



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	6
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Concerns with preserving community character and resources as growth occurs.

Both the physical and the cultural limits of a community's ability to absorb growth require greater emphasis from the State. Greater emphasis should be placed on the protection of historic and cultural assets, particularly in centers. Here, the goal of absorbing regional growth can overwhelm not only physical infrastructure capacities (roads, water, sewers, educational institutions), but also destroy those features which give communities their unique identity. While there may be some ability to absorb growth in centers, it is not absolute and must be accommodated within locally defined limits.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 9. Historic, Cultural and Scenic Resources

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 9. Historic, Cultural and Scenic Resources, p. 144

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

The State Plan recognizes that preservation of historic and cultural resources are important as stated in various policies. Various state agencies, including OSG and NJDOT has been working with municipalities to utilize good design solutions that take into account the character of the community while planning for infrastructure concerns.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	9
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Economic

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

State Plan should encourage revitalization partnerships with the private sector and should expand policies to attract investment in urban centers.

Chester Borough agrees with State Plan goals and policies to target reinvestment and encourage redevelopment in the State's urban centers. State agencies should develop partnerships with the private sector to encourage redevelopment in the State's urban centers and the State should develop state funding mechanisms, similar to open space and farmland preservation funding programs, to catalyze private sector reinvestment in the urban center. Special policies should be developed to direct funding toward improving essential services, such as adequate police, fire, emergency and educational services, and to fund infrastructure improvements needed to support the redevelopment of existing neighborhoods and the development of new neighborhoods in the cities.

The Borough supports policies and encourages the development of expanded policies that will foster social, cultural and economic growth and diversity in urban centers. Particular attention and special public investment programs may be needed to attract private sector investment in the State's cities. In this way, sprawl development pressures may be effectively relieved in the fringe, rural and environmentally sensitive planning areas.

The goal should be to measurably improve the quality of life in urban areas to provide NJ's citizens with a realistic living alternative and lifestyle choice to sprawl development in areas of the State that are remotely situated relative to employment centers.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 6. Urban Revitalization

Statewide Policy 6. Urban Revitalization, p. 27

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 6. Urban Revitalization, p. 129

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

The State Plan encourages public/private partnerships. Encouraging partnerships with the private sector is essential not only to leverage public/private sector funding sources, but to increase joint and coordinated decision-making and pre-planning activities which is a critical ingredient to the successful and sustained launch of any reinvestment activity, especially in urban centers.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	10
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Chester Borough recommends that the State develop tax incentives to retain/restore/adaptively reuse buildings and structures of historic and potentially historic significance. Additional strategies and incentives should be developed at the state level to encourage the retention of historic structures.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 9. Historic, Cultural and Scenic Resources

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 9. Historic, Cultural and Scenic Resources, p. 144

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

Based on the Goals and Policies put forth in the State Plan, State Agencies can create programs to encourage their implementation. While it may appropriate to develop such tax incentives, the development of tax incentives is a legislative matter that is beyond the scope of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

However, current programs exist for the rehabilitation of historic resources including the Federal Historic Preservation Tax Credit. Also, the New Jersey Historic Trust, a non-profit funded by the state, has grant programs available for historic resources. A bill to enact a statewide preservation tax credit has been proposed but has not yet passed in the legislature. Additional programs, including the state Rehabilitation Code, encourage adaptive reuse of existing buildings.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	11
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Housing

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

More affordable farm labor housing is needed; concerns with cost of acquiring land for affordable housing; concerns with impact of increased educational facility costs where affordable housing is built.

Affordable housing policies: Sufficient farm labor housing resources are needed in the rural and environmentally sensitive planning area to accommodate farm labor housing needs, irrespective of whether housing resources are located in centers or on the farm. Sufficient farm labor housing resources will help maintain the economic viability of agricultural operations and help protect public investments and productivity of agricultural areas that have been preserved through taxpayer funded farmland preservation.

In most centers, land with infrastructure to support new development and affordable housing is growing increasingly scarce and prohibitively expensive to acquire. Municipalities need funding assistance to provide safe, decent affordable housing in centers where increased land values are limiting municipal and private sector efforts to provide affordable housing.

