

TOWN OF MORRISTOWN

MORRIS COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

MASTER PLAN 2008 RE- EXAMINATION

2003 Master Plan

Prepared by and adopted by The Morristown Planning Board
August 14, 2003

Re-examination prepared by and adopted by the Morristown Planning Board
September 25, 2008

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

TRANSMITTAL AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

August 28, 2008

Chairwoman Mary Dougherty
Morristown Planning Board
200 South Street
Morristown, New Jersey 07963

Dear Chairwoman Dougherty:

I am pleased to submit to the Planning Board this 2008 Re-examination of the 2003 Master Plan.

The Re-examination was prepared in accordance with the provisions of NJSA40:55D-89.

It was presented to the Board and posted on the Town's web site on July 11, 2008 and discussed by the Board at its July 24, 2008 meeting.

Because of their age and near obsolescence, the Zone Map, Schedule I and Schedule II were the first elements of the Master Plan to be re-examined. These documents were reviewed by the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Board and the public at four meetings between November 2006 and February 2007. Subsequently, they were reviewed by the full Planning Board and the public at two meetings in March 2007. They were presented to the Council on April 10, 2007 and after several meetings were approved on September 11, 2007.

Note that this reexamination does not contain a Housing Element. Since the COAH regulations have not been finalized by the State as of this writing, the basic legislation necessary to prepare the Housing Element is yet to be enacted.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the many people whose input went into the preparation of this re-examination. If I have missed anyone, I apologize in advance.

Mayor Donald Cresitello
The Morristown Planning Board
The Morristown Parking Authority
The Morristown Historic Preservation Commission
John Fugger, Zoning Officer
Jeff Hartke, P.E., Town Engineer
Mark Gandy, Engineering Technician and CADD Operator
Laura Leach , Administration Department
Ron Gordon, Esq., Town Attorney
Matthew O'Donnell, Esq., Board Attorney
Elizabeth Anne Valandingham, Esq., Board Attorney

I trust that you will find it satisfactory.

Very truly yours

Michael D'Altilio, P.E., P.P.
Town Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part 1 – Background Information

1.1.0 Introduction and Overview

- 1.1.01 General Statement of Purpose
- 1.1.02 Master Plan Content
- 1.1.03 The Master Plan As a Legal Document
- 1.1.04 The Master Plan Reexamination Process
- 1.1.05 The Re-Examination Process in Morristown
- 1.1.06 The Planning Process In Morristown
- 1.1.07 A Brief History of Morristown
- 1.1.08 Influencing Factors Relate to Morristown’s Development Pattern
- 1.1.09 Evolution of Form In Morristown
- 1.1.10 State and Regional Overview

1.2.0 Goals and Objectives

- 1.2.01 Introduction and Purpose
- 1.2.02 Quality of Life
- 1.2.03 Land Use
- 1.2.04 Environmental Protection
- 1.2.05 Circulation
- 1.2.06 Economic Development
- 1.2.07 Population
- 1.2.08 Building Compatibility
- 1.2.09 Historic Preservation
- 1.2.10 Housing
- 1.2.11 Community Facilities

1.3.0 Planning and Development Issues

- 1.3.01 Introduction and Identification of Issues

1.4.0 Socio-Economic Data

- 1.4.01 Overview and Analysis of 2000 Census Data
- 1.4.02 Housing and Related Data (Except for the introduction to this section, it is superseded by Section 2.6.0)

1.5.0 Existing Land Uses and Zoning Conditions Since 2003

- 1.5.01 Introduction
- 1.5.02 Trends in Land Use since the 2003 Master Plan

1.6.0 Transportation and Parking Infrastructure

- 1.6.01 Goals and Objectives
- 1.6.02 Inventory of Existing Transportation System
- 1.6.03 Existing Conditions Traffic Assessment

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.7.0 Other Infrastructure Components

- 1.7.01 Overview
- 1.7.02 The Sewerage System
- 1.7.03 The Water Supply System
- 1.7.04 The Storm Drainage System
- 1.7.05 Miscellaneous Infrastructure Component

1.8.0 Natural Features Analysis

- 1.8.01 Introduction and Overview
- 1.8.02 Soils
- 1.8.03 Topography and Geology
- 1.8.04 Surface Waters, Wetlands and Flood Plans
- 1.8.05 Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat

1.9.0 Historic Resources

- 1.9.01 Introduction
- 1.9.02 Inventory of Cultural and Historic Resources
- 1.9.03 The Bertland Survey No.1 - A Summary

Part 2 - The Plan Elements

2.1.0 The Plan Elements - An Overview

- 2.1.01 Relationship of Parts 1 and 2
- 2.1.02 Purpose and Scope of the Part 2 Plan Elements

2.2.0 The Land Use Plan

- 2.2.01 Introduction
- 2.2.02 Policy Decisions
- 2.2.03 The Land Use Plan Map

2.3.0 The Circulation and Parking Plan

- 2.3.01 Introduction
- 2.3.02 Short and Long Term Operational Improvements
- 2.3.03 Future Conditions Traffic Assessment

2.4.0 The Historic Preservation Plan

- 2.4.01 Introduction and Statement of Purpose
- 2.4.02 Establishment of the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission
- 2.4.03 Historic Preservation Components of the Master Plan
- 2.4.04 A Summary of Morristown's Historic Preservation Strategy

