

**BOROUGH  
OF  
PEAPACK AND GLADSTONE**

**SOMERSET COUNTY  
NEW JERSEY**

---

**MASTER PLAN  
AND DEVELOPMENT  
REGULATIONS PERIODIC  
REEXAMINATION REPORT**

**October 16, 2014**

**Amended January 29, 2015**

---

PREPARED BY COPPOLA & COPPOLA ASSOCIATES  
Pennington ~ New Jersey

**BOROUGH  
OF  
PEAPACK AND  
GLADSTONE  
SOMERSET COUNTY  
NEW JERSEY**

**MASTER PLAN  
AND DEVELOPMENT  
REGULATIONS PERIODIC  
REEXAMINATION REPORT**

THE ORIGINAL OF THIS REPORT WAS SIGNED AND SEALED  
IN ACCORDANCE WITH N.J.S.A. 45:14A-12

PREPARED BY COPPOLA & COPPOLA ASSOCIATES  
Pennington ~ New Jersey

*I, John P. Szabo, Jr., PP, AICP hereby certify that I have read this document in its entirety, reviewed same with the Land Use Board of the Borough of Peapack and Gladstone and agree with the contents and recommendations contained herein adopted by the Board on January 29, 2015.*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
*John P. Szabo, Jr., PP, AICP #3445*

BOROUGH OF PEAPACK AND GLADSTONE  
 MASTER PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS  
 PERIODIC REEXAMINATION REPORT  
 October 16,2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PEAPACK AND GLADSTONE BOROUGH	1
THE BOROUGH'S CURRENT MASTER PLAN DOCUMENTS	2
1996 Master Plan	2
Combined Conservation And Recreation Plan Elements	2
Environmental Resources Inventory (NRI) - 2004	2
Master Plan And Development Regulations Periodic Reexamination And Land Use Plan Update Report	3
Supplemental Report No. 1 To The Master Plan And Development Regulations Periodic Reexamination And Land Use Plan Update Report	3
Housing Plan Element And Fair Share Plan & Fair Share Plan Addendum	4
Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan Update –2010	4
Open Space And Recreation Plan Update –2011	4
THE PURPOSE & REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REEXAMINATION REPORT	4
THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PEAPACK AND GLADSTONE MASTER PLAN, THEIR STATUS AND RECOMMENDED MASTER PLAN AND ORDINANCE CHANGES	5
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES	24
ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED ORDINANCE MODIFICATION	25
RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE STUDY	26
RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE INCORPORATION OF REDEVELOPMENT PLANS	27
BRIEF SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	27

# **BOROUGH OF PEAPACK AND GLADSTONE MASTER PLAN AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS PERIODIC REEXAMINATION REPORT**

**October 16, 2014  
Amended and Adopted January 29, 2015**

## **BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF PEAPACK AND GLADSTONE BOROUGH**

The Borough of Peapack and Gladstone is located in the northern end of Somerset County, along the Somerset County/Morris County border, and contains approximately 5.9 square miles, or 3,776 acres of land. The Borough shares common boundaries with the Townships of Chester and Mendham in Morris County to the north and with the Township of Bedminster and the Boroughs of Far Hills and Bernardsville in Somerset County to the west, south and east.

In addition to the municipal boundaries, the Borough of Peapack and Gladstone has the natural boundary of the North Branch of the Raritan River along its east and southeast borders, which separates the Borough from the Boroughs of Bernardsville and Far Hills. Together with the Peapack Brook, the presence of the Raritan River is significant, because it affects the environmental attributes of many of the land areas within the Borough.

The municipality is traversed from north to south by U.S. Route 206 and Main Street (County Route 512). Main Street continues northward as County Route 671 (Old Chester Road), and County Route 512 becomes Portersville Road as it turns to the west. Mendham Road (County Route 647) traverses the Borough of Peapack and Gladstone from the north towards the south, intersecting with Main Street (County Route 512). Additionally, County Route 661 (Holland Avenue) runs east-west to connect U.S. Route 206 with Main Street (County Route 512).

Fowler Road, a local road, follows most of the western municipal boundary line with Bedminster Township. Other local roads, such as Mosle Road and Branch Road, continue into adjacent municipalities. Willow Avenue crosses the North Branch of the Raritan River to the east into the Borough of Far Hills.

The Borough of Peapack and Gladstone is a diverse municipality, with very different types and concentrations of land uses, which, together, create a community that benefits from its diversity. In addition to the historic villages of "Peapack" and "Gladstone", the Borough contains rural, wooded and agricultural expanses, as well as more traditional suburban type development.

Additionally, the Borough of Peapack and Gladstone contains a wide variety of housing, from historic homes in the historic villages, to townhomes and apartment flats also in the historic villages, to more contemporary and larger homes outside the villages, to farmsteads and estates in the rural land areas. The Peapack and Gladstone Borough officials are appropriately proactive in managing the growth of the Borough in order to achieve a balanced development pattern which enhances the quality of life for all of the residents of the Borough.

## **THE BOROUGH'S CURRENT MASTER PLAN DOCUMENTS**

### **1996 Master Plan**

The comprehensive Master Plan document of Peapack and Gladstone was adopted by the Land Use Board on December 18, 1996. The 1996 Master Plan contains the following elements as required or permitted in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:550-28 of the Municipal Land Use Law:

- A "Statement of Objectives, Principles, Assumptions, Policies and Standards";
- A "Land Use Plan Element";
- A "Circulation Plan Element";
- A "Utility Plan Element";
- A "Conservation Plan Element";
- An "Historic Preservation Plan Element";
- A "Recycling Plan Element"; and
- A "Statement" indicating the compatibility of the Borough's Plan with the plans of other jurisdictions.

The 1996 Master Plan was amended on February 3, 1999 to include some relatively minor modifications and changes which emanated from the public hearing process on the 1996 Master Plan.

### **Combined Conservation And Recreation Plan Elements**

On May 1, 2002, the Borough's Land Use Board adopted a "Combined Conservation And Recreation Plan Elements" document.

- The document built upon and updated the information gathered, mapped and analyzed within the 1996 "Conservation Plan Element";
- The document added a "Recreation Plan Element" to the Borough's Master Plan; and
- The document incorporated the "Open Space and Recreation Plan" (OSRP), previously prepared during May 2001 by the Borough's Open Space Advisory Committee, into the Borough's Master Plan.

### **Environmental Resources Inventory (NRI) - 2004**

This report was prepared by the Upper Raritan Watershed Association under the direction of the Peapack & Gladstone Environmental Commission.

