

# CARLSTADT

I. Municipality: Borough of Carlstadt

II. Date of Meeting: July 13, 2004

III. Those in attendance:

- Erwin Fedkenheuer, Cross Acceptance Representative
- Walter A. Siri, Planning Board Councilman
- Paul R. Scherer, Zoning Board Chairman
- Jane Fontana, Town Administrator
- Ken Aloisio, Bergen County
- Christopher Helms, Bergen County
- Laura LiVecchi, Bergen County

IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

V. Issues/Notes:

**Xanadu Development.** The borough of Carlstadt is very concerned about the proposed Meadowlands Xanadu development to be built in neighboring East Rutherford. This massive (440,000 square feet) entertainment, recreation and shopping site will severely stain/ impact Carlstadt's infrastructure and ambulance, fire & police services with Carlstadt receiving no benefit from this project.

**Tidegates/Flooding.** Borough has \$150,000 grant to use to fix tide gates but cannot get permits from DEP.

**Rail Service.** Borough would like to see a rail station in their town.

## EAST RUTHERFORD

- I. Municipality: Borough of East Rutherford
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

- X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map  
Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.

## HASBROUCK HEIGHTS

- I. Municipality: Borough of Hasbrouck Heights
- II. Date of Meeting: July 22, 2004
- III. Those in attendance:
- Laura LiVecchi, Bergen County
  - Thomas Meli, Cross Acceptance Representative/Councilman
  - Burt Samuelson, Bergen County
  - Michael Kronyak, CFO/Administrator
  - Ron Kistner, Councilman
  - Hank Dobbelaar, Planning Board
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?
- YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.
- X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

V. Issues/Notes:

**Parks.** Hasbrouck Heights would like more parkland in its municipality. There is an area of Hasbrouck Heights that is located in the southeast portion of the borough, on the municipal border and east of Railroad Street. The borough would like to make this land, which is mostly wetlands, a park. The park could have multiple uses to benefit the residents of Hasbrouck Heights. The borough is also interested in creating pocket parks.

**Revitalization.** The Borough is in the process of trying to revitalize its Central Business District (CBD). The Borough has applied for TEA-21 money for the past 5 or 6 years, but has yet to receive any funding. The Borough is very proactive in their attempts to revitalize their CBD and has begun the process themselves.

**Flooding.** Flooding in areas of Hasbrouck Heights is a major concern. The open water shown on the northeast most corner of the map is called the Riser Ditch. The borough of Hasbrouck Height has gone above and beyond doing what they can to stop this ditch from flooding. Something must be done to fix this permanently. Not only does flooding effect the immediate area but it also effects a Shop Rite Shopping Center that is located to the south west of this ditch. The flooding is so bad that Shop Rite does not want to renew its lease. Finding a new tenant will prove to be difficult, if not impossible due to the flooding.

**Rail Service.** Hasbrouck Heights would like to see a rail station come back to its municipality. At one time there was a train stop at Franklin Avenue. A train station with commuter parking could be located between Franklin Avenue and Williams Avenue. Access is available from Routes 46, 80 and 17. The train station would also provide a new destination for commuters. Currently commuters are parking on borough streets and creating traffic.

## LITTLE FERRY

- I. Municipality: Borough of Little Ferry
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.

## LYNDHURST

- I. Municipality: Township of Lyndhurst
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.

## MOONACHIE

- I. Municipality: Borough of Moonachie
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.

## NORTH ARLINGTON

- I. Municipality: Borough of North Arlington
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.

## RUTHERFORD

- I. Municipality: Borough of Rutherford
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?
- X YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.  
NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

BERGEN COUNTY



CROSS-ACCEPTANCE

CROSS ACCEPTANCE  
MUNICIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

for

Borough of Rutherford  
(Name of Municipality)

Please use additional paper if necessary to complete your responses.

