

Monroe (1985)

2/15/85

Preliminary Eval of Site Suitability
for ~~ML~~ Laurel Compliance

pgs = 33

no p.i.

ML000177 E

**PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF SITE
SUITABILITY FOR MT LAUREL II COMPLIANCE**

**MONROE TOWNSHIP,
Middlesex County NJ**

ML000177E

HINTZ / NELESSEN ASSOCIATES P.C.

Planning — Urban Design — Environmental Analysis — Landscape Architecture

PRELIMINARY EVALUATION OF SITE SUITABILITY FOR
Mt LAUREL II COMPLIANCE

MONROE TOWNSHIP, Middlesex County NJ

prepared for:
Township Council
Township of Monroe

prepared by:
Hintz-Nelessen Associates, P.C.
12 North Main St
Pennington, NJ 08534

02/15/85

Introduction

Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C. (H.N.A.) has prepared a series of site selection criteria for determining the appropriateness of future medium to high density housing in Monroe Township, as well as to determine the relative appropriateness of thirteen proposed Mt Laurel compliance sites for this type of housing. This set of 17 site evaluation criteria is consistent with the planning principles set forth in Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), and more particularly those criteria set forth in the Municipal Master Plan (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28). It is the opinion of H.N.A. that Monroe's 13 proposed Mt Laurel compliance sites should be weighed against these criteria if both legal and planning principles of efficiency, economy, site adequacy, safety, health and welfare are to be achieved. These criteria are as follows: 1. Job location within 15 minutes; 2. Compact shape; 3. Natural features; 4. Adequate utilities; 5. Mass transportation; 6. Highway network; 7. Neighborhood commercial; 8. Regional shopping; 9. Health care; 10. Schools/day care; 11. Recreational facilities; 12. First aid, fire and police; 13. Consistency with existing neighborhood character; 14. Consistency with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities; 15. Consistency with agricultural preservation policies; 16. Location relative to S.D.G.P. designated growth area; 17. Builder/Developer performance experience .

Background Considerations

In Section 19b2-9 of the 1976 MLUL (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-29(b)2-9), the various public policy considerations which must be addressed in the master plan elements dealing with land use, housing, circulation, utility service, community facilities, recreation,

conservation, economics and energy conservation are set forth as follows:

... (2) A land use plan element (a) taking into account the other master plan elements and natural conditions, including, but not necessarily limited to, topography, soil conditions, water supply, drainage, flood plain areas, marshes, and woodlands. (b) showing the existing and proposed location, extent and intensity of development of land to be used in the future for varying types of residential, commercial, industrial agricultural, recreational, educational and other public and private purposes or combination of purposes, and (c) including a statement of the standards of population density and development intensity recommended for the municipality;

(3) A housing plan element, including but not limited to, residential standards and proposals for the construction and improvement of housing;

(4) A circulation plan element showing the location and types of facilities for all modes of transportation required for the efficient movement of people and goods into, about, and through the municipality;

(5) A utility service plan element analyzing the need for and showing the future general location of water supply and distribution facilities, drainage and flood control facilities, sewage and waste treatment,

solid waste disposal and provision for other related utilities;

(6) A community facilities plan element showing the location and type of educational or cultural facilities, historic sites, libraries, hospitals, fire houses, police stations, and other related facilities, including their relation to the surrounding areas;

(7) A recreation plan element showing a comprehensive system of areas and public sites for recreation; and

(8) A conservation plan element providing for the preservation, conservation, and utilization of natural resources, including, to the extent appropriate, open space, water, forests, soil, marshes, wetlands, harbors, rivers and other waters, fisheries, wildlife and other natural resources;

(9) An energy conservation plan element which systematically analyzes the impact of each other component and element of the master plan on the present and future use of energy in the municipality, details and specific measures contained in the other plan elements designed to reduce energy consumption, and proposes other measures that the municipality may take to reduce energy consumption and to provide for the maximum utilization of renewable energy sources;

...

Most of the H.N.A.'s 17 criteria address these considerations in determining where medium and high density housing should be

located in a municipality. In addition, in Mount Laurel II the Supreme Court made it clear that available infrastructure, and physical proximity to adequate transportation and community facilities, should be considered in any attempt to voluntarily comply with the constitutional mandates enunciated in this decision. Thus, at 92,NJ 211, the Court cautioned developers that they could not trample on valid land use policies of municipal governments, particularly those who are conscientiously attempting to comply with their obligation:

...Builders may not be able to build just where they want--our parks, farms and conservation areas are not a land bank for housing speculators. But if sound planning of an area allows the rich and middle class to live there, it must also realistically and practically allow the poor. And if the area will accommodate factories, it must also find space for workers. The specific location of such housing will of course continue to depend on sound municipal land use planning. ...