Master Plan And Development Regulations Periodic Reexamination And Land Use Plan Update Report

On February 16, 2005, a "Master Plan And Development Regulations Periodic Reexamination And Land Use Plan Update Report" was adopted by the Land Use Board.

- As recommended in the "Combined Conservation And Recreation Plan Elements" document, the report narrowed the "Village Community Boundary" line relative to that which had been adopted in the 1996 Master Plan. More specifically, the boundary line now only includes those lands east of the railroad zoned within the Borough's "VN", "R-11" and "R-18" zoning districts.
- The report also recommended the elimination of both the "R-6" and the "R-2A" zoning districts because the subject land areas were no longer developable under the zoning regulations, and they were subsequently eliminated via ordinance by the governing body.
- The report added two (2) additional "goals and objectives" of the Borough's Master Plan; one (#29) regarded lighting and the other (#30) regarded noise.
- The report recommended and the governing body subsequently amended the Land Development Ordinance provisions to permit the Land Use Board to approve accessory barn structures and garages to be as high as twenty feet (20'), provided that public notice of the requested approval was given to all property owners within two hundred feet (200') of the subject property, and subject to certain design requirements.
- The report acknowledged a request that a portion of the Essex Hunt Club and Essex Fox Hounds property be provided public sewerage service, but no recommendation was made because additional data and analyses were necessary and, to date, have not been provided.
- The report also acknowledged a request for the rezoning of the property owned by T. Leonard & Pamela Hill within the "R-2" zoning district along Pottersville Road, but no recommendation was made because additional information was needed. Subsequently, the additional information was provided and the Land Use Board, after a public hearing process, voted on July 6, 2005 not to recommend the requested rezoning.

Supplemental Report No.1 To The Master Plan And Development Regulations Periodic Reexamination And Land Use Plan Update Report

On February 16, 2005, the Land Use Board adopted a "Supplemental Report No. 1 To The Master Plan And Development Regulations Periodic Reexamination And Land Use Plan Update Report.

- The report specifically considered a request by Peapack Residential Associates, LLC, that the Borough permit the construction of a luxury age-restricted community on certain lands within the "ORL" and "RR-5" zoning districts on the west side of Route 206 as an optional development alternative.
- The report concluded that the construction of an age-restricted housing development on the subject lands would have less adverse impacts upon the road network, infrastructural needs, the environment, the Borough's then potential affordable housing obligations, etc., than would result if the lands were developed in accordance with the underlying "ORL" zoning.
- Therefore the report recommended that the requested zoning change be implemented, and the governing body subsequently amended the zoning provisions accordingly.

#### **Housing Plan Element And Fair Share Plan & Fair Share Plan Addendum**

The Land Use Board adopted a "Housing Plan Element And Fair Share Plan", dated November 20, 2008, and a "Fair Share Plan Addendum", dated August 24, 2009.

- Both documents were submitted to the New Jersey Council On Affordable Housing (COAH) as required in order for the "Fair Share Plan" to be approved by COAH and for the Borough to be granted "Substantive Certification".
- COAH granted "Substantive Certification" on August 25, 2009 and the Borough became one of only 68 of the 565 municipalities in New Jersey to have had its "Fair Share Plan" so approved under the then prevailing 3<sup>rd</sup> round COAH rules.

#### **Comprehensive Farmland Preservation Plan Update - 2010**

This report was prepared by The Land Conservancy of New Jersey with the Borough of Peapack & Gladstone Agricultural Advisory Committee.

#### **Open Space And Recreation Plan Update -2011**

This report was prepared by The Land Conservancy of New Jersey with the Borough of Peapack & Gladstone Open Space Advisory Committee.

### **THE PURPOSE & REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REEXAMINATION REPORT**

It is the purpose of report to reexamine the currently adopted elements of the Peapack and Gladstone Master Plan as well as the implementing Land Development ordinance provisions. Such a reexamination is required by the Municipal Land Use Law to be accomplished every ten (10) years; in the case of Peapack and Gladstone Borough, the due date for the adoption of this report is February 16, 2015.

In accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89 of the Municipal Land Use Law, the reexamination report must address the following five (5) items:

- "a. The major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last reexamination report."
- "b. The extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have been increased subsequent to such date."
- "c. The extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies and objectives forming the basis for the master plan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density and distribution of population and land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of natural resources, energy conservation, collection, dispositions and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in State, county and municipal policies and objectives."
- "d. The specific changes recommended for the master plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared."
- "e. The recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment plans adopted pursuant to the "Local Redevelopment and Housing Law", P.L. 1992, c. 79 (C.40A:12A-1 et al.) into the land use plan element of the municipal master plan, and recommended changes, if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the municipality."

**THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE  
PEAPACK AND GLADSTONE MASTER PLAN, THEIR STATUS  
& RECOMMENDED MASTER PLAN AND ORDINANCE CHANGES**

The Municipal Land Use Law, enacted by the State Legislature on January 14, 1976, empowers municipal governments with the right to control the development of the lands within their bounds. N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2 of the Municipal Land Use Law, as amended, lists fifteen (15) general purposes regarding the local planning process, which are as follows and which must be supported by a municipality which chooses to plan and zone under the authority of the Municipal Land Use Law:

- "a. To encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of lands in this State, in a manner which will promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare;



- b. To secure safety from fire, flood, panic and other natural and manmade disasters;
- c. To provide adequate light, air and open space;
- d. To ensure that the development of individual municipalities does not conflict with the development and general welfare of neighboring municipalities, the county and the State as a whole;
- e. To promote the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities and regions and preservation of the environment;
- f. To encourage the appropriate and efficient expenditure of public funds by the coordination of public development with land use policies;
- g. To provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of agricultural, residential, recreational, commercial and industrial uses and open space, both public and private, according to their respective environmental requirements in order to meet the needs of all New Jersey citizens;
- h. To encourage the location and design of transportation routes which will promote the free flow of traffic while discouraging location of such facilities and routes which result in congestion or blight;
- i. To promote a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques and good civic design and arrangements;
- J. To promote the conservation of historic sites and districts, open space, energy resources and valuable natural resources in the State and to prevent urban sprawl and degradation of the environment through improper use of land;
- k. To encourage planned unit developments which incorporate the best features of design and relate the type, design and layout of residential, commercial, industrial and recreational development of the particular site;
- l. To encourage senior citizen community housing construction;
- m. To encourage the coordination of the various public and private procedures and activities shaping land development with a view of lessening the cost of such development and to the more efficient use of land;
- n. To promote utilization of renewable energy sources; and

- o. To promote the maximum practicable recovery and recycling of recyclable materials from municipal solid waste through the use of planning practices designed to incorporate the State Recycling Plan goals and to compliment municipal recycling programs.<sup>11</sup>

Consistent with the preceding general purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law, the Borough of Peapack and Gladstone has extrapolated certain specific objectives and goals for its future development and land preservation. Specifically, the 1996 Master Plan set forth twenty-eight (28) "Goals And Objectives" for the master planning of the Borough, and two (2) additional ones (i.e., #29 & #30) were added as part of the 2005 "Reexamination Report".