In addition to affordable housing production subsidies, the State should implement revenue sharing to help defray the cost of educational services generated by the production of new affordable housing.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 7. Housing

Statewide Policy 7. Housing, p. 27

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 7. Housing, p. 136

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

Affordable farm labor housing is a major issue in areas of the state where active agriculture is a major land use. The ability of municipalities to make provisions for affordable agricultural labor housing as part of their overall affordable housing plan will reflect the reality and the correlation of housing needs generated by local employment opportunities and provide housing opportunities for an under recognized and under served segment of the population in these areas.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	12
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Remove center designation in Chester Township.

From Chester Township:

Remove the identified center of Route 206-Cooper Lane. The area does not meet the criteria for a village center and the Township has no plan to develop the area as a center.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Section in Existing State Plan:**Additional Information Regarding Proposal:****Staff Response:**

All identified and proposed centers are being removed from the State Plan Policy Map. Only designated centers will be shown.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	13
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Comment from Harding Township:

The definition of "Smart Growth" found on page 30 of the document titled Building a Better New Jersey dated April 28, 2004 (The New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan: Preliminary Plan) should be amended to include the words "historic and cultural resources" in the first sentence to reflect that these important resources should be preserved.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:**Section in Existing State Plan:****Additional Information Regarding Proposal:****Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

We agree to add historic and cultural resources in the definition.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	15
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Environmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Comment on TDR strategy.

Comment from Madison:

Statewide strategy to allow transfer of development must be broad enough to allow communities that can absorb development consistent with State Plan objectives via Smart Growth and/or redevelopment to provide for appropriate infrastructure and incentives to allow this growth to occur safely and far removed from core preservation areas.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 18. Special Resource Areas

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 18. Special Resource Areas, 171

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

The Highlands Act includes incentives for Highlands municipalities choosing to implement the voluntary TDR program for the Highlands. The Highlands Council is drafting a comprehensive Regional Master Plan which will include a TDR program. Adequately funded incentives and support for municipalities that engage in proper planning within the Highlands should be a priority.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	20
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Include language regarding responsible growth management strategies and local plan support at the state level.

Comments from Morris Plains:

Although the plan goals, objectives and policies are broad in nature and indicate that existing housing and commercial neighborhoods are to be preserved where appropriate, we recommend that language be added with emphasis on the following:

1. Growth should only occur where needed, and not be used as a tool to justify the elimination of stable residential neighborhoods, commercial districts and remaining vacant lands with that of more intensive development than what would otherwise be permitted by local ordinance and existing transportation routes.
2. Support of local master plans should be clarified within the plan in terms of supporting overall development types and intensity made at the municipal level.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

The State Plan seeks to maintain and promote stable residential neighborhoods, commercial districts, and open space. While a main goal of the State Plan is to accommodate growth and demand for growth through redevelopment of areas where infrastructure already exists, any proposal and/or market forces leading to an intensification of growth and development must take into account the impact on the area where the change is contemplated. This includes the extent to which growth might lead to neighborhood de-stabilization as well as the ability of local resources and infrastructure capacity to support the proposed development. An impact assessment must take into account current plans to insure stabilization in the short and long term assuming additional growth does not occur.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	21
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

The State Plan needs to provide objective standards for plan consistency and delineation of planning areas.

Comments from Morris Township:

Changes should be made to the State Plan to clarify and refine what objective standards are to be used to evaluate local plan consistency with State Plan Statewide Goals, Strategies and Policies. Without revision the current format leads to endless subjectivity and opinion regarding coordination of State, County and local plans.

Delineation criteria for planning areas must be better refined and articulated to reflect the State's diversity of counties and municipalities. Once this has been accomplished it would be more likely that a consistent application of planning areas could be achieved statewide. Definitions of centers are too limited and inflexible to reflect the desirable planning objectives of special purpose centers such as CCRC's.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

The current state plan and a resolution passed by the SPC objective standards for existing planning areas. Each Planning Area is sufficiently defined. They are not intended to be highly specific in order to allow for enough flexibility within each planning area so that its unique requirements can be addressed .



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	22
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Morristown has concerns with accommodating more growth and preserving community historic and environmental character.

