTION AND PROMOTION

A. EXISTING AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY SUPPORT

The Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan describes the sustainability of agriculture as follows:

“There is a great need to retain farming as a career and to show that farming can produce enough income to support families and individuals. As expressed in the public forums, many of the farmers in Salem County, as well as the rest of New Jersey, are older, aged 50 years or more. Attracting young people to the farming profession continues to challenge the agricultural community. Creating and identifying incentives to attract people to a career of farming the land are essential for the future viability of farming. The SADC Farm Link Program plays a vital link in assisting new farmers or those interested in getting into farming to get started by providing a way for them to network with experienced farmers. Programs that help increase the diversity of farmers will also introduce a greater number of people to the agricultural business.

The Farm Bureau’s workshop series on “Women in Farming” is an example of such a program. In addition, such awards as the “Young Farmer of the Year” bestowed by the State Department of Agriculture provides recognition for the successes of young and new farmers and provides an opportunity to highlight the challenges of the farming industry today, including soil and resource conservation practices.”

A.1. Right to Farm

Mannington Township has recently updated its Right to Farm ordinance to mirror the SADC model Ordinance. The RTF ordinance is attached as an appendix at the end of this document.

A.2. Farmland Assessment

A List of all of Township farms in farmland assessment is attached at the end of this document as an appendix.

**B. OTHER STRATEGIES****B.1. Permit Streamlining**

Costs of building permits on agricultural buildings are calculated at a reduced rate.

B.2. Agricultural Vehicle Movement

Agricultural vehicle movement is generally adequate throughout the Township. Few, if any, conflict have been reported.

B.3. Agricultural Labor Housing

Agricultural housing exists on some farms in Mannington and historically they have been approved when a need is demonstrated. It is not proven to be necessary for most Mannington farms, however.

B.4. Wildlife Management Strategies

The Mannington Township Agricultural Advisory Committee reports that wildlife management especially the white tailed deer population is not an intense issue in the community because most farmers hunt their property or allow others to do so. In addition to the burrowing problems caused by large rodents such as groundhogs that have historically been a management issue on farms a relatively new agricultural pest is the growing beaver population. Waterways used for irrigation may require daily cleaning to remove beaver dams and debris which stem the flow of irrigation water from surface water sources and flood neighboring farm fields. Hunting regulations may be inadequate to control this growing problem.

B.5. Agricultural Education and Promotion*Rutgers Cooperative Extension*

Farm viability is dependent upon farm operators keeping current on the most productive and economically sound techniques and procedures that also protect the natural resources needed to for sustainability. In Salem County, a major source of this information comes from the Rutgers Cooperative Research and Extension (RCRE) of Salem County. The RCRE provides education programs for farmers and farm employees. Assistance and training are available in marketing, business management, fertility, pest control, alternative crops, variety selection, and the maintenance of environmental quality. The



available programs offer an individual farm operator the opportunity to gain the latest information on topics such as crop selection, crop protection, and utilization of mechanization and marketing techniques. RCRE also offers Salem County farmers timely information on plastic mulch recycling, and how to dispose of used farm tires.

Rutgers Agricultural Experiment Station

Rutgers University, the School of Environmental and Biological Sciences (formerly Cook College) and its association of programs are a primary source of information and coordination in the Garden State. Farmland owners need to share successful technologies and strategies. The Rutgers Agriculture Experiment Station provides a full range of research and publications distributed through programs such as 4-H and Cooperative Extension (RCRE). Publications include: Farm Management and Safety, Pest Management, Plant and Animal Agriculture.

Food Innovation Center

A satellite facility of the Agricultural Experiment Station called the Food Innovation Center is located in Bridgeton. Its mission is as follows:

“Stimulate and support sustainable economic growth and prosperity to the food and agricultural industries in the New Jersey region by providing businesses with innovative research, customized practical solutions, resources for business incubation, and a trusted source for information and guidance”.

The FIC is a food business incubator designed for use by farmers and cooperatives, startup food companies, existing small and mid-sized food companies, and retail and foodservice establishments who will be assisted from concept to commercialization, and be able to have new product prototypes tested and evaluated, and to literally have their products produced in a state-of-the-art food processing facility that will meet the regulatory standards of local, state and federal (both FDA and USDA) agencies. This type of facility could create new opportunities for Salem County farmers seeking to develop new products or simply new markets for their existing commodities as specialized processing may be able to be done in the region. An example shared at a public session held by Salem County CADB was the market for “waste” tomatoes, those tomatoes of a quality not reaching a standard for human consumption. A farm doubled its yearly income by finding and serving a market that could use this product. Ways to improve the profits made from farming as a business are important to share and highlight.¹²

¹² Salem County Farmland Preservation Plan, Economic Development Section



B.6. Intergenerational Transfer of Family Farms

There is no question that transferring a family farm or farm business to the next generation can be a challenging task. Legal issues, tax laws, and personal differences are some of the many issues families must confront in determining how and when to transfer farm assets and business control. Many farmers are aware of the work necessary to plan for a successful transfer. Many farmers also know of stories of farm transfers gone awry. It is not unusual for a lack of planning to cause families to sell all or part of the farm to pay inheritance taxes or to ensure an equitable distribution of a farm estate among the heirs. In some cases, the absence of planning has resulted in permanent, emotional rifts among family members. By planning for an orderly transfer of the farm, all generations can enjoy peace of mind in knowing the future of the farm operation is secure and there is a plan for everyone to be treated fairly.¹³

The SADC has published an informative “how to manual” to assist farm families with the difficult task of planning to pass the farm to the next generation entitled, “*Transferring the Family Farm. What Worked. What Didn’t, for 10 New Jersey Families.*”

B.6. Avoiding Conflicts

The SADC published a pamphlet entitled “*Farmer to Farmer Advice for Avoiding Conflicts with Neighbors and Towns*”. More than 50 farmers from throughout New Jersey have offered their tips and strategies for minimizing right-to-farm conflicts for this publication. From Sussex County in the north to Salem County in the south, they shared a lot of the same risk-management advice and ideas: Get to know your neighbors. Listen and talk to people when they have concerns. Use common sense. Be involved in the community. Keep the farm looking nice. Make the farm an asset in the eyes of the community. Underpinning all of these suggestions was one piece of common advice: Good communication, appropriate consideration, and active involvement are the keys to maintaining good relationships with neighbors and municipalities.¹⁴

