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INTRODUCTION

"Buy land. They ain't making any more of the stuff."

Will Rogers

The role of Historic Preservation in establishing National Historic Landmarks has been significant and in numerous instances successful in saving and preserving valuable structures and locations. From limited beginnings, this field has brought together many individuals from varying backgrounds, all with a common cause of identifying and working to preserve our architectural and engineering heritage. Within the recent past, Preservation has through its maturation as a profession, faced the challenge of expanding its purposes and the methods in which it achieves these purposes. Identification and documentation, have been joined by such disciplines as growth management, land use and tax law, financial feasibility studies, as well as the integration of Preservation into planning, to name a few. The expansion of the role of Preservation brings with it some inherent problems. Most specifically, the Preservation professional must work toward more clearly delineating how Preservation becomes an ongoing part of both short term and
long term planning, on a local as well as state and national level.

Planning in itself demands that a balance be achieved between various competing interest to achieve a common benefit. In itself, this task would appear to be somewhat impossible. Total success would appear to be utopian, while limited success should be accepted as optimum. While the identification and rehabilitation of historic structures has proven to be a significant challenge on all fronts to the field of preservation, a new challenge has appeared on the horizon. This challenge is somewhat less tangible, and equally if not more difficult in its charge. Our country continues to grow in population and built environment. Nowhere is this more evident, than in our rural communities, most specifically those within a 100 mile radius of major urban centers. Running tandem with this "sprawl" has been the significant decline in the Agricultural industry. This decline has affected all types of farming activities in all parts of the nation, and though certain problems can be identified to specific locations, the borderline feasibility of farming is common to all.

This "demand" for more land on the part of both residential and commercial users coupled with the "supply" of farmland no longer economically profitable for farming sets up a very
clear market condition. Fueling this demand and supply scenario, is the added attraction of bucolic settings and the "quality of life" often associated with living in the country. Societal changes are also affecting growth patterns, as increasingly more Americans work in office park settings and corporate headquarter locations outside of urban centers.

A majority of those engaged in farming are nearing the age of retirement, with minimal interest on the part of younger generations to continue in the profession. The sale of farmland signifies various things to various parties. To the farmer, the sale represents conversion of a fixed asset into a pension fund, to the developer it represents a scenic location within which to construct either corporate facilities or large scale residential projects, to the existing residents of the community if often represents unwanted, though in most instances, inevitable growth. Clearly, this simple formula of supply and demand creates a conflict of interests.

The Township of East Amwell, in Hunterdon County, New Jersey is a case study in rural sprawl and the decline of agriculture. Historically, a rural community which covers approximately 28.1 square miles, the pressures of development are strong, emanating primarily from the
Princeton/Route corridor and the Flemington/Raritan corridor. The residents of this community were primarily engaged in agriculture and were for the most part lower and middle class with respect to their income levels. Several significant historical areas exist, including the Village of Ringoes, the smaller cross-roads villages of Wertsville, Reaville, Copper Hill and Linvale (New Market).

"Highfields", the infamous home of Charles and Ann Lindbergh and the site of the fatal kidnapping of their first child is also located within East Amwell.

Within the past few years, as the market pressures have pushed real estate values upward, several distinct facts have become evident. Gentrification has occurred in significant proportions, as "gentleman farms" are pushed further away from the surrounding cities and towns. Demands for increased public services, as well as expansion of schools has resulted from growth. The township has one grade school (K-8), with students attending a regional high school for grades 9-12. Planning for the construction and implementation of a middle school for the township are currently taking place. At the present time the township has no public water or sewer, fire protection is voluntary and police protection is provided by the State Police.

To some extent a division has arisen between "newcomers" and
"oldtimers". The political polarization which has resulted is one common to many other changing rural communities throughout the United States. Most of the residents in the township would like to see growth minimized and would further like to provide for permanent open space, yet the financial implications are somewhat prohibitive.

The internal pressures and resulting problems arising from the ongoing growth, are compounded by external factors which must be addressed. The newly created New Jersey State Planning Commission has in its draft proposal designed a Tiered Development Plan for the entire State. While the Plan targets most of East Amwell as an agricultural and conservation tier, with extremely low density; pragmatic formulas with respect to how this down zoning can be legally achieved have not been forthcoming. Some panic selling has occurred by older farmers who fear a significant reduction in their land values and consequently in their perceived pension monies. A statewide TDR bill is stalled in the State Legislature.

The purpose of this Thesis is to present a workable Preservation Plan for the Township of East Amwell, which should aide the residents and elected officials in growth management, the of historic districts and buildings, as well as the identification of a critical path for future needs of
the community and how these needs could be met.

Analysis will also focus on the proposed State Development Plan and its impact on this community, and what if any changes to the plan should be recommended by the governing body. Various programs for rural land growth management used in other locations will be evaluated with respect to their applicability to this location. Recommendations will be made with respect to the ability or inability to preserve farming as an activity and what the community can do on a local to provide incentives. These agricultural recommendations will also include how the local government can work with county and state officials to create programs to benefit farming activities.

This Thesis is not intended to provide simple answers to extremely complex questions, but rather is intended to provide guidelines for action and possible sources for information. It is expected that this Preservation Plan will become a working document for the residents and elected officials to aide in the management of their municipality. The plan is designed in such a way as to emphasize large scale community involvement in the gathering of information and establishment of guidelines and less upon hiring outside consultants and relying on state level intervention.
Finally, this Thesis is intended to present a document which reflects the services that the professional preservationist can offer in assisting communities in their planning process.
"It has been said, that in the earliest days of the colony of New Jersey, two men named Stout came into this part of the province. One settled on the North side of Rocky Hill and the other on the South side. They frequently visited each other. "The usual salutation of the one was, 'I hope you're well.' The response was as uniform, and sometimes repeated, "I am well - I am well.' In process of time, the one became designated as the 'Hopewell Stout,' and the other the 'Amwell Stout'."

Local Folklore

To begin the preparation process for a Preservation Plan for the Township, a knowledge of the history of the Township is necessary. It should be noted that in 1976 a book entitled *A History of East Amwell, 1700-1800*, was published by the East Amwell Bicentennial Committee. The contents of the book provides a very detailed history of the events which transpired during the 18th century, and some information on historic structures.

The earliest residents off the lands which now comprise East Amwell were the Lenni-Lenape, which means "Original People", early settlers called them the "Delaware" because many of them lived along the shore of the residents.
EAST AMWELL'S ROOTS IN WEST JERSEY

The earliest reference to a place called Amwell dates to 1703, when a man named John Reading named his farm near the present-day town of Stockton, Mount Amwell after the village in Hertfordshire England which had been his home.\(^1\) By 1708, Amwell Township was established by a Royal Patent from Queen Anne. The boundaries of this Amwell Township were extensively more far reaching that those of today. The area contained approximately 130,000 acres and covered almost half of the present-day Hunterdon County. (Refer to Appendix A: Map 1-A)

"It was bounded on the west by the Delaware River, on the south by a tract known as the 300,000 acres (Hopewell Township), on the east by the old partition line between East and West Jersey as far as the South Branch of the Raritan River and on the north-west by a line connecting the South Branch with the Delaware."\(^3\)

Prior to the early 1700's Amwell Township was part of the larger area referred to as West Jersey. These lands were held in proprietorship by a Lord Berkeley and Sir Carteret who had received the land in the mid 1600's. A line which connected the Barnegat Bay with the Pennsauken Creek on the Delaware River became the north-south dividing line for New Jersey, with Lord Berkeley holding those lands south of the line.
Berkeley contracted with a Quaker named Edward Byllynge to colonize the lands for profit. Byllynge hired a fellow Quaker, John Fenwick to assist with this effort. When a conflict resulted, "William Penn was called upon to arbitrate the dispute". (4) The settlement resulted in the further subdivision of South Jersey into East and West Jersey, with the dividing line being a line running from Little Egg Harbor to a point on the Delaware River 41° North latitude. Byllynge and his trustees retained West Jersey. The area divided under the authority established by a representative assembly. (5) It followed that in 1702 governing powers were surrendered to Queen Anne, and East and West Jersey were re-united as a Royal Province.

The Council of West Jersey Proprietors worked to purchase the lands from the Indians and to survey and apportion them. It is interesting to note that the Council of West Jersey Proprietors is still in existence today. Their headquarters, located in Burlington, New Jersey and their records are continually used to check surveys.

AMWELL - THE EARLY YEARS

Definitive documentation does not exist regarding the first settler in the area then known as Amwell though the aforementioned John Reading, Esq. was one of the most
prominent men in the colony who by warrant owned one
twentieth of all the land in West Jersey. This warrant
dates to 1702.(6) A man named John Holcombe purchased land
along the Delaware north of Lambertville in 1705. Legend
has long held that a man named John Ringo was the first
permanent settler in the area now known as East Amwell.
Though "an old deed for the transfer of property in Ringoes
recites that one of the boundary lines 'along the line of
land of Frances Moore'."(7)

In 1720 when John Ringo settled in the East Amwell region,
it was primarily wilderness of solid forest. The road
system had evolved from primitive thoroughfares of foot
paths created by the resident Indians. These roads were
gradually widened as use expanded from foot travel to horse
travel to the use of wagons and carriages. At the center of
Ringoes on Old York Road, John Ringo constructed a log hut
which became a famous stopping place. (Refer to
Appendix C:Illustration - Site of John Ringo’s Tavern).

"The term "York Road" came to mean the entire
road from Philadelphia to New York by wa of
Lambertville. The villages of Mount Airy,
Ringoes, Reaville, and Centerville later
developed on the Hunterdon County portion of
this trail. At Reaville the Amwell Road
branched off from the York Road to lead to New
Brunswick....The main north and south route of
Hunterdon County was the one which led from
Trenton...to the Delaware Water Gap. This
road crossed the York Road at present-day
Ringoes."(8)
John Ringo's hotel and tavern (no longer standing) came to be a place where travelers could find the comfort and refinements of civilization. It also became a meeting place for the prominent settlers, who would discuss the Indian warfare which occurred during the French and Indian war and later the stirrings of desire for Independence. John Ringo prospered from his establishment and upon his death left East Amwell with one of it's most famous and lasting legends.

"Before the Revolution he had a considerable amount of money. He would walk up and down the road, very much distress for fear the British would get his treasure. He finally buried it and died without revealing the place where it was concealed, so that his family were left comparatively poor...None of his buried treasure has every been found." (9)

The Ringos Tavern served as a meeting place for the Committee of Lower Amwell prior to the Revolution. These meetings were held to organize citizens who were opposed to the encroachment by England on their personal rights. On July 8, 1774, the Freeholders of Hunterdon County met at John Ringo's home in Amwell and penned a Resolution. During the year 1776, further resolutions were made and on July 2, 1776, the independent State of New Jersey was formed. Amwell residents were first drafted into the Militia in June 1776. One of the main theaters of the war was immediately
south of East Amwell outside of Trenton and Princeton and many families fled to the Hunterdon Hills for safety.

Families worth noting included the Stout, Landis, Manners, Sutphin, Blackwell, Prall and Graff. Many of the original 18th century homesteads of these individuals are still standing in the Township.

Always at the center of the development of East Amwell, was the industry of Agriculture. The early settlers did not usually acquire large acreage. "For example, the farms sold from one part of 'the Field Trace' averaged only 103 acres."\(^{10}\) Farms were primarily family establishments, as hired labor, as well as slave labor was scarce. Peripheral milling industries were spawned from the grain growing activities. Early settlers owed much to the Indians who lived in the area and who had farmed the lands. These Indians were very instrumental in helping the early white settlements learn "how to cultivate corn, where to look for meat, where to catch fish".\(^{11}\) The white settlers gradually added their own crops and livestock.

AMWELL - 1800's

Much like the balance of the State of New Jersey, the Township was scarcely populated during much of the 19th century. Most of the residents had their employment and
income based in farming, which rebounded significantly after the Revolutionary War. The War itself had strained the area and in many instances had resulted in significant damage to the lands because of the many battle fought here and hundreds of troops who moved through the area.

Agriculture grew and prospered and up until 1875, New Jersey stood first among all states in farm income per acre. These farming activities had shown a variety of types and levels of operation, as farmers expanded into milk and chicken production. These expansions during the latter part of the 19th century were closely associated with the coming of the rail systems to various parts of New Jersey. The railroads were both a blessing and a bane to New Jersey farming, as it not only allowed New Jersey farmers access to other markets, such as New York and Philadelphia, but also brought competition from other farming areas out West who also took advantage of the railroad and could provide the products, especially beef and port at lower prices.

This competitive market required New Jersey farmers to begin an entirely new management style with respect to their operations. After nearly 150 years of taking from the fields and pasturelands, the problems of soil conservation required more diligent agricultural methods. Additional problems such as the San Jose scale, destroying much of New
Jersey's lucrative peach industry created a situation where farm values reach a low point in 1900. (13)

Though the industrial revolution impacted significantly on the larger cities in New Jersey, East Amwell felt little of this other than the railroads and modernization of equipment that affected farming, such as incubators.

East Amwell's largest village realized significant strides in the area of education. The greatest influence can be attributed to Cornelius Wilson Larison, who has been described as a physician, farmer, educator, author, editor, publisher and exponent of phonetic spelling. (14) In 1869 Dr. Larison opened the "Seminary at Ringoes", which was to be a scientific boarding and day school in what was the Amwell Academy. The Seminary School continued to operate until 1881. The Amwell Academy was built in 1811 had offered a course of study which included: Greek, Latin, English, French, geography, arithmetic, writing, logic, geometry, philosophy and the art of speaking. The Amwell Academy had operated until 1830. After the Seminary closed in 1881, Polly L. Blackwell, operated a school in the Amwell Academy building from about 1898 to 1907. (15) (Refer to Appendix C - Illustration of Amwell Academy Building in 1988.)

In 1876, to meet a request for study of natural sciences,
Dr. Larison opened the Academy of Science and Art. The school was located in a home which still stands today, and also housed the Fonic Publishing House, which Larison established. The Academy's program emphasized students to take part in all classes, such as dissections of animals and also emphasized field work for the study of geography and nature. The Fonic Publishing Co. was based on the theory that the English language should be adapted to a Fonic spelling system, to facilitate and simplify reading and writing. The efforts of Dr. Larison to institute this Fonic system were fervent, but unsuccessful.

AMWELL - THE EARLY 1900'S
Best described as the "back road" life, the agricultural communities, such as East Amwell seemed to stand still during the early part of the 20th century. Agriculture had moved toward more modern methods of farming, utilizing steam engines, by the end of the 19th century and portable gasoline engines around 1900. Small electrical plants were acquired by farmers and provided lighting. High line electricity did not appear until the 1920's and 1930's. Tomatoes, which had once been scorned as poisonous, became an important produce product, which continues today. A cannery was located in Ringoes.

The homes in East Amwell in the early 20th century were not
much different than those built in the 18th and 19th century. Materials were primarily wood and stone, though a few brick homes can be found. A description found in *The First 250 Years of Hunterdon County 1714 - 1964* offers the following:

"Homes were frequently modest in size, with additions being added as the family grew and finances permitted. Basement cellars were common. Sometimes they were used for kitchens, but mostly for food storage. Many of the early houses had an outside kitchen adjoining the house....Some early observers noted that many Hunterdon farmers preferred having large, well-constructed barns to having substantial homes...Most farms had barracks, adopted from Dutch settlers. A barracks was in essence a roof which could be adjusted in height to that of the hay stored beneath it."

The community continued on its slow pace with little outside notoriety until 1928 when Charles and Anne Morrow Lindbergh decided to build a country retreat in the Township in 1928. This retreat named "Highfields", contained approximately 250 acres, part of which is located in neighboring Hopewell Township. The residence was designed by Charles Lindbergh and is reported to be a replica of the home he lived in as a small boy in Minnesota. That boyhood home was destroyed by fire and this perhaps influenced Lindberg in his decision to build his home of feldspar stone with poured concrete floors. The walls of this structure measure 18", with keystone arches over each window and a thick undulating slate roof. (Refer to Appendix C: Illustrations of Lindbergh
The residence gained substantial not from the kidnapping of the Lindberghs' first child, Charles Augustus Lindbergh, Jr. on March 1, 1932. The body of the child was found on May 12, 1932 in some woods in Hopewell Township. The subsequent arrest, conviction and execution of Richard Hauptman earned this kidnapping and murder the title "the Crime of the Century". The Lindberghs donated the property to the State of New Jersey in 1933 with the request that it be used for youth. Since 1938, the Department of Corrections has run a group home for teenage boys at the home. The program has in fact become a model program which stresses tutorial education, guided group interaction and community service. (Refer to Appendix A - Map 1-B for location of "Highfields").
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CHAPTER II

PROFILE OF EAST AMWELL IN 1988

In order to begin the preparation work for a Preservation Plan it is important to know as much factual information as possible about the existing municipality. Information should include not only that which relates to historic properties and locations but also the general profile of the community itself.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

East Amwell Township (Township) comprised of approximately 28.1 square miles, is located in the southeastern corner of Hunterdon County in the State of New Jersey. The Township is bounded on the north by Raritan Township; on the east by Hillsborough and Montgomery Townships; on the west by West Amwell and Delaware Townships and on the south by Hopewell Township. The existing boundaries where established in 1954.\(^{(1)}\) A base map of the Township is included in the Appendix A: Map 2-A.

The census calculated population in 1980 was estimated to be 3468.\(^{(2)}\) Hunterdon County Board of Estimates has calculated
null
the population to be 3985 in 1986. These population estimates would indicate a population density of 141.8 per square mile. Current per capita income information was estimated at $26,978 in 1980. The community is currently classified as a rural non-developing community by the State of New Jersey. While the primary industry has been agriculture, much of the land is not owned by the resident farmers who farm the land which would indicate speculative land ownership. The non-farming individuals who live in the community, are employed outside of the Township.

LOGISTICS
East Amwell is located approximately 15 miles northeast of the center of Princeton and 10 miles southwest of Flemington. Major urban centers within commuting distance include New York which is approximately 65 miles to the northeast and Philadelphia which is approximately 45 miles to the southwest. Other urban and suburban centers located within commuting proximity include Trenton, New Brunswick and Pennington and the Somerset Hub. Smaller towns and villages within close proximity include Lambertville, Frenchtown, Pennington and Hopewell.

