

RESOLUTION OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE ADOPTING AN AMENDED FOURTH ROUND HOUSING ELEMENT AND FAIR SHARE PLAN

RESOLUTION #2026-04

WHEREAS, the Borough of Park Ridge (hereinafter the “Borough” or “Park Ridge”) has a demonstrated history of voluntary compliance as evidenced by its Third Round record; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to In re N.J.A.C. 5:96 and 5:97, 221 N.J. 1 (2015) (Mount Laurel IV), on or around July 2, 2015, the Borough of Park Ridge filed a Declaratory Judgment Complaint in Superior Court, Law Division seeking, among other things, a judicial declaration that its Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, to be amended as necessary, satisfied its “fair share” of the regional need for low and moderate income housing pursuant to the “Mount Laurel doctrine,” and

WHEREAS, that culminated in a Court-approved Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan and a Judgment of Compliance and Repose, which precludes all Mount Laurel lawsuits, including builder’s remedy lawsuits, until July 1, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the Borough continues to actively implement its Court-approved Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan; and

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2024, Governor Murphy signed into law P.L. 2024, c.2, which amended the 1985 New Jersey Fair Housing Act (hereinafter the “Amended FHA”); and

WHEREAS, the Borough adopted a resolution on January 28, 2025, committing to a present need obligation of 137 and Fourth Round prospective need obligation of 119 and thereafter filing a declaratory judgment action within 48 hours of the adoption of the Resolution; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Amended FHA and the Administrative Office of the Court’s Directive No. 14-24, the Borough filed a timely Fourth Round Declaratory Judgment complaint (“DJ Complaint”) with the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program (“the Program”), along with its binding resolution, on January 23, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the filing of the DJ Complaint gave the Borough automatic, continued immunity from all exclusionary zoning lawsuits, including builder’s remedy lawsuits, which is still in full force and effect; and

WHEREAS, the Borough received an objection from the New Jersey Builders Association to Prospective Need number by February 28, 2025; and

WHEREAS, the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program (“the Program”) recommended that the Borough’s Fourth Round prospective need obligation be 124; and

WHEREAS, on the basis of the Program’s recommendation, on June 11, 2025, the Planning Board adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan and subsequently filed the

requisite documentation with the Court with a Fourth Round prospective need obligation of 124; and

WHEREAS, following the Borough adopting its Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, on June 16, 2025, the Borough received reduced Fourth Round Obligations from the Honorable Gregg A. Padovano, J.S.C., determining the Fourth Round prospective need obligation to be 119; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with the Amended FHA, the Borough's Planning Board adopted an Amendment to the Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan to reflect the revised obligation on July 9, 2025; and

WHEREAS, both the adopted Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan and the Amendment thereto were endorsed by the Borough Council and thereafter filed with the Program and the Superior Court; and

WHEREAS, on August 31, 2025, Fair Share Housing Center ("FSHC") filed a challenge to the Borough's Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Borough participated in mediation before the Program to resolve FSHC's challenge, which mediation resulted in the execution of a Mediation Agreement dated January 23, 2026; and


WHEREAS, pursuant to the FHA and the terms of the Mediation Agreement, the Borough is required to further amend its Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan to incorporate the terms and conditions agreed upon therein; and

WHEREAS, the Borough has prepared an Amended Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, attached hereto as **Exhibit A** (the "Amended Fourth Round Plan"); and

WHEREAS, upon notice duly provided pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-13, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing on the Amended Fourth Round Plan on February 11, 2026; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has determined that the attached Amended Fourth Round Plan is consistent with the goals and objectives of the Borough's current Master Plan, and that adoption and implementation of the Amended Fourth Round Plan is in the public interest and protects public health and safety and promotes the general welfare.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of the Borough of Park Ridge, County of Bergen, State of New Jersey, that the Planning Board hereby adopts the Borough's Amended Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, attached hereto as Exhibit A.


Chairman of the Planning Board

CERTIFICATION

I certify that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by the Planning Board of Borough of Park Ridge at a regular meeting held on February 11, 2026.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Sonya Jancic", is written over a horizontal line. Below the line, the text "Planning Board Secretary" is printed.



Community Planning
Land Development and Design
Landscape Architecture

B U R G I S
ASSOCIATES, INC.

Principals:

Joseph Burgis PP, AICP

Edward Snieckus, Jr. PP, LLA, ASLA

David Novak, PP, AICP

2026 AMENDED HOUSING ELEMENT AND FAIR SHARE PLAN

BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE
BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

PREPARED FOR:

BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE PLANNING BOARD
BA# 4157.04

The original document was appropriately signed and sealed on January 19, 2026 in accordance with Chapter 41 of Title 13 of the State Board of Professional Planners.

Joseph H. Burgis, P.P., AICP
Professional Planner #2450

Robyn K. Welch, P.P., AICP
Professional Planner #5971

January 19, 2026
ADOPTED: FEBRUARY 11, 2026

MEMBERS OF THE BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE PLANNING BOARD

Raymond Mital, Chairman
Peter Von Bradsky, Vice-Chairman
Mayor Keith Misciagna
Councilman Greg Hoffman
Jessica Mazarella
Mark Bisanzo
Mark Cristaldi
Donald Schwamb
Marc Weinberg
Thomas Greco (Alt. #1)
Tyler Lee (Alt. #2)

Planning Board Secretary

Tonya Janeiro

Planning Board Attorney

Robert Ferraro, Esq.
Bruno and Ferraro

Planning Board Planner

Nicholas Dickerson, P.P., A.I.C.P.
Colliers Engineering & Design

Planning Board Engineer

Gregory Polyniak, P.E. and John Dunlea, P.E.
Neglia Engineering

Affordable Housing Planning Consultants

Joseph Burgis, P.P., A.I.C.P. and Robyn Welch, P.P., A.I.C.P.
Burgis Associates, Inc.

Affordable Housing Special Counsel

Michael J. Edwards, Esq.
Surenian, Edwards, Buzak & Nolan LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY..... | 1 |
| SECTION I: INTRODUCTION | 8 |
| SECTION 2: HOUSING ELEMENT | 13 |
| SECTION 3: FAIR SHARE OBLIGATION | 31 |
| SECTION 4: FAIR SHARE PLAN..... | 39 |
| APPENDICES | 62 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|---|----|
| TABLE 1: AFFORDABLE HOUSING OBLIGATIONS SUMMARY..... | 1 |
| TABLE 2: PLAN COMPONENTS SATISFYING FIRST & SECOND ROUND OBLIGATION..... | 2 |
| TABLE 3: CALCULATION OF THIRD ROUND RDP | 4 |
| TABLE 4: PLAN COMPONENTS SATISFYING THIRD ROUND RDP..... | 4 |
| TABLE 5: PLAN COMPONENTS SATISFYING FOURTH ROUND RDP | 6 |
| TABLE 6: FOURTH ROUND UNMET NEED COMPONENTS | 6 |
| TABLE 7: 2024 AFFORDABLE HOUSING REGION 1 INCOME LIMITS BY HOUSEHOLD SIZE..... | 8 |
| TABLE 8: DWELLING UNITS (1980-2023)..... | 19 |
| TABLE 9: HOUSING UNITS BY TENURE AND OCCUPANCY STATUS (2010 AND 2023)..... | 19 |
| TABLE 10: UNITS IN STRUCTURE (2010 AND 2023)..... | 20 |
| TABLE 11: NUMBER OF BEDROOMS IN HOUSING UNITS (2010 AND 2023)..... | 20 |
| TABLE 12: YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT (2023)..... | 21 |
| TABLE 13: OCCUPANTS PER ROOM (2010 AND 2023)..... | 21 |
| TABLE 14: EQUIPMENT AND PLUMBING FACILITIES (2010 AND 2023)..... | 22 |
| TABLE 15: GROSS RENT OF SPECIFIED RENTER-OCCUPIED UNITS (2010 AND 2023)..... | 22 |
| TABLE 16: VALUE OF SPECIFIED OWNER-OCCUPIED HOUSING UNITS (2010 AND 2023)..... | 23 |
| TABLE 17: NUMBER OF RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS ISSUED FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (2014-2023)..... | 24 |
| TABLE 18: POPULATION GROWTH (1930-2023)..... | 25 |
| TABLE 19: AGE CHARACTERISTICS (2010 AND 2023)..... | 26 |
| TABLE 20: AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD SIZE (2000-2023)..... | 26 |
| TABLE 21: HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION (2010 AND 2023)..... | 27 |
| TABLE 22: EMPLOYMENT STATUS - POPULATION 16 & OVER (2010 AND 2023)..... | 27 |
| TABLE 23: EMPLOYED RESIDENTS AGE 16 AND OVER, BY OCCUPATION (2010 AND 2023)..... | 28 |
| TABLE 24: EMPLOYED RESIDENTS AGE 16 AND OVER, BY INDUSTRY (2010 AND 2023)..... | 28 |
| TABLE 25: AVERAGE COVERED EMPLOYMENT TRENDS (2014-2023)..... | 29 |
| TABLE 26: NON-RESIDENTIAL SPACE AUTHORIZED BY BUILDING PERMITS (2014-2023)..... | 30 |
| TABLE 27: SUMMARY OF FAIR SHARE OBLIGATION..... | 33 |
| TABLE 28: CALCULATION OF THIRD ROUND RDP | 36 |
| TABLE 29: AFFORDABLE HOUSING OBLIGATIONS SUMMARY..... | 40 |
| TABLE 30: PLAN COMPONENTS SATISFYING FIRST & SECOND ROUND OBLIGATION..... | 41 |
| TABLE 31: PLAN COMPONENTS SATISFYING THIRD ROUND RDP..... | 42 |
| TABLE 32: PLAN COMPONENTS SATISFYING FOURTH ROUND RDP..... | 42 |

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The following **2026 Amended Housing Element and Fair Share Plan (Amended HE&FSP) of the Master Plan** has been prepared for the Borough of Park Ridge, Bergen County, New Jersey.

This plan is designed to outline the manner in which the Borough will address its affordable housing obligations. As discussed in greater detail herein, these obligations were derived from a variety of different sources including the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH), prior Court-approved Judgments of Compliance and Repose and settlement agreements with Fair Share Housing Center (FSHC), and most recently from Fourth Round obligation calculations provided by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) as modified by a Structural Conditions Survey, a June 16, 2025 trial court order, and a mediation agreement with FSHC executed on January 6, 2026.

These obligations are summarized as follows:

Table 1: Affordable Housing Obligations Summary

| Category | Obligation |
|---|------------|
| Present Need (Rehabilitation) Obligation | 45 |
| First & Second Round Obligation (1987-1999) | 112 |
| Third Round Obligation (1999-2025) | 225 |
| Fourth Round Obligation (2025-2035) | 119 |

First & Second Round Obligation

The Borough of Park Ridge has prepared a number of Housing Elements and Fair Share Plans over the years to affirmatively address its affordable housing obligations. The Borough adopted its first HE&FSP in 1989, which was prepared to address Park Ridge’s 1987-1993 pre-credited housing-need obligation of 169 units. The Plan called for a Vacant Land Adjustment resulting in a Realistic Development Potential (RDP) of 86 units and addressed same with 30 affordable housing units within five inclusionary developments, credit for 4 previously rehabilitated housing units, credit for 36 existing affordable housing units for the handicapped, and provision for the rehabilitation of 16 additional existing units. COAH granted First-Round substantive certification to the Borough on January 29, 1990.

Then, in 1994, COAH issued revised housing-need numbers for the combined First and Second Round period between 1987 and 1999. Park Ridge was assigned a combined First and Second Round new construction obligation of 112 units. In 1995, the Borough adopted an amended HE&FSP, which addressed Park Ridge’s twelve-year cumulative obligation for the years 1987-1999, and sought a revised Vacant Land Adjustment, which resulted in a 69-unit RDP. COAH granted the Borough Second-Round substantive certification on June 5, 1996.

The Borough's Second Round plan was subsequently amended in both 1996 (receiving amended substantive certification in 1997) and in 1999 (receiving amended substantive certification in 2000, which was then extended in 2005). Although the revisions to the Second Round HE&FSP did not change the Borough's affordable housing obligations or Vacant Land Adjustment, they did result in modifications to the mechanisms proposed to address said obligations. Ultimately, the second round HE&FSP (as amended) addressed its 69-unit RDP with the provision of 18 affordable housing units within four inclusionary developments, the transfer of 15 Regional Contribution Agreement (RCA) units, and credit for 36 existing affordable housing units for the handicapped.

Then, in 2020, the Borough and FSHC (along with an intervenor, Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC) entered into a Settlement Agreement which established both its First and Second Round (1987-1999) and Third Round (1999-2025) obligations and set forth the parameters with which the Borough would comply. As part of that settlement, the Borough agreed to address the entirety of its 112-unit First and Second Round obligation, despite the fact that the Borough had previously secured a Vacant Land Adjustment and continued to lack vacant, developable land.

The Borough ultimately addressed this First and Second Round obligation through the components identified in Table 2 below, all of which have been completed.

Table 2: Plan Components Satisfying First & Second Round Obligation

| Plan Component | Units | Bonus | Total | Status |
|---|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| <i>Prior Cycle Credits:</i> | | | | |
| Woodland Gardens/Lehmann Gardens | 35 | -- | 35 | Completed |
| <i>RCA:</i> | | | | |
| Borough of Ogdensburg | 12 | -- | 12 | Completed |
| <i>Alternative Living Arrangements/Group Homes:</i> | | | | |
| Care Plus NJ | 4 (bdrms) | 4 | 8 | Completed |
| Everas Community Services | 4 (bdrms) | 3 | 7 | Completed |
| New Concepts for Living | 6 (bdrms) | 4 | 10 | Completed |
| <i>Inclusionary Rental Developments:</i> | | | | |
| Quail Run (a.k.a. Hawthorne West) | 4 | 4 | 8 | Completed |
| 70-72 Park Ave (a.k.a. Krell Building) | 1 | 1 | 2 | Completed |
| 26 Hawthorne Ave (a.k.a. Park Ridge Properties) | 5 | 5 | 10 | Completed |
| Ridge Manor | 1 | 1 | 2 | Completed |
| Hawthorne Terrace | 1 | 1 | 2 | Completed |
| 40 Park Ave (a.k.a. PRAH Associates, LLC) | 2 | 2 | 4 | Completed |
| The James (a.k.a. Park Ridge Transit, LLC) | 9 | 3 | 12 | Completed |
| Total | 84 | 28 | 112 | -- |

Third Round Obligation

As noted above, on November 18, 2020, the Borough and FSHC (along with an intervenor, Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC) entered into a Settlement Agreement which established a Third Round (1999-2025) new construction obligation of 225 units. As part of that settlement, the Borough agreed to address the entirety of its 225-unit Third Round obligation in lieu of a Vacant Land Adjustment, despite the fact that the Borough continued to lack sufficient vacant, developable land. The Borough subsequently adopted a Third Round HE&FSP on July 14, 2021 and was granted a Conditional Judgment of Compliance and Repose (Third Round JOR) on February 28, 2022.

Park Ridge's 2021 HE&FSP set forth various plan mechanisms to address the entirety of its 225-unit Third Round obligation. Whereas the majority of said plan mechanisms have been constructed and occupied by low- and moderate-income households, or are currently under construction, one project remains unbuilt: the 100 percent affordable Bear's Nest project projected to consist of 50 affordable units. In addition, despite the Borough establishing an Accessory Apartment Program to allow for the creation of up to 7 subsidized affordable units, no such units have yet come to fruition. These projects account for 57 units in its Third Round plan.

Although the Borough did everything it was supposed to do with respect to the Bear's Nest project, including amending the zoning to allow for the development and adopting a resolution of need to support the developer's New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency (HMFA) application, it was revealed in early 2022 that the entirety of the property in question is environmentally constrained and is not developable for the proposed use. Specifically, a December 2021 survey prepared for the developer showed that the site is completely constrained by wetlands, wetland transition area and/or steep slopes, leaving no developable area. For this reason, the Bear's Nest development has not moved forward and is no longer considered to be a viable development.

As described above, at the time of the Round 3 conditional judgment, the Borough lacked sufficient vacant, developable land to satisfy its full Round 3 obligation. Despite that fact, its plan accounted for the full Round 3 obligation because, in part, it assumed developability of a 100 percent affordable project at Bear's Nest, which was an efficient use of land relative to the output of affordable housing. Had the Bear's Nest site been determined to be undevelopable at the time of the conditional judgment, the Borough would have had a Third Round RDP of 146 units, as shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Calculation of Third Round RDP

| Property | Assigned RDP |
|---|--------------|
| 40 Park Ave (at 20% of total units) | 4 |
| The James (at 20% of total units) | 48 |
| Metro Homes (at 1 AH unit per settlement) | 1 |
| Landmark/Hornrock (at 20% of total units) | 90 |
| Other eligible sites (at 12 du/ac & 20%)* | 3 |
| Bear’s Nest (no development potential) | 0 |
| Total | 146 |

*: At the time of Third Round settlement, three additional vacant lots qualified for RDP analysis: B 1019 L 9 (0.46 ac developable); B 1405 L 1 (0.52 ac developable); and B 2001 L 1 & 9 (0.44 ac developable). Despite the size and character of these lots, a density of 12 du/ac had been assigned for settlement purposes.

Against this backdrop, the Borough now seeks to amend its Round 3 plan, Judgments and Settlements to account for this change in circumstance. The only logical solution, given the still-existing land constraints, is to adjust the Borough’s Round 3 obligation due to the demonstrable lack of vacant and developable land that existed at the time of the judgment, as exacerbated by removing the Bear’s Nest site. In other words, because of these changed circumstances at Bear’s Nest that were not foreseen at the time of the 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC, the Borough is now entitled to a Vacant Land Adjustment for its Round 3 obligation.

As shown in Table 4 below, the Borough can satisfy the entirety of its 146-unit Third Round RDP obligation with existing units/credits, all of which meet the applicable requirements set forth in COAH’s Round 2 rules and the 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC (i.e., minimum 25 percent rental units (half of which must be family rentals), maximum bonus credits up to the rental minimum, maximum 25 percent age-restricted, and minimum 50 percent of actual units for families). The plan components proposed to address Park Ridge’s Third Round RDP are as follows.

Table 4: Plan Components Satisfying Third Round RDP

| Plan Component | # of Units | Bonus Credits | Total Credits | Status |
|--|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|
| <i>Assisted Living (senior rentals):</i> | | | | |
| The Residence at Park Ridge (formerly Atrium) | 28 | -- | 28 | Completed |
| <i>Inclusionary Developments (family rentals):</i> | | | | |
| The James (a.k.a. Park Ridge Transit, LLC) | 15 | 15 | 30 | Completed |
| Landmark (a.k.a. Sony/Hornrock) | 66 | 22 | 88 | Under Construction |
| Total | 109 | 37 | 146 | -- |

To address Park Ridge’s Third Round Unmet Need of 79 units, the Borough proposes to apply 40 of the 80-95 total affordable units expected to be developed in the existing NB Neighborhood Business Zone toward the Third Round Unmet Need.

Fourth Round Obligation

Governor Murphy signed A-40/S-50 into law on March 20, 2024, after the Senate and Assembly adopted it. This legislation (FHA-2) amended the Fair Housing Act (FHA) by abolishing COAH and created a new process that involved the creation of an entity known as the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program (the Program), which is overseen by seven retired judges. The Program has modified the procedures at the trial court level – and eliminated COAH formally – regarding the approval process involving municipal HE&FSPs. The DCA and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) are both also involved in assisting the Program and the trial courts with this process.

FHA-2 directed the DCA to calculate the Present Need (also referred to as the Rehabilitation obligation) and the Prospective Need (also known as the new construction obligation) for Round Four based upon the standards set forth in the Act. The DCA issued its report on October 18, 2024, and, in accordance with the Act, made clear that the obligations generated by the report were advisory only and were non-binding. For Park Ridge, the DCA Report identified a Present Need of 137 and a Prospective Round Four Need of 138.

Since the DCA report is non-binding, each municipality had the opportunity to study and define why its obligations should be different based on the standards in the Act. The Borough conducted such an analysis and determined that the DCA had made errors in the Land Capacity Factor calculation, which is part of the formula that determines fair share obligations. The Borough adopted a binding resolution on January 28, 2025, which committed to the 137-unit Present Need obligation identified by DCA but identified a reduced Prospective Need obligation of 119 units due to the Borough's assessment of errors in DCA's report pertaining to Park Ridge's Land Capacity Factor. Ultimately, a trial court order issued on June 16, 2025 officially set the Borough's Round Four Present Need at 137 and its Round Four Prospective Need at 119.

Although the Borough accepted DCA's Present Need (Rehabilitation) calculation of 137 units for the Fourth Round, the January 28, 2025 resolution reserved the Borough's right to conduct a Structural Conditions Survey to more accurately reflect the number of units in need of rehabilitation in Park Ridge. Accordingly, the Borough conducted a Structural Conditions Survey in accordance with COAH's Round 2 rules, the results of which found 45 substandard units estimated to be occupied by low- and moderate-income households in Park Ridge. As such, the Borough's Present Need obligation is 45 units.

In addition, the January 28, 2025 resolution further noted that the Borough reserved the right to seek an adjustment of its Fourth Round Prospective Need number based upon a lack of vacant, developable and suitable land. Accordingly, the Borough undertook a detailed analysis to determine if there were any changed circumstances since the 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC that would warrant a recalibration of Park Ridge's RDP. The Borough concludes that only one property represents a changed circumstance requiring a Fourth Round RDP obligation. This

property generates a total Fourth Round RDP obligation of 3 units.

The Borough proposes to address the entirety of its 3-unit Fourth Round RDP obligation with a combination of units under construction and units approved to be developed, as summarized in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Plan Components Satisfying Fourth Round RDP

| Plan Component | # of Units | Bonus Credits | Total Credits | Status |
|--|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|
| <i>Inclusionary Developments (family rentals):</i> | | | | |
| Landmark (a.k.a. Sony/Hornrock) | 1 | -- | 1 | Under Construction |
| 155 Park Avenue | 2 | -- | 2 | Approved |
| Total | 3 | 0* | 3 | |

*: Although units are eligible for bonus credits per FHA-2, none applied as same would exceed maximum 25% bonus cap.

The Borough proposes to address its 116-unit Fourth Round Unmet Need as identified in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Fourth Round Unmet Need Components

| Plan Component | # of Units | Status |
|---|------------|-------------------------|
| Excess Landmark (Sony/Hornrock) Unit | 1 | Under Construction |
| Accessory Apartment Program | 7 | Program/Zoning in Place |
| Amendments to AH Zone at Hawthorne Avenue | 13 | Proposed Amendments |
| Amendments to AH Zone at Wampum Road | 10 | Proposed Amendments |
| Amendments to AH Zone at Bear's Nest | 10 | Proposed Amendments |
| NB Neighborhood Business Zone | 40-55 | Zoning in Place |
| Mandatory Set-Aside Ordinance | TBD | Proposed Ordinance |

Accordingly, the remainder of this Amended HE&FSP is divided into the following sections:

❖ Section 1: Introduction

The first section of the Amended HE&FSP provides an introduction to affordable housing. It summarizes what affordable housing is, offers an overview of the history of affordable housing in the state, and explains the role of a housing element and fair share plan.

❖ Section 2: Housing Element

Section 2 contains the Housing Element for the Borough of Park Ridge. It offers a community overview of the Borough, as well as background information regarding its population, housing, and employment characteristics. It also provides projections of the Borough's housing stock and employment.

❖ Section 3: Fair Share Obligation

Next, Section 3 provides an overview of the Borough's fair share obligation. It includes a brief history of the methodologies utilized to calculate affordable housing obligations throughout the state.

❖ Section 4: Fair Share Plan

Finally, Section 4 details the manner in which the Borough has addressed its prior First, Second and Third Round obligations, how it will address its Fourth Round Prospective Need Obligation, and how same is consistent with the FHA, applicable COAH and UHAC regulations, and state planning initiatives.

SECTION I: INTRODUCTION

The following section provides an introduction to affordable housing. It summarizes what affordable housing is, offers an overview of the history of affordable housing in the state, and explains the role of a housing element and fair share plan.

A. WHAT IS AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

Affordable housing is income-restricted housing that is available for sale or for rent. Typically, affordable housing is restricted to very-low, low-, and moderate-income households. These categories are derived from median regional income limits established for the state. New Jersey is delineated into six different affordable housing regions. Park Ridge is located in Region 1, which includes Bergen, Hudson, Passaic and Sussex counties.



Regional income limitations are updated every year, with different categories established for varying household sizes. Table 7 identifies the 2024 regional income limits by household size for Region 1. As shown, a three-person family with a total household income of no greater than \$86,697 could qualify for affordable housing in the Borough's region.

Table 7: 2024 Affordable Housing Region 1 Income Limits by Household Size

| Income Level | 2 Person | 3 Person | 4 Person | 5 Person |
|--------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Median | \$96,329 | \$108,371 | \$120,412 | \$130,045 |
| Moderate | \$77,064 | \$86,697 | \$96,329 | \$104,036 |
| Low | \$48,165 | \$54,185 | \$60,206 | \$65,022 |
| Very-Low | \$28,899 | \$32,511 | \$36,124 | \$39,013 |

One of the most common forms of affordable housing is inclusionary development, in which a certain percentage of units within a multifamily development are reserved for affordable housing. Affordable housing can be found in a variety of other forms, including but not limited to: 100 percent affordable housing developments, deed-restricted accessory apartments, alternative living arrangements such as special need/supportive housing or group homes, assisted living facilities, and age-restricted housing.

B. WHAT IS THE HISTORY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING IN NEW JERSEY?



The history of affordable housing in New Jersey can be traced back to 1975, when the Supreme Court first decided in *So. Burlington Cty. NAACP v. Township of Mount Laurel* (known as *Mount Laurel I*) that every developing municipality throughout New Jersey had an affirmative obligation to provide for its fair share of affordable housing. In a subsequent Supreme Court decision in 1983 (known as *Mount Laurel II*), the Court acknowledged that the vast majority of municipalities had not addressed their constitutional obligation to provide affordable housing.

As such, the Court refined this obligation to establish that every municipality had an obligation, although those within the growth area of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) had a greater obligation. The Court also called for the state legislature to enact legislation that would save municipalities from the burden of having the courts determine their affordable housing needs. The result of this decision was the adoption of the Fair Housing Act in 1985, as well as the creation of the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing (COAH), which became the state agency responsible for overseeing the manner in which New Jersey's municipalities address their low- and moderate-income housing needs.


COAH proceeded to adopt regulations for the First Round obligation, which covered the years 1987 to 1993. It also established the Second Round housing-need numbers that cumulatively covered the years 1987 through 1999. Under both the First and Second Rounds, COAH utilized what is commonly referred to as the "fair share" methodology. COAH utilized a different methodology, known as "growth share," beginning with its efforts to prepare Third Round housing-need numbers. The Third Round substantive and procedural rules were first adopted in 2004.

These regulations were challenged and in January 2007, the Appellate Division invalidated various aspects of these rules and remanded considerable portions of the rules to COAH with the directive to adopt revised regulations.

In May 2008, COAH adopted revised Third Round regulations which were published and became effective on June 2, 2008. Coincident to this adoption, COAH proposed amendments to the rules they had just adopted, which subsequently went into effect in October 2008. These 2008 rules and regulations were subsequently challenged, and in an October 2010 decision, the Appellate Division invalidated the Growth Share methodology, and also indicated that COAH should adopt regulations pursuant to the Fair Share methodology utilized in Rounds One and Two. The Supreme Court affirmed this decision in September 2013, which invalidated much of the third iteration of the Third Round regulations and sustained the invalidation of growth share. As a result, the Court directed COAH to adopt new regulations pursuant to the methodology utilized in Rounds One and Two.

Deadlocked with a 3-3 vote, COAH failed to adopt newly revised Third Round regulations in October 2014. Fair Share Housing Center, who was a party in both the 2010 and 2013 cases, responded by filing a motion in aid of litigants’ rights with the New Jersey Supreme Court. The Court heard the motion in January 2015 and issued its ruling on March 20, 2015. The Court ruled that COAH was effectively dysfunctional and, consequently, returned jurisdiction of affordable housing issues back to the trial courts where it had originally been prior to the creation of COAH in 1985.

This 2015 Court decision created a process in which municipalities may file a declaratory judgment action seeking a declaration that their HE&FSP is constitutionally compliant and receive temporary immunity from affordable housing builders’ remedy lawsuits while preparing a new or revised HE&FSP to ensure their plan continues to affirmatively address their local housing need as may be adjusted by new housing-need numbers promulgated by the court or COAH.



