The Borough of Glen Rock

Reexamination Report

BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

NOVEMBER 2014

PREPARED FOR:

THE BOROUGH OF GLEN ROCK PLANNING BOARD

PREPARED BY:

Cofone Consulting Group, LLC

Christine A. Nazzaro-Cofone, AICP, PP
New Jersey Professional Planner License #5517

Justin E. Auciello, AICP, PP
New Jersey Professional Planner License #6023

Cofone Consulting Group, LLC
125 Half Mile Rd, Suite #200
Red Bank, NJ 07701

Office: 732-933-2715
Cell: 732-439-6400
Fax: 732-933-2601

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1..... INTRODUCTION

2..... MAJOR PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES RELATING TO LAND DEVELOPMENT AT THE TIME OF THE ADOPTION OF THE LAST REEXAMINATION REPORT

7..... EXTENT TO WHICH SUCH PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES HAVE BEEN REDUCED OR HAVE INCREASED SUBSEQUENT TO SUCH DATE

10..... EXTENT TO WHICH THERE HAVE BEEN SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE ASSUMPTIONS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES FORMING THE BASIS OF SUCH PLAN OR 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, AND CHANGES IN STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPALITY POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

13..... 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

15..... DEMOGRAPHICS AND HOUSING ANALYSIS

19..... COMMUNITY FACILITIES ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) requires every municipality in New Jersey to reexamine its Master Plan at least once every ten years (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89) to ensure a periodic review of current information and changing conditions in order to keep municipal planning efforts current. The statute previously required an examination once every six years prior to legislation signed by Governor Chris Christie in 2011.

Glen Rock Borough ("Borough") last adopted a comprehensive Master Plan in 2002. Since the adoption of the 2002 Master Plan, the Borough also adopted a Master Plan Reexamination Report in 2008.

Given changing circumstances in the Borough, officials determined that it was necessary to review certain portions of the municipality that could benefit from a planning intervention.

The ultimate goals of the 2014 Master Plan Reexamination Report are to set policy that will help preserve and protect the primarily single family residential character of the Borough. With that being said, a key component to protecting the Borough's character and fiscal stability is to spur economic development in appropriate locations, prevent against any further economic stagnation in the commercial areas throughout the Borough, generate housing for diverse groups, and generally advance the continued high quality of life that residents enjoy.

The Planning Board must adopt, by resolution, a report on the findings of such reexamination. The Planning Board must submit a copy of the report and resolution to the Bergen County Planning Board and Municipal Clerk of each adjoining municipality.

The MLUL sets forth that the Reexamination Report must address the following five specific areas:

a) Major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of such adoption, last revision or reexamination, if any;
b) Extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date;
c) Extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies and objectives forming the basis of such plan or 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, and changes in state, county, and municipal policies and objectives;
d) 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; and
e) Recommendations for 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:12 A-1 et al.) into the land use plan element of the municipal master plan, and recommend changes if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the municipality.

This Reexamination Report has been prepared to meet statutory requirements as specified in the MLUL. This report represents an evaluation by the Planning Board of all previously prepared planning documents and recommends any necessary amendments or additions to the Master Plan and Land Development Regulations.

MAJOR PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES RELATING TO LAND DEVELOPMENT AT THE TIME OF THE ADOPTION OF THE LAST REEXAMINATION REPORT

[NOTE: Beginning with point "1" below, all content is verbatim from the 2008 Periodic Reexamination of the Master Plan. The language is substantially repeated from the Master Plan; however, slight modifications have been made where necessary.]

The Borough of Glen Rock adopted its last Periodic Reexamination of the Master Plan on February 7, 2008. The Housing Element and Fair Share Plan was adopted on December 10, 2008.

The Borough described the extent to which the following issues referenced in the 2002 Master Plan have been reduced or have increased since the adoption of the 2002 Master Plan in the *verbatim points that follow from the 2008 Periodic Reexamination of the Master Plan*:

1. The 2002 Master Plan emphasizes that preservation and continued maintenance of the quality of Glen Rock's residential neighborhoods is one of the most important objectives. Consequently, the 2002 Master Plan made no substantial modifications to the single-family residential designation.

   The Borough's residential land use pattern has not significantly changed in the past six years, and the Borough has maintained its vibrant suburban residential character. This continues to be a fundamental objective of the Master Plan. However, the Borough has recognized the growing concern with respect to renovation and replacement of existing homes with larger structures. This issue is discussed in the 'Issues Currently Facing the Borough' section.

2. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the expansion of the A-2 Zone to include Block 105, Lot 10, which is located on the northerly side of Rock Road between Iona Place and Maple Avenue.

   Block 105, Lot 10 has been rezoned to the A-2 District. This objective has been achieved.