TRANSPORTATION INFRASTRUCTURE
The transportation infrastructure within the Township is comprised of mostly secondary county and Township roads.
These roads are primarily two lane roads, with minimal shoulders and tend to be rolling with many sharp turns. Major arteries, such as Route 31, 518, 179, 579 and 514 provide adequate connections to surrounding towns and municipalities. The only divided highway located in the Township is Route 202, which crosses the Township near its largest village, Ringoes, though the length of Route 202 in East Amwell is only a few miles. Traffic on Route 202 and other county and township roads is increasingly more congested and many roads are experiencing traffic volumes far in excess of their original construction capacity. Besides providing transportation routes for local residents, these roads carry large volumes of thru-traffic and commuters heading for various contiguous employment centers.

Transportation infrastructure systems located outside of the Township but within accessible distances include the New Jersey Turnpike, Pennsylvania Turnpike, I-95 and I-78.

No public transportation systems operate within the Township. Commuter bus service operates out of the Flemington area and Amtrak/New Jersey Transit rail service operates out of the Princeton Junction and Trenton rail stations. Rail commuter service is also provided by the Pennsylvania Septa rail systems out of Trenton and West Trenton. The Black River Railroad operates seasonal tourist
steam engine service between Lambertville, Ringoes and Flemington.

GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND AGENCIES

The Township is governed by a three person Township Committee, elected by the Township residents as prescribed by New Jersey law. Each individual serves a three year term, with one member's term expiring in each year. The only other elected officials within the Township are the members of the School Board, all other employees and public officials are appointed by the Township Committee. The Township has a Board of Health, Environmental Committee, Planning Board and Board of Adjustment. The requirements and duties of these committees are prescribed by the Municipal Land Use Law.\(^3\) Ancillary agencies include an Agricultural Advisory Board (newly created), a Recreation Committee, and a Re-Cycling Committee. Though provisions exist within the Municipal Land Use Law\(^4\), an Historic Preservation Commission has not been created.

Fire fighting and Ambulance services are provided by two volunteer organizations, the Amwell Valley Fire and Rescue Square in Ringoes and the Hopewell Valley Fire and Rescue Square in Hopewell. No local police force exists, therefore police protection is provided by New Jersey State Police.
from barracks located in Flemington and Wilburtha (West Trenton).

No public water or sewer systems exist within the Township. All residents and commercial buildings are serviced by on site septic systems and in ground wells. No working plans to implement public systems exist at this time, though Elizabethtown Water has expressed an interest in providing water to the northeast quadrant of the Township.

Trash and refuse is picked up by independent haulers, who are primarily contracted with by individual residents and properties owners. The Township does sponsor a voluntary re-cycling program, though a mandated re-cycling program was recently enacted by the State of New Jersey with implementation to take place within 1988.(5)

SCHOOLS
The Township has one public school which has classes for Kindergarten through 8th grade. Schooling for grades 9 - 12 are provided at a regional high school, Hunterdon Central, located north of Flemington. Over 90% of the school children travel to school by school bus or family car. No permanent public library exists within the Township. A temporary modular unit, operated by the County Library System was recently opened adjacent to the Municipal
Building. Refer to Appendix C: Illustrations of Temporary Library, East Amwell School and Municipal Building.

RECREATION

Public recreational facilities are limited to playing fields located adjacent to the elementary school and the Township Municipal Building, as well as one privately owned facility adjacent to the firehouse in Ringoes. Because of its rural history, most of the recreational activities which existed in the Township in prior years, were those activities which residents participated in on their own land. These would include dirt biking, snowmobiling, horseback riding, hunting and fishing. The Amwell Valley Hunt (Foxhunting) is still active in the community, though hunting takes place on several landowners and farmers property. Amwell Lake, a county owned facility is located off of Route 31. (Refer to Appendix C: Illustration of Amwell Lake). No plan is currently in place which outlines the future recreational needs of the community and how those needs will be met.

OTHER

The State of New Jersey Department of Corrections operates a residential juvenile correctional facility for teen-age boys at Highfields, the former home of Ann and Charles Lindbergh. The house and property (approximately 250 acres) were donated to the State by the Lindberghs in 1933, with an
expressed request that the facility be used for boys.

LAND USES AND CONTROLS

TOPOGRAPHY

Topographically, the Township is comprised of a rocky mountainous area known as the Sourland Ridge (herein referred to as Mountain) which runs in an east-west direction, sloping lands on either side of the ridge, a large valley area (herein referred to as Valley) north of the ridge is best described as undulating. Over 80% of the Mountain area is wooded. Extensive soil data exists for all areas of the Township, with the most current survey having been conducted in 1974. The northern half of the township has been classified as Prime Agricultural Land, though the Soil Survey of Hunterdon County indicates a variety of soil types and with varying suitabilities. Slopes create significant run off problems, and extensive terracing has been utilized by many local farmers to alleviate this condition. (Refer to Appendix C: Illustrations of terracing of farmland). Underlying geology is Brunswick Shale in the Valley and Diabase (Traprock) and Lockatong (Argillite) in the Mountain.
The boundaries follow the subsoil geology very closely. Refer to Appendix A: Map 2B). The Mountain and Valley Districts have recently experienced zoning changes, most specifically with respect to minimum lot sizes for construction. The minimum lot size for the Mountain District was changed from 3 acres to 5 acres, with flag lots remaining at 10 acres. Additional changes were made to frontage requirements. The Valley District was changed from 1 1/2 acre minimum lots to 3 acres. A provision for clustering was included. The change in zoning to the Valley District also included the creation of a "Transfer Development Credit" system, to allow the transfer of development credits to a Receiving district located to the west of Ringoes and a small area outside the village of Reaville. (Refer to Appendix A: Map 2-C for receiving district information). Litigation is pending with respect to down-zoning changes made to the Mountain District in 1987 and litigation is threatened with respect to down-zoning changes made to the Valley District in 1988. Provision for non-residential uses are minimal.

The most recent Master Plan is dated 1985, though it differs only slightly from prior Master Plans prepared as far back as 1974. A considerable number of changes have been discussed and approved by the Township Planning Board over the past two years and in fact the Municipal Zoning Laws are
not in compliance with the Master Plan in several areas. Though clustering provisions do exist within the current law, no significant cluster development has occurred, primarily because the current cluster provision does not provide any incentive to the developer. Residential development has primarily occurred along existing roads on a house-by-house minor-subdivision basis. The "transfer development credits" provision included in the recent Amendments to the Master Plan(9), would appear to be questionable from a legal standpoint as the ability to utilize TDR's has not yet been mandated by the State, with the exception of the Pinelands which has separate enabling legislation. A bill to allow the use of TDR's throughout the state is currently stalled in the State Legislature.(10)

INDUSTRY
The primary industry in the Township, has been historically and continues to be Agriculture, though on a decreasing volume basis. Most of the farming activities are grain related. Several dairy operations exist, though the numbers have decreased significantly in the past few years(11). Horse operations include breeding facilities, training and boarding facilities, as well as private farms. Cooperative farming does exist, the most active is the local hay market for local horse and cattle farms. Some goat, pig and sheep breeding activities can be found. Tree farming can be
divided into two categories; wood lot and tree farming (primarily Christmas).

Farm related industries such as specialty feeds, farm equipment and fertilizer businesses do exist locally. No major grain elevator facilities operate within the vicinity, which has been a major negative factor influencing grain farming. Businesses which repair and service larger farm related equipment, are not found within easy commuting distance of the Township. Extensive damage to crops occurs yearly due to the large deer population found in the area. This is a problem shared by all rural communities and many suburban communities in New Jersey.

Though some non-agriculture business exists within the Township, it would best be described as minimal. The businesses which operate in the Village of Ringoes are mostly local service businesses. Home occupation is permitted and some do exist. A junkyard operates in the Mountain area, and has been in existence from many years, though the increased residential population the immediate vicinity has created conflicting feelings with respect to the continued viability and appropriateness of this operation.

HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL
No National Historic or State Historic Landmarks exist within the Township. Several small lots at the intersection of Amwell Road and Rainbow Hill Road are included in the Clover Hill Historic District (National and State).\(^{(12)}\) In 1977, the Hunterdon County Planning Board completed extensive surveying and research work, and published an **Historic Sites Inventory**. The report is extensive and provides a detailed inventory of historic sites. Though the chapter relating to East Amwell Township mapped and delineated over one hundred sites of historic interest, significant bridges, as well as a recommendation for five separate historic districts (Refer to Appendix A: Map 2-D) and Appendix B: Historic Sites Inventory), no local governmental action was taken. The East Amwell Bicentennial Committee was formed in 1973 and completed its work in 1976, which resulted in the publishing of *The History of East Amwell, 1700 - 1800*. Some of the work covered the documentation of historic structures, though the main focus of the research and published work was a history of the Township during the 18th century. The Master Plan makes reference to some of the sites and briefly recommends the creation of three historic districts. No local designation, as provided for in the Municipal Land Use Law exists at this time.\(^{(13)}\)

As previously indicated in Chapter I - Historical
Background, documentation exists regarding the existence of Indian artifacts. There is currently no local protection offered to these sites in the event of excavation for development. The Hunterdon County Planning Board identifies two significant natural formations:

"Rock Caves - These are four distinct formations of weathered diabase rocks which are found in the Buttonwood Corners area of East Amwell. These are cave-like forms and the fourth is a balancing rock, which is a huge boulder perched on a solid base of about 35 to 40 feet tall. History has it that John Hart, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, hid for about three years in these caves to avoid being caught by the British."

Three Brother - This is a formation on Pero's Hill in East Amwell of three distinct rocks perched on another larger rock. Legend has it that three brothers were sent out to destroy the Devil, but he instead turned them to stone."(14)

(Refer to Appendix C: Illustration of "Three Brothers").
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CHAPTER III

INTERNAL ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

Internal issues of importance which were considered for the preparation of a Preservation Plan evolved from various sources and forums. The most useful forum was a "Round Table" which was held at the Township Municipal Building on August 4, 1987. Approximately eighty-five Township residents attended this open forum which was advertised in the local newspaper. The evening was divided into two parts; the first of which allowed each person to express their areas of concern and the second part which focused on the major categories. Five separate categories evolved from these discussions and have been used for the outline of this chapter: Growth, Ecology, Social Services, Aesthetics/History and Economics.

Additional sources of information were public testimony at the Township Committee, Planning Board and Environmental Committees. Interviews with older residents and local farmers were also conducted.

GROWTH

DENSITY
The most often mentioned and most passionately discussed topic was the perceived increase in growth which has occurred within the Township in the past few years. Residents who had moved to the Township within the past ten years to avoid density and congestion were distressed as contiguous lots were being developed. The discussion of growth involved the concern over adequate water supply and on-site septic capabilities. The concepts of water/sewer are herein discussed under the ECOLOGY category.

In the past year two major subdivision applications were received by the Planning Board for review and approval. Both of these parcels of land were farms whose owners could no longer manage the farming activities. (Refer to Appendix A: Map 3A) Concerns expressed by the public focused on the impact these developments would have to the locations, open space, water and septic.

The issue of growth has become a major political issue and has caused tremendous polarization within the community. Large landowners, many farmers, fear that they are being down-zoned to provide open space for the benefit of small lot owners. The response by farmers is often, "if everyone wants open space, then let everyone bear the cost of obtaining open space".
PUBLIC UTILITIES

At the current time no public water or sewage treatment facilities exist within the Township. Discussions regarding the possible future necessity of planning for public facilities have primarily focused on the needs of the village of Ringoes. Discussions on the concept of providing public utilities to the village of Ringoes have often focused on whether this installation could accommodate the present requirements of the location with some continued growth, or whether the installation would encourage large scale development at a rate not previously experienced.

In considering the concept of cluster development, the issue of on site sewage treatment plants is a requisite when the intention is to cluster the housing on minimal land areas to achieve maximum open space. At the present time the State of New Jersey requires that for any on site sewer treatment plants, the local municipal government must be a co-permittee signer for the facility. Many residents expressed trepidation with respect to the liability the Township would be accepting in this situation.

TRAFFIC
As the population within the community and in surrounding communities has increased the volume of car and truck traffic on all roads has increased considerably. As previously detailed in Chapter II, many roads are experiencing volumes of traffic far in excess of their originally intended design and construction. Further, many interior roads in the Township are very winding, with extremely sharp turns, blind driveways and minimal visibility ranges. New home construction in the Township has occurred primarily on small lots along existing roads. This has resulted in additional ingress/egress driveways, which creates additional problems on the roadways.

Excessive through traffic is occurring as people travel from residential areas within the Township and surrounding Townships to major employment centers such as Flemington, Raritan/Somerset, Princeton and Trenton.

Residents expressed concern that improvements to local roads could result in increased volumes of traffic and excessive noise and air pollution will result. Township farmers are having increased difficulty travelling along interior roads with farming equipment. Many farmers currently farm numerous parcels of not only their land, but leased land. These parcels are not all contiguous and require that farmers travel the public roads to move
farming equipment from one area to another. Impatient drivers are at conflict with these slow moving farm machines, and lack of width prevents the farmers from pulling off the roads to provide safe passing for cars.

ECOLOGY
WATER AND SEPTIC
Of major concern to residents and public officials is the area of water supply and adequate septic facility. With no public utilities, these issues are of prime importance to all for obvious reasons. Hydrologists and Hydrogeologists have presented much data before the Planning Board, with respect to the availability of potable water supplies within the Township and the ability of the existing soils and subsoil geology to handle not only the existing septic requirements, but also the perceived future septic requirements. The data has in many instances been conflicting in its conclusions, creating additional confusion and concern among residents.

Perk and soil log tests are required on all subdivisions, minor or major, prior to approval. These tests are monitored by the Township's Board of Health. Because of underlying geology of Diabase and Lockatong in the Mountain, coupled with the slope conditions, some areas do experience periods of high groundwater tables and surface
water run off. Flood plain conditions have been identified along the Neshanic River in the northeast quadrant of the Township and along Back Brook, which crosses the Township from east to west and is a tributary of the Neshanic River. (1)

TRASH

No municipal trash removal service exists. Independent haulers contract with property owners for the removal of trash, with rates, number of pick-ups and volume of pick-ups varying among the haulers. Concern has been expressed by some residents regarding the ability for lower income and senior citizens to pay not only the existing rates, but the anticipating increased rates of the future.

As the State and County plan for and seek suitable sites for solid waste facilities, the less dense communities, such as East Amwell become prime targets. In 1986, several potential sites were identified in Hunterdon County and local citizens became immediately aware of the fact that East Amwell, with its low density population and large amount of open space was being considered, as were surrounding municipalities. While the County, has narrowed its list to a few sites, none of which are located within the Township, the residents have continual trepidation regarding the future requirements of the County.
A voluntary re-cycling program has been in existence within the Township, and recently the State of New Jersey passed legislation which will make re-cycling mandatory, with implementation required by July of 1988. While general concensus has been that all will benefit from re-cycling, residents have expressed the need for a system which is workable for the average citizen. As trash removal and mandatory re-cycling impact the entire state, residents in not only this Township but all rural areas express serious concern over illegal trash dumping which occurrs along remote roads in less densely populated areas. The Township currently experiences some illegal trash dumping and residents do not want the situation to become any worse.

CONSERVATION
The concern over natural resource conservation focused on three areas, soils, rivers/streams and woodlands. Associated with these categories were the associated wildlife issues. Local farmers have long been knowledgable in the types of soils which exist in the Township and the suitability of these soils. The most sophisticated methods of land management are currently practiced by most of the active large scale farms, primarily out of their commitment to the land and the economic necessity to manage the land in the most efficient manner. The terracing work discussed
in Chapter II was a major effort on the part of farmers to control run-off conditions and therefore utilize the soils responsibly.

Farmers involved in large scale farming operations have expressed concerns over lack of soil management on the part of smaller farmers, who in many instances are new to farming or farm on a part-time basis, i.e. gentlemen farmers. Primary areas of concern are those land management responsibilities which are associated with grazing livestock on smaller parcels of land, disposal of manure, control of multi-flora rose and other unacceptable vegetation and the continual replenishment of nutrients to the soils. Soil erosion is evident in several locations within the Township, which has been a direct result of over grazing of livestock.

WATER/STREAMS
Associated with the concerns of growth, have been the concerns over the impact that development will have on the local streams and rivers, as run-off increases. Besides the Neahanic River, numerous creeks and small streams criss-cross the Township. (Refer to Appendix A: Map 3B) Also associated with the run-off problem is the impact chemicals utilized for residential landscaping have on the ecological balance of the natural waterways. Concern over the
possibility of septic effluent leaching into natural waterways is also a concern. The State of New Jersey recently passed legislation which precludes the development of any locations designated as "wetlands".

WOODLANDS
Over 90% of the Mountain zone is wooded and a significant portion of the Valley zone is wooded. Several woodlots are "farmed" and under the Farmland Assessment Program are required to have acceptable forestry management programs in place. Development is impacting on the woodlands, as lots are cleared for construction. These activities have increased the ongoing conflict between man and the resident deer population. The woodlands harbour large populations of deer who have been prolific in the reproduction, and who use cultivated crops and landscape plantings for their main source of nourishment.

SOCIAL
HOUSING
Housing costs in East Amwell have historically been within an affordable range for persons in all income levels. A great deal of fear has been expressed regarding the ability for lower and middle income families to either purchase existing homes or build new homes within the community, as land and housing prices increase. With the per capita
income at roughly $28,000 in 1980, it is obvious that this community was not heavily populated by persons of great affluence. As the push for housing contiguous to open space eminates from Princeton and surrounding suburban centers (Refer to Chapter IV), great fear exists on the part of Township residents that the location will suffer from "Gentrification". This has in fact been happening to some extent, as recent construction shows much larger homes, with much larger price tags. Based on current sales, the 1990 per capita income for the Township will easily double.

Under the guidelines established by the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing, the Township was required to provide for 14 indigenous affordable housing units. Concern has been expressed regarding the lack of new affordable housing units most specifically any new housing for senior citizens. Many long time residents of the Township are nearing retirement age, and would like to continue living in the Township after they retire. As is often the case, their current home and land holdings are far beyond their physical or economic capabilities.

SCHOOLS
Within the past year, the School Board of the Township has indicated the need for immediate expansion of the existing
school facility (K-8) and the need for long term planning for the creation and construction of a Middle School. Concern over the economic impact of this new construction and ongoing operational costs, has been expressed by local residents. A consensus exists regarding the need and desire for quality schooling, but trepidation exists regarding the ability of the existing community to fund large scale new construction and if this new construction will fuel the fires of development.

The existing school is located near the intersection of Wertsville Road and Route 202, adjacent to one of the areas zoned for Highway/Office use. A proposed shopping center along Route 202 northeast of Wertsville road, contiguous to the school property has been fought by the School Board. The litigation is ongoing and has been quite costly for the School Board.