2.5.0 The Recycling Plan

- 2.5.01 Strategy Requirements and Provisions
- 2.5.02 Solid Waste Collection and Recycling in Morristown
- 2.5.03 Recommendations

2.6.0 The Housing Plan (TO BE PUBLISHED)

Part 3-Acknowledgements and References

- 1.0 Acknowledgements**
- 2.0 References**
- 3.0 Appendix 1: Existing Land Uses and Zoning Conditions
From The 2003 Master Plan**
- 4.0 Appendix 2: Storm Water Master Plan**
- 5.0 Appendix 3: 2000 Demographic Data**

PART 1

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

PART 1

SECTION 1.1.0

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.1.0 INTRODUCTION & OVERVIEW

1.1.01 General Statement of Purpose

A master plan is a comprehensive and coordinated guide for the future growth of a community. The overall goal of a municipal master plan is to reflect all aspects of a community's development, both public and private. It must be based on a clear understanding of the locality and the pressures affecting its growth. This means that the plan must deal with all of the essential physical elements, which comprise the community and influence its development.

The plan for any municipality cannot exist in a vacuum. Just as development does not end at the border of an adjacent municipality, neither do the influences affecting its development. The plan must take into account the development trends of a larger geographic setting within which the municipality is situated.

Nevertheless, the process and the plan cannot ignore individual neighborhoods and objectives. Local issues must be considered. The plan must focus on individual neighborhoods, identify their concerns, and be able to provide effective recommendations.

In short, a municipal master plan should strike a balance between regional trends and local concerns. Since a municipality can neither deny outside influences nor ignore the individual needs of its residents, the plan must reflect both and set a course for future growth which is responsive to varied pressures.

A master plan can't solve every problem, nor meet each resident's individual concerns. It can, however, present a comprehensive response to a full range of problems and provide a coordinated guide to ensure the continued viability of the entire community.

1.1.02 Master Plan Content

This Master Plan for Morristown (the Plan) is intended to provide a comprehensive analysis of those elements and conditions that comprise and affect Morristown and which will influence its future growth. Local and regional factors are reviewed herein and these factors, together with an analysis of the physical character of the community, plus a number of stated goals and objectives, form the framework upon which decisions about the future development and redevelopment of the community can be made.

The Plan also identifies facilities and services which comprise Morristown and evaluates interrelationships that exist among these components. Land use and zoning conditions are mapped and the stability of the Town's physical components is addressed. The adequacy of these components to meet current and future demands is also reviewed and areas of concern are identified and strategies to rectify these concerns are offered.

Thus, the Plan provides policies for all forms of community development and redevelopment. Input for development decisions, both long and short range, are formulated. Policies as well goals and objectives are established and recommendations for implementing policies, to reflect these aims, are presented. This document is also intended to be an expandable one with other segments being added as new information

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

becomes available and other issues are addressed.

As a consequence, the Plan will provide a guide for development throughout Morristown. The Plan is written to serve everyone from a homeowner planning an addition to his home, to a developer negotiating for a major development. And it is especially intended to aid the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment, as well as other municipal agencies and officials in their deliberations. In all instances the Plan should provide the basis for a full range of decisions.

Nevertheless, the scope of the Plan, of necessity is somewhat limited. Since the primary objective is to coordinate decision-making in the various areas of physical development, the emphasis is on broad policy issues. Consequently, more detailed studies concerned with specific areas and projects are not provided. These should be carried out as time and funds permit. The Plan will advise where such studies are needed.

1.1.03 The Master Plan As A Legal Document

The Master Plan is more than merely a guide for development, it is a legal document.

On January 14, 1976, the New Jersey State Legislature approved "The New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law" (MLUL) which has been amended numerous times since. Whereas previously, a municipality was not required to have a Master Plan in order to enact zoning ordinances or prepare an official map, the MLUL requires that all planning decisions must reflect appropriate provisions in a master plan

and no community can impose restrictions upon development without one. Thus, a master plan is required to insure the control of development and must be reexamined every six years. The following MLUL provisions pertain to the preparation of a master plan:

Article 3 Master Plan

40:55D-28 Preparation: contents: modification

a. The Planning Board may prepare and, after public hearing, adopt or amend a master plan or component parts, thereof, to guide the use of lands within the municipality in a manner which protects public health and safety and promotes the general welfare.

b. The master plan shall generally comprise a report or statement and land use and development proposals, with maps, diagrams and text, presenting, at least the following elements (1) and (2) and, where appropriate, the following elements (3) through (12):

(1) A statement of objectives, principals, assumptions, policies and standards upon which the constituent proposals for the physical, economic and social development of the municipality are based.