3. The 2002 Master Plan indicated that the Borough has approximately 32 two-family housing units. Two-family housing units are not permitted in the A-2 District, although they are scattered throughout this district.

   Conversion from a one-family dwelling to a two-family dwelling is only permitted in the C-3 Wholesale District, provided that there is at least 4,000 square feet of lot area per family. Non-conforming two-family homes in the A-2 District have been an issue. According to the 2007 tax data, the Borough still has 30 two- or three-family homes that are non-conforming in the A-2 District. In order to maintain the integrity of the Borough's single-family districts, the Borough continues to discourage two-family housing units in the A-2 District. Therefore, this objective remains valid.

4. The 2002 Master Plan indicated that the types of housing provided within the Borough do not directly address the needs of certain age groups – the age 55 to 74 category and the young single and young married persons in age group 20 to 34.

   As a fully developed municipality, the Borough has no reasonably large vacant and developable parcels of land upon which housing for particular age groups could be built.

Consequently, the 2002 Master Plan stated that areas located on either side of the Daryl Court condominium would be appropriate for special-purpose housing. The 2002 Master Plan recommended that the site north of Daryl Court be designed to accommodate an age-restricted adult 55 and over type of a complex while the site south of Daryl Court be designated for studio and/or one-bedroom apartments.

The site north of Daryl Court (Block 43, Lots 13 and 14) has been subdivided to create three single-family lots, while a 20-unit townhouse complex with two affordable units has been built on the site south of Daryl Court (Block 43, Lot 1). The townhouse complex is fully occupied. As a result, the objective remains valid.

5. The 2002 Master Plan recommended no changes to the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial District, except that a small strip center, located on the southeast corner of Maple Avenue and Harristown Avenue (Block 178, Lot 16) be changed from OB-2 to C-1.

   This property has not been rezoned to the C-1 District. The site still contains a small strip center, and the existing businesses (nail salon and hair salon) are non-conforming uses. However, the property's inconsistency with the OB-2 District should be addressed, as it is more consistent with the C-1 District. Therefore, this objective remains valid.

6. The 2002 Master Plan proposed to include lands currently developed for offices (Block 115, Lots 13 & 14) and the northerly side of West Plaza Ext. (Block 112, Lot 12) in the Central Business District (CBD).

   These properties have been rezoned to the C-2, Central Business District Zone. This objective has been achieved.

7. The 2002 Master Plan identified that the D District has evolved into a mixed-use area that is dominated by office and bank uses and recommended to create a new Corporate Office Zoning District. The intent of the proposed Corporate Office Zoning District is to stimulate possible redevelopment of the light industrial uses to corporate office use.

   Although the Corporate Office Zoning District was never created, the D Industrial District continues to be primarily an office district. There is currently only one remaining light industrial use (Block 196, Lot 6) in the D District, while the rest of the properties are all office uses. This area is an important employment base and is a valuable asset to the Borough. Therefore, this objective remains valid.

8. The 2002 Master Plan indicated that there are a number of existing nonconforming professional office uses that are currently zoned A-2 Residence District. The 2002 Master Plan recommended designating these properties as Transitional Office Building (TOB-1) with appropriate limited use and buffering standards.

   The OT, Office Transitional District was created under Ordinance #1460 on March 4, 2004. The following properties were rezoned to the TOB-1 Districts:

   - *Block 2, Lot 5*
   - *Block 17, Lot 8*
   - *Block 181, Lot 2*

As a result, this objective has been achieved.

Open Space and Recreation Plan Element

1. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the Borough explore the possibility to relocate the recycling center in the Faber Field Complex, thereby freeing up four acres of useable land for active recreation facilities.

   The Borough is currently exploring opportunities to improve the Faber Field Complex, which will include an upgraded recycling center. However, the recycling center cannot be moved so that exploring the possibility to relocate the recycling center is no longer a valid objective.

   There have been significant improvements at the recycling center, including the construction of a new building and parking lot as well as bathroom facilities for employees and guests of the recreation area.

2. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the development of the larger Dean Street parcel, Block 20, Lot 21 as a passive park with pedestrian paths, sitting areas and additional low profile landscaping.

   The larger Dean Street parcel (Block 20 , Lot 21) has been used as a passive park; however, no improvements have been made to this parcel. This remains a valid objective, subject to an assessment of neighborhood interests.

3. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the preservation of the lands located adjacent to the Ho-Ho-Kus and Diamond Brooks, particularly where environmental constraints are present. In appropriate areas linear parkland could be developed along the brooks in order to promote and provide the residents with an aesthetic park environment, which could be used for walking, jogging or biking or for residents to enjoy the aesthetic qualities of the brooks and its environs.

   Parks and open space located adjacent to the Ho-Ho-Kus and Diamond Brooks have been preserved and protected. Part of the Lower Main Street Park, which has been renamed Diamond Brook Park, remains a heavily-wooded open space area with trails and a historic railroad turnaround. Passive recreation use is a valuable community asset and this objective remains valid.

4. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the possible expansion of the Sycamore field. The site is large enough to accommodate a soccer field or a multi-purpose field, which preserving adequate buffers to the adjacent resident areas. The 2002 Master Plan, however, indicated that the development should only be considered if there is a well-documented need for additional soccer facilities.

   The Sycamore field remains passive open space that is occasionally used for various sports activities. Instead of developing the site as a soccer field, the Borough prefers to maintain the site for as a passive recreation area. However, since the Faber Field referendum failed in 2014, the Borough should consider examining the future usage of Sycamore field.

5. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the continuing improvement of the Arboretum, with special sensitivity to the Diamond Brook corridor and adjacent homes.

The Friends of the Glen Rock Arboretum (FOTA) is a non-profit organization responsible for maintaining the Glen Rock Arboretum. The arboretum has been managed by FOTA, and the Borough continues to recognize the arboretum and its continued improvement as valuable open space for the community. Therefore, the objective remains valid.

6. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the acquisition of Block 159, Lots 14 and 15 currently occupied by Perry's Florist for future development as an active recreation facility with a combination soccer field and baseball field.

   Identification of specific parcels for open space acquisition is not appropriate. Therefore, this objective is no longer valid.

Economic Plan Element

1. The 2002 Master Plan Economic Plan Element did not make any specific objectives nor recommendations. It did, however, recognize the Borough's heavy dependence on residential tax ratables. According to the 1996 real property valuation data, slightly over 90 percent of its rate taxable value came from residential land uses, with 8.09 percent were derived from its commercial tax base.

   The Borough continues to rely heavily on its residential tax ratable base. According to the 2006 real property valuation data, over 91 percent of ratables comes from residential land uses while 8.2 percent are derived from commercial land uses. The Borough's commercial areas are small, but they are solid and have been successful. The Borough recognizes that Glen Rock's commercial areas, particularly the CBD and the D Industrial District, are vital to the community's economic being.

Historic Preservation Plan Element

1. The 2002 Master Plan indicated the need to protect the architectural characteristics of historic structures in the Borough. The 2002 Master Plan recommended the Borough consider the creation of overlay zoning that would protect historic sites and provide design criteria and guidelines for their maintenance.

   The Borough has not created an overlay zoning district to protect historic sites. The Borough, however, continues to recognize the importance of historic preservation. This reexamination report reaffirms the Borough's commitment to preserve historic properties included in the Historic Preservation Element of the 2002 Master Plan, however, creation of such an overlay zone is not presently a valid objective.

Recycling Plan Element

1. The 2002 Master Plan indicated the Borough's commitment to recycling, which is evidenced by the adoption of a recycling ordinance and the creation of a full-service recycling center.

   Glen Rock continues to actively implement the Borough-wide recycling program. The Borough's recycling ordinance requires Borough residents to separate recyclable materials from regular garbage, and curb-side pick up of recyclable materials is available on the second and the fourth Wednesday of the month. Borough residents also have an option to bring

recyclable materials to the recycling center on Doremus Avenue. This reexamination report reaffirms the Borough's commitment to enhance the quality of living through recycling.

The Borough also identified the following new issues and concerns since the adoption of the 2002 Master Plan:

- Residential Overdevelopment
- Broad Street Corridor
- Senior Citizen Housing
- Green Buildings
- D Industrial District and the Route 208 Corridor Planning Study

EXTENT TO WHICH SUCH PROBLEMS AND OBJECTIVES HAVE BEEN REDUCED OR HAVE INCREASED SUBSEQUENT TO SUCH DATE

A reexamination report is required by the MLUL to identify the major land use problems and planning objectives that are outlined in the most recently adopted Master Plan. The Borough's specific objectives and recommendations in the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination are shown below. Below each objective describes the extent to which such issues have been reduced or have increased since the adoption of the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination.

Land Use Plan Element

1. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination found that the land use pattern had not "significantly changed" since 2002 and the vibrant suburban residential character had been maintained.

But the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination recognized a "growing concern with respect to renovation and replacement of existing homes with larger structures."

This issue is discussed in detail in the "Issues Currently Facing the Borough" section.

2. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination indicated that non-conforming two family homes in the A-2 District continued to be an issue. Two-family housing units are not permitted in the A-2 District, although they are scattered throughout the district.

According to the borough's tax assessor in 2014, the Borough still has approximately 30 two- or three-family homes that are non-conforming in the A-2 District. In order to maintain the integrity of the Borough's single-family districts, the Borough continues to discourage two-family housing units in the A-2 District. Therefore, this objective remains valid.

3. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination indicated that a diversity of housing choices, specifically for those 55 years and older and 20 to 34, remained an issue. The document indicates that development occurred north and south of Daryl Court between 2002 and 2008, with the former to accommodate 55 and over type units and the latter designated for studio and/or one-bedroom apartments.

This is an ongoing issue considering the fully built-own nature of the Borough and the lack of appropriately sized and vacant parcels to accommodate development. Accordingly, this objective remains valid. However, as discussed in detail in the "Issues Currently Facing the Borough" section, there are portions of the Borough suitable to accommodate and encourage multi-family housing.

4. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination indicated a land use inconsistency between a small strip corner, located on the southeast corner of Maple Avenue and Harristown Road (Block 178, Lot 16), and the underlying zoning district, the OB-2 District. The document recommended that the property be changed to the C-1 Neighborhood Commercial Zone.

The property, which contains a small strip center with non-conforming uses, remains zoned OB-2. Therefore, this objective remains valid.

5. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination found that the D Industrial District continued to be primarily an office district, with only one industrial use, with an important employment base and valuable asset to the Borough.

Since the adoption of the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination, the Borough has seen an increased interest in uses other than office and industrial in the D Industrial District. As such, the Borough adopted Ordinance No. 1633, modifying the Land Development Ordinance to permit medical offices and all educational uses in all commercial zones.

In the 85 Harristown Road LLC application for Block 196, Lot 5 adopted in December 2010, the Borough's Planning Board granted approval for a medical building conversion. While the D Industrial District remains primarily office, the recent institution of a medical use signals that the district is attractive for other uses that are not currently found in therein. This objective remains partially valid since land uses have changed in the D Industrial District but the Borough remains supportive of appropriate uses.

Open Space and Recreation Plan Element

1. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination indicated that the larger Dean Street parcel (Block 20, Lot 21) continued to be used as a passive park but no improvements had been made.

As the Borough is continually seeking methods to improve recreation choices throughout the Borough, this remains a valid objective.

2. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination indicated that parks and open space adjacent to the Ho-Ho-Kus and Diamond Brooks had been preserved and protected since a recommendation presented in the 2002 Master Plan.

As the Borough is continually seeking to preserve passive recreation uses, this remains a valid objective.

3. The 2008 Master Plan indicated that the Glen Rock Arboretum has been managed by The Friends of the Glen Rock Arboretum (FOTA), a non-profit organization.

As the Borough continues to recognize the arboretum and its continued improvement as valuable open space for the community, this remains a valid objective.

Economic Plan Element

1. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination indicates that while commercial areas only account for a small share of the Borough's ratable base, they are vital to the community's economic well-being.

The Borough is currently exploring interventions to spur economic activity within the CBD and other commercial districts. Stabilizing the commercial tax base in Glen Rock will aid the continued provisions of high quality facilities and programs for the benefit of all Glen Rock residents. The D Industrial District continues to thrive, likely as a result of the Governing Body amending the zoning ordinance to allow for additional uses. As the Borough is continually and actively seeking to improve and expand commercial uses in appropriate areas, this remains a valid objective.

Recycling Plan Element

1. The 2008 Master Plan Reexamination indicated that the Borough continues to actively implement the Borough-wide recycling program, reaffirming its commitment to enhance the quality of living

through recycling.

As the Borough remains committed to a strong recycling program, this objective remains valid.

EXTENT TO WHICH THERE HAVE BEEN SIGNIFICANT CHANGES IN THE ASSUMPTIONS, POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES FORMING THE BASIS OF SUCH PLAN OR 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, AND CHANGES IN STATE, COUNTY, AND MUNICIPAL POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES

Since the adoption of the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination, the Borough is facing a variety of issues and concerns that require examination. The following represents a list of new issues and concerns since the adoption of the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination.

Land Use Issues

1. Gross Floor Area Equity and Habitable Floor Area Ratio

As a mature suburban community, the Borough is desirous of maintaining and preserving the charming character of its residential neighborhoods.

In recent years, older homes have been torn down to accommodate larger structures, resulting in a visual condition of homes being out of scale with the remainder of the neighborhood. This is an issue that requires a land use intervention.

The Borough previously examined the existing Effective Gross Floor Area Ratio Ordinance to ensure not just control over the ratio between a structure and the lot upon which it exists, but also equity between the A-1 and A-2 Zones.

The overall intention is to allow homeowners with lots which are the top ends of lot area to build homes at a square footage beyond what is currently permitted in the A-2 Zone and place a cap of on the permitted floor area in the A-1 Zone. After conducting a planning examination, the Borough approved an amendment to the Effective Gross Floor Area Ratio Ordinance through Resolution #1695 on April 16, 2014.

