

UL, CA

Plainsboro.

03/28/1985

E-report.

Township Administrator's
report on reasons why
units now should be constructed
on the McCarthy #1 site

pg. 2.

CA 002516 E



Township of Plainsboro

641 Plainsboro Road, Box 278, Plainsboro, New Jersey 08536-0278 (609) 799-0909

DATE: March 28, 1985

MEMO TO: Civic League

Barbara Williams
John Payne
Alan Mallock

FROM: Peter I. Hechenbleikner, Township Administrator

RE: Financial Review of Options Regarding Construction of 288 Units of Moderate Income Rental Housing and 125 Units of Low Income Senior Citizen Housing on Separate Sites

Regarding our conversation of March 26, 1985 the following information is provided:

- Assuming that separation of the senior citizens and moderate income units would take place with the senior citizen housing remaining on the "McCarthy #1 property" and the possible sites for the moderate income housing are limited to the sites considered initially in the senior citizen housing site selection process.

- Assuming that the moderate income housing to be developed should not be developed at a density greater than the existing garden apartment developments in the community (14 units/acre).

- The sites reviewed were:

- Linpro 11/10.09 Under development for offices

- Pollera 5/21.01 Available - 23 acres

- Bowers 5.01/22 & 23 Approved for shopping center and professional office development

- Cooper 6.16/24.01 Site is too small to accommodate 288 units

- Walker Gordon 15/16.01 Available 35.9 acres

- McCarthy #1 10.01/13.07 Site is too small to accommodate 288 units

- McCarthy #2 10/12 Available and site selected for senior citizen and moderate income developments

- Of the two sites available other than the McCarthy #1 site, off-site infrastructure costs and non-routine on-site improvements estimated by the Township Engineer are as follows:

Pollera: Construction of on-site 1000 * berra along railroad	50,000
Off-site sewer & pump	120,000
Off-site water	40,000
Road Improvements	100,000
	<u>\$310,000</u>

Financial Review of Options Regarding Construction of 288 Units of Moderate Income Rental Housing and 125 Units of Low Income Senior Citizen Housing on Separate Sites

March 28, 1985

Pg 2

Walker Gordon: Construction of on-site 2000* berm along railroad	\$100,000
Sidewalks to Shopping	30,000
Road Improvements	50,000
	<u>\$180,000</u>

- Linpro has indicated that the costs associated with construction of the 413 units on two sites include the following:

Duplication of management costs	\$ 7,000
Duplication of maintenance costs	20,000
Extra legal costs	20,000
Extra site-planning costs	12,500
Extra production costs	317,000
	<u>\$376,500</u>

These costs are caused by reduced efficiency, the need to acquire and close on two sites, the need to develop topographic information and plans for two separate sites, and duplicated costs of mobilization and reduced efficiency of construction on two sites.

- in addition to the costs noted above, the combined project, as anticipated, includes \$250,000 worth of recreational facilities to be shared by the 413 units. If the projects were located on separate sites and the recreational facilities were duplicated, the cost would be an additional \$250,000.
- A major part of the criteria for selection of the McCarthy #1 site for senior citizen housing is also applicable to the moderate income housing. These criteria included:
 - 1) No site environmental problems. Both the Pollera site and the Walker Gordon site are immediately adjacent to the railroad. Although berming would help reduce the effects of the location, it cannot eliminate the noise of the railroad.
 - 2) The McCarthy #1 site is adjacent to other areas of multi-family development and, therefore, not conspicuous or isolated.
 - 3) The McCarthy #1 site is central within the community, needs little in the way of infrastructure improvements, has no environmental on-site problems, is easily accessible to shopping and all community services, and will not present problems to the remaining community in terms of traffic generation, scale of development, or construction impact.

This memo outlines a broad range of reasons why, in the opinion of Plainsboro Township, the 413 units can be and should be constructed on the McCarthy #1 site.