

ULr-Career, P. Scathway

10/18/84

(1984)

Letter responding to judicial request  
for a planning evaluation of Park View,  
§2 (Block 593 + 595)

-constraint on site sufficient that  
Mt. Laurel II development is limited,  
should not be considered

ZPS  
post # 1649

CADD ~~740~~ L  
759

CARLA L. LERMAN  
413 W. ENGLEWOOD AVENUE  
TEANECK, NEW JERSEY 07666

RECEIVED

OCT 23 1984

JUDGE SERPENTELLI'S CHAMBERS  
October 18, 1984

Hon. Eugene D. Serpentelli  
Ocean County Court House  
C.N. 2191  
Toms River, N.J. 08753

Dear Judge Serpentelli,

This letter is in response to your request for a planning evaluation of the site identified as Park View, Section Two (portions of Block 593 and 595), in Piscataway.

The site should be evaluated in terms of its feasibility for multi-family housing development, from the standpoint of adjacent uses, site layout, access, utilities, and potential densities.

A. The site is adjacent to single family residential development on two sides, municipal park land, and vacant County-owned land on the other sides. It is approximately one-half mile from Hoes Lane, on a dead end street; at this location Hoes Lane contains municipal and office buildings. Although it is relatively isolated from other multi-family uses and shopping, it is adjacent to two new single-family developments (one of which is Section One of Park View), and is an appropriate site for residential use. Not unlike many suburban locations, this location would require residents to depend entirely on their own automobiles for transportation. Generally this would not present any real constraints on the occupants, except in the cases of very low income households or elderly households.

B. The site is somewhat unusual in configuration. It is a long and narrow rectangle, more than four times wider than it is deep, with a right angle extension at either end of the rectangle. The long rectangle (1140'x270') is seven acres, and the two extensions are between one and two acres each.

The site is buildable, but its limited depth and apparent need for a roadway for its entire length will put serious limitations on the placement of multi-family housing clusters, parking areas, recreation areas, garbage dumpsters, etc., in reference to adequate setbacks from the adjacent single family development.

C. Access to the site would logically be through the adjacent single family area presently under construction, via the southwest corner, off Lincoln Avenue. Although this street and corner were not intended for service to a multi-family development, it does not appear to present a serious problem.

D. The site would be served by an 8" sewer line, and water lines, already in place. On the assumption that any multi-family development would justify the installation of these water and sewer lines, and therefore that the money expended on these lines is not an issue, there still remains a question of adequate size, and appropriateness of location, in a site plan for multi-family housing.

The sewer line feeds into a pumping station in the single family area, which will pump to Hoes Lane. It would be advisable to obtain an engineer's opinion, evaluating the capacity of the 8" sewer lines and the pumping station to serve more than the 55 housing units that they were originally intended to serve. Although an 8" line might be adequate for a multi-family development on certain topography, the slope of this site is not great, and therefore suggests the need for an engineer's evaluation.

If the existing 8" line already in place were not to be used, there would be serious questions regarding location of another line, as the use of the existing pumping station would still appear to be necessary to make the connection to Hoes Lane.

E. If the provision of adequate utilities were satisfactorily resolved, without costs that would render the project economically infeasible, the density of housing units would be severely limited by the configuration of the site. It is unlikely that a gross density of more than six to eight units per acre would be feasible. This would result in a development of 60-80 units; assuming 20% low and moderate income units, there might be a provision of 12 to 16 units of Mt Laurel housing.

In summary, I believe the constraints on the site are sufficient in nature and the potential for development of housing for low and moderate income households is so limited, that this site should not be considered to add to Piscataway's proposed sites for low and moderate income households.

If you need any further information to evaluate this site, please let me know.

Sincerely,



Carla L. Lerman, P.P.

cc: B. Williams, P.Paley, H.Gran, Esqs.