2. Housing to meet the needs of diverse groups

The Borough's population is aging, according to an analysis comparing numbers from the 2000 and 2010 U.S. Census. Approximately 26% of the population is 55 years or older in the 2010 Census, while the same cohort registered 23% in 2000. This is consistent with the national trend, which began following the economic downturn during the late part of the last decades, of the older population deciding to age in place instead of selling their homes to the younger population. Therefore, there is a continuing planning need to provide housing designed to accommodate the older population in the Borough.

The 2002 Master Plan and 2008 Master Plan Reexamination both identified the lack of senior housing as a concern, recommending that the Borough continue to explore options to meet the growing demand.

However, in a Borough where little land is available for development and the vast majority of the

homes are single-family detached, there are limited opportunities to accommodate senior citizen housing. Glen Courts continues to be the only senior citizen community in the Borough.

Housing is also needed for young professionals, who may or may not be married and have children. This cohort is particularly attractive, as studies have found that young professionals are now seeking to live in downtown areas. Glen Rock has an opportunity to attract more young professionals to live and spend in the downtown.

The Borough, which currently has three group homes serving individuals with special needs, reaffirms its commitment to serving that population.

Therefore, the Borough should support reasonable efforts to develop senior citizen housing at appropriate locations and attract housing opportunities in the downtown.

In addition, the Borough should permit multi-family housing in all commercial zones to spur land development, providing business owners with a built-in clientele. It is not the intention of this Reexamination Report to consider two-family housing as multi-family housing.

3. Economic activity in the downtown and commercial districts

The Borough is continually seeking to improve the business climate in the downtown and commercial districts. In recent years, the Borough saw an increase in vacancies and heard from business owners who are concerned about a lack of activity and patronage.

There are strategies the Borough should consider in both the short and long term. Downtown New Jersey, a one-stop resource for invigorating New Jersey downtowns, provides the following overarching strategies:

- Aim for a multi-functional downtown.
- Develop a broad strategy for revitalizing downtown areas.
- Create partnerships.
- Pay particular attention to attracting commercial business.
- Focus on developing the unique qualities of downtowns.
- Maintain and develop genuine public spaces.
- Make strategies locally based and flexible.

The Borough should consider forming a Special Improvement District (SID), pursuant to NJSA 40:56-65, which "provides a mechanism for the businesses and property owners of a community to organize as a single entity, to raise funds for activities that *enhance* or *expand upon* municipal services, and through a District Management Corporation, to manage themselves to become a more effective destination for commerce." SIDs throughout New Jersey include but are not limited to Belmar, Bloomfield, Carteret, Keyport, New Brunswick, Red Bank, Spring Lake, and Toms River.

Regardless of a SID being formed to support the commercial districts, it is recommended the Borough work closely with the Chamber of Commerce to attract businesses to appropriate areas of Glen Rock.

Through the zoning ordinance, the full range of permissible commercial uses should be identified. This is relevant not just to the downtown, but rather all commercial zoning districts. The Committee believes that the zoning ordinance should be modified to expand and identify the enumerated permitted use list in all commercial districts of the zoning ordinance.

In the short-term, however, there are some solutions that can serve as a magnet for downtown patrons, including:

- Car shows
- Farmer's markets
- Arts, wine, jazz fests
- Promotional events for downtown businesses
- Craft fairs
- Movie nights

The Borough should survey business owners to gauge their concerns and determine the best potential solutions. Additionally, there are land use interventions that can help with creating a more vibrant environment in the downtown.

To spur residential development in commercial areas that will create a supply of patrons for businesses, the Borough should consider increasing the allowable density. This will provide motivation and an incentive for developers to construct multi-family uses.

The Borough should also make a proactive efforts to add complementary ratables in all commercial districts.

In addition, the Borough should consider exploring creative parking solutions in commercial areas that will maximize parking supply and encouraging additional mixed-use development while reducing the need for additional surface parking areas. Likewise, the concept of land banked parking should be provided for in the zoning ordinance.

4. Split Zoned Lots

The Borough should review all split-zoned lots and determine whether zone line adjustments are warranted. In some instances, where a property is split between residential and commercial zones, the residential portion of the property may not require any mitigation that is commonly associated with commercial development. Eliminating split zoned lots will ensure more land use predictability and compatibility. Transitional uses stepping down intensity of development between commercial and residential zoning districts should be considered.

5. Affordable Housing

The Council on Affordable Housing adopted new Third Round Rules on June 2, 2014 and the Fair Share Housing Center, a housing advocacy organization, filed a lawsuit at the New Jersey Supreme Court on June 17, 2014 challenging said rules.

The Borough should continue to monitor the ongoing litigation and the ultimate outcome, which will inform when the Housing Plan Element should be updated.

In all future filings to the Council on Affordable Housing, the Borough should continue to seek credit for the housing for special populations that exist within the municipality.

