



**Clarke Caton Hintz**

Architecture  
Planning  
Landscape Architecture

Honorable Maryann L. Nergaard, J.S.C.  
Morris/Sussex Vicinage  
P.O. Box 910  
Morristown, NJ 07963-0910

September 13, 2017

100 Barrack Street  
Trenton NJ 08608  
clarkecatonhintz.com  
Tel: 609 883 8383  
Fax: 609 883 4044

**Re: In the Matter of the Application of the Township of Denville  
Docket No. MRS – L – 1641 – 15**

Dear Judge Nergaard:

This report has been prepared pursuant to Your Honor’s instruction In the Matter of the Application of the Township of Denville, County of Ocean, Docket No. MRS-L-1641-15, which directed interested parties and intervenors to provide comments by August 21, 2017 regarding Denville Township’s July 18, 2017 report, entitled *2017 Vacant Land Analysis for the Township of Denville, New Jersey* (“VLA Report”). Your Honor also requested that I prepare a letter by September 11, 2017 on the Township’s VLA Report and any comments received.

This letter reviews the compliance of the Township’s VLA Report with the substantive rules of the Council on Affordable Housing (hereinafter “COAH”) (*N.J.A.C. 5:93*, or the “Second Round rules”). I also summarize the motions and comments submitted by intervenor-defendants U.S. Home Corporation, doing business as Lennar (hereinafter, “Lennar”) and 382 Franklin, LLC. (hereinafter, “Franklin”), and interested party Fair Share Housing Center (“FSHC”), and recommend changes to the Township’s VLA.

Philip Caton, FAICP  
John Hatch, FAIA  
George Hibbs, AIA  
Brian Slauch, AICP  
Michael Sullivan, AICP

**1. BACKGROUND**

---

The Township of Denville is a suburban municipality in Morris County, located northwest of Morristown and east of Dover. The topography is varied, with several lakes. Housing is predominantly in the form of single-family detached development, which is densest near the downtown area, where single-family lots are as small as one-tenth of an acre. The Denville and Mt. Tabor New Jersey Transit commuter train stations are south of the downtown. In this area there are multi-family developments

*Emeriti*  
John Clarke, FAIA  
Carl Hintz, AICP, ASLA



## Clarke Caton Hintz

and senior-living facilities. There are also several multi-family and townhouse developments in the NJ Route 10 Corridor. Outside of those two areas, housing is typically on large single-family lots in subdivisions and lakeside communities. Much of the Township's undeveloped land is dedicated for open space and conservation or is outside of the designated sewer and water utility service areas.

Seven acres of the Township are within the Highlands Preservation Area and the remainder is in the Highlands Planning Area. In 2011, the Highlands Council approved the Township's petition to conform its Master Plan and land use ordinances to the Highlands Regional Master Plan as they pertain to those lands in the Preservation Area. The Township opted not to conform its Master Plan and land use ordinance to the Highlands Regional Master Plan as they related to its lands in the Planning Area; as such, it was not required to amend its Master Plan or land use ordinances for consistency with the Highlands Regional Master Plan.

### *Vacant Land Adjustment Report*

Denville Township submitted its first Vacant Land Adjustment ("VLA") Report in October of 2016. The Report calculated the Township's Realistic Development Potential ("RDP") at 93 units, based on an analysis of parcels classified by the tax assessor as being "vacant" with a net "developable" area of at least 0.84 acres per parcel and an RDP density of 6 dwelling units per acre ("du/ac"). My office reviewed the Report for consistency with N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2 and advised the Township to calculate additional RDP from farmland, developable parcels that are partially in neighboring municipalities, existing sites with an inclusionary set-aside and sites that have been proposed for inclusionary development by their owners or prospective developers.

On July 18, 2017, the Township submitted a revised VLA Report that implemented my recommendations and increased the Township's RDP to 138 units. While being generally consistent with COAH's Second Round rules, the Township's revised vacant land analysis requires further revisions which will increase its RDP, as discussed in the subsequent sections of this letter.