The following are the currently adopted thirty (30) Master Plan goals and objectives with comments and recommendations regarding them as a result of the discussions among the members of the Master Plan Reexamination Committee (MPRC):

- "1. To protect the low density rural character of the Borough in appropriate areas."

Comments

The MPRC noted that this goal and objective is an overriding one which also is the aim of other adopted goals and objectives and should be maintained.

- "2. To preserve the high quality scenic and historic character of the Villages of Peapack and Gladstone."

Comments

The MPRC felt that this goal and objective is being achieved, but that it always will require constant attention.

- "3. To narrowly limit the areas of higher density, residential development (one acre or less) in areas appropriate for such development."<sup>11</sup>

Comments

The MPRC noted that the "Combined Conservation And Recreation Plan Elements" document, which was adopted by the Land Use Board on May 1, 2002, narrowed the "Village Community Boundary" line relative to that which had been adopted in the 1996 Master Plan.

The new "Village Community Boundary" line, which also is shown on a map in the 2005 "Reexamination Report", limits the boundary to include only those lands east of the railroad zoned within the Borough's "VN", "R-11" and "R-18" zoning districts.

The MPRC agreed that the new demarcation more accurately reflects the extent of the "Peapack" and "Gladstone" village areas and makes it clear that the Borough does not intend to expand the area of the "Village Community" or increase the densities of the "VN", "R-11" and/or the "R-18" zoning districts.

"4. To protect the low density areas from suburban intrusion."

Comments

In this regard, the MPRC noted that the 2005 "Reexamination Report" identified three (3) properties east of the "Village Community" which are zoned within the "RR-1" zoning district. Two of these properties are located just east of School Street and the municipal complex. The third property is located to the east of, and against the rear yards, of homes fronting on Tainter Street.

The "RR-1" zoning district permits the development of single-family detached dwellings on lots at least one (1) acre in size. The reason that the zoning of these three (3) properties were reexamined is that they directly border lands to the east which are within the "RR-5" zoning district. The "RR-5" zoning district permits the development of single-family detached dwellings on lots at least three (3) acres in size provided, however, that the density of development cannot exceed 0.2 dwelling units per acre. Therefore, the average required lot size for development within the "RR-5" zoning district is five (5) acres.

The reexamination of the zoning of these three (3) properties substantiated and reaffirmed that the current "RR-1" zoning is appropriate for the following reasons:

- a) The properties are included in the sewer service area;
- b) One of the lots borders existing development in the "RR-1" zoning district as well as the municipal complex west of School Street;
- c) Another of the lots borders the municipal complex west of School Street as well as lands on the north side of Willow Avenue which are zoned within the "R-18" zoning district and have been so developed. The "R-18" zoning district permits the construction of single-family detached dwellings on 18,000 square foot lots; and

- d) Another of the lots is bordered on two (2) sides by lands zoned within the "R-18" zoning district and on a third side by lands zoned within the "RR-2" zoning district. These lands have been developed in accordance with the respective zoning district regulations.

Summarily, because of the zoning and development of adjacent properties and the fact that the subject properties are within the sewer service area, they were viewed as "transitional" lots between the "Village Community" to the west and the rural portions of the Borough to the east, and the "RR-1" zoning of the properties was deemed to be appropriate.

Nevertheless, the MPRC discussed and understood that the lands within both the "RE" Rural Estate and the "RR-5" Rural Residential zoning districts could be subdivided for single-family detached home development in accordance with the applicable ordinance provisions at a density of ldu/10ac in the "RE" district and ldu/5ac in the "RR-5" district.

- "5. To discourage infrastructure extension into and through areas intended for large lot development."

Comments

During 2012, the Borough Sewer Planning Committee worked with Somerset County to provide input into the process of delineating updated "Future Wastewater Service Area (FWSA) Boundaries". During January 2013, the NJ Department of Environmental Protection adopted a "Future Wastewater Sewer Service Areas" map.

As a result of consultation with the Borough Engineer, the MPRC agreed that no changes to the wastewater service area boundaries are warranted or desired and that no additional studies or analyses need be prepared at this time.

- "6. To adopt design and siting standards to protect the Borough's historic and rural character."

Discussion

The MPRC agreed that this goal and objective is very general and no specific need for any changes to the implementing ordinance provisions were identified at this time.

"7. To maintain a stable tax base."

Discussion

While what is meant by the term "stable tax base" is difficult to define, the MPRC agreed that the current ordinance provisions of the Borough should be revised to increase the opportunity for appropriate development that not only will be an asset to the residents of the Borough but also will add to the municipal tax base.

The recommendations of the MPRC include the following modifications and additions to the Borough's existing ordinance provisions:

***The "VN" Village Neighborhood Zone***

The current "VN" ordinance provisions contain two (2) permitted uses which require clarification; one of these is the "Mixed use buildings" use and the other is the "Conversion of existing buildings and vacant lots..." conditional use.

More specifically, the "Mixed use buildings" permitted use is undefined as to its meaning, so it is not possible to know what specific uses are permitted within the building. Therefore, the MPRC recommends that the wording be expanded to read as follows:

"Mixed use buildings, with a combination of personal service facilities and retail uses catering to the residential population of the Borough such as beauty and barber shops, travel agencies, florists, wine and liquor stores, restaurants, real estate offices, travel agencies, medical and general offices and financial institutions, provided that no drive-through window is permitted for any use, and provided further that residential apartments shall be permitted where appropriate.

Site plan review and approval by the Land Use Board shall be required in order to insure that the following requirements are satisfied:

- (a) The architectural design of the building is consistent with the existing building facades along Main Street;
- (b) Adequate on-street parking exists and/or adequate off-street parking is provided;

- (c) No parking shall be located between the building and Main Street;
- (d) The building shall have gable, mansard or other similarly pitched roof lines; and
- (e) The visual character of the building, including its entryways, windows and doors, shall be oriented to pedestrian access from the sidewalk along Main Street."