SPECIFIC CHANGES RECOMMENDED FOR THE MASTER PLAN OR DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS, IF ANY, INCLUDING UNDERYLING OBJECTIVES, POLICIES AND STANDARDS, OR WHETHER A NEW PLAN OR REGULATIONS SHOULD BE PREPARED

This section provides a list of recommended amendments to the current Master Plan. In response to the new planning issues identified in this report, additional recommendations to the current Master Plan.

Recommended Amendments to the Current Master Plan

1. Housing Plan Element

The Council on Affordable Housing adopted new Third Round Rules on June 2, 2014 and the Fair Share Housing Center, a housing advocacy organization, filed a lawsuit at the New Jersey Supreme Court on June 17, 2014 challenging said rules.

The Borough should continue to monitor the ongoing litigation and the ultimate outcome, which will inform when the Housing Plan Element should be updated.

Additional Recommendations

1. The Borough should support appropriate efforts to develop multi-family and senior citizen housing.

2. The Borough actively encourage multi-family housing in all commercial zones to spur land development, providing business owners with a built-in clientele of young professionals that are attracted to such housing.

3. The Borough should implement all recommendations contained in this report in regards to spurring economic activity in the Central Business District.

4. The Borough should identify all split zoned lots and determine whether zone line amendments are required.

5. The Borough should continually monitor land use board activity to determine if any master plan amendments and/or zoning amendments are warranted.

6. The Borough should continue to maintain and upgrade municipal facilities and recreation fields for the benefit of Glen Rock citizens.

RECOMMENDATINS FOR THE PLANNING BOARD CONCERNING THE INCORPORTATION OF REDEVELOPMENT PLANS PURSUANT TO THE LOCAL REDEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING LAW, P.L. 1992, C. 79 (C.40A:12 A-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

There have been no redevelopment plans adopted since the issuance of the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination Report.

Population

A comprehensive population analysis of the past and present helps the Borough plan for future community needs, such as schools, housing, commercial needs, and community facilities.

This analysis employs US Census data to observe trends and help plan for the future. Population trends are influenced by a variety of factors, including national, state, and regional economic conditions, social changes, and government policy.

Importantly for the Borough, an older, predominately built-out community, ongoing needs include state-mandated affordable housing, school capacity, and services (such as police, fire, and public works) to the Borough.

Changing birth rates and employment trends, consumer preferences, and numerous other factors can affect future development within the Borough, although it is a predominately built-out community. The Borough, however, can guide future development and can manage growth by development appropriate standards for population density as part of its land planning effort.

According to the US Census Bureau, the Borough's population in 2010 was 11,601. Table 1 shows the historical population trend in Glen Rock from 1900 to 2000.

		CHANGE	
YEAR	POPULATION	NUMBER	PERCENT
1900	613	---	---
1910	1,055	442	72.1
1920	2,181	1,126	106.7
1930	4,369	2,188	100.3
1940	5,177	808	18.5
1950	7,145	1,968	38.0
1960	12,896	5,751	80.5
1970	13,011	115	0.9
1980	11,497	(1,514)	(11.6)
1990	10,883	(614)	(5.3)
2000	11,546	663	6.1
2010	11,601	55	0.48

While Glen Rock experienced modest growth between 1900 and 1950, the most explosive jump in population was between 1950 and 1960. The 1950s saw rapid residential construction, the peak of the baby boomer generation, and a surge of relocation from cities to suburban areas, as personal vehicles became more accessible with more inexpensive models and increasing incomes during a time of economic prosperity. The once rural nature of the Borough quickly changed not just due to the aforementioned reasons, but also the construction of Route 208. As employment centers began to shift from the cities to the suburban areas, where land was cheap and plentiful, people followed and purchased homes.

While population growth continued between 1960 and 1970, it slowed, followed by a relatively significant decline in 1980 – the first ever drop in population – due to a decline in the Borough's birth rate and the outmigration of residents.

After a continued decline through the 1980s, dropping to the lowest recorded number of residents in 1990, the Borough stopped losing residents. The most recent 2010 Census data shows that the population has increased since 2000, which saw an increase from 1990. In 2010, the Borough's population had increased 0.48% to 11,601, its highest population count since 1980.

Sex and Age

According to the 2010 Census, consistent with national trends, there are slightly more females (5,966) than males (5,635) residing in the Borough. The comparison between the population characteristics in 2000 and 2010 in Table 2 enables us to observe age shifts and trends within the Borough.