### *Fair Share Obligation*

The Township's Third Round fair share obligation has not yet been determined by the Court. FSHC's methodology expert, Dr. David Kinsey, PhD, PP, FAICP, and the Township's expert, Econsult Solutions Inc. ("ESI") have produced a series of reports, the most recent of which were published in April of this year, calculating municipal fair share obligations statewide. The table below shows the fair share obligations calculated by the respective experts in their April 2017 reports.



Clarke Caton Hintz

OBLIGATION	FSHC APRIL 2017*	ESI APRIL 2017
PRESENT NEED (2015)	70	46
PRIOR ROUND (1987-1999)	325	325
THIRD ROUND (1999-2025)	1,313 (20% CAP)	64
GAP NEED (1999-2015)	726	64
PROSPECTIVE NEED (2015-2025)	758	0

\* FSHC's April 2017 report only included calculations of municipalities' gap present need. The 70-unit Present Need and 758-unit Prospective Need are taken from FSHC's May 2016 report.

The Township's currently calculated RDP of 138 units is more than double Econsult's calculated Third Round obligation of 64 units, but only a tenth of the obligation calculated by FSHC. In the subsequent sections of this letter, I propose revisions and additions that could increase the Townships RDP to 277.4 units. The differential between the RDP and the Township's allocated fair share is termed the Unmet Need.

## 2. INTERVENORS AND INTERESTED PARTY COMMENTS

---

Interested Party FSHC and Intervenor-defendants Lennar and Franklin submitted comments on the Township's revised VLA Report in accordance with Your Honor's instructions. They are summarized below, followed by my response in boldface.

### FSHC

Josh Bauers, Esq. of FSHC submitted comments on the July 17, 2017 revised VLA Report on August 30, 2017. His letter alleges seven ways in which Denville's vacant land analysis is not compliant with *N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2*. They are as follows:

1. The Township's analysis only considers sites that are "vacant" and does not include sites that are currently used for low-density / low-intensity development (as identified in *N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2(d)*) and which could generate affordable housing if zoned for inclusionary development.

**No specific parcels were identified by FSHC and I have not identified any additional low-density/intensity parcels except for oversized residential parcels I discuss under item 7 of this list.**



**Clarke Caton Hintz**

2. The Township identifies developable parcels and calculates their RDP yield based on the minimum presumptive density RDP density of 6 du/ac permitted by N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2(f). That section of the Second Round rules requires municipalities to consider higher densities on lots suitable for more intense development.

**I have considered this comment in my calculation of a revised RDP.**

3. The Township's analysis excludes lands from consideration if they are outside of the sewer service area, which, Mr. Bauers claims, is not permitted by the Second Round rules.

**I address this item at the end of Section 2 of this letter.**

4. The Township should combine contiguous parcels that under common ownership, rather than assess each parcel's RDP individually. This is a requirement of N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2(c)2.

**I address this item at the end of Section 2 of this letter.**

5. The Township eliminates property from generating an RDP due to prior development approvals which, Mr. Bauers argues, is not permitted in the Second Round rules.

**I agree that approved but unbuilt sites should not be excluded; however, I am not aware that the Township excluded any parcels for that reason.**

6. The Township eliminates several farmland assessed properties from generating an RDP for reasons that are not permitted in the Second Round rules and/or which require additional information from the Township.

**I have concluded that, with the exception of one parcel identified in Section 3 of this letter, the Township appropriately calculated RDP from farmland assessed properties.**

7. The Township should consider residential lots having two or more acres, in accordance with COAH's recommendation that lots with low-density uses should be considered in the analysis.

**This has been incorporated into my analysis.**

**Lennar**

Lennar submitted its Motion to Intervene on July 17, 2017, and was granted intervenor status by Your Honor on August 4, 2017. Pursuant to Your Honor's instruction,



## Clarke Caton Hintz

Lennar submitted a report entitled *Objection to Denville Vacant Land Analysis*, prepared by Art Bernard, PP, on August 18.