FIRE/POLICE
As was indicated in Chapter II, the Fire and Emergency services are provided by two volunteer organizations, one located in Ringoes and the other located in Hopewell Borough. Some residents feel the increased development within the Township, will create a need for a municipally owned Fire and Emergency department. This concern extends to police protection, which is currently supplied by the
New Jersey State Police. Municipalities without local police protection, have such protection provided by the State Police by State law. Some long term residents fear that newer residents, long used to local fire and police protection, will eventually demand these local services from the Township. It is felt that the cost of administering local services will greatly increase the tax rates.

RECREATIONAL
The expressed need for additional recreational space is included under the "Aesthetic" category.

AESTHETIC
HISTORIC/ARCHITECTURAL
The lack of a local historic commission is nowhere more evident than in the village of Ringoes. Though sufficient documentation exists to defend the creation of an Historic District for Ringoes, no governmental action has been taken. This lack of action has in fact had a negative impact on the village itself, in that no protection is offered to the streetscapes and building facades. Commercial establishments in the central business district of Ringoes have no architectural control over changes or renovations to building exteriors. Some recent remodeling
has actually diluted the cohesiveness of the village streetscapes. Refer to Appendix B: Illustrations of Ringoes Village. Residents continually express concern over preserving the "charm" of Ringoes. The additional Historic Districts of Reaville, Werts ville and Linvale are also lacking.

Though substantial research and documentation was created for the preparation of the History of East Amwell, 1700-1800, additional work is necessary. As the Hunterdon County Master Plan has delineated (Refer to Appendix A: Map 2-D), East Amwell Township has a significant number of sites of historic interest.\(^5\) No cohesive literature exists which offers the existing residents or new residents a base of information regarding the historical resources of the Township.

Archeological sites of significance have also not been identified or offered protection from desicration by development or construction.

"Highfields", the Lindbergh property, is currently owned by the State of New Jersey, and under the Department of Corrections, operates a residential correctional facility for boys in the residence facility. The house is the site of the kidnapping of the first child of Ann and Charles
Lindbergh, which has often been referred to as the "crime of the century". The property is not listed on either the State or National Register of Historic Places, and no efforts are currently in existence to do so. The land is approximately 250 acres, some of which is in Hopewell Township. The residence is within the boundaries of East Amwell Township. A legislative action to sell off some of the lands occurred several years ago, and with public pressure was reversed. No protection currently exists to preclude the State of New Jersey from selling any of the lands. The Highfield property adjoins a substantial parcel of land owned by the State of New Jersey and two smaller parcels owned by the Township.

OPEN SPACE/SCENIC VISTAS

Though large numbers of residents have attested to their love of the scenic vistas within the entire Township, no definitive plan exists to protect these open space corridors. The fear of development is associated with the anticipated loss of open space and "rural" character which has been a source of pride for long time residents and a reason for relocation into the Township by newer residents.

A majority of the existing open space is farmland, and these open spaces exist as such because they are actively
frowned. Fear exists that even if the lands are not developed, a cessation of farming activities could result in the lands' inevitable return to its natural state and a substantial increase in the growth of multi-flora rose and other such forms of unwanted vegetation.

A concern exists regarding the placement of new homes on the lands and the visual impact that these structures make from an aesthetic standpoint. Opposition to changes in familiar landscapes is a natural phenomenon shared by not only small lot owners, but large land owners also.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES
As the profile of residents has changed in the Township, the need for recreational facilities for those residents who desire team sport programs or who prefer recreational activities which are not possible within the limits of their own property have occurred. The organized sports program operated within the Township are at capacity, with continual demands increasing yearly. The Recreation Committee has recognized this fact and has expressed concern over the need for expanded public facilities. To meet these needs, the Township would have to acquire additional land and construct suitable facilities.

ECONOMIC
AGRICULTURE

With agriculture as its major industry, the Township is overwhelmingly sensitive to the agricultural industry and its continued economic viability. Resident farmers have expressed numerous concerns over their ability to continue farming in the Township at the current levels for several reasons. A majority of the resident farmers are reaching retirement age and few have children who have expressed an interest or an intention to continue farming. This decision on the part of the next generation is based on the questionable economic feasibility of farming and the diminishing farmlands available for viable farming operations to exist. Residents farmers are currently farming some lands which they do not own. It must be assumed that some of these lands are speculative investments.

According to census information, the amount of farmland in Hunterdon County is decreasing, while rural population, on the decline in the first forty years of this century, is now increasing yearly. Average farm size has been a continually decreasing number. This can be attributed to the small "gentlemen" farmettes, which are usually around 6-10 acres to meet minimum Farmland Assessment requirements.
Smaller part-time farmers and gentlemen farmers express concern over their ability to continue their farming activities, as larger working farms cease to exist. Under the New Jersey Law, farmland assessment is available to any property with five or more acres of land devoted to agriculture, which receives $500 plus $5 per acre in agricultural related income per year. Many residents either lease their lands to full time farmers or have cooperative farming efforts with full time farmers. Some of these part time activities would be unable to continue without full time farming operations within the area.

TAXES
Owing to its rural character, low density and lack of public services, East Amwell has enjoyed relatively low real property taxes. These taxes are primarily residential in their source. With the need for additional Social Services on the part of the Township, residents have raised concern over the related impact this will have on their taxes. Specific concern is focused on the Township's minimal rateable tax base and a concern that East Amwell is becoming a bedroom community for surrounding employment centers. Senior citizens have questioned how they will be able to continue to live within the community as property taxes increase.
Other residents have been concerned that any increase in Industrial or Commercial construction will result in the Township losing its status as a non-growth rural community. Should this non-growth status be lost, additional low-income housing requirements will be required under the Mount Laurel II(7) ruling which affects the amount of affordable housing which must exist within each community. Growth communities are required to provide a percentage of affordable housing within each new major development.

The tax rate in the Township was recently raised to $2.67 for 1988 from $2.36 in 1987. (Prior tax rates were $1.73 - 1983; $1.88 - 1984; $1.98 - 1985 and $2.16 - 1986. The current rates reflect no provision for any bond issues for either agricultural development rights purchase programs, open space/green acres purchase programs, funding for either the expansion of the existing school or construction of the middle school or any future construction of public utilities.
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CHAPTER IV

EXTERNAL ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

The evaluation of the subject Township necessitated consideration of certain external issues. It was felt that these issues had either an indirect or direct effect on the Township and also could impact on future plans of the Township.

Many of these issues, such as growth and agricultural economics are extremely complex issues which cannot be discussed completely in the limits of this chapter. It is necessary, though, to highlight certain aspects of these issues which are being considered in the preparation of a Preservation Plan.

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT

New Jersey is currently the most densely populated state in the United States and has experienced phenomenal growth over the past decade. This growth can be attributed to several factors including, a per capita income level which
is higher than the national average, a low un-employment rate and close proximity to not only New York and Philadelphia, but also direct access to other major cities in the Northeast corridor. This growth and expansion has for the most part avoided the previously existing urban centers, such as Trenton, Camden, Newark and Paterson and has focused primarily on the suburban and rural areas of the state. In fact, the six largest cities of the State lost over 13% of their population from 1970 - 1985. Farmland within the State has dropped by 830,000 acres from 1950 to 1985. (1) The rate of loss of farmland is increasing. Major corporate employment centers have been established around Princeton, Somerset and Morristown, to name a few. These suburban employment centers result in a shift of residential demand to previously undeveloped communities as well as additional growth and density within older established suburbs. Additional traffic and congestion problems associated with suburban employment have effectively "choked" many of New Jersey's roadways. 

No roadway has experienced more congestion than the Route 1 Corridor which runs from New York to Trenton. Based on studies completed by the New Jersey Department of Transportation, the population along this corridor will continue to grow through the year 2005, even though conditions along the roadway are best described as
"unbearable". The Route 1 Corridor is within ten miles of East Amwell Township.

As the Princeton Corridor and Somerville employment centers have continued to grow and attract Fortune 500 companies to their office parks and town centers, the need for local housing has exploded. Many existing homes have experienced appreciation of 150% to 300% in the past five years. The demand for quality housing has far exceeded the available supply. The domino affect of this rapid growth, has resulted in existing towncenters becoming more densely populated and new construction beginning to consume surrounding open spaces at an ever increasing rate. Several neighboring municipalities are reaching the point of complete build out, such as Plainsboro and West Windsor.

This urban sprawl has forced land prices to all time highs, offering retirement age farmers an enticing enducement to sell their land and in their words "reap their last harvest". These attractive proposals, would allow many individuals the ability to retire with a financial stability that they have not previously enjoyed during a career which was comprised of long hard hours of work, with little leisure time and marginal economic return.

As the growth has eminated outward from more densely
populated centers, conflict has not only arisen between newcomers and oldtimers in various communities, but also between various municipalities. Princeton Borough recently tried to sue surrounding communities who were welcoming growth, because it felt this growth did not only not benefit Princeton Borough, but that it actually had a negative impact on the location. It would appear to be a consensus that most residents of New Jersey have welcomed the economic benefit which this tremendous growth has brought, but disdain any change within their community which affects where they live and how they live. In short, the "not in my backyard" mentality applies.

Many examples of bad development, exhibiting poor planning, marginal construction quality and objectionable architectural style, have become highly visible bench-marks for municipalities to use in their efforts to fight development. Rural communities, such as East Amwell, fear large scale development of "townhomes", gobbling up the rolling hillsides of their township. Many communities, including East Amwell, have considered and in fact legislated larger minimum lot sizes for residential construction, with the feeling that this would thwart the pressures of development. This has in reality not been in any way an effective mechanism to deter the continual nibbling away of the open land. Market pressures are so
strong that developers have adapted to the larger lot requirements and have built larger homes to compensate for having to build fewer homes.

NEW JERSEY STATE PLANNING COMMISSION

On January 2, 1986, Governor Kean signed into law a State Planning Act, which created a State Planning Commission which would have the responsibility of evaluating the growth within the State and preparing a State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP). The creation of this Commission resulted from a general consensus by not only local and state governmental agencies, but also environmental and agricultural groups and private citizens, that the growth in New Jersey had to be controlled in a more statewide cohesive manner.

Certain commitments were evident and included a commitment to continued viability of farming in this the "Garden State"(4), as well as strong regulatory controls to protect the natural resources of the State. While the creation of the "Pinelands" in gave legislative protection to over an environmentally sensitive area in the central portion of New Jersey, concern has been directed to the coastal shoreline, groundwater throughout the state, numerous parklands and forest, as well as the smaller towns and
villages found throughout the State. The SDRP also had the responsibility of providing guidelines to reverse the migration from the decaying urban centers and thereby decreasing the momentum of urban sprawl into suburban and rural communities.

To summarize the following goals were established:(5)

1. To Promote Beneficial Economic Growth, Development and Renewal
2. Provide Adequate Public Services at Reasonable Cost
3. Protect Natural Resources
4. To Revitalize Urban Areas
5. To Provide Housing at a Reasonable Cost
6. To Preserve and Enhance Historic, Cultural, Open Space and Recreational Lands and Structures
7. To Ensure Sound and Integrated Planning Statewide

The SDRP effectively broke the entire State of New Jersey into seven tiers (with Open Space indicated on the mapping, but not described as a tier):

GROWTH AREAS
1. Redeveloping Cities and Suburbs
2. Stable Cities and Suburbs
3. Suburban and Rural Towns
4. Suburbanizing Areas

LIMITED GROWTH AREAS
5. Future Suburbanizing Areas
6A. Agricultural Areas
6B. Environmentally Sensitive Areas
7. Environmentally Sensitive Areas

OPEN SPACE

(Refer to Appendix C: Map 4-A Planning Commission Map).

The SDRP is currently a two volume document and was presented in January 1988 as a working document in "draft".
Comments and suggestions regarding its content are to be presented to the State Planning Commission by mid-May of 1988. Because New Jersey is a "home-rule" state, which affords local municipalities the powers to create their own zoning controls, the SDRP must complete a cross-acceptance provision in order to be adopted by each municipality. No municipality is required to adopt the SDRP, though the success of the SDRP for the entire State would appear to be directly dependent on uniform acceptance by local governments. The process of cross acceptance is expected to take at least four months.

REACTIONS TO THE STATE PLAN
For the preparation of East Amwell's Preservation Plan, several responses to the proposed SDRP were evaluated. Some of these responses were from the Agricultural Community. It was felt that the impact of the SDRP on Agriculture is of great importance to the Township, if indeed the municipality is committed to preserving agriculture. Further, a substantial part of the township was mapped in Tier 6A and 6B, Agricultural and Environmentally Sensitive Areas respectively.

A response to the SDRP by Arthur R. Brown, Jr., State Secretary of Agriculture focused on how the proposed
density factors would affect the value of farmland. The land values are of major concern to farmers, as this often affects their ability to borrow money to operate. The SDRP had prescribed 20 acre density levels for the lands deemed to be within Agricultural Tiers. Secretary Brown felt these restrictions on growth were excessively restrictive in light of economic pressures affecting the agricultural industry. The loss of equity to the farm land owners created by the down-zoning proposals of the SDRP could actually "put more 'for sale' and 'sold' signs on agricultural land than any other policy change in history". (6)

The New Jersey Farm Bureau, a private organization, which is the only organized representative for the farming industry has been greatly involved in the review of the SDRP, and has on numerous occasions expressed similar concerns to those noted by Secretary Brown. Discussions of the SDRP were held at length with members of the Farm Bureau, and on January 19, 1987 a program was sponsored by two local East Amwell organizations, wherein the Farm Bureau discussed various planning issues, including TDR's and the economics of agriculture in general. (7)

Various local, county and state agricultural board representatives met in February of 1988 with John Epling,
the Director of the New Jersey State Planning Commission to express their concerns over the proposed State Plan and how it would effect their local operations, both now and for the future. The State Planning Commission has indicated that no economic analysis will be prepared regarding the impact of extremely low densities on farm land values.

The New Jersey Builders Association indicated in their "State Development and Redevelopment Plan Overview", that it was their impression that the SDRP was actually a conservation plan, with housing and economic development being residual issues of lower priority. The fact that Tiers 6 and 7 reflects two-thirds of the State's entire land, is felt to be excessively restrictive to allow for even necessary growth. The Association feels that the State has not fully evaluated or realized the economic impact that the proposed SDRP will have on the State's economy, not only in the short term, but also in the long term.

TRANSFER DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS-ENABLING LEGISLATION

The State of New Jersey does not currently have enabling legislation to allow for Transfer Development Rights, except for special legislation which enabled the Pinelands Development Commission to utilize TDR's within the Pinelands. At this time a Bill which would allow for this
type of land use administration, is stalled in the State Assembly.

In December of 1986, Secretary of Agriculture Arthur Brown and Walter Ellis, Jr., President of the NJ Farm Bureau prepared and presented to the various State legislators a "TDR: Critical Points for Agriculture" paper which outlined the concerns the agricultural community has regarding proposed TDR legislation. (Refer to Appendix B: "TDR: Critical...). 

AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY

The continued economic viability of farming within East Amwell is dependent to a great extent on not only statewide and U.S. economic conditions in agriculture, but also on worldwide factors. The United States has had a general movement away from smaller family owned farm operations, toward larger corporate owned farming operations. This movement is evident in New Jersey where average farm size (excluding small farmettes) in acres increased from 79 acres in 1956 to 130 acres in 1979.\(^9\) Realizing the importance of maintaining a certain level of good quality agricultural land, the United States Department of Agriculture, as well as various State Ag Boards, and also Agricultural Economists at major universities have analysed
the crisis of diminishing farmland and an agricultural industry which offers minimal return to the farmer.

Various techniques range from differential assessment, income tax credits, agricultural zoning, purchase of development rights and transfer of development rights, just to name a few. In 1960, New Jersey became the second state to enact a differential assessment statute for lands classified as "agricultural", which were being actively farmed. The minimum acreage for qualification is five acres, excluding land around the residence and farm buildings. Income requirements are $500 plus $5 per acre per annum of farm related income. Agriculture in this instance embraces all forms of agricultural activities, from grain farming to flower hot houses. Tree farms and timber forests also apply, though in the latter instance a formal forestry management program must be filed with the application. Roll-back taxes are imposed for farmland which is taken out of active farming status.

As U.S. Farmers face increased competition from foreign growers (who experience far lower labor and management costs, as well as considerable governmental subsidies) the ability to continue to operate a financially viable farming operation diminishes. Current cash grain prices are often not sufficient to cover expenses for planting and
harvesting, with no margin for capital (equipment & land). Refer to Appendix B: Chart 4-A for cash grain price information.

Recently, the State of New Jersey through a voters referendum question increased the flexibility of the 1981 Farmland Preservation Bond Fund and allocated $50,000,000 for the purchase of Agricultural Development Rights. This program would require the land owner to sell the development rights to their property in perpetuity. The value of these rights would be the difference in value in the land as it exists today, and what the value will be with the development right restriction placed on the parcel. The proceeds from the sale of Agricultural Development Rights are taxed as income to the landowner. The final review process for selection will consider various items, such as the current operation and viability for future operation, the quality and size of the land and whether the farm is contiguous to other operating farms. Four farms in the Township have applied to sell their agricultural development rights.

As of April of 1988 the State Agriculture Development Committee had received $111,000,000 in applications. This would indicate a serious problem in adequately providing to protect existing farm operations from encroaching
development. The staff of the State Ag Development Committee has recently suggested that a cap be set on price per acreage paid by the state, and counties and local municipalities be required to provide the additional funding required to compensate the land owner for the appraised value of the development rights.

PRESERVATION AND CONSERVATION ISSUES
At the same time that the referencum ballot approved the $50,000,000 for the purchase of Agricultural Development Rights, a Bond Issue for $100,000,000 was approved which allowed for conservation and cultural programs, including Historic Preservation.

New Jersey does have a "Green Acres" program for the conservation of open space. Local municipalities are eligible for this program through a matching grant system.

