

NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2007 TIME: 9:30 AMLOCATION: COMMITTEE ROOM 1, STATE HOUSE ANNEX

NAME	AFFILIATION & ADDRESS	PHONE
Tamara Horvath	West County Planning Commission	973-579-1811
Carolyn Kutz	SGPC	973-762-8885
Mary Emeline	S.C. Economic Dev Partnership	973 300 1908
Andrew Bond	S.E. Planning	973-764-4681
Paul Dietrich	Upper Township	609 628 2011 ext 244
Rich Vanden	Green Township Sussex Co.	973-786-6953
STEVE SKOBSKY	HOW ARCHITECTS, NEWTON NJ - Sussex Co.	973-383-5550
BOB KOLLING	Sussex Rural Electric Cooperative	973-875-5101
Marianne Smith	Hardyston Twp.	973-823-7028
Tom Collins Esq.	Vogel Chart Collins & Schneider, Hardyston Twp	201 919 1409
Bob Guerin	Hardyston Twp	973-252-9340

NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2007 TIME: 9:30 AM

LOCATION: COMMITTEE ROOM 1, STATE HOUSE ANNEX

NAME	AFFILIATION & ADDRESS	PHONE
Maria Skibben	Mesa Consulting representing Upper Township	908. 238-0900
Heileen Horvath	NJETS	809 394-3467
Nick DiRocco	NJ Assoc. of Counties	908-234- 1225 x 103
Frederick	Greene County	913-962-0562
Wendy Sauer	New Jersey Highlands Coalition	913-839-2031
Rene Dittmer	Skylands CREAS	732-545-9525
Susan Gyarmati	Ringwood	908-234-1225
Sara Krumholz	NS NAIDP	609-580-3658
Wilma Frey	New Jersey Conservation Fund	973-539-7547
Susan Weber	NSA	
Barbara Palmer	ANSEC	

NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2007 TIME: 9:30 AM

TIME: 9:30 AM

LOCATION: COMMITTEE ROOM 1, STATE HOUSE ANNEX

[illegible]

February 21, 2007

Public Comment to the State Planning Commission

From Barbara Palmer, Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions

The Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions supports the State Plan and the Plan Endorsement process for its promotion of good land use planning and protection of the environment. ANJEC has been following the progress of the Sussex County petition for Plan Endorsement and commented on it on several occasions. At the June 1, 2006, public hearing, ANJEC asked that the State Planning Commission postpone endorsement of the Sussex plan until the Highlands Plan is in place. We reiterated this position at the PIC meeting on January 24 and we continue to recommend postponement.

We would all be happier if the Highlands Regional Master Plan (RMP) were already adopted. Please use any influence you might have with the Governor to move the RMP development process forward as a highest priority. But the plan is not in place at this time. The State Planning Commission designated the Highlands for protection as a special resource area; however the Sussex County Strategic Growth Plan projects its Highlands municipalities to be the major growth area in the county, stating that over 60% of projected population growth through 2020 will take place in the Highlands. Proper planning would dictate that the Highlands Regional Master Plan must come before the Sussex Plan, so that the effects of the Highlands RMP can be factored into the Sussex Plan. Without an RMP and without an MOU between the SPC and the Highlands Council, it is not clear what an endorsement of the Sussex plan means for the affected municipalities and leaves them in a difficult position. In fact your counterpart in the Highlands, the Highlands Council has asked you to hold off on endorsing Highlands region petitions until the RMP is adopted.

We recognize that OSG has made some changes to the report and PIA to address the conflict with the Highlands Regional Master Plan. But the report and PIA call for coordination with the Sussex plan only after the RMP has been adopted and endorsed. Unfortunately the Highlands Act does not require endorsement of the RMP by your body, it only requires the submission of the plan. This may not be of consequence, but it could be, and it could add to a delay in Sussex having to consider the RMP by several years. By that time, development projects and road expansions may have moved forward that are in direct conflict with the intent of the Highlands Act.

Also of concern in regard to growth inconsistent with the Highlands Act is that the Sussex Strategic Growth Plan uses pre-Highlands population projection numbers. These are the numbers that are used as well by COAH and DOT in their decisions on infrastructure expansions. COAH has just issued a statement regarding third round certification in light of the recent court challenge. They are encouraging municipalities to adopt growth share ordinances based on the challenged rules. The population projections that form the preliminary growth share numbers are based on pre-Highlands statistics and are inflated. But if an amendment of the Sussex plan to coordinate with the RMP does

not take place for several years, the growth numbers in the Sussex plan will not be revised until then and might lead to considerable development in the meantime.

Although we recommend that you do not endorse this plan at this time, should you decide to move forward with endorsement, please note that the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Act in effect stays most agency action in the Highlands Protection and in the Planning Areas until after the RMP is adopted. The Act specifically amends numerous statutes to require coordinated action with the RMP.

Should you vote to endorse the Sussex plan today, we would also recommend that you include in your resolution a statement that clarifies what county endorsement means for the individual municipalities in the county. ANJEC would like to see municipalities protected from the misinterpretation of an endorsed regional plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.



CAHE

Coalition for Affordable Housing & the Environment

145 W. Hanover Street • Trenton, NJ 08618

ph: 609.278.5656 • fax: 609.393.9016 • e: info@cahenj.org

www.cahenj.org

**Paul D. Chrystie, Executive Director
Testimony Before the State Planning Commission
February 21, 2007**

Good morning. As you may know, the Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment is comprised of forty organizations who share the common goal of promoting sound planning, environmental protection, urban revitalization and affordable housing opportunities. These are, of course, the goals of the State Planning Act as well.

Last month an Appellate Division panel struck down the Council on Affordable Housing's third round rules as unconstitutional, finding that those rules "frustrate, rather than further, a realistic opportunity for affordable housing."

However, COAH was not the only panel at which the Court took aim. The Court also found fault with the State Plan, citing the "circularity" of a process in which a planning document for the state is developed "in large part on the basis of municipal planning documents."

In short, the Court found COAH's touting of a link to the State Plan unpersuasive because they found little state planning in the State Plan.

We raise this issue today not because the Court has concurred with what we have said for a number of years, but because it is not too late for the State Planning Commission to do something about it. Your mandate from the Act is clear, and we believe that you all want to meet that mandate.

In a letter to Chairwoman Foglio last August, we outlined what we thought the Plan needed. We wrote:

Using the goals identified by the Governor's economic development team and other data outlining New Jersey's economic development needs, **the State Plan should identify:**

- how much growth is necessary or desired;
- where that economic growth should go;
- what types of infrastructure investments are needed, where are they needed and how much will they cost;
- what critical elements, such as affordable housing, and at what level are necessary to support the economic development goals; and
- what specific natural resource protection strategies are required to ensure that growth does not go to the wrong locations.

That letter to Ms. Foglio, as well as the previously-submitted documents it references, is attached.

No doubt there are some who will say the process is too far along to change much, and that it isn't fair to the municipalities and counties that have participated in the process to seek substantive change now. Although those points have some validity to them, we do not live in a static world, and adjusting to changed conditions is something we all do every day to keep our work relevant.

The Appellate Division has issued the State Planning Commission an unambiguous challenge – produce a State Plan based on state planning, or risk having your work ignored.