Lennar is the contract purchaser of an approximately 18-acre tract in Denville consisting of Block 30501, Lots 8, 32-34, 36, and 37; Block 30601, Lot 16; Block 30607, Lot 15-17; and Block 30611, Lots 1-5. This tract is occupied by a single-family house, but is otherwise densely wooded and unimproved. It is located on the top of a hill between Thurmont Road, a rural residential street that connects to Estling Lake Road, and a railroad right of way that forms the tract's north and east boundaries. If accessed by Thurmont Road, the site is within walking distance to New Jersey Transit's Denville Station and commercial services at the intersection of East Main Street and Luger Road.

The Township did not calculate an RDP from the Lennar site, due to its exclusion of undersized parcels and the steep slopes that constrain the site. The site is comprised of a 16 parcels under common ownership, many of which are less than 0.84 and have an even smaller developable acreage after accounting for steep slopes. As noted by each of the experts, the Township's analysis did not consider the parcels as forming one larger developable tract for the purposes of calculating an RDP. Additionally, the Township's analysis eliminated lands encumbered by steep slopes, rather than using the municipal Steep Slopes Ordinance to calculate the portion of slope-constrained lands that could be disturbed.

According to NJ DEP data, approximately 7.3 acres of the tract are environmentally constrained by wetlands and steep slopes (slopes exceeding 15%). Lennar submitted a letter dated July 17, 2017, prepared by William H. Hamilton, PP, AICP, LLA, LEED AP of Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd., stating that wetlands have been confirmed but would not conflict with Lennar's proposed development as shown on its concept plan. **I requested that Lennar's attorney provide a wetland delineation, if one exists, but I have not yet received it.**

Mr. Bernard's report asserts that the Township's vacant land analysis was not compliant with the "lack of land" adjustment requirements in COAH's Second Round rules at *N.J.A.C. 5:93-4*. He also suggests that the Lennar site could be developed at 20 du/ac, notwithstanding the presence of wetlands and steep slopes. This is more than double the density in Lennar's 150-unit concept plan, which was prepared by Bowman Consulting.

Mr. Bernard points out that the Second Round Rules defer to municipal steep-slopes ordinances to guide a municipality's calculation of steep-slope constrained acreage of an RDP site. The Township's ordinance provides a sliding scale that permits land



## Clarke Caton Hintz

disturbance of 50% for slopes between 15 and 20%, 25% for slopes between 20 and 24.9%, 10% for slopes 25 to 29.9%, and 0% disturbance permitted where slopes exceed 30%. For the purpose of analyzing the Township's vacant land adjustment, I have followed the Township's sliding scale to the extent permitted by available topographic data.

COAH's rules at *N.J.A.C. 5:93-5.3* "New Construction; Site Criteria and General Requirements" require that sites selected for new construction meet the criteria found in the "Definitions" section at *N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3* for suitability, developability, availability, and approvability. The criteria are met by the Lennar site as follows:

- *N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3* defines "Suitable Site" as "a site that is adjacent to compatible land uses, has access to appropriate streets and is consistent with the environmental policies delineated in *N.J.A.C. 5:93-4* ["Municipal Adjustments"]".

**The site is nearby commercial uses, multi-family, and single-family residential uses, an N.J. Transit commuter train station, and a railroad right-of-way that includes a service road. As such, the nearby uses are compatible.**

**On June 2, 2017, Lennar submitted a concept plan for a 150-unit townhouse development with two points of proposed road access. One two-way driveway would connect to Thurmont Road. The other proposed access driveway, on the opposite side of the site, would require use of the railroad right-of-way to connect to Fox Hill Road and Lackawanna Avenue. Lennar should clarify whether the site has adequate road access for the scale of development proposed.**

**The site is also constrained by steep slopes and wetlands. In its July 12, 2017 letter opposing Lennar's motion to intervene, Denville cites steep slopes as a significant concern. Lennar alleges that its engineer has confirmed that its conceptual 150-unit development plan can be safely constructed.**

- *N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3* defines "Developable Site" as "a site that has access to appropriate water and sewer infrastructure, and is consistent with the applicable areawide water quality management plan (including the wastewater management plan) or is included in an amendment to the areawide water quality management plan submitted to and under review by DEP."