On a national level, Congressman Morris Udall (AZ.) has recently introduced federal legislation, called the "Trust Fund" bill, which will require that the unappropriated balances of the Historic Preservation Fund and the Land and Water Conservation Fund be placed in interest bearing accounts. This joint effort of conservationists and preservationists would allow for adequate monies to support
their efforts. Funds would not come directly from the much overdrawn National Budget, but would come from Outer Continental Shelf Lands leases.\(^{(12)}\)

**LEGAL ISSUES**

Recent United States Supreme Court decisions (First English Evangelical Lutheran Church v. County of Los Angeles\(^{(13)}\) and Nollan v. California Coastal Commission \(^{(14)}\)) affecting due compensation for the taking of land, have had a significant impact on the legal opinions surrounding zoning ordinances which significantly affect a landowners ability to develop land. In fact this issue of confiscation of lands, has taken on Executive attention, and on March 15, 1988, President Reagan issued an order entitled "Governmental Actions and Interferences With Constitutionally Protected Property Rights". President Reagan charged the United State Attorney General to provide guidelines for unanticipated takings of land. The guidelines are to be established by May 1, 1988. The decision to make this request, was a result of the recent Supreme Court decisions, which "reaffirmed the fundamental protection of private property rights provided by the Fifth amendment".\(^{(15)}\)

**CONTIGUOUS COMMUNITIES**

The Township of East Amwell shares borders with seven other
municipalities which are located in three counties (Hunterdon, Somerset and Mercer). Significant zoning variances exist between East Amwell's recent zoning changes and between East Amwell's recent zoning changes and those across the Township boundaries. (Refer to Appendix A: Map 4-B. Additional issues include the fact that four of East Amwell's recommended historic districts have a portion of their area in neighboring municipalities. West Amwell Township is currently preparing documentation to have the Rocktown district placed on the State and National Register of Historic Places. East Amwell is not participating in this nomination process.

A portion of the Township has been included in the SDRP as a Future Suburbanizing Area, primarily due to the location's proximity to Hopewell Borough and the Route 518/Route 31 intersection. The Township currently has this area zoned at it's lowest density.
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11. Expands the existing Farmland Retention Program to allow for the purchase of Development Rights beyond the current 50% limit.


13. U.S. Supreme Court Case, First English Evangelical Lutheran Church v. County of Los Angeles, 96 L.Ed.2d 250.

15. As reported in *This Week in Farm Bureau*, published by the New Jersey Farm Bureau, Vol XXVI, No. 14, April 9, 1988.
CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS

The analysis is intended to draw conclusions based on the information available. Where insufficient information was found it is so indicated.

GROWTH

The ability to effectively stop growth within the Township or to hold the growth rate at the level experienced in the past few years, is improbable given not only legal constraints, but also the extremely strong development pressures from surrounding communities. Efforts on the part of the Township government have been directed in the "stop development" direction and not in the "growth management" direction. While the majority of residents would prefer to see the Township remain unchanged, it is unlikely that no development will occur.

No longer looked at with an upturned nose by the large corporate metropolis of New York, New Jersey is now seen as a wonderful real estate bargain, and the mass migration of
Fortune 500 companies to various locations in the Garden State proves this premise. But the State has realized that is paying the price for development as growth is running unchecked in all areas.

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan was prepared after much evaluation of plans used in other states, such as Vermont, Florida, Hawaii and Oregon. What is perhaps lacking in the utilization of the guidelines in these other plans, was the necessary adjustment to meet the demographics and economics of the State of New Jersey. As an example, Florida has a very high senior citizen population, therefore, the state’s economic basis and demographic cross-section is much different. Housing is more oriented to the retired person or the vacationer. New Jersey has long been a bedroom community for New York and in recent years for Philadelphia. The continuing need to provide housing for major U.S. cities, is to be expected by New Jersey and while the SDRP does anticipate the growth it has been written with a belief that a State Plan can direct where people will live. The intention of the SDRP in its focus on inner city rehabilitation is well founded, but the working parameters for achieving this rehabilitation is not yet completed.

Any rehabilitation of the inner cities and suburbs of the State can aide in providing much needed housing for the
lower and middle income families, but even with considerable redevelopment, it is questionable whether a direct impact will occur on residential development in the rural areas. The land prices show emphatically that the cost of even minimum lots for new house construction fall within the spending abilities of the upper middle class and upper class families. The SDRP guidelines which will deter State financing of public utilities in Agricultural and Environmental Tiers(1) will perhaps thwart large scale developments aimed at the middle income bracket, but it is questionable whether this will have any affect on the individual who is financially able to purchase a larger lot and provide on site water and septic. Density factors alone can be misleading in evaluating whether growth management has been successful in preserving open space and agricultural lands. Refer to Appendix B: Illustrations of New Homes. Fewer homes does not guarantee that open space is preserved, and a proliferation of large mini-mansions is not an identifying characteristic of a rural location.

The problem of traffic and inadequate road systems will not abate even in the event of no growth in rural areas. Even now the Township experiences large volumes of through traffic resulting not only from commuters, but also truck traffic looking for alternatives to the "choked" Route 1 Corridor.
Research for this Preservation Plan has shown that the State of New Jersey has, through not only the newly created State Planning Commission, but through numerous other State departments and agencies, studied and defined its needs with respect to growth management, protection of natural resources, preservation of agriculture and historical areas. But action on these already clearly defined points, is and has been very slow in coming. In short, the State has been long on rhetoric and very short on action. A case in point would be open space which has been on too many agenda’s as a necessity for any level of quality of life in the entire State. But the "Green Acres" program has had limited funding, requiring matching funds from local municipalities, many of whom will never have the adequate resources. The result of this creation of a good concept with inadequate funding has been growth in areas already targeted for permanent open space. The continual drop in acres devoted to Agriculture is known on a yearly basis through the Farmland Assessment applications, and yet the recent funding of $50,000,000 to purchase Agriculture Development Rights, was inadequate from its inception. These short-falls in funding come at a time when the State is experiencing a surplus in its treasury.

This concept and attitude of spending far too long in the
research and study phase, and far too little time in the creation of pragmatic plans with adequate funding has permiated to the County governments and Local governments. In the case of the study Township, the subject of local bonding to provide funding for the purchase of Ag Development Rights, was again tabled for no definitive reason. Waiting for action on the part of the County, in this case, allows for considerable passage of valuable time. Local municipalities, while certainly cognitive of State level planning efforts, would do well to begin to create more detailed Master Plans for their own communities, as large-scale plans for the entire State are long in the preparation and discussion stages, and development in the mean time continues to eat up more acres of open land.

ECOLOGY

GROUND WATER/SEPTIC

Certain ecological issues were of major importance in considering the future of the Township. The long term question has yet to be answered regarding the ability of a Township like East Amwell to continue through even a normal growth pattern with no public utilities. In the event of ground water contamination, no alternative water source is in place nor has the ability to provide alternative water sources been evaluated. The the reluctance of
municipalities to enter into the co-permitree requirement for on site sewer treatment plants evolved from the bad experiences which occurred previously in the State. It would seem that with the extensive research being conducted by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, that clear guidelines could be established which would allow municipalities to better evaluate proposed systems, so as to avoid mechanical failures which result in economic burdens. Technology is improving, and in fact, many newer on site sewage treatment facilities may be far more ecologically safe than older on site septic systems installed by individual homeowners.

The argument regarding whether public utilities create growth or respond to it is an ongoing one. What is necessary is to evaluate what the community needs to provide safe potable water and adequate septic treatment facilities, not only now, but in the foreseeable future.

In June of 1987, Governor Kean issued an executive order prohibiting the issuance of any state permit for construction or development on the identified freshwater wetlands in New Jersey. This 18 month order will remain in effect until enabling legislation is in place to make the requirement law. The Township has significant date regarding the location of wetlands within its boundaries.
Refer to Appendix A: Map 5-A.

TRASH SITES

The possibility of East Amwell being chosen for either trash burial sites or dumping sites would seem to be diminished at this point in time. This is not to eliminate the future possibility of the location becoming more attractive as the State continues to grow and populate. If the effort of the State through it's SDRP is to protect the Environmental and Agriculture Tiers, it would appear to be prudent to prohibit any construction of either trash recovery plants or dumping sites within these Tiers. This would assure municipalities that their large inventory of open space does not put them in a target position for future dumping sites.

CONSERVATION

The basic guidelines for conservation of natural resources do not appear to be known by all residents of the Township. The State of New Jersey has extensive information through various agencies regarding soil conservation, wood lot management and protection of streams and ponds, and yet this information has not been disseminated and reproduced in a form useful to the average resident. Long term farmers have long known these guidelines for land management, but in many cases those new to the concept of farming do not practice even the basics of acceptable manure disposal. Overgrazing
of pastures is evident and has already caused erosian problems. Refer to Appendix C: Illustration of overgrazed land.

While a map prepared for the Master Plan which shows the areas targeted for conservation (Refer to Appendix A: Map 5-B), this information has not been used to plan for either the direct procurement of these lands or the acceptance of any donation of these lands by a municipal agency to assure their protection. In 1970 the "Hunterdon County Park and Open Space Plan" was prepared by the Hunterdon County Parks and Open Space Advisory Committee. The report is concise and well prepared. It blueprints a cohesive park system for the entire County. The portion of this map which includes East Amwell Township is found in Appendix A: Map 5-C. At the time of preparation it was established that a ratio of eight (8) acres per 1000 residents was the target ratio. In 1970, the Township was deficient by 17 acres, and with estimated populations for 1986, it would be deficient by 29 acres. A detail sketch plan for the Back Brook park area was prepared for this report and is included in Appendix A: Map 5-D. It is interesting to note that this proposed park system runs adjacent to both of the properties which recently applied for major-subdivisions before the East Amwell Township Planning Board. (Refer to Appendix C: Illustrations of Back Brook area).
The Township currently has no mowing requirements on open space or pastureland. Therefore, lands previously cleared and used for farming have become overgrown with weeds such as multa-flora rose. These unsightly patches of brambles continue to grow and encroach on surrounding lands. The beautiful vistas and open spaces created by active farming will not remain so should the farming activities cease. Refer to Appendix C: Illustration of farmland overgrown with brambles and multi-flora rose. This possibility is always looming over the Township, as local farmers age and profit margins in farming shrink. No landowner can be required to farm, and the ability to conserve the lands are directly dependent on the ability to keep farming activities ongoing. Farmlands are, therefore, not a a guaranteed source of perpetual open space or scenic vistas. It is poor planning for municipalities to improperly plan for permanent open space and parklands procurement with the assumption that the beautiful planted fields and mowed pastures will provide these benefits.

Damage to croplands and cultivated trees and shrubs by the resident deer population increase yearly, as the forestlands and open spaces continue to shrink. Some farmers indicate that the loss to deer is of major financial impact to their operations. Though yearly hunting seasons have experienced
record levels in the past few years, the deer have adjusted and populate at higher rates. Clearly adjusted to residential encroachment, deer often graze on lawns and shrubs adjacent to homes, often during daylight hours. Traffic accidents involving deer are numerous and usually result in extensive damage. Public sentiment from those new to rural living often expressed in Letters to the Editor in local newspapers, often decries the barbaric killing of wildlife. Too often safe-hunting is precluded by more dense residential areas adjacent to working farms and woodlands.

ECONOMICS
AGRICULTURE

The question of viability of agriculture is extremely complex and has involved much research on the part of agricultural economists. While New Jersey continues to reiterate its commitment to agriculture, it would appear to be necessary for the State of define the types of agriculture it intends to preserve. The specific land, buildings, etc. requirements for the targeted agricultural industries would aide in the planning decisions making process which is ongoing. Peter Furey of the New Jersey Farm Bureau feels that the amount of agricultural lands targeted in the Agricultural Tiers might be far in excess of the requisite number of acres that the State will need in the future. As farming becomes more mechanized and efficient, land
requirement can decrease. Certain types of livestock farming, such as pigs and chickens, might be suitable for operation in a limited number of locations, due to contiguous residential areas. Conflict arises as working farms are near residential areas, though New Jersey does have "Right to Farm" legislation. Residents new to rural living are often unfamiliar with odors, noise, pesticides and long hours required for farming.

The fact that the referendum vote heavily supported (80/20) the Agricultural Development Rights program, indicates a clear commitment on the part of residents to the protection of the best agricultural operations. The $50,000,000 amount is inadequate and support should be immediately ongoing for yearly allocations to this program, so as to avoid a situation where farmers not selected for the Ag Development Rights Program, decide to take the "developer's offer".

Local (i.e. county and municipal) development rights programs are beginning to exist in New Jersey. Recent discussions of a local bonding issue have been stalled at the discussion stage, with no implementation planned for the immediate future.

An annual joint meeting of the agricultural boards on February 22, 1988 allowed those in attendance to question
John Epling, Director of State Planning on the provisions of the SDRP, specifically relating to the Agricultural Tiers. Mr. Epling conceded that there is "a need for more tools" to preserve agriculture, but offered no definitive information. (3) Farmers voiced their opinions on the failure of the Pinelands Development Credit program, the assumption that agricultural TDR programs have really "worked" in Montgomery County, Maryland and simple economic questions regarding the practical future of agriculture in the State. After significant pressure on the issues of Agriculture, the Office of State Planning established a technical advisory committee to help in the review process of the SDRP. A rural technical committee will also be created.

LAND TRUSTS

Land banking is used to describe large scale public acquisition of land for future uses. These uses can be for development or non-development, such as agriculture or recreation. In his essay, "Land Banking, Public Policy, Alternatives & Dilemmas", (4) Sylvan Kamm concludes that Land Banking is not a workable solution for the United States. He feels that the uses in Europe, primarily in Sweden, were not applicable to this country. The burden of debt is extremely high, and often the purchase process has an inflationary impact on the value of the land. Not
completely negative on the subject of land banking, Kamm feels that it is useful in small doses. Ann Strong, analysed the use of Land Banking in Europe to ascertain its applicability in the U.S. in 1979(5), and found that there was a difference in attitude about land banking in this country. Americans have long associated procurement of land with speculation for profit. It is questionable whether this country would embrace the public land trust procurement of land at prices which were not accepted as "due compensation".

One could argue that the national park system is a form of land banking, as is the governmental ownership of vast rangelands in the Western and Southwestern parts of the United States. Though these lands, were for the most part acquired at times when the purchase prices were minimal. Present land values, would dictate very large price tags for governmental land banking, at a time when the Federal Budget is experiencing record deficits. Congressman Udall's proposal for federal legislation to provide full funding of unappropriated balances in the "Trust Fund" would provide a source of funds for the acquisition of lands. It is interesting to note that this philosophy of land use and the requisite for federal legislation was outlined in detail in an article written by Congressman Udall in 1975, entitled "Land Use: Why We Need Federal Legislation".(6)
The SDRP establishes no Land Trusts in its provisions, but rather focuses on the philosophy that low-density provisions in the Environmental and Agriculture tiers will force development to other areas. It is questionable if the mere description of an area as an Agricultural area, without definitive economic and planning practices to assure its continued viability, will provide the agricultural lands perceived necessary into the future.

TAX BASE/DEMOGRAPHICS

East Amwell Township has in its history been a municipality with a low per capita income level, low density and because of minimal municipal services a low tax rate. Current sales price information indicates that the average three bedroom, 1 1/2 bath home in the Township on a minimal lot has a market price of $200,000. New construction for the same house on minimal lots (3 to 5 acres) carry a price tag of averaging $350,000. Using conventional mortgage terms of 80% financing ratios, a 25 year term with a rate of 10.5%, the purchaser for an existing home would be required to have an income of approximately $70,000. New home purchasers would require an income of approximately $110,000. These income levels would indicate a large disparity in the person moving into the community and the person currently residing in the community (using the 1980 per capita income of
The recent increases in tax-rates and property values have in fact created selling for profit or displacement due to an inability to afford current real estate taxes. In effect, those residents who moved into the Township over five years ago to realize a certain level of quality, are now finding that they are becoming the "lower class" in the Township. It is questionable if necessary funding for conservation, social and agricultural programs is within the limits of some residents. The preservation of the community has a significant challenge in this regard, as the character of the community has been strongly built on the profile of "rural" residents who have lived here and worked here over the past three hundred years.

AESTHETICS
HISTORIC DISTRICTS/COMMISSION
The need for a local Historic Commission is paramount to this community's planning process. The lack of follow-up on recommendations made not only by the County, but also in a more diluted form in the Master Plan, has no definitive response. The small Hamlets recommended for Historic Districting, are currently unprotected, and the Lindberg Estate, "Highfields" has no historic designation. This lack of a municipal agency which focuses on the historic
entegrity of the Township has fostered a lack of knowledge on the part of residents regarding their community. Many new residents have no knowledge of the historic significance of many structures and locations.

With the recent polarization of the community caused by recommended zoning changes, a fracturing of community spirit has occurred. Working to establish a definitive history of the Township and identification of its valuable historic and natural resources would be an invaluable method of fostering public pride and community spirit. History, after all, belongs to all residents, and if nothing else, it would provide a common bond for newcomers and oldtimers, small land owners and large landowners.

OPEN VISTAS/SCENIC EASEMENTS

Without a local governmental agency, conservation easements would appear to be prohibited. Though certain private organizations, such as the Natural Lands Trust in Philadelphia accept conservation easements, the use of conservation easements in the State of New Jersey have not been extensive. These easements do provide certain tax benefits to the landowner if certain criteria are met.

Currently, none of the scenic vistas in the Township have protection. In fact, numerous new homes are constructed in
the center of these scenic areas, to the benefit of the home owner and the detriment of all who view the home.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

Public comments and reports by the Township's Recreation Committee have reiterated the need for additional recreational space within the community. As previously stated the Township is deficient in the acreage ratio established by the County's Recreational Committee. With the assumption that land values are not anticipated to decline, the lack of action on the part of the Township makes a bad situation worse. Ongoing recreational programs within the Township are at capacity, with many children being turned away due to lack of adequate facilities and recreational space. Discussions with proposed development owners regarding the use of open space in conjunction with cluster construction has not been constructive.

In regard to recreational space for ballfields or parks, the issue of liability and maintenance is at the forefront. A small organization committed to the creation of a "bridle trail/hiking path" system through the township has been met with the same concerns by landowners.

SOCIAL

HOUSING
The discussion of tax basis and demographics above delineated the problems relating the soaring home prices and significant changes in per capital income requirements. While the Township has a plan to meet its minimum Fair Housing requirements, no plans exist regarding the construction of low or moderate income housing. This issue is of importance to many older long time residents of the community who fear they will be unable to continue living in the Township for not only economic reasons, but also the ability to find suitable housing.

Senior citizen housing is most appropriately located in the town or village locations, which affords access to stores and services. Many older residents realize that they will be unable to continue residing in remote residential properties through-out the Township, but can find no suitable housing within the Township’s village areas. This will cause an inevitable displacement of these individuals to other communities, thereby changing the resident profile.

FIRE/POLICE
The concern has often been expressed by local residents regarding the perceived demand for municipally funded police and fire protection by those new to rural living. Additional concerns focus on the ability of local volunteer organizations to serve a more densely populated community.
With only on-site wells, questions regarding of adequate local water supply for major fire fighting arise.