Given this recommended rewording of the "Mixed use buildings" land use, the MPRC also recommends that the conditional use references to the "Conversion of existing buildings and vacant lots..." in Subsections 23-39.6 d.1. and 23-40.10 b.7. of the ordinance provisions be deleted.

***The "LI" Office Research/Light Industrial Zone***

The MPRC noted that there is a single location in the Borough of the "LI" zoning district, that location being along Holland Avenue which includes the Peapack train station. Most of the land area, approximately 23 acres in area west of the railway line and identified as Block 20/Lot 11 on the Borough Tax Maps, currently is occupied by the Komline-Sanderson company, which develops, designs and manufactures equipment for industrial process/production applications, industrial and municipal wastewater treatment plants and flue gas treatment.

In order to be proactive regarding the potential redevelopment of the property at a future date, the MPRC recommends that an "Age-Restricted Inclusionary Housing Development" be permitted as an optional development alternative on the approximately 23 acre land area. Such zoning provisions in many ways would be similar to those existing ordinance provisions governing the development of "Age-Restricted Residential Housing Communities" on certain lands west of U.S. Route 206, but in other ways would be significantly different, such as the following:

- Each lot would be a minimum of 4,500 square feet in area and a maximum 6,000 square feet in area, provided that the size of all the lots averaged a minimum of 5,000 square feet in area.
- The maximum density would be three (3) dwelling units per gross acre of land.

- Approximately fifteen percent (15%) of the total number of permitted units would be affordable units in accordance with the prevailing affordable housing rules.
- All units would be detached dwelling units with attached garages, provided that the developer could opt for the affordable units to be within two-family side-by-side buildings, preferably located on corner lots so that the driveway leading to the attached garage for each of the units would be along one of the two frontage streets.

***A New "CC" Community Commercial Zone***

The MPRC recommends that a new "CC" Community Commercial zoning district be located on two (2) land areas along U.S. Route 206, including the following:

Land Area #1 = 7.583± Acres

This land area is comprised of two (2) adjacent lots on the west side of U.S. Route 206. The northern lot (Block 33/Lot 16) is occupied by the American Legion Somerset Hills Post 216 and currently is zoned within the "RR-5" district. The southern lot (Block 33/Lot 15) is occupied by the Elks club and currently is zoned within the "ORL" district.

Land Area #2 = 5.44± Acres

This land area is a single lot (Block 31/Lot 6) on the east side of U.S. Route 206 south of Holland Avenue and Maple Street. The lot is occupied by a Sunoco gas station with a convenience store, as well as additional unrelated uses elsewhere on the property, and is zoned within the "RR-1" district.

As the name implies, the purpose of the "CC" Community Commercial zoning district would be to provide retail sales and service uses for the residents of the Borough as well as to the people travelling along U.S. Route 206.

However, unlike a "highway commercial" zoning district, which generally permits relatively large shopping center buildings and large individual uses, including gas service stations and new car dealerships, the proposed "CC" district would limit the permitted uses and, even

more importantly, would limit the maximum size of individual buildings in order to create an appearance not resembling a conventional shopping center or a large individual use out of character with the existing appearance of the U.S. Route 206 streetscape within the Borough.

More particularly, the MPRC recommends that the new "CC" district permit uses such as the retail sales of goods and services; banks and pharmacies, with or without drive through windows; offices and office buildings, and animal hospitals for small animals, excluding outside facilities and kennels.

Regarding the design of buildings within the "CC" district, the overall goal is to promote a village atmosphere of relatively small buildings clustered in a pedestrian oriented, nonlinear layout, and to that end, the following building and site design requirements are recommended by the MPRC:

- No individual building shall exceed twenty thousand (20,000) square feet in area, although more than one (1) building shall be permitted within a development;
- Covered walkways between buildings may be constructed to enable pedestrian circulation between buildings, and the walkways shall be excluded from the calculations for building and lot coverage;
- The architectural treatment of the front facade of all buildings shall be continued in its major features around all visibly exposed sides of the building;
- Long, monotonous, uninterrupted roof planes shall not be permitted. Instead, rooflines that mix flat and pitched components shall be required and shall include roof-line offsets, dormers and/or gables; and
- Parking shall be evenly distributed throughout the development, with pedestrian connections between buildings and to all public areas within the development, and large parking lots shall be avoided wherever possible.



"8. To meet the Borough's affordable housing obligations."

Discussion

It was noted by the MPRC that Peapack and Gladstone is one of only 68 of the 565 municipalities in New Jersey to have had its affordable housing "Fair Share Plan" approved by the New Jersey Council On Affordable Housing (COAH) under the then prevailing 3rd round rules.

However, new regulations to govern municipal affordable housing obligations from 2014 to 2024 have been proposed by COAH and were published in the June 2, 2014 New Jersey Register.

The proposed regulations have three (3) components and the currently proposed number of affordable units obligated to the Borough of Peapack and Gladstone are as follows:

Rehabilitation Component:	0 units
Prospective Need Component:	26 units
Unanswered Prior Round Component:	99 units

There are many unanswered questions regarding the proposed regulations. However, rules are expected to be adopted by COAH on October 22, 2014, with changes to the June 2nd rules as a result of written comments forwarded to COAR and oral comments stated to COAH at a July 2nd public hearing. Written comments were forwarded to COAH, the League of Municipalities and the Somerset County Planning Board by Mayor William Horton on behalf of the Borough on July 14, 2014.

No matter what rules are adopted by COAH, the MPRC recommends that nothing further regarding the new rules or the Borough's reaction to those rules be included in this "Reexamination Report", because, at a future date, a separate "Fair Share Plan" document will need to be prepared and adopted by the Borough Land Use Board as an amendment to the Master Plan.

"9. To address the Borough's recreation and open space needs."

Discussion

The MPRC recommends that the adopted 2011 Open Space And Recreation Plan Update be reviewed by the Borough's Open Space Advisory Committee (OSAC) to determine whether any additions and/or updates should be included in the Borough's Master Plan at a future date.

"10. To incorporate environmental performance standards (e.g. steep slopes, limestone, etc.) into the Borough Land Development Ordinance."<sup>11</sup>

Comments

The MPRC noted that these and other environmental performance standards already have been incorporated into the Borough's ordinance provisions and no additional such standards were identified to be needed at this time.