Part 1. Smart Growth Initiatives

- 1. Your Zoning Ordinance should be a reflection of the goals and desired future indicated in your Municipal Master Plan. Would you say that these two documents work together to achieve the desired future for your municipality? (Circle one)

YES      NO      UNSURE

If not, how do they differ? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

- 2. The goals and objectives for your municipality are expressed in your Master Plan and the mechanisms to achieve them are through your Zoning Ordinance. Are these two municipal documents consistent with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan? (Circle one)

YES      NO

If not, how do they differ? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Has the Planning Board amended, or will the Planning Board amend, your municipality's Master Plan to be consistent with the State Plan? (Circle one)

YES

NO

If "YES", please provide a brief description of the proposed changes below.  
If "NO", please explain why not. (continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary)

see addendum

---

---

---

---

4. Has the governing body amended, or will the governing body amend your municipality's zoning ordinance and/or map to be consistent with the State Plan. (Circle one)

YES

NO

If "YES", please provide a brief description of the proposed changes below.  
If "NO", please explain why not. (continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary)

see addendum

---

---

---

---

5. On April 28, 2004, the State Planning Commission approved a process that in concept, would allow a municipality to present its Master Plan and associated elements, Zoning Ordinance, and Map as a total package to the State Planning Commission for Plan Endorsement. This designation denotes that it has been reviewed and is consistent with the State Plan. A proposed advantage for a municipality in doing so would be for priority consideration in State funding programs. Would your municipality be interested in pursuing such a process? (Circle one)

YES

NO

UNSURE AT THIS TIME

6. Has your municipality been awarded a Smart Growth Planning Grant? (Circle one)

YES       NO

If "YES", how has this planning grant advanced your municipality's consistency with the State Plan? (Continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary)

See addendum  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**Part 2. Changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan**

This section should be filled in after your municipal meeting with the County Cross-Acceptance Representative, where there will be ample time to discuss and review the map.

1. Will your municipality be proposing any changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or does your municipality have corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.  
 NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map.

See addendum, Part 4

*NOTE: If your municipality will be proposing changes to the State Plan map, you will need to itemize each proposed change on a separate sheet of paper. Prior to the completion of Cross-Acceptance, an "NJOSG MAP AMENDMENT DOCUMENT" will need to be completed for each proposed mapping change or correction in preparation for our Cross-Acceptance Negotiation meetings with the State Planning Commission. The County Cross-Acceptance Representative will assist your municipality in completing this document (see sample NJOSG Map Amendment Document attached at end of this questionnaire).*

2. Please list any inconsistencies or disagreements with the State Plan Statewide Goals, Strategies, and Policies. Please note for each comment, the page number and section that it addresses in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan for reference. A

blank response to this question assumes that your municipality concurs with these elements of the State Plan. (Preliminary Plan dated April 27, 2004, **Section 2** pp. 13-21; **Section 3** pp. 22-23; and **Section 4** pp. 24-29). The Preliminary Plan can be found on the following website:

<http://www.nj.gov/dca/osg/docs/prelimplan042804.pdf>

Please Continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary.

See addendum

3. Please list any proposed changes to the description, delineation criteria, intent, policy objectives, and/or implementation strategy of any planning area. Please note for each change, the section and page number that the change addresses in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan for reference. (State Plan on the web: <http://www.nj.gov/dca/osg/plan/stateplan.shtml>, see each Planning Area description)

No changes proposed.

**Part 3. Reflections on the Municipal Master Plan:  
Future Growth and Preservation**

*This section of the questionnaire obtains information on future growth and preservation as outlined in your municipality's Master Plan, Reexamination Report, and the associated Zoning Ordinance.*

1. What is the date of your Municipality's Master Plan?  
12/1978 (month/day/year)
2. What is the date of the most recent Master Plan Reexamination?  
2/19/2004 (month/day/year)

3. Please check off which of the following elements are included in your Master Plan and provide date of adoption. (Check all that apply)

ELEMENT		ORIGINAL DATE OF ADOPTION (month/day/year)	LAST UPDATED (month/day/year)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Housing	4/17/1997	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Circulation		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Land-Use	December 1978	Jan. 16, 1997
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utility		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Community Facilities		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Open Space & Rec.		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Conservation		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Historic Preservation		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please specify)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please specify)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please specify)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (Please specify)		

4. Based upon your municipality's Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance, please provide the following information, where applicable: *See addendum*

Percentage of Existing and Committed Land Use by Category \*

Category	Percentage of Total*
Vacant Land	%
Residential (includes all multifamily, attached and detached single family)	%
Commercial Property (includes all office, retail and related property)	%
Research/Industrial Property	%
Public / Quasi Public	%

See addendum

House of Worship and Charitable Organizations		%
Undeveloped Agriculture and Agricultural/Residential		%
Parks and Preserved Open Space		%
Other (Local, County and State right-of-way, water bodies)		%

\* include all projects approved, under construction or under concept review.

