

Marro (1988)

attorney Correspondence

Myz = 2

no p.i.

CA000430L

Alan Mallach, AICP  
15 Pine Drive Roosevelt New Jersey 08555

609-448-5474

April 18, 1988

Louie Nikolaidis, Esq.  
Clifton & Schwartz  
401 Broadway Suite 403  
New York, N.Y. 10013

RE: Monroe Township

Dear Louie:

As we discussed, I will try to put down some of my concerns with respect to the designation of the Monroe Manor site as the sole vehicle - other than rehabilitation of existing occupied housing - for meeting Monroe township's fair share obligations.

(1) From a generalized planning standpoint, the site arguably represents precisely the sort of leapfrogging, associated with massive extensions of infrastructure across vacant land, that the state planning process now being initiated seeks to avoid. Although the site is not far removed from the existing Twin Rivers development in East Windsor township, the fact that the infrastructure is being brought to the site from the north rather than from East Windsor makes clear that this development is not a logical extension of existing development. Furthermore, Twin Rivers has for many years acted as an "edge" to the relatively developed area surrounding Exit 8 of the New Jersey Turnpike. Needless to say, there is still a substantial amount of land to be filled in to the west of Twin Rivers.

(2) Assuming the site is designated, by the township's optimistic assessment it will not be possible to have actual sewerage service to the site before mid-1991. This raises serious questions about whether it is realistic to expect that the entire 127 low and moderate income units will actually be provided before 1993, the end of the current fair share allocation period. In view of the many delays so far with respect to Monroe Township, it is risky in the extreme to make the entire complement of new housing units dependent on a process which is so prone to further delay and uncertainty.

(3) Assuming that the sewer line is indeed extended, it will render an area of roughly 1500-2000 acres suitable for intensive residential development. This is noted, with apparent approval,

Louie Nikolaidis, Esq. (2)

April 18, 1988

in the draft plan (page 19). That is not necessarily a problem, in itself. The issue is otherwise. Monroe township is an extreme case among New Jersey municipalities with respect to the disparity between its fair share obligation and its actual level of housing production. During the 1987-1993 period it is conceivable that over 3,000 market priced housing units will be constructed in the township, but its fair share obligation is only 127 new units.

For the township to use its Mount Laurel obligation as the springboard for extension of sewer lines to a large undeveloped area, and for that area to be permitted subsequently to develop without requiring provision of additional lower income units in reasonable proportion, strikes me as fundamentally at odds with the basic principles of Mount Laurel, whether or not it is technically not inconsistent with the rules of the Council on Affordable Housing.

I look forward to your reactions.

Sincerely,

  
Alan Wallach

AM:ms

cc: C.Roy Epps