Subsequently, the Supreme Court ruled on January 18, 2017 that municipalities are also responsible for obligations accruing during the so-called “gap period,” the period of time between 1999 and 2015. However, the Court stated that the gap obligation should be calculated as a never-before calculated component of Present Need, which would serve to capture Gap Period households that were presently in need of affordable housing as of the date of the Present Need calculation (i.e. that were still income eligible, were not captured as part of traditional present need, were still living in New Jersey and otherwise represented a Present affordable housing need).

On March 20, 2024, the State of New Jersey adopted a package of affordable housing bills which overhauled the Fair Housing Act for the Fourth Round and beyond. This legislation (FHA-2) ultimately eliminated COAH and created a new entity to approve the plans known as the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program (the Program), which consists of seven retired judges. FHA-2 also involved the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) and the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) in the process.

The DCA was designated by the legislation as the entity responsible for calculating the state’s regional needs as well as each municipality’s present and prospective fair share obligations pursuant to the Jacobson Decision. However, the legislation makes clear that these numbers are advisory and non-binding, and that each municipality must set its own obligation number utilizing the same methodology. The Program was tasked to handle any disputes regarding affordable housing obligations and plans, and to ultimately issue a Compliance Certification to approve a municipality’s HE&FSP, which would continue immunity from all exclusionary zoning lawsuits until July 30, 2035.

B. WHAT IS A HOUSING ELEMENT AND FAIR SHARE PLAN?

A Housing Element and Fair Share Plan (HE&FSP) serves as the blueprint for how a municipality will address its fair share of affordable housing. It is designed to help a community broaden the accessibility of affordable housing.

While technically a discretionary component of a municipal master plan, a HE&FSP is nevertheless an effectively obligatory plan element. As established by NJSA 40:55D-62.a of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), a municipality must have an adopted HE&FSP in order to enact its zoning ordinance. Thus, from a public policy perspective, a HE&FSP is an essential community

The **Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL)** is the enabling legislation for municipal land use and development, planning, and zoning for the State of New Jersey.

document. Moreover, without a HE&FSP, a municipality may be susceptible to a builder’s remedy lawsuit in which a developer could file suit to have a specific piece of property rezoned to permit

housing at higher densities than a municipality would otherwise allow, provided a certain percentage of units are reserved as affordable.

The Fair Housing Act, as most recently amended pursuant to FHA-2, establishes the required components of a HE&FSP. These are summarized as follows:

1. An inventory of the municipality's housing stock by age, condition, purchase or rental value, occupancy characteristics, and type, including the number of units affordable to low- and moderate-income households and substandard housing capable of being rehabilitated;
2. A projection of the municipality's housing stock, including the probable future construction of low- and moderate-income housing, for the next ten years, taking into account, but not necessarily limited to, construction permits issued, approvals of applications for development and probable residential development of lands;
3. An analysis of the municipality's demographic characteristics, including but not necessarily limited to, household size, income level and age;
4. An analysis of the existing and probable future employment characteristics of the municipality;
5. A determination of the municipality's present and prospective fair share for low- and moderate-income housing and its capacity to accommodate its present and prospective housing needs, including its fair share for low- and moderate-income housing;
6. A consideration of the lands that are most appropriate for construction of low- and moderate-income housing and the existing structures most appropriate for conversion to, or rehabilitation for, low- and moderate-income housing, including a consideration of lands of developers who have expressed a commitment to provide low- and moderate-income housing;
7. An analysis of the extent to which municipal ordinances and other local factors advance or detract from the goal of preserving multigenerational family continuity as expressed in the recommendations of the Multigenerational Family Housing Continuity Commission;
8. For a municipality located within the jurisdiction of the Highlands Water Protection and Planning Council, an analysis of compliance of the housing element with the Highlands Regional Master Plan of lands in the Highlands Preservation Area, and lands in the Highlands Planning Area for Highlands conforming municipalities; and
9. An analysis of consistency with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan, including water, wastewater, stormwater, and multi-modal transportation based on guidance and technical assistance from the State Planning Commission.

SECTION 2: HOUSING ELEMENT

The following section provides the housing element for the Borough of Park Ridge. It offers a community overview of the Borough, as well as background information regarding its population, housing, and employment characteristics. It also provides projections of the Borough's housing stock and its employment.

A. COMMUNITY OVERVIEW

The Borough of Park Ridge is located in the north central portion of Bergen County, New Jersey. As such, the Borough is part of Housing Region 1 as established by COAH consisting of Bergen, Passaic, Hudson and Sussex Counties. It is bound to the north by Montvale, to the south by Woodcliff Lake and a small portion of Hillsdale, and to the east by River Vale. The Borough occupies an area of 1,650 acres or 2.62 square miles.

Access is provided to the Borough by several County roadways including Grand Avenue (Route 2), Pascack Road (Route 111), Prospect Avenue (Route 102), Broadway (Route 117), Park Avenue, Freemont Avenue and Spring Valley Road. The majority of traffic is carried through the Borough on Kinderkamack Road (Route 503), which runs through the center of the Borough from the New York State Border to Route 4. The Garden State Parkway and Route 17 are the closest major regional highways serving the area.


The Borough is also served by a great amount of public transportation. Park Ridge was designated as a transit village in 2015 and is served by NJ Transit on the Pascack Valley Line which runs north and south to the Hoboken Terminal. Bus service is also provided in the Borough via Saddle River Tours / Ameribus and Rockland Coaches.

Park Ridge is a fully built-out community and has been so for quite some time, with only approximately 235 acres of remaining vacant land, including approximately 65 acres of publicly- or quasi-publicly owned vacant land and approximately 170 acres of privately-owned vacant land. The majority of this vacant land is environmentally constrained and/or consists of isolated lots that are too small to accommodate significant development. The vast majority of developed land within the Borough is developed for residential use. The bulk of the commercial use in the community is concentrated along Kinderkamack Road, extending from Wayne Street in the north to Clinton Place in the south. The Borough's existing land uses, as determined by Borough tax records, are illustrated on the accompanying Existing Land Use Map.


Environmentally constrained areas within the Borough are identified on the accompanying Environmental Constraints Map. As shown, Park Ridge has extensive areas of wetlands, floodplains and flood hazard areas, Category One streams, and steep slopes (defined as slopes greater than 15 percent).

The accompanying Sewer Service Area Map illustrates the areas within Park Ridge Borough that are within the Sewer Service Area.


Map 1: Existing Land Use



Map 2: Environmental Constraints



Map 3: Sewer Service Area



B. INFORMATION REGARDING DATA SOURCES

The background information contained in Section 2.C entitled “Inventory of Municipal Housing Stock,” Section 2.D entitled “Projection of Municipal Housing Stock,” Section 2.E entitled “Demographic and Population Data,” and Section 2.F entitled “Employment Characteristics and Projections” was obtained from a variety of publicly available data sources. These are summarized below:

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. United States Decennial Census</p> <p>The US Census is described in Article I, Section 2 of the Constitution of the United States, which calls for an enumeration of the people every ten years for the apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives. Since the time of the first Census conducted in 1790, it has become the leading source of data about the nation’s people and economy. Please note that all incomes reported in the Census are adjusted for inflation.</p> | <p>4. New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA)</p> <p>The New Jersey Department of Community Affairs is a governmental agency of the State of New Jersey. Its function is to provide administrative guidance, financial support, and technical assistance to local governments, community development organizations, businesses, and individuals to improve the quality of life in New Jersey.</p> |
| <p>2. American Community Survey (ACS)</p> <p>The American Community Survey is a nationwide ongoing survey conducted by the US Census Bureau. The ACS gathers information previously contained only in the long form version of the decennial census, such as age, ancestry, educational attainment, income, language proficiency, migration, disability, employment, and housing characteristics. It relies upon random sampling to provide ongoing, monthly data collection. Please note that all incomes reported in the ACS are adjusted for inflation.</p> | <p>5. New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development</p> <p>The New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development is a governmental agency of the State of New Jersey. One of its roles is to collect labor market information regarding employment and wages throughout the state.</p> |
| <p>3. New Jersey Department of Health</p> <p>The New Jersey Department of Health is a governmental agency of the State of New Jersey. The department contains the Office of Vital Statistics and Registry, which gathers data regarding births, deaths, marriages, domestic partnerships, and civil unions.</p> | |

C. INVENTORY OF MUNICIPAL HOUSING STOCK

This section of the Housing Element provides an inventory of the Borough’s housing stock, as required by the MLUL. The inventory details housing characteristics such as age, condition, purchase/rental value, and occupancy. It also details the number of affordable units available to low- and moderate-income households and the number of substandard housing units capable of being rehabilitated.

1. Number of Dwelling Units. As shown in the table below, the Borough’s housing stock grew every decade between 1980 and 2020. Since 2020, however, Park Ridge’s housing stock is estimated to have contracted by approximately 3 percent. In 2023, the total number of dwellings in Park Ridge was estimated at 3,410.

Table 8: Dwelling Units (1980-2023)

| Year | Dwelling Units | Change (#) | Change (%) |
|-------|----------------|------------|------------|
| 1980 | 2,758 | -- | -- |
| 1990 | 3,063 | 305 | 11% |
| 2000 | 3,258 | 195 | 6% |
| 2010* | 3,373 | 115 | 4% |
| 2020* | 3,532 | 159 | 5% |
| 2023* | 3,410 | -122 | -3% |

Sources: U.S. Census; * American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

The following table provides additional detail regarding the tenure and occupancy of the Borough’s housing stock. As shown below, approximately 78.5 percent of the Borough’s housing stock was estimated to be owner-occupied in 2023, up from approximately 75 percent in 2010. Over this same period, the percentage of rental units and vacant units both decreased slightly, from 19.4 percent and 5.7 percent, respectively, of all units in 2010 to 17 percent and 4.5 percent, respectively, of all units in 2023.

Table 9: Housing Units by Tenure and Occupancy Status (2010 and 2023)

| Characteristics | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|-----------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Owner-occupied units | 2,528 | 74.9% | 2,678 | 78.5% |
| Renter-occupied units | 654 | 19.4% | 578 | 17.0% |
| Vacant units | 191 | 5.7% | 154 | 4.5% |
| Total | 3,373 | 100.0% | 3,410 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

2. Housing Characteristics. The following tables provide additional information on the characteristics of the Borough’s housing stock, including data on the number of units in the structure and the number of bedrooms. As shown below, the housing stock is predominantly characterized by single-family detached units, which represent 70 percent of all dwelling units. Multi-family structures with 10 or more units represent the second most predominant housing type, at 10 percent. Approximately 74 percent of dwellings in Park Ridge have at least three bedrooms.

Table 10: Units in Structure (2010 and 2023)

| Units in Structure | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Single family, detached | 2,321 | 68.8% | 2,389 | 70.1% |
| Single family, attached | 243 | 7.2% | 238 | 7.0% |
| 2 | 264 | 7.8% | 154 | 4.5% |
| 3 or 4 | 208 | 6.2% | 242 | 7.1% |
| 5 to 9 | 62 | 1.8% | 49 | 1.4% |
| 10 to 19 | 133 | 3.9% | 132 | 3.9% |
| 20 or more | 142 | 4.2% | 206 | 6.0% |
| Mobile Home | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% |
| Other | - | 0.0% | - | 0.0% |
| Total | 3,373 | 100.0% | 3,410 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 11: Number of Bedrooms in Housing Units (2010 and 2023)

| Bedrooms | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| None | 10 | 0.3% | 134 | 3.9% |
| One | 437 | 13.0% | 322 | 9.4% |
| Two | 713 | 21.1% | 430 | 12.6% |
| Three | 1,214 | 36.0% | 1,149 | 33.7% |
| Four | 777 | 23.0% | 1,032 | 30.3% |
| Five or more | 222 | 6.6% | 343 | 10.1% |
| Total | 3,373 | 100.0% | 3,410 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

3. Housing Age. The following table details the age of the Borough’s housing stock. As shown, 60 percent of the Borough’s housing units were built prior to 1970. Like many similarly sized suburban municipalities within the area, the largest period of growth was during the 1950s. Nine (9%) percent of the Borough’s housing stock has been constructed since 2000.

Table 12: Year Structure Built

| Year Units Built | Number | Percent |
|------------------|--------------|---------------|
| 2014 or Later | 36 | 1.1% |
| 2010 to 2013 | 70 | 2.1% |
| 2000 to 2009 | 197 | 5.8% |
| 1990 to 1999 | 191 | 5.6% |
| 1980 to 1989 | 320 | 9.4% |
| 1970 to 1979 | 558 | 16.4% |
| 1960 to 1969 | 477 | 14.0% |
| 1950 to 1959 | 794 | 23.3% |
| 1940 to 1949 | 112 | 3.3% |
| 1939 or earlier | 655 | 19.2% |
| Total | 3,410 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

4. Housing Conditions. An inventory of the Borough’s housing conditions is presented in the following tables. Table 13 identifies the extent of overcrowding in the Borough, defined as housing units with more than one occupant per room. The data indicates that the number of occupied housing units considered overcrowded has decreased since 2010, from 65 units (2 percent of all occupied units) in 2010 to 22 units (0.7 percent of all occupied units) in 2023.

Table 13: Occupants per Room (2010 and 2023)

| Occupants Per Room | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 1.00 or less | 3,117 | 98.0% | 3,234 | 99.3% |
| 1.01 to 1.50 | 33 | 1.0% | 6 | 0.2% |
| 1.51 or more | 32 | 1.0% | 16 | 0.5% |
| Total Occupied Units | 3,182 | 100% | 3,256 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 14 below presents additional detail regarding housing conditions, including the presence of complete plumbing and kitchen facilities and the type of heating equipment used. As shown, all occupied housing units in the Borough had standard heating equipment in 2023. The number of occupied housing units lacking complete kitchen facilities increased between 2010 and 2023, from 42 units (1.3 percent of all occupied units) in 2010 to 82 units (2.5 percent of all occupied units) in 2023. The number of occupied housing units lacking complete plumbing, however, decreased between 2010 and 2023, from 34 units (1.1 percent of all occupied units) in 2010 to 14 units (0.4 percent of all occupied units) in 2023.

Table 14: Occupied Housing Units – Equipment and Plumbing Facilities (2010 and 2023)

| Facilities | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| <u>Kitchen:</u> | | | | |
| With Complete Facilities | 3,140 | 98.7% | 3,174 | 97.5% |
| Lacking Complete Facilities | 42 | 1.3% | 82 | 2.5% |
| <u>Plumbing:</u> | | | | |
| With Complete Facilities | 3,148 | 98.9% | 3,242 | 99.6% |
| Lacking Complete Facilities | 34 | 1.1% | 14 | 0.4% |
| <u>Heating Equipment</u> | | | | |
| Standard Heating Facilities | 3,167 | 99.5% | 3,256 | 100% |
| Other Fuel | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| No Fuel Used | 15 | 0.5% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Total Occupied Units | 3,182 | 100.0% | 3,256 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

5. Purchase and Rental Values. Table 15 below shows that whereas only 34 percent of Park Ridge’s rental housing stock had monthly rents of \$1,500 or more in 2010, 92 percent of Park Ridge’s rental units had monthly rents of \$1,500 or more by 2023. The Borough’s median monthly rent in 2023 was \$1,995, representing a 56 percent increase over the Borough’s median monthly rent in 2010.

Table 15: Gross Rent of Specified Renter-Occupied Housing Units (2010 and 2023)

| Rent | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|--------------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Less than \$500 | 40 | 6.3% | 8 | 1.4% |
| \$500 to \$999 | 109 | 17.2% | 18 | 3.2% |
| \$1,000 to \$1,499 | 270 | 42.7% | 19 | 3.4% |
| \$1,500 to \$1,999 | 213 | 33.7% | 238 | 42.4% |
| \$2,000 to \$2,499 | | | 64 | 11.4% |
| \$2,500 to \$2,999 | | | 30 | 5.3% |
| \$3,000 or more | | | 184 | 32.8% |
| No cash rent | 22 | X | 17 | X |
| Total | 632 | 100.0% | 561 | 100.0% |
| Median Gross Rent | \$1,282 | | \$1,995 | |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 16 below shows that whereas 65 percent of Park Ridge’s owner-occupied units had a value of \$500,000 or more in 2010, approximately 81 percent of Park Ridge’s owner-occupied units had a value of \$500,000 or more in 2023. The Borough’s median housing value of \$666,200 in 2023 was approximately 14 percent higher than the Borough’s median value in 2010.

Table 16: Value of Specified Owner-Occupied Housing Units (2010 and 2023)

| Value Range | 2000 | | 2023 | |
|------------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Less than \$50,000 | 8 | 0.3% | 22 | 0.8% |
| \$50,000 to \$99,999 | 22 | 0.9% | 38 | 1.4% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 9 | 0.4% | 18 | 0.7% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 7 | 0.3% | - | 0.0% |
| \$200,000 to \$299,999 | 101 | 4.0% | 98 | 3.7% |
| \$300,000 to \$499,999 | 735 | 29.1% | 336 | 12.5% |
| \$500,000 to \$999,999 | 1,422 | 56.3% | 1,805 | 67.4% |
| \$1,000,000 or more | 224 | 8.9% | 361 | 13.5% |
| Total | 2,528 | 100.0% | 2,678 | 100.0% |
| Median Value | \$585,300 | | \$666,200 | |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

6. Number of Units Affordable to Low- and Moderate-Income Households. Based on the Affordable Housing Professionals of New Jersey (AHPNJ) 2024 regional income limits, the median household income for a three-person household in COAH Region 1, Park Ridge’s housing region comprised of Bergen, Hudson, Passaic and Sussex counties, is \$108,371. A three-person moderate-income household, established at no more than 80 percent of the median income, would have an income not exceeding \$86,697. A three-person low-income household, established at no more than 50 percent of the median income, would have an income not exceeding \$54,185.

An affordable sales price for a three-person moderate-income household earning 80 percent of the median income is estimated at approximately \$237,000. An affordable sales price for a three-person low-income household earning 50 percent of the median income is estimated at approximately \$143,000. These estimates are based on the UHAC affordability controls outlined in N.J.A.C. 5:80-26.1 et seq. Approximately 3 percent are valued at less than \$150,000, according to the 2023 American Community Survey. (No units in Park Ridge are valued between \$150,000 and \$200,000.)

For renter-occupied housing, an affordable monthly rent for a three-person moderate-income household is estimated at approximately \$2,200. An affordable monthly rent for a three-person low-income household is estimated at approximately \$1,400. According to the 2023 American Community Survey, approximately 50 percent of Park Ridge’s rental units have a gross rent less than \$2,000, and 8 percent have a gross rent less than \$1,500.

7. Substandard Housing Capable of Being Rehabilitated. As discussed in more detail in Sections 3 of this plan, the Borough of Park Ridge has undertaken a Structural Conditions Survey, pursuant to COAH’s Round 2 rules, to provide an estimate of the number of units in Park Ridge that are in need of rehabilitation and are not likely to experience

“spontaneous rehabilitation.” Per the results of the Structural Conditions Survey, Park Ridge’s rehabilitation share is determined to be 45 units. The Borough’s rehabilitation share is further explored in Section 3, Fair Share Obligation, of this plan.

D. PROJECTION OF MUNICIPAL HOUSING STOCK

The COAH regulations require a projection of the community’s housing stock, including the probable future construction of low- and moderate-income housing, for the ten years subsequent to the adoption of the Housing Element. This projection shall be based upon an assessment of data which minimally must include the number of residential construction permits issued, approvals of applications for residential development, and probable residential development of lands. Each of these items are identified and outlined below.

1. Housing Units Constructed During the Last Ten Years. The table below provides data concerning residential building permits issued for new construction over the past ten years. During this period, a total of 287 residential building permits were issued for new construction, the majority (240 units) of which were issued in 2019 for the Park Ridge Transit (a.k.a. The James) inclusionary multi-family development. A total of 112 residential demolition permits were issued during this period, all of which were for one- and two-family units. Therefore, the Borough of Park Ridge experienced a net growth of 175 new units over the last decade.

Table 17: Number of Residential Building Permits Issued For New Construction (2014 to 2023)

| Year Issued | Permits | | | | Demos | Net Growth |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|
| | 1 & 2 Family | Multi-Family | Mixed-Use | Total | | |
| 2014 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 1 |
| 2015 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 6 |
| 2016 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 30 | -24 |
| 2017 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 37 | -33 |
| 2018 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | -10 |
| 2019 | 2 | 240 | 0 | 242 | 10 | 232 |
| 2020 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 2021 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| 2022 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| 2023 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | -1 |
| Total | 47 | 240 | 0 | 287 | 112 | 175 |

Source: New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA) Construction Reporter.

2. Probable Residential Development of Lands. Considering the rate of residential growth experienced in Park Ridge over the last decade and the building permits that are currently in the process of being issued for the Sony/Landmark inclusionary multi-family

development, coupled with current economic uncertainty and the fact that there are a limited number of vacant, developable parcels remaining in the Borough, it is anticipated that Park Ridge will continue to see a similar rate of residential growth over the next decade as it experienced in the last decade.

E. DEMOGRAPHIC AND POPULATION DATA

The MLUL requires that the Housing Element of this plan provide data on the municipality’s population, including population size, age and income characteristics.

1. Population Size. As shown in the table below, the Borough’s population continually grew between 1930 and 1970, with the largest growth between 1950 and 1960 when the population doubled in size. However, Park Ridge’s population decreased through the 1970s and 1980s and has fluctuated since 1990. The 2023 population estimate of 9,218 people suggests that Park Ridge has grown by approximately 7 percent since 2010.

Table 18: Population Growth (1930 to 2023)

| Year | Population | Change (#) | Change (%) |
|-------|------------|--------------|------------|
| 1930 | 2,229 | -- | -- |
| 1940 | 2,519 | 290 | 13% |
| 1950 | 3,189 | 670 | 27% |
| 1960 | 6,389 | 3,200 | 100% |
| 1970 | 8,709 | 2,320 | 36% |
| 1980 | 8,515 | -194 | -2% |
| 1990 | 8,102 | -413 | -5% |
| 2000 | 8,708 | 606 | 7% |
| 2010* | 8,615 | -93 | -1% |
| 2020* | 8,721 | 106 | 1% |
| 2023* | 9,218 | 497 | 6% |

Sources: U.S. Census; *American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

2. Age Characteristics. The Borough’s age characteristics, which are outlined in the table below, indicate an aging community. Whereas the proportion of Borough residents under 10 years old decreased by 41 percent between 2010 and 2023, the proportion of Borough residents age 15 to 24 increased by 106 percent during this time. Also, whereas the proportion of Borough residents age 35-54 decreased by 20 percent between 2010 and 2023, the proportion of Borough residents age 55 and over increased by 27 percent during this time. The median age of Park Ridge residents increased from 43.1 years in 2010 to 46.6 years in 2023.

Table 19: Age Characteristics (2010 and 2023)

| Age | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|-------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Under 5 years | 539 | 6.3% | 326 | 3.5% |
| 5 to 9 years | 659 | 7.6% | 434 | 4.7% |
| 10 to 14 years | 735 | 8.5% | 596 | 6.5% |
| 15 to 19 years | 341 | 4.0% | 774 | 8.4% |
| 20 to 24 years | 234 | 2.7% | 495 | 5.4% |
| 25 to 34 years | 939 | 10.9% | 930 | 10.1% |
| 35 to 44 years | 1,240 | 14.4% | 963 | 10.4% |
| 45 to 54 years | 1,494 | 17.3% | 1,377 | 14.9% |
| 55 to 59 years | 513 | 6.0% | 776 | 8.4% |
| 60 to 64 years | 394 | 4.6% | 636 | 6.9% |
| 65 to 74 years | 837 | 9.7% | 1,037 | 11.2% |
| 75 to 84 years | 419 | 4.9% | 429 | 4.7% |
| 85 years and over | 271 | 3.1% | 445 | 4.8% |
| Total | 8,615 | 100.0% | 9,218 | 100% |
| Median Age | 43.1 | | 46.6 | |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

3. Average Household Size. Park Ridge’s average household size has fluctuated since 2000, when the average household size was 2.65 people per household. In 2023, the average household size in Park Ridge was estimated to be 2.76 people per household.

Table 20: Average Household Size (2000-2023)

| Year | Average Household Size |
|-------|------------------------|
| 2000 | 2.65 |
| 2010* | 2.66 |
| 2020* | 2.56 |
| 2023* | 2.76 |

Sources: U.S. Census, *American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

4. Household Income. Detailed household income figures are shown in the table below. As shown, between 2010 and 2023, the percentage of Borough households earning annual incomes of \$200,000 increased nearly 180 percent, from 15 percent of all households in 2010 to 41 percent of all households in 2023. At the same time, the percentage of Borough households earning less than \$10,000 per year nearly doubled, from 0.9 percent of all households in 2010 to 1.6 percent of all households in 2023. Overall, the Borough’s median household income increased by approximately 59 percent during this period, from \$104,053 in 2010 to \$165,391 in 2023.

Table 21: Household Income Distribution (2010 and 2023)

| Income Category | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|------------------------|------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Less than \$10,000 | 28 | 0.9% | 53 | 1.6% |
| \$10,000 to \$14,999 | 56 | 1.8% | 40 | 1.2% |
| \$15,000 to \$24,999 | 186 | 5.8% | 111 | 3.4% |
| \$25,000 to \$34,999 | 212 | 6.7% | 25 | 0.8% |
| \$35,000 to \$49,999 | 209 | 6.6% | 178 | 5.5% |
| \$50,000 to \$74,999 | 478 | 15.0% | 320 | 9.8% |
| \$75,000 to \$99,999 | 327 | 10.3% | 276 | 8.5% |
| \$100,000 to \$149,999 | 769 | 24.2% | 362 | 11.1% |
| \$150,000 to \$199,999 | 452 | 14.2% | 563 | 17.3% |
| \$200,000 or more | 465 | 14.6% | 1,328 | 40.8% |
| Total | 3,182 | 100.0% | 3,256 | 100.0% |
| Median Income | \$104,053 | | \$165,391 | |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

F. EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND PROJECTIONS

The MLUL requires that a Housing Element include data on employment levels in the community. The following tables present information on the Borough’s employment characteristics.

1. Employment Status. The table below provides information on the employment status of Borough residents age 16 and over. As shown, the unemployment rate for Park Ridge’s civilian labor force decreased by more than 54 percent between 2010 and 2023, from 5.9 percent in 2010 to 2.7 percent in 2023. Notably, the percentage of Park Ridge’s population not in the labor force also decreased during this period, from 33.7 percent in 2010 to 32.3 percent in 2023.

Table 22: Employment Status – Population 16 & Over (2010 and 2023)

| Employment Status | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| In labor force | 4,372 | 66.3% | 5,290 | 67.7% |
| Civilian labor force | 4,372 | 66.3% | 5,290 | 67.7% |
| Employed | 4,115 | 62.4% | 5,147 | 65.9% |
| Unemployed | 257 | 3.9% | 143 | 1.8% |
| % of civilian labor force | -- | 5.9% | -- | 2.7% |
| Armed Forces | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Not in labor force | 2,222 | 33.7% | 2,523 | 32.3% |
| Total Population 16 and Over | 6,594 | 100.0% | 7,813 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

2. Employment Characteristics of Employed Residents. The following two tables detail information on the employment characteristics of Park Ridge residents. Table 23 details employment by occupation and Table 24 details employment by industry. More than half (54 percent) of employed Borough residents are employed in management, business, science and arts occupations. Additionally, the amount of employed residents in education, health and social services has increased to nearly 30 percent of employed residents.

Table 23: Employed Residents Age 16 and Over, By Occupation (2010 and 2023)

| Occupation | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Management, business, science, and arts | 1,893 | 46.0% | 2,800 | 54.4% |
| Service | 467 | 11.3% | 831 | 16.1% |
| Sales and office | 1,359 | 33.0% | 1,014 | 19.7% |
| Natural resources, construction, and maintenance | 291 | 7.1% | 110 | 2.1% |
| Production, transportation, and material moving | 105 | 2.6% | 392 | 7.6% |
| Total | 4,115 | 100.0% | 5,147 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

Table 24: Employed Residents Age 16 and Over, By Industry (2010 and 2023)

| Industry | 2010 | | 2023 | |
|--|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Agriculture, forestry, fishing, hunting and mining | 0 | 0.0% | 0 | 0.0% |
| Construction | 231 | 5.6% | 146 | 2.8% |
| Manufacturing | 381 | 9.3% | 464 | 9.0% |
| Wholesale trade | 216 | 5.2% | 108 | 2.1% |
| Retail trade | 476 | 11.6% | 446 | 8.7% |
| Transportation, warehousing and utilities | 101 | 2.5% | 220 | 4.3% |
| Information | 143 | 3.5% | 315 | 6.1% |
| Finance, insurance, real estate, rental and leasing | 445 | 10.8% | 586 | 11.4% |
| Professional, scientific, management, administrative and waste management services | 934 | 22.7% | 594 | 11.5% |
| Educational, health and social services | 665 | 16.2% | 1,538 | 29.9% |
| Arts, entertainment, recreation, accommodation and food services | 223 | 5.4% | 404 | 7.8% |
| Other services (except public administration) | 175 | 4.3% | 74 | 1.4% |
| Public administration | 125 | 3.0% | 252 | 4.9% |
| Total | 4,115 | 100.0% | 5,147 | 100.0% |

Source: American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates.