5. Your current zoning represents the implementation of the goals and desired future for your community and its development and preservation patterns (as outlined in your master plan). Given this, if your zoning was fully implemented (a condition known as "buildout"), what additional development would your community absorb, and what land use changes would take place?

a. Number of housing units

Existing: 7,223 units <sup>tl</sup>  
 Under Zoning Buildout: \* units

b. Square footage of retail commercial development

Existing: -\* sq. ft.  
 Under Zoning Buildout: -\* sq. ft.

c. Square footage of office development

Existing: -\* sq. ft.  
 Under Zoning Buildout: -\* sq. ft.

d. Square footage of industrial development

Existing: -\* sq. ft.  
 Under Zoning Buildout: -\* sq. ft.

e. Acreage of municipally-owned permanently preserved open space as conservation or natural areas

Existing: 2.49 acres  
 Proposed: 2.49 acres

f. Acreage of municipally-owned park and recreation areas

Existing: 52.68 acres  
 Proposed: 52.68 acres

g. Acreage of preserved farmland

Existing: -0- acres  
 Proposed: -0- acres

h. Acreage of vacant land

Existing: 14 <sup>tl</sup> acres (excluding NJMC jurisdiction)

\* Data not available. Town has reached build-out, excluding the NJMC jurisdiction.

6. Based upon your municipality's Master Plan, please provide the following population and household information:

2000 Census Population  
Current Population  
Population Projection for 2025  
Buildout Population  
Buildout Year

18,110  
18,020 (2003 Census estimate)  
19,481 (NJTPA)  
Not available  
Not available

2000 Census Housing Units  
Current number Housing Units  
Projection for 2025 Housing Units  
Buildout Housing Units  
Buildout Year

7,214  
7,223 (estimated using bldg. permit data)  
Not available  
Not available  
Not applicable

7. Has your municipality met its Round 2 COAH Affordable Housing Unit obligation? (Round 3 Formula has been proposed, but not yet approved)

YES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO
-----	-------------------------------------	----

  
See addendum

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our Cross-Acceptance Coordinator, Ms. Laura LiVecchi at 336-6446.



**SCHOOR DEPALMA**  
Engineers and Consultants

**ADDENDUM TO CROSS ACCEPTANCE  
MUNICIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE**

**For**

**BOROUGH OF RUTHERFORD  
BERGEN COUNTY**

Prepared on behalf of:  
The Borough of Rutherford

September 10, 2004

Prepared by:  
Ryan W. Rapp, PE/AICP

**Your Bottom Line Results Partner \***

Justin Corporate Center, 200 State Highway Nine, P.O. Box 900, Manalapan, NJ 07726-0900 Tel: 732.577.9000 Fax: 732.577.9888  
Manalapan • Atlantic City • Brick • Clinton • Exton • Kipsville • Parsippany  
Philadelphia • Phillipsburg • Stafford • Voorhees • White Plains  
[www.schoordepalma.com](http://www.schoordepalma.com)



Cross Acceptance III Questionnaire  
Borough of Rutherford, Bergen County  
September 10, 2004  
SDI Job Number: 040037002  
Page 2 of 7

### **PART 1 - Smart Growth Initiatives**

#### **Part 1, Questions 3 and 4**

Both the master plan and implementing zoning ordinance are consistent with the statewide goals, strategies and policies of the State Plan.

#### **Part 1, Question 6**

Rutherford Borough was awarded a smart growth grant for the creation of a Vision Statement. The visioning process and resultant vision statement advances the state plan by implementing statewide policy category #2 [Comprehensive Planning]. The planning grant enabled the borough to promote planning with strong public participation facilitated by adequate professional planning resources and funding.



Cross Acceptance III Questionnaire  
Borough of Rutherford, Bergen County  
September 10, 2004  
SDI Job Number: 040037002  
Page 3 of 7

## **PART 2 - Changes to the State Plan**

### **Part 2, Question 2**

The Transportation Policies (pp. 140 to 143 of the State Plan) should include a policy (or policies) specific to the Transit Village Initiative of the NJDOT and NJ Transit. Policy language in this regard should offer priority public funding to a designated transit village municipality. Similar to Housing Policies #27 and #28 (p. 139), it is recommended that the transit village policies be framed as or subtitled as "Coordination with NJDOT and the Transit Village Initiative".

Summary of Public Investment Priorities (p. 117) item #2 should be revised to add "municipalities with transit village designation by NJDOT". Alternately, item #5 may be revised to add another bulleted item of the same language.