We have no doubt that this Commission possesses the expertise to develop a meaningful State Plan. Our question is whether it has the will to do so.

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

145 WEST HANOVER STREET, TRENTON, NJ 08618

Phone: (609) 278-5656 Fax: (609) 393-9016

E-mail: info@cahenj.org

Web: www.cahenj.org

August 30, 2006

Ms. Christiana Foglio
Chair, State Planning Commission
Office of Smart Growth
101 S. Broad Street
P.O. Box 204
Trenton, NJ 08625

Dear Ms. Foglio:

The Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment (membership list attached) appreciates the opportunity to provide comments on the Preliminary State Development and Redevelopment Plan for consideration during the cross acceptance and county negotiation processes. We believe that accepting comments on the Plan from non-governmental organizations and from the public represents a significant step forward in the state planning process, and the Commission is to be congratulated for taking it. We agree with the comment made by Somerset County at the last Plan Development Committee meeting that the public comments received by the Commission should be compiled into one document with a response to each comment from Office of Smart Growth, similar to the document containing the county comments and OSG responses. We also believe that the results of the negotiations with the counties on these items raised by the public should be included in the statement of agreements and disagreements.

As you may know, the Coalition has been an ongoing participant since the cross acceptance process was restarted earlier this year. We have provided OSG with recommendations related to the structure of the Plan, its policies and the Planning Areas, and we have commented on the county comments and the OSG responses. To the greatest extent possible we have not repeated those comments here. Instead they are attached as a reference.

General Comments

One comment we will repeat however is that **the Plan must be made more user-friendly**. As we noted in our May 25, 2006 memo to Eileen Swan, the Plan "is too long, too vague and it is organized in such a way that neither the state agencies nor the local governments charged with implementing it are given sufficient guidance to assure consistent and comprehensive implementation across the state." A number of counties in their comments concurred with this assessment. We therefore are pleased that a reorganization of the Plan is under consideration, and we refer the Commission to our draft outline submitted along with that May 25 memo.

Along with reorganizing the Plan we continue to believe that there are far too many extraneous policies enumerated in the existing Plan. Adding new policies contemplated in the Preliminary Plan will further burden the document. Accordingly, **we suggest that the Plan include only those policies that address broad state goals and that provide specific direction to state agencies, counties and municipalities.** Policies that call for enforcing existing law, micro-managing the private sector or promoting best practices simply make the Plan less useful. For example, in the recommended policies the Coalition provided in May (addressing Equity, Planning, Public Investment, Housing, Public Facilities), we were able to reduce the number of policies to 41, down from 99 in the 2001 Plan.

Our issue-specific comments are as follows:

Role of the State Plan

Neither of the first two iterations of the Plan is in fact a planning document. Rather, they serve simply to compare two potential futures for New Jersey – Trend and Plan. They assume the same level of growth regardless of any steps taken by state or local governments, and they are silent on both the level of economic opportunity necessary to achieve state or SDRP goals and on the specific steps necessary to promote that economic opportunity while protecting the state's environment.

With the Governor's office preparing a Strategic Economic Growth Plan, the time is ripe for turning the Plan into a true plan. While Governor Corzine's economic team is identifying the economic needs of New Jersey, the State Planning Commission should be identifying how those needs can be met in a smart growth context. Using the goals identified by the Governor's economic development team and other data outlining New Jersey's economic development needs, **the State Plan should identify:**

- how much growth is necessary or desired;
- where that economic growth should go;
- what types of infrastructure investments are needed, where are they needed and how much will they cost;
- what critical elements, such as affordable housing, and at what level are necessary to support the economic development goals; and
- what specific natural resource protection strategies are required to ensure that growth does not go to the wrong locations.

The Coalition is aware that the Commission does not currently have the data necessary to complete the analysis called for above. However, the development of the Plan should identify existing problems (congestion, pollution) and opportunities (existing or achievable infrastructure capacity, vacant land, redevelopment sites). The amount of growth and the type of growth is inextricably linked to whether the Plan will meet its goals of job creation, housing opportunities, urban revitalization, and environmental protection, among others. The Infrastructure Needs Assessment is a critical tool in this effort, and should accordingly be completed prior to the Plan. (See below for additional Infrastructure Needs Assessment comments.)

The State Planning Commission has a singular opportunity to create a true road map to economic prosperity, social equity and environmental sustainability, and the Coalition urges the Commission to take advantage of that opportunity.

Infrastructure Needs Assessment

A significant flaw in the earlier iterations of the Infrastructure Needs Assessment is that it only measured need at a statewide level. As a result, while the Assessment had value in determining the general level of need, it was of virtually no value in determining where that investment should take place if the state was to meet its redevelopment goals as outlined in the State Plan. If New Jersey is to grow its economy and grow it in a way that meets both open space preservation and urban revitalization goals, the Infrastructure Needs Assessment must address where infrastructure improvements are needed as well as how much they will cost.

Statewide Goals and Strategies

Each of the Statewide Goals and Strategies is taken from the Legislative Findings and Declarations of the State Planning Act. However, one legislative finding has been omitted from the Statewide Goals. We therefore recommend adding a ninth goal, "Facilitate the provision of equal social and economic opportunities."

Targets & Indicators

General Usefulness

Targets and indicators could be a valuable tool for determining where the Plan is working and not working, and what measures might be necessary to make the Plan more effective. Such analysis could be particularly useful and instructive if the Plan becomes a real planning document as recommended above. However, to date there has been virtually no analysis as to whether the targets are being met, and as a result this section does little more than take up space in an already overly-long document. Accordingly, the Coalition recommends that the Commission create a process for monitoring the targets and indicators that includes a mechanism and timetable for ongoing reports. In addition, appropriate targets and indicators should be incorporated into Plan Endorsement documents and progress toward meeting those targets should be included in the monitoring of endorsed plans.

State Agency Goals

Each of the state's executive departments has adopted numeric goals related to the successful implementation of their statutory mandates. The State Planning Commission should collect those goals from the agencies and incorporate them into the Plan as the targets for those particular program goals.

Affordable Housing

The preliminary Plan is schizophrenic when it comes to affordable housing. The Plan outlines numerous connections between land use and affordable housing – proposing new indicators related to substantive certification and zoning, referencing affordable

housing produced through zoning (in the section on the relationship between the Plan and COAH) and linking housing affordability to the differences between TREND and PLAN development patterns. The Plan then makes the suggestion that the indicator for Annual Production of Affordable Housing (Additional Indicator 24) be removed based on the absurd and contradictory notion that the provision of affordable housing is not "related to land use decisions" nor "can it be impacted by land-use planning." The Coalition recommends that the Commission adopt the creation and preservation of 100,000 affordable homes over the next ten years as the State Plan's affordable housing indicator. Such a target would be consistent with Governor Corzine's commitment to produce and preserve 100,000 affordable homes. (Note that in addition to this specific target, the Plan should identify the actual need for affordable housing in New Jersey, which is approximately 650,000 units by 2014.)