3. Employment Projections. A projection of the Borough’s probable future employment characteristics is based on an assessment of historic employment trends, the number of non-residential construction permits issued, and probable non-residential development of

lands. Each of these items are identified and outlined below.

- a. Historic Employment Trends. The table below provides data on Park Ridge’s average annual employment covered by unemployment insurance since 2014. As shown, the Borough experienced employment decline every year between 2014 and 2020, with the most significant job losses occurring in 2018 and 2020. Since 2020, however, employment levels in Park Ridge have increased every year, with 12.5 percent job growth between 2022 and 2023 alone.

Table 25: Average Covered Employment Trends (2014 to 2023)

| Year | Number of Jobs | Change in Number of Jobs | Percent Change |
|------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|
| 2014 | 3,441 | -- | -- |
| 2015 | 3,251 | -190 | -5.8% |
| 2016 | 3,116 | -135 | -4.3% |
| 2017 | 2,989 | -127 | -4.2% |
| 2018 | 2,594 | -395 | -15.2% |
| 2019 | 2,467 | -127 | -5.1% |
| 2020 | 2,083 | -384 | -18.4% |
| 2021 | 2,090 | 7 | 0.3% |
| 2022 | 2,196 | 106 | 4.8% |
| 2023 | 2,510 | 314 | 12.5% |

Sources: NJ Department of Labor and Workforce Development.

- b. Non-Residential Square Footage Constructed During the Last Ten Years. The table below provides data concerning the amount of non-residential square footage authorized by building permits between 2014 and 2023. During this period, building permits were issued for 146,814 square feet of non-residential space; however, the majority of this space (81 percent) was for storage permitted in a single year (2019). The remainder was for office space (17 percent), retail (1 percent), and education (0.5 percent). Overall, excluding 2019, the Borough issued permits for approximately 3,100 square feet of non-residential space per year, on average over the past decade.

Table 26: Square Feet of Non-Residential Space Authorized by Building Permits (2014 to 2023)

| Year Issued | Office | Retail | Education | Storage | Total |
|--------------|---------------|--------------|------------|----------------|----------------|
| 2014 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2015 | 2,200 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2,200 |
| 2016 | 5,423 | 1,932 | 0 | 0 | 7,355 |
| 2017 | 11,508 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11,508 |
| 2018 | 0 | 0 | 700 | 0 | 700 |
| 2019 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 118,841 | 118,841 |
| 2020 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2021 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2022 | 6,210 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6,210 |
| 2023 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 25,341 | 1,932 | 700 | 118,841 | 146,814 |

Source: New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA) Construction Reporter.

- c. Probable Non-Residential Development of Lands / Future Employment Characteristics. Despite the 118,841 square feet of storage space permitted in 2019, the Borough of Park Ridge otherwise experienced minimal non-residential growth over the past decade, with an average of 3,100 square feet of new non-residential space per year. At the same time, the Borough has been experiencing steady job growth since 2021 as it recovers much of the significant job losses experienced in 2018 and 2020, as shown in Table 25 above. Given the minimal amount of non-residential building permits issued over the past decade, the projected continuation of weak office and retail markets in the near term, and the limited availability of vacant, developable land for new non-residential development in the Borough, it appears that employment levels in Park Ridge may continue to grow over the next decade, but may not fully return to pre-2018 levels.

SECTION 3: FAIR SHARE OBLIGATION

The following section provides an overview of the Borough's fair share obligation. It includes a brief overview of the methodology utilized to calculate affordable housing obligations throughout the state.

A. SUMMARY OF FAIR SHARE OBLIGATION

On March 20, 2024, the State of New Jersey adopted a package of affordable housing bills which overhauled the Fair Housing Act (FHA-2).

FHA-2 now designates the Department of Community Affairs (DCA) as the entity responsible for calculating the state's regional needs. Specifically, NJSA 52:27D-304.2 establishes the methodology to be utilized by the DCA to determine the state's regional prospective needs of low- and moderate-income housing for the ten-year period spanning from July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2035. In summary, the projected household change for this period is estimated by establishing the household change experienced in each region between the most recent federal decennial census and the second-most recent decennial census. This household change, if positive, is then to be divided by 2.5 to estimate the number of low- and moderate-income homes needed to address low- and moderate-income household change in the region for the next ten years. According to the DCA, this methodology resulted in a statewide prospective need of 84,698 low- and moderate-income units.

Furthermore, the DCA is also the entity responsible for calculating each municipality's present and prospective fair share obligations. However, FHA-2 makes clear that these calculations are advisory and non-binding, and that each municipality may set its own obligation number utilizing the same methodology.

On January 28, 2025, the Borough of Park Ridge adopted Resolution No. 025-062, which established its affordable housing obligations for the Fourth Round. A copy of this resolution is located in Appendix A of this plan. As noted therein, while the Borough accepted DCA's Present Need calculation of 137 units, it reserved the right to adjust the Borough's Present Need Obligation based upon a Structural Conditions Survey prepared in accordance with NJAC 5:93-5.2(a). Accordingly, the Borough conducted a Structural Conditions Survey, the results of which identified a Present Need obligation of 45 units. This is discussed in greater detail herein below.

Furthermore, Resolution No. 025-062 did not accept DCA's Prospective Need calculation of 138 units, opting instead to conduct its own analysis of Park Ridge's Land Capacity Factor. The results of that analysis found that DCA arrived at the Borough's Land Capacity Factor based, in part, on incorrect assumptions and erroneous data and that – based on an accurate calculation of the Borough's vacant, developable land – the Borough's Prospective Need number for Round Four should be 119 units. Ultimately, a trial court order issued on June 16, 2025 officially set the Borough's Round Four Prospective Need at 119. A copy of the trial court order is included in Appendix B of this plan.

In addition, Resolution No. 2025-78 further reserved the Borough's right to conduct a Vacant Land Adjustment (VLA) analysis to determine its Realistic Development Potential (RDP). This too is discussed in greater detail herein below.

Table 27: Summary of Fair Share Obligation

| Affordable Obligation | Units |
|-------------------------------|-------|
| Present Need (Rehabilitation) | 45 |
| Prospective Need | 119 |

B. STRUCTURAL CONDITIONS SURVEY

As noted above, the DCA calculated a Present Need (rehabilitation) obligation of 137 units for the Borough of Park Ridge. To more accurately reflect its substandard units in need of rehabilitation, the Borough conducted a Structural Conditions Survey utilizing the available criteria established in N.J.A.C. 5:93-5.2 and N.J.A.C. 5:97-6.2, which reference “Appendix C” of the rules. As per NJAC 5:93-5.2:

“Each municipality shall be provided with the Council’s estimate for substandard units occupied by low and moderate income households. This estimate shall be the municipality’s indigenous need, unless the municipality or an objector performs the Council’s Structural Conditions Survey (see Appendix C, incorporated herein by reference). Where the municipality or objector performs the Structural Conditions Survey, the Council shall review the results of the data collected and shall modify the indigenous need if it determines a modification is warranted.”

Appendix C of N.J.A.C. 5:93 identifies that the first step in the Structural Conditions Survey process is for the municipal Construction Official (or their designee) to conduct an exterior survey to determine the number of substandard units in the municipality.

In regard to this first step, Park Ridge’s Construction Official completed an exterior survey of the Borough on March 3, 2025. As per that survey, the Construction Official observed 52 units being in need of repair. A copy of the completed survey is located in Appendix C of this plan.

The second step in the process, per Appendix C of N.J.A.C. 5:93, is to estimate the number of those surveyed units found to be substandard that are occupied by low- and moderate-income households. In order to come up with this estimate, Appendix C states that “the Council will rely on census information that is available from the Public Use Micro-Data Sample (PUMS).” (For example, if a municipality performs an exterior survey and finds 100 substandard units, and the PUMS data for the geographic area covering the municipality indicates that 82 percent of substandard units are occupied by low- and moderate-income households, then the survey results indicate that 82 low- or moderate-income households are living in substandard housing units (100 x 0.82 = 82). The municipality’s Present Need obligation would then be established at 82 units.)

However, in calculating Round 4 Present Need obligations, the DCA did not rely on PUMS data for determining the percent of substandard units occupied by low- and moderate-income

households in each municipality. Instead, the DCA relied on HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset for this estimate. The DCA's Fourth Round Methodology Report provides the reasoning behind this as follows:

"Previous approaches have calculated county-level LMI deficient housing shares from the American Community Survey Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) and used them to estimate the LMI-occupied portion of each municipality's deficient housing. However, this approach essentially assumes that the LMI share of deficient housing is uniform in a county, which is not the case. For example, data from HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset show that for 2017-21, the LMI share of housing lacking complete plumbing or kitchen facilities in Atlantic County was 69.1 percent. However, in Brigantine, it was 100 percent. Using the county LMI deficient share for Brigantine would result in underestimating city present need, undercounting the number of deficient housing units actually occupied by LMI households.

Therefore, the analysis utilizes data from HUD's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) dataset, which has municipality-level data on the number and percentage of LMI households from a special tabulation of Census Bureau American Community Survey (ACS) data. The latest CHAS data release at the time of calculation corresponds to the 2017-2021 5 Year Estimates. To ensure data year and source consistency, the LMI deficient housing calculation relies on 2017-2021 data."

Therefore, in order to conduct the second step in our Structural Conditions Survey, we relied on the CHAS data and DCA's methodology. As detailed in the calculations included in Appendix C of this plan, applying the CHAS data estimates for the number of substandard units occupied by low- and moderate-income households in Park Ridge to the 52 units identified as substandard by the Structural Conditions Survey results in a total of 45 units determined to be in need of rehabilitation. As such, the Borough's Present Need obligation is 45 units.

C. REALISTIC DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

The Borough of Park Ridge is a fully developed community and is therefore entitled to adjust its Prospective Need obligation in accordance with a procedure set forth in the FHA. Specifically, N.J.S.A. 52:27D-310.1 permits municipalities to perform a Realistic Development Potential (RDP) analysis by seeking a Vacant Land Adjustment (VLA).

An RDP analysis requires an identification of vacant sites and underutilized sites in a municipality. Municipalities are required to consider all privately- and municipally-owned vacant parcels, as well as underutilized sites such as driving ranges, farms in SDRP Planning Areas 1 and 2, nurseries, golf courses not owned by their members, and non-conforming uses.

However, municipalities are also permitted to eliminate a site or a portion of a site based on a variety of factors, including: lands dedicated for public uses other than housing since 1997; park lands or open space; vacant contiguous parcels in private ownership of a size which would accommodate fewer than five housing units; historic and architecturally important sites listed on the State Register of Historic Places or the National Register of Historic Places; preserved agricultural lands; sites designated for active recreation; and environmentally sensitive lands.

1. First and Second Round RDP

As detailed in the Executive Summary of this plan, the Borough conducted a VLA as part of its first HE&FSP in 1989, which resulted in an 86-unit RDP. This plan received First Round substantive certification from COAH on January 29, 1990. Subsequently, in 1995, the Borough adopted an amended HE&FSP, which addressed Park Ridge's cumulative First and Second obligation for the years 1987-1999 and sought a revised VLA resulting in a 69-unit RDP. This plan received Second Round substantive certification from COAH on June 5, 1996. Nevertheless, despite the Borough having secured these VLAs and continuing to lack vacant, developable land, the Borough agreed to address the entirety of its 112-unit First and Second Round obligation as part of its Third Round settlement agreement with FSHC. As discussed in Section 4 of this plan, all of the plan components addressing Park Ridge's entire First and Second Round obligation have been completed.

2. Third Round RDP

On November 18, 2020, the Borough and FSHC (along with an intervenor, Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC) entered into a Settlement Agreement which established a Third Round (1999-2025) new construction obligation of 225 units. As part of that settlement, the Borough agreed to address the entirety of its 225-unit Third Round obligation in lieu of a VLA, despite the fact that the Borough continued to lack vacant, developable land. The Borough subsequently adopted a Third Round HE&FSP on July 14, 2021 and was granted a Conditional Judgment of Compliance and Repose (Third Round JOR) on February 28, 2022.

Park Ridge's 2021 HE&FSP set forth various plan mechanisms to address the entirety of its 225-unit Third Round obligation. Whereas the majority of said plan mechanisms have been constructed and occupied by low- and moderate-income households, or are currently under construction, one project remains unbuilt: the 100 percent affordable Bear's Nest project projected to consist of 50 affordable units. In addition, despite the Borough establishing an Accessory Apartment Program to allow for the creation of up to 7 subsidized affordable units, no such units have yet come to fruition. These projects account for 57 units in its Third Round plan.

Although the Borough did everything it was supposed to do with respect to the Bear's

Nest project, including amending the zoning to allow for the development and adopting a resolution of need to support the developer’s New Jersey Housing and Mortgage Finance Agency (HMFA) application, it was revealed to the Borough in January 2022 that the entirety of the property in question is environmentally constrained and is therefore not developable for the proposed Round 3 use. Specifically, a December 20, 2021 survey prepared for the developer illustrates that there is no developable area on the site outside of wetlands, an assumed 50-foot wetlands transition area buffer, and/or steep slopes of 15 percent or greater. A copy of this survey is included in Appendix D of this plan. Subsequently, Bear’s Nest proceeded through an informal review process with NJDEP throughout 2022 and 2023 to determine if a scaled-down development containing only 15 housing units could be supported by the Department. However, the Department’s final communication on the matter opined that even the scaled-down design was unsupported and that the site is too encumbered for a development of such intensity. A copy of these communications is also included in Appendix D of this plan. For these reasons, the Bear’s Nest development has not moved forward and is no longer considered to be a viable development.

Were it not for the assumed developability of the Bear’s Nest site (which assumptions were based on macro-level NJDEP wetland and slope data), Park Ridge would have been entitled to a Vacant Land Adjustment with an RDP of 146 as part of its Third Round settlement. The basis for this conclusion is set forth in the Vacant Land Assessment Map and Table included in Appendix E of this plan, which is the Borough’s 2018 VLA updated to remove any development potential from the Bear’s Nest site. Table 28 below provides a summary of that assessment, which includes all sites qualifying for Third Round RDP analysis.

Table 28: Calculation of Third Round RDP

| Property | Assigned RDP |
|---|--------------|
| 40 Park Ave (at 20% of total units) | 4 |
| The James (at 20% of total units) | 48 |
| Metro Homes (at 1 AH unit per settlement) | 1 |
| Landmark/Hornrock (at 20% of total units) | 90 |
| Other eligible sites (at 12 du/ac & 20%)* | 3 |
| Bear’s Nest (no development potential) | 0 |
| Total | 146 |

*: At the time of Third Round settlement, three additional vacant lots qualified for RDP analysis: B 1019 L 9 (0.46 ac developable); B 1405 L 1 (0.52 ac developable); and B 2001 L 1 & 9 (0.44 ac developable). Despite the size and character of these lots, a density of 12 du/ac had been assigned for settlement purposes.


Against this backdrop, the Borough now seeks to amend its Round 3 plan, Judgments and Settlements to account for this change in circumstance. The only logical solution, given the still-existing land constraints, is to adjust the Borough’s Round 3 obligation due

to the demonstrable lack of vacant and developable land that existed at the time of the judgment, as exacerbated by removing the Bear’s Nest site. In other words, because of these changed circumstances at Bear’s Nest that were not foreseen at the time of the 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC, the Borough is now entitled to a Vacant Land Adjustment for its Round 3 obligation, which yields an RDP of 146.

3. Fourth Round RDP

Park Ridge continues to be severely lacking in vacant, developable land. As such, we undertook a detailed analysis of potential changed circumstances in the Borough in order to evaluate whether any such changed circumstance would warrant a recalibration of the RDP. This analysis included a review of all development applications in Park Ridge since the Borough’s 2018 VLA and an assessment of all vacant lots in private and public ownership (Class 1 and Class 15), as well as all farm qualified (Class 3B) properties within Planning Areas 1 and 2 in the Borough. A copy of this analysis is included in Appendix F of this plan. As set forth therein, only one property represents a changed circumstance requiring a Fourth Round RDP obligation. This site is as follows:

- ❖ 155 Park Avenue



The 3.21-acre parcel located at 155 Park Avenue (which is identified by Borough tax records as Block 1807 Lot 5) is developed with an existing apartment complex known as the Park Terrace Apartments. The site is located in the GA-1 Zone, wherein garden apartments are a permitted use and a density bonus is permitted

for applicants that set aside 10 percent of their units for affordable housing. Pursuant to this provision, in 2023, Park Ridge Apartments, LLC applied for – and the Park Ridge Planning Board granted – preliminary and final site plan approval to construct an additional 16 apartment units on the property, including 2 affordable units. As such, the Borough now anticipates that this property will be developed with 16 additional dwelling units, which, at a 20 percent set-aside, equates to an RDP of 3.2 units. The Borough therefore assigns this property a Fourth Round RDP of 3.2 units.

Based on the above changed circumstance, we find that Park Ridge has a total Fourth Round RDP obligation of 3 units. This finding is affirmed by the Borough’s 2026 Mediation Agreement with FSHC. The Borough’s proposal to satisfy this obligation is set forth in the following Section 4, Fair Share Plan.

SECTION 4: FAIR SHARE PLAN

The following Fair Share Plan outlines the components and mechanisms the Borough will utilize to address its affordable housing obligations.

A. PLAN SUMMARY

The Fair Share Plan identifies the manner in which the Borough’s fair share affordable housing obligations are to be addressed. These obligations are summarized as follows:

Table 29: Affordable Housing Obligations Summary

| Category | Obligation | RDP | Unmet Need |
|---|------------|-----|------------|
| Present Need (Rehabilitation) Obligation | 45 | -- | -- |
| First & Second Round Obligation (1987-1999) | 112 | -- | -- |
| Third Round Obligation (1999-2025) | 225 | 146 | 79 |
| Fourth Round Obligation (2025-2035) | 119 | 3 | 116 |

As detailed herein, the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan can accommodate the entirety of the community’s affordable housing obligation through 2035 in a manner that affirmatively addresses affordable housing need, while at the same time addressing planning concerns and maintaining the overall character of the community.

B. PLAN COMPONENTS

This section of the plan details the projects, mechanisms and funding sources which will be used to meet the Borough’s affordable housing obligations, as discussed above. The Plan Components Map included at the end of this plan illustrates the location of all developments identified herein.

1. Present Need (Rehabilitation) Obligation

As established in Section 3 of this plan, Park Ridge has a Present Need (Rehabilitation) obligation for the Fourth Round of 45 units. The Borough will address this obligation by continuing to contract with Community Grants, Planning & Housing (CGP&H) to administer Park Ridge’s municipal Home Improvement Program, which is available to both owners and renters. The Borough will utilize funds from its affordable housing trust fund to fund this program.

In addition to the municipal Home Improvement Program, the Borough will continue to participate in the Bergen County Home Improvement Program (BCHIP) to help address its rehabilitation share, to the extent that funding is available for the County program. Participation in the program is established through an interlocal agreement and utilizes Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

In order to fully satisfy its Rehabilitation obligation, the Borough of Park Ridge will commit to spend \$10,000 per unit. This will require a total contribution of \$450,000. Pursuant to COAH’s rules that allow municipalities to utilize money collected from development fees for this purpose, the Borough shall set aside the required \$450,000 from its affordable

housing trust fund account to be made available to income-qualified households to participate in the program. As of December 31, 2024, that account contains a balance of \$597,731, thus demonstrating sufficient funding for the Borough’s Rehabilitation Program. A copy of the Borough’s Fourth Round Spending Plan is located in Appendix G of this plan.

2. First and Second Round Obligation

Park Ridge’s First and Second Round obligation is 112 units. The Borough has addressed the entirety of this obligation with a combination of rental housing for the handicapped (prior cycle credits), RCAs completed under a Prior Round substantive certification/judgment of repose, alternative living arrangements (group homes), affordable units within inclusionary rental developments, and rental bonus credits permitted in accordance with COAH’s Round 2 rules. These components – all of which have been completed – are identified in the table below, with more detail on each development provided in Section 4.C.

Table 30: Plan Components Satisfying First & Second Round Obligation

| Plan Component | Units | Bonus | Total | Status |
|---|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| <i>Prior Cycle Credits:</i> | | | | |
| Woodland Gardens/Lehmann Gardens | 35 | -- | 35 | Completed |
| <i>RCA:</i> | | | | |
| Borough of Ogdensburg | 12 | -- | 12 | Completed |
| <i>Alternative Living Arrangements/Group Homes:</i> | | | | |
| Care Plus NJ | 4 (bdrms) | 4 | 8 | Completed |
| Everas Community Services | 4 (bdrms) | 3 | 7 | Completed |
| New Concepts for Living | 6 (bdrms) | 4 | 10 | Completed |
| <i>Inclusionary Rental Developments:</i> | | | | |
| Quail Run (a.k.a. Hawthorne West) | 4 | 4 | 8 | Completed |
| 70-72 Park Ave (a.k.a. Krell Building) | 1 | 1 | 2 | Completed |
| 26 Hawthorne Ave (a.k.a. Park Ridge Properties) | 5 | 5 | 10 | Completed |
| Ridge Manor | 1 | 1 | 2 | Completed |
| Hawthorne Terrace | 1 | 1 | 2 | Completed |
| 40 Park Ave (a.k.a. PRAH Associates, LLC) | 2 | 2 | 4 | Completed |
| The James (a.k.a. Park Ridge Transit, LLC) | 9 | 3 | 12 | Completed |
| Total | 84 | 28 | 112 | -- |

3. Third Round RDP

As established in Section 3 of this plan, it is the Borough’s position that it is entitled to a Third Round RPD obligation of 146 units. The Borough can satisfy the entirety of this 146-unit Third Round RDP obligation with a combination of existing affordable family and

senior units, affordable family units under construction, and rental bonus credits permitted in accordance with COAH’s Round 2 rules. These components are identified in the table below, with more detail on each development provided in Section 4.C.

Table 31: Plan Components Satisfying Third Round RDP

| Plan Component | # of Units | Bonus Credits | Total Credits | Status |
|--|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|
| <i>Assisted Living (senior rentals):</i> | | | | |
| The Residence at Park Ridge (formerly Atrium) | 28 | -- | 28 | Completed |
| <i>Inclusionary Developments (family rentals):</i> | | | | |
| The James (a.k.a. Park Ridge Transit, LLC) | 15 | 15 | 30 | Completed |
| Landmark (a.k.a. Sony/Hornrock) | 66 | 22 | 88 | Under Construction |
| Total | 109 | 37 | 146 | -- |

All of the above plan components proposed to satisfy the Borough’s Third Round RDP obligation fully satisfy the minimum/maximum requirements identified in COAH’s Round 2 rules and the 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC (i.e., minimum 25 percent required to be rental units (half of which must be family rentals), maximum bonus credits permitted up to the rental minimum, maximum 25 percent permitted to be age-restricted, and minimum 50 percent of actual units required to be for families).

4. Fourth Round RDP

As established in Section 3 of this plan, Park Ridge has a Fourth Round RDP obligation of 3 units. The Borough will satisfy the entirety of this 3-unit Fourth Round RDP obligation with a combination of family rental units under construction and family rental units approved to be developed. These components are identified in the table below, with more detail on each development provided in Section 4.C.

Table 32: Plan Components Satisfying Fourth Round RDP

| Plan Component | # of Units | Bonus Credits | Total Credits | Status |
|--|------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|
| <i>Inclusionary Developments (family rentals):</i> | | | | |
| Landmark (a.k.a. Sony/Hornrock) | 1 | -- | 1 | Under Construction |
| 155 Park Avenue | 2 | -- | 2 | Approved |
| Total | 3 | 0* | 3 | |


*: Although units are eligible for bonus credits per FHA-2, none applied as same would exceed maximum 25% bonus cap.

C. DEVELOPMENT SITES

Each of the Borough's affordable housing sites identified in Section B. is discussed in more detail below. The Plan Components Map included at the end of this plan illustrates the location of all developments identified herein.

1. Woodland Gardens/Lehmann Gardens. The Woodland Gardens/Lehmann Gardens apartments are located at 12 Sulak Lane. This 4.37-acre site is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1602 Lot 9. The development is owned and operated by the Housing Authority of Bergen County and contains 35 affordable rental units designed for people in wheelchairs. The development was constructed in 1985 and therefore meets COAH's definition of Prior Cycle Credits as outlined at N.J.A.C. 5:93-1.3. Pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules at N.J.A.C. 5:93-3.2, which outlines the requirements for Prior Cycle Credits, these units are eligible for one-for-one credit. Therefore, the Woodland Gardens/Lehmann Gardens apartments are eligible for 35 Prior Cycle Credits. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns all 35 credits toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 1: Woodland Gardens/Lehmann Gardens




2. Care Plus NJ Group Home. Care Plus, NJ operates a group home at 83 Spring Valley Road, which is identified by municipal tax records as Block 503 Lot 16. The site occupies an area of approximately 0.44 acre. The group home was opened in 1989 and is licensed by the Department of Human Services' Division of Mental Health Services. It contains 4 bedrooms for special needs residents. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns credit for all 4 bedrooms to the First and Second Round obligation. In addition, the special needs bedrooms are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As such, the Borough also assigns 4 rental bonus credits toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 2: Care Plus NJ Group Home



3. Everas Community Services Group Home. Everas Community Services, Inc. operates a group home at 99 DeGroff Place, which is identified by municipal tax records as Block 2201 Lot 5. The site occupies an area of approximately 0.65 acre. The group home is licensed by the Department of Human Services' Division of Developmental Disabilities. It was opened in 2001 by Jawonio, Inc. and then was transferred to its current owner, Everas, in 2014. Although this residence originally had only 3 special needs bedrooms, Everas added a fourth special needs bedroom when they took over the facility in 2014. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns credit for all 4 bedrooms to the First and Second Round obligation. In addition, the original 3 special needs bedrooms are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As such, the Borough also assigns 3 rental bonus credits toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 3: Everas Community Services Group Home



4. New Concepts for Living Group Home. New Concepts for Living, Inc. operates a group home at 221 Doxey Drive, which is identified by municipal tax records as Block 102 Lot 14. The site occupies an area of approximately 0.31 acre. The group home was opened in 1992 and is licensed by the Department of Human Services' Division of Developmental Disabilities. Although this residence originally had only 4 special needs bedrooms, New Concepts for Living added 2 additional special needs bedrooms circa 2019. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns credit for all 6 bedrooms to the First and Second Round obligation. In addition, the original 4 special needs bedrooms are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As such, the Borough also assigns 4 rental bonus credits toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 4: New Concepts for Living Group Home



5. Quail Run. The Quail Run inclusionary development (also known as Hawthorne West) is located at 107 Hawthorne Avenue. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1401 Lot 5 and occupies an area of approximately 1.06 acres. The development contains a total of 20 units, including 4 affordable family rental units. These 4 affordable units were built in 2002 and have 30-year deed restrictions. The units are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns the 8 credits generated by this site (4 units plus 4 rental bonus credits) toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 5: Quail Run



6. 70-72 Park Avenue (Krell Building). The Krell Building is an existing inclusionary development located at 70-72 Park Avenue. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1604 Lot 1 and occupies an area of approximately 0.49 acre. The mixed-use development contains ground floor offices, and 6 upper-level apartment units, 1 of which is an affordable family rental unit. Said unit was built in 2013 and has a 30-year deed restriction. The unit is eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH’s Round 2 rules. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns the 2 credits generated by this site (1 unit plus 1 rental bonus credit) toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 6: 70-72 Park Ave (Krell Building)



7. 26 Hawthorne Avenue (Park Ridge Properties). The Park Ridge Properties building is an existing inclusionary development located at 26 Hawthorne Avenue. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1517 Lot 1 and occupies an area of approximately 0.23 acre. The building was renovated with an addition in 2013 and now contains a total of 10 units, including 5 affordable family rental units with 30-year deed restrictions. The units are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns the 10 credits generated by this site (5 units plus 5 rental bonus credits) toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 7: 26 Hawthorne Ave (Park Ridge Properties)



8. Ridge Manor. Ridge Manor is an existing inclusionary development located at 71-91 Hawthorne Avenue. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1402 Lot 3 and occupies an area of approximately 3.69 acres. The property was originally constructed with 44 market rate multi-family units; however, as a result of an ordinance amendment permitting increased density in exchange for inclusionary development, 12 additional units were constructed in 2012, which include 1 affordable family rental unit. Said unit has a 30-year deed restriction and is eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns the 2 credits generated by this site (1 unit plus 1 rental bonus credit) toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 8: Ridge Manor




9. Hawthorne Terrace. Hawthorne Terrace is an existing inclusionary development located at 79-81 Berthoud Street. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1509 Lot 2 and occupies approximately 1.06 acres. The property was originally constructed with 29 market rate multi-family units (on both Block 1509 Lot 2 and Block 1514 Lot 2); however, as a result of an ordinance amendment permitting increased density in exchange for inclusionary development, 12 additional units were constructed in 2017, including 1 affordable family rental unit. Said units have 30-year deed restrictions and are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns the 2 credits generated by this site (1 unit plus 1 rental bonus credit) toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 9: Hawthorne Terrace



10. 40 Park Avenue (PRAH Associates, LLC). The PRAH Associates building is an existing inclusionary development located at 40 Park Avenue. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1601 Lot 10.01 and occupies an area of approximately 1.36 acres. The mixed-use development was constructed in 2016 and contains the Park Ridge Animal Hospital and other retail uses on the ground floor, with 22 multi-family residential units above, including 2 affordable family rental units. Said units have 30-year deed restrictions and are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns the 4 credits generated by this site (2 units plus 2 rental bonus credits) toward the First and Second Round obligation.