"11. To provide flexibility in development design standards to specifically encourage very low density development."

Comments

The MPRC noted that flexible design standards already have been included in the Borough's ordinance provisions for both the "RE" and the "RR-5" rural zoning districts including, but not limited to, the following:

- a) Requiring only 50 feet of frontage on a public street, and requiring no frontage on a public street for lots utilizing common driveways; and
- b) Not including the portions of driveways which extend beyond 100 feet from the street line in the calculation of lot coverage.

"12. To discourage the establishment of a conventional road network in areas where access is problematic."

Comments

While this is an appropriate goal and objective, the MPRC noted that it is not readily translated into an ordinance provision.

"13. To assure development in the Villages is at a size and scale consistent with the existing Village character;" and

"14. To carefully review the Village zoning standards."

Comments

The MPRC noted that the zoning "Schedule I" in the ordinance entitled "Table Of Height, Area & Other Bulk Requirements" was reviewed during 2001 and amended during 2002, with particular attention to the provisions therein governing development within the "R-11" & "R-18" zoning districts.

At that time, changes were made to "Schedule I" as well as to the definitions of "Floor area, residential" and "Floor area ratio (FAR)" to encourage the upgrading of the existing residences in the "R-11" and "R-18" zoning districts in order to maintain the prevailing character of development.

"15. To avoid retail development along the Route 206 corridor."

Discussion

While the MPRC noted that the existing zoning provisions of the Borough, which do not permit any retail development along U.S. Route 206, implement this goal and objective, the MPRC also noted that three (3) land areas along the Route 206 corridor are appropriate for small scale retail development.

As a result, the MPRC recommends that these three (3) land areas be rezoned into a new "CC" Community Commercial zoning district to permit relatively small scale retail development, which is discussed on Pages 12 & 13 of this report under goal and objective #7.

Therefore, the MPRC also recommends that goal and objective #15 be changed to read as follows:

"15. To avoid large scale retail development along the Route 206 corridor."

"16. To review the Borough zoning as it relates to large scale quasi-public uses."

Comments

The MPRC reviewed the current ordinance provisions regarding the following quasi-public uses:

- Houses of Worship;
- Public or Private Schools;
- Residential Health Care Facilities in Conjunction with a School; and
- Assisted Living Residence and Long-Term Care Facility/Nursing Facility/Nursing Home.

As a result of its review of the current ordinance provisions governing these quasi-public uses, the MPRC recommends the following:

### ***Houses of Worship & Public or Private Schools***

The MPRC noted that both "Houses of worship" and "Public or private schools approved by the State of New Jersey, Department of Education" are permitted uses in all the residential zoning districts within the Borough. More specifically, both uses are permitted as of right in the "VN" district and are permitted in the "R-11", "R-18", "RR-1", "RR-2", "RR-3", "RR-5" and the "RE" districts subject to the conditions specified in Subsection 23-40.10 b.1. of the zoning ordinance provisions, which includes a minimum 10 acre lotarea.

Regarding public schools, in 1981 Peapack and Gladstone students became part of the Somerset Hills Regional School District (SHSD), comprised of Bernardsville, Far Hills and Peapack and Gladstone. The SHSD includes the Bernards High School, the Bernardsville Middle School, and the Bedwell Elementary School, also in Bernardsville. Therefore, there are no public schools in Peapack and Gladstone. Additionally, there are no conventional free-standing private schools existing within Peapack and Gladstone.

Regarding houses of worship, there are four (4) existing churches in the Borough, including the St. Brigid Catholic Church, the Peapack Reformed Church, St. Luke's Episcopal Church, and the Gladstone United Methodist Church. All four (4) of these houses of worship are located within the "Village Community Boundary" including the "VN", "R-18" and "R-11" zoning districts, with three (3) on Main Street and one (1) on Church Street.

The MPRC recommends that the Borough's ordinance provisions be amended to eliminate both public and private schools and houses of worship as permitted land uses within the "RR-1", "RR-2", "RR-3", "RR-5" and the "RE" districts. First, there is no current proposal for another public school within the Borough. Second, it is not prudent to encourage either a private school or a house of worship on a minimum 10 acre lot outside of the "Village Community Boundary" because of potential adverse impacts to the use and enjoyment of surrounding properties and impairment to the existing character of the area.

The Subsections of the ordinance provisions to be eliminated include 23-39.1 d.2. & 3. and 23-39.2 c.2. & 3.

***Residential Health Care Facilities in Conjunction with a School,  
and Assisted Living Residence and Long-Term Care  
Facility/Nursing Facility/Nursing Home***

The MPRC noted that both of these land uses are only permitted within the "RE" and "RR-5" zoning districts. However, the MPRC also noted that in Subsection 23-39.1 of the existing ordinance provisions, two (2) of the "Purposes" of these zoning districts are as follows:

1. "Protect the natural and estate character of this area of the Borough from the adverse impacts of development," and
2. "Preserve the rural character of the environs of the Borough and the beauty of the area so as to lessen the effect of artificially imposed development."

Regarding residential health care facilities in conjunction with a school, the MPRC concluded that the only existing land use in the Borough that might possibly be included in this land use category is the Matheny School & Hospital located at the eastern end of Highland Avenue.

However, the Land Use Board reviewed an application for development submitted by Matheny School & Hospital, Inc. during 2008 and determined that the existing complex of activities on the subject property did not comport with the "residential health care facilities in conjunction with a school" land use and heard the application as a "use" variance application.

There is no other existing land use in the Borough that might possibly be included in this land use category. Therefore, in consideration of the purposes of the "RE" and "RR-5" zoning districts to protect the character of these zoning districts from the adverse impacts of development and to preserve their rural character, the MPRC recommends that the "Residential health care facilities in conjunction with a school" land use be eliminated from the Borough's ordinance provisions in Subsections 23-39.1 d.4. and 23-40.10 b.3. Given the complexities of the land use issue specifically concerning the "Matheny parcel" the Land Use Board recommends that further analysis is warranted and should be performed in a timely manner.

Regarding assisted living residences and long-term care facilities including nursing care facilities and homes, the MPRC notes that no such uses currently exist in the Borough. Additionally, given the stated purposes of the "RE" and "RR-5" zoning districts, it is not prudent to permit such institutional uses where they may likely cause adverse impacts to the use and enjoyment of surrounding properties and impairment to the existing character of the area.