The State has recently decided to relocate the Flemington State Police Barracks to the Ringoes area. This will of course afford easier access for State Police. The southern portion of the Township currently comes under the jurisdiction of the State Police Barracks in Wilburtha, adjacent to the Delaware River on I-95. It would be prudent for the areas of responsibility to be realigned to allow the new barracks in Ringoes to cover the entire Township.

SCHOOLS

Discussions before the East Amwell Township School Board have focused on the need for expansion of the existing school and construction of a new "Middle School". Census projections for Hunterdon County found in the ODEA Economic-Demographic Model, (a portion of which is reproduced below) show that the most significant increase in population over the next thirty eight years will occur in the 45-64 age group and the 65-over age group. The 5-14 age group experiences only a 4% increase from 1980 to 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7</th>
<th>PROJECTION OF POPULATION OF HUNTERDON COUNTY BY AGE GROUP&lt;7&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U-5</td>
<td>5485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-14</td>
<td>14566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-44</td>
<td>41559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>17647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-over</td>
<td>8104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The figures in this projection would indicate that the future needs for schooling are perhaps questionable, when in fact the increase of school age children is not excessive and in fact the lowest age group experiences decline in the period 2000 to 2005. The largest increases in the older age groups emphasizes the need for future planning for affordable housing for senior citizens previously discussed under Housing.

It would seem prudent for any and all planning and discussions for either improvement of or expansion of school properties require the inclusion of adequate recreational space for the Township.

**TOWNSHIP PLANNING AND GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES**

The current Master Plan for the Township is inadequate to handle the various changes and pressures affecting the community. Because of numerous updates and memorandum addended to the original Plan, the result is a patch-work which does not always have recommended actions in agreement
with earlier findings. The Township has the ability to create a new in-depth Master Plan which can serve as a model for other communities facing similar planning challenges. A copy of the current Master Plan must be filed as part of the Cross-Acceptance Process for the SDRP, and it is questionable if the current Plan is adequate. As indicated in previous chapters, there are in fact contradictions between the current Zoning Ordinances in the Township and the SDRP.

The current Master Plan had recommended provisions for creating an additional zone, which was never implemented. The entire Township has almost 90% of its land in two zoning districts, with each one of these districts varying in density and orientation within. It is questionable whether two zones works to control growth and manage the land. Certain areas which now fall in the five acre minimum zone, have the majority of residential lots far smaller than the five acre minimum. This creates a large number of non-conforming lots, which negates the large-lot zoning.

The new Master Plan should include much more community participation, with substantial input from the various governmental agencies. More emphasis should be placed on creating a Master Plan which works for this Township, even if that would require certain special enabling legislation
at the State level, rather than copy methods used in other locations.

No continual review of Master Plans of contiguous municipalities has occurred and no cooperative efforts with respect to planning procedures or goals has occurred. This has often resulted in significant zoning variations across municipal boundaries, creating visual incongruity and questionable planning controls with respect to water and septic.

As part of this process to create a workable Master Plan it is necessary to assess the ability of the existing Township Agencies to prepare the required documentation. The Planning Board is currently working at it's maximum capacity handling applications and the subsequent review process. Liaison work with surrounding communities is no feasible, as most Planning Board members are employed full-time and cannot be available additional evenings each month.

The Township Committee has the ability to create numerous additional advisory committees, and has used this ability to create an Agricultural Advisory Committee. The Committee worked to survey the Township residents with respect to their opinions on municipal programs to ensure continued agricultural activities within the community. The majority
of the residents who responded supported the creation of a municipal bond issue to purchase lands outright or purchase development rights. The Committee was not charged with the responsibility of presenting a plan for a locally funded Agricultural Development Rights program. Rather, this task was given to a resident who volunteered to handle the work. This diluted the responsibilities of the Agricultural Advisory Committee, which should be an ongoing source of input to the Township Committee.

Increasing community involvement is a requisite for the success of the future planning for this Township. The lack of sufficient municipal funding for paid positions and the vast number and complexity of issues facing the community clearly indicates an "overload" situation for the current Township Committee, Planning Board and other agencies. Even under the best conditions, mistakes can be made, and information overlooked, given a situation where too much be accomplished by too few in too little time, success is questionable. The recent change in zoning for the Valley District, which included a provisions for Transfer Development Credits to a receiving district west of the village of Ringoes, gives no consideration to the environmental, aesthetic and visual affect the maximum build out could have on the village.
No Master Plan can be described as perfect, but recent zoning changes in the Township have negated any cohesiveness to the existing Plan and clearly points up a need for a new Plan. Zoning to stop development seems not to work, while zoning to control development is much more difficult but more beneficial in the long term. The focus on the Township's efforts must be toward management of growth and change, and away from zoning changes which will result in only short-term adjustments to development. Current litigation and threatened litigation creates a large financial burden on a Township with limited resources. These monies would be more constructively spent on Plans which will benefit the Township and will not be open for legal interpretation within the very expensive legal process in court.
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CHAPTER VI

RECOMMENDATIONS

The historical background of East Amwell, its current profile, internal and external parameters are the factors necessary to evaluate and define the process which the Township should follow in its efforts to preserve not only its historical, scenic and cultural resources, the community spirit which has permeated its existence but also the industry of Agriculture which serves as the backbone to its rural character.

Just as the previous chapters have served as the basis for the recommendations found in this chapter, so the recommendations should serve as a blueprint for the Township in its preservation planning process. Many of the suggestions require further research and documentation and wherever possible guidelines and possible sources of information have been delineated.

CREATION OF AN HISTORIC COMMISSION

The creation of an Historic and Cultural Commission (HCC) for the Township is paramount to its preservation planning process. The ability to create historic local government
agencies is provided in the New Jersey Law and the recommendation for the creation of these types of commissions has been made by national and state historic agencies, as well as Hunterdon County. The reference to an Historic Commission was briefly made in the Township's Master Plan, along with recommendations for Historic Districts and no definitive action was taken. The focus of the Commission should include but not be limited to the following:

1. History of East Amwell
2. Designation of Historic Districts: Ringoes Reaville Linvale (New Market) Wertsville Rocktown
3. Designation of "Highfields"
4. Create and Implement a Local Cultural Heritage Program
5. Identify and Nominate Structures of Historic Significance
6. Identify Structures and Locations of Historic and Cultural Interest
7. Work with the Environmental Commission Regarding Conservation Easements

HISTORY OF EAST AMWELL
As is often the case in rural municipalities, the focus on history of East Amwell has, for the most part existed as in fragmented forms within other books and chronicles of either the history of Hunterdon County or New Jersey, and to some extent within the history of the industry of Agriculture. Prior to 1976, when the East Amwell Bicentennial Committee, took on the challenge of creating a documented history of
the Township for the 18th century, no concise history on East Amwell was available. As members of the Committee found, the research lead them to numerous sources and resources and due to time constraints some research was limited in scope.

Documentation on rural communities is often sketchy and property boundaries are often identified by natural landmarks or vegetation which are no longer to be found. Though the history of a rural community is often lacking in precise information regarding interior inventories or insurance surveys of homes, it has a richness much like the patena on the handle of a handtool, which has been smoothed and polished by the craftsman hand. These histories are the most difficult to research and document, but they are often filled with more human spirit and provide the generations which followed more of an understanding of how the people, rather than the structures, created the community and quality of life.

As the History of East Amwell, 1700-1800 shows, this quiet rural community has a distinct history all its own. One which differentiates it from even those surrounding rural townships such as West Amwell and Delaware which were also once a part of "Amwell". The Bicentennial Committee challenged the readers of its work to "fill one of the gaps
or solve on of the puzzles". (2) This work is at hand for the Township as well as the much needed documentation of the 19th and early 20th centuries. Emphasis should also be placed on the history of Agriculture, as it has been a major factor in the history of the Township. John Schlebecker's book, "Whereby We Thrive, A History of Farming 1607-1972" provides an overall history and though dated, "New Jersey Agriculture - Historical Facts & Figures" by Dimitry Pitt and Lewis Hoagland is extremely useful.

HISTORIC DISTRICTS

The recommendations for the creation Historic Districts within the Township was made over ten years ago in the Hunterdon County Planning Board's Historic Sites Inventory, (3) though no action was ever taken on this recommendation. At the present time West Amwell is preparing documentation to have the Rocktown area designated as an Historic District, and a joint effort should be a priority item for the HCC. This designation will not only make residents more aware of the heritage which exists in the history of these locations, but will also provide the basis for zoning restriction to protect these hamlets from development which will occur around them.

The village of Ringoes deserves priority attention with respect to the designation process, though all of the
districts can be nominated in one application. Much of the architecture in Ringoes has been altered in significantly negative ways, which as had a negative impact on the streetscape of this extremely significant cross-road village. (Refer to Appendix C: Illustrations)

Protection of these districts should include guidelines on infill construction, signage, major exterior alterations to street facades, as well as any negative impact which would occur due to development on contiguous open land. Open space and landscaping requirements will be discussed in the Conservation section of this Chapter.

HIGHFIELDS

The Lindbergh property, Highfields, is currently owned by the State of New Jersey and comes under the administrative direction of the Department of Corrections. In 1985 a fire severely damaged part of the residence, and a restoration and renovation process is ongoing. Because the property has no historic designation, the structure has no protection with respect to reconstruction efforts or modernization which includes new mechanical systems and fire and safety systems required for a residential facility. Praise must go to Dr. Porter C. Brashier, who serves as a part-time medical staff person and full-time unofficial historian and protector of the property. (4) Through his efforts, most of
the current work has not significantly altered either the interior or exterior of the building.

The property is extremely significant from an historic standpoint, because of the events which took place there in the early part of the century. Clearly, the "crime of the century", which involved the child of one of America's true heroes, Charles A. Lindbergh, deserves Landmark status and protection. As anyone is able to make the application for this status, it would be appropriate for the Township to take up the effort, which has been neglected by the State.

The land surrounding Highfields, some of which is in Hopewell township, has been identified by the Forestry Department of State, as one of the few virgin forest remaining in the State. The Department is currently mapping the lands and identifying the natural vegetation and rock formations. These lands should be protected. Several years ago, an attempt was made to sell off some of these lands and the decision was only reversed after much public pressure was brough to bear. There is nothing to preclude this from happening in the future.

The residence house at Highfields, designed by Charles Lindbergh, has been overlooked completely with respect to its design and construction. As the tragic kidnapping and
murder of his son overshadowed the significance of the home itself. A complete documentation of the structure should be included in the nomination process.

HERITAGE PROGRAMS

The HCC should prepare guidelines for Historic and Cultural Programs which will be oriented to this community. A local designation process should be created which follows that set up by the State and Federal Government. These programs should include such areas as historic structures documentation. Useful information is available from the Office of New Jersey Heritage in Trenton, and includes such useful publications as "How to Research the History of a House". As those working on the Bicentennial Committee found, the process is often difficult and filled with blind alleys and dead ends, but often property owners have no idea where to begin or how to begin. Many properties which were not completely researched or designated for research during the first effort are perhaps now owned by different individuals who would be willing to continue the efforts. Information provided by the HCC should include:

-Sources of Information
-Methods of Research
-Documentation which is currently available
-Requirements for Local, State and National Designation
- Liaison efforts with State Agencies and Federal Agencies involved with
Historic Preservation

Additional efforts on the part of the HCC should include a process for visual identification of historic and cultural places. Community involvement in the form and design of such a designation would encourage public awareness and pride. School programs should be introduced to make the youngest residents aware of their local resources and history. Such programs could include profiles of "People in East Amwell's History", somewhat like, but not as extensive as Harry Weiss's, "Country Doctor - Cornelius Wilson Larison". (6)

A "Guide to the Heritage of East Amwell" should be available to the public at a price which will cover the cost of production. Updates should be done as required or as additional information becomes available.

NOMINATIONS

Structures, other than Highfields, which clearly deserve Landmark status should be identified. While the research work required for documentation appears overwhelming, the initial approach would be to invite the current property owner to join in the effort. Many homeowners feel great pride in the history of their homes and in fact feel the documented history provides additional value to their investment.
The nomination process should not be limited to structures, as this rural community is rich in historic resources which are not houses. The Old York Road, serves as one example of an historic landmark which is not a residence. The history of this roadway finds its earliest beginnings as an Indian footpath, through its documented history as a stage coach line to its present history as a main thoroughfare. A joint effort with communities which share this roadway would foster a cooperative spirit with other municipalities. Emogene Van Sickle's "The Old York Road and Its Stage Coach Days" provides a detailed account of this roadway and includes numerous pictures of locations and structures along its length.(7)

POINTS OF INTEREST

While a certified Designation was previously recommended, an additional designation as "Point of Interest" should also be included. This identification should include those structures which due to alteration or modification do not qualify for certification and for locations of significance which do not qualify for any designation. A form of official designation, modified from the certified designation should be available for those property owners who desire it. This physical identification would be purchased by the property owner and would remain so long as
the property owner desire.

These Points of Interest would be included in the "Guide to the Heritage of East Amwell" as previously recommended. It is strongly felt that these efforts to identify significant structures and locations, such as "Three Brothers" and "Hart Cave" will foster tremendous community pride and will allow a common thread for homeowners who have lived here for both a short and long time. Further, it could provide an incentive for homeowners to modify and rehabilitate their homes in such a way as to honor the original design and integrity. Too often serious mistakes are made out of ignorance of the structures history. Evidence of this exists throughout the Township, as modernization has been undertaken with the best of intentions, but with little understanding of the structures original integrity.

CONSERVATION EASEMENTS

The HCC should work with the Township's Environmental Commission to establish criteria for the receipt and administration of Conservation Easements. This will be discussed under Conservation in this Chapter.

ENVIRONMENTAL

SEWER/WATER

The Environmental Commission and the Board of Health would
begin the create a blueprint for the needs of the entire Township with respect to public water and sewer. Within the guidelines would be identification of specific locations and their levels of determined need. Further guidelines would be established for the various on-site sewer treatment facilities currently in use in other locations and the success or failure of these systems. These two agencies would set requirements for applicants with on-site requirements, so that the applicant provides sufficient information on the proposed system and its current use in other locations. Well water yield requirements on new homes prior to construction are currently be addressed by the Township though no zoning ordinances currently exist. Use of water must also be addressed non-residential uses (swimming pools, sprinklers, etc.), and should include the ability to prohibit such uses if yields are determined to be insufficient.

SOIL AND WATERSHED CONSERVATION

Guidelines should be prepared to assist those new to farming, if even on a small scale, so that proper soil conservation methods are followed. These guidelines should include such topics as methods of proper manure disposal and pasture rotation and fertilization requirements to prevent erosion.
CONSERVATION ZONES

Utilizing existing information and working in conjunction with the Township's Recreation Committee and Heritage Commission, the Environmental Commission and Board of Health should clearly delineate those areas which are designated as Conservation Zones. Criteria for designation could include scenic vistas, environmentally sensitive areas and those areas detailed in the "Hunterdon County Park and Open Space Plan". These zones would be targeted for acquisition by the Township and would also be targeted as areas the Township will accept for either Conservation Easements or outright deeds of ownership.

A newly created Conservation Commission would act as an agency to create these zones and would also be advised by the Planning Board of any proposals for development which would include the lands in these zones. The Conservation Commission would then have the ability to recommend and work toward a method of retaining these lands as open space. The zoning would provide clear guidelines to landowners or developers, on those areas targeted by the Township for Open Space.

Aside from Conservation Easement guidelines, the Conservation Commission should also explore the concept of Land Trusts and their feasibility within the Township. Ann
Strong's book, "Land Banking: European Reality, American Prospect", provides information on the existing land banks in various European countries and the applicability to the United States. It is assumed that the financial requirements for land banking would preclude any local, program, but the Township could make recommendations to the State and include lands within the municipality as target areas.

SOCIAL AND AESTHETIC REQUIREMENTS

SCHOOLS

The current discussions on requirements for school expansion will have a significant impact on the tax base of the Township. In this community, with such a strong historical background in education based on the various institutions which have been documented to have existed in Ringoes, quality education should be without questions. The information provided in Chapter 5 on the "Projection of Population of Hunterdon County by Age Group" would appear to raise serious questions regarding the need for significant school expansion for the Township.

Efforts to pass Bond Issues within the Township could prove difficult as pointed out by Calvin L. Beale in "Making A Living in Rural and Small Town America", "The younger, better educated families, in demanding changes in school policies
or more funding to school and related services, may confront retirees whose needs for better health care, transportatio and physical security are paramount. School bond issues in smaller communities are especially difficult to get passed". (11)

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The aforementioned population projections gives strong merit to the need for affordable housing, specifically that which would be physically and economically oriented to senior citizens. The "graying" of America is a phenomena which will continue to affect all communities, and serious planning efforts must be made in the area of housing for this ever increasing segment of our population. Logistically, it is more feasible for affordable housing to be located in the village areas of the Township, primarily because of access to services. Certain bonus provisions could be enacted to allow for an incentive for the construction of affordable housing for senior citizens.

The planning process should also focus on the "gentrification" which has affected the Township and the significant change in per capita income which has resulted. Historically this Township has not been populated by upper income families, any efforts to preserve the "rural character" must address exactly what this means.
RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

The work completed by the County with respect to a County Park and Open Space plan should be incorporated into a plan for the Township. As previously indicated in the Environmental section, the Recreational needs of the Township must be addressed in concert with the Conservation effort. The deficiency in public recreational facilities was identified in 1970 and has only become worse over the last 18 years. This problem must be addressed and in conjunction with the analysis taking place on the school expansion, a requisite for recreational facilities should be included in any expansion plan.

ECONOMIC ISSUES

AGRICULTURE

For the Township to properly address the feasibility of Agriculture continuing within the municipality, it must first accept the premise that Agriculture is an "industry" and not an "activity". With this basic premise in mind, the following serves to summarize the pressures facing the East Amwell farmer concisely,

"Let's see a show of hands. Who's in favor of motherhood, the Fourth of July and apple pie? Great! Now, how many are in favor of farm preservation? Just about the same number!

Now, how many would change places with the farmer? Not nearly as many. The
answer is obvious. The farmer works too hard, gets little or no time off, and has a cash flow equal to your kid's weekly allowance.

Like everything else the law of supply and demand operates. Farmland preservation is a matter of economics. If the farm shows an annual profit, it will be preserved. When the farm marketings fail to even meet production costs - while, at the same time, gluttonous developers are parked at the barnyard door waving checkbooks - another answer seems obvious.

People who want open space are usually those who reside on acreage that was once open space....

