



TOWNSHIP OF WEST ORANGE

66 MAIN STREET, WEST ORANGE, N.J. 07052

Department of Planning and Development

ROBERT D. PARISI
Mayor

Tel: (973) 325-4110
Fax: (973) 325-6359
Email: planning@westorange.org

TO: Zoning Board Members

FROM: Paul Grygiel, AICP, PP, Township Planning Director

DATE: May 22, 2020

RE: **PB-20-02/Green Essex Partners Urban Renewal Entity, LLC**
Block: 155; Lots: 40.02, 42.01 and 42.02; Zone: Executive Drive Multi-Family
Residential (Essex Green-Executive Drive Redevelopment Plan)
100 and 200 Rooney Circle
Supplemental Memo to Review Additional Application Materials

INTRODUCTION

This document supplements my May 13, 2020 memorandum to review the additional documents submitted by the applicant listed below. There are some issues with the submitted fiscal impact study that need to be addressed.

ADDITIONAL SUBMISSIONS

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>SIGNED BY</u>	<u>DATE/REVISION</u>
Environmental Impact Statement	Zachary E. Chaplin, P.E.	5/21/20
Fiscal Impact Summary	Richard B. Reading	5/5/20
Executive Drive Redevelopment Waste Management Plan	(Not signed)	5/18/20



AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER
www.westorange.org

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This document outlines existing and proposed conditions on the subject property and evaluates potential environmental impacts from the proposed development. It addresses the requirement of the Essex Green-Executive Drive Redevelopment Plan (“the Redevelopment Plan”) for a development applicant in the redevelopment area to submit an environmental impact statement at the time of site plan application. The document submitted by the applicant follows the standards forth in Section 25-13.4 of the Township of West Orange Land Use Regulations Ordinance for the format and information to be provided in an environmental impact statement.

I defer to the Board Engineer to comment on a number of items within this document, as they relate more to site plan and engineering issues. I note the environmental impact statement includes two typical alternatives to a development of this type, a “no-build” scenario and redevelopment as a permitted use. In this instance, the permitted use is what is proposed in the subject application, so the applicant has cited the uses permitted by the former OB-1 zoning of the property, but did not provide an estimate of what could be built. Given the site’s developed character and its status as a redevelopment area with an adopted redevelopment plan, it is reasonable to focus on existing improvements on the site and those proposed in the subject application.

FISCAL IMPACT SUMMARY

The Redevelopment Plan requires a development applicant in the redevelopment area to submit a community impact statement at the time of site plan application. A “community impact statement” is not defined in the Redevelopment Plan. However, fiscal impacts are generally among the foremost concerns of a proposed development, including municipal service and public school district impacts. It is noted the proposed development is fully compliant with use and density regulations for the subject property, meaning that the Township Council considered the potential impacts of the redevelopment of the subject property and others in the Redevelopment Area when it adopted the Redevelopment Plan.

In terms of the calculations and projections in the Fiscal Impact Summary, the document that is the source of the demographic multipliers is a Rutgers University document commonly utilized by planners and others for population projections, [Who Lives in New Jersey Housing?](#). This document was updated in November 2018 and provides relevant information to project the number of residents and public school children in the proposed development.

I have reviewed the data and multipliers utilized in the report. For the most part, they appear correct, although there appear to be two erroneous multipliers listed. In the estimated population table on page 5, the second row (Apt-2BR) lists the multipliers for 5-49 Units (Rent), 2 BR in the table (i.e. 2.359 and 0.196). However, the calculations in that row are correlate to the correct



multipliers for 50+ Units (Rent), 2 BR (i.e. 2.356 and 0.065). Therefore the projected numbers (379 total population and 10 public schoolchildren) are correct. The table must be corrected.

A more significant issue is that the breakdown of units in the Fiscal Impact Study is inconsistent with the unit mix listed on the site plan with a revision date of May 7, 2020. The breakdown of units by bedroom type as listed in the site plan is as follows:

	Market-rate	Affordable	Total
One-bedroom	149	13	162
Two-bedroom	173	38	211
Two-bedroom plus den	39	0	39
Three-bedroom	0	13	13
TOTAL	361	64	425

The breakdown of units by bedroom type as listed in the Fiscal Impact Study is as follows:

	Market-rate	Affordable	Total
One-bedroom	200	15	215
Two-bedroom	161	34	195
Three-bedroom	0	15	15
TOTAL	361	64	425

The applicant must confirm which numbers are correct, as they affect the fiscal impact calculations. For example, if the site plan numbers are correct, the projections for the numbers of total residents and public schoolchildren would be higher, which would affect other numbers throughout the report.

WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN

This document describes proposed solid waste and recycling facilities and procedures for the proposed development. The assumptions seem reasonable.

It is noted the breakdown of units by type on pages 2 through 4 lists the two-bedroom plus den units as three-bedroom units, and projects the number of residents per unit accordingly. This assumption is at odds with the other submitted materials, which consider the two-bedroom plus den units as two-bedroom units for parking requirements and population projections. The applicant should address this discrepancy and revise the submitted documents accordingly.