	2000		2010	
Age Group	**Total**	**% of Total**	**Total**	**% of Total**
Under 5 years	962	8.3	703	6.05
5 to 9 years	1,048	9.1	1,034	8.91
10 to 14 years	939	8.1	1,096	9.44
15 to 19 years	591	5.1	874	7.53
20 to 24 years	306	2.7	361	3.11
25 to 34 years	954	8.3	643	5.54
35 to 44 years	2,214	19.2	1,643	14.16
45 to 54 years	1,874	16.2	2,253	19.42
55 to 59 years	624	5.4	828	7.13
60 to 64 years	455	3.9	666	5.74
65 to 74 years	742	6.4	729	6.28
75 to 84 years	644	5.6	529	4.55
85 years and over	193	1.7	242	2.08
	11,546	100.0	11,601	100.0

The demographic composition of Glen Rock's 2010 population indicates shifts in age group populations. In a decade, there has been an increase in population of persons 10 to 14 years, 15 to 19 years, 20 to 24 years, 45 to 54 years, 55 to 59 years, 60 to 64 years, and 85 years and over, while population decreases are observed in the cohorts under 5 years, 5 to 9 years, 25 to 34 years, 35 to 44 years, 65 to 74 years, and 75 to 84 years. The largest percentage increase in terms of total population was seen in persons between the ages of 15 to 19 years (32.38%) followed by those 60 to 64 years (31.69%). The largest percentage decrease in terms of total population was seen in persons between 25 and 34 years (-32.6%) followed by those under 5 years (-26.93).

The data indicates that compared to the 2000 Census, the Borough is aging. Approximately 26% of the population is 55 years or older in the 2010 Census, while the same cohort registered 23% in 2000. This is consistent with the national trend, which began following the economic downturn during the late part of the last decades, of the older population deciding to age in place instead of selling their homes to the younger population. Therefore, there is a continuing planning need to provide housing designed to accommodate the older population in the Borough.

While still a significant share of the Borough's total population at approximately 39.12%, there has been a decrease in the young family-rearing age group from 25 to 54 between 2000 (5,042) and 2010 (4,539), representing a 9.98% decline. Just like the older cohort, the recent economic downturn has also had an impact on this group, with recent trends indicating young adults remaining in urban areas longer than in previous decades or traveling for job opportunities. This trend is also reflected in the significant decrease in the population of ages under 5 to 9 from 2,010 to 1,737, representing a drop in

nearly 14%.

Housing

In the 2010 Census, there were 4,016 housing units in the Borough, compared to 4,024 in 2000, representing a decrease of 8 or less than 1% from the previous decade. An older community that is nearly fully built-out, single-family detached homes continue to dominate the housing landscape, accounting for 91.7% of the Borough's housing stock, according to the 2012 American Community Survey. This represents a single-family unit decrease of 3.9%. The second largest share of the housing stock is single-family attached homes, accounting for 3.6%, followed by a structure containing two apartments, accounting for 2.0%.

According to the 2010 Census, the vast majority of the housing units are owner occupied, accounting for 92.2% of the total, compared to 92.3% in 2000.

The average household size in 2010 was 2.96 persons per household, which is an increase as compared to the 2.89 persons per household in 2000.

The average family size in 2010 was 3.28 persons per family, also representing an increase from the 2000 count of 3.22 persons per family.

Income Characteristics

In 2000, the median household income was $104,192, compared to $152,804 according to the 2008-2012 American Community Survey 5-year Estimates, representing a $48,612 increase. Table 3 depicts the Borough's income distribution.

INCOME	NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS
Less than $10,000	50
$10,000 - $14,999	42
$15,000 - $24,999	101
$25,000 - $34,999	162
$35,000 - $49,999	153
$50,000 - $74,999	253
$75,000 - $99,999	319
$100,000 - $149,999	716
$150,000 - $199,999	582
$200,000 or more	1,299

Employment Characteristics

Between 2000 and 2010, the labor force in the Borough increased from 5,413 to 6,216 persons, of which 3,459, or 60.1%, were employed in management, business, science, and the arts occupations, according to Table 4.

OCCUPATION	NUMBER OF PERSONS
Management, business, science, and arts occupations	60.1%
Service occupations	6.0%
Sales and office occupations	28.0%
Natural resources, construction, and maintenance occupations	2.2%
Production, transportation, and material moving occupations	5.7%

A general analysis of the Borough's adult labor pool from 2000 to 2010 is included in Table 5.

YEAR	LABOR FORCE	EMPLOYED	UNEMPLOYED	RATE
2000	5,962	5,828	134	2.2
2001	5,925	5,765	159	2.7
2002	5,895	5,681	214	3.6
2003	5,905	5,690	215	3.6
2004	5,911	5,733	178	3.0
2005	5,957	5,794	163	2.7
2006	6,027	5,856	171	2.8
2007	6,038	5,883	155	2.6
2008	6,097	5,893	204	3.3
2009	6,070	5,715	355	5.9
2010	5,698	5,376	322	5.6
2011	5,894	5,464	430	7.3
2012	6,177	5,656	521	8.4
2013	6,146	5,689	457	7.4

The data indicates that Glen Rock is a microcosm of state and national economic trends. Beginning the 21st century with the lowest unemployment rate of the decade, during the economic downturn following the dot com bust and the September 11, 2001 attacks, the rate peaked at 3.6% in 2002 and 2003. The economy then started to bounce back in 2004, with the unemployment rate falling below 3% in 2005. The global economic downturn that began in the 2007 spurred a gradual rise in employment, peaking at 8.4% in 2012. Although lower annually, the Borough's unemployment rate followed a similar trend in Bergen County, which registered growing unemployment beginning in 2007, peaking at 9.1% in July 2012 before dropping back to 7.3% in July 2013.