¹³ SADC website, www.state.nj.us/agriculture/sadc/farmlink.htm

¹⁴ SADC website: www.nj.gov/agriculture/sadc



APPENDIX 1: FARM ASSESSED PROPERTIES LIST



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| BLOCK | LOT | PROPERTY LOCATION | OWNERS NAME | LU CODE | Acres |
|-------|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|-------|
| 36 | 3 | SUNSET DR (PAPER) | GLENSIDE FARMS INC | 3B | 0.04 |
| 18 | 11 | SWEDES BRIDGE RD | MYERS FAMILY IRREVOCABLE TRUST | 3B | 0.20 |
| 28 | 32 | SUNSET DRIVE (PAPER) | SHERRON, ALBERT W | 3B | 0.28 |
| 29 | 6 | ROOSEVELT AVE | THOMAS LOT | 3B | 0.42 |
| 29 | 4 | ROOSEVELT AVE | TRUSTY, ABRAHAM EST | 3B | 0.43 |
| 42 | 14 | DICKINSON ST (PAPER) | ZANE, DOUGLAS K + ROBIN O | 3B | 0.43 |
| 14 | 19 | ALLOWAY- WOODSTOWN RD | BARBARA, EDWARD L & LINDA J | 3B | 0.46 |
| 51 | 12.01 | OLD KINGS HWY | NEWELL, JAMES | 3B | 0.65 |
| 15 | 26 | MITCHELL RD | BARBARA, EDWARD L & LINDA J | 3B | 0.69 |
| 39 | 3 | ROUTE 45 | VITTORI, MARIE ESTATE | 3B | 0.76 |
| 32 | 9 | SAUNDERS ST | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 0.86 |
| 20 | 17 | COMPROMISE RD | BITTER, JOHN B JR %J BITTER III | 3B | 1.16 |
| 47 | 5 | ROUTE 45 | VITTORI, MARIE ESTATE | 3B | 1.44 |
| 2 | 16 | 525 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL & JOAN K | 3B | 1.52 |
| 30 | 2 | ROOSEVELT AVE | KELLY LOT | 3B | 1.54 |
| 50 | 8.01 | 150 HARRIS RD | ACKLEY, EDWARD M & MARY F | 3B | 1.71 |
| 22 | 4 | KINGS HWY | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 1.91 |
| 30 | 5 | ROOSEVELT AVE | HUMPHREYS, MELVIN E | 3B | 1.91 |
| 8 | 23 | | | 3B | 1.92 |
| 19 | 12 | MANNINGTON YORKETOWN RD | COLES, MERTON M JR | 3B | 2.12 |
| 57 | 4.02 | | | 3B | 2.19 |
| 37 | 18 | SUNSET DR (OFF) | FRANK RICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 2.20 |
| 47 | 20 | DUBOIS RD | DEPALMA, BARBARA F | 3B | 2.24 |
| 7 | 5 | 66 CEMETERY RD | JOHANSON, JOSEPH R + DOROTHY | 3B | 2.46 |
| 12 | 13 | ALLOWAY WOODSTOWN RD | FOSTER, EDWARD H & JOAN H | 3B | 2.57 |
| 56 | 5 | QUAKER NECK RD | SOLOMON, MARIAN F | 3B | 2.61 |
| 15 | 1 | 134 MCKILLIP RD | RADIANT HOLDINGS, LLC | 3B | 2.65 |
| 44 | 8 | PENTON STATION ROAD | ZANE, DOUGLAS K + ROBIN O | 3B | 2.77 |
| 24 | 5 | POINTERS AUBURN | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 2.83 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | RD | | | |
|----|-------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|----|------|
| 50 | 14.01 | 120 HARRIS RD | CULVER, SUZANNE HANCOCK | 3B | 2.92 |
| 31 | 4 | SAUNDERS ST (PAPER) | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 3.06 |
| 3 | 18 | WARNER RD | JUSKA, GEORGE & DOROTHY | 3B | 3.07 |
| 28 | 30 | SUNSET DR | ACTON, CHARLES OR WM VANNEMAN | 3B | 3.12 |
| 30 | 3 | ROOSEVELT AVE | HUMPHREYS, MELVIN E | 3B | 3.48 |
| 44 | 2 | 28 DOLBOW RD | DOLBOW, WILLIAM M JR & DONNA D | 3B | 3.59 |
| 14 | 7 | MITCHELL RD | BARBARA, EDWARD L & LINDA J | 3B | 3.69 |
| 8 | 22.03 | | | 3B | 3.85 |
| 38 | 4.01 | 84 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CULVER, DAVID ALAN & SUZANNE H | 3B | 4.09 |
| 42 | 3.02 | KERLIN RD | MYERS, BRENT M & JEAN | 3B | 4.16 |
| 40 | 7.02 | SWEDES BRIDGE RD | CALDWELL, ROSS T & JUDITH R | 3B | 4.27 |
| 37 | 13 | HARRIS RD (OFF) | CADWALLADER, DAVID L | 3B | 4.55 |
| 36 | 5 | SUNSET DR | MORRIS, JOHN | 3B | 4.58 |
| 25 | 11 | HAINES NECK RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL J & JANIE E | 3B | 4.88 |
| 15 | 23 | MITCHELL RD | WALTER, JOHN H | 3B | 4.93 |
| 12 | 1 | MANNINGTON YORKETOWN RD | DOAK, JOSEPH E & CINDY L | 3B | 5.02 |
| 3 | 11 | KINGS HWY + BLACK RD | HERITAGE, DAVID A | 3B | 5.11 |
| 20 | 2 | 17 + 19 COMPROMISE RD | RICHMAN, JOHN A & MELANIE A E | 3A | 5.18 |
| 15 | 11 | MITCHELL RD | MUSUMECI, JOSEPH A | 3B | 5.52 |
| 34 | 13 | 80 SUNSET DR | LILLYA, MARTIN & JANINE | 3B | 5.65 |
| 38 | 2 | 369 KINGS HWY | ZIEGER, JOHN F + DAWN MARIE | 3A | 5.72 |
| 24 | 6 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | FICHERA, FRANK J | 3B | 5.74 |
| 24 | 11.01 | 400 POINTERS AUBURN RD | FICHERA, FRANK J + DEBORAH R | 3B | 5.84 |
| 34 | 4 | MARSHALLTOWN RD | FREY, JAMES R & RITA MARIE A | 3B | 5.85 |
| 38 | 13 | | | 3B | 5.85 |
| 53 | 24 | | | 3B | 5.96 |
| 45 | 10 | DOLBOW RD | ROBINSON, SCOTT | 3B | 6.04 |
| 59 | 7 | QUAKER NECK RD | BATTIATO, FRANK J | 3B | 6.08 |
| 20 | 22.03 | 67 COMPROMISE RD | LASPINA, BLANCHE | 3B | 6.10 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|------|
| 44 | 4 | 36 DOLBOW RD | WILSON, JOHN J & KRIS | 3B | 6.25 |
| 39 | 13.01 | 580 KINGS HWY | ELWELL, DEBRA KAREN & TIMOTHY J | 3B | 6.29 |
| 6 | 3 | CHENEY RD | BITTER, JOHN B JR %J BITTER III | 3B | 6.32 |
| 39 | 13.02 | 620 KINGS HWY | BATTIATO, CHRISTI L | 3B | 6.33 |
| 53 | 25 | | | 3B | 6.35 |
| 14 | 23 | MANNINGTON YORKETOWN RD | SLACHTA, LAWRENCE J & TERESA K | 3B | 6.37 |
| 1 | 5.03 | 123 HAINES NECK RD | DRAKE, LAURA | 3B | 6.44 |
| 50 | 31 | 279 ROUTE 45 | BOBBITT, JOHN W & JACQUELYN | 3B | 6.59 |
| 57 | 4.01 | 96 ACTON STATION RD | SPARKS, WENDY J | 3B | 6.70 |
| 40 | 20 | 440 WELCHVILLE RD | WEIGEL, THOMAS JR & EVELYN M | 3B | 6.74 |
| 55 | 1.01 | CLANCY RD | MACCHERONE, SANTO JOHN & ANTOINETTE | 3B | 6.77 |
| 57 | 3 | CLANCY RD | SHAY, CHARLES D | 3B | 6.77 |
| 47 | 16.01 | 131 DUBOIS RD | FEDORA, MICHAEL & EMELIE JEANNE | 3B | 7.13 |
| 17 | 9 | 139 OECHSLE RD | SHIMP, ERIC S & CYNTHIA R | 3A | 7.13 |
| 16 | 2 | 32 OECHSLE RD | STARTARI, FRANK & BARBARA | 3B | 7.22 |
| 27 | 4.02 | 814 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | BENNETT, MARK | 3B | 7.23 |
| 36 | 2 | SUNSET DR | SHERRON, ALBERT W | 3B | 7.27 |
| 40 | 7.01 | SWEDES BRIDGE RD | CALDWELL, ROSS T & JUDITH R | 3B | 7.41 |
| 8 | 20 | MANNINGTON YORKETOWN RD | CREAMER, MONICA L | 3B | 7.43 |
| 3 | 4.03 | BLACK ROAD | SMITH, PHIL & BETTY JEAN | 3B | 7.45 |
| 40 | 15 | | | 3B | 7.55 |
| 40 | 7 | | | 3B | 7.61 |
| 56 | 2 | QUAKER NECK RD | SOLOMON, MARIAN F | 3B | 7.68 |
| 19 | 9.01 | COMPROMISE RD | VANDOVER, WAYNE T & JENNIFER C | 3B | 7.71 |
| 6 | 4.01 | CHENEY RD | FORD, EVERN D | 3B | 7.84 |
