

Piscataway

(1987)

Letter stating deficiencies in Piscataway's
adopted element + fair share plan submitted to
Council on Affordable Housing

logs

yellow note: 1023

ML000289F



STATE OF NEW JERSEY
COUNCIL ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING

ML000289F

Arthur R. Kondrup, *Chairman*
(609) 987-2186

707 Alexander Road • CN 813 • Trenton, N.J. 08625-0813

March 19, 1987

Municipality of Piscataway
County of Middlesex

Mayor of Piscataway Township
Municipal Complex
455 Hoes Lane
Piscataway, NJ 08854

Dear Mayor:

Your municipality submitted an adopted housing element and an accompanying fair share plan to the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) for substantive certification. After a careful review and analysis of your submittals by both COAH staff and a task force of COAH members, deficiencies were found which rendered your submittals incomplete for mediation and review. This was by resolution of COAH at its March 16, 1987 meeting, a copy of which was forwarded to you.

These deficiencies demonstrated a misunderstanding of the rules adopted by COAH. If you need clarification of the rules you may contact the Principal Planner referenced at the end of this letter.

The deficiencies are attached to this letter. It is your responsibility to address the deficiencies and to file an adopted housing element that conforms to COAH's Substantive Rule, N.J.A.C. 5:92.

To remain under COAH's jurisdiction you have until May 19 at 5 p.m. to file an adopted housing element and a fair share plan that meets COAH requirements and addresses the deficiencies. Filing means stamped in at the COAH office.

Kindly take note that any amendments to your housing element require a public hearing and an adoption by the planning board. You must also re-publish your petition of substantive certification in a newspaper of general circulation within your municipality and county no later than May 18, 1987. Please review N.J.A.C. 5:91-4.4. Documentation of adoption and publication must also be submitted.

Please take note that all objectors of record to your initial submittal will also be considered objectors of record for any future submittals (unless COAH is notified to the contrary by the objector).

Page 2
Mayor
Incomplete Review Letter

COAH expects full compliance from all municipalities and is prepared to take whatever action is necessary if compliance is not forth coming, including in those circumstances when necessary, accelerated denial.

If you have any questions please call the Principal Planner referenced below.

Sincerely,

Douglas V. Opalski, Executive Director
Council on Affordable Housing

By 
Principal Planner

cc: Planning Board Chairman
Municipal Attorney
Objectors of Record
COAH Members

attachment

d0180e
SMB/DVO/py

Piscataway Township
Incompleteness Review

The following deficiencies are noted below:

A. Crediting

1. Rehabilitation Credits -

Piscataway Township has participated in a rehabilitation program; however, no rehab credits have been requested. The Township may be eligible to reduce its indigenous need through previous rehabilitation efforts. A copy of the amended COAH rule N.J.A.C. 5:92 - 6.1 is enclosed for your reference along with revised crediting forms.

2. Section 8 Certificates -

No credits are given for Section 8 Rental Assistance Certificates.

3. Group Homes -

Group Homes are only eligible for crediting if they are open to the general public, and there are income eligibility controls and affordability controls in place.

4. Nursing Homes -

COAH, as a matter of policy, has determined that nursing homes are not eligible for crediting because they are intended to serve a medical as compared to a housing need.

5. Society Hill

Are all 109 low and moderate income units completed? Documentation verifying affordability controls must be submitted.

B. Rehabilitation Program -

This portion of the plan requires more detail. The administrative mechanism, eligibility criteria, method for certifying and other administrative information, must be provided in an ordinance format.

Piscataway Township

C. Inclusionary Sites -

Certain information is missing for all of the inclusionary sites. Better mapping for the sites, especially those that are not approved yet, must be submitted. It is also necessary to know the project's status in the approval process. More detailed information on the sewer and water capacities for the projects should be provided. The following are questions about the specific developments.

1. "Canterbury" Project - 171 units.

The plan shows this as a condominium project with preliminary approval. What is the low and moderate unit income mix? To what extent will it meet COAH standards for affordability range and bedroom mix? COAH has indicated that it will be flexible on prior approvals. Information to support any required waivers must be submitted.

2. Ethel Road Project - 60 units

Township property is to be sold. Are the proceeds of the sale being used to implement the fair share plan?

3. Highland Park - 80 units

This is Rutgers University property. Is this proposed for university housing? Additional information explaining development of this site is needed.

4. Senior Citizen Housing Site - 150 rental units

A project plan and funding details are required.

Piscataway Township

5. Ridgedale Gardens - 8 units rental

Apparently a use variance has been approved. Again, more detail on the project is needed. To what extent will the project meet COAH standards?

D. How were sites selected? To what extent were COAH guidelines of available, approvable, developable and suitable utilized? Were lands of developers who have expressed an interest in providing affordable housing considered?

E. Fair Share Total -

Based on submitted information, after all crediting, proposed rehab, approved units, and proposed inclusionary units are counted, the Township is 154 units short of its fair share number.

911 Precredited need

-179 Indigenous for rehab

-109 Credits Society Hill

623

-469 (from C 1 - 5 above)

154 Units short

F. Rental Component

Piscataway is intending to meet its rental housing need primarily through a Senior Citizen project. Bonus rental credit is limited to 20% of the rental need

$911 - 179 - 109 = 623 \times 20\% = 125 \text{ units}$

$125 \text{ units} \times .33 = 41 \text{ bonus credits}$

Bonus credits are not available until units are constructed and occupied. However, COAH has indicated it will consider a waiver to grant bonus credits at the time of substantive certification for rental projects with development approvals. The approval status of the senior citizen project would have to be clear to proceed with a waiver request.

G. Fair Share Plan

Piscataway has current inclusionary zoning. The current ordinance and proposed amendments to bring it into conformance with COAH standards must be submitted. This additional information must be in ordinance format and must include controls on affordability, bedroom distribution, range of affordability, age restriction, affirmative marketing and administrative procedures.

JB/cb

00018k