Policies

In addition to the general comment that the Commission should look to eliminate unnecessary or redundant policies, the Coalition offers the following specific recommendations:

- The policy on Equity should state that the State Plan in general and specifically the Planning Areas should not be used as a means to weaken regulatory standards
- The policy on Environmental Justice should not only oppose disproportionate adverse exposure but also affirm that urban communities, communities of color and low-income communities should share fairly in beneficial environmental programs, such as open space acquisition
- Comprehensive Planning – the Coalition has identified issues related to local plan goals, available resources, integration of plans, and monitoring of results (see attached comments submitted May 25)
- Public Investment Priorities – the Coalition has offered specific recommendations to target investment to where growth is desired (see attached comments submitted May 25)
- Provide Adequate Housing at a Reasonable Cost – the Coalition has outlined steps that would maximize the production of environmentally-appropriate affordable housing (see attached comments submitted May 25)
- Provide Adequate Public Facilities and Services at Reasonable Cost – the Coalition has identified policies related to transportation, sewer and water, and green infrastructure (see attached comments submitted May 25)
- Urban Revitalization – Add policy acknowledging the need for and benefits of urban conservation resources such as wetlands and habitat (note that this is different from the open space referenced in the Neighborhood Parks policy)
- Transportation – Add policy specifically supporting transit villages and the inclusion of mixed uses, mixed incomes and open spaces in those villages as per the policy of Governor Corzine and Commissioner Kolluri
- Waste Management, Recycling and Brownfields – Add policy supporting the remediation of brownfields (and greyfields) for open space purposes in all Planning Areas

Planning Areas

General

The Coalition submitted substantial comments recommending an overview for Planning Areas and a suggested structure and text for the section addressing Planning Area 1 in its May 25 submission and refers the Commission to that submission. It bears repeating that **planning areas are a wholly inappropriate means of determining a level of environmental protection standards**. Environmental protection standards are appropriately based on a statutory charge, not on the outcome of a negotiation between the Commission and a local government.

Although the 2001 Plan noted in its second paragraph that "It is not appropriate to use the State Plan directly to formulate...administrative rules or other regulations," several recent rule proposals proposed different standards for surface water, threatened and endangered species, and sewer service for planning areas 1, 2 and centers compared to planning areas 3, 4 and 5. The proposed level of protection in the so-called urban areas (1, 2 and centers) was lower than the other areas. This not only violates state and federal legislation that requires standards be based on environmental factors, but also constitutes an environmentally unjust "write-off" of the urban areas. Given that the explicit direction from the Plan itself that planning areas are not to be used for environmental standards was completely ignored by those charged with implementing the Plan, the Coalition believes that reiterating the prohibition on using planning areas for environmental regulatory standards is of value, and should be done in the planning area section as well as in the overview of the Plan.

Planning Areas 1 and 2

The Coalition agrees with the comment made at the most recent Plan Development Committee meeting that a mechanism to distinguish between dissimilar communities in Planning Area 1 must be found. The comparative examples given at the meeting, Alpine and Hillside, might have nothing in common except for their Planning Area designation, and it is critical for the Plan to be relevant to each without trying to impose monolithic policies based on their shared Planning Area. The same point can be made for Planning Area 2.

It should not be forgotten that development under the State Plan is not supposed to fill in the entirety of Planning Areas 1 and 2 but rather is to be center-based. The purpose of the Plan is to create compact sustainable development patterns that a) provide growth and economic opportunity in mixed use communities throughout the state and b) protect natural resources throughout the state. The Plan should reflect that purpose in both Planning Areas 1 and 2.

Plan Endorsement

If Plan Endorsement is to be meaningful and effective, the State Planning Commission must implement it with discipline and with clarity. Endorsement must mean that the land use plans of the petitioner **are** consistent with the State Plan, **not that they will be**

consistent after some implementation items have been achieved. Endorsement standards must ensure that the land use outlined in the endorsed plan cannot be overturned or undermined through strategies such as builders remedy litigation. (Note that in this regard the Coalition agrees with the OSG responses to the counties that "adequately addressing a community's affordable housing obligation is essential to good planning," and "crafting an adequate affordable housing plan...will be an essential part of the Plan Endorsement process.") Municipal adherence to Plan Implementation Agreements must be monitored, and sanctions up to and including loss of endorsement must be quickly and consistently applied when implementation has not occurred for reasons within a municipality's control.

Relationship to Other Plans

The level of capacity-based planning currently underway by the Highlands Council is simply not feasible for the State Planning Commission to undertake. Given that the Council's legislative charge is to determine the amount of human activity the Highlands ecosystem can support, and given that the Council has undertaken extensive scientific analysis to determine that level of human activity, absent any egregious disagreements in policy the Commission should defer to the Council's Regional Master Plan in the Planning as well as in the Preservation Area.

Cross Acceptance Process

Although public hearings are held on the draft Plan subsequent to the completion of the Impact Assessment, the completion of the Impact Assessment is by and large the completion of the cross acceptance process. While significant changes to the Plan are technically possible after the Impact Assessment has been completed, in reality that the impact of such changes will be unknown makes any changes extremely unlikely.

Accordingly, the Coalition recommends that the Commission release a draft Plan subsequent to the county negotiation process, hold public hearings and accept public comments, make any changes to the Plan deemed necessary based on those comments, and then conduct the Impact Assessment. Such a process will ensure that the public has the opportunity to actually shape the Plan as opposed to merely participate in a statutorily-required but essentially meaningless exercise.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide our comments on the Preliminary Plan. Please feel free to contact me if I can provide any further information regarding our views.

Sincerely,

Paul D. Chrystie
Executive Director

cc: Eileen Swan

Attachments

- Coalition Membership List
- May 25, 2006 memorandum to Eileen Swan
- Draft outline for reorganization of the SDRP
- Draft sample Goals and Policies for
 - Goal #1 Ensure Sound, Equitable and Integrated Planning and Implementation Statewide
 - Equity and Environmental Justice Policies
 - Comprehensive Planning Policies
 - Public Investment Priorities
 - Goal #5 Provide Adequate Housing at a Reasonable Cost
 - Housing Policies
 - Goal #7 Provide Adequate Public Facilities and Services at Reasonable Cost
 - Infrastructure Investment Policies
- Draft Planning Areas Section
 - Overview
 - Planning Area 1

COALITION FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND THE ENVIRONMENT

145 WEST HANOVER STREET, TRENTON, NJ 08618

Phone: (609) 278-5656 Fax: (609) 393-9016

E-mail: info@cahenj.org

Web: www.cahenj.org

MEMORANDUM

DATE: May 25, 2006
TO: Eileen Swan
FROM: CAHE Work Group
SUBJECT: Revising the State Plan

Thank you for the opportunity to present suggested revisions for the next edition of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. The members of the Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment's State Plan Work Group have been meeting for several months to compile suggestions to aid you in the publication of a new and more usable State Plan.

As we have discussed, it is the conclusion of the Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment's State Plan Work Group that the implementation of the Plan lags far behind the intent of the Act in large part due to the structure and content of the Plan itself. It is too long, it is too vague, and it is organized in such a way that neither the state agencies nor the local governments charged with implementing it are given sufficient guidance to assure consistent and comprehensive implementation across the state. A significant structuring of the Plan is needed.

The State Planning Commission is to be commended for recognizing some of these flaws and taking steps – such as the proposed reorganization of the "Statewide Goals, Strategies and Policies" section – to address them. However, adding new policies to the more than 250 existing policies will ensure that the policies of the Plan will continue to be ignored.