| 25 | 10 | 208 HAINES NECK RD | SCHAEFFER, DAVID L + ALLISON C | 3B | 7.84 |
| 25 | 12 | 220 HAINES NECK RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL J & JANIE E | 3B | 7.91 |
| 40 | 24 | ROUTE 45 | MYERS FAMILY IRREVOCABLE TRUST | 3B | 8.15 |
| 3 | 4.02 | 65 BLACK RD | WILLIAMS, DONALD J & ANN | 3B | 8.15 |
| 40 | 6.04 | 52 SWEDES BRIDGE | BOOZ, LESLIE H III & LOU ANN | 3B | 8.16 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | RD | | | |
|----|-------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 28 | 26 | MARSHALLTOWN RD N | TURNER, JOHN | 3B | 8.19 |
| 40 | 23 | ROUTE 45 | CATALANO, MICHAEL + JANIE | 3B | 8.20 |
| 14 | 10 | MITCHELL RD | BARBARA, EDWARD L & LINDA J | 3B | 8.41 |
| 20 | 22.02 | 105 COMPROMISE RD | JESS, SANDY R & AMY S | 3B | 8.44 |
| 2 | 18 | 541 POINTERS AUBURN RD | EBER, RICHARD JR & MARY ANNE | 3B | 8.50 |
| 48 | 10 | 455 ROUTE 45 | PANKONIEN, WILLIAM J&MA FITTABLE | 3B | 8.66 |
| 21 | 1.01 | 44 BASSETT RD | RICHMAN, JOHN A & MELANIE A E | 3B | 8.70 |
| 21 | 17 | 711 ROUTE 45 | EWEN, ALLEN | 3B | 8.71 |
| 53 | 25.02 | DUBOIS RD | TAYLOR, SAMUEL ESTATE & MARY E | 3B | 8.74 |
| 16 | 4 | 100 HACKETT RD | MITCHELL, SCOTT K & ESTHER A | 3B | 8.76 |
| 53 | 37 | 510-510A QUAKER NECK RD | TARK, ERNEST F JR + MAXINE RAUCH | 3B | 8.83 |
| 20 | 20 | 139 COMPROMISE RD | WILSON, NICOLINA F | 3B | 9.00 |
| 15 | 16 | MITCHELL & BARBER RDS | BARBARA, EDWARD L & LINDA J | 3B | 9.07 |
| 15 | 12 | | | 3B | 9.11 |
| 37 | 20 | SUNSET DR (OFF) | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 9.13 |
| 12 | 2 | PIERSON RD | DOAK, JOSEPH E & CINDY L | 3B | 9.20 |
| 28 | 36 | SUNSET DR | BANK, DAVID | 3B | 9.32 |
| 4 | 2 | HAINES NECK RD | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 9.33 |
| 5 | 9 | 875 ROUTE 45 | JOHNSTON, JAMES C + GLORIA J | 3B | 9.37 |
| 20 | 2.01 | 61 COMPROMISE RD | RICHMAN, MERWIN D JR & KIMBERLY A | 3B | 9.45 |
| 28 | 10 | 954 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | STEWART, WILLIAM L | 3B | 9.47 |
| 4 | 10.01 | 511 HAINES NECK RD | HERITAGE, ROBERT D & C A LAWLER | 3B | 9.53 |
| 53 | 1 | | | 3B | 9.78 |
| 15 | 14 | MITCHELL RD | BARBARA, EDWARD L & LINDA J | 3B | 9.85 |
| 28 | 39 | MARSHALLTOWN RD RR | KIGER, DAVID & ELWOOD %JOHN HUMPHRE | 3B | 9.94 |
| 38 | 12 | SEABROOK RD | DEPALMA, FEDELE J + BARBARA F | 3B | 9.94 |
| 41 | 1 | 178 KERLIN RD | MYERS, BRENT M & JEAN | 3B | 9.95 |
| 63 | 19 | 52 OLD KINGS HWY | FOWLER, RAYMOND L | 3B | 10.06 |
| 50 | 18 | HARRIS RD | HANCOCK, WILLIAM C III | 3B | 10.08 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 14 | 18 | MANNINGTON YORKETOWN RD | SLACHTA, ANDREW F,APC,RES,RAS.LL,P | 3B | 10.08 |
| 64 | 23 | | | 3B | 10.09 |
| 58 | 7.01 | 78 SANDY RIDGE RD | DIXON, HUGH J | 3B | 10.40 |
| 28 | 27 | MARSHALLTOWN RD | HUMPHREYS, MELVIN E | 3B | 10.42 |
| 21 | 4 | 120 BASSETT RD | ALLEN, CHARLES R | 3B | 10.44 |
| 58 | 6.01 | SANDY RIDGE RD (OFF) | HASSLER, EDWARD E JR | 3B | 10.67 |
| 8 | 11 | | | 3B | 10.71 |
| 40 | 11 | WELCHVILLE + MCKILLIP RDS | SALEM CO UTILITIES AUTHORITIES | 3B | 10.82 |
| 19 | 6 | COMPROMISE RD | CLAUER, JAMES | 3B | 10.88 |
| 8 | 9 | 232 FENWICK RD | BURKERT, ROBERT H & CAROL ANN | 3B | 10.91 |
| 62 | 4 | OLD KINGS HWY | SPARKS, MILDRED A | 3B | 11.19 |
| 39 | 29 | 635 ROUTE 45 | BROWN, CHRISTOPHER GZ & VIVIAN VEGA | 3B | 11.34 |
| 45 | 15 | QUAKER NECK RD | HEIL, ERWIN L & BARBARA A | 3B | 11.50 |
| 16 | 3 | OECHSLE RD | MITCHELL, SCOTT K & ESTHER A | 3B | 11.80 |
| 20 | 8 | 768+770 ROUTE 45 | EMEL, IRENE E | 3B | 11.89 |
| 2 | 11 | 459 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CATALANO, JOSEPH J & BARBARA L | 3A | 11.95 |
| 37 | 14 | HARRIS RD (OFF) | FRANK FICHERA FARMS | 3B | 12.06 |
| 50 | 8.01 | 150 HARRIS RD | ACKLEY, EDWARD M & MARY F | 3B | 12.14 |
| 57 | 5 | ACTON STATION RD | DARE, LAIRD Y REVOCABLE LIVING TRST | 3B | 12.20 |
| 42 | 8 | 132 PENTON STATION RD | ZANE, DOUGLAS K + ROBIN O | 3B | 12.51 |
| 53 | 29 | 243 ACTON STATION RD | WADDINGTON, BARRY + RHONDA C | 3B | 12.65 |
| 40 | 13 | 322 WELCHVILLE RD | SINNOTT, RANDALL F & JACQUELINE J | 3B | 12.71 |
| 19 | 27 | MANNINGTON YORKETOWN RD | COLES, MERTON M JR | 3B | 12.87 |
| 51 | 12 | NEWELL RD | NEWELL, ROBERT EST % JAMES NEWELL | 3B | 13.01 |
| 53 | 31 | ACTON STATION RD | ROBINSON, SCOTT | 3B | 13.19 |
| 38 | 1 | POINTERS-AUBURN RD | WHITAKER FARMS LLC | 3B | 13.20 |
| 28 | 9 | 930 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | MESSICK,AMY L,DONALD D FEDERANKO JR | 3B | 13.28 |
| 42 | 2 | WELCHVILLE RD | POMPPER, LARRY C SR & LINDA KAY | 3B | 13.42 |
| 21 | 2 | BASSETT RD 18 | HARRIS, EVERETT W JR + NANCY A | 3B | 13.66 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 40 | 16 | WELCHVILLE RD | CARROLL, LINDA | 3B | 13.69 |
| 26 | 38 | 849 + 851 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | HILL, ANDREW W + DEBORAH L | 3B | 13.73 |
| 55 | 1 | SANDY RIDGE RD | MACCHERONE, SANTO JOHN & ANTOINETTE | 3B | 13.76 |
| 53 | 2 | 270 ROUTE 45 | CAMPBELL, KEITH S + SHIRLEY B | 3B | 13.83 |
| 17 | 33 | HACKETT RD | MOORE, EARL B JR | 3B | 14.11 |
| 5 | 1 | 910 KINGS HWY | LAROSA, CARMEN J & CHARLENE | 3B | 14.17 |
| 39 | 20 | BASSETT RD | VITTORI, JOEL L & FAITH C | 3B | 14.26 |
| 39 | 32 | ROUTE 45 | RICHMAN, JOHN A & MELANIE A E | 3B | 14.28 |
| 13 | 1 | 25 BARBER RD | RAHAIM, THOMAS JOHN & LISA RAE | 3B | 14.34 |
| 38 | 6 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | WRIGHT, RUTHANNE H | 3B | 14.34 |
| 42 | 3 | PENTON STATION RD | MYERS, BRENT M & JEAN | 3B | 14.67 |
| 3 | 4.01 | BLACK RD | FARIS, DUANE & DONNA | 3B | 14.91 |
| 20 | 12 | 209 COMPROMISE RD | BITTER, JOHN B JR % J BITTER III | 3B | 15.00 |
| 45 | 5 | WELCHVILLE RD | FRANK FICHERA FARMS | 3B | 15.19 |
| 61 | 23 | ROUTE 45 | NEWELL, ROBERT EST % JAMES NEWELL | 3B | 15.23 |
| 22 | 11 | 10 BIDDLE RD | GAUDIOSI, ROBERT & SUSAN | 3B | 15.36 |
| 8 | 8 | FENWICK RD | FRAHM, ROBERT B & EARLENE R | 3B | 15.43 |
| 7 | 11 | FENWICK RD | WEST, DONALD | 3B | 15.44 |
| 37 | 8 | HARRIS RD | WHITAKER, JEAN E | 3B | 15.53 |