Cross Acceptance III Questionnaire  
 Borough of Rutherford, Bergen County  
 September 10, 2004  
 SDI Job Number: 040037002  
 Page 4 of 7

**PART 3 - Reflections on the Municipal Master Plan**

**Part 3, Question 4**

The land use categories provided in the questionnaire do not coincide with the borough's land use categories. Excluding the jurisdiction of the NJ Meadowlands Commission, approximately 72% of the parcel acreage is zoned single-family residential; 12.5% is 2-family; 5.4% is multi-family; 5.3% is office; 2.7% is office & retail; 2.1% is other commercial.

The following tables are provided in response to the question:

**Percentage of Land Use by Borough Zoning District**  
 \*Excludes land under the jurisdiction of the NJ Meadowlands Commission

Category (Zoning District)	Percent Total
B-1 = Three Story Office	1.50%
B-2 = Five Story Office	0.87%
B-3 = Three Story Office - Retail	2.70%
B-3/SH = Business / Senior Housing	0.44%
B-4 = Business / Light Industrial	0.45%
H-C = Highway Commercial Development	0.54%
O.R.D. = Ten Story Office, Research & Development	2.90%
P.C.D. = Planned Commercial Development	0.68%
R-1 = Single Family Residential	65.10%
R-1A = Single Family Residential	2.70%
R-1B = Single Family Residential	2.50%
R-2 = Two Family Residential	12.50%
R-3 = Three Story Apartment	4.80%
R-4 = Five Story Apartment	0.59%
U-R1A = University / Residential, Single Family	1.70%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>



Cross Acceptance III Questionnaire  
 Borough of Rutherford, Bergen County  
 September 10, 2004  
 SDI Job Number: 040037002  
 Page 5 of 7

### Percentage of Existing Land Use / Land Cover (1997 NJDEP)

\*Excludes land under the jurisdiction of the NJ Meadowlands Commission

Land Use / Land Cover Category	Percent Total
Residential	78.0%
Commercial	13.4%
Industrial Uses	0.2%
Unclassified urban/built-up land	3.3%
Parks & Recreation	4.0%
Undeveloped	1.2%
Wetlands	0.0%
Grand Total	100.0%

#### Part 3, Question 7

The Borough of Rutherford adopted a housing element and fair share plan on April 17, 1997 to address its Round 2 COAH affordable housing obligation. The housing element and fair share plan was filed with COAH on November 3, 2003 without a petition for substantive certification.



Cross Acceptance III Questionnaire  
Borough of Rutherford, Bergen County  
September 10, 2004  
SDI Job Number: 040037002  
Page 6 of 7

## PART 4 - NJOSG MAP AMENDMENTS

### Amendment #1 - Historic Cultural Site (HCS)

**Proposed Change:** Delete the Union Avenue Bridge (Union Avenue over the Passaic River) as an HCS.

**Reason for Change:** The Union Avenue Bridge is mistakenly mapped as an HCS. The New Jersey State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) issued an opinion on this site on August 14, 1990; it was never listed on either the NJ or National Register of Historic Places. Furthermore, the original bridge has since been demolished and replaced with a new modern bridge.

**Source:** New Jersey and National Registers of Historic Places [NJ SHPO; Last updated on February 25, 2004]. Relevant pages of this document are attached.

### Amendment #2 - HCS

**Proposed Change:** Add the Kip Homestead (12 Meadow Road) as an HCS.

**Reason for Change:** The Kip Homestead (12 Meadow Road) was listed on the State and National Registers of Historic Places on October 3, 1980 and January 1, 1983, respectively.

**Source:** Ibid.

### Amendment #3 - HCS

**Proposed Change:** Add Iviswold Castle (on the campus of Felician College) as an HCS.



Cross Acceptance III Questionnaire  
Borough of Rutherford, Bergen County  
September 10, 2004  
SDI Job Number: 040037002  
Page 7 of 7

**Reason for Change:** NJ SHPO granted this HCS a Certificate of Eligibility on May 14, 2001. This HCS was subsequently listed on the State Register of Historic Places on June 18, 2004. According to Sarah Andre, National Registration is being pursued. Location of this HCS is depicted on page 12 of the Borough Profile prepared in May 2004 (attached).