Comments from Morristown:

As one of the first Designated Regional Centers, Morristown has always been supportive of the goals and objectives of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. In the last ten years in particular, Morristown has been one of the leaders in allowing higher density and transit oriented projects that help implement New Jersey's Smart Growth policies.

However, Morristown is now at a point where serious concerns have been raised about how much more growth can be absorbed within its 2.9 sq. miles. The 2003 Morristown Master Plan emphasizes the need to protect the lower density residential areas within the Town from unwanted intrusions. "Unwanted intrusion" is defined as non-residential uses and higher density residential uses that would disrupt the neighborhoods consisting of the two and a half story wood frame construction that is predominant in a band that encircles the more densely developed core of the community that has the Town Green, as its focal point. In addition, with respect to the densely developed core of the community, the line has been drawn in the sand with respect to building height. Five stories have been reaffirmed as the maximum and in certain locations (primarily along South St) the height restriction is to be lowered from five to three stories. So, while Morristown anticipates accommodating more growth and development – residential as well as non-residential – the amount of ground area is increasingly limited and the upward extent of that growth is to be limited as well.

It is also the position of the Town that the State Plan map should be amended to reflect a number of Critical Environmental Sites and a number of existing parks. We are not, however, suggesting the mapping of Historic and Cultural Sites but the Town may choose to do so at some future date. This lack of action now, however, should not be construed to mean that our historic resources are unimportant. Quite to the contrary, Morristown is Morristown largely because of its historic resources and the importance of same is increasingly being factored into our land use decisions.

So, in summary Morristown is a Designated Regional Center and intends to remain as such but we want to make it clear that there are limits to the amount of growth that is appropriate here. And how that growth affects our quality of life, our mobility and the historic character of the community will be the criteria to be used to determine what is appropriate and what is not.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	22
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response:

The state is interested in working with communities to develop effective strategies for balancing regional growth. Both the Office of Smart Growth and the Highlands Council can provide technical assistance to Morristown as it plans for its future.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	23
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Agreement

General Topic:

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Concerns with development in areas of environmental sensitivity.

Comment from Parsippany-Troy Hills Township:

It seems that due to the regional premise of the planning areas, the ability to recognize that location specific issues such as steep slopes, wetlands, limitations of sewer service areas, water supply limitations, well head protection and other geographic specific issues will limit greater development of specific tracts of land. This represents a great concern due to the general growth premise that is portrayed under the PA-1 areas, irrespective of the environmental effects on the critical environmental sites within a tract of land or the sub region or the other infrastructure and fiscal impacts. It is strongly recommended there be further recognition within the planning areas policies that certain parcels within the specific planning area may fall within a regional planning area, but due to site conditions or infrastructure limitations, these areas may not be appropriate for a greater level of development.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response:

The state is interested in working with communities to develop effective strategies for balancing regional growth with environmental issues. Both the Office of Smart Growth and the Highlands Council can provide technical assistance to Parsippany-Troy Hills as it plans for its future.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	19
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Defer to PE

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Montville Township is considering center designation for Towaco Village Center.

Comment from Montville Township:

The Township during the previous round of Cross-Acceptance for the 2001 State Plan advised the State Planning Commission that it did not have any areas within PA-1 that qualified as a center under the terms of the State Plan. Now, however, the Township has addressed the planning, land development and design issues of the Towaco Village Center with a new ordinance and design standards. The Township may wish to further advance this center for formal designation in the State Plan. Further, since the adoption of the 2001 Plan, Montville has focused considerable planning and urban design efforts along its Route 46 and Pine Brook commercial "cores." The resultant improvements are in new design elements of lighting, landscaping, signage, and circulation of traffic with new Route 46 roadway improvements by NJDOT now underway.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

Discrete centers are no longer being designated by the State Planning Commission outside of Plan Endorsement. However the township may pursue Plan Endorsement and have the Towaco Station and areas along Route 46 recognized as growth areas.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	1
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Infrastructure (Not Trans)

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Fees and regulations on infrastructure facilities are burdensome and may hinder their ability to perform services and increase capacity.

Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority comments:

With respect to Goal #4 on protecting the environment and Goal #5 on providing public service at reasonable cost, the State Plan needs to recognize that burdensome fees and regulations on facilities that help accomplish these goals may result in facilities that are either not developed and/or not upgraded. For example, recent increases in NJDEP fees and regulatory requirements on recycling facilities act as a hindrance to their development. This may result in facilities that could potentially protect the environment not being built and /or may result in facilities that don't provide public services at reasonable costs. In this situation the State's regulations and fees that are in place to help the environment may have the opposite impact resulting in environmental degradation due to a lack of adequate facilities.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments, p. 25

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments, p. 119

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

The State Plan provides a policy framework for regulatory decisions. It is not a regulatory document itself, nor is it a document to determine fees as a result of regulations. Notwithstanding this fact, regulatory structures should reflect the goal of constructing appropriate necessary facilities in sites that have the capacity and freedom from environmental constraints to support them



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	2
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Infrastructure (Not Trans)

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Concerns with State Plan infringing on municipal authorities' ability to perform basic functions.

Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority comments:

The MCMUA would object to any infringement through the State Plan on its ability to operate, maintain and expand its water production and transmission facilities. It contends that the operation and resource development goals of a utility are not threats to the State Plan; rather, they are critical components of sound planning and development within the Plan.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments, p. 25

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments, p. 119

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

There is no doubt that the operation and resource development goals of municipal utilities are critical components of sound planning which is precisely why it is correspondingly critical that municipal utilities--or ANY similar entity responsible for the provision of infrastructure that impacts the location and intensity of growth--be considered within the State Plan as a decision-making framework to advance smart growth by directing and shaping how our state develops.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	3
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Infrastructure (Not Trans)

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Issues with State Plan regulating water supply development and denial of supplier access to watersheds.

The MCMUA is concerned that the State Plan criteria will be extrapolated to regulate water supply development and infrastructure improvements within the various planning areas as if it was commercial development. Also, under the semblance of watershed protection, a water purveyor will be denied access to the resource that the plan is protecting. Development of water supply resources and facility improvements should be exempted in the entirety from the scope of the State Plan, as these activities are already regulated by the NJDEP.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments, p. 25

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 4. Infrastructure Investments, p. 119

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

The responsibility of state (i.e. NJDEP) or local agencies to promulgate and carryout regulatory actions is not a reason to exempt policy and planning subject matters from discussion in the State Plan. The intent of the State Plan is to provide an overarching and statewide policy and planning framework to guide various state agencies in the carrying out of their duties and responsibilities.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	4
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

InterGovernmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Concerns with maintaining municipal authority with State Plan mandates.

Greater acknowledgement should be made in the State Plan recognizing the right of self-determination by local communities. State Plan goals should not take precedence over local decision-making.

From Florham Park:

With regard to #2 Comprehensive Planning, General Planning Policies and Collaborative Planning there are many policies that promote regional planning and multi-jurisdictional planning. While regional planning and multi-jurisdictional planning should be supported and are an important aspect of comprehensive planning, the reality in New Jersey is that it is a home rule state, and the municipal master plan is the primary tool to establish land use. The criticism here is that there are no policies that acknowledge the home rule nature of this state. While intergovernmental cooperation and planning is a laudable goal, individual communities have their own character needs, assets and problems. Florham Park does not support any policy that relinquishes any of the authority it has to maintain its character and promote the factors that make it a desirable place to live and work.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

The State Plan seeks to call attention to the need for local jurisdictions to take a more inclusive, comprehensive and long-term view of the impact that their decisions will have upon their neighbors AND upon their own residents. We acknowledge the home rule status of NJ. The purpose of the State Plan is to bring a more regional perspective to local land use issues. There is value in articulating and promoting policies that seek to enlighten local, county and state decision-making, such as the consideration of intergovernmental cooperation and planning.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	5
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Planning Area and Center definitions are too broad.

Planning Area and Center categorizations need to be expanded to recognize center, municipal and county diversity. For example, Planning Area 1 encompasses areas as diverse as Newark and Florham Park. These are clearly different areas, but both are characterized as Planning Area 1. A category is needed between PA1 Metropolitan and PA2 Suburban to address "edge" metropolitan areas that are neither urban nor suburban.