| 18 | 10 | 59 SWEDES BRIDGE RD | CALDWELL, ROSS T & JUDITH R | 3B | 15.61 |
| 36 | 9 | SUNSET DRIVE | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 15.94 |
| 58 | 1 | CLANCY RD | MACCHERONE, SANTO JOHN & ANTOINETTE | 3B | 15.96 |
| 16 | 5 | HACKETT RD | RADIANT HOLDINGS, LLC | 3B | 15.98 |
| 17 | 15 | 102+104 MANN-YORKETOWN RD | HOOPER, DOUGLAS + MARY | 3B | 16.05 |
| 37 | 5 | SUNSET DR | OWENS, FLORENCE W | 3B | 16.18 |
| 40 | 10.01 | 138 SWEDES BRIDGE RD | CASPER, JOSEPH G JR & HEATHER | 3B | 16.22 |
| 37 | 16 | SUNSET DR (OFF) | OWENS, FLORENCE W | 3B | 16.23 |
| 40 | 12 | 310 WELCHVILLE RD | KELLEY, THOMAS F JR + AMBER LEE | 3B | 16.43 |
| 19 | 23 | CEMETERY RD | PORTER, KATIE EST %PORTER | 3B | 16.43 |
| 28 | 6 | HAWKS BRIDGE RD | MEADOWS, JAMES G + ANNA M | 3B | 16.49 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 58 | 5 | 61 ACTON STATION RD | WYSHINSKI,JOHN E JR, JOHN E,JULIE M | 3B | 16.67 |
| 25 | 21 | 867 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | SPARKS, MILDRED ANN | 3B | 16.93 |
| 63 | 21 | OLD KINGS HWY | GRISCOM IRREVOCABLE FAMILY TRUST | 3B | 17.59 |
| 17 | 6 | 105 OECHSLE ROAD | BURGENTS, EDWARD L JR + MARY E | 3B | 17.68 |
| 28 | 33 | SUNSET DR | HUMPHREYS, MELVIN E | 3B | 18.13 |
| 47 | 14 | 285-289 ACTON STATION RD | COLLETTI, MICHAEL J & LOUISE | 3B | 18.52 |
| 40 | 10 | 138 SWEDES BRIDGE RD | LAPE, CONNI, CHRIS, JOE JR CASPER | 3B | 18.61 |
| 20 | 22.01 | 75 COMPROMISE RD | BUTLER, FLORENCE A | 3B | 19.17 |
| 40 | 16.02 | WELCHVILLE RD | POMPPER, LARRY C SR & LINDA KAY | 3B | 19.53 |
| 5 | 7 | HAINES NECK RD | MIHLEBACH, ELAINE STARR | 3B | 19.89 |
| 4 | 12.01 | BLACK RD | TUFTS, WARREN E,ANNA L REVOC TRUST | 3B | 19.92 |
| 3 | 10 | WARNER RD | HERITAGE, DAVID A | 3B | 20.16 |
| 28 | 41 | MAPLE AVE 22 | HUMPHREYS, MELVIN E | 3B | 20.27 |
| 27 | 11 | HAWKS BRIDGE RD | HILL, CALVIN | 3B | 20.29 |
| 3 | 1 | 550 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CATALANO, JAMES & CAROL | 3B | 20.31 |
| 4 | 14 | 136 BLACK RD | HOLLADAY, CHARLOTTE | 3B | 20.54 |
| 2 | 11.01 | | | 3B | 20.83 |
| 53 | 32 | DUBOIS RD RR | ROBINSON, SCOTT ALLEN | 3B | 21.26 |
| 15 | 4.01 | 60 OECHSLE RD | WINKERS, JESSICA LYNNE | 3B | 21.53 |
| 47 | 15 | ACTON STATION RD | GRISCOM, DAVID A & JANET K | 3B | 22.64 |
| 42 | 4 | PENTON STATION RD RR | MYERS, BRENT M & JEAN | 3B | 23.01 |
| 2 | 8 | HAINES NECK RD | CATALANO, JOSEPH F JR | 3B | 23.12 |
| 5 | 6 | 609 HAINES NECK RD | GRISCOM, ROBERT M & TINA J | 3B | 23.17 |
| 17 | 28.01 | 41 HACKETT RD | JOHANSSON, JONAS S & LAURA ESTATE | 3B | 23.43 |
| 15 | 3 | 115 HACKETT RD | RADIANT HOLDINGS, LLC | 3B | 23.45 |
| 5 | 2.01 | OLD KINGS HWY | LAROSA, CARMEN J + CHARLENE W | 3B | 23.57 |
| 39 | 18.01 | 125 BASSETT RD | STECHEER, ROBERT + JOYCE M | 3B | 23.80 |
| 17 | 29 | HACKETT RD | COUCE, ROBERT B + ANNAMARIE | 3B | 24.04 |
| 15 | 4.02 | OECHSLE RD | MANCUSO, JAMES L | 3B | 24.22 |
| 40 | 16.03 | | | 3B | 24.81 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|----|-------|
| 4 | 12 | BLACK RD | MOORE, EARL B JR + ROBERT MOORE | 3B | 25.80 |
| 42 | 2.02 | | | 3B | 25.81 |
| 24 | 14 | HAINES NECK RD | UMO HARRISON M MYERS - TRUST A | 3B | 25.89 |
| 20 | 9 | ROUTE 45 | EMEL, IRENE M | 3B | 25.93 |
| 39 | 18 | 690 KINGS HWY | PIERSON, HOWARD J + JUDITH A | 3B | 26.16 |
| 59 | 6 | 633 QUAKER NECK RD | JENKINS, DAVID A + CONSTANCE Z | 3B | 26.69 |
| 26 | 39 | HAWKS BRIDGE RD | NATURE'S WELFARE % ANDY HILL | 3B | 27.21 |
| 21 | 14 | ROUTE 45 | EMEL, IRENE M | 3B | 27.25 |
| 17 | 31 | HACKETT RD | DAVIS, MILDRED S | 3B | 27.41 |
| 24 | 1 | SEABROOK RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 27.56 |
| 40 | 16.04 | | | 3B | 27.65 |
| 8 | 53 | FENWICK RD | KANE, CRAIG D & BONI L | 3B | 27.81 |
| 21 | 13 | ROUTE 45 | BITTER, JOHN B JR %J BITTER III | 3B | 27.81 |
| 50 | 14 | 120 HARRIS RD | WHITAKER, JEAN E | 3B | 28.04 |
| 3 | 19.01 | 64 WARNER RD | KIGER, MORI L | 3B | 28.09 |
| 7 | 7 | 123 MANN-YORKETOWN RD | PORTER, KATIE EST %PORTER | 3B | 28.33 |
| 25 | 2 | HAINES NECK RD | CATALANO, JOHN D | 3B | 28.35 |
| 40 | 6.02 | 32 SWEDES BRIDGE RD | MAHONEY, CHARLES & JEANNE | 3B | 28.35 |
| 24 | 7 | POINTERS-AUBURN RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 28.49 |
| 20 | 22 | 97+99 COMPROMISE RD | EDDIS, GERALD W + JACQUELINE L | 3B | 28.54 |
| 23 | 9 | 55 BIDDLE RD | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 28.61 |
| 46 | 6 | ROUTE 45 | CADWALLADER, DAVID L | 3B | 29.28 |
| 7 | 6 | CEMETERY RD | PORTER, JAMES W | 3B | 30.01 |
| 17 | 28 | HACKETT RD | LAM SERVICES LLC | 3B | 30.38 |
| 18 | 4 | COMPROMISE RD | KROLL, ELIZABETH Z | 3B | 30.58 |
| 64 | 1 | OLD CAUSEWAY RD (PAPER) | SHAY, CHARLES D | 3B | 30.83 |
| 47 | 12 | ACTON STATION RD | CADWALLADER, DAVID L | 3B | 31.49 |
| 19 | 26 | CHENEY RD | KELLUM, CLARENCE J JR | 3B | 31.55 |
| 36 | 6 | SUNSET DR (PAPER) | HUMPHREYS, MELVIN E | 3B | 31.68 |
| 7 | 4 | 66 CEMETERY RD | JOHANSON, JOSEPH R + DOROTHY | 3B | 31.96 |
| 62 | 3 | OLD KINGS HWY | SPARKS, MILDRED A | 3B | 32.06 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|------------------------|--|----|-------|
| 14 | 22 | MANNINGTON-YORKTOWN RD | SLACHTA, ANDREW F APC,RES,RAS,LL,P | 3B | 32.44 |
| 50 | 19 | HARRIS RD | WHITAKER, JEAN E | 3B | 32.48 |
| 15 | 11 | | | 3B | 33.88 |
| 39 | 15 | KINGS HWY | DEPALMA, FEDELE J + BARBARA F | 3B | 33.89 |
| 60 | 9 | MANNINGTON MILLS RD RR | MANNINGTON MILLS INC | 3B | 34.03 |
| 18 | 8 | OECHSLE RD | WINKERS, JESSICA LYNNE | 3B | 34.23 |
| 6 | 5 | CEMETERY RD 16 | LAM SERVICES LLC | 3B | 34.33 |
| 57 | 4 | 80 ACTON STATION RD | MURPHY, ROBERT F & SUSAN A | 3B | 34.38 |
| 25 | 15 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | FICHERA, FRANK J | 3B | 34.66 |
| 48 | 8 | KINGS HWY | CARPENTER, SAMUEL PRESTON COLES, EDWIN C JR & SHIRLEY M TRUST | 3B | 35.14 |
| 7 | 1 | CEMETARY RD | | 3B | 35.15 |
| 25 | 4 | HAINES NECK ROAD | HOWELL, JAMES B III | 3B | 35.30 |
| 34 | 15 | 126 SUNSET DR | FREY, JAMES R & RITA MARIE A | 3B | 35.42 |
| 20 | 21 | COMPROMISE RD | CLAUER, JAMES | 3B | 35.45 |
| 23 | 15 | KINGS HWY | CARPENTER, JOHN S III & DONNA O | 3B | 35.57 |