After a lifetime of scratching the soil for a living, the farmer is certainly entitled to at least one good crop - even if the last one is his land."(13)

No definitive solution exists to preserve the industry of Agriculture in the State of New Jersey. While the SDRP weakly attempts to create land banks of agricultural land without purchasing them, it offers no significant economic programs to assure this industry. In fact, the question of continued viability of farming in the United States is a serious, ongoing issue which challenges the United States Department of Agriculture on a daily basis.

The average working farmer in East Amwell is over 50 year of age.(14) Discussions with the County Agricultural Extension Officer, Ernest Kuster, indicated that the number of young people entering farming in the entire Hunterdon County is certainly below 15 in number. Without economic
incentive it is difficult to maintain even those who have a lifelong love for farming.

The most common types of programs used to protect agricultural land are preferential property tax, deferred property tax, restrictive agreements and tax credits. Additional programs including Transfer Development Rights, Purchase of Development Rights and Inheritance/Estate Tax Relief. New Jersey currently utilizes a preferential property tax, under its Farmland Preservation Program. The Township has moved slowly with respect to a local bonding issue for the purchase of development rights. This is a poor management decisions, in that it does not give the issue of farmland retention high priority and it delays the process of implementing the purchase program. Clearly, from the amount of money appropriated from the State for the purchase of Development Rights, $50,000,000, the amount is insufficient to handle the current applications. Therefore, Counties and Local governments must begin to prepare their own programs, and not wait additional revenues at the State level. The Township should consider the possibility of funding a Development Rights purchase program which would have a sunset provision, wherein the land was not set aside in perpetuity, but rather for a defined length of time. This would allow for an interim solution to vanishing farmland, and would allow the Township to purchase more rights for the
same amount of money. This program would be instituted with
the understanding that yeomen efforts would be put forth to
pressure the State into allocating a set amount of money
each year for the purchase of Development Rights in
perpetuity at the deadline of the local program.

The Township should support the TDR guidelines as presented
by Secretary Art Brown and the Farm Bureau.(15). And if
necessary meetings should be held with the sponsors of the
current TDR Bill in the State Legislature to discuss the
need for a separate TDR program for agricultural
communities.

Other programs could be explored, such as a moratorium on
assessments for new farm structures or tax abatements on
existing farm structures located on working farms. Several
excellent sources exist with respect to the issue of
farmland and agricultural preservation including an
article which appeared in the Rutgers Law Journal, entitled,
"The Future of Farmland and Preservation: Will New Jersey
Remain the Garden State", by Douglas F. Johnson.(16) This
and other writings have shown that local municipalities
cannot economically support their agricultural industries,
without tremendous financial support from the State and even
the Federal governments.
With the preservation of agriculture being used as the vanguard for this communities recent zoning changes, it is unfortunate that the Township government has not taken a more active and vocal role in speaking up for the local farmers at the State level. Strong local governmental and community support signals elected officials that this issue bears attention and requests for special enabling legislation become reality. Merely zoning for agriculture is no assurance of even a short term preservation of open land, the industry of agriculture, while dependent on its main resource, the land, is heavily impacted by market economics. As the value of crops diminishes and the value of cropland sky-rockets, no land owner can be blamed for taking advantage of market conditions.

OTHER INDUSTRIES
At the present time the industrial and commercial activity within the Township, exclusive of farming, is minimal. More effort should be put forth with respect to the development of the Highway/Office and Industrial areas along Route 202. While some residents fear the development of these areas would cause the Township to lose its non-growth status, that is certainly questionable when the limited size of the commercial zones is considered.

Local business should be allowed to exist in Village
Centers, which is compatible with the history of these villages and will also be required as villages expand.

TAX ISSUES

Several recommendations made within the context of this Plan have included various Bond Issues for either Development Rights Purchase or Green Acres. These bond issues will certainly have an impact on the tax base for the town residents. At this time, no estimate exists with respect to what this impact will be and lack of action is being based on insufficient information. With local funding the Township would be eligible for Matching Grants under the Green Acres program from the State. Additionally, the Heritage Commission, if certified, would also be eligible for Matching Funds from the Historic Preservation Fund. The ability to except conservation easements or agricultural easements, by the local government, would allow the Township to possible lease these lands to cover expenses.

Some municipalities have enacted "Real Estate Transfer Taxes" for the purpose of generating revenues to fund Open Space Programs, Affordable Housing Funds, and Agriculture Easement Funds. This type of program would require special legislation for the Township from the State. The most successful program was completed in Nantucket in Massachusetts, and has become a model for other programs.
This type of tax allows the local municipality to keep the revenues within their community to benefit their programs.

**PLANNING PROCESS**

**NATIONAL LEVEL**

The creation of the Heritage and Cultural Commission will allow for a conduit for information regarding federal programs and tax provisions, as well as information regarding communities in other locations facing similar problems. The National Trust for Historic Preservation offers a Rural Conservation program at its Annual Conference. These panels provide valuable information on what activities are taking place in other states as well as what programs are being instituted by the Federal government.

Additional information is available from the Conservation Foundation, located in Washington, D.C. This foundation is a nonprofit environmental organization which was founded in 1948, with a dedication to the improvement of the quality of the environment as its basis. The organization offers excellent seminars, planning materials and also serves as a clearing housing for information.

Governmental and citizen support to the currently proposed
federal legislation by Congressman Morris K. Udall regarding the appropriation for the Land Trust.

STATE LEVEL- SDRP

The State Development and Redevelopment Plan has created a situation where municipalities are "waiting" to see what the State is doing, and in the interim irreversible damage and poorly managed growth is occurring. The Township must begin to focus not just on the limited growth aspects of this plan, but also on the fact that the SDRP would appear to funnel the bulk of its financial resources into the Growth Areas. Careful analysis of the SDRP should focus on and recommend if necessary that a formula exist to calculate funding from the State, so that non-growth areas receive adequate financial support for their program. Non-growth areas will require significant economic support if lands are to remain open for either environmental or agricultural uses. A financial commitment to ongoing State funded programs for these areas must be a part of the SDRP.

Some conflict would appear to exist within the SDRP which states "development and redevelopment in limited growth areas should be of a ltype and scale which is supported by existing public facilities(...)and will not conflict with (...)the agricultural economy or the(...)sensitive environmental resources" and goes on to say in the same
paragraph, "the limited growth areas are anticipated to accommodate a substantial amount of the State's population and employment growth(...) while retaining their rural character."(17) Clarification is certainly required as to how these seemingly conflicting requirements are to be achieved.

As previously recommended in Chapter 5, any trash dump sites or recycling facilities should be prohibited in the Agricultural and Environmental Tiers of the SDRP. As the State has defined these areas as those which should be maintained as rural and open, protection from waste disposal facilities should be provided.

TRANSFER DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS

The bill currently stalled in the State Legislature would provide for a Transfer Development Rights law for the entire State. An argument for a separate TDR program for agricultural lands was previously recommended under Agriculture. James Franklin and Dennis Gales provide incite on the administrative and definitional problems involved in TDR programs in their book, "Zoning for Sale".(18)

LOCAL

MASTER PLAN AND ZONING

The current Master Plan for the Township is extremely dated
and cannot sufficiently meet the needs of the community as it currently exists. Previously, East Amwell was a rural community experiencing only minor growth patterns and though the growth over the past few years has not been overwhelming, growth in surrounding communities harbinger a change in this pattern. The Master Plan sufficed for a non-growth community and met the minimal requirements set by law to provide a Master Plan for the municipality.

The recent changes to the zoning have resulted in a situation which can best be described as an inner tube with more patches than tube. While the creation of a new Master Plan from "the ground up" seems to be prohibitive, closer analysis would show that with significant input provided by various existing Township agencies and by additional agencies as herein recommended, the process is certainly doable. This new Master Plan would provide for significantly less outside recommendations and considerably more internal recommendations. By that, adjustments to a plan used by another municipality would not be duplicated which has been the process in the past.

Substantial information exists regarding the concept of Rural Preservation and in fact the National Land Trust recently established a Rural Program, which should serve as a clearing house for information on this issue. At the
National Trust for Historic Preservation Conference held in Washington D.C. in 1987, both Thomas P. Salmon, former Governor of Vermont and William R. Klein, Director of Nantucket Planning and Economic Commission stated that the success of the planning programs in Vermont and in Nantucket were based on the fact that the plans were solidly based on what would work for these individual situations.\(^{(20)}\) By that, communities must decide what they have as needs, what in fact they can control and what the best way is to achieve these goals. Municipalities should not be afraid to seek special legislation from their States, but should have documentation in hand to support their argument. East Amwell is clearly in a position to become a model for other communities.

Certain zoning recommendations are evident based on the information currently available. The fact that the entire Township has over 90% of its lands in two districts would appear to be ambiguous. An alternative districting proposal is exhibited in Appendix A: Map 6-A. Additional Detail Maps are also included in Appendix A. This zoning proposal shows the creation of more districts, based on a combination of subsurface hydrology, surface groundwater, elevations, existing density and delineated historic and environmentally sensitive zones. This districting proposal was further based on the following guidelines:
HISTORIC DISTRICTS:
-Historic Districts are created, with specific guidelines for infill and contiguous construction
-Historic Districts would prohibit multiple housing of more than two units and would not be defined as receiving districts for TDR's

VILLAGES DISTRICTS:
-Village areas are expanded to allow for a natural growth process, much that same as that which as occurred historically. Volume of expanded village areas was based on the existing size of the current village and estimated growth from inception.
-Park and open space "green acre" locations and requirements were established by the Environmental and Heritage Commissions.
-Villages were not defined as "receiving districts" for TDR's
-Multiple housing was permitted with certain restrictions (design compatibility, septic/water, etc.)
-The village of Ringoes would retain its Central Business District, other Villages would permit some local business uses
-Concentrates traffic on main roads

RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT:
-Residential areas surrounding Villages were established to accommodate further growth from town centers.
-Multiple housing was permitted, though attached housing was limited to three units per structure. This would preclude large scale "townhouse" structures.
-Residential Districts would be defined as "receiving districts" for TDR's
-Concentrates traffic on main roads

HIGHWAY/INDUSTRIAL/OFFICE DISTRICTS:
-The Highway/Office districts zones along Routes 202 would be expanded to accommodate future growth requirements.
-The Highway/Office district at the intersection of Routes 518/31 would be expanded to provide an additional rateable source at a location which is unsuitable for residential use.
- Buffer zones have been delineated between H/I/O and Residential zones.

**VALLEY DISTRICT:**
- This district zone was not defined as a "sending" district for TDR's. Density in this district would preclude any large open space preservation efforts for agricultural purposes.
- Conservation areas are delineated within or contiguous to the district.
- Attached housing would be permitted with up to two units per structure under a Cluster design.

**RURAL DISTRICT:**
- This district would be defined as an "A" Sending Zone for TDR's, which would allow a premium for calculation of rights.
- The minimum zoning requirements would be equal to the Valley zone.
- Attached housing would be permitted with up to two units per structure under a Cluster design.
- Agricultural Development Rights purchases would be targeted for lands within this district.

**SLOPE DISTRICT:**
- This district would be defined as a "B" Sending Zone for TDR's, which would give no premium for calculation of rights.
- The minimum zoning requirements would be equal to the Valley Zone.
- Conservation areas would be delineated.
- Attached housing would be permitted with up to two units per structure under a Cluster design.

**RIDGE DISTRICT:**
- This district one would be "A" Sending Zone.
- No attached housing would be permitted.
- Zoning would be at a level less dense than the Valley, Rural and Slope.
- Conservation areas would be identified with priority.

These districts are recommended to allow for the development of town centers which would deter scattered development.
which is a waste of land and would also offer centers of community life. The transportation is concentrated around these growth areas and away from the rural and ridge areas. The ability to create smaller homes would be in line with the historical background of the community, which has a documented history of small residences. As opposed to the current proposal which forces all concentrated development into basically one area west of Ringoes (with some around Reaville), this plan's proposal allows growth to emanate from various village areas which follows a more historic growth pattern. Therefore, growth is accommodated at various points throughout the Township.

Certain other aspects should be consideration in determining the zoning requirements for lot sizes within these various districts. In an executive summary prepared for Lawrenceville township by Robert E. Coughlin and John C. Keene entitled, "Growth Without Chaos", reference is made to the recommendation by the Maryland Department of State Planning, which does not permit lot sizes that are greater than one acre or less than 20 acres in those areas targeted for agricultural, rural or conservation. This would obviate the necessity for cluster development in the Rural District for the Township.

With respect to the focus on preservation of farmland and
open spaces, it should be noted that not all lands currently in agriculture are owned by the individuals who farm them. An article entitled, "Ownership of Undeveloped Land and Farmland Preservation in New Jersey", by Allan Campbell and Stephen Decter indicates that in 1980 approximately 25% of East Amwell's open land was Investor owned. (22) Therefore, programs aimed at the farmer will not affect all of the open lands, and in fact the farmer might not have the ability to control the future use of the land, even with incentive programs.

PLANNING LIASONS

The Township Planning Board should establish a program whereby Planning Liaisons are created to interface with surrounding municipalities. These individuals would not be members of the Planning Board, but would be residents of lands adjacent to the municipality they are assigned to cover. The target of two individuals for each adjacent municipality would allow for liaisons to rotate attendance at various meetings. The purpose of this plan is to relieve the Planning Board Members from attempting to attend meetings in other municipalities. At this time, the Planning Board has an extremely heavy work load, and the liaisons would serve to provide information of great value to the Board members.
These liaisons would submit reports to the Planning Board on pertinent planning and development issues for their assigned municipality. It is recommended that a joint meeting a representative of each neighboring Planning Board, the East Amwell Planning board representative and the liaisons be held at least once in each fiscal year. This process allows for a more cohesive planning process, offers the possibility for joint efforts with respect to information gathering or studies (which can be economical) and helps to prevent conflicting zoning regulations. (Refer to Appendix A: Map 6-B).

TOWNSHIP OWNED PROPERTY

The Township currently owns property on Route 202 at the intersection of Werts ville Road. The facility at this location includes a Municipal Building and Garage and an adjacent ball field. The Township should explore the feasibility of selling the land which the buildings and parking lot currently occupy, and using the proceeds to purchase a larger site. This would allow the construction of a more suitable facility, which could include a much needed permanent library site, expanded offices and meeting areas, all of which would offer handicap access.

The area along Route 202 would appear to be more marketable as commercial space and could prove to be a source of
revenue to the Township. It would be possible to have a "land swap" for land elsewhere in the Township, which could be done on a tax-free basis to the owner of the property. The ability to obtain more land without financial investment could allow for expanded recreational facilities, as well as municipal facilities.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion the Township faces numerous challenges, but solutions do exist if sufficient effort is put forth and adequate research is accomplished. The point cannot be made too often that success can only be achieved if the community defines its needs, now and into the future, sets achievable targets for what it can and cannot affectively accomplish and works diligently to defend its plan. With these goals in mind, the community spirit can be preserved along with the rural qualities and the growth which must occur will be accommodated in a manageable way.

Community involvement is paramount and the Township should not hesitate to set up numerous sub-committees to serve existing and recommended committees. It is true that many hands make light work, and as these positions are all volunteer and part time, it allows for distribution of tasks so that individuals are not faced with unachievable workloads. Following the premise that good government
should have administration and management similar to a well run business, the recommendations offer a method for more individuals assigned smaller tasks, rather than a few individuals attempting to complete insurmountable tasks. Rural governments have historically not required large staffs, but rural communities in such a high growth State as New Jersey cannot afford to operate under these restrictions. Protecting natural resources and managing growth and change is a full time effort, and if the Township cannot afford to hire full time staff persons, then their guidelines should be expanded to create more volunteer agencies with more community involvement. Significant effort must be made to "non-political" appointments to various committees, and in fact, if volunteer levels are of a large number, further subdividing of tasks at hand should take place to utilize "all who want to serve".

The Heritage and Cultural Commission can help to bring the history of East Amwell alive, so that new residents can take as much pride in their community as those whose families have worked for generations on these lands. It is hoped that the recommendations made in this Plan will serve as a starting point for the development of a Preservation Plan Ordinance for East Amwell. This Plan will serve to guide the growth and manage the changes this community faces, now and in the future, so this changing rural farm community can
continue to retain its spirit and natural beauty.

"Let us never forget that the cultivation of the earth is the most important labor of man. When tillage begins, other arts follow. The farmers, therefore, are the founders of human civilization."

Daniel Webster
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1-A "Amwell" as it was in 1739
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3-A Current Major Subdivisions
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4-A New Jersey SDRP Map of Tier System

5-A Wetlands
5-B Conservation Areas
5-C Park System proposed by Hunterdon County
5-D Detail of Back Brook Park area as proposed

6-A Map of proposed zoning
6-B Contiguous Township zoning
6-C Proposed Conservation Areas, Parks & Agricultural Development Rights Purchase Target Areas
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APPENDIX - B

1- Cash Grain Prices

2- "Hunterdon County Master Plan: Site of Historic Interest"
   As transcribed April 1988.

CASH GRAIN PRICES
AS AT 3/31/88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LAST NIGHT</th>
<th>LAST WEEK</th>
<th>LAST YEAR</th>
<th>TWO YEARS AGO</th>
<th>THREE YEARS AGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOY</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHEAT</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORN</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *This Week In Farm Bureau*
Volume XXVI  No. 13
April 2, 1988
TRANSCRIBED FROM THE HUNTERDON COUNTY MASTER PLAN: SITES OF HISTORIC INTEREST.