**The Lennar site is in the sewer service area and is consistent with the areawide water quality management plan.**

- *N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3* defines "Available Site" as "a site with clear title, free of encumbrances which preclude development for low and moderate income housing."



Clarke Caton Hintz

**I am not aware of any conflicts over title or other issues that would make this site unavailable for development of affordable housing.**

- N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3 defines “Approvable Site” as “a site that may be developed for low- and moderate-income housing in a manner consistent with the rules or regulations of all agencies with jurisdiction over the site. A site may be approvable although not currently zoned for low and moderate income housing.”

**The site is in the Highlands Planning Area. Denville opted out of conformance with the Highlands Regional Master Plan for its Planning Area lands; therefore, the Highlands Council’s impact on development of this site may be limited to issues pertaining to water and sewer access. I am not aware of any conditions precluding the proposed project from being approved by any other agencies or jurisdictions.**

**382 Franklin, LLC.**

Intervenor-defendant 382 Franklin, LLC. (“Franklin”) submitted an August 24, 2017 letter from its counsel, Jeffrey Kantowitz, Esq. and a report prepared by its planning expert Christine A. Nazzaro-Cofone, PP, AICP of Cofone Consulting Group, LLC. Franklin is the contract purchaser of Block 21101, Lot 5 (also known as 382 Franklin Road), an approximately 8-acre site near the State Route 10 corridor. The uses closest to the site are agricultural or single-family residential on lot sizes ranging from a half-acre to six acres or more, with frontage on Franklin Road.

Mr. Kantowitz’s letter is largely concerned with the Township’s application of a Township-wide 6 du/ac density to eliminate sites from the RDP analysis and calculate RDP. **I have considered this argument in my calculation of a revised RDP.**

Ms. Cofone’s report on behalf of Franklin provides an inventory of almost three dozen parcels that she alleges were inappropriately excluded from the Township’s analysis or incorrectly found to be undevelopable. Most of the parcels are sites that Ms. Cofone claims are near enough to existing sewer and water infrastructure that they should be considered in the VLA. **I address this argument at the end of Section 2 of this letter.**

Of the 32 sites that are listed in Ms. Cofone’s report, I find that only 2 should actually be considered for the RDP (one of which already contributes to the Township’s RDP). The remaining 30 sites are not appropriate to generate an RDP for a variety of reasons, the most important of which are as follows:

1. The sites are preserved open space as identified in the Township’s Environmental Resource Inventory or its Recreational and Open Space Inventory, or they are owned by homeowners’ associations or similar entities.



Clarke Caton Hintz

2. The sites are outside of the sewer service area.
3. They are heavily environmentally constrained.

### Common Themes

There were a number of recommendations and concerns that were shared between at least two of the three parties that submitted comments. They include the following:

- **Sewer Service:** Both Ms. Cofone’s report and FSHC’s letter express the opinion that the Second Round VLA rules do not exclude sites from generating an RDP just because they are outside of the sewer service area. However, *N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3* defines “Developable Site” as “a site that has access to appropriate water and sewer infrastructure, and is consistent with the applicable areawide water quality management plan (including the wastewater management plan) or is included in an amendment to the areawide water quality management plan submitted to and under review by DEP.” Therefore, a site that is outside of the sewer service area is not realistically developable.

Ms. Cofone indicates that her selection of sites outside of the sewer service area are “within a reasonable distance (750-feet or closer)” to utility lines. The reasonableness of the cost of installing infrastructure depends upon a number of factors, including the distance involved, the number of users who would benefit, and the type of soils. However, none of these factors come into play in a vacant land analysis unless the site to be served is within the approved sewer service area. COAH accounted for the issue of sewer access and capacity by providing a separate mechanism for adjusting municipal obligations to account for a lack of sewer or water service, commonly referred to as a “durational adjustment” (*N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.3*).