The Work Group suggests a more minimalist approach, including only those policies that address broad state goals and that provide specific direction to state agencies, counties and municipalities. Those policies that call for following existing law ("enforce fair-lending practices"), micro-managing the private sector ("emphasize...front porches") or promoting emerging best practices ("encourage...traffic calming"), while nice, serve to clutter the document and obscure the more important policies ("ensure that local land use plans...are consistent with adopted plans...."). It is the opinion of the Work Group that the number of policies in the Plan can be cut by 50-60 percent, and that the resulting document will provide more useful guidance to implementing entities.

Similarly, the Work Group believes that the section of the Plan addressing the Planning Areas can be made clearer and more useful by reducing the narrative and specifically outlining the implementation strategy for each of the goals for each Planning Area. With this format, state, county and municipal governments will be able to consider their investment and policy decisions under the framework of the statewide goals by Planning Area.

The Work Group has taken a stab at providing templates for the Plan organization and content that it believes will make the Plan more understandable and useful. Attached please find:

- A draft outline for reorganization of the SDRP
- Draft sample Goals and Policies for
 - Goal #1 Ensure Sound, Equitable and Integrated Planning and Implementation Statewide
 - Equity and Environmental Justice Policies
 - Comprehensive Planning Policies
 - Public Investment Priorities Policies
 - Goal #5 Provide Adequate Housing at a Reasonable Cost
 - Housing Policies
 - Goal #7 Provide Adequate Public Facilities and Services at Reasonable Cost
 - Infrastructure Investment Policies
- Draft Planning Areas Section
 - Overview
 - Planning Area 1

Not yet included in the draft but suggested by the Work Group is an overhaul of the targets and indicators included in the Plan. That we are unaware of any attempt by any agency to monitor progress toward the targets is an indication that the current version of targets and indicators is of little value and is not taken seriously by the State. As an alternative, the Work Group proposes a series of targets and indicators based on the Planning Areas and applicable to local planning. The Group expects to forward a sample version shortly.

Note that while the members of the work group have years of experience and familiarity with the Plan, we are not suggesting that the attached documents are the only way that the Plan could be made clearer and more understandable. Rather, they are meant as a starting point for a discussion as to how the Plan could provide more guidance to those charged with implementing it.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer our suggestions as to how the State Plan could be restructured so as to make it easier to implement.

DRAFT OUTLINE OF REORGANIZATION OF SDRP

INTRODUCTION

- State Planning Act
- State Plan Response to Act
- State Agency Response to Act
- General Strategies of the Plan
- Infrastructure Needs Assessment
- Vision and Targets and Indicators for new Horizon Year
 - A vision and one measurable target for each of Planing Act Goals
- Process i.e. Plan Development-Cross-Acceptance-Plan Endorsement
- Reading and Using Plan- Cross cutting Policies application in Planning Areas Etc
 - Application of Statewide Policies in Planning Areas, Centers, CES and CHS
 - State Agency Response
- Role of State Plan vs. MLUL, County Planning Act, Fair Housing Act, TDR Act, WQMP etc.

STATEWIDE GOALS AND POLICIES

Introduction explaining how Policies should be applied overall, in Planning Areas, Centers, and Critical Environmental and Historic Sites

Goal #1 Ensure Sound, Equitable and Integrated Planning and Implementation Statewide

- Policies On Equity and Environmental Justice
- Policies on Comprehensive Planning
- Policies on Planning Regions Established by Statute
- Policies on Public Investment Priorities

Goal #2 Revitalize State's Cities and Towns

- Policies on Urban Revitalization
- Policies on Design
- Policies on Public Investment Priorities

Goal #3 Conserve the State's Natural Resources

- Policies on Coastal Resources
- Policies on Water Resources
- Policies on Air Resources
- Policies on Open Lands and Natural Systems
- Policies on Special Resource Areas

Goal #4 Protect the Environment, Prevent and Clean Up Pollution

- Policies on Energy Resources
- Policies on Waste Management, Recycling and Brownfields

Goal#5 Provide Adequate Housing at a Reasonable Cost

- Policies on Housing

Goal#6 Promote Beneficial Economic Growth, Development and Renewal for All Residents of New Jersey

- Policies on Economic Growth
- Policies on Agriculture

Goal#7 Provide Adequate Public Facilities and Services at Reasonable Cost

- Policies on Infrastructure Investment
- Policies on Transportation

Goal#8 Preserve and Enhance the Historic, Cultural, and Scenic Open Spaces and Recreational Values

- Policies on Historic, Cultural and Scenic Resources

APPLICATION OF PLANNING STRATEGIES AND POLICIES FOR MEETING GOALS OF THE ACT AND THE PLAN

CENTERS AND ENVIRONS

- Intent and Use in Planning Areas
- Types with Delineation Criteria
 - Urban, Regional, Town, Village, Hamlet
- Components
 - Boundaries, Cores, Nodes , Neighborhoods
- Policies for Centers
- Policies for Environs

CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL SITES

- Introduction -local mapping
- Delineation Criteria
- Intent
- Application of Policies

SPECIAL RESOURCE AREAS

- Introduction – discuss plan and policy coordination
- Pinelands National Reserve
- Highlands
- Coastal Zone
- Delaware and Raritan Canal
- Meadowlands

PLANNING AREAS

- Planning Area One
 - Delineation Criteria
 - Intent-Target and Indicator¹
 - Application of Statewide Policies to meet goals
- Planning Area Two
 - Delineation Criteria
 - Intent-Target and Indicator
 - Application of Statewide Policies to meet Goals
- Planning Area Three
 - Delineation Criteria
 - Intent- Target and Indicator
 - Application of Statewide Policies to meet goals
- Planning Area Four
 - Delineation Criteria
 - Intent- Target and Indicator
 - Application of Statewide Policies to meet goals
- Planning Area 4B
 - Delineation Criteria
 - Intent-Target and Indicator
 - Application of Statewide Policies to meet Goals

¹ Targets and Indicators should be applicable to local planning

Planning Area Five
Delineation Criteria
Intent- Target and Indicator
Application of State wide Policies to meet goals

Planning Area 5B
Delineation Criteria
Intent- Target and Indicator
Application of Statewide Policies to meet goals

STATE PLAN POLICY MAP

GLOSSARY

STATE PLANNING ACT VERBATIM

ONE PAGE SUMMARY OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT

INDEX

Goal #1 Ensure Sound, Equitable and Integrated Planning and Implementation Statewide

Policies On Equity and Environmental Justice

Policy 1.Equity

It is the position of the State Planning Commission that a basic policy in implementation of the State Plan is to achieve the public interest goals of the State Planning Act while protecting and maintaining the equity of all citizens. It is the intent of the State Planning Commission that the benefits and burdens of implementing the State Plan should be equitably distributed among all citizens of the state. Where implementation of the goals, policies and objectives of the State Plan affects the reasonable development expectations of property owners or disproportionately affects the equity of other citizens, agencies at all appropriate levels of government should employ programs, including, for example, compensation, that mitigate such impacts to ensure that the benefits and burdens flowing from implementation of the State Plan are borne on an equitable basis.