| 20 | 2.02 | COMPROMISE RD | RICHMAN, JOHN A & MELANIE A E | 3B | 35.91 |
| 28 | 7 | HAWKS BRIDGE RD | CATALANO, JOHN D | 3B | 36.18 |
| 18 | 9 | 31 OECHSLE | SIMPSON, RITA A SHADE | 3B | 36.19 |
| 45 | 13 | ACTON STATION RD | ROBINSON, SCOTT | 3B | 36.62 |
| 26 | 9 | HAINES NECK RD | DEGEORGE, JOHN F + GARY R SHIVERS | 3B | 37.15 |
| 39 | 4 | 475 ROUTE 45 | VITTORI, MARIE ESTATE | 3B | 37.67 |
| 1 | 5 | HAINES NECK RD | SPINA, RUSSELL C JR & MICHAEL E | 3B | 38.56 |
| 3 | 19 | 80 WARNER RD | DIGREGORIO, ROBERT S | 3B | 39.21 |
| 60 | 8.01 | ROUTE 45 | MANNINGTON MILLS INC | 3B | 39.49 |
| 3 | 17 | WARNER RD | DIGREGORIO, ROBERT S | 3B | 39.81 |
| 28 | 17 | MARSHALLTOWN RD CORNER | FICHERA, FRANK, ROSE, FRANK J,DIANE | 3B | 39.84 |
| 28 | 1 | 866 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | BAKER, RICHARD L + DAVID J MARANO | 3B | 39.91 |
| 23 | 11 | KINGS HWY | HANCOCK, WILLIAM C + MARY D | 3B | 40.56 |
| 58 | 2 | CLANCY RD | JANNETTI, CARL & EUGENIA J | 3B | 40.94 |
| 20 | 21.01 | 115 COMPROMISE RD | DUNHAM, KENNETH H | 3B | 41.54 |
| 11 | 2 | 338 PIERSON RD | BERGLUND,GJ,JA,RH,D,WE,L,%L | 3B | 41.66 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | EWEN | | |
|----|-------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 55 | 2 | CLANCY RD | LAM SERVICES LLC | 3B | 42.12 |
| 4 | 17 | POINTERS-AUBURN RD | VAN DOVER, JENNIFER | 3B | 42.24 |
| 47 | 16 | DUBOIS RD | WALDAC FARM INC | 3B | 42.67 |
| 53 | 28 | DUBOIS RD 7 | ROBINSON, SCOTT ALLEN | 3B | 43.08 |
| 40 | 6.01 | SWEDES BRIDGE ROAD | MYERS, CHARLES | 3B | 43.25 |
| 50 | 13 | POINTERS-AUBURN RD | CULVER, DAVID A & SUZANNE H | 3B | 43.51 |
| 53 | 50 | QUAKER NECK RD | VENGENOCK, EDWARD JR & THEODORE | 3B | 43.91 |
| 45 | 1 | WELCHVILLE RD | BEINLICH, SUZANNE C & LISA C NEAL | 3B | 44.16 |
| 17 | 7 | 109 OECHSLE RD | MENDENHALL, TIMOTHY J | 3B | 44.29 |
| 16 | 1 | SWEDES BRIDGE RD | EMEL, DAVID C & DONALD W | 3B | 44.65 |
| 25 | 9 | HAINES NECK RD RR | CATALANO, JOSEPH F JR | 3B | 45.51 |
| 20 | 18 | 181 COMPROMISE RD | CLAUER, JAMES | 3B | 45.60 |
| 53 | 33 | DUBOIS RD RR | COLEMAN, ROBINA M + PATTI L DAVIS | 3B | 45.64 |
| 20 | 7 | ROUTE 45 | EMEL, IRENE E | 3B | 46.45 |
| 25 | 6 | | | 3B | 46.88 |
| 25 | 8 | 182 HAINES NECK RD | LILLYA, GEORGE EST & GLADYS | 3B | 48.54 |
| 3 | 7 | BLACK RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL J | 3B | 49.15 |
| 53 | 27 | DUBOIS RD | COLEMAN, ROBINA M + PATTI L DAVIS | 3B | 49.31 |
| 53 | 29.01 | ACTON STATION RD | ROBINSON, SCOTT A + VALERIE A | 3B | 49.33 |
| 21 | 12 | ROUTE 45 | SLOAT, ROBERT K | 3B | 49.52 |
| 59 | 11 | CLANCY RD | MACCHERONE, SANTO JOHN & ANTOINETTE | 3B | 49.71 |
| 34 | 10 | 233 POINTERS AUBURN RD | WRIGHT, RUTHANNE H | 3B | 50.16 |
| 54 | 1 | SANDY RIDGE RD | BATTIATO, FRANK S | 3B | 50.63 |
| 46 | 5 | WELCHVILLE RD | CADWALLADER, ASA JR | 3B | 50.99 |
| 36 | 10 | SUNSET DR | FREY, JAMES R & RITA MARIE A | 3B | 51.11 |
| 19 | 9 | 160 COMPROMISE RD | HART, BEATRICE D | 3B | 51.40 |
| 64 | 7 | 50 TIDE MILL RD | ABBOTT, JAMES E & DEBRA | 3B | 51.43 |
| 3 | 4 | BLACK RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL | 3B | 51.43 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 5 | 8 | HAINES NECK RD | BONACORDA, JOHN | 3B | 52.32 |
| 1 | 7 | 163 HAINES NECK RD | R & D SPINA INC | 3B | 53.55 |
| 58 | 6 | SANDY RIDGE RD | STOMS, JEFFERY R | 3B | 53.60 |
| 16 | 6 | SWEDES BRIDGE RD | LAPE, CONNI, CHRIS + JOE JR CASPER | 3B | 53.79 |
| 47 | 4 | ROUTE 45 | ALLEN, WAYDE D & MARGARET A | 3B | 54.20 |
| 23 | 2 | HALLTOWN RD | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 54.46 |
| 22 | 12 | BIDDLE RD | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 54.92 |
| 21 | 1 | ROUTE 45 & BASSETT RDS | RICHMAN, JOHN A & MELANIE A E | 3B | 54.93 |
| 21 | 8 | 576 HAINES NECK RD | MOORE, JOHN J + LORI A | 3B | 55.20 |
| 4 | 3 | HAINES NECK RD | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 55.79 |
| 7 | 13 | 249 + 249A FENWICK RD | LAM SERVICES LLC | 3B | 55.91 |
| 64 | 11 | 98 OLD KINGS HWY | GRISCOM IRREVOCABLE FAMILY TRUST | 3B | 55.91 |
| 37 | 15 | SUNSET DR (OFF) | WILKINSON, WILLIAM T | 3B | 57.09 |
| 2 | 15 | 487 POINTERS AUBURN RD | MORGAN, KARL R JR | 3B | 57.61 |
| 34 | 3 | MARSHALLTOWN RD | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 57.94 |
| 58 | 4 | ACTON STATION RD | DESTEFANO, CHARLES G & THERESA | 3B | 58.77 |
| 24 | 21 | 84 SEABROOK RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 60.10 |
| 21 | 16 | 741 ROUTE 45 | EMEL, IRENE E | 3B | 60.58 |
| 39 | 13 | 594 KINGS HWY | BATTIATO, FRANK ESTATE & JANICE | 3B | 61.15 |
| 4 | 1 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | FRANK FICHERA FARMS | 3B | 61.60 |
| 58 | 8 | 88 SANDY RIDGE RD | MACCHERONE, SANTO JOHN & ANTOINETTE | 3B | 61.91 |
| 34 | 12 | SUNSET DRIVE | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 62.02 |
| 42 | 2.01 | WELCHVILLE RD | POMPPER, LARRY C SR & LINDA KAY | 3B | 62.03 |
| 59 | 12 | 73 SANDY RIDGE RD | JOHNSON, CARLTON G JR & RALPH E | 3B | 62.19 |
| 45 | 7 | DOLBOW RD | DOLBOW, WILLIAM M SR | 3B | 62.30 |
| 38 | 10 | 55 + 19 SEABROOK RD | SEABROOK, JOHN M & ELIZABETH TOOMEY | 3B | 63.46 |
| 39 | 34 | 503 ROUTE 45 | BOOTH, KEVIN M | 3B | 63.54 |
| 53 | 44 | 634 QUAKER NECK RD | MANNINGTON MILLS INC | 3B | 63.55 |
| 24 | 12 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | LEONE, SALVATORE G + GEORGE A | 3B | 64.41 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|-------|
| 3 | 20 | 92 WARNER RD | JUSKA, GEORGE & DOROTHY | 3B | 64.70 |
| 24 | 8 | POINTERS-AUBURN RD | FICHERA, FRANK J | 3B | 65.76 |
| 42 | 5 | 82 DOLBOW RD | DOLBOW, WILLIAM M SR | 3B | 67.32 |
| 3 | 9 | BLACK RD | BROWN, LAURAETTA % JANICE FENTON | 3B | 67.33 |
| 56 | 1 | QUAKER NECK RD | SOLOMON, MARIAN F | 3B | 68.01 |
| 38 | 4 | 116 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CULVER, DAVID A & SUZANNE H | 3B | 68.04 |
| 2 | 1 | HAINES NECK RD | LILLYA, GLADYS A | 3B | 69.48 |
| 35 | 1 | MARSHALLTOWN RD & SUNSET | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 69.89 |
