



State of New Jersey
DEPARTMENT OF STATE
NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION
P.O. Box 820
TRENTON, NEW JERSEY 08625-0820

PHILIP D. MURPHY
Governor

THOMAS K. WRIGHT
Chairman

SHEILA Y. OLIVER
LT. GOVERNOR

DONNA A. RENDEIRO
Executive Director/Secretary

**New Jersey State Planning Commission
Plan Implementation Committee
Minutes of the Meeting Held on January 18, 2023
Zoom Video Conference**

CALL TO ORDER

Chairwoman Robinson called the January 18, 2023 meeting of the New Jersey Plan Implementation Committee (PIC) order at 9:32 a.m.

OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

It was announced that notice of the date, time, and place of the meeting has been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

ROLL CALL

Members Present

Nick Angarone, Designee for Shawn LaTourette, Department of Environmental Protection

Bruce Harris, Municipal member

Keith Henderson, Designee for Lt. Governor Sheila Oliver, Commissioner, Department of Community Affairs

County Commissioner Director Shanel Robinson, Chair, County Member

Susan Weber, Designee for Diane Gutierrez-Scaccetti, Department of Transportation

Others Present through Video Conference

See Attachment A

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairwoman Robinson asked everyone to recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairwoman Robinson asked for a motion to approve the minutes with corrections of the December 21, 2022 meeting. Bruce Harris made the motion; seconded by Nick Angarone. All were in favor. The December 21, 2022 minutes were approved.

CHAIRWOMAN'S COMMENTS

Chairwoman Robinson wished everyone a happy new year to everyone.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director Rendeiro said that she also wants to wish everybody a happy new year. We are planning on a pretty active year coming up. Details will follow. You will be receiving the final draft of the annual report that includes the accomplishments as well as proposals for the 2023 activities within a week.

NEW BUSINESS

Endorsement proposal for the City of Vineland

Director Rendeiro referred the presentation to Meghan Wren.

Meghan Wren proceeded to present City of Vineland.

This presentation can be found at:

<https://nj.gov/state/planning/assets/docs/meeting-materials/pic/materials/2023-0118/pic-materials-2023-0118-Recommendation-Report-PIC-Vineland.pdf>

Kathy Hicks from Vineland said that Meghan mentioned that we have internal staff. That has been the situation for many decades. I think that is an advantage. I've been in my current position for 35 years. We always try to adhere to regulations and programs. There are times we go beyond; affordable housing is one issue. We have no obligation for new construction because we are an urban community, but we have recently done three tax credit projects for seniors simply because we know there is a need. We are also investigating doing family units because our housing authority has been approved by HUD to sell over 100 scattered site homes, and they have no plans to replace those. We are looking at our options.

The same goes for environmental issues. We bought into wild and scenic rivers early, and we have endeavored to insulate the Maurice River. We have always considered Route 55 as our boundary as to how far west we would extend development and try to protect the Maurice. We try to do it right. I am not saying we always do. We have to balance all our issues, whether it is economic development, housing, and farmland preservation.

We really have not mentioned farmland preservation. It is a difficult issue for us because during my years here I endeavored to set a line that we would not have more development beyond the Menantico Creek to the East, trying to insulate and preserve those farms. We have some of the most productive soils in the whole state of New Jersey, we have a very active agricultural community, and we have industry that is dependent on that. Trying to keep those farms from going for development has been an issue as long as I have worked in the City. The problem with trying to restrict industrial development on that Route 55 border is that everyone starts looking at those farms that would not be an ideal location for a fulfillment center. We have endeavored to prevent that. That is why we have struggled to preserve our development options along Route 55.

That is why Meghan has had to negotiate for us. Particularly the Lampe property, which is the largest property we have in that area near an interchange. Our last reexamination we rezoned that area for industrial because we saw the demise of commercial retail. In many of those areas, we made mixed use so that they could be industrial or commercial, but they do not have the advantage of the proximity to Route 55, so they do not have the same attractiveness. Everybody wants to be near 55. That has been kind of the driving force. We tried to do it right, but we have to balance many competing factors in our planning efforts. Thank you.