In contributing to the development of the State Plan, many groups have expressed concerns about "equity." Urban Center residents, for example, feel that their equity has been eroded through urban disinvestment and resource allocation policies favoring new development in suburban and rural areas. Suburban residents, on the other hand, feel that they have lost equity via overcrowded highways, loss of nearby open space, rising taxes, and other negative growth impacts, the result, they feel, of inadequate planning, underfunding of infrastructure and other factors. Rural residents, particularly farmland owners and other land owners, feel that their equity is eroded when the use or intensity of use of their land is constrained to the extent that it lowers the value of their property and, in particular, jeopardizes the economic viability of farming operations. These groups have expressed their desire that the Plan address these issues.

It is the position of the State Planning Commission that the State Plan should neither be used in a manner that places an inequitable burden on any one group of citizens nor should it be used as a justification for public actions that have the effect of diminishing equity. It is also the position of the Commission that the achievement, protection and maintenance of equity be a major objective in public policy decisions as public and private sector agencies at all levels adopt plans and policies aimed at becoming consistent with the State Plan. The Commission urges individuals and groups that have concerns about equity to use all avenues to assure that their concerns are considered in governmental actions and to prevent inappropriate application, or abuse, of the State Plan. The State Plan is a statement of state policy formulated to guide planning to meet the goals of the state planning act. Public sector agencies and private sector organizations such as lending institutions, should not use designations and delineations contained in the State Plan to determine the market value of particular tracts or parcels of land. The State Plan is not designed to regulate and should not be applied to the future use or intensity of use of specific parcels of land. Both public and private sector agencies are cautioned that

direct application of the State Plan to specific parcels of land may result in inequitable distribution of the benefits and burdens of public action.

Policy 2. Environmental Justice

Adopt planning principles aimed to ensure the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of the public in land use decision making in accordance with Federal and State Environmental Justice policies. Ensure planning policies and regulations prevent disproportionate adverse exposure to environmental health risks, including fine particulate pollution, by communities of color or low income.

Target:

Indicator:

Policies on Comprehensive Planning

Policy 1 Planning Resources

Provide adequate professional and technical planning resources, funding, and training for professional and lay planners to ensure effective capacity-based planning at all levels of government.

Policy 2 Assessing Impacts of Master Plans and Development Proposals

Assess master plans and development proposals to identify their social, economic and environmental impacts locally and on cities and towns within the region. Address findings of adverse regional impacts of these plans or proposals through appropriate mitigation strategies.

Policy 3 Integrate Plans, Regulations and Programs

Ensure that local land use plans, regulations infrastructure investments and other related programs, recognize and are consistent with adopted plans and regulations on an intra- and inter-governmental basis.

Policy 4 Collaborative Planning and Conflict Resolution

Provide enhanced opportunities for conflict resolution throughout the planning and regulatory process with due regard for public input and disclosure. Develop plans in collaboration with appropriate communities, organizations and agencies not traditionally involved in comprehensive planning processes, making a special effort to seek out and include those from diverse cultural groups. Develop plans that create opportunities for and reduce barriers to economic and racial integration. Resolve conflicts between all development and environmental objectives and/or infrastructure capacity through the master planning process and before development applications are filed.

Policy 5 Indicators, Targets and Reporting

Include Indicators and Targets in municipal, county, regional, specialized and state agency plans, and provide periodic reporting on progress towards meeting the goals of these plans.

Policy 6 Municipal Plans and Development Regulations

Develop municipal plans and development regulations that follow the policies of this plan for example:

- encourage compact, center based, mixed-use development and redevelopment
- streamline regulatory procedures for consistent applications in centers
- create opportunities for and reduce barriers to economic and racial integration
- coordinate with state and federal regulatory programs
- use a wide variety of planning tools (for example, Build Out Analysis, Capacity Analysis, vision planning, Geographic Information Systems, Density Transfers, Transfer of Development Rights, Clustering, impact fees, agricultural enterprise zones, lot size averaging and Special Improvement Districts)
- coordinate with hazard mitigation and emergency response planning
- proposes land uses based on the capacity of natural and built infrastructure to sustain such uses
- recognizes federal, regional and state regulations governing appropriate land uses
- provide for transitional land uses or protective natural buffering between two or more incompatible land uses to protect environmental resources and/ or residential neighborhoods from adverse impacts.*

Policy 7 Multi-Jurisdictional Planning and Public Service Delivery

Promote multi-jurisdictional planning and provision of public services wherever efficiencies can be achieved.

Policy 8 Federal Plans, Regulations and Programs

Collaborate with federal agencies to ensure that federal comprehensive and functional plans, investments, regulations and programs are consistent with the State Plan and other state policies.

Policy 9 State Agency Plan, Regulations and Programs

Coordinate the development, revision and implementation of state agency functional plans, regulations and funding programs, to the maximum extent permitted by law, so that they are consistent with and promote the goals, strategies and policies of the State Plan.

* New policy

Policy 10 Geographically Specialized Plans, Regulations and Programs

Collaborate to develop and implement geographically specialized plans, regulations and programs (for example, watersheds, airsheds, corridors, etc.) wherever appropriate, consistent with the State Plan.

Policy 11 Tax Systems and the Ratable Chase

Restructure the state and local tax and revenue system to promote revitalization in cities and towns and to minimize the impact of the ratables chase on sound and coordinated planning.

Policies on Public Investment Priorities*

Policy 1 Priority for Public Health and Safety

Highest priority should be given to infrastructure projects and programs statewide that remedy life-threatening situations and emergent threats to the public's health and safety, regardless of the location. In no instance should such an investment increase the capacity of the system in question unless it meets other Public Investment Priorities criteria.

Policy 2 Priority for Planning Resources

Priority for planning resources should be given to those municipalities, counties and regions where implementation of the State Plan is critical -- urban communities where growth is desired and rural communities where preservation is the goal -- comprised primarily of Planning Areas 1, 4 and 5 with per capita tax bases below the state average.

Policy 3 Priority for Infrastructure Maintenance and Repair

Infrastructure investments designed solely to maintain or restore infrastructure systems to adequate working order with no increase in capacity should be prioritized as follows:

- Prior to January 1, 2008
 - Urban Complexes
 - Urban Centers
 - Regional Centers
 - Growth Areas in Urban Aid municipalities
 - Growth Areas in Endorsed Plans
 - Facilities serving Planning Area 1
 - Facilities serving Planning Area 2
 - Facilities serving centers in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5
 - Non-growth areas in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5
- Subsequent to January 1 2008
 - Growth Areas in Endorsed Plans
 - Urban Complexes
 - Urban Centers
 - Regional Centers
 - Growth Areas in Urban Aid municipalities
 - Facilities serving Planning Area 1

- Facilities serving Planning Area 2
- Facilities serving centers in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5
- Non-growth areas in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5

Policy 4 Priority for Infrastructure Capacity Expansion

Infrastructure investments designed to increase capacity to serve areas of the state where development is desired should be prioritized as follows:

- Prior to January 1, 2008
 - Urban Complexes
 - Urban Centers
 - Regional Centers
 - Growth Areas in Urban Aid municipalities
 - Growth Areas in Endorsed Plans
 - Facilities serving Planning Area 1
 - Facilities serving Planning Area 2
 - Facilities serving centers in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5
- Subsequent to January 1, 2008
 - Growth Areas in Endorsed Plans
 - Urban Complexes
 - Urban Centers
 - Regional Centers
 - Growth Areas in Urban Aid municipalities
 - Facilities serving Planning Area 1
 - Facilities serving Planning Area 2
 - Facilities serving centers in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5

Infrastructure investments that increase capacity can be a driver of sprawl if they are placed in the wrong locations. Accordingly, no infrastructure investments to increase capacity should be made to serve Planning Areas 3, 4 or 5 outside of centers.