- **Contiguous Parcels Under Common Ownership:** All three parties argue that the Township should have calculated RDPs from contiguous lots under common ownership whose aggregate developable acreage would generate one or more affordable units at an appropriate density. While I do not disagree with this approach, I did not come across any clusters of commonly owned lots that should be considered in the RDP, with the exception of the Lennar site.
- **Low Density Uses:** The parties commented that the Township only considered privately owned vacant lots in its analysis, and did not consider sites that have low density uses and which could be redeveloped for inclusionary development if zoned for such use. COAH’s rules recommend investigating golf courses, driving ranges, farm uses in Planning Areas 1, 2, and 3, nurseries, and nonconforming uses. Municipalities should also consider large residential lots that would be susceptible to subdivision and redevelopment.



## Clarke Caton Hintz

The Township's July 2017 revised VLA Report included farmland in its analysis. With the exception of one farmland assessed parcel, which I address in the subsequent section of this report, the Township appropriately considered agricultural sites in its RDP analysis.

The Rockaway River Country Club, a golf course in the northeast part of the Township, is outside of the Sewer Service Area and is member-owned. Therefore, it should not generate an RDP.

FSHC recommended that the Township look at residential parcels having two or more acres in area. I analyzed residential properties fitting into this category and found that most of them are not appropriate for inclusionary development due to being outside of the sewer service area, being near incompatible uses, and having constraints that make them inappropriate for development. The few large residential lots that I have considered appropriate to generate an RDP are nearby the NJ Route 10 corridor, the downtown, or the NJ Transit commuter train stations, or are along roads that can accommodate multi-family development.

- **Minimum Presumptive Density:** All three parties argued that the Township should have applied a range of RDP densities to developable sites to calculate an RDP rather than universally applying the minimum presumptive 6 du/ac density across the whole Township. COAH intended for municipalities to apply higher densities in areas that are more suitable for multi-family development. I agree that the Township should have utilized higher densities in areas that are proximate to Denville's downtown area, the two NJ Transit commuter rail stations, and the Route 10 commercial corridor, as well as relatively unconstrained by environmental factors. In a limited number of cases, increasing density may result in the calculation of RDP from lots as small as half an acre.
- **ROSI Open Space:** The parties identified open space parcels that the Township excluded from generating an RDP. The majority of those identified by Ms. Cofone are listed on the Township's Recreational and Open Space Inventory ("ROSI"), rendering them protected from development. FSHC identified two sites (Block 31001, Lot 31, and Block 11101, Lot 3) that the Township excluded due to having been "purchased for open space" or "purchased through Green Acres," but which are not listed on the ROSI. FSHC recommended that the Township provide an explanation for the exclusion of a few sites that did not appear on the ROSI. Mr. Kasler has communicated to me by way of email that the sites identified received ROSI funding. One site identified by Ms. Cofone, at Block 21301, Lot 5.02 was not listed on the ROSI, but is listed in the Township's Environmental Resources Inventory, which is sufficient to permit its exclusion, according to *N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2(e)*. It should also be noted that any designated open space or recreation parcels that existed in the Township at the time that the Township received Green Acres



Clarke Caton Hintz

funding are considered by Green Acres to be preserved open space, even if they are not listed on the ROSI.