All 17 site selection criteria relate in some fashion to either environmental considerations, accessibility to transportation and community facilities, or accessibility to infrastructure, including sewage and water. Each one of these considerations was addressed by the Supreme Court in Mount Laurel II. Thus, at Footnote 68, at 92 N.. 331, the Court cautioned that a housing development should not be undertaken so as to degrade the environment, and that consideration of environmental factors and meeting the housing

obligations cited in the constitution are not incompatible:

We emphasize here that our concern for protection of the environment is a strong one and that we intend nothing in this opinion to result in environmentally harmful consequences. See Mount Laurel I, 67 N.J. at 186-87.

We are, however, convinced that meeting housing needs is not necessarily incompatible with protecting the environment. In fact, according to the Middlesex-Somerset-Mercer Regional Study Council (MSM), the kind of higher density development that is necessary to provide lower income housing can actually result in far less environmental pollution than traditional suburban development patterns. See MSM, Cur Region's Response to the Mount Laurel Decision and the New Municipal Land Use Law (1978).

Where a particular proposed lower income development will result in substantial environmental degradation, such a development should not be required or encouraged by trial courts' enforcement of the constitutional doctrine.

In citing examples of "bad planning", which it condemns, the Court in Mt. Laurel II referred to "wasteful extension of roads and needless construction of sewer and water facilities", 92 N.J. at 238, and then once again stated that the preservation of open spaces, natural resources, and land use planning which would limit public facility costs were totally compatible with

the provision of low and moderate income housing for New Jersey citizens:

....The lessons of history are clear, even if rarely learned. One of those lessons is that unplanned growth has a price: natural resources are destroyed, open spaces are despoiled, agricultural land is rendered forever unproductive, and people settle without regard to the enormous cost of the public facilities needed to support them. Cities decay; established infrastructures deteriorate for lack of funds; and taxpayers shudder under a financial burden of public expenditures resulting in part from uncontrolled migration to anywhere anyone wants to settle, roads leading to places they should never be --a pattern of total neglect of sensible conservation of resources, funds, prior public investment, and just plain common sense. ... 92 N.J. at 236

In conclusion, the 17 criteria contained in this report are an attempt by H.N.A. to aid Monroe Township in meeting the challenge of the Supreme Court so as to have this municipality face its housing obligations in a sensible and cost efficient manner.

The 17 Site Selection Criteria

As stated earlier, it is our opinion that all sites must be weighed against these criteria if the planning principles of efficiency, economy, adequacy, legibility, safety, health and welfare are to be achieved. These criteria are not absolutes, but represent guides for appropriate development. Site selection and planning requirements must be related to the socio-economic characteristics of the "Mt Laurel population", at the same time remembering that 80 percent or more of the units which will be built will be competitive market-rate units. These medium to upper income market-rate units must be of high-quality design to offset required internal subsidies. To balance these socio-economic requirements, criteria must be built in to guarantee efficiency and economy. But, most importantly, the Township must attempt to concentrate growth into selected development areas, at higher density and with a community/commercial focus, in order to assure orderly and efficient growth now and in the future, instead of a haphazard leap-frog development pattern.

Table 1

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

1. Job Location 15 minutes
2. Compact shape
3. Natural features
4. Adequate utilities
5. Mass transportation
6. Highway network
7. Neighborhood commercial
8. Regional shopping
9. Health care
10. Schools/day care
11. Recreational facilities
12. First aid, fire and police
13. Consistency with existing neighborhood character
14. Consistency with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
15. Location relative to S.D.G.P. designated growth area/limited growth/non-growth area
16. Consistency with agricultural preservation goals
17. Builder/Developer's past experience in similar projects

Source: HNA

1. Is the site located within a 15 to 25 minute isochrom commute to existing or proposed job opportunities for a full range of households who will be living in the new housing?
2. Does the site have a compact shape? Ideally, a site approximates a square or simple rectangle. This shape allows for more efficient site layout and design. Sites with highly irregular shapes are less efficient because of setbacks, internal site circulation requirements, preservation of environmentally sensitive areas, etc.
3. Are there any natural features, floodplains, geology or soil characteristics which make the site or portions of the site unsuitable for development? The site should have soil characteristics capable of facilitating construction at least cost. The area of the site to be built on should be free of peat. The construction area should not be on non-compacted fill. If on fill, the nature of the fill should not have bedrock at or close to the surface. The site should not have water at or near the surface during times of seasonal high water. The site, if over a major aquifer outcrop recharge area, should consider ways to minimize coverage and maximize recharge.