**Source:** Ibid; and, per Sarah Andre of SHPO.

#### **Amendment #4 - HCS**

**Proposed Change:** Re-plot HCS known as Yeareance-Berry House (91 Crane Avenue; also known as the Meadowlands Museum).

**Reason for Change:** The location of this HCS as depicted on the State Plan Map is mis-plotted to an extent that warrants correction. The correct location is at the easterly end of Crane Avenue, which is approximately 2 blocks to the south of the currently mapped location depicted on the State Plan Map. The correct location of this HCS is depicted on a tax map exhibit and also on page 12 of the Borough Profile prepared in May 2004 (both attached).

**Source:** Ibid; and, see attached tax map exhibit.



## MEMORANDUM

**TO:** Laura LiVecchi  
Bergen County Cross Acceptance Coordinator  
Bergen County Department of Planning & Economic Development

**FROM:** Ryan Rapp, PP/AICP *Rh Rapp*

**DATE:** October 26, 2004

**RE:** **Rutherford Borough  
Population and Employment Projections  
Cross-Acceptance**

**PROJECT NUMBER:** 040037002-06

As per your letter dated October 6, 2004, I have reviewed the population and employment projections for the Horizon Year 2025 as generated by the North Jersey Transportation Authority (NJTPA). I have also obtained household projections directly from NJTPA. Over the course of the next 20 years, from 2005 to the Year 2025, the NJTPA anticipates that Rutherford will realize net growth and development in the form of 803 additional households (dwellings), 926 additional jobs and almost 1,200 additional residents. The projection data reviewed for Rutherford is summarized in the table below:

### NJTPA Projections for Rutherford Borough

Year	Population	Employment	Households	HH Size
2000	18,110	7,344	7,055	2.57
2005	18,014	7,626	7,064	2.55
2010	18,066	7,794	7,133	2.53
2015	18,226	7,999	7,301	2.50
2020	18,718	8,484	7,607	2.46
2025	19,204	8,552	7,867	2.44
2030	19,672	9,053	8,068	2.44
Change 2005 to 2015	211	374	237	-0.05
Change 2005 to 2025	1,189	926	803	-0.11
Change 2005 to 2030	1,658	1,427	1,004	-0.11

*Source: NJTPA draft projections, September 15, 2004 (for Nov. adoption). Please note that household size has been calculated for this memo.*

Your bottom line results partner®



040037002-06

Rutherford Borough Cross-Acceptance

Population Projections

October 26, 2004

Page 2 of 3

### Comments on Household (Dwelling Unit) and Population Projections

During the 20-year period from 2005 to 2025, the NJTPA projections equate to an average annualized net growth of approximately **40 households per year**, amounting to a net increase of over **800 households**. Viewed in the context of the lack of land available and zoned to accommodate household (housing unit) growth of this magnitude, this number seems unrealistic.

Excluding land under the jurisdiction of the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission (NJMC), the "Borough Core", under which Rutherford still retains control of land use development, has been built-out. Nearly all new development in the Borough Core involves tear-down and demolition activities to make way for new development. Under this scenario, redevelopment can not and should not be categorically characterized as always resulting in a net increase in housing units. In Rutherford, this can be specifically supported by the fact that the US Census actually reported a net loss in the number of total housing units from 7,220 housing units in 1990 to 7,214 housing units in 2000 (a net loss of 6 units).

Another factor to consider is historical building permit and demolition data. According to building permit and demolition permit data reported in the NJ Constructor Reporter Annual Reports (NJDCA; 1995-2003), 58 residential building permits and 26 residential demolition permits were issued in Rutherford. This results in a net gain of only 32 dwelling units from 1995 to 2003 (inclusive) which for a 9-year period equates to a net gain of less than 4 dwelling units per year (annualized average). The NJTPA projection anticipates net household growth of a magnitude that is more than 10 times the historic rate of increase in the number of households as measured by construction activity.

With that said, however, it must be recognized that Rutherford could experience some growth in the number of households without an increase in its housing stock. In fact, according to the US Census, the total number of households increased from 6,684 to 7,055 (1990 to 2000), an increase of 371 households despite the fact that there was a net loss of 6 dwelling units overall in the borough. This was directly attributed to the unusually high incidence of residential vacancy during the 1990 Census, when 536 housing units were reported to be vacant. During the 2000 Census, the number of vacant housing units was reduced to 159 housing units—a decrease of 377 vacant housing units since the 1990 Census. In theory, but not likely, Rutherford could accommodate an additional 159 households through 100% occupancy of its total existing housing stock.