The adequacy and realized expectation of community services, such as police and fire protection, schools, and parks and recreation, is an important component of quality of life in a community. The Community Facilities Analysis provides an evaluation of the public services and facilities needs of the Borough of Glen Rock. This analysis evaluates municipal resources, existing service levels and potential deficiencies and considers future community facilities and service needs based on the Borough's present and future demographic composition. Utilizing the planning standard/service level provided in the *Development Impact Assessment Handbook*, the analysis provides a statement of service level for each community facility.

Police

The Borough's police department employs 21 officers. The standard level of service is 2 police officers per 1,000 residents. Applying the standard, the Borough provides approximately one police officer for every 553 residents or approximately 1.89 officers per 1,000 residents, which is less than the standard of 2 police officers per 1,000 residents. However, with only a slight deviation from the standard, the Borough's police operations are sufficient to accommodate current and future growth.

Fire

The Glen Rock Fire Department recently celebrated its 100th anniversary in 2010. According to the department's website, there are 35 volunteer members. The Borough provides one firefighter for 331 residents or 3.01 firefighters per 1,000 residents, which exceeds the standard service level of 1.65 per 1,000 residents. The fire department utilizes one Chief's vehicle, one Assistant Chief's vehicle, two engine trucks, one ladder truck, and one rescue truck.

EMS

The Glen Rock Volunteer Ambulance Corps has a commitment to the people of Glen Rock. Their main goals are to provide emergency care and assistance to the Borough of Glen Rock. All members are certified as Emergency Medical Technicians. These EMTs provide emergency coverage 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. It is sometimes difficult to find coverage during the daytime hours.

Schools

The Glen Rock Public School District is widely regarded as one of the finest in New Jersey. The District includes four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. The elementary schools, serving K-5 students, include the Alexander Hamilton School, Clara E. Coleman School, Central School, and Richard E. Byrd School.

As adopted by the Glen Rock Board of Education in April 2014, the school district's mission statement is as follows:

> The Glen Rock School District, an integral part of a supportive community founded on the principles of education, embraces its students as its highest priority by providing an exceptional education and opportunities for personal development of the whole child in a secure environment through a comprehensive, innovative and rigorous curriculum and co-curricular activities to foster productive and responsible citizens of the globally connected society. Approved and adopted by the Glen Rock BOE April 7, 2014.

Budgeted projects in the school district's 2014-2015 budget include, but not limited to, a field house for the middle school and high school, a maintenance garage, upgraded security systems and surveillance cameras, wireless infrastructure upgrades, a field improvement at the Coleman School.

Student enrollment between the 2003-2004 and 2012-2013 fiscal years remained fairly constant, with marginal increases in multiple years and declines over two consecutive years. During the 2003-2004 school year, student enrollment was at 2,414, while there were 2,401 students in the district during the 2012-2013 school year.

For the fiscal year ending 2013, the annual report found that the school district was in "superior financial condition." The report found that student enrollment growth in the elementary schools "continues to be an area of concern," although the district expressed confidence that the referendum building program will address overcrowding issues at the Middle School/High School facility and maintenance/infrastructure improvements at all schools.

Parks and Recreation

The Department of Parks and Recreation, under the direction of Mark Barone, oversees the activity and upkeep at the Borough's fields, courts and rinks and is responsible for all of the activities at Borough parks, the Municipal Pool and the summer recreation program (The Shack).

The Department also runs a host of programs throughout the year including swim lessons, safety courses and open gym. In addition, the Department runs a Community Shuttle for seniors and acts as the conduit between the Borough and numerous citizen-run committees and organizations in town.

With the defeat of the Faber Field referendum in 2014, the Borough will be discussing options for active recreation space.

Public Works

The Department of Public Works (DPW) is responsible for sanitation, recycling, municipal services and a host of other services in Glen Rock. DPW has a total of 28 full-time employees and 5 part-time employees, according to Bob Tirserio, the Director of DPW.

DPW has five 25cy garbage trucks, two tri-axle roll-offs, four front end loaders, one backhoe, six 4x4 pick-up trucks, three rack/utility trucks, three tandem dump trucks, three 7/10cy salt trucks, three mason dump trucks, one 50 foot bucket truck, one 15cy box truck, one jet sewer truck, one vacuum truck, one sweeper, one SUV, two 7/10cy dump trucks, and one car.