Aerial 10: 40 Park Ave (PRAH Associates, LLC)




11. The James (Park Ridge Transit, LLC). The James (previously known as Park Ridge Transit) is an existing inclusionary development located at 87 Madison Avenue. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1801.01 Lot 1.01 and occupies an area of approximately 3.07 acres. The mixed-use development was completed in 2021 and contains 17,600 square feet of retail on the ground floor with 240 multi-family residential units above, including 24 affordable family rental units. Said units have 30-year deed restrictions and are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules, up to the 25 percent bonus cap for each round. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns 12 credits (9 units plus 3 rental bonus credits, which is the maximum permitted per N.J.A.C. 5:93-5.15.d) toward the First and Second Round obligation, and assigns 30 credits (15 units plus 15 rental bonus credits) toward the Third Round RDP obligation.

Aerial 11: The James (Park Ridge Transit, LLC)



12. The Residence at Park Ridge (Atrium Senior Living). The Residence at Park Ridge (formerly known as Atrium Senior Living) is an existing assisted living facility located at 124 Noyes Drive. The property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 1401 Lot 1 and occupies an area of approximately 8.12 acres. The assisted living facility is licensed by the New Jersey Department of Health and was constructed in 1995. In 2019, the Borough entered into an agreement with the previous owner of the property (Park Ridge Health Care Properties, LLC) to deed-restrict 28 of the existing assisted living units for a period of 30 years, therefore qualifying same for credit pursuant to COAH’s Round 2 rules at N.J.A.C. 5:93-5.16(a). Although the property changed hands in 2022, the current property owner (Park Ridge NJ Property LLC) has confirmed that they are enforcing the deed restriction. As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns the 28 credits generated by this site toward the Third Round RDP obligation.

Aerial 12: The Residence at Park Ridge (Atrium)



13. Landmark (Former Sony Site). On November 18, 2020, the Borough entered into a Settlement Agreement with Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC (and FSHC) in order to resolve Landmark's intervention in the Borough's 2015 Declaratory Judgment action. Landmark is the owner of the former Sony site located along Brae Boulevard and Sony Drive, adjacent to the municipal boundaries with the Boroughs of Montvale and Woodcliff Lake. The approximately 30-acre property is identified by municipal tax records as Block 301 Lot 1 and was previously developed with the former Sony Electronics, Inc. corporate headquarters.

In accordance with the 2020 Settlement Agreement and the 2021 HE&FSP, the Borough rezoned the site to a new AH-4 Affordable Housing Zone in August 2021 to allow the site to be redeveloped with an inclusionary family rental development containing a total of 448 units, of which minimally 15 percent were required to be set aside for affordable housing. Subsequently, in July 2022, Landmark filed an application with the Park Ridge Planning Board for preliminary and final site plan approval for the development of 371 multi-family rental units (of which 68 will be affordable family rental units) and 77 townhouse rental units, for a total of 448 units. A resolution memorializing the Board's approval was adopted on January 11, 2023. Since that time, the former Sony building has been demolished, the Borough has issued building permits, and the development is now under construction.

As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns credit for 66 of the 68 affordable units to be generated from this development toward Park Ridge's Third Round RDP obligation and assigns credit for 1 of the 2 remaining affordable units to be generated from this development toward Park Ridge's Fourth Round RDP obligation. In addition, the units assigned to the Third Round RDP obligation are eligible for 2:1 rental bonus credits, pursuant to COAH's Round 2 rules, up to the 25 percent bonus cap. As such, the Borough also assigns 22 rental bonus credits (which is the maximum permitted per N.J.A.C. 5:93-5.15.d) toward the Third Round RDP obligation. (Although the unit applied to the Fourth Round RDP obligation would also be eligible for a 0.5 bonus credit pursuant to FHA-2 for being constructed on land previously developed with an office, no bonus credits are applied in this plan toward the Fourth Round RDP obligation as same would exceed the 25 percent bonus cap.)

Credit for the 1 remaining affordable unit to be generated from this development will be applied to the Borough's Fourth Round Unmet Need, as discussed in more detail in Section D. below.

Aerial 13: Landmark (Former Sony Site)



14. 155 Park Avenue. The 155 Park Avenue site is a through-lot with frontage on Park, Highview and Chestnut Avenues. It is identified by Borough tax records as Block 1807 Lot 5 and encompasses an area of approximately 3.21 acres. The property is developed with an existing apartment complex known as the Park Terrace Apartments, which consists of three buildings. As discussed in Section 3 of this plan, the site is located in the GA-1 Zone, wherein garden apartments are a permitted use and a density bonus is permitted for applicants that set aside 10 percent of their units for affordable housing. Pursuant to this provision, the owner of the property, Park Ridge Apartments, LLC, filed an application with the Park Ridge Planning Board on January 20, 2023 for preliminary and final site plan approval to construct one additional building containing 16 apartment units, including 2 affordable units, on the property. On July 12, 2023, the Planning Board adopted a resolution memorializing its approval of the application. The Borough therefore anticipates that a total of 16 additional dwellings will be produced on this property, including 2 affordable family rental units.

The portion of the lot to be redeveloped is bound by commercial and office development to the north, west and south. The existing three apartment buildings in the complex are located to the east. The Park Ridge Train Station is less than one-quarter mile to the west along Park Avenue. The site is fully within State Planning Area – 1 (Metropolitan) and the Sewer Service Area and is entirely devoid of environmental constraints.


The property meets site suitability criteria as follows:

- a. Approvable. Site plan approval has already been granted for this site. Although this approval was originally slated to expire in July 2025, the Park Ridge Planning Board granted the applicant a one-year extension of its approvals until July 2026. This extension was memorialized at the Planning Board's June 11, 2025 meeting.

- b. Available. There are no known title issues or encumbrances which would prohibit the development of this site.
- c. Developable. The site has access to appropriate water and sewer infrastructure.
- d. Suitable. The site is adjacent to compatible land uses, has access to appropriate streets, and is free of environmental constraints.

As detailed in Section B. above, the Borough assigns credit for these 2 affordable units toward Park Ridge's Fourth Round RDP obligation. Although these units would also be eligible for 0.5 bonus credit per unit pursuant to FHA-2 for being located within one-half mile of a NJ Transit station, no bonus credits are applied in this plan toward the Fourth Round RDP obligation as same would exceed the 25 percent bonus cap.

Aerial 14: 155 Park Avenue



D. UNMET NEED

The difference between the Borough's Prospective Need obligations and its RDP obligations is what is known as Unmet Need. Whereas the RDP obligations must be affirmatively addressed by the Borough (as outlined in Subsections B.3. and B.4. above), addressing Unmet Need involves a lower standard, as the entire Unmet Need obligation does not have to be fully satisfied by 2035. Park Ridge has an Unmet Need of 79 for Round 3 and an Unmet Need of 116 for Round 4, for a total combined Unmet Need of 195 units. The Borough will address Unmet Need as set forth below and as illustrated on the Plan Components Map included at the end of this plan.

1. Third Round Unmet Need

The Borough will address its 79-unit Third Round Unmet Need through the following

mechanism:

- a. *NB Neighborhood Business Zone.* In 2010, the Borough created a Neighborhood Business (NB) Zone encompassing approximately 21 acres along Park Avenue and Broadway in the vicinity of the Borough's train station. In 2011, the boundaries of the NB Zone were expanded south along Broadway from Park Avenue nearly to Highland, and north along Kinderkamack from Park Avenue to the Montvale border (including all parcels previously located in the B-3 Zone). This expansion enlarged the NB Zone to encompass a total of 44 acres. It includes the 40 Park Avenue, 70-72 Park Avenue, 26 Hawthorne Avenue, and The James inclusionary developments.

As part of its 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC and its 2021 HE&FSP, the Borough agreed to maintain the NB Zone – which permits mixed-use development with residential uses above the ground floor with a required 20 percent set-aside for affordable units – despite the fact that it had already committed to addressing the entirety of its obligations for Round 1, 2 and 3 and therefore was not relying on additional credits from this zone. As such, the Borough will continue to maintain the NB Zone, but proposes to now establish this zone as an Unmet Need mechanism.

It is anticipated that the NB Zone could yield approximately 80-95 additional affordable units (over and above the affordable units already created at the above-noted inclusionary developments, the credits for which are assigned toward the Borough's First and Second Round obligation and Third Round RDP obligation). The Borough will assign credit for 40 of these 80-95 anticipated affordable housing units toward Park Ridge's Third Round Unmet Need. Credit for the remaining 40-55 anticipated affordable units will be assigned toward Park Ridge's Fourth Round Unmet Need, as discussed in more detail below.

2. Fourth Round Unmet Need

The Borough will address its 116-unit Fourth Round Unmet Need through the following mechanisms, which mechanisms shall also be considered to fulfill the Borough's obligation under C.52:27D-310.1, as amended by P.L.2024, c.2, of FHA-2 to adopt realistic zoning:

- a. *Excess Unit from Landmark.* As detailed in Subsections 4.B. and 4.C. above, the Borough assigns credit for 66 of the 68 affordable units under construction as part of the Landmark (also known as Sony/Hornrock) development toward Park Ridge's Third Round RDP obligation, and assigns credit for 1 of the remaining 2 affordable units under construction toward its Fourth Round RDP obligation. As such, the Borough has 1 excess affordable unit from this project that can be applied toward Park Ridge's Fourth Round Unmet Need.

- b. *Accessory Apartment Program.* In accordance with the Borough's 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC and its 2021 HE&FSP, the Borough established an Accessory Apartment Program in order to create 7 affordable accessory apartment units that would be credited toward Park Ridge's 225-unit Third Round obligation. Specifically, in 2021, the Borough hired Community Grants, Planning & Housing (CGP&H) to establish and administer the Program, adopted an operating manual to implement the Program, amended its ordinances to permit the creation and subsidy of affordable accessory apartment units, and amended its spending plan to provide funding for the accessory apartments through its Affordable Housing Trust Fund. Despite these efforts, however, no accessory apartments have been created under this Program to date. As such, the Borough will continue to implement the Program through the Fourth Round, but proposes to now establish this Program as an Unmet Need mechanism and apply any units created thereunder toward Park Ridge's Fourth Round Unmet Need.

The Borough will continue to commit \$30,000 per accessory apartment deed restricted for moderate-income families, \$40,000 per accessory apartment restricted for low-income families, and \$50,000 per accessory apartment restricted for very low-income families. This will require a total contribution of \$260,000 from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund to subsidize the creation of these units, as the Borough's program requires that at least one of the accessory apartments be restricted for very low-income families and that no more than three of the accessory apartments be restricted for moderate-income families. In addition, the Borough will continue to contract with CGP&H to administer and affirmatively market the Program through the Fourth Round.

- c. *AH Affordable Housing Zones at Hawthorne Avenue and Wampum Road.* As part of the Borough's substantive certification for Rounds 1 and 2, Park Ridge established affordable housing zones for a 4.43-acre area along Hawthorne Avenue (comprised of Block 1401 Lots 4, 5 and 6 and Block 1403 Lot 1) and a 2.04-acre area on Wampum Road (comprised of Block 1602 Lot 5). This zoning produced the Quail Run inclusionary development on Block 1401 Lot 5, but has not produced any additional units to date.

As part of its 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC and its 2021 HE&FSP, the Borough agreed to maintain these zones – which permit townhouses, garden apartments, and multifamily residential up to a density of 12 units per acre with a required 20 percent set-aside for affordable units – despite the fact that it had already committed to addressing the entirety of its obligations for Round 1, 2 and 3 and therefore was not relying on additional credits from these zones. As such, the Borough will continue to maintain these affordable housing zones, but proposes to now establish these zones as Fourth Round Unmet Need mechanisms.

In addition, the Borough proposes the following amendments to these affordable housing zones:

- ❖ AH Zone at Hawthorne Avenue: The AH Zone along Hawthorne Avenue, encompassing Block 1401 Lots 4, 5 and 6 and Block 1403 Lot 1, inclusive of the Quail Run inclusionary development, will be amended to increase the permitted density from 12 units per acre to 19 units per acre. It is anticipated that this amendment could yield approximately 13 additional affordable units to be credited toward Fourth Round Unmet Need (over and above the 4 affordable units already created at Quail Run, the credits for which are assigned toward the Borough's First and Second Round obligation).
- ❖ AH Zone at Wampum Road: The AH Zone along Wampum Road, encompassing Block 1602 Lot 5, will be expanded to include Block 1602 Lots 6 and 19, which will increase the total area of this zone from 2.04 acres to 3.62 acres. In addition, the Borough will increase the permitted density in this zone from 12 units per acre to 14 units per acre. It is anticipated that these amendments could yield approximately 10 affordable units to be credited toward Fourth Round Unmet Need.

Thus, in total, the AH Affordable Housing Zones at Hawthorne Avenue and Wampum Road, as proposed to be amended, could potentially yield 23 additional affordable housing units, the credits for which will be assigned to Park Ridge's Fourth Round Unmet Need.

- d. *AH Affordable Housing Zone at Bear's Nest.* As discussed at length above, the Borough, pursuant to its 2020 Settlement Agreement with FSHC and its 2021 HE&FSP, amended the zoning on the Bear's Nest property (comprised of Block 206 Lots 1 and 2) to allow Lot 2 to be developed with a 50-unit, 100 percent affordable rental development (plus 1 additional unit for a superintendent's apartment). However, because of the extensive environmental constraints subsequently determined to be present on the property, the site no longer represents a realistic development potential. That said, in order to allow the regulatory process to play itself out and reduce the financial strain on any potential developers, the Borough proposes to maintain the existing AH Affordable Housing Zone on the Bear's Nest site, but to amend same to permit inclusionary development with a 20 percent set-aside for affordable housing, as opposed to 100 percent affordable development. This amendment could yield up to 10 affordable units on the site, the credits for which would be assigned to the Borough's Fourth Round Unmet Need.
- e. *NB Neighborhood Business Zone.* As detailed in Subsection 4.D.1.a. above, the Borough assigns credit for 40 of the 80-95 affordable housing units anticipated to be

developed in the existing Neighborhood Business (NB) Zone toward Park Ridge's Third Round Unmet Need. Credit for the remaining 40-55 affordable units anticipated to be developed in the NB Zone will be assigned toward Park Ridge's Fourth Round Unmet Need.

- f. *Mandatory Set-Aside Ordinance.* Additionally, in order to capture future affordable housing opportunities in the Borough and address the remainder of Park Ridge's Fourth Round Unmet Need, the Borough agrees to adopt a Borough-wide Mandatory Set-Aside Ordinance, which will require that any site that is developed with five or more new multi-family or single-family attached dwelling units shall provide an affordable housing set-aside at a rate of 20 percent. This requirement will ensure that new multi-family or single-family attached development in Park Ridge will provide its fair share of affordable units and assist with the Borough's continuous efforts to address its affordable housing obligation. The Borough will not, however, be under any obligation to grant subdivision and site plan approvals, rezonings, use variances, redevelopment or rehabilitation designations, and/or any other approvals for any such construction and development applications will be required to otherwise conform to the Borough's zoning requirements. Any affordable units created pursuant to this ordinance will be applied toward Park Ridge's Fourth Round Unmet Need.

E. DEVELOPMENT FEE ORDINANCE

Lastly, the Borough shall continue to impose development fees on new development, as set forth in the Borough's development fee ordinance at Chapter 51 of the Borough Code. As stated therein, residential development fees of 1.5 percent of the equalized assessed value shall be collected on all residential development involving new buildings or when an existing building undergoes a change to a more intense use, is demolished and replaced, or is expanded, if the expansion is not otherwise exempt from the development fee requirement. In addition, non-residential development fees of 2.5 percent of the equalized assessed value shall be collected on all non-residential development, with the exception of those types of developments specifically exempted pursuant to the Statewide Non-Residential Development Fee Act. The funds generated by the collection of development fees will be applied directly toward implementation of Park Ridge's Fourth Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. A copy of the Borough's Fourth Round Spending Plan is included in Appendix G of this plan.

F. REJECTED DEVELOPMENT SITES

There are no sites for which inclusionary development was considered that were rejected and not included in this Plan.

G. OTHER PROVISIONS

The following additional requirements are noted:

1. Fourth Round Bonuses. Fourth Round bonuses will be applied in accordance with N.J.A.C. 52:27d-311.k.
2. Very-Low Income and Low-Income Units. At least 50 percent of the units addressing the Fourth Round Prospective Need obligation shall be affordable to very low-income and low-income households with the remainder affordable to moderate-income households. A minimum of 13 percent of the affordable units will be made available to very low-income households, defined as households earning 30 percent or less of the regional median income by household size.
3. Rental Component. At least 25 percent of the Fourth Round Prospective Need obligation shall be met through rental units, including at least half in rental units available to families.
4. Families. At least half of the actual units created to address the Fourth Round Prospective Need obligation must be available to families.
5. Age-Restricted Cap. No more than 30 percent of all units developed or planned to meet the Fourth Round Prospective Need obligation shall be met with age-restricted units.

H. CONSISTENCY WITH STATE PLANNING INITIATIVES

As noted in Section 1 of this plan, a HE&FSP must also include:

- ❖ An analysis of the extent to which municipal ordinances and other local factors advance or detract from the goal of preserving multigenerational family continuity as expressed in the recommendations of the Multigenerational Family Housing Continuity Commission; and
- ❖ An analysis of consistency with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan, including water, wastewater, stormwater, and multi-modal transportation based on guidance and technical assistance from the State Planning Commission.

Accordingly, the following subsection analyzes the consistency of this Amended HE&FSP to the above referenced state planning initiatives.

1. Multigenerational Family Housing Continuity Commission

The Multigenerational Family Housing Continuity Commission was established by the

State of New Jersey in 2021. As noted in N.J.S.A. 52:27D-329.20, one of the primary duties of the Commission is to “prepare and adopt recommendations on how State government, local government, community organizations, private entities, and community members may most effectively advance the goal of enabling senior citizens to reside at the homes of their extended families, thereby preserving and enhancing multigenerational family continuity, through the modification of State and local laws and policies in the areas of housing, land use planning, parking and streetscape planning, and other relevant areas.”

As of the date of this Amended HE&FSP, the Multigenerational Family Housing Continuity Commission has not yet adopted any recommendations.

2. State Development and Redevelopment Plan

As established by N.J.S.A. 52:18A-200(f), the purpose of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan (SDRP) is to “coordinate planning activities and establish Statewide planning objectives in the following areas: land use, housing, economic development, transportation, natural resource conservation, agriculture and farmland retention, recreation, urban and suburban redevelopment, historic preservation, public facilities and services, and intergovernmental coordination.”

As such, the SDRP establishes a number of goals and strategies related to a number of different topics, including economic redevelopment. One such goal is to revitalize existing urban centers by directing growth and development to those areas. Specifically, the SDRP seeks to revitalize the State’s cities and towns by protecting, preserving, and developing the valuable human and economic assets in cities, towns, and other urban areas.

As indicated by the SDRP’s Policy Map, the entirety of Park Ridge Borough is located in the PA-1 Metropolitan Planning Area, wherein development and redevelopment are intended to be directed. The intent of this Planning Area is to:


- ❖ Provide for much of the state’s future redevelopment;
- ❖ Revitalize cities and towns;
- ❖ Promote growth in compact forms;
- ❖ Stabilize older suburbs;
- ❖ Redesign areas of sprawl; and
- ❖ Protect the character of existing stable communities.

Accordingly, this Amended HE&FSP is consistent with the intents of the PA-1. Specifically, it is designed to encourage redevelopment and growth in a compact form, while also protecting the character of the existing community.

I. CREDITING DOCUMENTATION AND ONGOING COMPLIANCE

The Borough of Park Ridge is following the applicable requirements regarding unit monitoring and reporting. Specifically, the Borough has completed and will continue to complete the statutorily required updates to its housing project status report by DCA's annual deadline of February 15th. These updates are included in the State's new Affordable Housing Monitoring System and should be considered to fulfill the Borough obligation to specify the creditworthiness of all existing affordable units. Further, all crediting documentation submitted to and approved by the Court as part of the Borough's Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan remains on file with and accessible from the Court. All other crediting documentation, for plan components that were not part of the Borough's Third Round HE&FSP, is included in the appendices of this plan.

Map 4: Plan Components Map



Appendices

- A Resolution No. 025-062
- B June 16, 2025 Trial Court Order
- C Structural Conditions Survey and Calculation of Adjusted Present Need
- D Bear's Nest Survey and NJDEP Communications
- E Third Round Vacant Land Adjustment Map and Table (Updated to Remove Development Potential from Bear's Nest site)
- F Fourth Round Vacant Land Adjustment Map and Table
- G Fourth Round Spending Plan
- H Project & Unit Monitoring in AHMS
- I Landmark Supportive Documentation
- J 155 Park Avenue Supportive Documentation
- K 2026 Mediation Agreement Between Borough of Park Ridge and FSHC

Appendix

A Resolution No. 025-062

**BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE
RESOLUTION NO. 025-062**

**RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH
OF PARK RIDGE COMMITTING TO ROUND 4 PRESENT
AND PROSPECTIVE NEED AFFORDABLE HOUSING
OBLIGATIONS**

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2024, Governor Murphy signed into law P.L. 2024, c.2 (hereinafter "A4" or "Amended FHA"); and

WHEREAS, A4 calculates the size of the regional affordable housing need as follows: "projected household change for a 10-year-round in a region shall be estimated by establishing the household change experienced in the region between the most recent federal decennial census, and the second-most recent federal decennial census. This household change, if positive, shall be divided by 2.5 to estimate the number of low- and moderate-income homes needed to address low- and moderate-income household change in the region, and to determine the regional prospective need for a 10-year-round of low- and moderate-income housing obligations..."; and

WHEREAS, this means that the regional need equates to 40% of regional household growth; and

WHEREAS, the 1985 version of the Fair Housing Act and A4 both prohibit a result that would compel a municipality to spend its own money on compliance; and

WHEREAS, the theory which permits a municipality to meet its obligations without municipal subsidy is zoning for "inclusionary zoning"; and

WHEREAS, inclusionary zoning most typically requires a 15% or 20% set aside; and

WHEREAS, it is not clear how a regional need predicated upon 40% of anticipated growth can be met with 15-20% set asides and without municipal subsidy; and

WHEREAS, this is exacerbated by the fact that certain other municipalities in the region have an allocation of 0% of the prospective need (new construction obligation), irrespective of the growth in that particular municipality; and

WHEREAS, A4 yields a statewide new construction obligation of over 8,400 affordable units per year; and

WHEREAS, this is a substantially higher annual number than was imposed by COAH in the "Prior Round" or any iteration of its Round 3 regulations; and

WHEREAS, A4 determines the size of the regional need, but does not calculate allocation of the need to individual municipalities; and

WHEREAS, instead, A4 required the Department of Community Affairs ("DCA") to produce non-binding estimates of need on or before October 20, 2024, which it did provide on October 18, 2024 ("DCA Report"); and

WHEREAS, the DCA Report calculates the Borough's Round 4 (2025-2035) obligations as follows: a Present Need or Rehabilitation Obligation of 137 units and a Prospective Need or New Construction Obligation of 138 units; and

WHEREAS, the Borough accepts the conclusions in the DCA Report, except regarding the land capacity allocation factor; and

WHEREAS, as to the **Land Capacity Allocation Factor**, the Borough notes that the DCA belatedly provided the data it used to establish this factor, i.e., on or about November 25, 2024 instead of by October 20, 2024; and

WHEREAS, the Borough further notes that the link to the DCA GIS data that the DCA belatedly made available to municipalities includes the following language: "The land areas identified in this dataset are based on an the best available data using publicly available data enumerated in N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304.3c.(4) to estimate the area of developable land, within municipal and regional boundaries, that may accommodate development. **It is important to note that the identified areas could be over or under inclusive depending on various conditions and that municipalities are permitted to provide more detailed mappings as part of their participation in the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program.**" (emphasis added); and

WHEREAS, the DCA maintains that the areas the DCA identified as developable are indeed overinclusive and, consequently, the Borough's Professional Planner has prepared a report, attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, correcting the allocation factors results in the Borough's Round 4 Prospective Need Obligation being 119 units rather than the 138 units the DCA calculated; and

WHEREAS, Section 3 of A4 provides that: "the municipality's determination of its fair share obligation shall have a presumption of validity, if established in accordance with sections 6 and 7" of A4; and

WHEREAS, the Borough's calculation of need is entitled to a "presumption of validity" because it complies with Sections 6 and 7 of A4; and

WHEREAS, the Borough specifically reserves the right to adjust those numbers based on one or any of the foregoing adjustments: 1) a Structural Conditions Survey or similar exterior survey which accounts for a higher-resolution estimate of present need; 2) a Vacant Land Adjustment predicated upon a lack of vacant, developable and suitable land; 3) a Durational Adjustment (whether predicated upon lack of sewer or lack of water); and/or 4) an adjustment predicated upon regional planning entity formulas, inputs or considerations, including, but not limited to the Highlands Regional Master Plan and its build out, the Pinelands or Meadowlands regulations and planning document; and

WHEREAS, in addition to the foregoing, the Borough specifically reserves all rights to revoke or amend this resolution and commitment, as may be necessary, in the event of a successful challenge to A4 in the context of the Montvale case (MER-L-1778-24), any other such action challenging A4, or any legislation adopted and signed into law by the Governor of New Jersey that alters the deadlines and/or requirements of A4; and

WHEREAS, in addition to the foregoing, the Borough reserves the right to take a position that its Round 4 Present or Prospective Need Obligations are lower than described herein in the event that a third party challenges the calculations provided for in this Resolution (a reservation of all litigation rights and positions, without prejudice); and

WHEREAS, in light of the above, the Mayor and Council finds that it is in the best interest of the Borough to declare its obligations in accordance with this binding resolution and in accordance with the Act; and

WHEREAS, in addition to the above, the Acting Administrative Director issued Directive #14-24, dated December 13, 2024, and made the directive available later in the week that followed; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Directive #14-24, a municipality seeking a certification of compliance with the Act shall file an action in the form of a declaratory judgment complaint . . . within 48 hours after adoption of the municipal resolution of fair share obligations, or by February 3, 2025, whichever is sooner; and

WHEREAS, nothing in this Resolution shall be interpreted as an acknowledgment of the legal validity of the AOC Directive and the Borough reserves any and all rights and remedies in relation to the AOC Directive; and

WHEREAS, the Borough seeks a certification of compliance with the Act and, therefore, directs its Affordable Housing Counsel to file a declaratory relief action within 48 hours of the adoption of this resolution; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED on this 29th day of January, 2025, by the Council of the Borough of Park Ridge, Bergen County, State of New Jersey, as follows:

1. All of the Whereas Clauses are incorporated into the operative clauses of this resolution.

2. The Mayor and Council hereby commit to a Present Need Obligation of 137 units and the Round 4 Prospective Need Obligation of 119 units as described in this resolution subject to all reservations of rights, which specifically include:

- a) The right to adjust the number based on an exterior survey, lack of land, sewer, water, regional planning inputs, or any combination thereof;
- b) As described in the WHEREAS section, all rights to revoke or amend this resolution in the event of a successful legal challenge, or legislative change, to A4;
- c) All rights to take any contrary position in the event of a third-party challenge to the obligations.