Therefore, the MPRC recommends that the "Assisted living residence and long-term care facility/nursing facility/nursing home" land use be eliminated from the Borough's ordinance provisions in Subsections 23-39.1 d.6. and 23-40.10 b.2.

"17. To preserve the scenic and rural character of designated roadway corridors in the Borough."

Comments

The MPRC noted that there are no specific scenic and rural roadways designated in the Borough; nevertheless this goal and objective is appropriate and is relevant to the review of applications for development along the Borough's internal road network off of U.S. Route 206.

"18. To review the standards of the Limestone Ordinance."

Comments

The MPRC consulted with the Borough Engineer who informed the committee that there is no longer a specific ordinance section addressing limestone. The prior limestone ordinance provisions were eliminated based upon a recommendation in the 1996 Master Plan because the provisions were difficult to administer and, therefore, were ineffective. Instead, limestone issues now are required to be investigated and addressed as part of any required "Environmental Impact Assessment" in accordance with Section 23-27.5 of the Borough's ordinances. This process of review at the time of the submission of a subdivision or site plan application has worked well, and the MPRC does not recommend any changes to the ordinance provisions at this time.

"19. To evaluate the zoning standards associated with home occupations."

Comments

The MPRC noted that during 2000 a new "Home Office" use was incorporated into the Borough's ordinance provisions. A "Home Office" now is permitted within any single-family detached dwelling without review and approval by the Land Use Board, provided that the strict limitations specified in Subsection 23-40.6 b.2. of the ordinance are met.

At this time, the MPRC reviewed the ordinance provisions governing "Home Occupations", which are permitted uses within any single-family detached dwelling within the "RE", "RR-5", "RR-3", "RR-2", "RR-1", "R-18", "R-11" and "VN" zoning districts in accordance with the conditions specified in Subsection 223-40.10 b.5. of the ordinance. Upon review, the MPRC recommends that no changes to the ordinance provisions be made at this time.

"20. To incorporate design standards which will mitigate against development impacts."

Comments

The MPRC noted that this goal and objective is very broad and encompasses many different types of zoning and design provisions. The MPRC concluded that there was no apparent need for any changes to the current ordinance provisions at this time relative to this goal and objective.

"21. To conserve the Borough's natural resources by planning the location and intensity of growth to maintain the capacities of natural resource systems;" and

"22. To protect environmentally sensitive areas, which are defined in the Borough's natural resource inventories, by planning for growth in compact forms at locations and intensities of use that protect land and water quality."

Comments

The MPRC noted that the Borough's zone plan has limited the location of the more intensive zoning districts, both residential and nonresidential, in areas served by public sewage treatment facilities.

The MPRC also noted that a 2013 "Environmental Resource Inventory Update" document was prepared by the Borough which analyzed the environmentally sensitive areas within the Borough. At the outset, the 2013 document is considered to be attached to this report for adoption as part of the Borough's Master Plan.

Additionally, in consideration of helping to insure that new homes constructed within the Borough on lands not served by public sewage treatment facilities have an appropriately situated land area to support a septic system commensurate with the carrying capacity of the land and in a manner that protects land and water quality, the MPRC recommends that any lot to be developed on lands not served by public sewage treatment facilities have a minimum usable development area equal to at least one (1) contiguous acre in accordance with the following criteria:

1. The contiguous one (1) acre area must not contain any freshwater wetlands, wetlands transitional buffers, 100-year flood plains, detention or retention basins, topographic slopes twenty-five percent (25%) or greater and/or any stream corridor buffers required by the State of New Jersey;
2. The contiguous one (1) acre area must be determined by the Borough Engineer to be appropriately situated for the location and construction of the principal building and its appurtenances, including customary accessory uses and both the septic system and any potable water well serving the lot. More specifically, the Borough Engineer shall determine that the contiguous one (1) acre area is of sufficient dimension and location within the required setback requirements that the principal building and its accessory uses can be constructed without variances;
3. The area must be shaped to permit the inscription of either a circle with a diameter of at least two hundred (200) feet within its bounds or, alternatively, with a rectangle at least one hundred fifty (150) feet in width and length and with an area of at least three-quarters (3/4) of an acre or thirty-two thousand six hundred seventy (32,670) square feet (it is noted that the circle will be approximately thirty-one thousand four hundred sixteen (32,416) square feet, which is relatively close to three-quarter (3/4) of an acre or thirty-two thousand six hundred seventy (32,670) square feet in area); and
4. The development of the lot shall be designed to minimize disturbance of any wooded areas and environmentally sensitive features.

"23. To conserve and enhance open space by identifying these resources and using preservation, conservation and regulatory programs and other methods to guide growth in locations to protect them;" and

"24. To preserve the integrity of large contiguous tracts of forests and grasslands."

#### Comments

The MPRC agreed that the existing available mechanisms for the preservation of open space are&;, including farmland and open space land acquisitions, often with moneys from the Borough's "Open Space Fund", as well as farmland assessment tax incentives, which are not in



the control of municipalities, have been successful in helping to preserve open space areas within the Borough.

"25. To identify and protect scenic corridors by use of easement purchases, transfer of development rights and other effective mechanisms."

Comments

The MPRC agreed that the "transfer of development rights" mechanism is not feasible, appropriate or needed in the Borough to identify and protect scenic corridors. Therefore, the MPRC recommends that this goal and objective should be rewritten to read as follows:

"25. To identify and protect scenic corridors by use of easement purchases and other effective mechanisms."

"26. To protect air quality, promote alternate modes of transportation and support efficient transportation systems."

Comments

The MPRC agreed that this "goal and objective" should be revised to emphasize non-motorized modes of transportation, including walking and bicycling. Additionally, the MPRC agreed that additional verbiage should be added to this goal and objective regarding slowing down traffic on local roadways and improvements to the intersections along U.S. Route 206.

Therefore, the MPRC recommends that this goal and objective should be rewritten to read as follows:

"26. To protect air quality and promote alternate modes of transportation such as walking and bicycling, to promote the appropriate installation on local roads of traffic calming devices such as 3-way stop signs and speed tables to slow traffic and discourage non local traffic, and to encourage the New Jersey State Department of Transportation to investigate and, where appropriate, implement improvements to the intersections along U.S. Route 206."

"27. To protect and conserve the Borough's water resources and establish and maintain vegetated buffers along streams, wetlands and ponds."