| 4 | 16.01 | BLACK RD | BUZBY, ANDREW & DAWN | 3B | 70.04 |
| 5 | 2 | KINGS HWY | MANNINGTON FARM PROPERTIES %MCKENNA | 3B | 70.15 |
| 39 | 12 | 550 KINGS HWY | CARPENTER, JOHN S JR & EMILIE W | 3B | 70.55 |
| 50 | 8 | 130 HARRIS RD | HANCOCK, WILLIAM C III | 3B | 70.67 |
| 59 | 6.01 | QUAKER NECK RD | BATTIATO, FRANK J | 3B | 70.81 |
| 25 | 13 | 429 POINTERS AUBURN RD | FOGG, CHARLES R III & JAMES E | 3B | 70.94 |
| 25 | 5 | HAINES NECK RD | R & D SPINA INC | 3B | 71.02 |
| 45 | 11 | 374 QUAKER NECK RD | HEIL, ERWIN L & BARBARA A | 3B | 71.55 |
| 36 | 7 | SUNSET DR | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 72.06 |
| 45 | 17 | ACTON STATION RD | GRISCOM, DAVID A + JANET K | 3B | 72.07 |
| 47 | 18 | 81 DUBOIS RD | COLEMAN, ROBINA M + PATTI L DAVIS | 3B | 72.43 |
| 37 | 3 | SUNSET DR | OWENS, FLORENCE W | 3B | 72.50 |
| 14 | 11 | ALLOWAY-WOODSTOWN RD | BARBARA, EDWARD L & LINDA J | 3B | 72.66 |
| 7 | 2 | 96 CEMETERY RD | LAM SERVICES LLC | 3B | 72.70 |
| 3 | 23 | WARNER RD (OFF) | KELLY, ELIZABETH F & JACQUELINE T | 3B | 73.25 |
| 27 | 10 | HAWKS BRIDGE RD | HILL, CALVIN E & CALVIN T | 3B | 73.79 |
| 4 | 15 | 80 BLACK RD | CATALANO, JOANNE J | 3B | 74.49 |
| 50 | 20 | POINTERS-AUBURN RD | HANCOCK, WILLIAM C JR | 3B | 74.67 |
| 4 | 10 | KINGS HWY | MANNINGTON FARM PROPERTIES %MCKENNA | 3B | 75.84 |
| 34 | 8 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | FICHERA, FRANK, ROSE, FRANK J,DIANE | 3B | 77.60 |
| 48 | 7 | 421 ROUTE 45 | DEPALMA, BARBARA F | 3B | 78.75 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|-------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------|--------|
| 18 | 6 | 40 HACKETT RD | LAM SERVICES LLC | 3B | 79.34 |
| 3 | 3 | 21-25 BLACK RD | BUZBY, ANDREW T & DAWN | 3B | 80.52 |
| 24 | 3 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | WRIGHT, RUTHANNE H | 3B | 80.55 |
| 21 | 3 | 90 BASSETT RD | VITTORI, JOEL L & FAITH C | 3B | 81.08 |
| 25 | 18.01 | 893 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | SPINA FARMS LLC %DANTE C SPINA JR | 3B | 81.25 |
| 28 | 20 | MARSHALLTOWN RD | CATALANO, JAMES II | 3B | 81.60 |
| 15 | 4 | 120 OECHSLE RD | WALTER, JOHN H | 3B | 83.40 |
| 24 | 11 | 370 POINTERS AUBURN RD | FICHERA, FRANK JAMES | 3B | 83.52 |
| 19 | 3 | 200 COMPROMISE RD | RAAB, HENRY E | 3B | 84.23 |
| 21 | 15 | ROUTE 45 | EMEL, IRENE E | 3B | 84.61 |
| 5 | 3 | KINGS HWY | MANNINGTON FARM PROPERTIES %MCKENNA | 3B | 85.19 |
| 39 | 11 | 500 KINGS HWY | BOOTH, DATHAN M III | 3B | 86.24 |
| 3 | 6 | 115 BLACK RD | CATALANO, JOANNE J | 3B | 87.28 |
| 23 | 10 | BIDDLE RD | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 90.44 |
| 45 | 16 | 240 ACTON STATION RD | ROBINSON, SCOTT | 3B | 90.46 |
| 40 | 9 | 124 SWEDES BRIDGE RD | MCMAHON, DAVID R | 3B | 91.89 |
| 24 | 18 | HALLTOWN RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 92.52 |
| 2 | 16.01 | 525 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL J & JOAN K | 3B | 92.64 |
| 24 | 19 | 61 HALLTOWN RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 92.91 |
| 23 | 12 | 655 KINGS HWY | DEPALMA, FEDELE J + BARBARA F | 3B | 93.22 |
| 53 | 41 | | | 4A/3B | 94.89 |
| 38 | 3 | KINGS HWY | CULVER, DAVID A & SUZANNE H | 3B | 94.93 |
| 64 | 8 | OLD KINGS HIGHWAY | SPARKS, MILDRED A | 3B | 95.53 |
| 53 | 38 | QUAKER NECK RD | TARK, ERNEST F JR + MAXINE RAUCH | 3B | 95.96 |
| 21 | 11 | HAINES NECK RD | GREENACRE MANNINGTON, LLC %JJ CLYMER | 3B | 96.56 |
| 3 | 12 | 16 WARNER RD | HERITAGE, DAVID A | 3B | 97.36 |
| 5 | 4 | HAINES NECK RD | MOORE, JOHN J + LORI A | 3B | 99.29 |
| 47 | 6 | ROUTE 45 | VITTORI, MARIE ESTATE | 3B | 100.20 |
| 47 | 10 | 523-525 WELCHVILLE RD | CADWALLDER, ASA JR | 3B | 100.62 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|----|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----|--------|
| 59 | 9 | 114 CLANCY RD | MACCHERONE, SANTO JOHN & ANTOINETTE | 3B | 101.46 |
| 53 | 26 | DUBOIS RD | TAYLOR, SAMUEL ESTATE & MARY E | 3B | 101.78 |
| 4 | 16 | 68 BLACK RD | CATALANO, JOHN D & KNOELL | 3B | 101.84 |
| 40 | 4 | 22 + 22A COMPROMISE RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL + JANIE | 3B | 102.15 |
| 4 | 7 | HAINES NECK RD | MYERS, ELIZABETH C | 3B | 104.00 |
| 40 | 21 | 350-378 ACTON STATION RD | CADWALLADER, DAVID L | 3A | 104.85 |
| 53 | 35 | 522 QUAKER NECK RD | WEIGEL, ARTHUR & MILDRED | 3B | 105.54 |
| 4 | 9 | HAINES NECK RD | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 110.13 |
| 50 | 33 | HARRIS RD | WRIGHT, RUTHANNE H | 3B | 111.28 |
| 23 | 1 | HALLTOWN RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 111.62 |
| 24 | 20 | 31 HALLTOWN RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 112.91 |
| 19 | 1 | CHENEY RD | BITTER, JOHN B JR %J BITTER III | 3B | 112.92 |
| 34 | 6 | MARSHALLTOWN RD | CATALANO, JAMES II | 3B | 112.98 |
| 22 | 2 | HAINES NECK RD | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 113.76 |
| 2 | 10 | 251 HAINES NECK RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL J & JANIE E | 3B | 116.98 |
| 50 | 32 | OLD KINGS HIGHWAY | HANCOCK, WILLIAM C JR | 3B | 117.24 |
| 55 | 3 | 477 QUAKER NECK RD | SHAY, CHARLES D | 3B | 117.81 |
| 23 | 13 | KINGS HWY | BATTIATO, JANICE M | 3B | 119.17 |
| 4 | 6 | HAINES NECK RD | UWO HARRISON M MYERS - TRUST A | 3B | 119.34 |
| 27 | 9 | HAWKS BRIDGE RD | UNKNOWN % TOM LUFF | 3B | 123.62 |
| 2 | 12 | 509 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CATALANO, JOSEPH F JR | 3B | 125.12 |
| 25 | 16 | HAWKS BRIDGE RD | GOLDEN DEVELOPMENT INC | 3B | 126.36 |
| 25 | 14 | POINTERS AUBURN RD | CATALANO, JAMES II | 3B | 126.46 |
| 23 | 3 | 132 HALLTOWN RD | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 130.79 |
| 53 | 40 | 570 QUAKER NECK RD | BACON, ALICE COLEMAN | 3B | 137.20 |
| 38 | 5 | 118 POINTERS AUBURN RD | CATALANO, MICHAEL J & JOAN | 3B | 140.54 |
| 12 | 6 | 470 ALLOWAY WOODSTOWN RD | DOAK, JOSEPH E & CINDY L | 3B | 140.74 |
| 38 | 14 | 465 KINGS HWY | CARPENTER, SAMUEL PRESTON | 3B | 146.81 |
| 40 | 25 | 622 ROUTE 45 | DUBOIS, ES JR, JA, ES III, SE | 3B | 153.28 |



