

Hardwick Township's comments on the Warren County Cross Acceptance Report draft of Jan 2005

Notes from 24 January 2005 Hardwick Cross Acceptance Team meeting

In attendance:

Dick Barrow

Kevin Duffy

Lori Gold

Jim McKim

John Satta

Comments on Major Issues Summary of 20 January 2005

A. Centers

no comment

B. Property Tax

no comment

C. Center designation / Plan Endorsement Process

no comment

D. Planning Areas

Hardwick disagrees with item 2.

Hardwick strongly believes that a fine gradation of planning area delineations is required.

The elimination of all gradation of environmental sensitivity invites development in inappropriate areas or a ban on all development outside town centers.

Such elimination is also inconsistent with the facts, i.e. some areas are more sensitive environmentally than others.

I. Municipal reports

Hardwick recommends that the final SDRP clearly states which town responses reflect the official position of the municipality and which do not.

In Hardwick's case, the response has been endorsed by a resolution of the Township Committee.

Other specific comments regarding Warren County Cross Acceptance report Draft (1-11-05)

On page 49, Item 6, paragraph 1 regarding the Lackawanna Cutoff:

The most impacted towns in the county, Hardwick, Knowlton, Blirstown and Hope, are on record as being opposed to restoration of the Lackawanna cutoff in part because this will result in the suburbanization of this mainly rural area.

Hardwick strongly requests that the county recommendation must reflect these towns' opposition to the restoration of rail service on the Lackawanna cutoff.

Hardwick strongly believes that consolidating all land outside urban suburban and rural town areas into a single category is a mistake.

Hardwick wants

- a methodology to precisely delineate the boundaries for designated areas
- more categories than urban, suburban, rural towns and env sens
- clear and unambiguous definitions of the planning area designations
- a clear and complete explanation of how the current map delineations were decided and who made those decisions

E. Local control of Land use planning

On page 13 section E. a., the current draft states:

In previous cross-acceptance rounds, the concern was that the State Plan was going to usurp local authority. The usurpation of local authority has come instead from the passage of the Highlands Act.

Hardwick suggests the following re-wording

In previous cross-acceptance rounds, the concern was that the State Plan was going to usurp local authority. **This concern remains. In the meantime, a more immediate usurpation of local authority has come instead from the passage of the Highlands Act.**

F. State Agency implementation and Policies

On page 10, Item 4f states

- f. Greenwich, Hardwick, and White are requesting a number of changes where some land areas should be placed in the Planning Area 8 or Park designation.

The Hardwick cross acceptance team never made any such request.

G. Population projections

Hardwick suggests that annual review of population projections is excessive.

H. Indicators

no comment