

# Township of White

Walter J. Menegus  
Mayor

555 CR 519  
BELVIDERE, NJ 07823

Kathleen R. Reinalda, RMC  
Township Clerk

February 22, 2005

Warren County Planning Department  
165 CR 519 South  
Belvidere, NJ 07823  
Attn: David K. Dech, Planning Director  
VIA Fax to (908) 475-6537 and Regular Mail



WARREN COUNTY  
PLANNING BOARD

Dear Mr. Dech:

White Township submits the following Cross Acceptance III Questionnaire response after review and modifications by the White Township Committee at a meeting held on Tuesday, February 15<sup>th</sup>.

1. Please describe how consistent or inconsistent your municipality's Master Plan and development regulations are with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan.
  - The 5.2mg/l Nitrate Dilution Model applied in the municipality's Master Plan is inconsistent with the State's new 2mg/l standard.
  - The State's Preliminary Policy Map is consistent with the municipalities view of White Township, however, most of the area within the township that is designated SSA-PA4 is inconsistent with the municipalities current Waste Water Management Plan.
  - The municipality has a major concern with the State's Highlands Map that shows a significant part of the township within the "Highlands Planning Area". Since the Planning Area has been defined as a "receiving district" or "Growth area" we find this to be inconsistent with the municipality's goals, which are to restrict development, preserve our open space, and maintain the rural nature of our township.
  
2. Please identify and describe where changes should or will be made in your plan, and/or the State Plan to attain consistency.
  - White Township's Master Plan is currently in the process of being reviewed by the public.
  - White is in the process of modifying its policies and plans from encouraging growth and development to restricting growth and development. A few examples of these efforts include increasing lot sizes, investments in Farmland Preservation, and the elimination of a number of Future Sewer Service Areas in the Waste Water Management Plan.

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 plan.
- We agree with the proposed changes identified in the Preliminary Plan.
4. What other changes should be made to the State Plan?
- As stated above, the impact of the Highlands Bill on the State Plan, as it applies to White Township, is of great concern. Most of White Township falls within the Highlands Area with approximately half of the township being designated within the "Planning Area". Considering White Township's change in policy since the Cross Acceptance II Report, to now restrict growth and development, a coordinated planning effort between the State, County and Municipality is vital to help us maintain our goals.
5. What changes in the Planning Area Map, including proposed centers, do you recommend for your municipality?
- White Township has no desire to have any center designations within its borders. Neighboring towns with designated centers are Oxford, Hope, Belvidere, and Washington Borough. White should be designated as a greenbelt between all these centers.
6. What types of public infrastructure need to be provided and/or expanded in your municipality? (examples include: water, sewer, roadways, public transportation, energy, communications, storm water facilities, solid waste facilities, recycling facilities, etc.)
- No additional state infrastructure is needed within White Township.
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 White Township Planning Board has just finished a review of the Master Plan. The Township Environmental Commission has begun extensive work on the Natural Resource Inventory, and the Open Space Committee has applied for a PIG grant and developed an inventory of farmland.
8. Please provide comments and recommendations on how well you believe state agencies have implemented the SDRP?
- Many of the States policies have fueled sprawl and unprecedented growth. White Township has received resistance from state agencies when we have applied for State Open Space and Farmland Preservation funds.

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?

- Addressed by the Highlands Bill.

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

- White Township considers itself a greenbelt, and does not want to encourage growth. Therefore, we have no plans or planning activity using State Smart Growth Grant monies.

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?

- The SDRP should take into account what is being done by the local municipalities and respect their wishes. For example, White Township wants to eliminate future sewer service planning areas from its Waste Water Management Plan, in sensitive farmland areas, to restrict growth and development. The NJDEP has opposed the Township's preference to eliminate one area along the Route 46 corridor.

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?

- None

Very truly yours,



Kathleen R. Reinalda, RMC  
Township Clerk

Cc: Township Committee  
Cross Acceptance Team