(2) A land use element (a) taking into account and stating its relationship to the statement provided for in subsection (1) hereof, and other master plan elements provided for in subsection (3) through (12) hereof and natural conditions, including, but not necessarily limited to, topography, soil conditions, water supply, drainage, flood plain areas, marshes, woodlands; (b) showing

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

- the existing and proposed location, extent and intensity development of land to be used in the future for varying types of residential, commercial, industrial, agricultural, recreations, educational and other public and private purposes or combination of purposes, and stating the relationship thereof to the existing and any proposed zone plan and any proposed zone plan and zoning ordinance; and (c) showing the existing and proposed location of any airports and the boundaries of any airport hazard areas delineated pursuant to the "Air Safety and Hazardous Zoning Act of 1983", P.L. 1983, c. 260 (C. 6:1-80 et seq.); and (d) including a statement of the standard of population density and development intensity recommended for the municipality;*
- (3) *A housing plan element pursuant to section 10 of P.L. 1985, c. 222 (C.52:27D-310), including but not limited to, residential standards and proposals for the construction and improvement of housing;*
- (4) *A circulation plan element showing the location and type of facilities for all modes of transportation required for the efficient movement of people and goods into, about, and through the municipality, taking into account the functional highway classification system and the Federal Highway Administration and the types, locations and availability of existing and proposed transportation facilities, including air, water, road and rail;*
- (5) *A utility service plan element analyzing the need for and showing the future general location of water supply and distribution facilities, drainage and flood control facilities, sewerage and waste treatment solid waste disposal and provision for other related utilities, and including any storm water management plan required pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 1981, c. 32 (C.40: 55D-93 et seq.);*
- (6) *A community facility plan element showing the existing and proposed location and type educational or cultural facilities, historic sites, libraries, hospitals firehouses, police stations and other related facilities, including their relation to the surrounding areas.*
- (7) *A recreation plan element showing a comprehensive system of areas and public sites for recreation;*
- (8) *A conservation plan element providing for the preservation, conservation and utilization of natural resources, including, to the extent appropriate, energy, open space, water supply, forests, soil, marshes, wetlands, harbors, rivers and other waters, fisheries, endangered or threatened species wildlife and other resources, and which systematically analyzes the impact of each component and element of the master plan on the present and future preservation, conservation and utilization of those resources;*
- (9) *An economic plan element considering all aspects of economic development and sustained economic vitality, including (a) a comparison of the types of employment expected to*

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

be provided by the economic development to be promoted with the characteristics of the labor pool resident in the municipality and nearby areas and (b) an analysis of the stability and diversity of the economic development to be promoted.

- (10) *A historic preservation plan element (a) indicating the location, significance, proposed utilization, and means for preservation of historic sites and historic districts, and (b) identifying the standards used to access worthiness and historic site or district designation.*

- (11) *Appendices or separate reports containing the technical foundation for the master plan and its constituent elements; and*

- (12) *A recycling plan element which incorporates the State Recycling Plan goals, including provisions for the collection, disposition and recycling of recyclable materials within any development proposal for the construction of 50 or more units of single-family residential housing or 25 or more units of multi-family residential housing and any commercial or industrial development proposal for the utilization of 1,000 square feet or more of land*

- (13) *A farmland preservation plan element, which shall include: an inventory of farm properties and a map illustrating significant areas of agricultural land; a statement showing that municipal ordinances support and promote agriculture as a*

business; and a plan for preserving as much farmland as possible in the short term by leveraging monies made available by P.L. 1999, c. 180 (C.4:1C-43.1) through a variety of mechanisms including, but not limited to, utilizing option agreements, installment purchases, and encouraging donations of permanent development easements.

- (c) *The master plan and its elements may be divided into sub plans and sub plan elements. Projected according to periods of time or staging sequences.*

- (d) *The master plan shall include a specific policy statement indicating the relationship of the proposed development of the municipality as developed in the master plan (1) the master plan of contiguous municipalities, (2) the master plan of the county in which the municipality is located, (3) the State Development and Redevelopment Plan adopted pursuant to the "State Planning Act", sections 1 through 12 of P.L. 1985, c. 389 (C.52:18A-196 et. Seq.) and (4) the district solid waster management plan required pursuant to the provisions of the "Solid Waste Management Act", P.L. 1970, c.39 (C.13:1E-1 et seq.) of the county in which the municipality is located.*

1.1.04 The Master Plan Reexamination Process

NJSA 40:55D-89 requires that the governing body shall, at least every six years, provide for a general

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

reexamination of its master plan and development regulations by the planning board, which shall prepare and adopt by resolution a report on the findings of such reexamination...The reexamination report shall state:

- a. The major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last reexamination report.
- b. The extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have been increased subsequent to such date.
- c. The extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies, and objectives forming the basis for the master plan or development regulations as last revised with particular attention to the density and distribution of population and land uses, collection, disposition and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in State, county and municipal policies and objectives.
- d. The specific changes recommended for the master plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared.
- e. The recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment plans adopted pursuant to the 'Local Redevelopment and Housing Law'into the land use plan element of the municipal master plan , and

recommended changes, if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the municipality."

1.1.05 The Reexamination Process in Morristown.

Although the Planning Board adopted a Master Plan in 2003 the Town Council in 2003 did not approve an updated Zone Map, Zoning Schedule I (Use Regulations) and Schedule II (Area, Bulk and Yard Requirements). These three documents had not undergone a comprehensive updating since 1978.

Accordingly, in 2006, The Mayor and Planning Board directed that the Planning and Zoning Division of the Department of Public Works undertake a reexamination of the 2003 Master Plan, with priority attention given to the Zone Map, Schedule I and Schedule II. It was decided that the Long Range Planning Committee of the Planning Board would conduct the initial review of proposed changes with subsequent review by the full Board. After review by the full Board, the changes were to be submitted to the Town Council for review, approval and enactment of appropriate legislation.

It was also decide that since the 2003 Master Plan provided a detailed description of the major problems and objectives related to land development at that time, the reexamination report findings and recommendations would incorporate the 2003 document .