Keith Henderson, Designee for Lt. Governor Sheila Oliver, Commissioner, Department of Community Affairs said that the Urban Enterprise Zone is possibly going to have a modification to its boundary. I think that the City has been working on making some minor changes, nothing significantly major. But to the extent that that gets mapped or anything and gets included in the analysis work in the PIA, I think that would be helpful to note. Also with that, there is a new zone development plan that is going to be required to be submitted sometime in the near future. So we might want to add that to the PIA. Also the relationship between the Urban Enterprise Zone boundary and the Main Street New Jersey boundary. Was that discussed in detail anywhere?

Meghan Wren responded that it was only mentioned, not in detail. Director Rendeiro added that it could be incorporated into the discussion.

Keith Henderson added that there is a Neighborhood Preservation Program District that is in there. I do not know whether the Business Improvement District is a nice well-rounded geography or whether its individual parcels that are supposed to be determined by ordinance and usually it would just be the particular parcels that are included in the BID. I did not really see the detail on that.

Director Rendeiro said that if Mr. Henderson wants to get us those boundaries, we would make sure that they are all consistent before it moves to The Commission.

Keith Henderson said that the proposed boundaries are a work in progress that is something that should not be shared until it is floated by the Urban Enterprise Zone Authority, but we should include some of those requirements in the PIA to make sure that we ask for other changes in any land use regulation. On the economic development side, it would probably be helpful to ask for updates on the zone development plan or any of those other related items.

Nick Angarone, Designee for Shawn LaTourette, Department of Environmental Protection said that I make two comments. One, this includes the areas that Meghan identified where we have some level of disagreement. I think we have identified too much wooded stream corridor areas as growth areas. We believe it is inappropriate for the State Planning Commission to incentivize development in these areas. Whether they are T&E habitat or not, wooded stream corridors have a significant impact on our water quality and flooding, and further developing these areas we believe is problematic. We did give some areas here that were environmentally sensitive whether they be stream corridors or habitat, but we believe that we have gone too far.

Second, I was reviewing the minutes from our last meeting when we were talking about broader policy issues. One of the issues that I identified I believe, is PA2 sprawl. I think that we are further exacerbating that with the planning areas that we have identified here. Vineland has a very strong core that I think we should point to as good planning. Beyond that, it very much goes into sprawl and low-density subdivisions. Some of which are included as PA1, are included in the Center, and are identified as PA2. I think that was not something that I was thinking about before I reviewed the minutes from the last discussion, but I do not think that what we have identified in this case, is appropriate in recognition that this is not just an academic exercise. There are incentives directly tied to the Planning Areas and Centers that we identify here. I do not think we have done it right.

Director Rendeiro asked Mr. Angarone if he was referring to the two areas of disagreement. Nick Angarone responded that no. The two areas of disagreement are included in those comments. My comments are not limited to those two areas.

Commissioner Harris said that where I was confused is on the acreage of the two areas that are in dispute. If I understand it correctly, the preserved areas are somewhat enlarged, but I wasn't sure how much they are being enlarged versus the acreage of the areas that are in dispute.

Director Rendeiro referred to Meghan Wren but indicated that by comparing the existing Center to the proposed Center, if you add the addition of the incremental PA5 and open space, it was approximately a little over 4000 acres between the two but the reduction of PA1 and PA2 was around 2000 acres. The Director asked Meghan to clarify.

Meghan said that it is a little over 2000. The Director said that the increase in preserved space/PA5 was about 2000 in rough numbers. That was one of our considerations for the proposal.

Meghan Wren said that because we were trying to not have it be a regulatory conversation but more of a planning conversation. There is still a regulatory hurdle for this property in particular, there is no guarantee that they are able to do what they want to do there until they do a habitat suitability determination, and it is not sewer. So they would need to get DEP's approval for a sewer service area amendment. We are not by this map saying, you can have it and do what you will; we are saying that it is reasonable to consider it as a possible expansion to the industrial area, but that it is really regulatory as to whether it would be allowed or not.