E1 SCHANK/ABBOTT FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A five bay, frame narrow center hall dwelling with a rear ell; center gable on the front. The large barn complex includes three frame wagon houses with additions, a large English frame barn and a dairy barn (2/5)

E2 BISHOPS HOMESTEAD/FARM DS, AS, P. A frame, two and a half story, deep side hall form dwelling; the gable to the street with symmetrical, two story, one bay extensions on each side and stone two story, three bay rear ell and lean-to. A braced-frame english barn, two small frame barns and wagonshed complete this complex. (4/4)

E3 BOSS PROPERTY DS, AS, P. A frame, four bay, narrow form "I" in a two bay, two story side entry unit and a smaller two bay side entry extension with a one bay lean-to additiona. There is a fine collection of frame farm buildings on this property. (5/11)

E4 BOWNE-MOORE FARMSTEAD AS, P. A three bay, frame deep side hall dwelling with a four bay, stone, one and a half story wing. The second dwelling is a frame, three bay "I" house with a two bay, lower and deeper unit lean-to. There is a two level frame barn with a lower ell. (6/1)

E5 WILSON PROPERTY DS, AS, P. A stucco, square, one room dwelling with a lean-to rear addition, giving a salt box silhouette; c.1800. There is a frame barn (deterioriated) and a stucco carriage house. (6/26)

E6 WILSON FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. The dwelling is a frame five bay, two and a half story "I" in two sections, a three bay center door and a two bay side door section. There is a frame barn, carriage shed and carriage house. (6/28)

E7 HOUSEL FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A four bay, brick, deep form swelling with a lower and narrower two bay brick wing; five chimneys (two in each gable of the main block and one in the outer gable of the wing). Traditionally called "Queen of the Valley." The barns are in ruins. (8/24)

E8 HAGAMAN "MANSION" AS, P. A four bay, frame, deep form
dwelling with a narrow four bay wing set back; shed roofed porch partially enclosed. A large frame English barn. (8B/25A)

E9 HOAGLAND HOMESTEAD AS, P. A four bay, stone, two story, narrow form "I" dwelling connecting two earlier structures; a three bay, one and a half story deep form unit on one gable, a a narrow, two bay, one and a half story, banked cellar unit on the other. Two units c.1745, connecting section c.1800. Complex of frame farm buildings on this property. (8B/29)

E10 DWELLING AS, P. A three bay, two and a half story frame "I" house with a center entry and cross gable; entrance porch has chamfered posts and gingerbread brackets. (10/3A)

E12 DWELLING AS, P. A frame, three bay "I" house with a one bay rear ell and a one bay lean-to. (16A/23)

E13 CHURCH: A frame, two story, three bay wide and four bay deep structure with an interior tower in the gable and narrow chancel extension; fine detailing in original entry doors. The parsonage is a four bay frame "I" house with a two story, slightly higher addition on the right gable, perpendicular to original unit. (16A/25)

E14 DWELLING DS, AS, P. A frame, three bay, one and a half story, deep side hall frame dwelling with a lower, narrower two story wing and lean to addition (16A/31)

E15 CENETERY P. Larison's Corner cemetery contains the gravestones of the earliest German settlers whose church was located here in 1749. (17/1)

E16 KENNEDY FARMSTEAD DS, AS P. A five bay, tow and a half story, deep center hall frame house; Federal style with a traditional Georgian floor plan, with a lower and narrower side wing. The large barn complex includes a frame English barn with ell and a small frame barn. (17/16)

E17 PRALL DWELLING DS, AS P. A five bay, deep center hall frame dwelling with a low and narrow two bay wing: three chimneys, two in the main unit and one in the outer gable of the wing. (17/24)

E18 LABAW FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A five bay, deep center hall frame dwelling with a low and narrow two bay wing; three chimneys, two in the main unit and one in the outer gable of the wing. (17/24)
E19 PRALL DWELLING AS, P. An Italianate, frame, five bay, two and a half story house on a high, brownstone foundation; deeply projecting bracketed cornice with a small square eyebrow windows; several frame sheds. (17/28)

E20 WILLIAMSON HOMESTEAD AS, P. A frame, four bay, deep form dwelling with a lower, narrower, four bay wing, and lean-to; two shed roofed dormers in each unit. Three chimneys. There is one and a half story frame wagon house and a frame English barn. (17/32A)

E21 SCHENCK FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A three bay, two and a half story, side hall, deep form dwelling; two exposed brick fireback; frame wing (two bays) with shed dormers and an additional one story, two bay wing. Excellent frame outbuildings on stone foundations (17/34)

E22 HAY BARRACKS AS, P. A frame, fixed roof hay barracks, deteriorating. (17/35)

E23 PRALL FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A frame, three bay, two and a half story, side hall, deep form dwelling with a lower and narrower wing. Frame barn with carriage ell is on a stone foundation. (18/1)

E24 SUTPHIN FARMSTEAD DS, AS P. A one and a half story, three bay, frame, deep form dwelling; extensively altered but retaining its eighteenth century silhouette with a lower, one and a half story frame wing. There is a stone and frame stable; rough pressed brownstone side walls with frame gable ends. c.1770 (18/19)

E25 CHAMBERLIN PROPERTY DS, AS, P. A frame, four bay, two and a half story, flat roofed deep form dwelling with a story, narrower, two bay wing (also flat roofed) and a lean-to; interesting detailing. There is a well house, windmill, bank barn and wagon house (18/21-3)

E26 CHAMBERLIN TRACT DS, AS, P. A three bay, two and a half story, side hall frame dwelling with lower and narrower side wings; fine details on doorway. Complex of outbuildings includes a barn, smokehouse, carriage shed and stables. (18/23)

E27 MATHEWS PROPERTY DS, AS, P. A frame five bay, narrow form (on a bank cellar) with a large rear ell; side porch on ell, three bay porch front (18/24)
E28 SUTPHEN DWELLING AS, P. A frame, two story "I" structure with a lower and narrower three bay west wing (built in parts) and a lean-to, three chimneys (20/29)

E29 DOWD TAVERN DS, AS P. A frame, two story, five bay, narrow center hall structure with a two story frame rear ell. A chimney in each gable. (21/9A)

E30 LANNING DWELLING DS, AS, P. A frame, two story, three bay side hall form, "I" house with a lower four bay, frame two story wing; shed roofed porch on the side. (21/10)

E31 HILL-READING RESIDENCE AS, P. A frame, two story, six bay deep form structure with a small stone lean-to; built in several sections; three chimneys, one in center of the left gable with an exposed chimney back, and two in the right gable. (22/2A)

E32 CHAMBERLAIN DWELLING DS, AS, P. A frame five bay structure (three bay deep side hall unit and two bay extension) with a smaller single and lean-to; notable for the degree to which the original fabric has survived; one of the few structures to retain beaded clapboards. (22/3A)

E33 SUTPHIN DWELLING/BARN DS, AS, P. A frame two story five bay narrow center hall structure with a lower, set back two bay wing and rear ell with the roof pitch perpendicular to the front; shed roofed "L" shaped, partially enclosed porch to the side. There is a frame wagonhouse and English barn. (23/8)

E34 MANNERS HOMEISTEAD DS, AS P. A two story, frame, five bay structure, four bay "I" and a one bay extension on a stone bank cellar; modern lean-to; contains a wide timber lintel fireplace with brick arch opening; beehive bake oven in the rear wall. There are Indian mounds in the area. (23/11)

E35 VAN LIEU FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A frame, two story, five bay, deep center hall dwelling with a rear ell. There is a large frame bank barn with smaller ells in each gable, a one and a half story frame wagon house, a stone wagon house and silo. (24/3)

E36 QUICK FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A frame, two story, five bay, deep form structure with a shed porch across the front three bays which is enclosed; chimney in each gable has exposed stone chimney back. There is a frame wagon house and a frame bank barn on a stone stable with frame additions. (24/11)
E37 FISHER FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A five bay, two and a half story, frame, deep center hall form, dwelling with a smaller three bay wing; wing has door and enclosed porch. There is a frame barn, carriage house and a two and a half story barn with silo. (25/9).

E38 PRALL FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A frame, one and a half story, deep side hall structure with a lower three bay wing; two plastered chimneys. There are three frame wagon sheds and a frame English barn with frame ells and lean-to. (25/10)

E39 QUICK PROPERTY DS, AS, P. A five bay, two and a half story dwelling with a center entry; a three bay, two story rear ell with an enclosed porch. Frame and stone barn complex and outbuildings. (25/12)

E40 DWELLING/BARN DS, AS P. A frame, two story, one bay "I" house with a lower three bay extension; one chimney. There is a frame English barn. (25/15)

E41 VAN DOREN FARMSTEAD AS P. A frame, one and a half story, banked cellar four bay structure with a lower and narrower one bay extension; enclosed shed roofed porch. There is a frame wagon house and barn. (26/2)

E42 STOUT FARMSTEAD DS, AS P. A frame, two story, four bay "I" house with a one and a half story banked wing. The bank barn is a frame, gambrel roofed structure on a stone stable. (26/3)

E43 DAWLIS MILL COMPLEX AS, P. a five bay, two and a half story, stuccoed stone "I" house with a leanto; good illustration of "Federalized" country architecture, Federal doorway, fanlight and surround which is finely detailed. Complex includes a large stone mill and has a stone tenant house and a frame barn. the original mill destroyed, but recorded by the Historic American Building Survey. (27/7)

E44 HUNT DWELLING DS, AS, P. A two story, frame four bay narrow form structure with a rear lean to; internal chimneys; small frame wood shed. (27/33)

E45 DURHAM FARMSTEAD AS, P. A two story, frame, five bay, narrow form structure with a read ell; one interior chimney and a shed roofed, "L" shaped rear porch, partially enclosed. There is a frame bank barn, small frame barn, wind mill and three silos. (27/39)

E46 SKED PROPERTY DS, AS P. A frame two story three bay
center entry dwelling with a kitchen lean-to on one gable end. There is a frame, one and a half story shop and a three bay English barn with a two bay extension. (27/41)

E47 SERVIS FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A frame two story two bay, "I" house with a two bay lower wing that has a two bay, lean-to addition. There is a frame out kitchen woodshed, a one and a half story frame wagon shed and a frame bank barn on a stone stable. (27/46)

E48 SERVIS DWELLING AS, P. A stone, two story, five bay narrow form (built in two parts) structure with a frame addition (27/47)

E49 CRAVEN DWELLING DS, AS P. A frame, two and a half story, five bay deep center hall structure, c. 1840, with an older two bay rear ell with enclosed side porch. Destroyed. (27A/12)

E50 REED TENEMENT AS P. A four bay, two story "I" structure with a small, one and a half story narrow form wing with a shed roof porch. (28/1)

E51 DWELLING AS, P. A frame, two story, five bay deep center hall structure with a two bay, two story wing; two chimneys. (30/4)

E52 DWELLING A rubble stone, two story, three bay center entry structure with a three bay, one and a half story frame wing, chimney right gable of stone unit in center of wing, wing altered several times. (30/5)

E53 EGE FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A representation of a large farm complex, c. 1800. The dwelling is a four bay frame deep form structure with a false front lean-to addition. (30/42)

E54 WHITSON/BIRDSALL DWELLING DS, AS, P. A two story stone two bay deep form structure, shed roofed porch on one gable and a one and a half story, one bay wing on the other. (31/12)

E55 DWELLING DS, AS, P. A frame, two story, five bay deep center hall structure with a smaller two bay wing; two internal chimneys in the right gable. (31/6)

E56 JOHNSON PROPERTY AS, P. A two story, brick, five bay, deep center hall dwelling with a rear ell. There is a large frame barn complex (32/1)

E57 JOHNSON HOMESTEAD AS P. A frame, one and half story,
two bay, deep form dwelling with a one story, two bay wing; chimneys in outer gables, on on main unit removed before 1752. (32/6)

E58 DWELLING AS P. A two story, frame five bay unit (three bay "I" with a two bay extension) with a three bay, one and a half story wing and rear lean to; c. 1790. Frame wagon house on property. (33/6A)

E59 STOUT'S TAVERN DS, AS, P. A frame two story six bay "I" house with a rear ell; porch on the front and a partially banked cellar. One gable and one internal chimney; house built in two sections. (33/10)

E60 QUICK DWELLING AS, P. A frame, one and a half story, three bay narrow center entry structure on a high stone cellar; one internal chimney. (34/1)

E61 FISHER DWELLING AS, A frame two story five bay center hall "I" house with a two bay extension, three chimneys. (34/4)

E62 LABAW FARMSTEAD AS, P. A stone, two story, five bay "I" house with a frame lean-to and rear ell; window lintels are notable. There is a frame English barn. (34/7A)

E63 STOUT FARMSTEAD AS, P. A two story, frame five bay deep center hall dwelling with a lower and narrower two bay wing and a lean-to addition; three chimneys. There are frame outbuildings. (34/27)

E64 RUNKLE-STOUT FARMSTEAD DS, AS, P. A frame, two story, six bay dwelling (four bay "I" and a two bay extension) with a two bay, two story, shed roof addition on the left and a lower two bay wing on the right; main entry has entablature with flanking pilasters. There is a brick out kitchen and a large barn complex with a frame English barn. (34/34)

E65 HEATH DWELLING DS, AS P. A five bay, frame classic "I" house with center door; totally undecorated. (35A/9)

E66 HEATH FARMSTEAD DS, AS P. A stone, one and a half story, two bay deep form structure on a banked cellar with a frame, two bay extension and lean to. There is a large frame barn on a stone foundation and several frame outbuildings. (35A/10)

E67 DWELLING AS, P. A two story frame five bay deep center hall form with a smaller two bay wing; center
gable on the front with elaborate cut out and pendant; large bay window (three bays wide) on second floor level over small bay window on the first floor level. (35A/11A)

E68 MOUNTAIN GROVE SCHOOL AS P. A one story frame, two bay deep structure with the entry in the center of the gable end that faces the road. (36/1)

E69 WYCKOFF DWELLING DS, AS, P. A two and a half story, frame, two bay deep form structure with a two story two bay extension and a three bay, one and a half story, three bay wing; shed roof side porch; two chimneys, one in each section. (37/3)

E70 WERTS DWELLING AS P. A stone two story, three bay "I" house with plain trim, transomed entry and one chimney in the left gable. (38/12)

E71 JOHNSTON DWELLING DS, AS, P. A stone, two story, five bay "I" house with plain trim, transomed entry and one chimney in the left gable. (38/12)

E72 CHAMBERLAIN DWELLING MS, DS, AS, P. A two story brick, five bay, rectangular deep center hall structure with a rear ell and hipped roof. (41/18)

E73 DWELLING/BARN AS, P. A two story, stone five bay "I" house with a lower, two bay, stone wing and lean-to; two chimneys. A large complex of farm buildings include a stuccoed stone barn. (41/41)

E74 BLACKWELL DWELLING DS, AS P. A frame, two story, three bay, deep side hall structure with a narrow two bay wing and lean-to. (41/43C)

E75 BLACKWELL DWELLING AS, P. A two story, frame, two bay, deep form structure with a two story, two bay wing and lean-to; chimney in the center of each outer gable; the stone hitching post remains. (41/44A)

E76 DWELLING AS, P. A four bay, two and a half story, stuccoed stone "I" house; authentic example of this type. (41/45)

E77 RINGOES STATION AS P. 1.)A frame, rectangular structure on a bank cellar overhanging eaves with large simple brackets. 2.)A rectangular, frame, one and a half story, gable roofed structure. 3.)A frame, two story, four bay, gable roof structure with Victorian details and elongated ell on the one gable. 4.) A frame, five bay, two story gable roofed structure. 5.)
A small frame structure with a small square hip-roofed unit in the front. (300/2,3,4)

LINVALE DISTRICT

LV1 LINVALE METHODIST CHURCH: A frame main block on stuccoed stone ground level, returned box cornice and square, hipped roof; projecting tower with louvers (30/18)

LV2 A four bay, "I" type with a rear ell; flat roofed stoop with square posts with moldings. (41/13)

LV3 A four bay, narrow form structure with a rear ell and a clipped, shed roofed porch. (41/14)

LV4 A three bay, main block, four bays deep and a lower, one and a half story, frame, rear wing. (41/15)

REAVILLE DISTRICT

RV1 A two and a half story, frame barn with a side gate and a wood shingle gable roof, horizontal weatherboards and lean-to on each end. The house is a four bay "I" house with two and a half stories and a frame rear addition. It has clapboard siding, boxed cornice and a porch, c. 1860. Altered. (18/6)

RV2 A three bay, two story, frame "I" house with an off center door to the left with transom. There is clapboard siding, a three bay porch with turned posts and turned brackets and a boxed cornice. (18/7)

RV3 A three bay, two story, frame "I" house with a rear ell. c. 1850. There is an off center door with fluted surrounds and bull's eye corner blocks. There is a large replacement bay window on the first floor, a boxed and returned cornice and a flush and plain board frieze. It is clapboard sided with a new porch. (18/8)

RV4 A five bay, two story, frame, narrow form house with a center hall and entrance. It is flanked on either end by two bay, two story, narrower and lower wings. The house has or had more stylistic importance than its neighbors. The pilasters at the corner at one time must have supported an entablature which is now missing. The house dates from 1840 or possibly earlier, but it has some modern additions. It is restorable to architectural importance. (18/9)

RV5 A one story, one room schoolhouse of stone masonry with
rough stucco covering. The gable front has a paneled door to the left. The gable is clad in tongue and groove vertical boards. No ornamentation whatsoever. c.1900. (19/10)

RV6 A two story, frame compound "I" house built in two or three phases with a low lean-to addition on the back. c.1800-1870. It is now clad in asbestos siding on the ends and cedar shakes on the front. The three bay part to the left was probably original with the five additinal bays to the right subsequent additions. Worthy of restoration. (18/11)

RV7 A five bay, two story, frame "I" house with a low lean-to addition on the back, originally center door, c. 1850. It now has a one story three bay covered porch or vestibule on the front, aluminum sided, first floor windows have been replaced. There are flush eaves and wide board entablature on the front. (18/12)

RV8 A three bay, two story, frame "I" house with a very deep flat roofed rear addition with an off-center door to the left. Asbestos siding. (18/13)

RV9 A three bay two story house with deep flat roofed rear addition. An offcenter door to the left. c.11860. Original clapboard siding, exposed fieldstone foundation on end. From an end, one can see the rear of the house was a subsequent addition built in two phases. Flush eaves. (18/14)

RV10 A four bay, two story, frame "I" house with the door to the center left with a lower two bay, two story wing to the left. The dates from 1800, although it has been rather altered in terms of exterior fabric and is presently aluminum sided. There is the original four light attic window and a two story porch on the side wing. There is a large two and a half story, frame barn to the rear of the house with vertical weather-boards and a corrugated metal roof, but it is in very bad shape; open to the elements and deteriorating. (18/15)

RV11 An intersting three bay gable front, frame house that is three bays deep in the rectangular plan with a wraparound veranda. c. 1870-1880. There is a five light transom; two and a half floors with a large diamond gable light which is now a vent. The festooned barge boards and eaves are well preserved and maintained (18/15A)

RV12 A four bay, two and a half story, frame "I" house with
a one and a half story lean-to on the left. c.1840-50. The door has Greek Revival fluted surround and transom and is in the center left bay. The eaves and barge boards are decorated with cusped gingerbread with a rough painted stucco foundation. A gabled entrance porch with two square posts; twentieth century, scalloped wooden hoods over the windows, clapboard siding. (20/3).