1.1.06 The Planning Process In Morristown

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Morristown's first Comprehensive Master Plan was prepared by the firm of McHugh and McCrosky in December 1951. That Master Plan's fundamental objectives were the preservation of the Town's residential quality and high character, and the continued viability of the central business district. Forty-five years later these objectives still remain of prime concern.

In 1966, the Master Plan was reviewed and revised by Harland Bartholomew & Associates (HBA) of Washington, D.C. The Plan provided a very comprehensive guide for Morristown's growth. Unfortunately, it was based on two assumptions, which could not be accurately predicted.

First, that Master Plan assumed that the population of Morristown would increase sixteen per cent (16%) from 1960 to 1970. This was based on a belief that more redevelopment of an existing land would occur than actually came to pass. In addition, the HBA Master Plan assumed larger family sizes and higher densities than actually occurred.

Furthermore, the actual effects of the I-287 extension on land use in the area of Madison Avenue were not anticipated. The HBA Master Plan predicted that I-287 would limit the spread of higher intensity uses extending outward from the center of Town. That document recommended that vacant parcels on Madison Avenue be developed as single-family housing. High-density housing was anticipated, and it was thought that such development would depreciate surrounding land value. In addition, HBA felt that the prospect of trees and grass encountered when entering the

Town along Madison Avenue would be a valuable asset. Consequently, low-density residential development was seen as a means to preserve this character.

Unfortunately, the economic value of the land for office use became the overriding factor. Due to the incomplete nature of the highway at that time, HBA had no means of recognizing the influence that I-287 would have on the surrounding area and the development pressure that the completed highway would have on Morristown.

Moreover, the HBA Master Plan did not identify Morristown as a major employment center for office jobs and did not anticipate the housing, recreational, commercial and cultural services that this increased employment would demand.

These factors made it impossible to fully implement the 1966 Master Plan. By the early 70's the Town realized that it would need to restudy and update its Master Plan.

Besides the new State legislation in 1976 previously described, there were three additional conditions, which thrust the Town into action on a new Master Plan. First, community residents expressed a strong desire to be involved in directing any change in the Town's character and sought to provide direct input so that their aspirations would become a vital part of any new plan. Second, the impact of recent major changes in Morristown, such as the opening of I-287 and changing traffic patterns, had stabilized by the mid 1970's. The third consideration, and probably the most important factor as it relates to the study approach taken, was that the governing

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

body wished to involve the community more directly with the planning process. Consequently, Richard P. Browne Associates was engaged to update the Master Plan and that firm developed an approach to permit maximum citizen participation during the study and planning phases of the assignment. This approach was met with excellent response in each area of the Town.

Before the first meeting, an attitude survey questionnaire developed by Fairleigh Dickinson University was distributed to all residents to learn people's feelings regarding existing services and programs provided by the Town. It also asked what improvements in these services or programs they would like to see in the future. The survey provided valuable background data for the discussion outline used in the meetings. The next event was a Town-wide public meeting held in February 1976 to introduce residents to the approach to be taken in preparing the new Master Plan.

Neighborhood district meetings, many of which took place in residents' living rooms, began in March 1976. One representative from the Planning Board, Planning Department and Richard P. Browne Associates attended each of these meetings. The Planning Board members served as discussion leaders at all meetings. Seventeen meetings were held with an average of thirty people attending each one.

Following area meetings, three summary meetings were held, one for each five or six contiguous areas in the Town, to discuss and describe preliminary findings with residents. These meetings generated additional citizen input, and provided the

opportunity to help each area understand that what happens in one area can, and will affect adjoining areas.

The three summary meetings were followed by a final summary meeting at the Thomas Jefferson School. A period of digestion, analysis, evaluation, and detailed planning followed. Out of this process came the 1978 Morristown Master Plan which was later amended in 1981 and which, in large part, serves as the basis for this document and the current land use regulations as well.

Subsequent to the 1981 Master Plan amendment, in conjunction with a committee formed by Mayor David Manahan in 1986, the Town undertook another review of the Master Plan. This effort also used a community outreach approach in an attempt to determine the views of the residents of Morristown with respect to future growth and the problems and opportunities associated with such growth.

The culmination of the 1986 effort was a report dated January 1987 entitled "A Report to the Residents of Morristown, New Jersey Concerning the Morristown Land Use Regulations and Related Items". That report is divided into five sections with a number of appendices. The table of contents of that report follows:

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The Moratorium
- 1.2 The Master Plan Review Process
- 1.3 The Technical Review
- 1.4 The CBD Study

2.0 The 1978/81 Master Plan

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

- 2.1 The Scope of the 1978/81 Master Plan
- 2.2 Goals and Objectives
- 2.3 The Short Range and Long Range Plan
- 2.4 The 1982 Re-examination Report
- 3.0 The Relationship of the Master Plan and Land Use Regulations**
- 4.0 The Issues and concerns of 1986/87**
 - 4.1 General
 - 4.2 Traffic
 - 4.3 Parking
 - 4.4 Administration of the Zoning Ordinance
 - 4.5 Housing
 - 4.6 Commercial
 - 4.7 Architectural/Historical
 - 4.8 Regional Affairs
 - 4.9 Recreational/Cultural
 - 4.10 Specific Areas
- 5.0 The Next Steps**
 - 5.1 Priority Items
 - 5.2 Secondary Items

Appendices

- A. Moratorium Resolution
- B. Questionnaire Form
- C. Neighborhood Meeting Notice
- D. Questionnaire Tabulation
- E. Summary of Technical Review
- F. A Description of the Comprehensive Community Master Plan
- G. A Description of the Land Use Regulations Ordinance

The 1986 report was later used as the basis for two Master Plan Re-examination Reports, one adopted in January of 1991 and the other in January of 1998. During the 1990's several amendments were also made to the Master Plan and Land Use Regulations of the Town. And several efforts were initiated to undertake a comprehensive review and revision of the Master Plan.