Policy 5 Priority for Permitting Resources

Permit application review resources should be prioritized to review applications that support development or redevelopment in the following order:

- Prior to January 1, 2008
 - Urban Complexes
 - Urban Centers
 - Regional Centers
 - Growth Areas in Urban Aid municipalities
 - Growth Areas in Endorsed Plans
 - Planning Area 1
 - Planning Area 2
 - Centers in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5
- Subsequent to January 1, 2008
 - Growth Areas in Endorsed Plans
 - Urban Complexes
 - Urban Centers

- Regional Centers
- Growth Areas in Urban Aid municipalities
- Planning Area 1
- Planning Area 2
- Centers in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5

Giving a higher priority to a particular application does not mean that the statutory responsibilities of the agency or the opportunity for public involvement or comment should be reduced.

*Eliminate the policy related to Secondary Considerations

Goal #5 Provide Adequate Housing at a Reasonable Cost

Housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income households is a constitutional obligation incumbent upon the State and every New Jersey municipality, as well as a critical component of any economic development strategy. The State Plan, along with state and local government financial investments and land use decisions, must support both the constitutional obligation as well as the policy objective of providing a variety and choice of housing options.

Policy 1 Affordable Housing in Master Plans

All municipalities must identify housing opportunities for low-, moderate- and middle-income (middle-income defined as 80-120% of median) households in their master plans

Policy 2 Point-based State Aid

State agencies will give additional points in any point-based ranking system for State aid to municipalities that have petitioned the Council on Affordable Housing for substantive certification of municipal housing elements and fair share plans, and further points for fair share plans that reserve 25 percent of the total affordable units for very low-income (below 30% of median income) households

Policy 3 Projects Supported by State Aid

Projects supported by state aid to municipalities must not eliminate or adversely impact affordable housing units or sites in fair share housing plans without identification of alternate units or site(s) that clearly satisfy the *Mount Laurel* "realistic opportunity" standard

Policy 4 Affordable Housing in Areas of Job Growth

State and state-controlled federal housing subsidies will be explicitly targeted to the fastest growing employment centers in Planning Areas 1 and 2 and centers to ensure housing for workers and employees for employers

Policy 5 Developments Supported with State and Federal Funds

Mixed use or residential-only development projects supported by state or state-controlled federal subsidies must include low-, moderate- and middle-income housing, with low-

and moderate-income housing each comprising at least 10 percent of the total number of housing units, and at least 30 percent of the income-restricted units reserved for very low-income households

Policy 6 Disposition of State Property

Disposition of State property for development or redevelopment must be conditioned upon inclusion of a range of affordable housing, including low-, moderate- and middle-income housing, in the new use, with low- and moderate-income housing each comprising at least 10 percent of the total number of housing units, and at least 5 percent reserved for very low-income households

Policy 7 Redevelopment

No redevelopment project may result in a net loss of affordable housing, and any affordable housing obligation created by a redevelopment project shall be met on site

Policy 8 Public and Private Support for Affordable Housing

Public subsidies and private market strategies are both critical components of a comprehensive statewide affordable housing policy

Policy 9 Environmental Appropriateness

Municipalities should seek to provide market-rate and affordable housing opportunities in as environmentally-sensitive fashion as possible

Goal #7 Provide Adequate Public Facilities and Services at Reasonable Cost

Policies on Infrastructure Investment

Policy 1 Coordination

To the extent possible infrastructure investments should be coordinated so that, as an example, transportation improvements complement environmental infrastructure upgrades, or natural resource investments complement educational investments so as to provide a complete community resource

Policy 2 Condition of the Transportation System

The state's transportation infrastructure should be restored to a state of good repair.

Policy 3 Multi-modalism

Multi-modal options are the preferred method of addressing the state's transportation needs

Policy 4 Transportation and Economic Development

Where economic development in Planning Areas 1 and 2 can be supported through system capacity increases, public transportation system capacity is the preferred option, with highway capacity increases limited to less than 4 percent of the annual capital program. Economic development in centers in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5 should be

supported through operational improvements, with no new highway capacity in Planning Areas 3, 4 or 5.

Policy 5 Wastewater Management Plans

Environmental infrastructure investments should be considered only when they are part of an up-to-date Wastewater Management Plan

Policy 6 Water and Sewer Capacity

Environmental infrastructure capacity increases are limited to Planning Areas 1, 2 and centers. While safety and health issues in Planning Areas 3, 4 and 5 should be addressed expeditiously, remediation of those concerns should not include an increase in water and sewer capacity.

Policy 7 EITF Land Acquisition

Environmental Infrastructure Trust funds should be available for land acquisition only in municipalities that have petitioned the Council on Affordable Housing for substantive certification.

Policy 8 Infiltration and Inflow

The state's water and sewer infrastructure should be brought to a state of good repair where infiltration and inflow amounts to less than 20 percent of total flow.

Policy 9 Land Acquisition

Natural resources investments should seek to protect water supplies, to preserve species habitat and to prevent fragmentation.

Policy 10 Urban Environment

Conservation, historic and recreation resources are critical components of a comprehensive urban revitalization strategy, and discreet funding streams should be available for land acquisition, capital investments, historic preservation and rehabilitation and stewardship needs in urban communities.

Policy 11 Educational Facilities

Schools and other educational facilities should support children's intellectual, social and physical development.

Policy 12 Community Access

Educational facilities should be made available to the community at large during non-school hours.

Policy 13 Contamination

Educational facilities should be constructed on environmentally-appropriate sites. Remediation of contaminated sites for future educational facilities should require a complete clean up to meet the highest remediation standard.

Policy 14 Accessibility

Educational facilities should be located as close as possible to public transit so as to minimize parking needs.

B. PLANNING AREAS

Geographic Framework For Communities Of Place

The State Plan promotes the strategic application of investment and regulatory policy to repair and maintain infrastructure in developed areas, to reestablish adequate levels of service in over-burdened communities and to protect the agricultural, natural and cultural resources of the State. The State Plan's Statewide Policies are applied in appropriate ways in each Planning Area, Center and Node to meet the goals of the State Planning Act. These Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites and Historic and Cultural sites mapping provides the distinct geographic framework for the application of the Statewide Policies of the State Plan in local, county and state agency planning.

The Planning Areas are:

- PA1: Metropolitan Planning Area;
- PA2: Suburban Planning Area;
- PA3: Fringe Planning Area;
- PA4: Rural Planning Area, which includes PA4B, the Rural/Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area; and
- PA5: Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area, which includes PA5B, the Environmentally Sensitive/Barrier Island Planning Area.

Planning Areas do not necessarily coincide with municipal or county boundaries, but define geographic areas that are suitable for common application of public policy.

