Udona Loague

6/14/83

(|983)

letter visking for finding to Major + proposel / impertence of Study



CA000232L

CA000232L



State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF THE PUBLIC ADVOCATE DIVISION OF PUBLIC INTEREST ADVOCACY

> CN 850 TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625

RICHARD E, SHAPIRO DIRECTOR TEL: 609-292-1693

JOSEPH H. RODRIGUEZ PUBLIC ADVOCATE

٠.,

June 14, 1983

Alan Mallach 27 W. Patcong Avenue Linwood, NJ 08221

Dear Alan,

Enclosed is a summary of the proposed Sternlieb study. I am writing to Sternlieb to find out more information.

Sincerely,

KENNETH E. MEISER Deputy Director

KEM:id encl. cc: Steve Eisdorfer

New Jersey Is An Equal Opportunity Employer



407 WEST STATE STREET, TRENTON, N.J. 08618 :: (609) 695-3481 JOHN E. TRAFFORD, Executive Director WILLIAM C. BESSER ANT. Frequere Director

May 31, 1983

JUNO1 1922

Dear Mayor:

Whether we as municipal officials of New Jersey like it or not, the New Jersey Supreme Court decision in Mt. Laurel II is the "law of the land". This decision not only spells out that nearly every municipality of the State must provide for "low" and "moderate income housing" but also outlines a judicial procedure for the courts to follow to assure that municipalities of the State (with first exceptions) do so provide. Three judges of the Superior Court are to be specifically assigned to handle nothing but "Mt. Laurel cases" and those judges are likewise authorized to employ the services of a Master specialized in zoning and planning to assist the Court and at the expense of the municipality involved.

Unfortunately, the two key issues of region and housing allocation to each municipality were not decided in the decision nor was any method suggested. These issues are vital to all municipalities because one cannot determine housing need until one knows in what of many regions a municipality may be located. Once the region is determined, then the total housing need therein will have to be allocated. There are numerous ways to doing that.

The real need as far as municipalities are concerned is uniformity in the implementation of Mt. Laurel II. Decisions of our courts on a "case by case" basis will be disastrous. If such a policy is followed, the "die will be cast" in the first few cases. The region will have been determined, as well as need therein, and an allocation formula. Your municipality may not have had any say in the determination. When a region is to be determined, all municipalities within the proposed region should have a say.

In addition, the figures and statistics needed to make these determinations are not available on a current basis. The State Development Plan is for outdated and there is little or no prospect in the foresecable future that there will be funds available nor the inclination on behalf of the administration to update it.

We can obtain the needed figures and statistics and suggestions as to how the regions should be determined from The Rutger's Center for Urban Policy Research headed by Dr. George Sternlieb, a recognized authority in this field. The cost will be \$50,000.00. The New Jersey Builders' Association has pledged \$25,000.00, or half of this amount. The Executive Board of the League of Municipalities has approved the solicitation of members of the League to raise the balance so the study can proceed. The study will be completed in four months in time to apply to the pending Mt. Laurel cases already before the courts. It is important to point out that the study, while, constituting an inventory of housing needs and availability on a regional basis, will not suggest individual "QUOTAS" or allocations for each municipality. Each municipality's share would be determined at the time of litigation within the framework of the regional data study and the statistics that the study would develop.

There are at least 100 Mt. Laurel cases pending now and many more to come. It is most urgent and important that we all participate in having this study and report made. It should and will assure uniformity of application and be made available to each municipality involved at considerably less expense per municipality than if we each try and go it on our own.

Let's make this a united effort for the benefit of local government and home rule in New Jersey.

Since this is a voluntary effort, we cannot determine at this point the exact dollar amount we would ask your municipality to contribute. However, to help us to assess the potential support would you please complete and return the tentative commitment form at the bottom of this letter. You will be advised of the exact amount necessary after all commitments are in. In any case contributions will not exceed \$500.00.

Enclosed is an executive summary of the proposal prepared by Dr. Sternlieb's office.

Very truly yours,

Charles Kicks

Charles Guhr League President

CG:meb

cc: Municipal Clerk

YES, WE WILL HELP TO SUPPORT THIS INPORTANT PROJECT. OUR MUNICIPALITY AGREES TO CONTRIBUTE AN AMOUNT, NOT EXCEEDING \$500.00, TO BE BILLED WITHIN 60 DAYS.

NAME OF MUNICIPALITY

COUNTY

NAME OF OFFICIAL COMPLETING THIS STATEMENT.

BASIC HOUSING MARKET

DETERMINATIONS FOR THE MT. LAUREL II DECISION

(Executive Summary)

Participating Institution

Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy Research

Principal Investigator

Dr. George Sternlieb

Study Sponsors

N.J. State League of Municipalities N.J. Builders Association

Study Participants

Dr. Robert W. Burchell Dr. David Listokin

WHAT THE STUDY WILL PROVIDE

Within a mutually agreed upon definition of three basic regions of the State, the following tasks will be undertaken.

I. PROJECTION OF HOUSING DEMAND

A tabulation of future housing need, considering job growth as well as supply of existing, sound housing.

This is done by:

- (a) Profiling current and future job-related and resident housing demand of moderate and lower income households (as defined by 80 percent and 50 percent of median income) by income, family size, marital status and age/dependency status of family
- (b) Measuring existing housing occupied by similar types of families in terms of: occupancy costs (rent and operating costs) size, tenure, and type of unit
- (c) Refining projected demand by summing the inventory of existing, sound housing in place and at appropriate price structures, in the region

II. PROJECTION OF HOUSING SUPPLY

Current housing cost delivery capacity by type of unit (including factory built) and tenure status.

This is done by:

- (a) Specifying existing minimum purchase price of various types of units in minimum cost configurations (singlefamily, townhouse, garden apartment, patio houses, etc.).
- (b) Describing minimum occupancy costs of these units including debt service/rent, operating costs/maintenance agreements, taxes, utilities, etc.

III. SPECIFYING AVAILABLE BRIDGE MECHANISMS

The public subsidies which are available to bring the costs of housing supply within the bounds of housing demand.

This is done by outlining:

- (a) Physical intervention mechanisms -- the effect on purchase price and occupancy costs of increased density and reduced infrastructure and structure size requirements
- (b) Financial intervention mechanisms -- the effect on purchase price and occupancy costs of reduced interest charges and varying mortgage arrangements
- (c) Fiscal intervention mechanisms -- the effect on purchase price and occupancy costs of reductions in property taxes and curtailments of special assessments and/or user charges
- (d) Outright subventions i.e., welfare, federal/state/county mechanisms

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

To provide a foundation of mutually acceptable building blocks of housing data. This study will define what housing can be provided, at what costs, utilizing the tools which are currently available. The study will also indicate the limits of the state-of-the-art.

It is our hope that this will minimize the penalties of time and cost to developers, communities and the public at large, while fulfilling the mandate of Mount Laurel II and reducing the uncertainties that currently cloud both municipal land use controls and resulting land values.