To be comprehensive, vacant land under the jurisdiction of the NJMC must also be considered when evaluating NJTPA's projections (roughly one-third of Rutherford is in the NJMC District). In Rutherford, two major developments have been planned in the NJMC District: EnCap and the Highland Cross Redevelopment Area. The portion of EnCap that is located in Rutherford will contain a total of 200 age-restricted dwelling units while Highland Cross is not planned to accommodate any



040037002-06

Rutherford Borough Cross-Acceptance

Population Projections

October 26, 2004

Page 3 of 3

residential development. Therefore, other than isolated infill redevelopment the only single major residential development likely to occur in Rutherford during the next 20 years is the 200 units planned in EnCap.

Based on the points outlined above, the projections overestimate both the household and population growth in Rutherford to the Year 2025. **For the purposes of Cross-Acceptance, it is recommended that the projections for the year 2025 be modified and reduced to 7,300 households and 18,250 persons.** Interim 5-year increments should also be adjusted downward according to these revised projections.

#### **General Comment on Projections, Cross-Acceptance, and the Meadowlands District**

Land use development and associated employment and population growth planned under the NJMC's Master Plan should not be evaluated in the Cross-Acceptance process since the State Plan policies are not directly applicable in the Meadowlands District. Therefore, it would seem logical as part of Cross-Acceptance, to recognize that projected population, employment and household growth to occur within the Meadowlands District is not under the scope of the State Plan.

As part of NJMC's recent master plan process, a Fiscal Impact Analysis for the Buildout of the Draft NJMC Master Plan (February 11, 2003) concludes that buildout in accordance with the Meadowlands Master Plan could add approximately 8,194 persons and 56,250 workers to the 14 municipalities of the Meadowlands Area. This growth is anticipated regardless of policies of the State Plan or the policies of the District municipalities. Ultimately, the forthcoming Impact Assessment of the Draft State Plan must acknowledge growth in the Meadowlands District as separate and distinct from growth according to the State Plan. Accordingly, consideration should be given to a refinement of the growth projections for the individual Meadowlands District communities so as to coincide with bounds of the State Plan Policy Map. In other words, for each Meadowlands District municipality, growth projections must specifically exclude growth planned to occur in the Meadowlands District.

It is recommended that Bergen County consider performing the suggested refinements or alternately include this commentary as part of its Cross-Acceptance Report to be submitted to the Office of Smart Growth (OSG) for further negotiation. This is especially important since there is a memorandum of understanding between OSG and the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH), linking growth projections from the State Plan to COAH's methodology for determining fair share affordable housing obligations.

RWR:

c: Timothy F. Stafford, Borough Administrator

N:\project\2004\0400370\02\Pop-Emp-Projections\_Rutherford-Memo.doc

## SOUTH HACKENSACK

- I. Municipality: Township of South Hackensack
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

- X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map  
Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.

Due Oct. 26, 2004

BERGEN COUNTY

CROSS-ACCEPTANCE

CROSS ACCEPTANCE  
MUNICIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE  
for

Township of South Hackensack  
(Name of Municipality)

Please use additional paper if necessary to complete your responses.

Part 1. Smart Growth Initiatives

1. Your Zoning Ordinance should be a reflection of the goals and desired future indicated in your Municipal Master Plan. Would you say that these two documents work together to achieve the desired future for your municipality? (Circle one)

YES

NO

UNSURE

If not, how do they differ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

2. The goals and objectives for your municipality are expressed in your Master Plan and the mechanisms to achieve them are through your Zoning Ordinance. Are these two municipal documents consistent with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan? (Circle one)

YES

NO

Unsure

If not, how do they differ?

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

3. Has the Planning Board amended, or will the Planning Board amend, your municipality's Master Plan to be consistent with the State Plan? (Circle one)

YES      NO

If "YES", please provide a brief description of the proposed changes below.  
If "NO", please explain why not. (continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary)

South Hackensack is willing to entertain  
discussions ~~for~~ on amendments to the plan.

4. Has the governing body amended, or will the governing body amend your municipality's zoning ordinance and/or map to be consistent with the State Plan? (Circle one)

YES      NO

If "YES", please provide a brief description of the proposed changes below.  
If "NO", please explain why not. (continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary)

same as 3

5. On April 28, 2004, the State Planning Commission approved a process that in concept, would allow a municipality to present its Master Plan and associated elements, Zoning Ordinance, and Map as a total package to the State Planning Commission for Plan Endorsement. This designation denotes that it has been reviewed and is consistent with the State Plan. A proposed advantage for a municipality in doing so would be for priority consideration in State funding programs. Would your municipality be interested in pursuing such a process? (Circle one)

YES      NO       UNSURE AT THIS TIME

6. Has your municipality been awarded a Smart Growth Planning Grant? (Circle one)

YES

NO

If "YES", how has this planning grant advanced your municipality's consistency with the State Plan? (Continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary)

The funds have not been applied  
to a project at this time

## Part 2. Changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan

This section should be filled in after your municipal meeting with the County Cross-Acceptance Representative, where there will be ample time to discuss and review the map.