However, those efforts were sidetracked because of other demands imposed on the municipal planning staff and the Planning Board. Consequently, it wasn't until 1999 that the Town secured a planning grant from the Federal government and the current Master Plan revision program got underway. The current effort has involved a series of meetings of the Planning Board's Long Range Planning Committee (LRPC) during which the public has been invited to attend and listen to a variety of topics and issues that have been discussed by the LRPC members. Detailed minutes of each meeting have been recorded and are included in the appendix of this document. In addition to the aforementioned LRPC meetings, two Planning Board meetings were held at Morristown High School in May of 2001 to obtain public input on a community wide basis regarding planning related issues of concern to the general public.

This document then builds on all of the Morristown planning efforts that preceded it and has considered a variety of comments, many of them conflicting, from individual residents, business representatives - including spokespersons from the Morristown Partnership - as well as neighborhood associations and several special interest groups.

In summary, then this document is a continuation of the planning process that has guided this community for more than fifty years. And it is also a distillation of much data and many community viewpoints that did not exist previously.

1.1.07 A Brief History Of Morristown

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

The establishment of Morristown and its subsequent growth has been closely associated with its varied topography, rich resources, and abundant water supply. Its earliest known inhabitants were the Leni-Lenape Indians who were members of the Algonquin family. The numerous streams and lakes offered what seemed to be an unlimited supply of fish and waterfowl. In addition, the area was once abundant with small game and fur bearing animals for hunting and trapping.

These attractions drew Dutch trappers from New York and Bergen County in the late seventeenth century. They explored the area and eventually set up trading posts. Settlers of English origin came soon afterwards. Finding accessible deposits of iron and abundant waterpower, several forges were then established about 1715 along the Whippany River. Later a tavern was erected, and additional structures were built along Spring and Water Streets.

Morristown, then known as West Hanover, erected its first church, the First Presbyterian Church, in 1733. Six years later a large tract of land was partitioned from Hunderton County and named Morris County, after the first governor of New Jersey, Lewis Morris. The Town of West Hanover became the County seat and soon afterwards it was rechristened Morristown. By this time the center of the Town had shifted to the Green, where the Presbyterian Church had been built.

The area, with its widely varying topography, had a great effect on the development of the American colonies as a whole, and especially on New Jersey. Parallel mountain ranges, known

as the New Jersey Highlands created a barrier to western and northwestern movements, because of few natural passes, while the long valleys between the ridges afforded convenient routes of communication between New England and the southern colonies. During the Revolution, these valleys also proved to be excellent defensive positions from which, George Washington's troops could harass the British, protected from reprisals by the mountains to the east. Morristown's role, during 1779 -1780, has resulted in it now being known as "The Military Capital of The American Revolution". Of note is the is Arnold's Tavern, long since gone, was often the meeting place of George Washington, Alexander Hamilton and the Marquis de Lafayette.

In July, 1825 the Marquis de Lafayette made an overnight visit to Morristown and was ceremoniously welcomed and dined.

In the beginning of the nineteenth century, Morristown was a thriving Community. The Morris Academy, a preparatory school, was educating boys and girls; the library opened with ninety-six volumes and Stephen Vail was operating the Speedwell Iron Works. Stephen's son, Alfred helped Samuel F. B. Morse perfect the telegraph at the Iron Works where, on January 6, 1838, the electronic telegraph was first demonstrated.

At the same time, Morristown was becoming an active cultural center. In connection with Morristown's role as a growing cultural and regional center a number of prominent literary people and artists established residences in the Morristown area during the 19th century. These included Homer

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Davenport, Bret Harte, Joyce Kilmer, Rudyard Kipling, Thomas Nast, Frank Stockton and William Graham Sumner.

By 1902, the Town had gained a national reputation. In that year the New York Herald reported that one-hundred millionaires lived within three miles of the Green with a combined wealth of half a billion dollars. Nevertheless, the Town also had a considerable population of lower income residents who found employment as laborers and servants on the large estates in the area. With the advent of the Great Depression of the 1930's, few families could afford to maintain large estates any longer. The year 1929 began the erosion of many estates. Consequently, large tracts were subdivided and many fine homes were ultimately razed to make way for residential and other types of development.

This trend continued into the forties and fifties. Following World War II, the area experienced an influx of middle and upper-income people from nearby urban areas. Increasing congestion and the physical deterioration of these cities contributed to this exodus. Lower density residences, superior school systems, abundant recreational land and other attractions drew many people to Morris County. In addition, many industries and commercial establishments followed suit and Morris County began to emerge as a major industrial and commercial center. Access to a skilled labor supply and trainable labor pool attracted highly sophisticated industries and research-oriented facilities to the area.