RV13 A four bay, two and a half story, frame "I" house which appears to have been built as a three bay house with the left bay as a later addition. The door is in the center left bay. The dwelling is very altered. c. 1860. To the left of the house is an excellent example of a small frame barn that has been restored and is in good condition. There are old horizontal weather boards, a wood shingled roof and a wooden sliding gate on the side towards the street.

RV15 A five bay, two and a half story, frame house with a center door. There is asymmetrical spacing of the windows (the left side of the house is longer than the right side) and a one and a half story side wing to the right. Tax records show the age of the house as 1720. Although there may be some framing buried in the house somewhere from that date, the house appears (before recent alterations) to be closer to 1820. A Federal door surround, asphalt roof, projecting eaves, internal brick chimneys and asbestos siding. Worthy of restoration. (20/5)
RINGOES

RN1 LANDIS DWELLING AS, P. A frame, four bay, dep form dwelling with a lower two bay rear ell expanded in frame one bay west and one floor up; "L" shaped front porch and side porch on the rear ell. (11/4)

RN2 This five bay center door, two story frame "I" house, now commercial property has random rubble foundation, paired four light attic lights, projecting box eaves and replacement shingle siding. (11/9)

RN3 RINGOES GRANGE: c. 1870-1880. A two and a half story, frame gable front building. There is clapboard with fish scale shingles on the gable. The doors are on the left and right bays of the gable front. (11/10)

RN4 A two story, three bay frame, "I" house with a two story bay window on the right bay. There is clapboard siding and a one story wing to the north. (11/12)

RN5 A two story, three bay frame, "I" house with a rear one story addition. There is a one story bay window to the left with an attractive two bay wooden porch to the right. The center door has a light transom (two) and the windows have small moulded drip boards or cornices and louvered shutters. The foundation is stuccoed stone. (11/13)

RN6 A two story, three bay "I" house with moulded window surrounds, a boxed and returned cornice and an original door in the left end bay. There is a new door on the right bay, a porch and exterior brick chimney. Wide clapboard siding. (11/14)

RN7 A five bay, center hall, cross gable, two and a half story frame house with a wraparound veranda. (11/15)

RN8 A three bay, two and a half story frame "I" house with the gable end to the street and facing south. There are beaded corner boards, random width clapboards and a porch on the south ell extending southwest, and a one story wing to the northeast. (11/16)

RN9 A five bay, two and a half story, frame "I" house with a two story rear addition, a front porch with ginger bread brackets, paired with four pane attic lights and an interesting twentieth century cross gable dormer. There are new doors in front, beaded corner boards, random width clapboards, boxed and returned cornice and louvered shutters. (11/17)
RN10 A three bay, two story, frame "I" house with a flat-roofed, two bay, two story rear addition and a projecting center front bay and new porch. The combination is unique and attractive, with narrow width clapboards, Colonial Revival porch and a decorative fan motif over central pediment. (11/18)

RN11 ODDFELLOWS HALL: c. date-corner stone - 1886, similar to the grange building but in more original state. A two and a half story, frame, gable front, rectangular plan structure. There are narrow clapboards on the first floor, asbestos siding on the second floor. There is an interesting and original wood decorative siding in the gable, bracketed cornice, elaborate six post front porch with turned columns, balustrade and porch frieze, gingerbread brackets and center triangular pediment. The original double center door is on the gable front. (11/20)

RN12 A four bay, two and a half story, brick house. The door is on the center left bay, and has a two light transom. The windows have large splayed lintels with keystones. The remnants of the original moulded cornice with full gable return can be seen beneath later projecting eaves. A one story, brick ell with a later frame second story. (11/20A)

RN13 PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH: A Neo-Gothic brownstone church with a gable front with a centered projecting tower. There is a pointed arch door centered in the tower and flanked by the corner tower piers. The original stone part of the church appears in excellent condition. The steeple portion of the tower appears a bit out of proportion. (11/21)

RN14 An "L" plan, gable front, two and a half story, frame gingerbread Victorian house with a wrap around veranda, lace-like barge boards and a three bay gable front with a door on the right bay. The door has sidelights and transom and there is a one bay bracketed window on the south end, slate roof and stone foundation. (11/22)

RN15 A five bay, two and a half story, deep form, center hall frame house with cross gables and a wrap around veranda. There are tall windows on the first floor and a two story end bay window; patterned slate roof, narrow clapboards and bargeboards. (11/23)

RN16 A five bay, two and a half story, center door frame house with cross gables, moulded window surrounds and an excellent fluted door surround with carved corner
blocks; two internal end brick chimneys, a four post wooden porch, projecting eaves, asphalt shingle roof. A very fine example of the early Victorian type. (11/25)

RN17 A three bay, two story house with very long rear ell. There is a side hall door to the right, projecting eaves, flush cornice and raking cornice, narrow clapboards, slate roof and paneled and louvered shutters. A later wrap-around porch was added. (11/26)

RN18 An "L" plan, two and a half story, frame house with a three bay gable front, double door on the right and very tall windows on the first floor. A four post front porch with very fine gingerbread; brownstone foundation, patterned slate roof. Unaltered, an architecturally important house. (11/27)

RN19 A five bay, narrow form, center door house with two and a half stories, frame, narrow clapboards, cross gable, patterned slate roof, later porch and rear ell. (11/28)

RN20 A five bay, two story, frame "I" house with a centered door; paired four pane attic lights and an interior chimney to the left. The dwelling is very plain with no ornament. (11/29)

RN21 A five bay, two and a half story, frame house with cross gables and a centered door; a later porch with Doric columns on stone piers. A segmental-arch fan-light over door is unusual feature. (11/33)

RN22 A three bay, two and a half story, narrow form house with a rear ell facing south. The house has Greek Revival corner pilasters. The original exterior fabric is hidden by asbestos siding. There is a center door with transom and a very unusual juxtaposition of early twentieth century glazing in the old windows. (11/34)

RN23 A three bay, two and a half story, frame house with narrow clapboards and a slate roof. First floor windows are new, along with the front porch. (11/35)

RN24 A three bay, gable front, frame, two and a half story, late Victorian house with Colonial Revival wrap-around porch. The structure has been altered with the gingerbread removed; aluminum siding. (12/2)

RN25 Similar to RN24 (12/3)

RN26 A three bay, two and a half story, frame house with a bay window on the southern gable end and a stone
foundation and an enclosed front porch. (12/4)

RN27 A very fine, five bay, two and a half story center hall frame house. The door has three light sidelights and transom; flushboard cornice and narrow clapboards. An early twentieth century veranda with attenuated Doric columns are in keeping with the Federal character of the house. (12/5)

RN28 A two and a half stor, frame "L" plan house with the gable end and bay window to the street and a porch facing south; slate roof and clapboard siding. (12/9)

RN29 a four bay, two and a half story, frame "I" house with a bay window on the north gable end; aluminum siding. (12/10)

RN30 A typical, three bay, frame, two and a half story "I" house which is very altered with additions and asphalt imitatatin stone siding. (12/13)

RN31 A three bay, two and a half story, frame narrow form house with a lower two bay wing to the south. A four pane diamond attic light and a five column front porch; aluminum siding. (12/18)

RN32 INSLEE HOUSE, A three bay, two story frame "I" house with exposed brick firback on the southern end, clapboard siding. (12/20)

RN33 A five bay, deep form, center hall, two and a half story, frame house with moulded window and door surrounds. Two vertical rows of windows on gable ends and a stuccoed, slightly projecting foundation; internal end brick chimneys; the four panel door has two light transom, moulded architrave surround, and a new front porch. (14/10)

RN34 A typical three bay "I" house with paired four pane attic lights, a center door and asbestos siding. New porch. (14/12)

RN35 ACADEMY OF SCIENCE AND ART, This small, three bay, two and a half story "I" house is made of coursed pressed stone laid in the Flemish bond pattern more commonly seen in brick construction. The window and door openings are topped by cut-stone segmental arches; paired four pane attic windows with monolithic flat stone lintels and sills. This is one of the county’s most outstanding architectural sites. (14/13)

RN36 MELDRUM HOUSE Very complex house, built in stages, at
various times. The three bay, two and a half story main block has an excellent round headed Federal style entrance to the left. The corner pilasters are Greek Revival style, and support an entablature cornice. The lower side wing is a simple four bay, two story "I" house with an added bay window, clapboard siding. (14/14)

RN37 A five bay, two and a half story, deep form frame house with a center hall. The center door has a two light transom; boxed cornice with returns and asymmetrical gable ends. No chimney stacks are visible and a much later bay window was added to the right of the door. The house is unpainted clapboard and has one bay lean-to addition in the rear. (14/15)

RN38 AMWELL ACADEMY: Originally a school. This well-known county landmark is among the finest examples of Federal architecture in the state. A five bay, two and a half story, deep form, center door, cut stone structure. Finely dressed and coursed ashlar exterior, boxed and returned cornice, finely cut lintels with keystones, recorded by the Historic American Buildings Survey. This and the frame house across from it define the northern edge of the district. (14/22)

RN39 A large, two and a half story, frame, late Victorian house with a wide veranda and a bay window to the side. The cross gables have round attic windows with decorative surrounds. The house appears to have been remodeled often. There is a very nice barn north of the house which bears the date "1879" on its gable front. A historic marker in front of the house identifies this site as that of Ringoe's Tavern. c. 1739-1779. (16/1)

RN40 An unusual three bay, gable front house with a high, steeply pitched roof and shiplap siding. The front porch at first glance, appears to be early twentieth century, but it could be much altered and older. It is about one hundred feet back from the road. (16/7)

RN41 LANDIS HOUSE: 1739, is a three bay, one and a half story gambrel-roofed structure with exterior random rubble masonry. There are three hipped roofed dormers a central chimney, segmental stone arches over the end windows, joist butts visible from the exterior where they pierce through masonry walls above the lintel level of the first floor windows and door. (16/8.02)

RN42 Directly across from the Amwell Academy is a frame house composed of three parts. The two and a half
story main block has three bays, center door; lower two bay side wing to the south; one bay lean-to to the south of that. Clad in ship-lap siding which probably dates from the end of the nineteenth century; a slate roof with projecting eaves. (16/9)

RN43 A seven bay, two and a half story tavern in the deep form with a high roof and massive central chimney. Doors on the second, third and seventh bay from the left (north). Tight eaves, flush rake boards, and an asphalt shingle roof. Lower and narrower two bay wing to the south. This wing and the southern three bays of the main block were probably built around 1800-1810. This building is at the southeastern edge of the Ringoes district. (27A/20)

RN44 RINGOES GENERAL STORE: A four/five bay, two and a half story, frame structure. It has a slate roof, a boxed return cornice, and a clapboard exterior. There is a twentieth century porch and commercial front on the first floor and an attached ell to a three bay, two story structure with a slate roof and clapboard siding. (27A/21)

RN45 Probably a very early house. This tiny frame structure consists of three/two bay main block, two stories high with a one story, two bay lean-to to the right and one a half story, two/three bay lean-to to the left; lean-to's have squared off false fronts. There is an internal brick chimney on the left end of the main block and a two post front porch. (27A/22)

RN46 Greek Revival frame house with a two or three bay main block, one room per floor. A centered door with elaborate surround and a two light transom. Two square posts support a well-detailed porch entablature with dentils and drop pendants. The windows have cornices; corner pilasters support entablature cornice. There is a one and a half story lean-to to the left (east) of the house which has a squared off false front. Narrow clapboard siding; unusual elaborate detailing. (27A/23)

RN47 Similar to the house above, except the trim has been removed and covered with aluminum siding. (27A/24)

RN48 A modified three bay, two and a half story "I" house. (27A/25)

RN49 Modified frame barn. (27A/26)
WERTSVILLE

WR1 A five bay, frame, Federal house (1810) with a two bay, side wing, fanlight over the door, festooned cornice and interesting outbuildings. William Wernt, founder of the village owned this property in early nineteenth century. (23/13)

WR2 A two and a half story, gabled structure. It appears to be transitional in style between Greek Revival and Italianate, corner pilasters support entablature and the rake boards have brackets, diamond shaped attic window. (34/29)

WR3 A two and a half story, narrow form house in three sections: two bay, two bay, three bay and a lean to. Enclosed front porch, asbestos siding. (34/30)

WR4 A frame barn. (34/31)

WR5 A five bay, two and a half story, narrow form house, c. 1860. Center door, boxed and returned cornice, slate roof and asbestos siding. Stone foundation and a high stoop with wooden railing. (34/35)

WR6 A two bay, two story "I" house with a one bay side lean-to. "Icicle type" barge boards, clapboard siding, front porch, and a slate roof. (34/36)

WR7 An Italianate, square plan house and barn. Segmental arch door head, attic windows in frieze cornice, pyramidal roof, clapboard siding, stone foundation and front veranda. (34/37)

WR8 A small, square plan, frame barn; gable roof, asbestos siding, large nineteenth century. (35A/2)

WR9 A two/three bay, two and a half story, frame house with a center door and side lean to, c. 1850. Flush eaves, clapboard siding, square attic lights. (35A/3)

WR10 A two and a half story, frame residence, "L" plan, square paired attic lights. The house faces both Werts ville and Lindbergh Road, c. 1860's. (35A/4)

WR11 A six bay, frame, two and half story, narrow form house with an enclosed porch in front; two internal chimneys; boxed and returned cornice, cedar shakes, c. 1840.

WR12 A large, barn-like stone church known as the "Baptist Meeting House" at Wert's Corner (Snell). Coursed rubble masonry with dressed quoins, unique details.
The enabling legislation should authorize a distinct "farmland TDR" separate from TDR for other purposes. The statute should contain a six year sunset provision. The term "sunset" means that the enabling legislation automatically expires at the end of the six year period. Action by the legislature would be necessary to reinstate TDR in the municipal land use law.

The enabling legislation should treat TDR on a limited basis so that the concept and its multiple components could be tested prior to the establishment of permanent legislation. The inequities of certain TDR programs in other states as well as the difficulties encountered with the Pinelands Development Credit program, have created the need for this cautious approach.

The review and approval system for ordinances should be clearly defined in the legislation so that municipalities do not vary from the essential criteria for TDR. All TDR ordinances must require a three year and six year evaluation and also contain a sunset provision (i.e., termination provision) if the ordinance has failed to meet the guidelines established by the DOA and DCA. If the ordinance is terminated, the landowners in sending areas may resume the same zoning designation/permitted uses that existed prior to the enactment of the TDR ordinance. We envision three municipalities using TDR in the first phase as being sufficient to test the concept.

The enabling legislation should direct the Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the state Department of Community Affairs, to promulgate regulations in the New Jersey Register governing the required background studies for those municipalities considering TDR ordinances. Those studies should include but not be limited to: an assessment of the real estate conditions in the municipality and surrounding area; an agronomic evaluation of the proposed sending area; an appraisal of the land values of the proposed sending areas; an evaluation of the existing infrastructure of the proposed receiving area, and other such studies. The "agronomic evaluation" means a study
prepared by a professional agronomist or agricultural economist which describes the economics and site characteristics of the farming being practiced in a given area.

The allocation of TDR credits to land in the sending area should be based upon the development rights value that prevailed immediately prior to the zoning change contained in the TDR ordinance. TDR credit allocation formulas may incorporate a factor for undeveloped property (wetlands, steep slopes, etc.) to ensure that imbalances be avoided in having the assigned credits reasonably resemble the developments right value of the property. The development right value should be determined by the appraisals done in the background study phase.

The municipality, in drafting the ordinance, must ensure that sufficient development pressure exists to achieve a substantial private market for credit purchases. The transfer ratio, (i.e., credits to bonus development units) must be created in a way that provides an incentive for developers to participate in the TDR program. The number of credits issued must be capable of being accommodated (i.e. balanced) with the growth potential in the receiving area. The infrastructure needs created by the additional development potential in the receiving area caused by the TDR ordinance should be identified and phased-in immediately with readily available capital funding. Other incentives, like "fast-track" development application review, should be considered to accelerate the establishment of incentives for credit purchases.

Every municipality that adopts an experimental TDR ordinance must make provision for an intermediary market for credits held by landowners in the sending area. This market may be achieved by either a municipal credit bank, a county credit bank, an allowance for non-agricultural development on a clustered basis on sites that are not well-suited for cropping in the sending area, or by some combination of each. The purpose of this section is to provide as a matter of right the option for a landowner in the sending area to liquidate a limited portion of his/her credit holdings, not to exceed 20% per year in any year coinciding with the anniversary of the effective date of the TDR ordinance. This will help meet the farmer's cash needs that sometimes arise from the vagaries of the farming business. This section also will provide a stimulus for the municipality to seek a private market for the purchase of credits, the failure of which will result in the municipality's requirement to underwrite the financing of this intermediate market.
In the event economic conditions decline, such that the development rights value used in the original credit allocation is substantially different, a municipality may adjust either the minimum value of the credits or the allocation of the credits for such landowners for a period of six years.

The Secretary of Agriculture, in conjunction with the Department of Community Agrairs, shall promulgate regulations governing the review, approval, and oversight of any TDR ordinance. The review process shall utilize the existing structure of the State Agriculture Development Committee and County Agriculture Development Boards. These regulations should also contain minimum requirements for the daily administration of TDR program, public hearings prior to enactment of a TDR ordinance, and performance goals for the TDR program.

All TDR programs shall be reviewed by the SADC after the first three years. This review shall include an analysis of credit transactions in both the private and public market, an update of current conditions in comparison to the original study projections, and an assessment of the performance goals for the TDR program. - including an evaluation of the units constructed with and without TDR credits.

A report of the SADC findings from this three year review and any recommended adjustments shall be submitted to the municipality, the county planning board, the DOA and the DCA.

Prior to the end of the six year trial period, the SADC shall again review the performance of the ordinance. The goal of a TDR ordinance must be to have at least one-third of all credits originally allocated purchased at the end of the first six year term. Failure to meet this measurable objective shall be reported by the SADC to the DOA and DCA and will result in the automatic termination of the TDR ordinance.

Regulatory assurances for farmers in the sending area must be equivalent to those afforded under the Right to Farm Act and the Agriculture Retention and Development Act and shall be an essential component to any TDR ordinance.

There shall be sufficient appropriation from the state’s General Fund to the SADC for administrative review costs. The Ag Retention Bond Act should be amended to permit grants between the state and local government match to be used in financing public purchases of TDR credits. Such funds may be used by the credit bank to guarantee loans. A minimum value per credit shall be established for use as collateral.
for farm lending purposes.

Any landowner in the sending area holding TDR credits vested in the property by virtue of the TDR ordinance shall receive an equitable return based on the development rights value held prior to the implementation of the down-zoning.
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