- Deed Restriction: FSHC argues that the Township inappropriately excluded a farm assessed parcel (Block 11202, Lot 7) from the RDP because it was recently subdivided and has a deed restriction that prohibits further subdivision of the lot. I believe that the site was excluded from generating an RDP due to its deed restriction, rather than its recent subdivision. The section of COAH's rules that allows for generating RDP from sites with low-intensity uses emphasizes the likelihood that a site would be redeveloped if inclusionary zoning was in place. A deed restriction would render redevelopment unlikely.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

---

I have reviewed the Township's VLA Report, and considered the comments and recommendations provided by the intervenor-defendants and by FSHC, and I have analyzed the Township's vacant and developable lands in accordance with *N.J.A.C. 5:93-4.2*. I have determined that the Township's VLA Report, as revised through July 18, 2017, is generally consistent with the Second Round rules, but that it did not sufficiently consider the opportunity for development densities greater than 6 du/ac or the potential for large single-family lots to be redeveloped as inclusionary multi-family housing, and did not calculate steep slope encumbrance in accordance with its own steep-slope ordinance, as required by the Second Round rules.

Taking these factors into consideration leads to the calculation of an additional 122.3-unit RDP from 37 parcels that were not considered in the Township's analysis, based on the following steps:

- I have analyzed vacant, privately owned parcels smaller than 0.84 acres and applied RDP densities as high as 12 du/ac.
- I have calculated steep-slope encumbered acreage in accordance with the Township's steep-slope ordinance.
- I have also considered residential lots having two or more acres that are within the sewer service area and are "suitable" according to the definition in *N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3*.
- I have calculated an RDP from the Lennar property based on a net density of 10 du/ac.

A table listing the 37 parcels identified in this analysis is attached as an exhibit to this letter.

Additionally, I revisited the Township's VLA Report and calculated an additional 17.1-unit RDP from the following sites that were considered in the Township's analysis:



**Clarke Caton Hintz**

1. The VLA Report includes a 10-unit RDP on the proposed Glenmont Commons site (Block 10002, Lot 3), which reflects the actual number of units proposed. Mr. Kantowitz, for 382 Franklin Avenue, noted in his August 24, 2017 letter that the effective RDP density of that site was only 4.35 du/ac (10 affordable units ÷ 20% = 50 total units ÷ 11.5 net acres (out of 13.5 gross acres) = 4.35 du/ac).  
  
I recalculated the site's RDP based on COAH's required minimum 6 du/ac density. Additionally, my analysis shows that only approximately 0.2 of the 13.5 gross acres on the site are actually environmentally constrained, as opposed to the 2 acres calculated by the Township. As such, I have recalculated the RDP at this site based on 13.3 net acres and a 6 du/ac density, yielding a 15.96 unit RDP. **Net increase of 5.96 units.**
2. I have also recalculated the 8.9-unit RDP on the 382 Franklin Avenue site using a density of 10 du/ac instead of 6 du/ac. This yields an RDP of 14.84 units. **Net increase of 5.94 units.**
3. The Township eliminated Block 30805, Lot 35, a farmland assessed parcel, due to steep slopes. I find that there are minimal steep slopes. As such, I recommend that the RDP be calculated at 6 du/ac on the lot's full 2.07 acres to yield a 3.5-unit RDP. **Net increase of 3.5 units.**
4. The Township calculates a 3.6-unit RDP based on a 6.76 du/ac density from the 2.66-acre parcel known as 3150 Route 10 (Block 20801, Lot 26) owned by Vision Properties. The site should generate an RDP at a 10 du/ac density, which would yield a 5.3-unit RDP. **Net increase of 1.7 units (5.3 - 3.6 = 1.7)**

In summary, I recommend that the Township's RDP should be calculated at 277.4 units.

<b>Recommended Revised RDP of 277.4 units</b>	
	138 units calculated by the Township
+	122.3 calculated from 2+ acre residential lots, Lennar site, and vacant lots < 0.84 acres
+	5.96 net additional units from Glenmont Commons
+	5.94 net additional units from 382 Franklin Road
+	3.5 net additional units from Block 30805, Lot 35
+	1.7 net additional units from 3150 Route 10
<b>=</b>	<b>277.4 RDP units</b>



**Clarke Caton Hintz**

It is worth noting that inclusion of a property in the Township's RDP is not necessarily an endorsement of the property for actual development of affordable housing, nor is the Township required to use any of the sites listed in the RDP as a mechanism for addressing its fair share obligation.