1. Will your municipality be proposing any changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or does your municipality have corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map.

**NOTE:** If your municipality will be proposing changes to the State Plan map, you will need to itemize each proposed change on a separate sheet of paper. Prior to the completion of Cross-Acceptance, an "NJOSG MAP AMENDMENT DOCUMENT" will need to be completed for each proposed mapping change or correction in preparation for our Cross-Acceptance Negotiation meetings with the State Planning Commission. The County Cross-Acceptance Representative will assist your municipality in completing this document (see sample NJOSG Map Amendment Document attached at end of this questionnaire).

2. Please list any inconsistencies or disagreements with the State Plan Statewide Goals, Strategies, and Policies. Please note for each comment, the page number and section that it addresses in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan for reference. A

blank response to this question assumes that your municipality concurs with these elements of the State Plan. (Preliminary Plan dated April 27, 2004, **Section 2** pp. 13-21; **Section 3** pp. 22-23; and **Section 4** pp. 24-29). The Preliminary Plan can be found on the following website:

<http://www.nj.gov/dca/osg/docs/prelimplan042804.pdf>

Please Continue on separate sheet of paper if necessary.

---

---

---

---

---

3. Please list any proposed changes to the description, delineation criteria, intent, policy objectives, and/or implementation strategy of any planning area. Please note for each change, the section and page number that the change addresses in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan for reference. (State Plan on the web: <http://www.nj.gov/dca/osg/plan/stateplan.shtml>, see each Planning Area description)

---

---

---

**Part 3: Reflections on the Municipal Master Plan:  
Future Growth and Preservation**

*This section of the questionnaire obtains information on future growth and preservation as outlined in your municipality's Master Plan, Reexamination Report, and the associated Zoning Ordinance.*

1. What is the date of your Municipality's Master Plan?

~~3/12/01~~ (month/day/year)  
3/12/01

2. What is the date of the most recent Master Plan Reexamination?

12/1/02 (month/day/year) Housing Plan

3. Please check off which of the following elements are included in your Master Plan and provide date of adoption. (Check all that apply)

ELEMENT	ORIGINAL DATE OF ADOPTION (month/day/year)	LAST UPDATED (month/day/year)
Housing	(11-1990) <i>(adoption 1991)</i>	12-2002
Circulation		
Land-Use	1	3-12-2001
Utility		
Community Facilities		
Open Space & Rec.		
Conservation		
Historic Preservation		
Other (Please specify)		
Other (Please specify)		
Other (Please specify)		
Other (Please specify)		

4. Based upon your municipality's Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance, please provide the following information, where applicable:

Percentage of Existing and Committed Land Use by Category \*

Category	Percentage of Total*
Vacant Land <i>18.5 % includes Hackensack River</i>	9.6 %
Residential (includes all multifamily, attached and detached single family)	17.5 %
Commercial Property (includes all office, retail and related property)	7 %
Research/Industrial Property	26 %
Public / Quasi Public	9 %

House of Worship and Charitable Organizations	0.1 %
Undeveloped Agriculture and Agricultural/Residential	%
Parks and Preserved Open Space	%
Other (Local, County and State right-of-way, water bodies)	19.9 %

\* Refer to Attached TABLE 1 from South Hackensack LAND USE ELEMENT PLAN  
 \* include all projects approved, under construction or under concept review.