3. The Borough hereby directs its Affordable Housing Counsel to file a declaratory judgment complaint within 48 hours after adoption this resolution attaching this resolution.

4. The Borough hereby directs its Affordable Housing Counsel to file this Resolution with the "Program" pursuant to the requirements on A4.

5. The Borough hereby directs that this Resolution be published on the municipal website within 48 hours of its passage, pursuant to A4.

6. This resolution shall take effect immediately, according to law.

Adopted 1/28/25 on roll call vote as follows:

| | Introduced | Seconded | AYES | NAYES | ABSENT | ABSTAIN |
|-----------|------------|----------|------|-------|--------|---------|
| Cozzi | | | ✓ | | | |
| Fenwick | | | ✓ | | | |
| Goldsmith | | | ✓ | | | |
| Hoffman | | ✓ | ✓ | | | |
| Metzdorf | | | ✓ | | | |
| Mintz | ✓ | | ✓ | | | |

APPROVED:



 KEITH J. MISCIAGNA, MAYOR

Attest:



 Magdalena Giandomenico
 Borough Clerk / Administrator

Appendix

B June 16, 2025 Trial Court Order

In the Matter of the Application of the Borough of Park Ridge

Docket # Ber-L 723-25

PROGRAM RECOMMENDATION STATEMENT OF REASONS

This matter came before the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program (“the Program”) pursuant to a complaint for declaratory judgment brought by the Borough of Park Ridge (“Petitioner”) pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304.2-304.3 and 304(1)(f)(1)(c) of the New Jersey Fair Housing Act, N.J.S.A. 52:27D-301 et seq. (collectively, “the FHA”) and in accordance with Section II.A of Administrative Directive #14-24.

On October 18th, 2024, pursuant to the FHA (as amended) the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (“DCA”) issued its report entitled, “Affordable Housing Obligations for 2025-2035 (Fourth Round).” The report set forth the “Present Need” and “Prospective Need” obligations of all New Jersey municipalities for the Fourth-Round cycle.

With regards to the Petitioner, the Present Need obligation of the Petitioner has been calculated and reported as 137 affordable units. Its Prospective Need obligation was calculated and reported as 138 affordable units. The main issue before the Program is the allocation of Prospective Need units of affordable

housing. Petitioner accepted the Present Need allocation but disputes the Prospective Need calculation.

The Petitioner timely adopted a resolution seeking a deviation from its assigned Prospective Need obligation based upon the recommendation of its counsel and/or experts. In this case, the Petitioner requests that its Prospective Need obligation be reduced to 119. The Petitioner's complaint was timely and properly with the Program. There is a 19-unit difference between DCA and the Petitioner's calculations for its Prospective Need obligation. Petitioner is a small municipality consisting of 2.63 square miles, located in Bergen County. It is in affordable housing region 5.

The Petitioner's position has been challenged by the New Jersey Builders Association ("Builders"), and an application that was supported by its own expert J. Creigh Rahenkamp. Builders contends that Petitioner's calculations fail to comply with the statutory methodology framework. In sum, Builders takes the position that the Petitioner's calculations are inconsistent with the FHA by seeking to reduce its Prospective Need without accounting for the impact of that reduction in the regional aspect of the allocation model. Builders seeks the Program to uphold the DCA determinations.

Notably, Fair Share Housing Center (Fair Share) did not file a challenge to the Petitioner's complaint. However, Fair Share calculated a Prospective Need allocation assessment for all 157 towns seeking to deviate from the DCA calculations. Dr. Kinsey prepared on behalf of Fair Share a report dated February 27, 2025 (attached). As stated by Dr Kinsey, the analysis was prepared to avoid dilution of the constitutional housing obligation, and out of fairness to the municipalities that accepted the DCA calculation. Fair Share recalculated the developable land among these 157 municipalities based on valid exclusion criteria and fairly reallocated the remaining Prospective Need of these municipalities. The Kinsey report concludes that the proper Prospective Need allocation for Petitioner is 132. This calculation is 6 units lower than the initial DCA determination of 138.

In accordance with Directive #14-24 and statutory framework, the Program assigned this case to program member Julio L. Mendez A.J.S.C. (ret.) to address the case in accordance with the FHA and ADC Directive. The Program member convened a settlement conference, but when settlement negotiations failed, a session was held in order that each party presented its position. The session was held "on the record". The record that was before the Program member was established based on all filings and available expert reports from Fair Share, Builders and Petitioner. The parties were permitted to present arguments concerning their positions. The Program member has reviewed all filings, legal

briefs and expert reports from all parties and considered all arguments. The following statement of reasons has been prepared to support the recommendation that is made by the Program member to the locally assigned and designated Gloucester County Mount Laurel Judge.

General Overview

The Mount Laurel Doctrine, originating from two landmark decisions by the New Jersey Supreme Court—Mount Laurel I (1975)¹ and Mount Laurel II (1983)²—mandates that municipalities take affirmative action to provide affordable housing opportunities for low- and moderate-income families. The Mount Laurel Doctrine emerged in response to the exclusionary zoning practices of Mount Laurel Township, which sought to prevent the development of affordable housing in its rapidly suburbanizing area. These zoning policies disproportionately impacted Black communities, leading to the 1971 litigation which culminated in the Mount Laurel I decision. This decision prohibited exclusionary zoning and required towns to contribute their “fair share” of regional affordable housing needs. The subsequent Mount Laurel decisions reinforced the mandate, allowing for the enforcement of housing obligations and establishing mechanisms like the "builder’s remedy," where developers could sue municipalities for non-compliance.

¹ S. Burlington County NAACP v. Mt. Laurel, 67 N.J. 151 (1975)

² S. Burlington County NAACP v. Mt. Laurel, 92 N.J. 158 (1983)

In 1985, the state legislature created the Fair Housing Act, which led to the establishment of the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) to manage the implementation of the doctrine. COAH faced challenges and delays in enforcement, particularly in the 2000s, which led to the New Jersey Supreme Court's intervention in Mount Laurel IV (2015). This decision reinforced the doctrine's enforcement, assigning jurisdiction to trial courts and offering municipalities limited immunity if they prepared housing plans under court supervision. By 2024, significant progress had been made, indeed the speed of development has accelerated since Mount Laurel IV. The Mount Laurel Doctrine has remodeled New Jersey's approach to affordable housing. The newly adopted statutory framework provides the roadmap for the next ten-year cycle of affordable housing obligations.

New Statutory Framework

The new framework established under P.L.2024, c.2 signed by Governor Murphy on March 20, 2024, outlines a detailed approach for determining and enforcing municipal affordable housing obligations under the Mount Laurel Doctrine and the FHA.

This law mandates that the New Jersey DCA calculates regional housing needs and municipal obligations in accordance with specific formulas. The primary

statutory objective is to make the affordable housing system more efficient, enforceable, and transparent. The statutory framework made significant amendments to the FHA and related housing laws to strengthen and streamline enforcement of the Mount Laurel Doctrine. These changes are aimed at addressing the state's affordable housing shortage by streamlining the planning and enforcement process while making it more transparent and accessible.

Over the years, the affordable housing process has experienced a seemingly never-ending history of litigation. The revisions are seeking to facilitate the process for municipalities to meet their obligations more effectively and avoid legal challenges and achieve lower costs. Importantly, the law codifies the fair share methodology based on the "Jacobson Methodology" as established by a Mercer County trial court in 2018³ following a lengthy trial that ultimately resulted in standards widely accepted by both housing advocates and municipalities in interpreting the methodology as directed by Mount Laurel IV.

The New Jersey DCA is tasked with making initial calculations of Present Need and Prospective Need as guidance for municipalities. In accordance with the statutory timelines, DCA has published and proposed the Fourth Round (2025-

³ In Re the Mun. of Princeton, 480 N.J. Super. 70 (Law Div. 2018).

2035) fair share obligations for New Jersey's 564 municipalities, including the DCA allocation mentioned above for Petitioner.

This Program member is of the opinion that the new legislative framework implemented by the Judiciary has been immensely successful so far. Of the 564 municipalities in New Jersey, a record **449** municipalities filed declaratory judgement actions pursuant to the new legislation, **157** more than have previously participated in the Mount Laurel process. Impressively, **290** towns accepted DCA calculations of Prospective Need, while **159** towns or about 35%, filed to deviate from the DCA numbers.

Fair Share has filed challenges in 65 of the 159 of those towns, while Builders has challenged all the 159 municipalities seeking to deviate from DCA calculations number. Very importantly, the legislative framework establishes that DCA calculations are non-binding and provides the town calculations with a presumption of validity. DCA acknowledged that its calculations are not perfect, and that often results in land incorrectly included in their calculations. The 159 municipalities seeking an adjustment of DCA allocation reported less developable land than the state's figures, claiming lower housing obligations. Fair Share has found that many of these claims valid.

This Program member has also found that the municipal calculations accurately point out properties in their towns that were incorrectly included in DCA calculations. As discussed in this recommendation, this is true for the case of Petitioner as well.

As highlighted above, Fair Share recalculated the land allocations for these 159 municipalities, ensuring a fair reallocation of the remaining housing needs. In many instances Fair Share accepts DCA numbers, in other cases calculating a higher or lower municipal allocation. Despite the statewide analysis conducted by Fair Share, the agency only challenged 65 municipalities seeking to deviate from the DCA calculations. Significantly, Fair Share did not file a challenge in this case.

On the other hand, Builders has taken the position, as pointed out above, that challenges to the DCA's calculations should all be rejected unless they are accompanied by a regional reallocation proposal. Builders argues that the methodology used by the DCA is consistent and fair on a regional level, and any minor errors should not derail the overall allocation process.

Builders points out that the Petitioner's calculations do not follow the methodology required by the statute. Builders takes the position that when a municipality chooses to present its own calculations as to developable land, it must, consistent with the statutory formula, calculate two numbers: the sum of the

total developable land area in the municipality, and the sum of the total developable land area in the region. As a result, Builders argues that the municipal calculations fail to account with the regional need aspect of the methodology, and should not be considered by the Program. It is important to note that the Builder's expert report of J. Creigh Rahenkamp did not provide detailed property analysis for each town, including in this case. Builders seeks to broadly accept the DCA calculations and point out that towns have their full opportunity to argue the property-by-property analysis at the next stage as part of the adjustment process.

The Petitioner points out that their calculations are consistent with the statute, and that the regional impact of the methodology is constantly changing because of settlements and decisions. The Petitioner also argues that the Builders challenge fails in that it lacks the necessary particularity required by the statutory framework. Regarding this issue, this Program Member concludes that the Builders are without question an interested party and meet the very liberal standing analysis under New Jersey Law. Indeed, Builders has been an active participant in Affordable Housing litigation, including a party in the Princeton case before Judge Jacobson. At the same time, the Program member recognizes that under the amendments to the FHA, the requirement for filing a challenge includes an added element of particularity. Here again, the Program member concludes that while the Builders' expert report of Mr. Rahenkamp is not town specific in its approach, its

reliance on DCA numbers is minimally sufficient to meet the particularity requirements of the statute.

Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program

The law also established a unique Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program. The Judiciary has issued a directive outlining the process for the Program's implementation. The new streamlined process allows municipalities to submit their plans for certification. If disputes arise about the feasibility of these plans, mediation and county-level housing judges will resolve issues to ensure compliance with affordable housing goals.

Directive #14-25 promulgates procedures and guidelines implementing the Affordable Housing Alternate Dispute Resolution Program ("Program") created by L. 2024, c. 2. This law amended N.J.S.A. 52:27D-302, the Fair Housing Act (FHA), abolished the Council on Affordable Housing (COAH), and created a new process for municipalities to come into constitutional compliance with their affordable housing obligations. The new law established the Program within the Judiciary for the purpose of resolving disputes associated with the FHA.

In furtherance of that end, the Administrative Director of the Courts is authorized to establish guidelines for the resolution of such matters, including the appointment of members, qualified experts, and staff. The May 17, 2024, Notice

to the Bar announced the Administrative Director's appointment of members of the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program, consisting of retired judges, including a chairperson. Any changes in the Program membership will similarly be announced by a notice to the bar. This member of the Program is one of six currently handling all 159 cases involving multiple challenges. The Program has successfully heard all 159 challenges in the very narrow 30-day statutory timeline, achieving a settlement in **113** cases, which represents over 70% of the cases.

Petitioner and Builders did not settle the allocation dispute. The Program is now tasked with making a recommendation regarding allocation of the Prospective Need dispute, as outlined in this statement of reasons.

Fourth Round Model (2025-2035)

The Fourth Round Model of affordable housing obligations in New Jersey, as stipulated by the 2024 amendments to the Fair Housing Act, reflects an effort by the legislature to streamline the process and minimize disputes. These amendments offer municipalities the opportunity to calculate their own prospective housing needs for the 2025-2035 period. However, the **Act acknowledges that no model is perfect, and thus disputes may arise.**

The law created a dispute resolution program, anticipating minimal challenges to the calculations. Municipalities can challenge the state's calculations

within a short, 30-day dispute resolution period. While the legislative intent is to minimize disputes, the land capacity factor has generated challenges, as some municipalities contest their obligations based on land use and development potential.

In other words, **the Program was tasked with resolving affordable housing allocation disputes in 30 days, which in the past often resulted in many years of litigation.** An immense task, and an amazing outcome so far.

Key aspects of the model revolve around determining the regional and municipal obligations based on several factors, including the change in household numbers, economic capacity, income, and land capacity. The land capacity factor has generated significant challenges from municipalities due to its broad approach to defining developable land.

The DCA developed its land capacity factor based on available land data, but this methodology has been criticized for being overly general, especially by municipalities that conducted parcel-by-parcel reviews to identify discrepancies. It is important to note that DCA acknowledges that their calculations are not perfect, and that at times properties that were incorrectly included, or at times excluded

Indeed, the property-by-property analysis was conducted by Petitioner in this case. The town obtained its own expert planner and prepared a comprehensive

report. The town highlights properties that were incorrectly included in the DCA calculation. This town is 2.63 square miles with very reduced available developable land.

In the Kinsey report, Fair Share has also acknowledged that the DCA's approach has errors, but advocates for a more refined methodology that allows for the exclusion of certain lands from the developable land calculation if they can be proven to be unsuitable for development, such as flood zones, wetlands, steep slopes, and properties with deed restrictions. This is precisely the basis for reduction of allocation advanced by the towns. Fair Share's position goes one step further and it allows municipalities to challenge the DCA's calculations and request the exclusion of certain lands from their developable land estimates. If these exclusions are accepted, Fair Share proposes that the resulting "lost units" be reallocated to other municipalities within the region. While this idea is intriguing, it raises concerns about statutory authority, as the legislature did not explicitly authorize such a reallocation in the statute.

Overall, this member is impressed with the position taken by Fair Share, and their effort to provide a more detailed town by town analysis, as well as regional analysis. Unfortunately, Fair Share was not involved in this case.

In the opinion of this Program member, the legislative framework anticipated potential issues and errors with DCA initial calculations. That is the reason that DCA numbers are non-binding, and the towns are provided with an opportunity to challenge the DCA numbers. At the same time, the town calculations are provided at the outset with a presumption of validity.

The overall framework provides the towns with an opportunity to seek deviation from DCA numbers, and it established a process to mediate and resolve disputes in a streamlined and accelerated process. One of the paramount principles of the new statutory framework is to provide towns with a fair and streamlined process to resolve allocation issues.

To analyze municipal claims on developable land, it is essential to understand the statutory basis for the Land Capacity Factor and its application. The FHA stipulates that the Land Capacity Factor is determined by estimating the area of developable land that may accommodate development, using specific state and federal data sources. DCA identified vacant, developable land using these sources, and excluded lands that do not meet the criteria, such as preserved open space, farmland, and wetlands. However, as highlighted in this statement of reasons, often properties were included in DCA calculations that were plainly not developable.

Legislative Objective

The Program member also points out that if the Builders' position is accepted, nearly all towns' positions will get rejected. As a result, rendering the Program process to achieve fair resolutions as established by the legislature somewhat meaningless. The legislature intended to provide the towns with a fair process to highlight properties that were incorrectly added to the DCA calculations and to have meaningful mediation of the disputes. The success of the mediation process as highlighted above is impressive. With the assistance of the Program, 113 out of 159 towns have settled disputes with Fair Share and Builders. The remaining towns that proceeded to a session are deserving of a careful assessment by the Program.

This Program member is less impressed with the Builders approach at this allocation stage. Builders position increases a town's burden significantly by requiring a calculation of regional allocation, at a time that that regional number is constantly shifting with changes in allocations taking place because of settlements and session decisions.

This member concludes that the Program is designed to give towns an opportunity to have a fair hearing at this stage of the proceedings and not to automatically deny their arguments, particularly for towns that present compelling

evidence to support their position. Once all allocations are established, a more thoughtful approach to regional impact may be determined. This does not mean that towns will get all they want. In fact, this member has in some cases adopted DCA calculations.

Ultimately, the Program is designed to address and resolve disagreements between municipalities and the DCA. This is precisely what the legislative framework intended. In this context, one critical issue is whether the land capacity factor, as calculated by the DCA, accurately reflects the available land for development. And in the case of Petitioner, it does not.

This Program member recommends adjusting the Prospective Need by reducing the land considered developable, in line with proven exclusions, particularly for properties where the Petitioner presents compelling evidence that the property was incorrectly included in the DCA methodology. However, this recommendation avoids adopting the reallocation formula due to concerns about its legal grounding and for all reasons expressed in this statement of reasons.

The final determination, including specific acreage reductions, will be based on an assessment of the DCA's land capacity figures, with exclusions clearly demonstrated by municipalities. This approach ensures that disputes are addressed fairly while respecting the statutory framework set by the legislature.

The overall goal of the new framework fully anticipates an opportunity for municipalities to seek modifications from DCA allocation numbers, particularly when towns present compelling evidence that the land was incorrectly included by DCA calculations. Indeed, The FHA marks a new era of streamlining of the process, transparency and collaboration and cost savings in affordable housing planning across New Jersey.

Recommendation of Special Adjudicator

In each case the AOC appointed an independent special adjudicator to assist the program. In this case, Frank Banisch was appointed to work closely with the Program. Adjudicator Banisch brings superb knowledge and perspective to the process. This Program member finds him credible, objective, experienced and knowledgeable regarding all issues of affordable housing, and particularly as it relates to Petitioner. He prepared a report and recommendation to the Program in this case (attached). This Program member gives his opinion substantial weight in arriving at the allocation recommendation to the Mount Laurel Judge.

In this case, the DCA's determination of 137 of Present Need is accepted by both parties and is adopted, and the only issue is the dispute regarding Prospective Need. Regarding Prospective Need, the Special Adjudicator recommended that the Prospective Need for Petitioner be set at a range of between 119 to 125.

The recommendation contained in the report of Special Adjudicator Banisch is as follows:

The only element of the DCA Report that Park Ridge challenged is the land capacity factor (LCF), not the calculations related to the income capacity factor and the nonresidential valuation factor. Of the three factors, LCF was the locally variable factor that municipalities frequently challenged based on more accurate data. The FHA states the LCF shall be determined by estimating the area of developable land in the municipality's boundaries and regional boundaries that may accommodate development through the use of the "land use / land cover data" most recently published by the Department of Environmental Protection, data from the American Community Survey and Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy dataset thereof, MOD-IV Property Tax List data from the Division of Taxation in the Department of the Treasury, and construction permit data from the Department of Community Affairs, and weighing such land based on the planning area type in which such land is located.

The DCA Report identified 4.08 acres in the westernmost corner of the Borough as developable, resulting in a LCF of 0.21% of Housing Region 1. As noted in the Planning Report of Joseph Burgis AICP, PP and Robyn Welch AICP, PP, none of these 4 acres should have been included. These polygons are a series of remnant vegetated areas on a site where Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC has received site plan approval for a Round 3 inclusionary development. FSHC agreed with these exclusions.

As a result, the Borough's regional LCF percentage is reduced from 0.21% to 0%. Correcting for this value in the DCA workbook results in the recalculation of the regional land capacity from 0.21% to 0.0%. When the corrected LCF acreage is input in the DCA workbook, the resulting calculation yields a total Round 4 obligation of 119 units for the Borough= as seen below.

Without identifying any errors in the Borough's exclusions from the DCA calculation of LCF, NJBA has opined that the Township's correction of the

DCA data violates the requirements of the FHA as does the resulting reduction in the Borough's Prospective Need in the official DCA workbook. However, the FHA provides municipalities with a presumption of validity in their calculation of Prospective Need, if determined in accordance with the FHA (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304.2.6, 304.2.7). Park Ridge determined its obligation by relying upon the official DCA workbook to make the calculation.

In summary, Park Ridge applied the proper exclusions to demonstrate a LCF of 0.0% of the region, yielding a municipal fourth round obligation of 119 pursuant to the official DCA workbook. FSHC concurred with the Borough's exclusions, which the NJBA did not prepare any similar analysis. Based on my review, I recommend that the Borough's Petitioner's Prospective Need obligation for the period 7-1-2025 to 7-1-2035 should be set between 119 and 125 affordable units.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This matter concerns the Fourth Round Affordable Housing obligations for Petitioner under the amended New Jersey FHA. The dispute arises due to Petitioner's challenge to the Prospective Need figure proposed by the DCA for the Fourth Round, which it asserts should be reduced based on land capacity factors.

The issues were presented in a complaint filed by the Petitioner contesting the DCA's allocation of a 138-unit Prospective Need and seeking to reduce the allocation to 119 units. The Present Need allocation is not an issue. As pointed out above, the Fair Share Kinsey report recalculated the Petitioner's Prospective Need at 132.

The dispute is based on an analysis of the land capacity factor used by DCA, which Petitioner claims overstates its development capacity. Builders opposes this challenge, asserting that any reduction in the Petitioner's Prospective Need must be matched by an increase in the allocation of Prospective Need to other municipalities within the same housing region, thereby maintaining regional fairness. For the reasons outlined above, this member is not persuaded by that position.

The Administrative Director appointed competent planning experts to provide guidance and expert analysis to the Program. The special adjudicators are often quite familiar with the assigned towns. They provide an invaluable, independent and competent expertise to the Program.

The Program member is not bound by the recommendation of special adjudicator. Here, however, the Program member is very impressed with Special Adjudicator Banisch and gives substantial weight to his recommendation. Special Adjudicator Banisch performed an excellent job, assessing each property the town presented as incorrectly included in the DCA calculation.

The core issue revolves around the accurate calculation of the Land Capacity Factor, which estimates available land for affordable housing. The statute requires using five state and federal data sources to determine developable land, and

exclusions are possible with demonstrable proof (e.g., landlocked parcels, environmental restrictions). The ongoing challenge is balancing accurate land assessments with the need to meet regional housing obligations. Here, the Petitioner presented compelling evidence that properties were incorrectly included in DCA calculations.

There is a particular property, included in the DCA Report that identified 4.08 acres located in the westernmost corner of the Petitioner as developable, resulting in a LCF of 0.21% of Housing Region 1. As noted in the Planning Report of Joseph H. Burgis that was prepared on behalf of the Petitioner, none of these 4 acres should have been included. These polygons are a series of remnant vegetated areas on a site where Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC has received site plan approval for a Round 3 inclusionary development. Fair Share agreed with these exclusions.

As this Program member has outlined in detail in the statement of reasons for this decision, the legislative objective of a fair, and streamlined mediation process is paramount. Providing towns at this stage with a way of resolving disputes and correcting errors in the DCA calculations is a primary purpose of the statutory framework.

There is no question that Petitioner has pointed out proprieties incorrectly included by DCA calculations. The DCA's calculation of Prospective Need at 138 and Petitioner's calculation of Prospective Need at 119 are 19 units apart. The Special Adjudicator recommends a range of 119 to 125. Importantly, Petitioner will have an opportunity to seek additional adjustments at the next stage of the process.

For all reasons outlined in this decision, the Program recommends a Prospective Need allocation of **124** which is within the range recommended by the Special Adjudicator.

Respectfully submitted, Judge Julio L. Mendez, retired

B A N I S C H
A S S O C I A T E S, I N C.

Planning and Design

April 9, 2025

Hon. Julio Mendez
Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program
Richard J. Hughes Justice Complex
PO Box 037
Trenton, NJ 08625

Re: In the Matter of the Application of the Borough of Park Ridge
Docket # Ber-L 723-25

Dear Judge Mendez,

This report has been prepared at your request in my capacity as Special Adjudicator for Park Ridge in the Affordable Housing Dispute Resolution Program (AHDRP).

As required by the Amended Fair Housing Act (FHA) (P.L. 2024, C. 2), the NJ Department of Community Affairs (DCA) developed estimates of municipal affordable housing obligations based on the Jacobson methodology including assumptions about developable lands. Municipalities were afforded the opportunity to either agree with the DCA estimate or develop their own calculation of their affordable housing fair share obligation.

Park Ridge adopted the binding resolution required by the FHA on January 28, 2025, prior to the January 31, 2025 deadline, agreeing with the DCA estimate of present need (137) but declaring their fourth round affordable housing obligation to be 119 units, providing the Borough's estimate of need after correcting the DCA land capacity factor. Fair Share agreed with the Park Ridge about the exclusions related to DCA's assumptions about land capacity on an approved inclusionary housing site.

The FHA requires that challengers to the municipal estimate of Round 4 prospective need obligation indicate with particularity where they disagree with municipal LCF exclusions. Fair Share Housing Center, which issued a workbook confirming its LCF calculations, did not challenge Park Ridge's exclusions, but rather FSHC concurred.

The New Jersey Builder's Association (NJBA) submitted an objection to the Township's fourth round present need and prospective need calculations on March 27, 2025 which did not include such critical assessment. Rather, the NJBA provided the February 25, 2025 report by Creigh Rahenkamp, PP, detailing methodological concerns set forth in the objection. NJBA and Park Ridge participated in a settlement conference/session on March 28.

Fourth Round Present Need

Park Ridge accepts the 137-unit fourth round present need obligation.

111 Main Street, Flemington, NJ 08822

908-782-0835/908-782-7636 (fax) frankbanisch@banisch.com

Fourth Round Prospective Need

The only element of the DCA Report that Park Ridge challenged is the land capacity factor (LCF), not the calculations related to the income capacity factor and the nonresidential valuation factor. Of the three factors, LCF was the locally variable factor that municipalities frequently challenged based on more accurate data. The FHA states the LCF shall be *determined by estimating the area of developable land in the municipality's boundaries and regional boundaries that may accommodate development through the use of the "land use / land cover data" most recently published by the Department of Environmental Protection, data from the American Community Survey and Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy dataset thereof, MOD-IV Property Tax List data from the Division of Taxation in the Department of the Treasury, and construction permit data from the Department of Community Affairs, and weighing such land based on the planning area type in which such land is located.*

The DCA Report identified 4.08 acres in the westernmost corner of the Borough as developable, resulting in a LCF of 0.21% of Housing Region 1. As noted in the Planning Report of Joseph Burgis AICP, PP and Robyn Welch AICP, PP, none of these 4 acres should have been included. These polygons are a series of remnant vegetated areas on a site where Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC has received site plan approval for a Round 3 inclusionary development. FSHC agreed with these exclusions.

As a result, the Borough's regional LCF percentage is reduced from 0.21% to 0%. Correcting for this value in the DCA workbook results in the recalculation of the regional land capacity from 0.21% to 0.0%. When the corrected LCF acreage is input in the DCA workbook, the resulting calculation yields a total Round 4 obligation of 119 units for the Borough.

Without identifying any errors in the Borough's exclusions from the DCA calculation of LCF, NJBA has opined that the Township's correction of the DCA data violates the requirements of the FHA as does the resulting reduction in the Borough's prospective need in the official DCA workbook. However, the FHA provides municipalities with a presumption of validity in their calculation of prospective need, if determined in accordance with the FHA (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-304.2.6, 304.2.7). Park Ridge determined its obligation by relying upon the official DCA workbook to make the calculation.

In summary, Park Ridge applied the proper exclusions to demonstrate a LCF of 0.0% of the region, yielding a municipal fourth round obligation of 119 pursuant to the official DCA workbook. FSHC concurred with the Borough's exclusions, which the NJBA did not prepare any similar analysis. Based on my review, I recommend that the Borough's municipal prospective need obligation for the period 7-1-2025 to 7-1-2035 should be set between 119 and 125 affordable units.