Upon conclusively determining the Township's RDP, the Township will need to prepare a plan that addresses the RDP and the Unmet Need in accordance with *N.J.A.C. 5:93* and Your Honor's orders.

Please let me know if Your Honor or counsel have questions or requests for additional information concerning this report.

Sincerely,

Philip B. Caton, PP, FAICP

Cc: Edward J. Buzak, Esq.  
Henry Kent Smith, Esq.  
Jeffrey Kantowitz, Esq.  
Irina B. Elgart, Esq.  
Josh Bauers, Esq.  
Jason L. Kasler, PP, AICP  
Christine A. Nazzaro-Cofone, PP, AICP  
Art Bernard, PP

W:\5000's\Court Master Towns\Morris County\5041 Denville\170912 Denville VLA Letter Draft 2.docx

Block	Lot	Address	Owner	Use Type	Gross Acres (GIS Calculated)	Developable Acres Step 1	Developable Acres Step 2	Total Developable Acreage	Density	RDP
11201	3	888 MILLER RD	BICHKOVSKAJA, ALINA	RESIDENTIAL	3.22	2.33	0.32	2.65	8	4.24
20801	4	385 FRANKLIN RD	VISION PROPERTIES OF DENVILLE,LLC	RESIDENTIAL	15.25	10.17	1.66	11.84	12	28.41
20901	4	316 PALMER RD	MARICONDA, FRANK/ROSANA	RESIDENTIAL	2.05	1.61	0.19	1.80	6	2.16
20901	9.01	367 FRANKLIN RD	DOLCE, ROBERT S	RESIDENTIAL	2.16	1.63	0.19	1.83	6	2.92
21101	12	77 COOPER RD	LINDSTROM, KENNETH G JR/LISA H	RESIDENTIAL	4.13	0.71	0.64	1.35	8	2.16
30101	1	318 FRANKLIN RD	M & T BANK	RESIDENTIAL	6.82	5.16	0.18	5.34	6	6.40
30101	11	72 COOPER RD	TRILIVAS, KIMBERLY	RESIDENTIAL	2.04	1.28	0.16	1.44	6	1.73
30101	12	68 COOPER RD	PATENAUDE, PAUL R/DOINA G ENE-	RESIDENTIAL	2.83	1.38	0.46	1.85	6	2.21
30101	13	66 COOPER RD	POMERANCE, MICHAEL/KIMMERLY	RESIDENTIAL	2.62	2.10	0.15	2.26	6	2.71
30101	14	64 COOPER RD	VANGLAHN, RICHARD/MARGARET	RESIDENTIAL	3.65	3.44	0.10	3.54	8	5.67
30101	3	328 FRANKLIN RD	FULLERTON, SCOTT/SANDRA	RESIDENTIAL	5.24	3.68	0.03	3.70	8	5.93
30101	4	330 FRANKLIN RD	MARSH, GLENN H/CARLA PINNELLI-	RESIDENTIAL	2.93	1.72	0.09	1.81	8	2.90
30101	5	332 FRANKLIN RD	THOMPSON, BRIAN M	RESIDENTIAL	3.01	1.56	0.14	1.70	8	2.72
30101	6	334 FRANKLIN RD	FELDMAN, JEFFREY H	RESIDENTIAL	2.90	1.76	0.04	1.80	8	2.89
30101	9	80 COOPER RD	LATTARI/WARZECHA, PHILIP M/KARIN R	RESIDENTIAL	4.36	1.63	0.08	1.70	8	2.72
30501	17.01	48 LACKAWANNA AVE	JOHNSON, GORDON H/LINDA M	RESIDENTIAL	2.33	0.53	0.25	0.78	8	1.25
30501	18	44 LACKAWANNA AVE	SHAH/SHAH, HITESH & GUNJAN H/PUSHPA	RESIDENTIAL	2.72	0.44	0.33	0.77	8	1.23
30501	26	12 LACKAWANNA AVE	MANCUSO/RICHTER, SALVATRICA A/ROBER	RESIDENTIAL	3.27	0.82	0.43	1.24	10	2.49