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

| | | | | | |
|----|------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|----|--------|
| 24 | 17 | HALLTOWN RD | MARINO BROTHERS | 3B | 159.58 |
| 27 | 7 | 818 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | BENNETT, MARK E | 3B | 162.96 |
| 59 | 8 | QUAKER NECK RD | BATTIATO, FRANK J | 3B | 163.68 |
| 40 | 8 | 54 SWEDES BRIDGE RD | WELDON, JR SR EST & E R %WELDON JR | 3B | 164.96 |
| 39 | 19 | 77 BASSETT RD | HARRIS, EVERETT W JR + NANCY A | 3B | 166.33 |
| 6 | 2 | | | 3B | 168.81 |
| 39 | 33 | 555 ROUTE 45 | WALDAC FARM | 3B | 169.80 |
| 37 | 2 | SUNSET DRIVE | FRANK FICHERA FARMS LP | 3B | 182.55 |
| 27 | 4 | 816 HAWKS BRIDGE RD | BENNETT, MARK E | 3B | 204.16 |
| 28 | 37 | SUNSET DR RR (PAPER) | HUMPHREYS, MELVIN E | 3B | 205.42 |
| 37 | 7 | 29 SUNSET DR | WILKINSON, WILLIAM T | 3B | 206.44 |
| 37 | 1 | SUNSET DR (OFF ROAD) | MANNINGTON HUNT CLUB LLC | 3B | 213.07 |
| 34 | 11 | 30 SUNSET DR | OWENS, FLORENCE W | 3B | 214.50 |
| 53 | 36 | 466 QUAKER NECK RD | PETERSON, ROY C | 3B | 240.09 |
| 40 | 6.03 | SWEDES BRIDGE RD | MYERS FAMILY IRREVOCABLE TRUST | 3B | 242.33 |
| 21 | 5 | 738+790 KINGS HWY | SALEM FARMS CORPORATION | 3B | 370.88 |



APPENDIX 2: MANNINGTON RIGHT TO FARM ORDINANCE



MANNINGTON TOWNSHIP

ORDINANCE NO.10-03

AMENDED “RIGHT TO FARM” ORDINANCE

WHEREAS, it is the Mannington Township Planning Board has recommended that the Mannington Township Committee adopt amendments that will bring Mannington Township’s Right to Farm Ordinance (Mannington Township Code § 70-46) into greater consistency with the New Jersey Right to Farm Act (*N.J.S.A. 4:1C-1, et seq.*);

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED, by the Township of Mannington, in the County of Salem, State of New Jersey, as follows:

1. **The following new definitions are hereby included in § 70-5 of Chapter 70 “Land Development” of the Mannington Township Code (“Words and phrases defined”):**

COMMERCIAL FARM – A farm management unit of no less than five acres producing agricultural or horticultural products worth \$2,500 or more annually, and satisfying the eligibility criteria for differential property taxation pursuant to the Farmland Assessment Act of 1964, *N.J.S.A. 54:4-23.1, et seq.*; or a farm management unit less than five acres, producing agricultural or horticultural products worth \$50,000 or more annually and otherwise satisfying the eligibility criteria for differential property taxation pursuant to the Farmland Assessment Act of 1964, *N.J.S.A. 54:4-23.1, et seq.*

FARM MANAGEMENT UNIT – A parcel or parcels of land, whether contiguous or noncontiguous, together with agricultural or horticultural buildings, structures and facilities, producing agricultural or horticultural products, and operated as a single enterprise.