Comments

The MPRC felt that the current ordinance provisions protecting environmentally critical areas do help to protect and conserve the Borough's natural resources. The only additional ordinance provisions recommended by the MPRC is a requirement that any lot to be developed on lands not served by public sewage treatment facilities have a minimum usable development area equal to at least one (1) contiguous acre in accordance with the criteria noted on Pages 20 and 21 of this report under goals and objectives #21 and #22.

"28. To inventory and maintain mature shade trees along main thoroughfares and provide for new plantings to ensure a proper inventory."

Comments

The MPRC felt that no changes to existing ordinance provisions are necessary to effectuate this goal and objective at this time.

"29. All lighting of residential and nonresidential properties shall be minimal for safety and security purposes, shall be directed downward with no lateral or upward glare and, to the extent possible, should be located so as to be screened by structures and/or landscaping from the view of any residence."

Comments

The MPRC noted that the Land Use Board has been implementing this goal and objective during its review of submitted site plan applications and that no ordinance changes are needed.

"30. Because of the topography of the Borough and the concentration of residential dwellings, noise can be a pronounced nuisance. Therefore, non-farm machinery producing excessive noise, and noise producing vehicles which are not permitted on public roadways, such as, but not limited to, dirt bikes and helicopters, shall be prohibited within one-half (1/2) mile of any residential dwelling and any residential zoning district, from any direction. Additionally, any outside gathering of people for recreational and/or other purposes not directly associated with a residential dwelling unit should be prohibited unless specifically sanctioned by the Borough of Peapack and Gladstone and, when permitted, such activities should only be permitted during daytime hours, with additional restrictions as may be appropriate."

### Comments

The MPRC felt that this goal and objective should continue to be monitored by the Land Use Board during its review of any application for development; if any additional ordinance provisions are deemed necessary by the Borough, they should be added to the police power portion of the general code.

## **ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES**

During the discussions among the members of the MPRC, it was agreed that three (3) new goals and objectives should be added to the Master Plan: one pertaining to the promotion of renewable energy resources; one pertaining to standards and procedures safeguarding against natural and man-made adversities; and one pertaining to sustainable development.

### **Promotion Of Renewable Energy Resources**

The MPRC recognized that the safe, effective and efficient use of solar and small wind energy systems reduces the on-site consumption of utility-supplied electricity and that solar and wind energy are abundant, renewable and nonpolluting energy resources. Converting solar rays and wind to electricity will reduce dependence on nonrenewable energy resources and decrease air and water pollution that results from the use of conventional energy sources.

The MPRC also recognized that one of the stated purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) at N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2.n. is "to promote utilization of renewable energy sources". Moreover, the MLUL, at N.J.S.A. 40:550-66.12, sets forth certain standards to govern municipal ordinances regulating small wind energy systems and, at N.J.S.A. 40:550-66.11, requires that both wind and solar facilities be permitted on industrially zoned lands comprising twenty (20) or more contiguous acres that are owned by the same person or entity.

The MPRC concluded that it is both necessary and prudent for Peapack and Gladstone to establish standards for the installation and operation of solar and small wind energy systems and other photovoltaic systems so that these clean, renewable energy resources can be utilized in appropriate locations in the Borough in accordance with recognized safety standards and without jeopardizing the quality of life enjoyed by its residents.

In order to assure that any wind, solar and photovoltaic energy systems ordinance that may be adopted by the governing body can be found to be in compliance with the Borough's Master Plan, the MPRC recommends that the following goal and objective be added:

- "31. To promote the safe, effective and efficient use of renewable energy sources with reasonable limitations and design parameters to protect the quality of life of the residents of Peapack and Gladstone and to lessen adverse impacts such as noise and unsightly visual landscapes."

### **Standards And Procedures Safeguarding Against Natural And Man-Made Adversities**

The MPRC expressed concerns that standards governing the construction of buildings within the Borough on lands potentially subject to natural environmental disruptions, such as flooding, are not always sufficient to safeguard against such natural adversities. Additionally, the MPRC felt that more could be done to be prepared for such natural adversities and also for manmade adversities such as fires and electrical outages.

Therefore, the MPRC recommends that the following goal and objective be added to the Borough's Master Plan:

"32. To encourage upgraded standards for the construction of buildings on lands potentially subject to natural environmental disruptions, and upgraded preparedness for such natural adversities and also for manmade adversities."

### **Sustainable Development**

A simple definition of sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. More broadly stated, sustainable development creates and maintains conditions under which humans and nature can exist in productive harmony that permits fulfilling the social, economic, environmental and other requirements of present and future generations. This synergistic goal of altogether promoting socially, fiscally and environmentally responsible development often is referred to as "smart growth".

The MPRC believes that the achievement of such sustainable development is a laudable ambition and recommends that the following goal and objective be added to the Borough's Master Plan:

"33. To encourage the synergistic goal of altogether promoting socially, fiscally and environmentally responsible development that creates a community meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."

### **ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDED ORDINANCE MODIFICATION**

The MPRC noted that both the "RE" and "RR-5" districts have lot averaging provisions as follows:

1. Lot averaging provisions in the "RE" zoning district require that the overall density of development be no more than 1du/10ac, but allows a residential lot to be 5 acres in subdivisions of two (2) lots or more.
2. Lot averaging provisions in the "RR-5" zoning district require that the overall density of development be no more than 1du/5ac, but allows a residential lot to be 3 acres in subdivisions of two (2) lots or more.

The MPRC also noted that an essential problem with these lot averaging provisions is that they allow a large tract of land to have all but one (1) of the lots to be 5 acres in area in the "RE" district or 3 acres in area in the "RR-5" district, with only one (1) large lot offsetting the smaller lots to achieve the required overall density of development.

In order to remedy the problem, the MPRC recommends setting a maximum lot size for the calculation of the overall density for development utilizing the lot average provisions; specially, no larger than 25 acres in the "RE" district and 15 acres in the "RR-5" district.

## **RECOMMENDED ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR FUTURE STUDY**

### **A Definition Of "Residential Agriculture"**

As a result of the review by the Land Use Board of an application involving the keeping of bees on a property developed with a single-family detached dwelling, the MPRC recommends that a definition of "Residential Agriculture" be added to the ordinance provisions to permit limited agricultural activities for the enjoyment of the residents of the property and not for commercial purposes.

The definition may consider the following three (3) items:

1. The growing and harvesting of plants in vegetable, ornamental and flower gardens typically associated with residential properties;
2. The keeping of household animals/pets on residential property, except as may be regulated elsewhere by code; and
3. The keeping of non-household animals on residential property, also except as may be regulated elsewhere by code.