5. Your current zoning represents the implementation of the goals and desired future for your community and its development and preservation patterns (as outlined in your master plan). Given this, if your zoning was fully implemented (a condition known as "buildout"), what additional development would your community absorb, and what land use changes would take place? (NOT SURE)

a. Number of housing units

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ units  
 Under Zoning Buildout: \_\_\_\_\_ units

b. Square footage of retail commercial development

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ sq. ft.  
 Under Zoning Buildout: \_\_\_\_\_ sq. ft.

c. Square footage of office development

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ sq. ft.  
 Under Zoning Buildout: \_\_\_\_\_ sq. ft.

d. Square footage of industrial development

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ sq. ft.  
 Under Zoning Buildout: \_\_\_\_\_ sq. ft.

e. Acreage of municipally-owned permanently preserved open space as conservation or natural areas

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
 Proposed: \_\_\_\_\_ acres

f. Acreage of municipally-owned park and recreation areas

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
 Proposed: \_\_\_\_\_ acres

g. Acreage of preserved farmland

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ acres  
 Proposed: \_\_\_\_\_ acres

h. Acreage of vacant land

Existing: \_\_\_\_\_ acres

6. Based upon your municipality's Master Plan, please provide the following population and household information:

2000 Census Population	<u>2249</u>
Current Population	<u>2249</u>
Population Projection for 2025	<u>2441</u>
Buildout Population	<u>-</u>
Buildout Year	<u>-</u>

2000 Census Housing Units	<u>829</u>
Current number Housing Units	<u>829</u>
Projection for 2025 Housing Units	<u>-</u> ?
Buildout Housing Units	<u>-</u>
Buildout Year	<u>-</u>

7. Has your municipality met its Round 2 COAH Affordable Housing Unit obligation? (Round 3 Formula has been proposed, but not yet approved)

YES       NO

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our Cross-Acceptance Coordinator, Ms. Laura LiVecchi at 336-6446 or email at [llivecchi@co.bergen.nj.us](mailto:llivecchi@co.bergen.nj.us)

**Table 1  
Existing Land Use: 1999  
South Hackensack, New Jersey**

Land Use Category	Acres	Percent of Total Area
Single-Family Residential	41.4	8.6
Two-Family Residential	42.4	8.8
Three- & Four-Family Residential	0.5	0.1
Light Industrial	124.4	25.7
Retail	23.0	4.8
Restaurant	2.1	0.4
Motel	8.1	1.7
Automotive	1.4	0.3
Office	10.5	2.2
Municipal Government	7.4	1.5
Federal Government	3.9	0.8
Church	0.4	0.1
Cemetery	26.7	5.5
School	6.4	1.3
Vacant Land & Hackensack River	89.4*	18.5
Streets and Rights-of-Way	96.1	19.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>100</b>

\* Vacant land accounts for 46 acres; Hackensack River accounts for 43.4 acres.  
Source: South Hackensack tax records and Burgis Associates land use survey.

### Residential Land Use

South Hackensack is an older residential community. Few residences have been constructed since the 1960's. A total of 84 acres, representing 17.5 percent of the township's total land area, is devoted to residential use.

The township's residential development is concentrated in the northernmost of the township's three segments. In this area, residences are primarily in the easterly portion of the community and south of Route 80. The westernmost section of the township contains a small residential neighborhood located along Garfield Place, while the "Moonachie" section does not have any residential uses.

Residential building lots generally range from 5,000 to 7,500 square feet.

Two-family residences are the most prevalent dwelling type in the township. The 1990 census reported there were a total of 422 two-family dwellings, representing 54 percent of all units in the township. A 1999 field survey by Burgis Associates found a total of 817 dwelling units in the community, of which 556 units were two-

## TETERBORO

I. Municipality: Borough of Teterboro

II. Date of Meeting: July 29, 2004

III. Those in attendance:

- Joseph Marra, Teterboro Construction Official
- Laura LiVecchi, Bergen County
- Christopher Helms, Bergen County
- Ken Aloisio, Bergen County

IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

X YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map

V. Issues/Notes

**Pump Station and Flooding.** Teterboro recently received approval for a pump station replacement at the base of the wetlands located along State Highway 17 North. The pump is replacing a pump that has been there since 1917. This should somewhat alleviate flooding in certain areas. This pump will handle runoff from the airport and a huge drainage basin.

## WALLINGTON

- I. Municipality: Borough of Wallington
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

- X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map  
Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.

## WOOD-RIDGE

- I. Municipality: Borough of Wood-Ridge
- II. Date of Meeting: N/A
- III. Those in attendance: N/A
- IV. Requested changes to the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. List the municipality's proposed changes to the delineation of Planning Areas, Critical Environmental Sites (CES), or Historic and Cultural Sites (HCS), or any corrections to the State Plan map?

YES, we are making changes to the State Plan map.

- X NO, we do not intend to make changes to the State Plan map  
Note: Lack of meeting/response indicates NO intent to make changes with County as the Negotiating Entity.