The State Plan anticipates continued growth throughout New Jersey in all Planning Areas. The character, location and magnitude of this growth vary among Planning Areas according to the specific character of the area.

The Resource Planning and Management Structure uses the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area as the primary means of protecting and managing the larger areas of natural and environmental resources of New Jersey. Because it recognizes that there are important natural and environmental resources found in other Planning Areas, the State Plan recommends the designation of particular resources as "Critical Environmental Sites or Historic and Cultural Sites" through the Cross-acceptance and municipal master and county planning processes. Designation as a "Critical Environmental Site" applies the Intent and applicable Policy Objectives of the Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area to these resources. Designation as a "Historic and Cultural Site" applies applicable Statewide Policies to these resources. Each Planning Area has Policy Objectives that guide the implementation of statewide policies in the context of its unique qualities and conditions. These Policy Objectives are intended to guide state, county and municipal planning in general and, specifically, to establish a regional system of Centers (with Cores and Neighborhoods) and Nodes to promote growth in Metropolitan and Suburban Planning Areas; guide the location and size of Centers to accommodate growth in Fringe, Rural and Environmentally Sensitive Planning Areas; and provide management for the Environs.

Implementation Strategies For All Planning Areas

To achieve consistency with State Plan Goals, municipal, county, regional and state agencies should implement Statewide Policies by undertaking the following activities, where appropriate:

- Strengthen or establish regional planning consortiums.
- Update county and municipal Master Plans based on Resource inventories which include analysis of status of vacant lots, brownfields, and natural resources
- Perform a community build-out analysis to determine opportunities for and impacts of future development under existing and proposed zoning.
- Identify regional and local focal points for public and private investment.
- Inventory the condition and capacity of infrastructure components such as roads, wastewater treatment facilities, water supply, and public buildings and parks, and
- Prioritize maintenance and rehabilitation projects.
- Develop strategic capital plans and budgets to reduce infrastructure backlogs and adequately address ongoing maintenance and modernization.
- Integrate planning and implementation at all appropriate scales—the neighborhood, municipality, county, corridor and region (including interstate linkages).
- Coordinate and streamline planning with permitting and land use approval requirements for growth and economic activity in appropriate areas..
- Identify strategies for linking the region internally and externally.
- Identify opportunities and prepare guidelines for retrofitting concentrations of commercial, industrial and institutional land uses.
- Support needed improvements for downtown business communities by establishing programs such as “Special Improvement Districts” in Centers.
- Capitalize on the opportunities for redevelopment in Centers afforded by redevelopment laws and brownfields redevelopment programs.
- Provide zoning for a diversity of uses and residential densities consistent with the urban fabric to promote development and redevelopment and protect the character of existing neighborhoods
- Establish and maintain a publicly accessible inventory of sites recommended for redevelopment.
- Develop a strategic acquisition plan for open space, park lands and farmland to support appropriate design of development and redevelopment and protect natural resources.
- Map and protect Critical Environmental Sites and Historic and Cultural Sites.
- Conduct a local visioning process to achieve a local consensus on the scale, location and form for growth in centers and the protection of the environs
- Perform a capacity analysis of natural and built infrastructure to determine sustainability of growth centers

Metropolitan Planning Area (PA1)

Introduction

This Planning Area delineation is based on the density of use and the availability of infrastructure to support future growth. It includes a variety of communities that range from large Urban Centers such as Newark, to 19th century towns shaped by commuter rail and post-war suburbs, such as Englewood and Cherry Hill. As the name implies, the communities in this Planning Area often have strong ties to, or are influenced by, major metropolitan centers—the New York/Newark/Jersey City metropolitan region in the northeastern counties (roughly within the I-287 beltway); the Philadelphia/Camden/Trenton metropolitan region along the lower Delaware River (roughly within the I-295 beltway); and on a smaller scale, the Easton/Phillipsburg metropolitan region along I-78. This Planning Area can also be found among the older shore towns of Monmouth County, Atlantic County, along the Delaware River in Salem County, and in the Bridgeton and Vineland-Millville areas in Cumberland County. Over the years, both the public and private sectors have made enormous investments in building and maintaining a wide range of facilities and services to support these communities. The massive public investment is reflected in thousands of miles of streets, trade schools and colleges, libraries, theaters, office buildings, parks and plazas, transit terminals and airports. Most of these communities are fully developed, or almost fully developed, with little vacant land available for new development. The communities in this Planning Area form a part of the metropolitan mass where municipal boundaries tend to blur. They share infrastructure systems that generally are beyond or approaching their reasonable life expectancy the need to rehabilitate housing to meet ever changing market standards; the recognition that redevelopment is, or will be in the not-too-distant future, the predominant form of growth; and a growing realization of the need to regionalize an increasing number of services and systems in light of growing fiscal constraints. In addition, the wide and often affordable choice of housing in proximity to New York and Philadelphia has attracted significant immigration, resulting in noticeable changes in demographic characteristics over time. The Metropolitan Planning Area includes many communities that could be categorized as cities, towns or villages in the classical sense. However, the most distinctive Center forms in the Metropolitan Planning Area are Urban and Regional Centers and Towns. The State Planning Commission designated the following municipalities as Urban Centers in 1992: Atlantic City, Camden, Elizabeth, Jersey City, New Brunswick, Newark, Paterson and Trenton. Many communities in this Planning Area contain a mixed-use Core that provides regional commercial, institutional, cultural and transportation opportunities. The Metropolitan Planning Area also contains numerous distinctive neighborhoods, main streets and downtowns that supply a range of housing opportunities and everyday commercial needs. Areas such as Routes 4 and 17 in Paramus, the Raritan Center in Edison, or the Cherry Hill Mall *Liberty Harbor North is a new urbanist project in Jersey City. Good design can accommodate high-density development with amenities that people want—parks, plazas, stores, convenient parking, schools and such—all within easy walking distance.* area along Route 38, constitute a very different development pattern than that found in Urban and Regional Centers and Towns, yet contain concentrations—or Nodes—of employment and economic activity. These conglomerations of office and warehouse parks, manufacturing districts, regional malls and power centers, retail strips, and medical and institutional complexes are often

economically successful, market-driven, dynamic and capable of evolving into new forms, as exemplified by current trends in "big box" retail and entertainment. They are often suburban in intensity, layout and automobile orientation; are located apart from the traditional town Cores and city downtowns; and tend to be located in larger municipalities such as Woodbridge, Wayne, Cherry Hill, Parsippany-Troy Hills and other Metropolitan Planning Area communities that have largely developed since World War II.

The Metropolitan Planning Area contains large tracts of open space, often in the form of county and state parks and preserves, significant environmentally sensitive areas, and extensive waterfronts. However, this Planning Area does not generally have Environs in the form of open land separating communities and protecting natural and agricultural resources.

The Metropolitan Planning Area should be managed in a way that recognizes both the distinctive character and cultural diversity of communities as well as their interrelationships. Effective public policy in the Metropolitan Planning Areas will broaden the focus to the multi-jurisdictional level to plan and Regional Strategic Plans, Urban

manage the interdependent and integrated systems Complex Strategic Revitalization Plans found throughout the region.