The site should not have slope problems -- sites should not be too flat (less than 1% grade) or steeper than 25 percent. A flat site may have drainage problems, while a steeper site will be more expensive to build on because of more complicated foundation problems and utility connections.

Are there sufficient natural features (e.g., trees, hedge-rows, rock out-croppings) which can be incorporated into the open spaces and buffers of the development and enhance the municipal open space network? Remaining mature trees on an undeveloped site typically signify land that was unsuitable for farming and has a high probability of being land with high water or drainage problems.

Are there any underground or above ground utilities, pipe channel, or easements which make the site or any portion of it unsuitable for development?

4. Does the site have adequate utilities at its boundaries, particularly if the site is smaller than 30 acres?
Sites from 30 to 200 acres (density at 6 d.u./ac.) providing a full range of income/housing types can absorb limited off-site extension of utilities. Larger sites 400 to 800+ acres can have their own utility arrangements, i.e., package sewer plant and wells, providing that soil and other environmental conditions allow.

If private water and sewers are proposed, these facilities should require a minimum public investment and have no negative environmental impacts.

5. The site should be within close proximity to mass transit. Ideally, this should not be longer than a 10-minute walk or 2,000 feet, particularly for a small high-density site, i.e. less than 20 acres. Larger sites not within the aforementioned walking distance should provide private transport service, i.e. van or bus, to major bus/train stops either

by internal subsidy in conjunction with a municipality's unused bus capacity, (off-peak use of school buses, re-routing local service lines, etc.) or by private carrier provided by developer or homeowners association.

6. Does the site have accessibility (within 10-minute drive) to a regional highway network, including interstate or limited access freeway/parkway?

Does not the site have direct access via a major state or county road? Will this road exceed design capacity with new development?

If the site is over 300 units, either a limited access road is constructed to required standards to provide the necessary access, or contributions from developers for off-site transportation network improvements should be required.

If new development should cause existing roads to exceed capacity, the additional volume should be absorbed by roads inside the development area and appropriately connected to roads presently under capacity.

7. Does the site have proximity to neighborhood commercial/community facilities as a focus and center for the community?

These neighborhood commercial/community facilities should be within a 1/2 mile maximum (8-10 minutes) walking distance. If the site is under 800 units, these facilities must preexist. 1,600 units is the optimum size required for basic neighborhood facilities. Projects over 800 units should

provide neighborhood commercial and community facilities to serve the projected population. If these community/commercial facilities do not meet the market threshold, these facilities must be located to provide pedestrian/vehicular access from the development area and vehicular/pedestrian access to the remainder of the market area.

8. Are community and regional shopping facilities within convenient driving or public transportation trip from the site?

9. Are health care facilities, including medical/dental offices and hospital within reasonable proximity of the site?

All sites should have medical/dental facilities within a 15 minute drive.

10. Does the site have reasonable access to schools?

Nursery schools/Day care - 5 minute walk

5 minute maximum driving time

Elementary School - 12 minute maximum walking (1/2 mile radius)

12 minute maximum driving time

Middle School - 12 minute maximum walkway times (optimum 1/2 mile radius)

15 minute maximum driving (busing) time

High School/Library - 15 minute maximum walking time (optimum 1 mile radius)

- 15 minute maximum driving time

All sites should provide localized daycare, nursery and preschool for the appropriate population thresholds.

11. Are recreation, playfields and natural areas in size and number sufficient to provide the recreational areas for the age and number of residents available within reasonable distance? These facilities should have similiar walking/access standards as the schools.

Recreation for small children should be within visual distance of residence/guardian.

Older children between the age of 5 and 15 should have access to recreation facilities associated with schools by means of bicycle. A range of structured/organized and unstructured recreational facilities and nature areas should be provided, in a relationship to the number of users.

12. Does the site have adequate fire, first aid and police protection?

-Within 1/2 mile preferable.