Respectfully,



Frank Banisch, PP, AICP
Special Adjudicator

Appendix

C Structural Conditions Survey and Calculation of Adjusted Present Need

EXTERIOR HOUSING SURVEY

Municipality: _____ Park Ridge Borough _____

County: _____ Bergen _____

Date of Survey: _____ 3/3/2025 _____

Performed By: _____ Keith Dalton _____

Title: _____ Construction Official _____

Areas of municipality surveyed:

_____ Entire Borough

Areas of municipality not surveyed:

_____ N/A _____

Reason(s) for not surveying these areas:

_____ N/A _____

The Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) has devised this exterior housing survey as an alternative mechanism to present data to COAH to estimate the rehabilitation need in a municipality. The survey requires an exterior inspection to determine if a housing unit is substandard. COAH then uses Census data to estimate the number of substandard units occupied by low- or moderate-income households.

In developing the exterior survey, COAH has divided the exterior structure of a building into six components: (1) foundation; (2) weatherization; (3) roof and chimney; (4) eaves, soffits, gutters, leaders; (5) rails, steps, stairs, porch; and (6) fire escape. Weatherization, foundation and roof and chimney are considered major systems. Weatherization means building insulation (for attic, exterior walls and crawl space), siding to improve energy efficiency, replacement storm windows, replacement storm doors, replacement windows and replacement doors. The remaining components are considered minor systems.

If one major system is determined to be in need of repair, the structure and all housing units within it are considered substandard. If two or more minor systems are determined to be in need of repair, the structure and all the units within the structure are considered substandard.

The survey can be conducted from the street, and, in most cases, there will be no need to step onto the property. A view of the front of the structure, its two sides (one side if it is semi-detached) and a portion of the roof should provide sufficient information to complete the survey. The person conducting the survey shall indicate on the survey form if a system is in need of repair. Tenure of Units should indicate whether the unit is an owner-occupied, rental or mixed-use unit.

The exterior housing survey shall be performed by individuals who are experienced in conducting building and/or housing inspections. COAH staff will review all surveys in accordance with COAH criteria and for accuracy of completeness and may at its discretion, request additional information.

The exterior survey report should yield an estimate of substandard units within the municipality. To estimate the number of substandard units occupied by low- and moderate-income households, the Council will rely on Census information that is available from the Public Use Micro-Data Sample (PUMS). This data allows COAH to match household income to the Census information COAH uses to estimate the rehabilitation need. The PUMS data has been configured to COAH regions to determine regional percentages used to calculate the rehabilitation share in each municipality by applying the "Low-Moderate Income Share" number found in Appendix B of N.J.A.C. 5:97.

As an example, let us assume that a municipality in Atlantic County conducts an exterior survey and finds 100 substandard units. The "Low-Moderate Income Share" for Atlantic County is .715. Multiplying 100 by .715 would result in 72 low- or moderate-income households living in substandard housing units.

DEFINITIONS FOR EXTERIOR HOUSING

The following relates to structural components of a residential building. Refer to the attached diagram for component identification.

In need of repair – The condition of the component requires immediate maintenance, repair or replacement. Further deterioration may adversely affect other exterior and/or interior components.

Examples:

Foundation (major system) – The component needs re-pointing, replacement of some stones, brick or blocks or some rebuilding due to: loose, broken or missing bricks or block; missing mortar; excessive cracks in the masonry; deterioration of the masonry surface; parget pulling away; sinking; or being out-of-plumb.

Siding and Walls (major system)

Brick – The component needs repainting, spot replacement, reconstruction, etc. due to: sagging; bowing; being out-of-plumb; excessive cracks in the masonry; missing bricks or missing mortar.

Stucco – The component needs patching, spot replacement, or reconstruction and painting due to deteriorated surface, cracks, holes, water damage, or bowing.

Wood – The component needs patching, spot replacement, or reconstruction and painting due to sagging, bowing, being out-of-plumb, rot, water damage, loose boards, cracked or broken boards.

Siding – The component needs spot, area or total replacement due to broken or missing siding.

Weatherization - Windows and Doors and Related Trim (major system) – The component needs putty or new glass. Other indicators of a system in need of repair include: missing or broken trim; missing or broken sill; a frame or sash out of square; rotted wood; and/or inoperable windows.

Doors – Indicators of a system in need of repair include: broken glass; a frame out of square; missing or broken trims; interior grade doors being used as exterior doors; rotted wood.

Roof and Chimney (major system)

Roof – The component needs moderate scattered shingle replacement, area replacement or total replacement due to: sagging; exposed paper or sheathing; hole(s); curling of shingles; blistering of rolled roofing; cracked shingles; missing shingles; rusted metal roof; and/or leakage.

Chimney – The component needs partial or total reconstruction due to: sinking; being out-of-plumb; excessive cracks; loose, broken or missing bricks; missing mortar; deteriorated surface and/or lack of a flue.

Eaves, Soffits, Gutters, Leaders (minor system) – Indicators of a system in need of repair include: broken or hanging sections; holes, rot leakage and/or missing sections, significant deterioration; or animal infestation.

Handrails, Steps, Stairs, Porch (minor system) – The components need replacement of boards, risers, joists, rafters, and/or beams, etc. due to: sagging; broken or unsound supports; a sinking or structurally unsound foundation; broken, missing or rotted boards; missing or unsound railings or balusters; broken or missing trim; missing mortar in the masonry or the masonry being generally deteriorated; excessive cracks in the masonry; or worn steps.

Fire Escape (minor system) – The component needs significant physical repairs or replacement and/or is not fully operational.

* Excessive cracks can mean multiple cracks affecting structural integrity or a crack or cracks as wide as ¼ inch.

EXTERIOR HOUSING SURVEY

MUNICIPALITY Park Ridge COUNTY Bergen

DATE 3/3/2025

| Street Address | Block/Lot | Number of Dwelling Units | Tenure of Units i.e. owner occupied/ rental/ mixed occupancy | Year Built | MAJOR SYSTEMS | | | MINOR SYSTEMS | | | Structure In Need of Repair (Mark "Yes" or "No") | If Yes, Provide Details |
|-------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--|------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Foundation | Weatherization | | Eaves/Soffits/ Gutters/Leader | Rails/Stairs/St eps/Porch | Fire Escape | | |
| | | | | | | Siding and Walls | Windows and Doors | | | | | |
| 20 Ridge Ave | 1104/18 | 2 | Rental | 1898 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 31 Lakeview Ave | 1103/12 | 3 | Rental | 1922 | | | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 58 Park Ave | 1603/4 | 2 | Rental | 1900 | | | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 140 Park Ave | 1912/1 | 2 | Rental | 1910 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 32 Chestnut Ave | 1909/6 | 1 | O.O. | 1948 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 52 Chestnut Ave | 1909/10 | 1 | O.O. | 1920 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 94 Rivervale Road | 2007/3 | 1 | O.O. | 1860 | | X | X | X | X | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 87 Chestnut Ave | 2004/4 | 1 | O.O. | 1962 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 259 Capri Terrace | 2411/13 | 1 | O.O. | 1960 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 13 Harding Court | 2407/8 | 1 | O.O. | 1959 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 12 Grobel Place | 2404/13 | 1 | O.O. | 1959 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 4 Fairview Court | 2303/24 | 1 | O.O. | 1954 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |
| 7 Fairview Court | 2303/27 | 1 | O.O. | 1954 | | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior Maintenance and repairs req. |

I verify that I have conducted this exterior housing survey according to COAH criteria

Signature: 

Print Name and Title: Keith Dalton

Construction Official

EXTERIOR HOUSING SURVEY

MUNICIPALITY Park Ridge

COUNTY _____

Belgen

DATE _____

3/3/2025

| Street Address | Block/Lot | Number of Dwelling Units | Tenure of Units i.e. owner occupied/ rental/ mixed occupancy | Year Built | MAJOR SYSTEMS | | | MINOR SYSTEMS | | | | Structure In Need of Repair (Mark "Yes" or "No") | If Yes, Provide Details |
|-------------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--|------------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Foundation | Weatherization | | Roof and Chimney | Eaves/Soffits/ Gutters/Leader | Rails/Stairs/St eps/Porch | Fire Escape | | |
| | | | | | | Siding and Walls | Windows and Doors | | | | | | |
| 159 Pascack Road | 1501/8 | 1 | Rental | 1955 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 121 Pascack Road | 1502/7 | 3 | Rental | 1895 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 125 Pascack Road | 1502/6 | 3 | Rental | 1895 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 86 Pascack Road | 1203/14 | 2 | Rental | 1910 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 61 Fremont Ave | 1312/2 | 2 | Rental | 1928 | X | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 97 North Fifth Street | 608/12 | 1 | O.O. | 1957 | X | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 182 Grand Avenue | 603/19 | 1 | Rental | 1954 | X | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 46 Midland Avenue | 1102/13 | 1 | Rental | 1900 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 42 Randolph Street | 1107/13 | 1 | Rental | 1947 | X | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 125 Colony Avenue | 709/3 | 1 | O.O. | 1900 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 127 Colony Avenue | 709/2 | 1 | O.O. | 1920 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 52 Spring Valley Avenue | 902/6 | 1 | O.O. | 1929 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 38 Spring Valley Avenue | 902/5 | 1 | Rental | 1948 | X | X | X | X | X | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |

I verify that I have conducted this exterior housing survey according to COAH criteria

Signature: 

Print Name and Title: Keith Dalton

Construction Official

EXTERIOR HOUSING SURVEY

MUNICIPALITY Park Ridge COUNTY Bergen

DATE 3/3/2025

| Street Address | Block/Lot | Number of Dwelling Units | Tenure of Units i.e. owner occupied/ rental/ mixed occupancy | Year Built | MAJOR SYSTEMS | | | | MINOR SYSTEMS | | | Structure In Need of Repair (Mark "Yes" or "No") | If Yes, Provide Details |
|----------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--|------------|--|------------------|-------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | One major system is required to indicate that the structure is in need of repair | | | | Two minor systems are required to indicate that the structure is in need of repair | | | | |
| | | | | | Foundation | Siding and Walls | Windows and Doors | Roof and Chimney | Eaves/Soffits/Gutters/Leader | Rails/Stairs/Steps/Porch | Fire Escape | | |
| 15 Fairview Avenue | 2303/30 | 1 | O.O. | 1954 | | X | | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 2 Hinson Place | 2208/8 | 1 | O.O. | 1958 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 4 Hiron Place | 2208/9 | 1 | O.O. | 1958 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 57-3 Fairview Avenue | 2207/13 | 1 | O.O. | 1920 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 28 Henry Avenue | 2205/7 | 1 | O.O. | 1959 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 80 Fairview Avenue | 2209/2 | 1 | O.O. | 1919 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 71 Fairview Avenue | 2207/7 | 1 | O.O. | 1926 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 54 Fairview Avenue | 2209/8 | 1 | O.O. | 1941 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 257 Rock Avenue | 2303/17 | 1 | O.O. | 1954 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 235 Rock Avenue | 2303/12 | 1 | O.O. | 1954 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 22 Clifford Drive | 2303/57 | 1 | O.O. | 1974 | | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |

Verify that I have conducted this exterior housing survey according to COAH criteria

Signature: 

Print Name and Title: Keith Dalton

Construction Official

EXTERIOR HOUSING SURVEY

MUNICIPALITY Park Ridge

COUNTY _____

Bergen

DATE 3/3/2025

| Street Address | Block/Lot | Number of Dwelling Units | Tenure of Units i.e. owner occupied/ rental/ mixed occupancy | Year Built | MAJOR SYSTEMS One major system is required to indicate that the structure is in need of repair | | | | MINOR SYSTEMS Two minor systems are required to indicate that the structure is in need of repair | | | Structure in Need of Repair (Mark "Yes" or "No") | If Yes, Provide Details |
|--------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--|------------|---|------------------|-------------------|------------------|---|---------------------------|-------------|--|---------------------------------------|
| | | | | | Weatherization | | | | Eaves/Soffits/ Gutters/Leader | Rails/Stairs/St eps/Porch | Fire Escape | | |
| | | | | | Foundation | Siding and Walls | Windows and Doors | Roof and Chimney | | | | | |
| 81 Lawn St | 1011/3 | 1 | O.O. | UNK | X | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 68 Louville Avenue | 716/3 | 1 | O.O. | 1910 | X | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 26 Second Street | 806/5 | 1 | O.O. | 1962 | X | X | | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| 80 Second Street | 901/18 | 1 | O.O. | 1953 | X | X | X | X | | | | Yes | Exterior maintenance and repairs req. |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

I verify that I have conducted this exterior housing survey according to COAH criteria

Signature: 

Print Name and Title: Keith Dalton

Construction Official

Borough of Park Ridge

Calculation of Estimated Number of Substandard Units Occupied by Low/Mod Income Households (Using CHAS Data & DCA's Fourth Round Calculation Workbook, as Applied to Results of Borough's Structural Conditions Survey)

1. Park Ridge's Present Need per DCA = 137 (Tab D, Column P)
 - a. 137 is comprised of:
 - i. 2 units LMI & Overcrowded (Tab D, Column N).
 - ii. 135 units LMI & Lacking Complete Plumbing or Kitchen (Tab D, Column O).
 - b. The 2-unit component was determined by multiplying 19 Overcrowded Units (Tab D, Column L) by 10% (LMI % of Overcrowded Housing Units per CHAS) (Tab D, Column M).
 - c. The 135-unit component was determined by multiplying 155 Units Lacking Complete Plumbing or Kitchen (Tab H, Column E) by 87.1% (LMI % of Housing Lacking Complete Plumbing or Kitchen Facilities per CHAS) (Tab H, Column G).
2. Results of Structural Conditions Survey per Park Ridge Construction Official = 52
3. To then determine how many of these substandard units are occupied by LMI households:
 - a. First, determine the proportion assumed to represent "overcrowded" units and the proportion assumed to represent "lacking complete plumbing and kitchen" units:
 - i. $2/137 = 1.46\% \rightarrow 52 \times 1.46\% = 0.76$ unit (represents overcrowded).
 - ii. $135/137 = 98.54\% \rightarrow 52 \times 98.54\% = 51.24$ units (represents lacking complete plumbing and kitchen units).
 - b. Second, multiply each component by the LMI% per CHAS data:
 - i. $0.76 \text{ unit} \times 10\%$ (Tab D, Column M) = 0.076
 - ii. $51.24 \text{ units} \times 87.1\%$ (Tab H, Column G) = 44.63
 - c. Last, add these two components together:
 - i. $44.63 + 0.076 = 44.71$ units (rounded up = 45 units)
4. Therefore, the survey results indicate that 45 low- or moderate-income households are living in substandard housing units in Park Ridge. The Borough's Present Need is therefore estimated to be 45 units.

Appendix

D Bear's Nest Survey and NJDEP Communications

Robyn Welch

To: Robyn Welch
Subject: FW: Park Ridge

From: Magdalena Giandomenico <mgiandomenico@parkridgeboro.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 10:37 AM
To: Robyn Welch <rw@burgis.com>
Cc: Keith Misciagna <kmisciagna@parkridgeboro.com>
Subject: FW: Park Ridge

From: Scott Reynolds <sreynolds@reynolds-lawgroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2025 10:31 AM
To: Magdalena Giandomenico <mgiandomenico@parkridgeboro.com>
Subject: FW: Park Ridge

Maggie:

Bear's Nest proceeded through an informal review process. I do not believe that a formal decision was made on NJDEP letterhead. Below is the last email I received in which the NJDEP expressed its view that the project cannot be approved. I do not have anything else.

Best,

Scott



Scott E. Reynolds
Reynolds Law Group LLC
233 Mt. Airy Road, Suite 100
PMB 8491
Basking Ridge, NJ 07920
t: 908.367.9060
f: 908.367.9062
e: sreynolds@reynolds-lawgroup.com
w: www.reynolds-lawgroup.com

Confidentiality Notice: This e-mail contains information that is privileged and confidential and subject to legal restrictions and penalties regarding its unauthorized disclosure or other use. You are prohibited from copying, distributing or otherwise using this information if you are not the intended recipient. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail and delete this e-mail and all attachments from your system. Thank you.

From: Brett Tanzman <BrettT@wilf-law.com>
Date: Wednesday, December 6, 2023 at 2:25 PM
To: Scott Reynolds <sreynolds@reynolds-lawgroup.com>
Subject: FW: Park Ridge

Scott – closing the loop with you on this. I'm available later this week to chat. Hope you are doing well.

Sincerely,

Brett

From: Anderson, Ryan [DEP] <Ryan.Anderson@dep.nj.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 11, 2023 9:12 AM
To: Michael J. Gross <MGross@ghclaw.com>
Cc: Brett Tanzman <BrettT@wilf-law.com>; John Cote <JCote@langan.com>
Subject: RE: Park Ridge

Mike
Becky and I discussed. This design is still a significant amount of disturbance....even with a wall. A large portion of the disturbance is for the parking lot (we wouldn't necessarily consider that an access drive). There is no way to put the parking under the building? I think we were suggesting that the only way we might be able to support the project was if the development occupied as much of the transition area on north and south of sites as possible with an access road or walkway connecting those two points. I don't see how we could support this design. I just think this site is way too encumbered for a development of this intensity. And this isn't even taking into consideration potential FHA issues (not sure where the flood hazard area is located or how large the RZ might be) and T&E concerns (wetlands onsite were intermediate but wetlands to the north are exceptional so any impacts would still have to be analyzed).

Ryan J. Anderson (he/him)
Manager

NJ Department of Environmental Protection
Division of Land Resource Protection (DLRP)
Bureau of Freshwater Wetland and Highlands Permitting
501 East State Street, Trenton, NJ 08625
ryan.anderson@dep.nj.gov
T (609) 940-4686

From: Michael J. Gross <MGross@ghclaw.com>
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2023 3:24 PM
To: Anderson, Ryan [DEP] <Ryan.Anderson@dep.nj.gov>
Cc: Brett Tanzman <BrettT@wilf-law.com>; John Cote <JCote@langan.com>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] FW: Park Ridge

Ryan,
If you recall we had a Teams meeting on January 10 at which time we presented plans that had residential units partially located in the freshwater wetlands. These plans were for an all affordable development to be constructed by United Way of Bergen County as part of Park Ridge's affordable housing plan. Your reaction was that you could not see permitting this development with those disturbances in freshwater wetlands. You indicated that if all of the impacts, except for access, were largely within the freshwater wetlands transition area, you could work with us. We went back and redesigned the development so that only the access encroaches on freshwater wetlands and that is the attachment to this email. The redesign results in a reduction to only 15 units of housing, but is still an important part of Park Ridge's affordable housing obligation.

We would greatly appreciate it if you could review this revised plan and advise whether you believe it is approvable with the understanding that a decision on a permit application would still be dependent on compliance with the relevant DEP freshwater wetlands regulations.

I will be on vacation until October 4, so please copy Brett and John on any response.
Thanks for your attention to this email.

Mike Gross

Michael J. Gross, Esq.

Co-Managing Shareholder | **Giordano, Halleran & Ciesla, PC**

Co-Chair of the Environmental Law Department

125 Half Mile Road, Suite 300 | Red Bank, NJ 07701

P: (732) 219-5486 | F: (732) 224-6599

E: mgross@ghclaw.com

[website](#) | [bio](#)

Appendix


- E Third Round Vacant Land Adjustment Map and Table (Updated to Remove Development Potential from Bear's Nest site)

BURGIS ASSOCIATES, INC.
 COMMUNITY PLANNING
 LAND DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN
 LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

25 Westwood Avenue
 Westwood, New Jersey 07081
 P: 201.666.1861
 F: 201.666.2222

Project Title:
 2018 Housing Element
 & Fair Share Plan

BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE
 BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY



Legend

Municipal Boundaries
 - Park Ridge (dashed line)

Parcel Categories
 - Not Vacant or Redevelopable (white)
 - Vacant or Redevelopable Parcel (light gray)

Water Features
 - Lake/Pond (blue)
 - Stream/River (light blue)

Wetlands
 - Wetland 50ft Buffer (yellow-green)
 - C1 Streams (yellow)
 - C1 Stream 300ft Buffer (orange)
 - 100 Year Floodplain (light green)

Slopes
 - Less than 15% (light brown)
 - 15% or Greater (dark brown)

| Sheet | Description | Date | Drawn By |
|-------|-------------|------|----------|
| | | | |

Vacant Land Assessment


Graphic Scale
 0 270 540 1,080 Feet

JOSEPH H. BURGIS ACP
 PROFESSIONAL PLANNER
 NEW JERSEY LIC. NO. 2450

Project No. 18103
 Sheet No. 1-11
 Date: 01/21/25
 Drawn: RWK
 Scale: 1" = 150'

Drawn Via
 Date: 1/21/25

THIS DOCUMENT IS THE PROPERTY OF BURGIS ASSOCIATES, INC. AND IS NOT TO BE REPRODUCED.



Source 1: Municipal boundary data from NJDEP.
 Source 2: Parcel data from NJDEP.
 Source 3: Parcel data from NJEN, Wyckhous, Bergen County, with updates from Burgis Associates, Inc. through January 2018.
 Source 4: Land use data from Borough of Park Ridge Tax Records, as of 1/26/18.
 Source 5: Flood data based on preliminary DFRM data from FEMA, 2015.
 Source 6: Wetlands from NJDEP based on Land Use Land Cover 2012 data.
 Source 7: Steep slopes data from Burgis Associates, Inc. calculated from NJDEP DEM (10m) data, dated 2012.
 Source 8: Streams and water bodies from NJDEP.

Round 3 Vacant Land Assessment
Park Ridge, New Jersey

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Area (ac) | Comments | Developable Area (ac) | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% (units) |
|----|-------|-------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 101 | 13 | EMILY DRIVE | NOEVIR CO LTD | 0.33 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 2 | 103 | 3 | BEAR'S NEST | BEAR'S NEST DEVELOPERS LLC | 51.15 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Common area for Bear's Nest condo development (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 3 | 206 | 1 | BEARS NEST SECTION | BEARS NEST DEVELOPERS L L C | 32.03 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Intervenor site. Environmental constraints: entire parcel is constrained by wetlands and wetlands buffers. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 4 | 206 | 2 | SPRING VALLEY RD | BEARS NEST DEVELOPERS LLC | 3.43 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Although intervenor site in Round 3 and included in 2021 HEFSP for 50-unit 100% affordable development, subsequently determined to be entirely constrained and undevelopable for proposed Round 3 use. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 5 | 301 | 1 | SONY DRIVE | HORNROCK PROPERTIES MPR LLC | 30.25 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Intervenor site and included in 2021 HEFSP for 448 inclusionary units. Site plan approval granted in 2023. Under construction. (Landmark) | 18.80 | Per Approval (448 units) | 89.6 |
| 6 | 304 | 1 | BRAE BLVD | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 0.20 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 7 | 403 | 10 | BRAE BOULEVARD | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 0.37 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 8 | 501 | 8 | SPRING VALLEY ROAD | JOSEPH ARTHUR B | 0.05 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 9 | 601 | 13 | DRAINAGE EASEMENT | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 1.50 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 10 | 604 | 14 | ALBERON DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.99 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 11 | 604 | 44.01 | FOREST STREET | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 0.67 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 12 | 604 | 51 | FOREST ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.39 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 13 | 604 | 52 | 68 FOREST ST | BOTTINO GEORGE & JEANETTE | 2.60 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: parcel is completely constrained by 100 year floodplain, C1 Stream and C1 Stream buffer. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 14 | 604 | 53 | INSIDE LOT | BOTTINO GEORGE & JEANETTE | 0.07 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: parcel is completely constrained by C1 Stream buffer. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 15 | 604 | 54 | FOREST ST | BOTTINO GEORGE & JEANETTE | 1.03 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: completely constrained by 100 year floodplain, C1 Stream and C1 Stream buffer. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 16 | 605 | 11 | DRAINAGE EASEMENT | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.31 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 17 | 606 | 15 | STEPHEN DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.03 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 18 | 608 | 3 | 5 TH & COLONY | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 19 | 608 | 14 | NORTH FIFTH ST | SULLIVAN JAMES D & LAURA A | 0.01 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 20 | 608 | 15 | NORTH FIFTH STREET | THE METRO HOME DEV AT WERIMUS LLC | 0.97 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Intervenor site and subject of 2020 Settlement Agreement. Although site completely constrained by C1 Stream and C1 Stream buffer, settlement allowed subdivision for 3 single-family lots and payment in lieu for 3/5 of an AH unit. | 0.00 | Per Settlement (3 units) | 0.60 |
| 23 | 608 | 37 | NORTH FIFTH ST | THE METRO HOME DEV AT WERIMUS LLC | 2.43 | | 0.00 | | |

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Area (ac) | Comments | Developable Area (ac) | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% (units) |
|----|-------|------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 21 | 608 | 19 | COLONY AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 22 | 608 | 26 | 8 MARTI ROAD | LJC HOLDINGS LLC | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: a2pprox. 0.266 ac constrained by C1 Stream buffer. Remaining lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 24 | 701 | 6 | MOUNTAIN AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 25 | 701 | 8 | FOREST ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.19 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 26 | 706 | 7 | MIDLAND AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 27 | 706 | 8 | FOREST ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.48 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 28 | 709 | 11 | MIDLAND AVE | MUINO, JULIA A | 0.12 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 29 | 710 | 1 | CRESCENT ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 1.12 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 30 | 712 | 5 | LOUVILLE AVE | LENTZ THEODORE & COLLEEN | 0.05 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 31 | 717 | 1 | LOUVILLE AVENUE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 32 | 801 | 8 | 159 RIDGE AVE | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 0.40 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. Pumping station. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 33 | 806 | 12 | ONETO COURT | PARK RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOL | 0.02 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 34 | 902 | 12 | MAPLELEAF DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.16 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 35 | 902 | 23 | PINE DRIVE | FELGRAFF, JON & JUDITH | 0.48 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: parcel is completely constrained by floodplain, wetlands & wetlands buffer, C1 Stream buffer, and steep slopes. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 36 | 903 | 3 | SPRING VALLEY RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.32 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. Right of way. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 37 | 905 | 5 | PINE DRIVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.44 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 38 | 905 | 14 | FREMONT AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.08 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 39 | 905 | 21 | 15 JENNY LANE | MCGLUE, EDWINA | 0.53 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: parcel is completely constrained by C1 Stream buffer. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 40 | 905 | 29 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.36 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 41 | 905 | 39 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 42 | 907 | 36 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.26 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 43 | 1006 | 6.03 | 6 WILLIAM J MURPHY WAY | WALSH, SUSAN | 0.60 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Under construction for single-family residential. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 44 | 1006 | 6.04 | 8 WILLIAM J MURPHY WAY | GRAND LAWN DEV II LLC | 0.61 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Under construction for single-family residential. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 45 | 1006 | 6.05 | 10 WILLIAM J MURPHY WAY | GRAND LAWN DEV II LLC | 0.81 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Under construction for single-family residential. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 46 | 1011 | 3 | 81 LAWN ST | SEANA CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LLC | 0.18 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Area (ac) | Comments | Developable Area (ac) | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% (units) |
|----|-------|------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 47 | 1019 | 5.02 | 14 GRAND AVE | THOMAS JOSEPH | 0.94 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Lot created as part of two-lot subdivision approved in November 2015 for the construction of single-family dwellings. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 48 | 1019 | 9 | 101 MILL RD | BLUE HILL ESTATES INC | 0.83 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: approximately 0.374 ac are constrained by wetlands and wetland buffers, C1 stream buffer, and steep slopes, but remainder developable at 12 du/ac. (Density assigned in Round 3 for settlement purposes.) | 0.46 | 12 du/ac | 1.104 |
| 49 | 1019 | 20 | 223 PASCACK RD | SEANA CONSTRUCTION COMPANY LLC | 1.28 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: majority of parcel is impacted by wetlands and wetland buffers. Only 8,852 s.f. of developable space | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 50 | 1103 | 5 | ECHO PLACE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 2.54 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 51 | 1304 | 1 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 3.34 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 52 | 1306 | 1 | 85 FREMONT AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 3.39 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 53 | 1310 | 1 | BEAR BROOK RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.50 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 54 | 1401 | 5 | HAWTHORNE AVE | HAWTHORNE AVE CONDO | 0.72 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Common area for Quail Run condo development (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 55 | 1402 | 1 | MILL ROAD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 12.47 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 56 | 1402 | 2 | NO MAPLE AVE | POND RIDGE ASSOC | 5.88 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Common area for Pond Ridge condo development (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 57 | 1403 | 2 | HAWTHORNE AVE | HAWTHORNE CONDO ASSSOC | 2.15 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Common area for Whispering Pines condo development (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 58 | 1405 | 1 | KINDERKAMACK RD | KINDERKAMACK REALTY LLC | 0.52 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Inadequate lot frontage, but could be developed with adjacent Block 2402 Lot 1 in Montvale (same owner) at 12 du/ac. (Density assigned in Round 3 for settlement purposes.) | 0.52 | 12 du/ac | 1.248 |
| 59 | 1405 | 9 | KINDERKAMACK RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.19 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 60 | 1406 | 6 | 161 KINDERKAMACK ROAD | MADISON ENTERPRISE LLC | 0.61 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Under construction for gas station renovation (approved in 2016). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 61 | 1504 | 6 | 20 STORMS AVENUE | MOKAS, ANDY & STEPHANIE | 0.29 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 62 | 1505 | 1 | MILL ROAD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.63 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 63 | 1506 | 2 | LINDEN AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.10 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 64 | 1507 | 1 | LINDEN & MAPLE AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.09 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 65 | 1509 | 1 | MAPLE & HAWTHORNE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.14 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 66 | 1516 | 1 | HAWTHORNE AVE | M.A.D. REALTY | 1.36 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Common area for Williamsburg Estates condo development (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 67 | 1601 | 3 | 16 PARK AVE | UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE | 1.26 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Parcel is fully developed with the U.S.P.S. facility. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 68 | 1601 | 10 | 38 PARK AVENUE | PRAH ASSOCIATES LLC | 0.68 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Under construction in Round 3 (since completed) | 0.68 | Per Approval (22 units) | 4.4 |