Metropolitan Planning Area (PA1)
840,276 Acres (17.5% of New Jersey)

611,539 Acres Developed
(72.8%)

46,254 Acres (5.5%) Preserved

77,622 Acres (9.2%) Unsuitable

104,861 Acres Vacant Undeveloped
(12.5%)

State Plan Policy Map 189

Delineation Criteria

The following criteria are intended as a guide for delineating the Metropolitan Planning Area. Local conditions may require flexible application of the criteria to achieve the Policy Objectives of this Planning Area:

1. Density of more than 1,000 people per square mile and.
2. Existing public water, sewer, and transportation systems or physical accessibility to those systems with sufficient existing capacity .and
3. Land area greater than one square mile and
4. 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.

Intent

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

- provide for much of the state's future redevelopment;
- revitalize cities and towns;

- promote growth in compact forms;
- stabilize older suburbs;
- redesign areas of sprawl; and
- protect the character of existing stable communities.

Policy Objectives

Though the State Plan's Statewide Policies are interlocking and interrelated the thrust in each planning area will be slightly different. The following strategies will be used to guide the application of the State Plan's Statewide Policies, in the Metropolitan Planning Area. These policies will apply when considering municipal or regional Plan Endorsement; They will be used by state agencies to ensure coordinated application of their programs.

Goal 1: Ensure Sound, Equitable and Integrated Planning and Implementation Statewide

Apply statewide policies on Equity, and, Comprehensive Planning, to

- ♦ upgrade local and county Master Plans and land use regulations to ensure internal and State Plan consistency
- ♦ regionalize as many public services as feasible
- ♦ enhance the cost-effective delivery of services.
- ♦ establish multijurisdictional policy and planning entities to guide the efforts of state, county and municipal governments to ensure compatible and coordinated redevelopment
- ♦ ensure that communities of color and/or low income are not disproportionately burdened with inappropriate land uses nor deprived of public facilities such as schools, parks and other public facilities

Goal 2: Revitalize the State's cities and Towns

Apply statewide policies on Urban Revitalization to:

- ♦ promote redevelopment and development in Cores and neighborhoods of Centers and in Nodes that have been identified through cooperative regional planning efforts
- ♦ encourage redevelopment at intensities sufficient to support transit, a broad range of uses and efficient use of infrastructure
- ♦ promote design that enhances public safety, encourages pedestrian activity and reduces dependency on the automobile
- ♦ promote diversification of land uses, including housing where appropriate, in existing single use developments and enhance their linkages to the rest of the community
- ♦ provide maximum active and passive recreational opportunities and facilities at the neighborhood, local and regional levels by concentrating on the maintenance and rehabilitation of existing parks and open space while expanding and linking the system through redevelopment and reclamation projects
- ♦ protect natural linear systems, including regional systems that link to other Planning Areas.

Goal 3: Conserve the State's Natural Resources

Apply statewide policies on Coastal Resources, Water and Air Resources, Special Resource Areas ,Open Lands and Natural Systems , Critical Environmental Sites and Centers to:

- ◆ reclaim environmentally damaged sites and mitigate future negative impacts, particularly to residential neighborhoods, waterfronts, scenic vistas, recreational parks and wildlife habitats.
- ◆ use open space to reinforce neighborhood and community identity, and protect natural linear systems, including regional systems that link to other Planning Areas
- ◆ use the designation of Critical Environmental Site to provide extra protections to environmentally sensitive areas less than a mile square or linear in nature
- ◆ give special emphasis to improving air quality
- ◆ use open space to reinforce neighborhood and community identity, and protect natural linear systems, including regional systems that link to other Planning Areas.
- ◆ implement water conservation
- ◆ protect surface and ground water resources from stormwater run off pollution

Goal 4: Promote Beneficial Economic Growth, Development and Renewal for All Residents of New Jersey

Apply statewide policies on Economic Development, Equity and Environmental Justice to:

- ◆ encourage strategic land assembly, site preparation, infill development and infrastructure improvements that support an identified role for the community within the regional market place.
- ◆ avoid the disproportionate impact of industrial and redevelopment activities on low income neighborhoods.
- ◆ encourage job training and other incentives to retain and attract businesses.
- ◆ encourage private sector investment through supportive government regulations policies and programs including tax policies and expedited review of proposals that support appropriate redevelopment

Goal 5: Protect the Environment, Prevent and Clean Up Pollution

Apply statewide policies on Energy Resources, Air and Water Resources and Waste Management, Recycling and Brownfields. to:

- ◆ conserve energy and ensure adequate energy resources .by making all new and restored buildings and transportation systems energy efficient.
- ◆ remedy urban air pollution
- ◆ prevent pollution from stormwater runoff to lakes, ponds, wetlands and streams
- ◆ ensure transportation systems serving all redevelopment and new development reduces both mobile and stationary sources of pollution.
- ◆ promote recycling , support source reduction and promote recycling and reuse of waste.
- ◆ capitalize on opportunities presented by the clean up of brownfield sites by ensuring that future uses can and will protect public health and the environment.

Goal 6: Provide Adequate Public Facilities and Services at a Reasonable Cost

Apply statewide policies on Transportation, Infrastructure Investments and Public Investment Priorities to:

- ♦ to regionalize as many public services as feasible and economical to enhance the cost-effective delivery of those services;
- ♦ establish multijurisdictional policy and planning entities to guide the efforts of state, county and municipal governments to ensure compatible and coordinated redevelopment;
- ♦ complete, repair or replacement of existing infrastructure systems to eliminate deficiencies and provide capacity for sustainable development and redevelopment in the region;
- ♦ encourage the concentration of public facilities and services in Centers and Cores;
- ♦ maintain and enhance a transportation system that capitalizes on high density settlement patterns by encouraging the use of public transit systems, walking and alternative modes of transportation to reduce automobile dependency;
- ♦ link Centers and Nodes, and create opportunities for transit oriented redevelopment; facilitate efficient goods movement through strategic investments and intermodal linkages
- ♦ preserve and stabilize general aviation airports and,
- ♦ where appropriate, encourage community economic development
- ♦ promote complementary uses for airport property such as business centers.

Goal 7: Provide Adequate Housing at a Reasonable Cost

Apply statewide policies on Housing, Design and Urban Revitalization to:

- ♦ provide a full range of housing choices through redevelopment, new construction, rehabilitation, adaptive reuse of nonresidential buildings, and the introduction of new housing into appropriate nonresidential settings;
- ♦ preserve the existing housing stock through maintenance, rehabilitation and flexible regulation
- ♦ create nodes and neighborhoods that provide a mixture of well defined functions and services; classic "Main Street" areas for local and regional commerce; and safe, quality residential neighborhoods.

Goal 8: Preserve and Enhance the Historic, Cultural, and Scenic, Open space and Recreational Values

Apply the Statewide Policies on Historic, Cultural and Scenic resources, Design, Comprehensive Planning, Centers and the designation of Historic and Cultural Sites to:

- ♦ encourage the preservation and adaptive reuse of historic or significant buildings, historic and cultural sites, neighborhoods and districts in ways that will not compromise either the historic resource or the area's ability to redevelop.
- ♦ coordinate historic preservation with tourism efforts
- ♦ use the designation of Historic and Cultural Sites to provide an extra level of protection to specific sites or neighborhoods.