From Florham Park:

During the last cross-acceptance process Florham Park issued a report that was critical of the broad designation of Planning Area 1 (PA1). Most of Florham Park is in that planning area. In 1997 we noted that PA1 accounts for 46% of all New Jersey municipalities, 17% of total New Jersey land area, 60% of the State's population and 67% of the State's total jobs. This planning area includes communities as diverse as Newark, Jersey City, Woodbridge, Westfield and Florham Park. A planning area this large and broad in scope has little meaning for municipalities such as Florham Park.

Descriptively, Florham Park seems that it could also fit into the Suburban Planning Area (PA2), but the Borough's population density is greater than the criteria of less than 1,000 people per square mile. Additionally, there are no contiguous PA2 communities adjacent to Florham Park.

This criticism of the broad reach of the PA1 designation that was forwarded during the previous cross-acceptance process is reiterated here. There should be another planning area designation that more appropriately accommodates Florham Park and other communities that have mostly developed since World War II, and are vastly different from the urban centers. This type of community is suburban in nature, may have some redevelopment opportunities, and may even have some vacant land that is subject to development pressures. These communities do not want to increase their overall density; on the contrary, their goals as often stated in their master plans are to maintain their existing character. Communities like Florham Park are lost within the PA1 designation, and the creation of an edge metropolitan planning area that recognizes this type of municipality would be appropriate.

From Chatham Township:

In the Cross Acceptance report submitted to your office in September 2004, the Chatham Township Planning Board agreed with the PA-1 Metropolitan planning area designation for the eastern and northern parts of the Township served by existing sewer facilities as shown on the maps in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) issued April 28, 2004. Since Chatham Township's Master Plan and Zoning for these areas are consistent with the State Plan's Intent and Policy Objectives for both the PA-1 and PA-2 Suburban planning areas, either designation may be appropriate at this time, given the state of the SDRP.

However, the following defining criteria for the PA-1 designation are not satisfied in the parts of Chatham



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	5
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

Township so designated:

1. Density of more than 1,000 people per square mile.
4. A population of not less than 25,000 people.
5. Areas that are totally surrounded by land areas that meet the criteria of a Metropolitan Planning Area, are geographically interrelated with the Metropolitan Planning Area and meet the intent of this Planning Area.

The defining criteria of the PA-2 Suburban Planning area more clearly apply to the parts of Chatham Township presently designated PA-1 in the State plan:

1. Population density of less than 1,000 people per square mile.
2. Natural systems and infrastructure systems reasonably anticipated to be in place by 2020 that have the capacity to support development that meets the Policy Objectives of this Planning Area. These systems include public water supply, sewage collection and treatment facilities, stormwater, transportation, public schools and parks.
3. A land area contiguous to the Metropolitan Planning Area.
4. Land area greater than one square mile.

Therefore, we request that the planning area designation for those areas of the Township presently designated PA-1 be reviewed if or when the SDRP is modified in the future.

We note in the Draft Morris County Cross-Acceptance Report that several municipalities have expressed similar concerns over the PA-1 and PA-2 definitions and their applications in the SDRP, and Chatham Township shares those concerns.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p.111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:

Staff Response:

STATEWIDE

New Jersey is a diverse state but similar planning area designations are not meant to suggest that the individual identity of these communities is being compromised. While we do recognize that the PA 1 designation encompasses diverse urbanized areas, the characteristics that these communities all have in common include extensive infrastructure, regional services, and nodes of economic activity. Within the PA 1 designation, there exist different types of centers including Urban Centers, Regional Centers, and Towns. Urban and regional centers are appropriate growth areas. However, some towns may or may not be appropriate growth areas.

The State Plan defers the decision to continue to grow or to redevelop in “existing developed places” to the

Thursday, July 19, 2007

Page 19 of 26



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	5
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

municipality's zoning authority and to the ability of infrastructure and resources to sustain additional development.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	7
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Appropriateness of centers in PA 4 and PA 5.

The State should reconsider the concept of transferring regional growth into centers in Planning Area 4 and 5. The center concept is inappropriate in these areas.

From Montville Township:

The PA-5 Environmentally Sensitive Area in the Township is not conducive to the establishment of centers. Any development in PA-5 should only be very low density. This coincides with the Township's very low density zoning for these areas. Also, it is now consistent with the recent delineation (August 10, 2004) of the northwest quadrant of the Township to be within the Preservation Area of the Highlands Region.