-1/2 Mile to 1 mile.

-Greater than 1 mile.

13. Analysis of the existing neighborhood density, character, housing type. Will the proposed higher density housing adversely impact that neighborhood?

14. The development of higher density housing should be consistent with the zoning and planning of surrounding towns. It should not set in motion higher density zoning or application for rezoning in the adjacent town. It should add to those communities' development patterns, and be reviewed by them for comment.
15. How is the site located relatively to the State Development Guide Plan growth area designation? Does it lie within the the designated growth area, the limited growth area, or the non-growth area? Sites within the growth area are to be favoured.
16. How is the site located relatively to the prime farmland in the township? Sites located on prime farmland, i.e. on soil classes I, II and III should be discouraged from development, as part of an active farmland preservation policy. Is the site an active farm, or surrounded by active farms? Farmland preservation should be encouraged whenever feasible.
17. What is the builder/developer's track record in similar enterprises? Builder/developer's experience should be placed within the following ranking:
 - * experience with large scale multifamily development, including low/moderate income housing components
 - * experience with residential development
 - * experience with non-residential (office/commercial) development
 - * experience with development packaging
 - * other building/development experience

Assessing the 14 Proposed Mt Laurel Compliance Sites

The 14 proposed Mt Laurel compliance sites were identified, following information received from the office of the Township Clerk, and mapped (see overall Location Map and individual Site Maps, attached). The list of the 14 sites is as follows:

Table 2

<u>14 PROPOSED MT LAUREL COMPLIANCE SITES</u>	
Site A - Tornopsky & Prottman	83 ac
B - Oak Realty	179
C - Kaufman	553
D - Balantrae	443
E - Lori	142
F - Monroe Development	596
G - Caton	28
H - Township Proposal	500
I - Monroe Greens (1)	
I - Monroe Greens (2)	545 total
J - Camelot	57
K - Estates Manor	30
L - Hobart Hills	80
M - HABD	166.5
N - Caleb	430

Source: Office of the Town Clerk

These 14 sites were ranked according to individual scorings obtained by applying the aforementioned 17 site selection criteria. An additional site (H) was asked to be evaluated by the township council since it seemed to have a number of the attributes for positive site

selection, including the potential for sewer, water and its location
in the growth area of the SDGP.

cmr /

monroe

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "A" TORNOPEKY & PROTMAN

+10	Job location 15 minutes
+10	Compact shape
+2	Natural features
0 SEWER WATER	Adequate utilities
+2	Mass transportation
+2	Highway network
0	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
0	Schools/day care
+1	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
+6	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+10	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+7	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+2	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record
COMMENTS	WITHOUT ADJACENT OAK REALTY, THIS SITE WOULD NOT BE APPROPRIATE!

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "B" OAK REALTY

+10	Job location 15 minutes
+6	Compact shape
+2	Natural features
0 SEWER 0 WATER	Adequate utilities
+10	Mass transportation
+9	Highway network
+4	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
0	Schools/day care
+2	Recreational facilities <i>COULD BE INTERNAL</i>
+3	First aid, fire and police
+6	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+10	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+2	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+5	Preservation of agricultural lands
+10	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T = 79

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "C" KAUFMAN

+9	Job location 15 minutes
+6	Compact shape
+7	Natural features
0 SEWER 0 WATER	Adequate utilities
+10	Mass transportation
+1	Highway network
+ 2	Neighborhood commercial COULD BE INTERNAL
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+ 3	Schools/day care
+ 3	Recreational facilities COULD BE INTERNAL
+ 3	First aid, fire and police
+2	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+3	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+7	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+3	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record
COMMENTS	PACKAGE TREATMENT PLANT MAY BE POSSIBLE GIVEN SIZE AND

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "D" BALANTRAE

+7	Job location 15 minutes
+5	Compact shape
+1	Natural features
+7 SEWER +7 WATER	Adequate utilities
+10	Mass transportation
+7	Highway network
+3	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+10	Schools/day care
+5	Recreational facilities COULD BE INTERNAL
+10	First aid, fire and police
+5	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+5	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+7	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+5	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T=94

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "E" LORI

+7	Job location 15 minutes
+8	Compact shape
+5	Natural features
+7 SEWER +7 WATER	Adequate utilities
+10	Mass transportation
+3	Highway network
+3	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+10	Schools/day care
+1	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
+2	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
(NA)+2	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+1	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+1	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T=70