The MPRC spent a great deal of time debating what animals should and should not be permitted, and divergent opinions were expressed. The MPRC also reviewed a number of communications to the committee pertaining to this issue.

The MPRC makes no specific recommendation regarding the definition of "Residential Agriculture" and feels that the issue should be debated among the full Land Use Board with public participation. In any case, no matter what animals are to be permitted, the MPRC felt that the potential adverse impacts upon adjacent and nearby properties must be factored into the decision and that any product derived from any animal be used solely for personal consumption.

### **Updated Sign Regulations**

The existing ordinance provisions governing signs in Peapack and Gladstone are written in Section 23-40.17 of the Land Development Ordinance. The provisions are extensive and comprehensive and include twelve (12) pages of text and three (3) tables. However, the ordinance provisions were adopted many years ago, and the MPRC recommends that the existing provisions be reviewed and be modified and updated as appropriate.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE INCORPORATION OF REDEVELOPMENT PLANS**

Because Peapack and Gladstone Borough has not adopted any redevelopment plans pursuant to the "local redevelopment and housing law", PL. 1992, c.79 (c.40a:12a-1 et al), and because there are no current plans to do so, no changes are recommended to the Land Use Plan Element of the Borough's Master Plan or to the local land use development regulations to effectuate any redevelopment plans.

### **BRIEF SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **Recommended Ordinance Modifications, Additions And Deletions**

1. A definition of "Mixed use buildings" is recommended to be included in the "VN" Village Neighborhood Zone to include personal service facilities and retail uses on the first floor and the option for residential apartments on the upper floors. It also is recommended that the conditional use references to the "Conversion of existing buildings and vacant lots..." in Subsections 23-39.6 d.1. and 23-40.10 b.7. of the ordinance provisions be deleted.  
*(See pages 10 & 11 of this report for further details)*
2. An "Age-Restricted Inclusionary Housing Development" is recommended within the only "LI" Office Research/Light Industrial Zone in the Borough as an optional development alternative in addition to the currently permitted nonresidential land uses. The subject zoning district contains approximately 23 acres and is located west of the railway line and the Peapack train station.  
*(See pages 11 & 12 of this report for further details)*
3. A new "CC" Community Commercial Zone is recommended for three (3) currently developed properties along U.S. Route 206 in order to permit the retail sales of goods and services, banks and pharmacies, including drive through windows, offices and office buildings and animal hospitals for small animals, excluding outside facilities and kennels. Certain design standards also are recommended to limit any development to relatively small buildings clustered in a pedestrian oriented, nonlinear layout.  
*(See pages 12 & 13 of this report for further details)*
4. It is recommended that the Borough's ordinance provisions be amended to eliminate both public and private schools and houses of worship as permitted land uses within the "RR-1", "RR-2", "RR-3", "RR-5" and the "RE" districts.  
*(See pages 16 & 17 of this report for further details)*
5. It is recommended that the Borough's ordinance provisions be amended to eliminate "Residential health care facilities in conjunction with a school" and "Assisted living residence and long-term care facility/nursing facility/nursing home" as permitted uses within the "RE" and "RR-5" zoning districts.  
*(See pages 17 & 18 of this report for further details)*

6. Inconsideration of the existing goals of the Borough's Master Plan "to maintain the capacities of natural resource systems" and "to protect environmentally sensitive areas", it is recommended that any lot to be developed on lands not served by public sewage treatment facilities have a minimum usable development area equal to at least one (1) contiguous acre in accordance with specified criteria.  
*(See pages 20 & 21 of this report for further details)*
7. It is recommended that the existing lot averaging provisions in the "RE" and "RR-5" zoning districts be modified by setting a maximum lot size for the calculation of the overall density for development utilizing the lot average provisions; specially, no larger than 25 acres in the "RE" district and 15 acres in the "RR-5" district.  
*(See pages 25 & 26 of this report for further details)*

### **Recommended Modifications And Additions To The Master Plan Goals And Objectives**

1. Modify goal and objective #15 from "To avoid retail development along the Route 206 corridor" to read:  

"15. To avoid large scale retail development along the Route 206 corridor."  
*(See page 16 of this report for further details)*
2. Modify goal and objective #25 from "To identify and protect scenic corridors by use of easement purchases, transfer of development rights and other effective mechanisms" to read:  

"25. To identify and protect scenic corridors by use of easement purchases and other effective mechanisms."  
*(See page 22 of this report for further details)*
3. Modify goal and objective #26 from "To protect air quality, promote alternate modes of transportation and support efficient transportation systems" to read:  

"26. To protect air quality and promote alternate modes of transportation such as walking and bicycling, to promote the appropriate installation on local roads of traffic calming devices such as 3-way stop signs and speed tables to slow traffic and discourage non local traffic, and to encourage the New Jersey State Department of Transportation to investigate and, where appropriate, implement improvements to the intersections along U.S. Route 206."  
*(See page 22 of this report for further details)*
4. Add a new goal and objective #31 to read:  

"31. To promote the safe, effective and efficient use of renewable energy sources with reasonable limitations and design parameters to protect the quality of life of the residents of Peapack and Gladstone and to lessen adverse impacts such as noise and unsightly visual landscapes."  
*(See page 24 of this report for farther details)*

5. Add a new goal and objective #32 to read:

"32. To encourage upgraded standards for the construction of buildings on lands potentially subject to natural environmental disruptions, and upgraded preparedness for such natural adversities and also for manmade adversities."  
*(See page 25 of this report for further details)*

6. Add a new goal and objective #33 to read:

"33. To encourage the synergistic goal of altogether promoting socially, fiscally and environmentally responsible development that creates a community meeting present needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs."  
*(See page 25 of this report for further details)*

### **Recommended Items For Future Study**

1. It is recommended that the adopted 2011 Open Space And Recreation Plan Update be reviewed by the Borough's Open Space Advisory Committee (OSAC) to determine whether any additions and/or updates should be included in the Borough's Master Plan at a future date.  
*(See page 14 of this report for further details)*
2. As a result of the review by the Land Use Board of an application involving the keeping of bees on a property developed with a single-family detached dwelling, it is recommended that a definition of "Residential Agriculture" be added to the ordinance provisions to permit limited agricultural activities for the enjoyment of the residents of the property and not for commercial purposes.  
*(See page 26 of this report for further details)*
3. It is recommended that the existing ordinance provisions governing signs in the Borough be reviewed and be modified as appropriate.  
*(See page 26 of this report for further details)*