

**SECTION 4**  
—  
**SUPPLEMENTAL  
COMMUNITY LIFE  
ASSESSMENT**

**PART I**  
—  
**IMPACTS ON QUALITY OF  
COMMUNITY LIFE**

## SUPPLEMENTAL COMMUNITY LIFE ASSESSMENT: PART I — IMPACTS ON QUALITY OF COMMUNITY LIFE

### ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

**QUALITY OF COMMUNITY LIFE:** *Quality of community life will increase in the future under both TREND and IPLAN. Slower increases in quality of community life may result for those households that seek redeveloping neighborhoods under IPLAN.*

### SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

**QUALITY OF COMMUNITY LIFE:** *Quality of community life will also increase in the future under AIPLAN. Its magnitude of increase will be essentially the same. There will also be similarly slower increases in quality of community life for those seeking redeveloping neighborhoods under AIPLAN.*

### — QUALITY OF COMMUNITY LIFE — COMPARATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT DIFFERENCES (STATEWIDE — 1990–2010)

QOL CHANGE TO 2010 OR ABSOLUTE CONDITIONS IN 2010	TREND CONDITIONS	IPLAN ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT	AIPLAN SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT
<i>Change in Overall State of Quality of Life</i> <sup>1</sup>	5.32%	2.60%	2.83%
<i>Quality of Life Index</i> <sup>2</sup>			
Major Urban Centers	1.02	1.06	1.06
Urban-Suburban Centers	3.03	3.04	3.04
Rural Centers	2.22	2.32	2.32
Rural Centers–Rural	2.30	2.36	2.32
Suburban	3.52	3.51	3.51
Suburban–Rural	3.52	3.54	3.51
Rural	3.33	3.30	3.27
<i>Difference from TREND</i>			
<i>Change in Overall Quality</i>	—	– 2.72	– 2.49
<i>Quality of Life Index</i> <sup>2</sup>			
<i>Urban Center Index</i>	—	+ .04	+ .04
<i>Urban-Suburban Index</i>	—	+ .06	+ .02
<i>Rural Center Index</i>	—	+ .10	+ .10
<i>Rural Center–Rural Index</i>	—	+ .06	+ .02
<i>Suburban Index</i>	—	– .01	– .01
<i>Suburban–Rural Index</i>	—	+ .02	– .01
<i>Rural Index</i>	—	– .03	– .06

<sup>1</sup> percent change in statewide QOL Index

<sup>2</sup> QOL Index on a scale of 1-5 (1 = poor, 5 = excellent)

### **GENERAL QUESTIONS ASKED/ANSWERS PROVIDED**

The most frequent question asked on the quality of community life assessment concerned whether the individual ratings of municipalities would be available at the conclusion of the study. The Office of State Planning indicated that all data from the study would be available to the public once it was produced in a more convenient and transferable form.

Another frequently asked question concerned the weighting of the various measures of quality of community life. In the Impact Assessment the multiple indices used to measure quality of community life are equally weighted.

### **MONITORING/EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

The dimension of nonresidential ratable base growth to which quality of life is linked should be looked at to see if its interpretive power can be expanded by adding residential property valuation per capita. While it indeed seems logical that growth is an accompaniment of quality of life, intuitive reasoning seems to indicate that this association should not be restricted to purely nonresidential growth.

### **DESIRABLE CHANGES TO BE INCORPORATED INTO THE STATE PLAN**

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan should attempt to target resources or infrastructure development to major urban areas to upgrade educational physical plants and programs available in these locations. There should be a similar redirection of resources to deal affirmatively with urban public safety issues. Education and public safety deficiencies are primary determinants of lower quality of life in central cities.

**PART II**  
—  
**IMPACTS ON HOUSING  
DEMAND, SUPPLY,  
AND COST**

## SUPPLEMENTAL COMMUNITY LIFE ASSESSMENT: PART II— IMPACTS ON HOUSING DEMAND, SUPPLY, AND COST

### ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

#### HOUSING SUPPLY:

*While total supply is similar, IPLAN development will provide somewhat more town-house and multifamily units than TREND. Both TREND and IPLAN development in the future will contain a larger percentage of single-family development than was the case for the 1980s. Overall, about 2.5 out of every four homes will be single-family detached units.*

#### HOUSING COSTS:

*In constant dollars, there will be slightly lower housing costs for all New Jerseyans in the future. Housing affordability will gradually increase over time. IPLAN will evidence slightly lower housing costs than TREND due to prevailing densities and housing availability in Centers.*

### SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT FINDINGS

#### HOUSING SUPPLY/DEMAND:

*Statewide and across all regions, housing supply will continue to meet demand. Under AIPLAN, the projected number of single-family homes is slightly higher than it is under IPLAN.*

#### HOUSING COSTS:

*Housing costs in constant dollars will essentially remain flat or be very slightly lower as a general rule. Housing affordability (reflecting increasing incomes, level housing costs, and slightly decreasing mortgage rates) will improve somewhat over IPLAN in the future. AIPLAN will continue to have lower housing costs than TREND due to the densities of Centers overcompensating for the land limitations of environs.*

— HOUSING SUPPLY—  
COMPARATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT DIFFERENCES  
(STATEWIDE — 1990–2010)

UNITS REQUIRED (1990–2010) INCLUDING VACANCY	TREND CONDITIONS	IPLAN ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT	AIPLAN SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT
<i>HOUSING SUPPLY</i>			
All Housing	430,447	431,105	430,853
Single-Family Detached	293,957	261,088	267,005
Single-Family Attached	83,939	91,971	94,181
Multifamily	52,551	78,227	69,668
Difference from TREND			
<i>All Housing</i>	—	+ 668 †	+ 388 †
<i>Single-Family Detached</i>	—	– 32,869	– 26,952
<i>Single-Family Attached</i>	—	+ 8,032	+ 10,242
<i>Multifamily</i>	—	+ 25,676	+ 17,117