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "F" MONROE DEVELOPMENT

+7	Job location 15 minutes
+6	Compact shape
+2	Natural features
+7 SEWER +7 WATER	Adequate utilities
+7	Mass transportation
-1	Highway network
0	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+7	Schools/day care
+2	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
+7	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+10	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+10	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+5	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record
COMMENTS	THIS IS THE "BUILDER'S REMEDY" SITE

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T-79

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "G" CATON

+4	Job location 15 minutes
+4	Compact shape
+2	Natural features
+5 SEWER +5 WATER	Adequate utilities
+10	Mass transportation
+1	Highway network
0	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+3	Schools/day care
+2	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
0	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+2 (NA)	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+10	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+5	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T-56

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "H" TOWNSHIP PROPOSAL

+10	Job location 15 minutes
+8	Compact shape
-5	Natural features ADJACENT LANDFILLS
+5 SEWER +5 WATER	Adequate utilities
+2	Mass transportation
+5	Highway network
+2	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+2	Schools/day care
+1	Recreational facilities
+1	First aid, fire and police
+5	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+6	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+10	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+7	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record
COMMENTS	THIS IS A SITE PROPOSED FOR CONSIDERATION BY TWP. COUNCIL

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer

"I 1" MONROE GREENS

+5	Job location 15 minutes
+5	Compact shape
+2	Natural features
+1 JEWEL +5 WATER	Adequate utilities
+3	Mass transportation
+1	Highway network
+5	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+7	Schools/day care
+2	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
-2	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
0	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+2	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+1	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

+ 40

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "I2" MONROE GREENS

+5	Job location 15 minutes
+5	Compact shape
-9	Natural features ADJACENT TO LANDFILL
+1 - SEWER +5 WATER	Adequate utilities
+9	Mass transportation
+1	Highway network
+7	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+10	Schools/day care
+3	Recreational facilities COULD BE INTERNAL
+3	First aid, fire and police
-2	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
NA-0	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+3	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+1	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record
COMMENTS	THIS PROPOSAL CONTAINS TWO PHYSICALLY SEPARATE PARCELS, THEREFORE 2

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

SEPARATE SCORES T=42

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "J" CAMELOT

+5	Job location 15 minutes
+6	Compact shape
-9	Natural features NEXT TO LANDFILL
+7 SEWER +10 WATER	Adequate utilities
+10	Mass transportation
+1	Highway network
+7	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+10	Schools/day care
+1	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
-3	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+2	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
0	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+1	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T=51

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer ^{"K"} ESTATES MANOR

+2	Job location 15 minutes
-8	Compact shape
+3	Natural features NEXT TO A JUNKYARD
+2 SEWER +5 WATER	Adequate utilities
-2	Mass transportation
-1	Highway network
+2	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+3	Schools/day care
0	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
+2	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+3	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
0	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+2	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T=16

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "L" HOBART HILLS

+4	Job location 15 minutes
+4	Compact shape
+4	Natural features
+5 +9 SEWER WATER	Adequate utilities
+5	Mass transportation
+2	Highway network
+5	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+10	Schools/day care
+2	Recreational facilities
+3	First aid, fire and police
-1	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+3	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
+5	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+2	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

Source: Hintz/Nelessen Associates, P.C.

T=62

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "M" HABD

+4	Job location 15 minutes
+3	Compact shape
+2	Natural features
0 SEWER +10 WATER	Adequate utilities
+10	Mass transportation
+2	Highway network
+3	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+10	Schools/day care
+2	Recreational facilities <i>COULD BE INTERNAL</i>
+3	First aid, fire and police
-3	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
0	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
0	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
+2	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record

SITE SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
MEDIUM-HIGH DENSITY HOUSING
CONTAINING MT. LAUREL HOUSING COMPONENT

Property/Developer "N" CALEB

+5	Job location 15 minutes
+5	Compact shape
+5	Natural features
0 SEWER +10 WATER	Adequate utilities
+5	Mass transportation
0	Highway network
+7	Neighborhood commercial
NA	Regional shopping
NA	Health care
+10	Schools/day care
+3	Recreational facilities <i>COULD BE INTERNAL</i>
+4	First aid, fire and police
+4	Consistent with existing neighborhood character
+2	Consistent with zoning and planning of adjacent municipalities
-5	Growth area of State Development Guide Plan
-5	Preservation of agricultural lands
?	Developer/builder track record