Block	Lot	Address	Owner	Use Type	Gross Acres (GIS Calculated)	Developable Acres Step 1	Developable Acres Step 2	Total Developable Acreage	Density	RDP
30501	32	5 PATNODE RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	0.54	0.35	0.09	0.44	10	0.89
30501	33	1 HIGHVIEW RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	0.24	0.24	0.00	0.24	10	0.48
30501	34	5 HIGHVIEW RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	0.28	0.27	0.01	0.27	10	0.55
30501	37	9 HIGHVIEW RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	0.25	0.10	0.03	0.13	10	0.26
30607	15	6 HIGHVIEW RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	1.08	0.63	0.22	0.86	10	1.71
30607	17	3 PATNODE RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	0.68	0.51	0.04	0.56	10	1.12
30611	1	25 THURMONT RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	7.56	3.02	0.94	3.95	10	7.90
30611	2	21 THURMONT RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	RESIDENTIAL	0.72	0.45	0.12	0.57	10	1.13
30611	3	19 THURMONT RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	RESIDENTIAL	1.16	0.51	0.13	0.64	10	1.27
30611	4	23 THURMONT RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	VACANT	2.43	1.54	0.35	1.89	10	3.78
30611	5	2 THURMONT RD	BLOOMFIELD L&M PARTNERS LP	NON-RES.	1.07	0.43	0.12	0.56	10	1.11
<b>Lennar Subtotal</b>					<b>16.02</b>	<b>8.05</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>10.10</b>		<b>20.20</b>
30802	15	5 DRUID WOOD RD	APSLEY, GEORGE E	RESIDENTIAL	3.08	1.98	0.39	2.37	8	3.79
30802	6	18 COOPER RD	RESNICK/RESNICK, SUSAN/HARRIS&MURIE	RESIDENTIAL	3.21	1.59	0.24	1.83	8	2.92
50501	14	17 MORRIS AVE	DANBURY, ROBERT/KATHERINE	RESIDENTIAL	3.04	1.21	0.21	1.42	8	2.28
51102	12	109 POCONO RD	KEARNEY, TERRENCE Q/DOLORES M	RESIDENTIAL	2.10	2.08	0.00	2.08	6	3.33
51102	13	103 POCONO RD	REDMOND, NILS/GEORGIA	RESIDENTIAL	2.10	1.79	0.09	1.87	6	3.00

Block	Lot	Address	Owner	Use Type	Gross Acres (GIS Calculated)	Developable Acres Step 1	Developable Acres Step 2	Total Developable Acreage	Density	RDP
60101	25	26 MORRIS AVE	DEDERBECK, FRANK W/MARGARET A	RESIDENTIAL	2.17	1.92	0.11	2.02	6	2.43
60801	1	196 MORRIS AVE	ZHANG, XIANGHUI	RESIDENTIAL	2.34	1.12	0.41	1.53	6	1.83
61601	7	17-21 DOCK RD	8 DOCK ROAD, LLC	RESIDENTIAL	2.47	0.54	0.58	1.11	8	1.78
<b>Total</b>					<b>108.05</b>	<b>62.21</b>	<b>9.53</b>	<b>71.74</b>		<b>122.30</b>

Note: The 122.3-unit RDP reflected in this table is generated from sites that were excluded from the Township's analysis due to having existing development or having fewer than 0.84 developable acres. When combined with the Township's RDP of 138 units and the 17.1 units from revisions to RDP assignments by the Township, the total RDP is 277.4 units.

Key

Developable Acres Step 1: Gross Acres minus net acres constrained by wetlands, 100-year flood zones, and Steep-Slopes

Developable Acres Step 2: Step 1 Acres + developable portion of Steep-Slope encumbered acres according to the Township's Steep-Slope Ordinance