Nevertheless, it wasn't until the late 1960's that Morris County was able to offer a surface transportation network

equal to other centers around the New York Metropolitan Area. The extension of Route 80 through Morris County and the construction of I-287 provided the County with an excellent system of highways. This system contributed to increased commercial and industrial activity throughout an extended period of slow growth and economic uncertainty at the state and national level in the early and mid 1970's. Exhibit 1-1 depicts Morristown's location in relationship to the New York-New Jersey Metropolitan Area and the transportation network serving this area.

Concurrently during this period, Morristown began to evolve into a prestigious office center, fueled in large part by the presence of Morris County government in the heart of the community. The development of Headquarters Plaza, during the first term of Mayor Cresitello, imposed a radical new look on the Morristown landscape but at the same time added hundreds of new employees within the Central Business District, which has had a profound change on the relationship of the Central Business District to the remainder of the community. Improved highway access also contributed to Morristown's emergence as a major hub in the County's development. Furthermore, throughout its history the Town has maintained a population of diverse racial and income composition, which has contributed to its continued vitality.

Returning to Morristown's early days for a moment, it is important to know that after the American Revolution Morris County experienced substantial economic growth. Industries developed which took advantage of the rich iron

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

ore being mined in the area. Steel mills, furnaces, and forges were constructed and the area fostered much of the early manufacturing in the state.

Consequently, Morristown became an important market center and an important stagecoach stop, as well. Community life became enriched in many ways. The Morris Academy, opening with thirty-two pupils, attained a national reputation. In addition, three public school districts were established. A number of newspapers began publishing, including the Morris County Gazette and the Genius of Liberty. A library, fire association, and aqueduct were also established.

Among early 19th century, local projects was the creation of the Morris Turnpike, which was a toll road designed to run from Elizabeth in Union County to Newton in Sussex County. This was begun in 1801, and along with the completion of the Morris Canal in 1831, helped to provide a cheap and efficient means of transporting local products. Concurrently, tracks were being laid for the Morris and Essex Railroad and by 1838, two trips daily to New York were being offered.

Despite these conveniences, local services were poorly managed and maintained. Roads were in very bad condition and many people were dissatisfied with local government. As a consequence, the citizens of Morristown petitioned the State Legislature to incorporate the Town and in 1865 these efforts met with success. One thousand acres, roughly in the center of Morris Township, became officially known as the Town of Morristown. The community boundaries remained fluid and additional parcels of Township land

were later annexed.

During the latter half of the 19th century, Morristown became known as a fashionable summer resort. Its pleasant climate, scenic countryside and rural character provided a peaceful interlude for many wealthy New Yorkers, who found that the close proximity to the New York City by rail together with low taxes permitted the luxury of living in a large estate in a rural setting, while still maintaining business interests in the City. Given these advantages many families decided to remain year round. Regular commuter service was established to New York on the railroad and the Town evolved into a major residential community during what is often referred to as the "Victorian House Period".

As noted previously, the Town continued to evolve through the early and middle parts of the twentieth century but still retained its role as a regional center and continued to be a heterogeneous community. The late 1970's and 1980's, however, were not especially good years for Morristown because of a series of problems, which began to confront the Town, including concerns associated with an aging infrastructure. Chief among these problems was an inadequate sewage treatment plant, which required a very expensive upgrade that resulted in a development moratorium being imposed on Morristown until the treatment plant was reconstructed. As the Town entered the decade of the 1990's, there were signs that Morristown was beginning to recapture some of its lost prestige. Development pressure increased and the preferred mode of expansion was vertical rather than horizontal. New Jersey Transit initiated

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

"Midtown Direct" service cutting the travel time via rail to New York by twenty minutes. The Morristown Partnership was established as a public/private cooperative effort charged with the responsibility of revitalizing the Town's business district and enhancing its image. The business district during the 1990's evolved into a commercial center much different than it was even 20 years ago; "mom & pop" businesses began phasing out and are still being replaced in many instances by more upscale ventures. So, as the Town now heads into the early years of the twenty-first century, it is a community at a crossroads. It is still very much a suburban environment but its core is becoming more urban than suburban. The population of the community is changing and traffic congestion seems to be the primary topic of discussion. The challenge in the years ahead will be to maintain the vitality produced by this city-like atmosphere, while also maintaining a link with the Town's more relaxed, suburban past. Exhibit 1-2, an aerial photograph of Morristown, depicts the development pattern in the community during the late 1990's with the center of Morristown, being densely developed and the fringes of the community accommodating lower density development.

As the twenty-first century opened, the Town embarked on an intensive redevelopment program. Initially, the redevelopment projects which were approved tended to be in or near the center of Town (The Vail Mansion in 2003, The Highlands in 2004 and Epstein's in 2006).

Later redevelopment projects were initiated under the Local

Redevelopment and Housing Law (NJSA 40A:12A-1). These projects tended to cluster on the Speedwell Avenue-Spring Street-Morris Street corridor (The Speedwell Avenue Redevelopment, the Spring Street Redevelopment, the Center-Coal Redevelopment the Lafayette Firehouse Redevelopment, initiated in 2007 and the Morris Street Redevelopment anticipated to begin in 2008), all during Mayor Cresitello's second term.