FARM MARKET – A facility used for the wholesale or retail marketing of the agricultural output of a commercial farm, and products that contribute to farm income, except that if a farm market is used for retail marketing at least 51 percent of the annual gross sales of the retail farm market shall be generated from sales of agricultural output of the commercial farm, or at least 51 percent of the sales area shall be devoted to the sale of the agricultural output of the commercial farm, and except that if a retail farm market is located on land less than five acres in area. The land on which the farm market is located shall produce annually agricultural or



horticultural products worth at least \$2,500.

PICK-YOUR-OWN OPERATION – A direct marketing alternative wherein retail or wholesale customers are invited onto a commercial farm in order to harvest agricultural, floricultural or horticultural products.

2. The term ROADSIDE STAND and its definition are hereby deleted from § 70-5 of Chapter 70 “Land Development” of the Mannington Township Code (“Words and phrases defined”).

3. Section 70-46 of Chapter 70 “Land Development” of the Mannington Township Code is hereby repealed and replaced with the following new § 70-46, as follows:

A. The right to farm is hereby recognized to exist in Mannington Township and is hereby declared a permitted use in all zones of Mannington Township. This right to farm includes, but not by way of limitation:

- (1) Production of agricultural and horticultural crops, trees, apiary and forest products, livestock, poultry and other commodities as described in the Standard Industrial Classification for agriculture, forestry, fishing and trapping. Intensive fowl or livestock farms are addressed further in Chapter 70, Article VII, § 70-54. Hunting, trapping, and skeet clubs are also addressed in Chapter 70, Article VII, § 70-52.
- (2) Housing and employment of necessary farm laborers. Migrant Housing shall meet the standards as delineated in Chapter 70, Article VII, § 70-59, in addition to other applicable provisions of Chapter 70.
- (3) Erection of essential agricultural buildings, including those dedicated to the packaging of the output and ancillary to horticultural production.
- (4) The grazing of animals and use of range for fowl.
- (5) Construction of fences.
- (6) The operation and transportation of large, slow-moving equipment over roads within Mannington Township.



- (7) Control of pests, including but not limited to insects and weeds, predators and diseases of plants and animals.
 - (8) Conduction of agriculture-related educational and farm-based recreational activities provided that the activities are related to marketing the agricultural or horticultural output of the commercial farm and permission of the farm owner and lessee is obtained.
 - (9) Use of any and all equipment, including but not limited to: irrigation pumps and equipment, aerial and ground seeding and spraying, tractors, harvest aides, and bird control devices.
 - (10) Packaging of the agricultural output of the commercial farm.
 - (11) The operation of a farm market with attendant signage, including the construction of building and parking areas in conformance with Mannington Township standards, including Chapter 70, Article VII, § 70-51.
 - (12) The operation of a pick-your-own operation with attendant signage.
 - (13) Replenishment of soil nutrients and improvement of soil tilth.
 - (14) Clearing of woodlands using the filed Woodland Data Form (WD-1) plan, installation and maintenance of vegetative and terrain alterations and other physical facilities for water and soil conservation and surface water control in wetland areas.
 - (15) On-site disposal of organic agricultural wastes.
 - (16) The application of manure and chemical fertilizers, and pesticides.
 - (17) Installation of wells, ponds and other water resources for agricultural purposes such as irrigation, sanitation and marketing preparation following applicable Federal, State, County and Municipal regulations.
- B. In addition to the uses, structures, activities and operations



referred to in subsection A., above, commercial farm operators may engage in any other agricultural activity as determined by the State Agriculture Development Committee and adopted by rule or regulation pursuant to the provisions of the “Administrative Procedure Act” (*N.J.S.A. 52:14B-1, et seq.*), provided that commercial farm operators are strongly advised to adhere to generally accepted agricultural management practices that have been:

- (1) promulgated as rules by the State Agriculture Development Committee;
 - (2) recommended as site-specific agricultural management practices by the Salem County Agriculture Development Board;
 - (3) approved by the local soil conservation district in the form of a farm conservation plan that is prepared in conformance with the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG), revised April 20, 1998, as amended and supplemented; or
 - (4) recommended by the Rutgers Agricultural Experiment Station.
- C. The foregoing activities must be in conformance with applicable Federal and State law.
- D. The foregoing practices and activities may occur on holidays, weekdays and weekends by day or night and shall include the attendant or incidental noise, odors, dust and fumes associated with these practices.
- E. It is hereby determined that whatever nuisance may be caused to others by these foregoing uses and activities is more than offset by the benefits of farming to the neighborhood community and society in general.
- F. Any person aggrieved by the operation of a commercial farm shall file a complaint with Salem County Agriculture Development Board (SCADB), prior to filing an action in court.



- G. To help parties resolve conflicts involving the operation of commercial farms, the State Agriculture Development Committee has also established an Agricultural Mediation Program. Mediation is a voluntary process in which a trained, impartial mediator helps disputing parties examine their mutual problems, identify and consider options, and determine if they can agree on a solution. A mediator has no decision-making authority. Successful mediation is based on the voluntary cooperation and participation of all the parties.

4. Section 70-51 of Chapter 70 “Land Development” of the Mannington Township Code is hereby repealed and replaced with the following new § 70-51, as follows:

- A. Farm markets, as defined in this chapter, may only be established in accordance with the Schedule of District Regulations and in accordance with the following standards and regulations:
 - (1) The farm market shall be maintained in good repair consistent with generally accepted agricultural management practices.
 - (2) The farm market shall not display goods closer than 40 feet to a street line.
 - (3) One off-street parking space shall be provided for every 100 square feet of display area.
 - (4) A maximum of three non-illuminated signs shall be permitted with a maximum total sign area of 24 square feet. Signs shall not be permitted within 10 feet of any property or street line.
 - (5) There shall be only one entrance and one exit on the street which shall meet the standards listed in Part 4, Site Plan Review.



5. The Use Regulations set forth in the Mannington Township Land Development Schedule of District Regulations (Land Development 70 Attachments 2.1 through 5.1) are hereby amended to include the following as an additional permitted Principal Use:

(#) All “Right to Farm” uses referred to in § 70-46.

6. The Use Regulations set forth in the Mannington Township Land Development Schedule of District Regulations (Land Development 70 Attachments 2.1 through 5.1) are hereby amended to delete all references to General purpose agriculture.

7. The Use Regulations set forth in the Mannington Township Land Development Schedule of District Regulations (Land Development 70 Attachments 2.1 through 5.1) are hereby amended to include the following as an additional permitted Accessory Use:

(#) Farm markets (per § 70-51).

8. The Use Regulations set forth in the Mannington Township Land Development Schedule of District Regulations (Land Development 70 Attachments 2.1 through 5.1) are hereby amended to delete all references to Roadside stands (per § 70-51).

9. All other references to “Roadside stand” or “Roadside stands” in Chapter 70 “Land Development” of the Mannington Township Code are hereby changed to “Farm market” or “Farm markets”, respectively.

10. All Ordinances or parts of Ordinances inconsistent with or in conflict with this Ordinance are hereby repealed to the extent of such inconsistency.

11. This Ordinance shall take effect upon the filing thereof with the Salem County Planning Board after final passage and publication in the manner prescribed by law.

12. If the provisions of any section, subsection, paragraph, subdivision, or clause of this Ordinance shall be judged invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, such order of



Clarke Caton Hintz

Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

judgment shall not affect or invalidate the remainder of any section, subsection, paragraph, subdivision, or clause of this Ordinance.



Mannington Township Farmland Preservation Plan

NOTICE

Notice is hereby given that the foregoing Ordinance # 10-03 was introduced and passed on first reading by the Township Committee of the Township of Mannington, County of Salem, State of New Jersey, at a regular meeting held on March 4, 2010. A second reading and public hearing on the foregoing Ordinance will be conducted by the Township Committee at a regular meeting to be held on May 6, 2010 at 7:30 p.m., in the Mannington Town Hall, 491 Route 45, Mannington Township, New Jersey, after which the Ordinance will be considered for final passage

ATTEST:

Esther A. Mitchell, Township Clerk

Ernest F. Tark, Mayor

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify the above to be a true copy of an Ordinance introduced and passed by the Mannington Township Committee on second reading following a public hearing at a regular meeting held May 6, 2010.

Esther A. Mitchell, Township Clerk

DATE: May 6, 2010