From Washington Township:

Washington Township does not object to the State Plan as adopted on March 1, 2001, except as it refers to centers. Washington Township does not agree that designated centers are appropriate in the 4b and 5 planning areas.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p.111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

The decision to create a center begins at the local level in any planning area. If a town in PA 4 or 5 chooses to grow, the growth should be guided into centers to preserve open space, farmland and natural resources and to preserve or improve community character, increase opportunities for reasonably priced housing, take advantage of existing infrastructure and strengthen beneficial economic development opportunities. Strategic planning and investing can accommodate beneficial development and redevelopment in Centers, both efficiently and equitably. Plan Endorsement does not require the creation of a Center.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	8
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

InterGovernmental

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

State Plan needs to develop standards for plan consistency.

Objective and definable standards should be developed for “consistency” determination between local, county and state planning documents. At this time, the term consistency is too subjective and, therefore, has little meaning.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:**Section in Existing State Plan:****Additional Information Regarding Proposal:****Staff Response:**

STATEWIDE

New Jersey is an extremely diverse state. Consistency with the State Plan is broadly defined in the State Planning rules to address the many different types of communities found throughout the state and the many different planning imperatives that must be considered. Consistency is interpreted to mean consistent with the goals, policies and strategies of the State Plan as well as the policies that apply to each planning area. The definition is adequate to provide guidance to both municipalities and to the SPC to assess consistency.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	14
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Consistency of Planning Areas with Highlands Preservation Area.

Comment from Kinnelon Borough:

The PA1 areas in Kinnelon are not consistent with the delineation of the Highlands Preservation Area within the Borough.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 18. Special Resource Areas

N/A

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 18. Special Resource Areas, 171

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

The Highlands Planning and Preservation Area boundaries do not necessarily follow planning designations from the Office of Smart Growth. The Preservation Area will be the subject of the Highlands Regional Plan and will not be subject to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan Cross-Acceptance process.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	16
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Mendham wants its Village Center designation to be permanent.

The Borough of Mendham recommends continuation of the Borough's "Village Center" designation on a permanent basis without need for further review or plan endorsement by the State Planning Commission. The Borough is an historic and widely recognized village center in the truest sense of the term and does not need or desire any further planning or bureaucratic process to confirm that fact.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

While we are pleased with the fact that Mendham wants to continue their center designation, current state plan regulations state that centers are designated for a limited time. This gives municipalities the option of not renewing the designation upon expiration if they choose to do so. The fixed time period also provides OSG the opportunity to re-review the municipalities' planning documents for consistency with state planning goals and objectives. As of now, municipalities seeking to renew their center designation must obtain Plan Endorsement, unless our state plan rules are changed to reflect the above concern.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	17
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

Better delineation between PA 1 and PA 5.

Comment from Montville Township:

A more precise boundary delineation is needed between PA-1 and PA-5 to better distinguish between the developed areas of PA-1 and the undeveloped, environmentally sensitive areas under PA-5.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p. 111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

The State Plan Policy Map is mapped based on criteria that apply statewide. The distinctions between PA 1 and PA 5 are clear in the plan. However precise, boundaries sometimes do not follow neatly defined lines.



New Jersey State Planning Commission Negotiation Worksheet Policy Issues

County:	MORRIS COUNTY	OSG Item No.	18
Source:	County Report	Approved by OSG Director	
NE Item No.	0	Preliminary Staff Recommendation:	Disagreement

General Topic:

Other

County/NE Proposed Change to State Plan Section:

PA 3 area may be more appropriate for PA 5 designation.

Comment from Montville Township:

An area designated as PA-3 may be more logical as PA-5 depending upon how the State Plan addresses adjacent areas in Lincoln Park and Kinnelon. The Township notes that the actual designation in Montville may not be too important since it will not alter the established, relatively built-up character of development in this area.

Preliminary State Plan Section as Currently Proposed:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p.24

Section in Existing State Plan:

Statewide Policy 2. Comprehensive Planning, p.111

Additional Information Regarding Proposal:**Staff Response:**

This was not submitted in the county's Cross Acceptance report as a proposed map change. In order to address Montville's issue with this Planning Area, we would need more information from the municipality.