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Area (ac) | Comments | Developable Area (ac) | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% (units) |
|----|-------|-----|---------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 69 | 1601 | 11 | 40 PARK AVENUE | PRAH ASSOCIATES, L.L.C. | 0.66 | for mixed-use development containing 22 inclusionary residential units. (PRAH) | 0.66 | | |
| 70 | 1602 | 4 | 20 WAMPUM ROAD | MITCHELL MICHELE | 0.26 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 71 | 1602 | 19 | 13 SULAK LANE | PR ELKS LDG#2234 BPOE OF USA | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Approx. 0.35 ac constrained by C1 stream buffer. Parking lot for Elks Club. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 72 | 1603 | 1 | PARK AVE | PARK RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOL | 3.78 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: entire parcel is constrained by 100 year flood plain, wetlands and wetlands buffers ,C1 Stream, C1 Stream buffer and steep slopes. Developed with high school football field and tennis courts. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 73 | 1603 | 15 | PARK AVE | PARK RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOL | 3.94 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: entire parcel is constrained by 100 year flood plain, wetlands and wetlands buffers,C1 Stream, C1 Stream buffer and steep slopes. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 74 | 1604 | 2 | PARK AVENUE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.47 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 75 | 1604 | 3 | SO MAPLE AVE | SO MAPLE AVE CONDO ASSOC | 4.27 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Common area for Park Ridge Crossing condo development (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 76 | 1701 | 5 | PASCACK ROAD | HACKENSACK WATER (ALTUS GRP US INC) | 32.62 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Environmental constraints: 4approx. 32.23 ac are constrained by 100 year floodplain, C1 Stream and C1 Stream buffers. Public utility (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 77 | 1701 | 6 | PASCACK ROAD | JONES,THOMAS & ALICE | 0.07 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 78 | 1702 | 7 | END EAST AVENUE | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 79 | 1706 | 6 | KINDERKAMACK RD | KORDULA REALTY CO | 0.14 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 80 | 1801 | 3 | 146 KINDERKAMACK R | AUTO BODY EXPRESS LLC | 0.33 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Under construction in Round 3 (since completed) for mixed-use development containing 240 inclusionary residential units. (The James) | 0.33 | Per Approval (240 units) | 48 |
| 81 | 1801 | 4 | 94 BERTHOUD ST | AUTO BODY EXPRESS LLC | 0.47 | | 0.47 | | |
| 82 | 1801 | 5 | PERRY STREET | PARK RIDGE TRANSIT LLC | 0.52 | | 0.52 | | |
| 83 | 1802 | 1 | 142 KINDERKAMACK R | PARK RIDGE TRANSIT LLC | 0.18 | | 0.18 | | |
| 84 | 1802 | 2 | 140 KINDERKAMACK RD | PARK RIDGE TRANSIT LLC | 0.17 | | 0.17 | | |
| 85 | 1802 | 3 | 138 KINDERKAMACK RD | PARK RIDGE TRANSIT URBAN RENW LLC | 0.18 | | 0.18 | | |
| 86 | 1802 | 4 | 136 KINDERKAMACK R | PARK RIDGE TRANSIT LLC | 0.35 | | 0.35 | | |
| 87 | 1802 | 5 | 132 KINDERKAMACK R | AUTOBODY EXPRESS LLC | 0.17 | | 0.17 | | |
| 88 | 1802 | 6 | 87 MADISON ST | PARK RIDGE TRANSIT LLC | 0.35 | | 0.35 | | |
| 89 | 1802 | 7 | 94 PERRY ST | PARK RIDGE TRANSIT LLC | 0.38 | | 0.38 | | |
| 90 | 1803 | 6 | MADISON ST | MADISON APTS KMT LLC | 0.13 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 91 | 1805 | 13 | KINDERKAMACK RD | PARK MGMNT PROPERTIES | 0.78 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Common area/parking lot for multi-tenant commercial building (no development potential). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Area (ac) | Comments | Developable Area (ac) | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% (units) |
|-----|-------|-----|-------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|
| 92 | 1902 | 2 | PERRYLAND STREET | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 0.16 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 93 | 1902 | 3 | KINDERKAMACK ROAD | FIRST UNION/WACHOVIA RE TAX DEPT | 0.18 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 94 | 1905 | 2 | 100 WOODLAND ST | PARK RIDGE BUILDERS LLC | 0.25 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 95 | 2001 | 1 | CYPRESS STREET | KORDULA CHARLES E & ALBERTE A | 0.28 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Undersized on its own, but developable with adjacent Lot 9 (same owner) at 12 du/ac. (Density assigned in Round 3 for settlement purposes.) | 0.28 | 0.28 | 0.672 |
| 96 | 2001 | 4 | CYPRESS STREET | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.01 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 97 | 2001 | 9 | ELM PLACE | KORDULA CHARLES E & ALBERTE A | 0.16 | Qualifies for RDP analysis. Undersized on its own, but developable with adjacent Lot 1 (same owner) at 12 du/ac. (Density assigned in Round 3 for settlement purposes.) | 0.16 | 0.16 | 0.384 |
| 98 | 2009 | 8 | WEILD COURT | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.99 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 99 | 2102 | 13 | SIBBALD DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.01 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 100 | 2102 | 15 | R O W PARK AVE | CCB ENTERPRISE LLC | 0.09 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 101 | 2103 | 6 | SIBBALD & WEILD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 102 | 2103 | 7 | WOODDALE PARK | BERGEN COUNTY OF | 0.56 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 103 | 2103 | 9 | WOODDALE PARK | BERGEN COUNTY OF | 2.29 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 104 | 2103 | 10 | WOODDALE PARK | BERGEN COUNTY OF | 1.70 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 105 | 2201 | 1 | OAK AVE | CROWLEY PATRICK J & REGINA B | 0.07 | Lot too small to qualify for RDP analysis. | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| 106 | 2205 | 11 | NEW STREET | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 0.28 | Does not qualify for RDP analysis. Preserved open space (ROSI designation and Green Acres funding). | 0.00 | 0.00 | - |
| | | | | | | | | TOTAL RDP: | 146 units |

Appendix

F Fourth Round Vacant Land Adjustment Map and Table

BURG IS ASSOCIATES, INC.
 COMMUNITY PLANNING
 LAND DEVELOPMENT PROFESSIONALS
 25 Montross Avenue
 Montross, Virginia 22061
 P: 202.666.1511
 F: 202.666.1512

2025 Housing Element & Fair Share Plan
 BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE
 BERGEN COUNTY, NEW JERSEY



Legend

- Municipal Boundaries
- Parcels
- W/A Inventory Lots
- Water Bodies
- C1 Streams
- 300-ft C1 Stream Buffer
- 50-ft Wetlands Buffer
- Footway
- NJ FEMA 100 Year + 3 Ft
- Slopes < 15%
- Sleep Slopes 15% or >

| Sheet | Description | Date | Drawn | Check |
|-------|-------------|------|-------|-------|
| | | | | |

Sheet Title: 4th Round Vacant Land Assessment

Scale: 1" = 150'


Graphic Scale: 0 325 650 1300 Feet

Project No.: 417204
 Date: 02/25/25
 Scale: 1" = 150'

Drawn: [Name]
 Check: [Name]

Sheet No.: 122 of 125
 Date: 02/25/25
 Scale: 1" = 150'

Drawn: [Name]
 Check: [Name]



Round 4 Vacant Land Assessment
Park Ridge, New Jersey

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Class | Area (ac) | Comments | Qualifying Acres | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% |
|----|-------|-------|--------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|-----------|--|------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | 101 | 13 | EMILY DRIVE | NOEVIR CO LTD | 1 | 0.33 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Part of commercially developed property assessed in Montvale (Block 3201 Lot 9). Approx. 0.05 ac environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 2 | 103 | 3 | BEAR'S NEST | BEAR'S NEST DEVELOPERS LLC | 1 | 50.01 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for Bear's Nest townhouse development. Developed with clubhouse, driveways, common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 3 | 206 | 1 | BEARS NEST SECTION | BEARS NEST DEVELOPERS L L C | 1 | 32.07 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 4 | 206 | 2 | SPRING VALLEY RD | BEARS NEST DEVELOPERS LLC | 1 | 2.44 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Site-specific survey identifies property as entirely constrained by wetlands, 50' wetland buffers and steep slopes. No development potential. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 5 | 301 | 1 | SONY DRIVE | LANDMARK AR PARK RIDGE LLC | 1 | 29.88 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Property has site plan approval for Landmark inclusionary development. 3rd Round Compliance Site (not developable for 4th Round). | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 6 | 304 | 1 | BRAE BLVD | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.21 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Approx. 0.05 ac environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 7 | 403 | 10 | BRAE BOULEVARD | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.45 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Approx. 0.07 ac environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 8 | 501 | 8 | SPRING VALLEY ROAD | JOSEPH,ARTHUR B & DENISE 2022 TRUST | 1 | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 9 | 601 | 13 | DRAINAGE EASEMENT | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 1.48 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 10 | 604 | 14 | ALBERON DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.98 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 11 | 604 | 44.01 | FOREST STREET | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.67 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 12 | 604 | 51 | FOREST ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH | 15C | 0.39 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 13 | 604 | 52 | 68 FOREST ST | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 2.60 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 14 | 604 | 53 | INSIDE LOT | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.07 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 15 | 604 | 54 | FOREST ST | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 1.03 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 16 | 605 | 11 | DRAINAGE EASEMENT | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.31 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 17 | 606 | 15 | STEPHEN DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.03 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 18 | 608 | 3 | 5TH & COLONY | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 19 | 608 | 14 | NORTH FIFTH ST | SULLIVAN JAMES D & LAURA A | 1 | 0.01 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 20 | 608 | 15 | NORTH FIFTH STREET | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.92 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 21 | 608 | 19 | COLONY AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH | 15C | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 22 | 608 | 37 | NORTH FIFTH ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH | 15C | 2.37 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Class | Area (ac) | Comments | Qualifying Acres | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% |
|----|-------|------|------------------|--------------------------|-------|-----------|--|------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| 23 | 701 | 6 | MOUNTAIN AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.06 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 24 | 701 | 8 | FOREST ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.18 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 25 | 706 | 7 | MIDLAND AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 26 | 706 | 8 | FOREST ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.49 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 27 | 709 | 11 | MIDLAND AVE | MUINO, JULIA A | 1 | 0.12 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 28 | 710 | 1 | CRESCENT ST | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 1.14 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 29 | 716 | 7.01 | 27 NO FIFTH ST | EABRAHIM LLC | 1 | 0.26 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 30 | 716 | 7.02 | 29 NO FIFTH ST | EABRAHIM LLC | 1 | 0.24 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 31 | 717 | 1 | LOUVILLE AVENUE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 32 | 801 | 8 | 159 RIDGE AVE | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.39 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Pumping station. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 33 | 806 | 12 | ONETO COURT | PARK RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOL | 15A | 0.02 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 34 | 902 | 12 | MAPLELEAF DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.16 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 35 | 902 | 23 | PINE DRIVE | FELGRAFF, JON & JUDITH | 1 | 0.48 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 36 | 903 | 3 | SPRING VALLEY RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.33 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Right-of-way. Approx. 0.18 ac environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 37 | 905 | 5 | PINE DRIVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.52 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 38 | 905 | 14 | FREMONT AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.08 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 39 | 905 | 21 | 15 JENNY LANE | MCGLUE, EDWINA | 1 | 0.55 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 40 | 905 | 29 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.36 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 41 | 905 | 39 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 42 | 907 | 36 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.26 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 43 | 1103 | 5 | ECHO PLACE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 2.54 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 44 | 1304 | 1 | LAUREL HILL RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 3.34 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 45 | 1306 | 1 | 85 FREMONT AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 3.36 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 46 | 1310 | 1 | BEAR BROOK RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.50 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 47 | 1401 | 5 | HAWTHORNE AVE | HAWTHORNE AVE CONDO | 1 | 0.71 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for Quail Run inclusionary development. Developed with driveways and common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 48 | 1402 | 1 | MILL ROAD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 11.95 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 49 | 1402 | 2 | NO MAPLE AVE | POND RIDGE ASSOC | 1 | 5.90 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for Pond Ridge condominium development. Developed with driveways and common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Class | Area (ac) | Comments | Qualifying Acres | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% |
|----|---------|------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------|-----------|---|------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| 50 | 1403 | 2 | HAWTHORNE AVE | HAWTHORNE CONDO ASSOC | 1 | 2.15 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for Whispering Pines condominium development. Developed with driveways and common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 51 | 1405 | 1 | KINDERKAMACK RD | KINDERKAMACK REALTY LLC | 1 | 0.52 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Inadequate lot frontage. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 52 | 1405 | 9 | KINDERKAMACK RD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.20 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Right-of-way. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 53 | 1505 | 1 | MILL ROAD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.63 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 54 | 1506 | 2 | LINDEN AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.10 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 55 | 1507 | 1 | LINDEN & MAPLE AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.09 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | | | |
| 56 | 1509 | 1 | MAPLE & HAWTHORNE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.14 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | | | |
| 57 | 1516 | 1 | HAWTHORNE AVE | ROSS,THERESA & BAUMANN,GARY CHARLES | 1 | 1.36 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for Williamsburg Estates townhouse development. Developed with driveways and common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 58 | 1601 | 3 | 16 PARK AVE | UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE | 15C | 1.26 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Developed with USPS Post Office. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 59 | 1602 | 4 | 20 WAMPUM ROAD | MITCHELL MICHELE | 1 | 0.25 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 60 | 1602 | 19 | 13 SULAK LANE | PR ELKS LDG#2234 BPOE OF USA | 15F | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Parking lot for Park Ridge Elks Lodge. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | | | |
| 61 | 1603 | 1 | PARK AVE | PARK RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOL | 15A | 3.80 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Athletic fields/courts for Park Ridge High School. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 62 | 1603 | 15 | PARK AVE | PARK RIDGE PUBLIC SCHOOL | 15A | 3.94 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Athletic fields/courts for Park Ridge High School. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 63 | 1604 | 2 | PARK AVENUE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.42 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 64 | 1604 | 3 | SO MAPLE AVE | SO MAPLE AVE CONDO ASSOC | 1 | 4.24 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for Park Ridge Crossing condominium development. Developed with driveways and common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 65 | 1701 | 5 | PASCACK ROAD | HACKENSACK WATER (ALTUS GRP US INC) | 1 | 32.62 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 66 | 1701 | 6 | PASCACK ROAD | LEVY, PATRICK & ARISH, YOSI | 1 | 0.07 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Entirety of lot is environmentally constrained. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 67 | 1702 | 7 | END EAST AVENUE | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.05 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 68 | 1706 | 6 | KINDERKAMACK RD | KORDULA REALTY CO | 1 | 0.14 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 69 | 1801.01 | 1.01 | 132-146 KINDERKAMACK RD | JAMES URBAN RENEWAL LLC ETALS | 1 | 3.29 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Developed with The James inclusionary development. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 70 | 1803 | 6 | MADISON ST | MADISON APTS KMT LLC | 1 | 0.13 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for 86 Madison Ave apartments. Developed with driveways and common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 71 | 1805 | 13 | KINDERKAMACK RD | PARK MGMNT PROPERTIES | 1 | 0.78 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Common element for the Cerullo Building (retail & office). Developed with parking, driveways and common areas. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |

| ID | Block | Lot | Location | Owner | Class | Area (ac) | Comments | Qualifying Acres | Applied Density (du/ac) | RDP @ 20% |
|------------------|-------|------|-------------------|------------------------------------|-------|-----------|--|------------------|-------------------------|----------------|
| 72 | 1808 | 15 | 58 HIGHVIEW AVE | UNITED METHODIST CHURCH PARK RIDGE | 15D | 0.62 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 73 | 1902 | 2 | PERRYLAND STREET | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.16 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Municipal parking lot. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 74 | 1902 | 3 | KINDERKAMACK ROAD | FIRST UNION/WACHOVIA RE TAX DEPT | 1 | 0.27 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Not vacant. Parking lot for Wells Fargo building. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 75 | 2001 | 1 | CYPRESS STREET | KORDULA CHARLES E & ALBERTE A | 1 | 0.28 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify, even with adjacent Block 2001 Lot 9 (same ownership). | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 76 | 2001 | 4 | CYPRESS STREET | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.01 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 77 | 2001 | 9 | ELM PLACE | KORDULA CHARLES E & ALBERTE A | 1 | 0.16 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify, even with adjacent Block 2001 Lot 1 (same ownership). | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 78 | 2007 | 1.02 | 80 RIVERVALE RD | KOHN JOSEPH AND MORGANNE | 1 | 0.36 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Building permit issued for single-family dwelling. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 79 | 2009 | 8 | WEILD COURT | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.99 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 80 | 2102 | 13 | SIBBALD DR | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.01 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 81 | 2102 | 15 | R O W PARK AVE | CCB ENTERPRISE LLC | 1 | 0.09 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 82 | 2103 | 6 | SIBBALD & WEILD | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.46 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 83 | 2103 | 7 | WOODDALE PARK | BERGEN COUNTY OF | 15C | 0.56 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 84 | 2103 | 9 | WOODDALE PARK | BERGEN COUNTY OF | 15C | 2.32 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 85 | 2103 | 10 | WOODDALE PARK | BERGEN COUNTY OF | 15C | 1.79 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 86 | 2201 | 1 | OAK AVE | CROWLEY PATRICK J & REGINA B | 1 | 0.07 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Lot too small to qualify. Rear yard of residentially developed lot assessed in Montvale (Block 2407 Lot 1). | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 87 | 2205 | 11 | NEW STREET | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 0.28 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 88 | 2206 | 7 | HENRY AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.62 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 89 | 2207 | 16 | FAIRVIEW AVE | BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE | 15C | 6.53 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 90 | 2208 | 1 | FAIRVIEW AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.09 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 91 | 2303 | 9 | DE GROFF PL | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.49 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 92 | 2304 | 4 | ROCK & PARK AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.50 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 93 | 2402 | 3 | HOMESTEAD PL | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.06 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 94 | 2509 | 5 | PROSPECT AVE | PARK RIDGE BOROUGH OF | 15C | 0.54 | Does not qualify for RDP Analysis. Preserved open space. | 0.00 | -- | 0 |
| 95 | 1807 | 5 | 155 PARK AVE | PARK TERRACE APARTMENTS LLC | 4C | 3.21 | Qualifies for RDP Analysis. Not vacant, but developable for 16 additional apartments per 2023 site plan approval. | 3.21 | Per Approval (16 units) | 3.2 |
| TOTAL RDP | | | | | | | | | | 3 units |

Appendix

G Fourth Round Spending Plan

May 20, 2025 – Revised January 10, 2026
Borough of Park Ridge
Affordable Housing Trust Fund Spending Plan

INTRODUCTION

The Borough of Park Ridge (hereinafter the “Borough”), Bergen County, has prepared a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan that addresses its regional fair share of the affordable housing need in accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1 et seq.), the Amended Fair Housing Act (FHA-2) (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-301) and the new Fair Housing Act Rules promulgated by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA) (N.J.A.C. 5:99). A development fee ordinance creating a dedicated revenue source for affordable housing and establishing the Borough of Park Ridge Affordable Housing Trust Fund was adopted by the Borough in 1996.

As of December 31, 2024, the Borough of Park Ridge has a balance of \$597,731¹ in its Affordable Housing Trust fund. All development fees, payments in lieu of constructing affordable units on site, funds from the sale of units with extinguished controls, and interest generated by the fees are deposited in a separate interest-bearing affordable housing trust fund account for the purposes of affordable housing. These funds shall be spent in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:99 as described in the sections that follow.

1. REVENUES FOR CERTIFICATION PERIOD

It is anticipated that during the period of January 1, 2025 through June 30, 2035, which encompasses the period that the Borough will have a Fourth Round Judgment of Compliance and Repose (hereinafter “Fourth Round JOR”), the Borough will add an additional \$352,800 to its Affordable Housing Trust Fund. This is detailed below.

- (a) Development fees: Based on development fee collection trends in the Borough of Park Ridge since 2021, the Borough anticipates that approximately \$189,000 in development fees will be generated between January 1, 2025 through June 30, 2035. This figure assumes that, on average, the Borough will collect approximately \$1,500 in development fees per month during the remainder of the Third Round and throughout the Fourth Round.

¹ All figures rounded to the nearest dollar.

- (b) Payment in lieu (PIL): The Borough of Park Ridge does not currently anticipate the contribution of any payments in lieu toward the municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund during the remainder of the Third Round nor during the Fourth Round.
- (c) Other Funds: The Borough of Park Ridge does not currently anticipate the contribution of any other funds toward the municipal Affordable Housing Trust Fund during the remainder of the Third Round nor during the Fourth Round.
- (d) Projected interest: It is estimated that the Borough of Park Ridge will collect approximately \$163,800 in interest between January 1, 2025 through June 30, 2035. This figure assumes that, on average, the Borough will collect approximately \$1,300 in interest per month during the remainder of the Third Round and throughout the Fourth Round.

| SOURCE OF FUNDS | PROJECTED REVENUES – AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND JANUARY 1, 2025 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2035 | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | 2025-2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | 2033 | 2034 | 1/1/35 to 6/30/35 | | |
| (a) Development Fees | \$36,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$18,000 | \$9,000 | \$189,000 |
| (b) Payments in Lieu of Construction | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| (c) Other Funds | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| (d) Interest | \$31,200 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$15,600 | \$7,800 | \$163,800 |
| Total | \$67,200 | \$33,600 | \$16,800 | \$352,800 |

In sum, the Borough of Park Ridge projects a total of \$352,800 in revenue to be collected between January 1, 2025 and June 30, 2035. This projected amount, when added to Park Ridge's current trust fund balance of \$597,731, results in a total anticipated trust fund balance of \$950,531 available to fund and administer the Borough's affordable housing plan. All interest earned on the account shall be used only for the purposes of affordable housing.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE MECHANISM TO COLLECT AND DISTRIBUTE FUNDS

The following procedural sequence for the collection and distribution of development fee revenues shall be followed by the Borough:

- (a) Collection of development fee revenues: Collection of development fee revenues shall be consistent with Park Ridge's development fee ordinance for both residential and non-residential developments in accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1 et seq.), the Amended Fair Housing Act (FHA-2) (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-301) and the new Fair Housing Act Rules promulgated by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA) (N.J.A.C. 5:99).
- (b) Distribution of development fee revenues: The administration of Park Ridge's development fee spending plan will be undertaken by the governing body and the Borough Chief Financial Officer. First, the governing body will approve the expenditure of development fee revenues. The governing body will then review the request for consistency with the spending plan. If consistent with the plan, the governing body will adopt a resolution authorizing the use and release of trust fund monies. Upon approval of the governing body resolution, the Borough Chief Financial Officer will be authorized to release the funds.

3. DESCRIPTION OF ANTICIPATED USE OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING FUNDS

- (a) Rehabilitation. The Borough has a Present Need (rehabilitation) obligation of 45 units. In order to address its rehabilitation obligation, the Borough will continue to contract with Community Grants, Planning & Housing (CGP&H) to administer Park Ridge's municipal Home Improvement Program – which is open to both owners and renters – and will utilize funds from the Borough's Affordable Housing Trust Fund. In addition, the Borough will continue to participate in the Bergen County Home Improvement Program, which utilizes Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds.

The Borough will set-aside \$10,000 per unit, which will require a total contribution of \$450,000. COAH's rules require municipalities to set aside sufficient funds to address one-third of their rehabilitation obligation within one year of approval of their plan. In addition, municipalities are required to set aside sufficient funds to address one-sixth of their rehabilitation obligation each subsequent year of the compliance certification period. As such, the Borough will set aside \$150,000 for 2026, and an additional \$75,000 each subsequent year until the rehabilitation program is fully funded.

- (b) Accessory Apartment Program. The Borough will continue to contract with Community Grants, Planning & Housing (CGP&H) to administer Park Ridge's Accessory Apartment Program, which provides funding for up to 7 accessory apartments through its Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The Borough will commit \$30,000 per accessory apartment deed restricted for moderate-income families, \$40,000 per accessory apartment restricted for low-income families, and \$50,000 per accessory apartment restricted for very low-income families. It is anticipated that approximately one very low-income, three low-income, and three moderate-income accessory apartment units will be created during the Fourth Round, requiring a total contribution of \$260,000.
- (c) Affordability Assistance. Pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:99-2.5, the Borough is required to set aside a portion of all development fees collected and interest earned for the purpose of providing affordability assistance to low- and moderate-income households in affordable units included in the Borough's fair share plan. Affordability assistance means the use of funds to render housing units more affordable to low- and moderate-income households and includes, but is not limited to, down payment assistance, security deposit assistance, low interest loans, rental assistance, assistance with homeowner's association or condominium fees and special assessments, common maintenance expenses, and assistance with emergency repairs and rehabilitation to bring deed-restricted units up to code, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:99-2.5. This may also include offering a subsidy to developers of inclusionary or 100% affordable housing developments or buying down the cost of low- or moderate-income units in the Borough's fair share plan to make them affordable to very low-income households, including special needs and supportive housing opportunities. The Borough will set aside \$50,000 from the Affordable Housing Trust Fund for this purpose through June 30, 2035.
- (d) Administrative Expenses. Per N.J.A.C. 5:99-2.4(a), no more than 20% of all affordable housing trust funds, exclusive of those collected prior to July 17, 2008, to fund an RCA, shall be expended on administration. The Borough of Park Ridge projects that a maximum of \$92,172 will be available from the affordable housing trust fund to be used for administrative purposes through June 30, 2035. Projected administrative expenditures, subject to the 20% cap, include payment for the salaries and benefits for municipal employees and consultant fees related to costs as set forth at N.J.A.C. 5:99-2.4(b), (c) and (d).

| | | |
|---|----------|-----------------|
| Actual development fees + interest through 12/31/24 | | \$1,269,388 |
| Payments in lieu of construction & other deposits through 12/31/24 | + | \$300,761 |
| Projected development fees + interest 1/1/25 through 6/30/35 | + | \$352,800 |
| Less RCA expenditures through 7/17/08 | - | \$315,000 |
| Total | = | \$1,607,949 |
| 20 percent requirement | x 0.20 = | \$321,590 |
| Less administrative expenditures through 12/31/24 | | \$229,418 |
| PROJECTED MAXIMUM Available for Administrative Expenses 1/1/25 through 6/30/35 | = | \$92,172 |

- (e) Other Emergent Housing Opportunities. The Borough will reserve the remaining trust fund balance, projected at \$98,359, for other emergent opportunities to create affordable housing that may arise during the Fourth Round. The Borough shall seek approval for any emergent affordable housing opportunities not included in the Borough's fair share plan in accordance with N.J.A.C. 5:99-4.1.

4. EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE

The Borough of Park Ridge intends to use affordable housing trust fund revenues for rehabilitation activities, accessory apartments, affordability assistance, administration, and any emergent affordable housing opportunities that may arise during the Fourth Round. Where applicable, the funding schedule below parallels the implementation schedule set forth in the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan and is summarized as follows.

| PROJECTS/ PROGRAMS | PROJECTED EXPENDITURES – AFFORDABLE HOUSING TRUST FUND | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|------------------------------|--|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| | 2025-2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 | 2031 | 2032 | 2033 | 2034 | 1/1/35 to 6/30/35 | | |
| Rehabilitation | \$150,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$75,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$450,000 |
| Accessory Apartment Program | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$26,000 | \$260,000 |
| Affordability Assistance | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$5,000 | \$50,000 |
| Administration | \$50,000 | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$3,572 | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$3,100 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$10,000 | \$92,172 |
| Other Emergent Opportunities | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$9,836 | \$98,359 |
| Total | \$240,836 | \$118,936 | \$118,936 | \$118,936 | \$119,408 | \$43,936 | \$43,936 | \$43,936 | \$50,836 | \$50,836 | \$50,835 | \$950,531 |

5. EXCESS OR SHORTFALL OF FUNDS

In the event of any expected or unexpected shortfall of funds necessary to implement the Fair Share Plan, the Borough of Park Ridge will handle the shortfall of funds through an alternative funding source to be identified by the Borough and/or by adopting a resolution with an intent to bond. In the event of excess funds, any remaining funds above the amount necessary to satisfy the municipal affordable housing obligation will be dedicated toward the Borough's rehabilitation program, accessory apartment program, additional affordability assistance and/or any other emergent affordable housing opportunities that may arise during the Fourth Round.

6. BARRIER FREE ESCROW

Collection and distribution of barrier free funds shall be consistent with the Borough's Affordable Housing Ordinance and in accordance with applicable regulations. A process describing the collection and distribution procedures for barrier free escrow is detailed within the Borough's Affordable Housing Ordinance.

SUMMARY

The Borough of Park Ridge intends to spend Affordable Housing Trust Fund revenues pursuant to N.J.A.C. 5:99 and consistent with the housing programs outlined in the Borough's Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

The Borough of Park Ridge has a balance of \$597,731 as of December 31, 2024 and anticipates an additional \$352,800 in revenues through June 30, 2035 for a total of \$950,531. During the period of the Borough's Fourth Round JOR through June 30, 2035, the Borough agrees to fund \$450,000 towards its rehabilitation program, \$260,000 towards its accessory apartment program, \$50,000 towards affordability assistance, \$92,172 towards administrative expenses, and \$98,359 towards other emergent affordable housing opportunities that may arise during the Fourth Round, totaling \$950,531 in anticipated expenditures.

Any shortfall of funds will be offset by an alternative funding source to be identified by the Borough and/or, the Borough of Park Ridge will bond to provide the necessary funding. The Borough will dedicate any excess funds or balance toward the Borough's rehabilitation program, accessory apartment program, additional affordability assistance, and/or any other emergent affordable housing opportunities that may arise during the Fourth Round.

| SPENDING PLAN SUMMARY | | |
|--|----------|------------------|
| Balance as of December 31, 2024 | | \$597,731 |
| | | |
| PROJECTED REVENUE THROUGH 6/30/35 | | |
| Development fees | + | \$189,000 |
| Payments in lieu of construction | + | \$0 |
| Other funds | + | \$0 |
| Interest | + | \$163,800 |
| SUBTOTAL REVENUE | = | \$352,800 |
| | | |
| TOTAL REVENUE | = | \$950,531 |
| | | |
| EXPENDITURES | | |
| Rehabilitation Program | - | \$450,000 |
| Accessory Apartment Program | - | \$260,000 |
| Affordability Assistance | - | \$50,000 |
| Administration | - | \$92,172 |
| Other Emergent Opportunities | - | \$98,359 |
| TOTAL PROJECTED EXPENDITURES | = | \$950,531 |
| REMAINING BALANCE | = | \$0 |

Appendix

H Project & Unit Monitoring in AHMS

Project List

| Project Name | Project Type | Project Sub Type | Project Status | Units | Remove from Plan |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------|-------|------------------|
| BEAR'S NEST | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - OFF SITE | | 0 | Remove from Plan |
| UNMET NEED | UNMET NEED | NONE | | 0 | Remove from Plan |
| 37 PARK RIDGE LLC | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | COMPLETED | 1 | Remove from Plan |
| 40 PARK AVE | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - COMBINATION | COMPLETED | 2 | Remove from Plan |
| 70-72 PARK AVE LLC | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | COMPLETED | 1 | Remove from Plan |
| CARE PLUS NJ | SUPP/SPEC NEEDS HSG | SUPP SHARED LIV HSG (BDRMS) | COMPLETED | 4 | Remove from Plan |
| EMSCO PROPERTY | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | COMPLETED | 4 | Remove from Plan |
| JAWONIO GROUP HOME | SUPP/SPEC NEEDS HSG | SUPP SHARED LIV HSG (BDRMS) | COMPLETED | 3 | Remove from Plan |
| NEW CONCEPTS FOR LIVING | SUPP/SPEC NEEDS HSG | SUPP SHARED LIV HSG (BDRMS) | COMPLETED | 4 | Remove from Plan |
| RESIDENCE AT PARK RIDGE | ASSISTED LIVING RESIDENCES | RESIDENTIAL HEALTH CARE FACILITY | COMPLETED | 28 | Remove from Plan |
| ROCKLAND BUILT HOMES - HAWTHORNE TERRACE | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | COMPLETED | 1 | Remove from Plan |
| SUNRIDGE ESTATES | OTHER INNOVATIVE APPROACHES | INCL DEV - OFF SITE | COMPLETED | 0 | Remove from Plan |
| THE JAMES | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | COMPLETED | 24 | Remove from Plan |
| WOODLAND GARDENS | NEW CONSTRUCTION - 100% AFFORD | NONE | COMPLETED | 35 | Remove from Plan |
| PARK/WILLET | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | NONE | DELETED | 0 | Removed |
| HAWTHORNE EAST | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | PROPOSED/ZONED | 0 | Removed |
| MADISON AVENUE | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | PROPOSED/ZONED | 0 | Removed |
| WAMPUM ROAD | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | PROPOSED/ZONED | 0 | Removed |
| 26 HAWTHORNE AVE. | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | 5 | Remove from Plan |
| RIDGE MANOR | INCLUSIONARY DEVELOPMENT | INCL DEV - ON SITE | UNDER CONSTRUCTION | 1 | Remove from Plan |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62514 | 37 PARK AVENUE | Block: 1505, Lot: 4 | | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|--------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 86021 | 37 PARK AVE. | | | 1 | 1 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86022 | 40 PARK AVE | | | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|------------|
| 62515 | 72 PARK AVENUE | Block: 1604, Lot: 1 | | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62513 | 83 SPRING VALLEY ROAD | Block: 0, Lot: 0 | | 4 | 1 BEDROOM LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62520 | HAWTHORNE AVE | Block: 1401, Lot: 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62529 | HAWTHORNE AVE | Block: 1401, Lot: 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62552 | HAWTHORNE AVE | Block: 1401, Lot: 5 | 3 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62553 | HAWTHORNE AVE | Block: 1401, Lot: 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|------------|
| 62517 | 99 DEGROFF PLACE | Block: 0, Lot: 0 | | 3 | 1 BEDROOM NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL SPEC NEEDS BR NON-AGE | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62519 | 221 DOXEY DRIVE | Block: 102, Lot: 14 | | 4 | LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL SPEC NEEDS BR NON-AGE | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 86836 | 1224 NOYES DR. | Block: 1401, Lot: 1 | | 28 | 1 BEDROOM ACCESSIBLE ADAPTABLE AGE RESTRICTED COMPLETED NEW NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL VERY LOW INCOME - 30% | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 86020 | 81 BERTHOUD ST | | | 1 | 1 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|------------|
| 86023 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 505 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86024 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 205 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL VERY LOW INCOME - 30% | |
| 86025 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 305 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86026 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 405 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86027 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 208 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86028 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 308 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|------------|
| 86029 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 408 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86030 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 508 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86031 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 218 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86032 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 212 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL VERY LOW INCOME - 30% | |
| 86033 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 312 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86034 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 412 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86035 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 232 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|------------|
| 86036 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 108 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86037 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 230 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86038 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 330 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86039 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 430 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86040 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 530 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86041 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 109 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86042 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 101 | 1 | 3 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL VERY LOW INCOME - 30% | |

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|--|------------|
| 86043 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 301 | 1 | 3 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86044 | 87 MADISON AVENUE | | 401 | 1 | 3 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86045 | 94 BERTHOUD ST. | | 204 | 1 | 3 BEDROOM COMPLETED NEW FAMILY MODERATE INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 86834 | 87 MADISON AVE. | | | 1 | 3 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME RENTAL | |

Unit List

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62547 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 5 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62548 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 2 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM ACCESSIBLE FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62555 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 3 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM ACCESSIBLE FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62556 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM ACCESSIBLE FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62557 | 11 SULAK ANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 4 | 1 | 2 BEDROOM ACCESSIBLE FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62559 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 6 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62560 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 7 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62561 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 8 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62562 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 9 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62563 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 10 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62564 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 11 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62565 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 12 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62566 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 13 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62567 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 14 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62568 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 15 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualification # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62569 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 17 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62570 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 16 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62571 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 18 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62572 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 19 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62573 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 20 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62574 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 21 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62575 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 22 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62576 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 24 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualification # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|---------------|--------------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62577 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 23 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62578 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 25 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62579 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 26 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62580 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 27 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62581 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 28 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62582 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 29 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62583 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 30 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62584 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 31 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

| Unit ID | Address | Unit/Block/Lot/Qualifier # | Unit/Apt# | Total Completed Units | Category (Check all that apply) | Bonus Type |
|---------|---------------|----------------------------|-----------|-----------------------|---|------------|
| 62585 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 32 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62586 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 33 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62587 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 34 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |
| 62588 | 11 SULAK LANE | Block: 1802, Lot: 9 | 35 | 1 | 1 BEDROOM FAMILY LOW INCOME NEW CONSTRUCTION (& GUT REHAB) RENTAL | |

Appendix

I Landmark Supportive Documentation

RESOLUTION # 2023-4

PB22-1

1-11-2023

BOROUGH OF PARK RIDGE PLANNING BOARD

LANDMARK AR PARK RIDGE, LLC

BLOCK 301, LOT 1
ONE SONY DRIVE

**PRELIMINARY AND FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN APPROVED FOR CONSTRUCTION
OF AN INCLUSIONARY MULTIFAMILY RESIDENTIAL PROJECT, INCLUDING
CONSTRUCTION OF RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS**

WHEREAS, Landmark AR Park Ridge, LLC (the “**Applicant**”), is the owner of property that is approximately 29.9 acres in size in the Borough of Park Ridge (the “**Borough**”), shown on the Borough tax maps as Block 301, Lot 1 (the “**Property**”);

WHEREAS, the Property is part of a larger, approximately 37.23-acre overall tract of land formerly developed as Sony corporate offices, since demolished, that is located within the Borough, the Borough of Montvale (Block 3302, Lot 1), and the Borough of Woodcliff Lake (Block 204, Lot 2);

WHEREAS, the Property has frontage on Sony Drive, and is situated in the AH-4 Affordable Housing Zone District, adopted by Ordinance No. 2021-021 on August 10, 2021 (the “**AH-4 Zone Ordinance**”);

WHEREAS, adoption of the AH-4 Zone Ordinance follows a court ordered settlement of affordable housing litigation between the Borough and current and prior owners of the Property;

WHEREAS, the AH-4 Zone Ordinance permits non-age-restricted multifamily rental dwellings and non-age-restricted townhouse rental dwellings, and the Applicant submitted an application dated July 7, 2022 to the Park Ridge Borough Planning Board (the “**Board**”), which application seeks preliminary and final major site plan approval (all approvals and relief sought being referred to as the “**Application**”) to allow for the construction of an inclusionary multifamily development on the Property consisting of 448 residential units: 371 multifamily rental dwellings (of which 68 will be affordable to low- and moderate-income individuals) and 77 townhouse rental dwellings. The Applicant is also proposing to construct amenities, including, but not limited to, an outdoor pool, residential storage room, package room, leasing office, club rooms, game room, fitness room, and outdoor patio space. The Applicant is further proposing to install stormwater management facilities, retaining walls, lighting, landscaping, signage and other related site improvements on the Property (collectively, the “**Project**”);

WHEREAS, the Board has exclusive subject matter jurisdiction over the Application by virtue of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-20, -46 and -52;

WHEREAS, a number of documents were submitted by the Applicant with regard to the Application, all of which documents are on file with the Board and are part of the record in this matter, with the following being the latest versions of the plans, drawings and documents for which

Board approval is sought, which plans, drawings and documents have been on file and available for public inspection for at least 10 days prior to the hearings on the Application in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10b and which were made available to the public online:

1. “Preliminary & Final Site Plan for AR Landmark Park Ridge, LLC, Proposed Multifamily / Townhouse Residential Development, 1 Sony Drive, Block 301, Lot 1; Borough of Park Ridge; Tax Map Sheet #3; Block 3302, Lot 1; Borough of Montvale; Tax Map Sheet #33; Block 204, Lot 2; Borough of Woodcliff Lake; Tax Map Sheet #2; Bergen County, New Jersey” prepared by Brett W. Skapinetz, P.E., of Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated June 6, 2022, last revised September 29, 2022 (except for Sheet Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10 and 35, which were last revised October 21, 2022), consisting of thirty-seven (37) sheets (the “**Site Plans**”);
2. Architectural plans prepared by Stuart A. Johnson, R.A., of Minno Wasko Architects and Planners, titled “Park Ridge Residential Community” dated July 5, 2022, last revised September 28, 2022, consisting of twenty-four (24) sheets (the “**Architectural Plans**”);
3. Stormwater Management Summary prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated July 2022, last revised September 2022 (the “**Stormwater Management Report**”);
4. Stormwater Maintenance Manual entitled “Stormwater Management Facilities Operation and Maintenance Manual for AR Landmark Park Ridge, LLC, Proposed Residential Development, 1 Sony Drive, Block 301, Lot 1, Borough of Park Ridge; Block 3302, Lot 1, Borough of Montvale; Block 204, Lot 2, Borough of Woodcliff Lake, Bergen County, NJ”, prepared by Brett W. Skapinetz, P.E. of Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated July 2022, last revised September 29, 2022 (the “**Stormwater Maintenance Manual**”);
5. Letter Report and Traffic Impact Assessment, prepared by Nick Verderese, P.E. and Justin Taylor, P.E., P.T.O.E. of Dynamic Traffic, LLC, dated July 6, 2022 (the “**Traffic Assessment**”);
6. Traffic Count Results, prepared by Dynamic Traffic, LLC, two (2) pages dated September 13, 2022 and one (1) page dated September 17, 2022 (the “**Traffic Counts**”); and
7. Fire Staging Exhibit, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C., dated October 7, 2022;

WHEREAS, the Board held duly noticed public hearings on the Application on October 12, 2022 and November 9, 2022, thereby conferring procedural jurisdiction over the Application with the Board, during which hearing the Applicant was represented by Peter J. Wolfson, Esq. and the Board was represented by Brian Giblin, Esq.;

WHEREAS, in support of the proposal, the following individuals testified during the hearing on the Application, were subject to cross examination, and the testimony is part of the record in this matter:

1. Brett W. Skapinetz, P.E. (Applicant’s civil engineering expert),
2. Stuart Johnson, R.A. (Applicant’s architectural design expert), and
3. Nick Verderese, P.E. (Applicant’s traffic engineering expert);

In addition, one member of the public testified during the hearing, submitted evidence and was subject to cross examination, namely Brian Larose, the owner of 64 Clairmont Drive.

TESTIMONY

The hearing commenced on October 12, 2022. The applicant was represented by Peter Wolfson, Esq. who provided an overview of the history of the site, the settlement between the Borough of Park Ridge and Fair Share Housing Center and the ordinances adopted pursuant to said settlement. Mr. Wolfson also gave an overview of the extent of the approvals being sought, namely for a total of 448 residential units of which 68 would be affordable, together with a pool, storage room, fitness room and leasing room.

The applicant then introduced its first witness, Brett Skapinetz, who qualified and testified as an expert in engineering.

The witness introduced an arial map as Exhibit "A1" which showed the existing conditions of the site, which contains a total of 29.9 acres.

The witness testified that there are no improvements proposed for the small portion of the property located in Woodcliff Lake.

The witness also testified that the Borough of Montvale has approved 185 units for construction on the adjacent portion of the Sony site located in Montvale.

The witness also testified about the existing site conditions, including the site topography which changes significantly across the tract. This difference, in total, is a 49-foot difference in elevation from one portion of the site to another.

The witness then introduced the overall site plan, which was accepted into evidence as Exhibit "A2".

The witness identified all of the buildings proposed for the site, which consist of the following:

1. Proposed three-story apartment building containing 12 units designated as Building "A1";
2. Proposed three-story apartment building containing 18 units designated as Building "B1";
3. Proposed three-story apartment building containing 18 units designated as Building "B2";
4. Proposed three-story apartment building containing 24 units designated as Building "C1";
5. Proposed three-story apartment building containing 30 units designated as Building "D1";
6. Proposed four-story apartment building over garage parking containing 137 units designated as Building "E1";
7. Proposed three-story apartment building over garage parking level designated as Building "F1";

8. Six proposed three-story townhome buildings containing 5 units each designated as Buildings "G1", "G2", "G3", "G4", "G5" and "G6";
9. Four proposed three-story apartment buildings containing 12 units each designated as Buildings "A2", "A3", "A4" and "A5";
10. Proposed three-story townhome buildings containing 4 units designated as Building "H1";
11. Two proposed three-story townhome buildings containing 7 units each designated as Building "H2" and "H3";
12. Proposed three-story townhome building containing 6 units designated as Building "H4";
13. Proposed three-story townhome building containing 7 units designated as Building "H5";
14. Proposed three-story townhome building containing 6 units designated as Building "H6";
15. Two proposed three-story townhome buildings containing 5 units each designated as Buildings "H7" and "H8".

The witness then described the onsite parking, and stated that Buildings E and F, the largest buildings on the site, contain parking decks and that the total parking proposed for the Park Ridge site is 792 parking spaces (not including credits for EV parking spaces), where 807 spaces are required.

The witness also testified that there are more than 200 electric vehicle parking spaces provided on the site and that, would be EV credit which the applicant is entitled to, the total number of parking spaces located in Park Ridge is 872. The witness also testified that there are 93 bicycle stalls provided whereas only 30 stalls are required.

The witness stated that Buildings E and F has internal trash rooms while the apartment buildings have trash enclosures. The remaining units on the site, namely the townhomes, will require the occupants to bring their trash to the curb for pickup.

The witness then described the onsite lighting which consists of 136 light fixtures including both wall mounted as well as pole mounted fixtures. The witness testified that all of the proposed lighting will be provided by LED type fixtures.

The witness then described the topography of the site and stated that, because of the changing in grade, there are several retaining walls proposed. The maximum height of a retaining wall is 25 feet and, because of the large drop-off, will have a safety fence mounted on top of it.

The witness then described the storm water management which was defined as "complex". The development has numerous areas of pervious pavement in order to allow for the dissipation of storm water but there was also a pond on site. The witness testified that the drains will be improved by only sending "clean" water to the pond whereas currently it receives "dirty" water, including water that has runoff from various paved surfaces.

The witness also described an isolated portion of wetlands that is located on the site and is proposed to be filled in as part of the project and will require a Department of Environmental Protection permit.

The witness then described signs that are proposed including one sign on Sony Drive which is 60 sq. ft. in size as well as directional signs that are approximately 9 sq. ft. each which will not be illuminated.

The witness also testified that there is a cross access agreement required for the parking on the westerly portion of the site because it cannot be accessed by the access drives located within the Park Ridge portion of the property but rather will need to be accessed through property located in Montvale. In response to questioning by the Board, the applicant's engineer, on behalf of the applicant, agreed to meet the Borough's professionals to relocate or provide additional handicap parking spaces. The applicant also agreed to provide curb ramps that are compliant with the "Americans with Disabilities Act" as requested by the Board Engineer.

The witness also agreed, on behalf of the applicant, that the applicant's Landscape Engineer will work with the Board's Landscape Engineer to improve the existing plan to meet the Board Landscape Engineer's satisfaction.

The applicant's next witness was Stuart Johnson who qualified and testified as an expert in architecture.

The witness testified that the 68 affordable housing units that are proposed must comply with UHAC and will meet the income restrictions, unit mix, etc. contained in the settlement between the Borough and FSHC as well as all applicable affordable housing regulations.

The witness also testified that all apartment buildings will contain NFPA13 fire suppression systems.

The witness then described the building mix proposed for the site. The witness testified that Building E1 will be four stories above one level of parking and will have a total height of 53.5 feet. The witness testified that Building F will contain three levels of residential units above one level of parking and will have an overall height of 51.65 feet.

The witness then introduced Exhibit A3 into evidence which was an illustrative view of Building E looking south from Sony Drive as well as Exhibit A4 which was an illustrative view of Building E looking north. The witness testified that Building E is "U-shaped" and will have a courtyard.

The witness then introduced Exhibit A5 which was an illustrative view of Building F looking west as well as Exhibit A6 which was an illustrative view of Building G looking south.

The witness testified that every apartment building is sprinklered with an NFPA13 Sprinkler System, that the townhouse units are sprinklered with an NFPA13D Sprinkler System, and that all of the units constructed will be rentals.

The witness further testified that there is no retail or commercial component proposed in any of the buildings.

The hearing was then continued to the Board's next meeting in order for the applicant to comply with some of the requests made by the Board.

At the commencement of the hearing on November 9, 2022, the applicant recalled Brett Skapinetz, who introduced a revised set of plans as Exhibit A-7 which consisted of colored renderings of the site and landscape plan with a revision date of November 9, 2022. The witness testified that Sheet 7, 8, 9, 10, and 35 of the exhibit had been revised from the prior plans. The witness also referenced the November 8, 2022 letter from Borough Planner Burgis Associates. On behalf of the applicant, the witness agreed to comply with item "D" on page 2, items "E" and "F" on page 3, and item "M" on page 4.

The witness testified that, in his opinion, no variance was needed for the height of retaining walls since the property is in the redevelopment area where a 30-foot height is permitted.

The witness also testified that he had submitted revised plans to the fire department and the fire department had no comments or recommendations on revised set of plans. The witness also agreed on behalf of the applicant, to additional landscaping as was requested by the Planning Board. After the applicant's engineer concluded his testimony, the Board Engineer, John Dunlea, briefly testified concerning several of the issues that had been raised.

The Board Engineer stated that he agreed that no variance was required for the retaining wall since, under the Borough Ordinance, a variance is not required if due to topographical features of the site, the retaining wall cannot be tiered. In the Board Engineer's opinion, this retaining wall cannot be tiered and therefore is conforming.

The Board Engineer also testified, and the applicant's witness agreed, on behalf of the applicant, to add additional storm water inlets along the Woodcliff Lake border in order to handle storm water runoff without allowing it to accumulate on the site.

The Board also discussed with the applicant's engineer the area outside the fence on the Woodcliff Lake Side of the project, and it was agreed that revised plans will be produced which will show gates along the fence on the Woodcliff Lake side of the property in order for the applicant to access the property it owns which is outside of the fence in order to properly care for and maintain that area.

The next witness called by the applicant was Nicholas Verderese, who qualified and testified as an expert in traffic engineering.

The witness testified that the site, as an office building use in the past, generated more peak traffic than what is proposed under this plan for residential use.

The witness also testified that all roadways near the site will have good levels of service even after the development is completed.

After the applicant concluded its testimony, Brian La Rose testified as an objector to the application. Mr. La Rose testified that he owns property adjacent to the site and that they currently have a flooding issue, and he was concerned that it would be exasperated by this development.

The objector introduced two exhibits which were accepted into evidence. The first Exhibit, which was accepted as "O1", was a prior developer's agreement and the second Exhibit, labeled "O2", was two pictures of the site which were taken on April 7, 2022.

The objector testified that at present, there was a 100-foot setback area prior to the parking lot and that there are wetlands existing in the southwest corner of the site.

The witness also testified that, although there are existing inlets for storm water runoff near the Park Ridge/Woodcliff Lake boarder of the property, they have not been maintained, and accordingly, water is collecting in those areas.

After the testimony of the objector was concluded, there was a discussion between the Board members and the applicant and several agreements were made on behalf of the applicant, including the following:

- 1) All storm water inlets installed near the Woodcliff Lake portion of the site will be maintained by the applicant.
- 2) There will be a maintenance plan submitted to the Planning Board Engineer which will be subject to the Board Engineer's approval and which will be recorded.
- 3) Any offsite drainage problems caused by the development will be addressed by the applicant at its sole cost and expense.

WHEREAS, the following members of the public provided comments during the hearing on the Application:

1. Sal Princiotto, Esq., on behalf of the Borough of Woodcliff Lake,
2. Ron Vradenburg, the owner of 26 Lakeview Avenue,
3. Boris Donsky, the owner of 72 Clairmont Drive,
4. Erin Comeau, the owner of 230 Shae Place, and
5. Brian Larose, the owner of 64 Clairmont Drive;

WHEREAS, the following exhibits were submitted into the record as evidence during the hearing, are on file with the Board, and are part of the record in this matter:

- A-1 Aerial Map Exhibit, dated October 12, 2022, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C.,
- A-2 Colorized Overall Site Rendering, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C.,
- A-3 Illustrative Perspective View, Sheet A-24, prepared by Minno Wasko Architects and Planners,
- A-4 Architectural Rendering, Sheet A-25, prepared by Minno Wasko Architects and Planners,
- A-5 Illustrative Perspective View (West View of Building F), prepared by Minno Wasko Architects and Planners,
- A-6 Illustrative Perspective View (View of Building G), prepared by Minno Wasko Architects and Planners,
- A-7 Revised Colorized Overall Site Rendering, dated November 9, 2022, prepared by Dynamic Engineering Consultants, P.C.,

- O-1 “Developer’s Agreement”, as presented by Brian Larose,
- O-2 Photographs of 64 Clairmont Drive, taken by Brian Larose, dated April 7, 2022

WHEREAS, AFTER CONSIDERING THE APPLICATION, DOCUMENTS, TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS REFERENCED ABOVE, AND GIVING APPROPRIATE WEIGHT TO SAME, AND BASED ON ITS UNDERSTANDING OF THE APPLICABLE LAW, THE BOARD MAKES THE FOLLOWING FACTUAL FINDINGS AND LEGAL CONCLUSIONS FOR THE PURPOSE OF MEMORIALIZING IN A WRITTEN RESOLUTION IN ACCORDANCE WITH N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10g(2) ITS ACTION IN GRANTING THE APPLICATION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS AS SET FORTH BELOW:

A. FACTUAL FINDINGS

1. **The Property, Zoning and Existing Conditions.** As set forth above, the Property consists of one lot (Block 301, Lot 1) totaling approximately 29.9-acres and has frontage on Sony Drive. The Property is situated in the AH-4 Affordable Housing Zone District. The Property previously contained the former Sony headquarters building. The Property is surrounded by an under construction residential development in the Borough of Montvale to the west, single family residences in the Borough of Woodcliff Lake to the south, and commercial uses to the north and east. The Property contains varied topographic features, including a topographic drop of about 49 feet, sloping in two directions, from the highest point in the southwestern corner of the Property, to the north and towards the east.

2. **The Application and Proposed Project.** As set forth above, the Applicant submitted the application dated July 7, 2022 to the Board seeking preliminary site plan approval and final site plan approval along with a de minimis exception from RSIS to allow construction of the Project, which is an inclusionary multifamily development consisting of 448 residential units: 371 multifamily rental dwellings (of which 68 will be affordable to low- and moderate-income individuals) and 77 townhouse rental dwellings, and related site improvements such as stormwater facilities, an outdoor pool, residential storage room, package room, leasing office, club rooms, game room, fitness room, outdoor patio space, retaining walls, lighting, landscaping, and signage. The specifics of the Project, and the specific exceptions that have been requested, are as follows:

a. **Specifics of the Project.** The proposed Project will consist of twenty-five (25) buildings located on the Property, including one 4-story multifamily rental building over a garage containing 135 residential units, one 3-story multifamily rental building over a garage containing 86 residential units, one 3-story multifamily rental building containing 24 residential units, five 3-story multifamily rental buildings containing 12 residential units each, one 3-story multifamily rental building containing 30 residential units, two 3-story multifamily rental buildings containing 18 residential units each, eight townhouse buildings containing 5 residential units each, one townhouse building containing 4 residential units, three townhouse buildings containing 7 residential units each and two townhouse buildings containing 6 residential units each. The site improvements include 792 parking spaces (including 200 parking spaces to be “make ready” for electric vehicles, bringing the parking count for Code purposes to a total of 872 spaces) to service the residential development, one externally illuminated, approximately 60 square foot