1.1.08 Influencing Factors Related To Morristown's Development Pattern

The emergence of a community and its subsequent development pattern rarely occurs by chance. Its origins are tied to specific social, economic, and physical conditions, which influence growth and dictate land use. The response to such factors as a fork in a river, the location of a railroad station, or even the placement of an exit on an interstate highway can generate new development and influence the physical characteristics of a community. These factors are clearly reflected in the spatial patterns of land use in a community.

Typically, the original settlement of many New Jersey towns developed along the edge of a river. A potable water supply was thereby secured and fresh fish provided a supplement to many diets. As the community grew, a local waterfall might have provided power to turn a wheel for the establishment of mills and other small industries. Concurrently, roads were being carved into the landscape and connections were established between adjacent communities. The intersection of two major roads often served as the marketplace for the surrounding area.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Farmers, hunters and trappers would come into town to exchange goods and to purchase industrial commodities. Small shops would spring up in the market place. As a community expanded, a main commercial strip would evolve and the "downtown" would become firmly entrenched. Closely spaced shops and small office buildings would line both sides of the main street and create the backdrop for the social, political, and economic activity of an area, which extended well beyond the boundary of the municipality.

The railroad also played an important role in the development of many communities in New Jersey. It served as the major conveyor of people and products. Consequently, those municipalities, which were bypassed when the tracks were being laid, failed to emerge as important centers.

The placement of the tracks through a community also had a great deal to do with the evolution of its physical form. When the station was constructed away from the center of town, a new business district would often emerge about the railroad station and eventually overtake the original district in prestige and importance.

Warehouses and industrial facilities would develop near the railroad, as well. Owners were thus assured an efficient means of transporting goods and products. These facilities would stretch along the tracks for easy access and loading.

The railroad also served to establish residential patterns. Lower income residential areas would become interwoven with the industrial

development along the railroad. As these areas expanded, additional housing would be built downwind from the railroad's black smoke.

Middle and upper income residences would be constructed "on the other side of the tracks". Being upwind from the pollutants, they were protected from the black veil that the railroad extended along its path. An upper income residential street would often be established along a main street leading into the community. Thus, fine mansions served as one's initial focus upon arrival.

In the twentieth century the creation of the interstate highway system like the railroads in the nineteenth century has assumed an important position as a physical determinant for new development. Interchanges have become prime real estate for the establishment of industrial parks, office complexes and shopping malls. Easy access and relatively inexpensive development costs have created the impetus for new construction and have fostered a shift in many communities, as the role of the "downtown" has been uprooted from the center of the community and moved to the highway interchange many miles distant.

This section will focus on the physical determinants, which have influenced Morristown's growth. Existing land use patterns will be reviewed in general terms later in this document and influences for future growth will be discussed as well. But first an overview of certain urban planning principles that apply to Morristown will be presented as means of understanding how Morristown has evolved into its current form. These principles were first

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

presented in the 1978 Master Plan.

Urban geographers have been analyzing the structure of American cities and towns for over a century. In 1933, Charles C. Colby identified two opposing forces, which he determined reflected the dynamic nature of American cities. They were Centrifugal Forces, which caused functions to migrate from central areas of the city to the periphery and Centripetal Forces, which impelled functions towards the central zone and attracted others to it.

Colby defined four Centripetal Forces, which attracted functions to the center of the city. One was Site Attraction, which invited the original occupancy. Functional Convenience was a second force, which resulted from the accessibility, which the central zone afforded. A third force was Functional Magnetism, which caused other functions to be attracted to the central zone because of the nature of existing establishments, (i.e. high-priced women's dress shop may attract a similarly priced shoe store or accessory shop). Consequently, Functional Prestige, the fourth force, evolved as a function of the attraction of like enterprises. Thus, one area might develop as a professional center, another might become known for fine dining establishments and a third for high priced boutiques.

In contrast, Centrifugal Forces encourage dissemination of functional elements from the center of the city. Colby identified five forces, which created such a condition. The first was the Spatial Force, whereby congestion in the central zone would contribute to the desire to expand elsewhere. A second force was the Site Force, which Colby

concluded encouraged resettlement in the less congested periphery. A third force was labeled the Situational Force. This was determined to result from unsatisfactory relationship with adjacent functional elements with a hope that a more satisfactory relationship could be established elsewhere. The fourth force, the Force of Social Evolution, was determined to evolve as a response to high land values, taxes, and concerns about ongoing trends. This was also seen to cause movement to peripheral locations where opposite conditions usually held true. Finally, the fifth force of Status and Organization of Occupancy was determined to encourage movement to the periphery because of improved status and the modern facilities, which that area could afford.

Colby also identified one additional force, which he labeled the Human Equation. Colby stated that this could work as either a centripetal or centrifugal force and was found to evolve from the cognitive perception of one's environment as perceived by the individual.

