

APPENDIX 1 - STEERING COMMITTEE ISSUES RESPONSE
SUMMARY (WORKSHOP NO. 1)

Warren County Strategic Growth Plan

Stakeholders Meeting
Warren County Technical School Gymnasium
October 29, 2002
7:00 PM

Meeting Notes

During Stakeholder Meeting No. 2, residents were asked to review draft County-wide goals that had been developed from input at Stakeholder Meeting No. 1. Residents were divided into four working groups and had an opportunity to respond to the questions listed below. The following meeting notes are taken directly from summary sheets recorded during the October 29, 2002 Stakeholder Meeting. These meeting notes represent comments and ideas voiced by Warren County residents participating in the workshop portion of the meeting.

Workshop Questions:

1. Do the goals reflect your vision for the County
- 2a. Define or give examples of “conflicting land uses” or inappropriate development.
- 2b. Define or give examples of desirable development.
- 3a. Should existing centers be required to grow?
 - internally through infill
 - expand geographic boundaries
- 3b. Should new centers be encouraged? If so, where?

Group #1:

Response to Goals:

- Goals represent the majority
- Infrastructure could encourage growth – may not be a goal (more housing)
- Some goals are conflicting - Maintain and improve existing transportation system is in conflict with preservation goals
- Goal 5 – unless growth is limited in terms of total buildout, this is not a goal
- Goal 11 – not a goal for bedroom communities
- Preserve agriculture/agribusiness
- Substantial control for residential development
- Need more emphasis on protecting water quantity and quality

Conflicting Land Uses/Inappropriate Development:

- COAH – Council on Affordable Housing – Greenwich; high density housing
- Pohatcong superfund site – discourages visitors
- High traffic generators on roadways that are not capable of handling traffic loads
- Non-residential near commercial – Pohatcong Wal-mart
- Greenwich

Desirable Development:

- Town centers are full/developed
- Conservation and farmland preservation
- Develop where services exist
- Redevelop/infill development in town centers
- Light industrial – Mansfield town center; Superior Quartz, Greenwich
- Home office

Existing Centers:

- Should grow internally
- Brownfields and redevelopment in centers through infill
- No expansion of geographic boundaries

New Centers:

- New centers should not be encouraged
- New centers would make infill impossible

Group #2

Response to Goals:

- Conflict with one another
- Goal 1 – yes to rural character; do not want to live in a city
- Goal 2 – could be combined with #1
- Goal 3 – Conflicting land uses – everything near highways, not in centers; mixed use good for some, other want separation
- Goal 4 – intermunicipal – every town wants ratables; part-time govt. is reason for pooling resources; goals will not be realized without
- Goal 5 – concentrate growth in centers- share ratables? Benefits? Development should start in developed areas
- Goal 6 – educational and cultural facilities bring more people – not desirable
- Goal 7 – existing transportation system needs to be maintained and improved
- Goal 8 – need alternatives; is there money for alternative modes?
- Goal 9 – water quality and quantity is VERY important (move to #2)
- Goal 10 – change to preserve and improve existing sewer and water infrastructure; no new capacity
- Goal 11 – conflicts unless in centers?
- New goals: creating resources for towns to do good planning; assistance with legal issues associated with center designation.

Conflicting Land Uses/Inappropriate Development:

- Greenwich
- Inappropriate – Ames/ Shop Rite area
- No large scale development – 100 houses, 500-1000 houses
- How much can be absorbed? Percentage – 5% per year) how much development can school support?

Desirable Development:

- None
- Corporate parks – varying views on impact of ratables
- Balance between residential and business
- Preserve farms - varying views
- Keep existing development
- Hawke Point – Rt. 31; golf course with senior community
- Main Streets – fix existing; Washington Boro – potential

Existing Centers:

- Infill development
- Should not grow geographically – issue with ratables and neighboring towns

New Centers:

- Not the answer for all
- Uncertain
- Hackettstown
- Such a designation could create growth

Group #3: Hartwick, Harmony, Phillipsburg, Lopatcong, Washington

Response to Goals:

- Concentrate population growth in center – state clearly
- Provide financial incentives to develop in centers
- Change goal 10 to read “improve existing infrastructure to support existing centers”
- Communities do not want cluster development
- Enact legislation for stronger control of growth – require building of community facilities; regulate the number of building permits per year.
- Need for improved relationship between employers and rail transit in surrounding counties
- Improve and expand bus transit service
- Need for a 4-year public college
- Broader range of courses at community college needed.
- Link to buses and shuttles for students
- Create county-wide industrial park at abandoned Ingersoll Rand site (Mobil Chemical)
- Ecotourism
- Industrial park should be on I-78 or I-80, but may require farmland

Conflicting Land Uses/Inappropriate Development:

- Toll Bros.
- Hovnanian – one home casts a shadow on the other
- Identical houses
- Large house (5+ bedrooms) on small lots
- Building when vacant lots and vacant buildings are available – need financial incentive

- Uses that raise taxes
- Senior housing in rural areas
- Not getting fair share from corporate uses on highway in region
- “same” chain stores

Desirable Land Uses:

- County-wide industrial park
- Open space
- Farmland
- Patio homes?
- Town centers with mixed uses
- Varied architectural styles
- Renovation of existing vacant buildings
- Keep uses close to highway
- Senior housing in or adjacent to centers
- Small businesses – widely varied

Existing Centers:

- Should be encouraged to grow, not necessarily required to grow
- Concerns with geographic expansion
- Sharing of community facilities i.e. libraries, police, community services
- Economic incentives exist to regionalize services, but issue with home rule hinders
- No enlargement of center footprints – go up
- Use regional facilities and services in centers

New Centers:

- No new centers – need to fix current centers
- Greenwich as an example of what not to do
- Need new centers to prevent sprawl style development
- Want “hamlet style mixed uses” to look like an old community with new buildings

Group #4

Response to Goals:

- Affordable housing should be goal
- Goal 2 – need to include natural resources such as mating areas, endangered and threatened species
- Goal 4 – include county- municipal- state cooperation as well. State and county need to see local picture
- Goal 5 – needs clarifying. Preserve farmland and open space while concentrating growth in centers. Look at new centers when existing centers are full. Look at growth, taxes and schools – who supports?
- Goal 6 – add recreation
- Goal 8 – rail and bus inter-county also
- Goal 9 – need reservoir

- Goal 10 – which communities? O.k. for communities already developed. Boundaries of centers served must be defined to control development outside
- Goal 11 – provide regional opportunities and redevelop existing or vacant sites

Conflicting Land Uses/Inappropriate Development:

- Greenwich
- Cookie-cutter housing development
- Large strip-mall development
- Housing and farms – complaints from new residents about odors from long-existing farms
- Fuel transfer operation in the country

Desirable Development:

- Local businesses that sustain the community (food market)
- Connecting developments to keep traffic off main roads
- Interconnecting roadways with sidewalks
- Cluster development with neighborhood parks
- Redevelopment of existing centers i.e. brownfields

Existing Centers:

- Saturate center before moving out – who will fund?

New Centers:

- No new centers unless there is no other alternative
- New centers encourage sprawl
- Parameters should be set on location of new centers
- NIMBY's
- Already enough centers
- Improve existing centers
- Must be a mix unless tax structure is changes
- Incentive for developing a town center?