

ALLAMUCHY TOWNSHIP
CROSS ACCEPTANCE III QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Please describe how consistent or inconsistent your municipality's Master Plan and development regulations are with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan.

Our Master Plan is partially consistent with the SDRP; growth is somewhat limited within the PA4 and PA5 areas of the Township, except where there is existing sewer service. Residential Density Transfer within the same zoning district and Cluster options for residential development, stream corridor and "critical areas" protection and preservation of woodlands are included in the Master Plan to encourage the protection of environmentally sensitive lands, farmland and natural resources.

2. Please identify and describe where changes should or will be made in your plans, and/or the State Plan to attain consistency.

The Township is starting a reexamination of its Master Plan which most likely will increase the required minimum lot sizes for residential development in the non-sewered areas of the Township and will consider the creation of a mixed use higher density development on the undeveloped remaining sewer properties in the Township where existing roads can support the more intense development.

As a part of the reexamination, the Planning Board ordered a Hydrogeology Study to determine nitrate based carrying capacity assessment . The study to be completed by the end of January 2005 will assist the Planning Board in making a scientific determination of proper lot sizing for homes to be located in non-sewered areas.

3. Do you agree with the proposed changes identified in the Preliminary Plan? Please identify where you believe the proposed changes are inconsistent with your plans.

The Preliminary Plan map identifies lands that are in sewer service areas outside PA1 and PA2 areas. The State Plan should acknowledge that PA3, PA4 and PA5 areas have existing sewer service areas that were developed prior to the SDRP and are not designed to accommodate growth due to 1) lack of excess capacity and inability to expand the sewer service system; 2) environmental concerns with water quality/quantity, limestone geology, etc.; and 3) existing saturation of development within the area. Panther Valley is a good example of this situation. These areas of inconsistency with the State Plan should be noted as pre-existing but should not be identified as potential areas for further growth, i.e. as centers or as PA1 or PA2 areas.

The current development within Panther Valley (Bowers Glen) has produced an enormous negative impact environmentally.

4. What other changes should be made to the State Plan?
The population and employment projections to be provided in the State Plan should be acknowledged as only generalized information. These projections should be

supplemented or replaced for COAH's use with more accurate projections based upon individual municipalities' build-out analysis computed on a lot by lot basis under the current zoning.

5. What changes in the Planning Area Map, including proposed centers, do you recommend for your municipality?

None. The Township Environmental Commission is in the process of preserving the Lehigh and Hudson Railroad Freight House. (Eligible for listing in the New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places.) The Township has received several grants and donations for this project. At a future time the Township would like to connect the Freight House to the Hamlet of Allamuchy via sidewalk. The sidewalk would extend from the Hamlet past the Allamuchy Elementary School to the Freight House.

6. What types of public infrastructure needs to be provided and/or expanded in your municipality? (examples include; water, sewer, roadways, public transportation, energy, communications, stormwater facilities, solid waste facilities, recycling facilities, etc)

None need to be expanded as this is contrary to the zoning and planning area designations for the Township; however, the sewer service area needs to be modified to eliminate preserved land area from the sewer service area and to follow lot lines so that a property is not partially within a sewer service area while the remaining land is outside the area. The Township has actually already taken action to change the zoning, but the state has not yet formally accepted the change.

7. Please describe how your municipality has included the Key Concepts, found on pages 4 through 7 of the 2001 State Development and Redevelopment Plan in your planning process and master plan?

The Township's Master Plan evolved through a very long public participation period (2 ½ years) and based upon a background study of the environmental features in the Township. As more information becomes available regarding environmental constraints and impacts, the planning process in the Township has reexamined its Master Plan to address the impact of this new information on its Master Plan and Zone Plan.

In addition to the preservation of the historically significant Freight House mentioned in #5 and the Township's desire to provide sidewalks connecting it to the Hamlet of Allamuchy, the Township Environmental Commission has invested in an inventory of Township Open Space, recently prepared by The Morris Land Conservancy. This document provides information concerning the potential uses for each parcel.

Utilizing this information, the Township will develop a long-range plan for the utilization of this space for parks, nature walks, public rain gardens (to assist in storm water management), an arboretum, etc.

8. Please provide comments and recommendations on how well you believe state agencies have implemented the SDRP?

While there has been some progress, there still are inconsistencies between state agencies.

9. What legislation, regulations, or other policy or programmatic changes are needed at the state, county, or municipal level to improve growth management, land preservation, economic development, transportation, and infrastructure delivery?

We believe the recent Highlands legislation is at odds with our Master Plan; designating an area that is sewerred and located adjacent to Route I-80 and County Route 517 as "core" instead of putting it in the "planning" area, while leaving wide areas of environmentally sensitive steep sloped and wetlands areas in the "planning area" instead of in the core.

More funding.

10. Do you have a plan or planning activity funded with a Smart Growth Grant, submitted, approved, underway, or complete?

11. If a planning activity has been completed, how consistent is the final product with the SDRP? How should the SDRP be changed to be consistent with your plan?

Generally, the final products are more consistent with the SDRP but with limitations due to equity issues, lack of funding, and legal constraints.

12. For municipalities with designated centers, Washington Borough, Washington Township, Hope, Oxford, please explain how you have carried out the required tasks listed in your planning and implementation agenda?

N/A

13. What areas in your municipality are being or are proposed for redevelopment?

The Freight Station.