

**APPENDIX 6 - STEERING COMMITTEE CENTERS-BASED
ALTERNATIVE COMMENTS (WORKSHOP NO. 6)**

**STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING NO. 6
MEETING NOTES**

The following is a summary of the comments made during the Steering Committee workshop to review the Centers-based Alternative Plan for Warren County.

Work Group No. 1

Frelinghuysen, Hardwick, Knowlton and Blairstown

Question 1 and 2: Do you like/dislike the alternative plan? / What changes would you make to the alternative?

- Concern with concept of having a center in each town; too inflexible – some more some less
- Not the same for all place – distinction between type of places (large vs. small: Hackettstown vs. Blairstown)
- Frelinghuysen
 - Markboro - maybe not one
- Would like criteria for what gets designated and what for each size
- This is not a regional plan
 - Eliminate some of these centers
- Concerned with Hope designation – would prefer ‘sprawl’ since hamlet can’t handle more traffic
- Too many centers will cause competing centers and make them not viable!
- Hardwick
 - Not a place for a center – forced fit
 - Squires Corner should not be a center
 - Centers are Stillwater (Sussex) and Blairstown
 - Squires Corner would not help traffic
- Frelinghuysen
 - Marksboro – not likely – not walkable
 - Johnsonburg – is building out as being planned, only thing lacking is sewer
- Knowlton
 - Columbia – Circle too big (already preserved land in there)
 - There is value to it as center, but have sewage disposal issue; have zoning in place (mixed use)
 - Need to get businesses to stay – the highway commercial is too strong a draw
- Hope
 - Individual towns cannot support centers and don’t want to draw from outside because creates traffic - don’t want to see more expansion
 - Concerned the center designation State will have negative repercussions
- Blairstown
 - Not present

Question 3: Which centers should have additional density?

- Johnsonburg (maybe) – but pretty much built out as planned

Work Group No. 2

Mansfield, Hackettstown and Liberty

Question 1: Do you like/dislike the alternative plan?

- Larger scale map for centers would be helpful
- Conceptually it makes sense
- Doable but difficult
- Ongoing process
- Need to encourage clean ratables
- Regional planning necessary with cooperation between towns

Question 2: What changes would you make to the alternative?

- Multiple smaller centers might make sense for Liberty (civic center and commercial center)
- We are in agreement with delineated town center areas for Mansfield and Hackettstown
- Hackettstown center bleeds over into Mansfield
- Liberty delineation not good because of environmental and access concerns

Question 3: Which centers should have additional density?

- Liberty would like to be the town center located along Route 46 between Independence and the Pequest Fish Hatchery instead of Free Union due to environmental and access issues

Work Group No. 3

Washington Township and Boro

Question 1, 2 and 3: Do you like/dislike the alternative plan? / What changes would you make to the alternative? / Which centers should have additional density?

- Washington Township and Boro have had wastewater issues between them
- Don't want Home Owner Associations (HOA's) owning sewer plants
- Not seeing a lot of progress on directing development
- Concept applies well to Washington Township and Boro
 - Makes sense
 - Reduces traffic
 - Reduces development
- Take a big educational effort by county to sell to planning boards and municipalities
- Ratables chase brings more traffic
- There will be a price to pay for commercial and industrial zoning under Mt. Laurel decision
- Washington Township - need to change sewer district
- New Washington south center shouldn't be retail - should be office and light industrial use only
- Use fringe of Boro instead of new "Washington South" to grow from center out and use areas with sewer capacity
- Transfer development rights into current center
- Township needs to decide where existing center should be adjusted

Warren County Strategic Growth Plan

- Not interested in transfers from other communities
- Shouldn't be two centers in Mansfield
- Want to force redevelopment of greyfields e.g.
 - Shelby Plaza
 - Ames Plaza
- Need to take a hard look at waste water management plans
- Shopping markets won't be in Boro but need to be very close
- 'Village Gate' is a good example of interconnected streets in Boro
- Now town wants to block interconnections of streets in new subdivisions
- S. Lincoln Ave. functions as a service road to relieve Rt. 31
- Need a law to require interconnection of streets
- Set development in interconnected office parks off Rt. 31 instead of along highway
- Want to see landscaping along Rt. 31 instead of buildings
- Need to have a "dog and pony show" - take to town boards and planning board
 - Visual preference survey
 - Buildout analysis, wastewater plans, fiscal consequences, results of county questionnaire, come with ordinances of how they can do this, DO IT NOW – ALMOST TOO LATE
- Scare the ... out of them
- Get more into the newspapers – keep at them
- Continue to stress why this is GOOD!

Work Group No. 4

Alpha, Greenwich, Lopatcong, Philipsburg and Pohatcong

Question 1: Do you like/dislike the alternative plan?

- Results support alternative plan
- Development in Lopatcong should occur along Route 22
- The future use of Ingersoll – Rand property should reflect character of Philipsburg
- Philipsburg – No residential development beyond current boundary
- Harmony industrial / Lopatcong residential
- Centers have to occur regionally
- Concepts are good
- Everyone was in support that planning must occur regionally

Question 2: What changes would you make to the alternative?

- Redevelopment in southern region
- NO new centers / development / redevelopment should occur in existing centers
- Develop Greenwich as zoned.
- Traditional center concepts should be applied to developing northern regions of the county
- No boundary expansion

Question 3: Which centers should have additional density?

- Philipsburg
- Artisan type communities

Warren County Strategic Growth Plan

- Should have redevelopment / increase density
- No boundary expansion
- Oxford
- Build a community not just stores and houses
 - Civic uses
 - Public spaces
 - Cultural attractions

Work Group No. 5

Belvider, White and Harmony

Question 1: Do you like/dislike the alternative plan?

- Implies improved infrastructure to allow development around capabilities
- Rural roads should limit development, should be a guide to limit growth
- Plan around what's there
- Center concept may not be appropriate for every municipality
- Municipal boundaries should not dictate where centers go
- Infill and refurbish in existing "centers" with municipal control and clear boundaries to develop within
- Development ordinances guide developers to large tracts rather than infill
- Equity issue needs to be addressed, who gets to sell and who gets to leave undeveloped
- Land is an investment, no guarantees on equity in the future
- Land use should be blind to economics, what is best use for land
- Need examples of alternative growth patterns in practice
- New industry, labor markets will be filled by out of state residents
- Disagree with alternative plans numbers
- Ratable chase is irrational and impracticable
- Some like to travel to commercial areas, want retail areas out of their community
- People are comfortable with a 5-10 mile ride

Question 2: What changes would you make to the alternative?

- Alternatives sound good but are they feasible?
- White Twp Free Union is not a good site
- Buttzville, Bridgeville, should be shown
- Should be on county basis, more regional

Question 3: Which centers should have additional density?

- No center should have additional density without TDR credits from other rural sites