† reflects small differences regarding vacancy assumptions associated with particular types of units

— HOUSING PRICE/AFFORDABILITY—  
COMPARATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT DIFFERENCES  
(STATEWIDE — 1990–2010)

PRICE/AFFORDABILITY IN 2010	TREND CONDITIONS	IPLAN ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT	AIPLAN SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT
Housing Price <sup>1</sup>	\$172,567	\$165,185	\$162,162
Housing Affordability <sup>2</sup>	118	123	126
Difference from TREND			
<i>Housing Price</i>	—	– \$7,382	– \$10,405
<i>Housing Affordability</i> <sup>3</sup>	—	– 5	– 8

<sup>1</sup> in constant 1990 dollars

<sup>2</sup> Index—higher numbers mean housing is more affordable

<sup>3</sup> raw index change

## **GENERAL QUESTIONS ASKED/ANSWERS PROVIDED**

One question asked with regard to housing is the marketability and density of Centers as a future means of accommodating housing demand. Only a small portion (two percent) of the 400-odd non-Hamlet Centers are the classic urban central cities. Others take the form of the Montclairs, Summits, Newtons, Mount Hollys, and Toms Rivers of the State. These are not, for the most part, difficult places to market to the general public as desirable residential locations.

Second, the densities of Centers used in this analysis are in the middle of the design standards recommended by the State Plan Advisory Committee and are also in the middle range of comparable existing Center locations. Thus, increased density of IPLAN or AIPLAN Centers is not a marketing issue because existing Centers are already found at comparable residential densities municipalities to designate Centers. The Amended Interim Plan contains more Centers than were used in the initial assessment. As mentioned earlier, there are more Regional Centers and Villages than was the case for the original assessment. All of these have been recommended by municipalities and counties.

## **MONITORING/EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

The designation of Centers by municipalities and counties, as well as the attractiveness of these Centers to future households, should be monitored over time. The attractiveness and draw of Centers is key to the State Plan's ability to accomplish both its economic and environmental goals.

## **DESIRABLE CHANGES TO BE INCORPORATED INTO THE STATE PLAN**

Broad-based housing availability is a responsibility of both Centers and environs. Although reduced in magnitude relative to the potential accomplishments of Centers, it should be made clear that environs should also be sites for housing at a variety of ranges of affordability.



**SECTION 5**



**SUPPLEMENTAL  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
COORDINATION  
ASSESSMENT**

**PART I**  
—  
**IMPACTS ON  
INTERGOVERNMENTAL  
COORDINATION**

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION  
SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT: PART I —  
IMPACTS ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION**

**ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT FINDINGS:**

- MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS:**      *Experience more contacts and better relationships with the County as a result of the State Plan.*
- COUNTY GOVERNMENTS:**      *Experience more contacts and better relationships with State, other counties, and local governments as a result of the State Plan.*
- STATE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES:**      *Experience more contacts and better relationships with other State agencies and the Counties as a result of the State Plan.*

**SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT FINDINGS:**

The additional mapping and resolutions of deferred issues do not affect the findings of this section.

— INTERGOVERNMENTAL COORDINATION —  
**COMPARATIVE IMPACT ASSESSMENT DIFFERENCES**  
(STATEWIDE — 1990–2010)

FREQUENCY/QUALITY OF CONTACT WITH OTHERS IN LAND-USE MATTERS	TREND CONDITIONS	IPLAN ORIGINAL ASSESSMENT	AIPLAN SUPPLEMENTAL ASSESSMENT
Municipality	—	More (County)	More (County)
County	—	More (All)	More (All)
Municipality	—	More (State/County)	More (State/County)
<b>Difference from TREND</b>			
Municipality	—	Increasing (County)	Increasing (County)
County	—	Increasing (All)	Increasing (All)
Municipality	—	Increasing (State/County)	Increasing (State/County)

### **GENERAL QUESTIONS ASKED/ANSWERS PROVIDED**

One of the two substantive questions asked with regard to intergovernmental coordination was whether the *citizens* of the State, as opposed to local, county, or State agency Cross-acceptance representatives, were asked how well the State Plan is working.

The answer is that they were not asked this question as part of the evaluation. However, citizens were recently (February 1992) polled by the New Jersey Center for Analysis of Public Issues, and a report of the findings exists as "Using Our Land." It is reproduced in the May-June 1992 issue of the *New Jersey Reporter*. Municipal officials were also recently surveyed by the New Jersey State League of Municipalities (March 1992), and a report of the findings exists as "Municipal Survey on the State Plan." Copies of the latter report are currently available from the State League of Municipalities in Trenton, New Jersey. Both of these surveys of citizens or their elected representatives point to a general desire for increased planning and/or growth management.

The other substantive question dealt with whether or not another development-related bureaucratic delay was being created by the State planning process. It is the belief of the study team that this is not intended to be the case, but efforts should be made to ensure that this is so.

### **MONITORING/EVALUATION RECOMMENDATIONS**

There should be a retention of the Intergovernmental Coordination sample base or if not possible, the sampling procedure used in the Impact Assessment to view how State planning participants' (formerly Cross-acceptance representatives) reactions to the State Plan change over time.

### **DESIRABLE CHANGES TO BE INCORPORATED INTO THE STATE PLAN**

The sections of the Interim Plan that deal with streamlining development permissions and reducing procedural delay and overlap should clearly be made a priority in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. This would ensure that enhanced intergovernmental coordination works directly to encourage more streamlined development processing.