Nick Angarone asked to clarify. There is no DEP regulation that the HS will determine whether it is developable because it is not wetlands or a stream corridor. It is upland and is not regulated by the Department, but the PIA requires that in any area that we have identified as CES that you are requiring that they go get an HST.

Meghan Wren said that in addition, the property would need a sewer service amendment so they do have to go to DEP. Nick Angarone said that is right, but you have included it in a Center and a PA2. You have guaranteed that it sewer service area is approved so long as there is sufficient capacity at the Landis plant so that's a red herring respectfully. Meghan Wren said that she was under the impression that that would also be dependent on the habitat suitability.

Director Rendeiro suggested that Meghan do a fact sheet that details our differences to talk about both DEP's position and OPA's position to send to the full Commission so that they can have a better understanding of what the differences are. We will vet any questions before or during the meeting. We will also include in it Keith's comments about the UEZ and all of the urban designations. We will vet that through Nick because obviously, our differences mostly are with Nick, and then give it to the full Commission to have a better and more detailed understanding of our differences. If we look at the whole picture, OPA believes that this does balance the need for protection and the need for economic growth. We think this is a reasonably acceptable compromise that DEP disagrees with. I think in order for the Commission members to make an informed decision they need more detail on the differences. That is what I would propose.

Chairwoman Robinson thanked the Director because it really speaks to some of the comments and or my question. How are we going to deal with this and move it to the Commission? Because I wasn't sure based on Mr. Henderson's comments. Thank you for the recommendation on how we can move this forward with those things in mind and the deliverables before we actually get to the SPC meeting.

Director Rendeiro said that she does not need to prepare the SPC agenda until the 26 or the 27. So in that time, we can prepare the fact sheet. We would ask for DEP's input to ensure that the facts are correct in terms of what their position is versus what our position is. We will get it out to the full Commission, so that the full Commission can understand the areas of disagreement and we will include Keith's comments regarding not only the UEZ but also all of the other designations that he referenced, to make sure that those are incorporated into the discussion.

Commissioner Harris said that the fact sheet will be very helpful. This is one of the most substantive issues that we have had to deal with in my term on the Commission, and I would like to make sure that the commissioners would be free to ask questions for clarification of the fact sheet and that the discussion be in public.

Director Rendeiro agreed with Commissioner Harris.

Director Rendeiro asked Nick Angarone if that will work for him. Nick Angarone responded that he would work with the Director on the memo. I do not support this moving to the State Planning Commission, but I understand where we are going.

The Chairwoman asked for a motion to move the endorsement of the City of Vineland forward to SPC on the condition of the memo fact sheet and any other comments as designated in addition to having the discussion in the public meeting. The motion was made by Bruce Harris and seconded by Keith Henderson.

With no further discussion or questions, Chairwoman Robinson asked for a roll call vote: Ayes: (4) Susan Weber, Bruce Harris, Keith Henderson, Shanel Robinson, Nays: (1) Nick Angarone. Abstains: (0). To move the endorsement of the City of Vineland forward to SPC on the condition of the memo fact sheet and any other comments as designated in addition to having a public meeting was approved.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further comments from the Committee or the public, Chairwoman Robinson asked for a motion to adjourn. The motion was made by Nick Angarone and seconded by Shanel Robinson. All were in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 10:28 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Donna Rendeiro, Secretary
State Planning Commission
Dated: February 15, 2023

ATTACHMENT A

**NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION
PLAN IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE
ATTENDEES
JANUARY 18, 2023**

Walter Lane – Director, Office of Planning - Policy and Economic Development, Somerset County
Jonathan Sternesky – NJHMFA
Jason Kasler – AICP, PP – NJPO
Anthony Soriano – Morris County
Matt Baumgardner – NJDEP
David DuMont – NJDEP
Ruth Foster – NJDEP
Jelena Lasko – NJDOT
Rachel DeFlumeri – NJDAG
Kathie Khicks – Vineland City