Today, additional factors provide assistance in understanding the dynamic of the urban structure. Social-economic forces have played an increasingly important role in influencing growth patterns. Nevertheless, these too have tended to evolve from Colby's' original determinants. Consequently, Colby's' concepts are still relevant and are useful in understanding the development process in a community like Morristown, and will be considered briefly in the regional analysis section of this document. In addition, more formal models, which explain the dynamics of

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

urban structure, have evolved. Known as the Concentric Circle Mode; the Sector Model; and the Multiple Nuclei Model, they reflect theoretical organization of the functional elements, which comprise urban situations. These models are described as follows:

In 1923, Ernest W. Burgess proposed the Concentric Circle Zone Hypothesis. The essence of this model was that the city expands radially from its center to form a series of concentric zones. The center of the city, Zone 1 would contain the Central Business District (CBD), which is the heart of the community and would include such activities as retail establishments, office buildings, financial institutions, hotels, entertainment and cultural facilities, and civic buildings. Encircling the CBD would be the wholesale and light-manufacturing district, Zone II. It also would contain an area of residential deterioration as a result of encroachments from the CBD. Around it, Zone III would be the zone of the independent workingman's homes. Burgess determined that this zone would be inhabited by working class residents. The next zone, Zone IV, would contain the higher income residences, and beyond it, the commuter's zone would filter out into the countryside. Burgess used the City of Chicago to explain his theory. A major feature was the fact that as one moved away from the center, incomes in residential areas rose as an inverse function of density.

A second model was formulated in

1939 by Homer Hoyt, and became known as the wedge or sector theory. Hoyt disputed Burgess' theory that the city developed radially. He analyzed the distribution of residential neighborhoods as defined by rent levels and found neighborhoods developed by income characteristics, that they tended to locate in pie shaped sectors, and that they did not form a complete circle around the city. Hoyt was able to make additional generalizations about the location of the functional elements, which comprised the city. He concluded that the area occupied by the highest income families tended to occur on high ground or on a lake, river, or ocean shore. The low-income families tended to live in sectors situated on the least desirable land alongside railroad, industrial or commercial areas. Hoyt's model took into account special elements, such as a major highway or the influence of the railroad, both of which play important roles in land development. Hence, Hoyt's model proved to be an improvement on Burgess' earlier effort.

The third model, the Multiple Nuclei, was formulated by Chauncy Harris and Edward Ullman in 1945. They argued that the land use pattern of a city did not grow from a single center, but from several distinct nuclei. In addition, they concluded that the number of nuclei vary from city to city and that the larger the city the more numerous and specialized are the nuclei.

The rise of separate nuclei and differentiated districts was determined to result from a

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

combination of four factors:

1. *Certain activities require specialized functions.*
2. *Certain like activities group together because they profit from linkages.*
3. *Certain unlike activities are detrimental to each other.*
4. *Certain activities cannot afford the high rents of more desirable sites.*

These factors are similar to those stated by Colby and reflect an extension of his determinants. Like Colby, Harris and Ullman recognize that there are forces, which pull elements away from the city, just, as there are those that, impel them to stay.

The configuration of a community as manifested by the pattern of land use development cannot absolutely be depicted in theories and models. Every community has individual factors, which influence its growth apart from universal trends. Thus, the models as depicted by Burgess, Hoyt, and Harris and Ullman, are not meant to correspond precisely to the existing land use pattern in a community. Nevertheless, they do help provide insight into the evolution of a community's development and can be used to diagram the interrelationship between diverse functional elements. In Morristown, these models can also be applied as a tool for describing past development influences, as well as to predict future development.

1.1.09 Evolution Of Form In Morristown

As already noted, Morristown's first settlement occurred about 1715 in the area of Spring Street, Center Street and Headquarters Plaza. A tributary of the Whippany River emptied into a pond, which had once existed on the site, and an iron forge was established there, followed by two grist mills and two saw mills. The land around the settlement was then sold to new settlers who were attracted to the fertile farmland in the area and soon many farmhouses and cabins sprang up over a 100-year period from 1777 to 1876. The bulk of the road network within Morristown also was established during this time frame.

As more people settled in and around Morristown, a town center was established. The Presbyterian Church was built on what now is the Town Green. A marketplace was established around the Green, and additional public facilities, including a courthouse and jail were constructed there as well.

Thus, the initial land use pattern reflected Burgess' "Concentric Circle" hypothesis. Commercial and public facilities became concentrated in a dense core around the Green, while farmhouses and cabins became more widely dispersed in a concentric pattern encircling the Town.

By 1798, a stagecoach route to Jersey City was established. The coach was driven into Town along Morris Avenue. The road had become a major thoroughfare, which extended through Morris and Sussex Counties. Other major routes included Speedwell Avenue, South Street, Washington Turnpike and what is now Mt. Kemble

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Avenue. As new homesteads were staked, most of them were built along these routes.

In 1838, when the railroad was first constructed, its original path came through Morristown along Maple Avenue. The first depot was built at the corner of DeHart Street and Maple Avenue. A new marketplace was established at the termination of the line along what is now Market Street. A few years later, as service on the line was expanded, the tracks were moved to their current location. This move generated new commercial development pressures around the new station. However, by that time, the downtown was firmly entrenched and although the location of the new railroad station increased commercial activity along Morris Street, the commercial center of the Town, was not displaced. Instead, as commercial growth continued, it became redirected towards the depot. Thus, the station served as a magnet, which attracted and intensified development along Morris Street and extended the commercial core of the Town.

By 1890 the Town's spatial pattern reflected Hoyt's Sector Model. Industrial development had followed the path of the railroad. Lower income residential growth became confined to an area downwind from the tracks and was interwoven with industrial facilities. Upper income residential neighborhoods were constructed south of the railroad, while the central commercial core spread out in a radial pattern along major thoroughfares.

Currently, Morristown's spatial configuration reflects a number of diverse functional influences. The

organization of the Town itself is still best described by Hoyt's Sector Model. The commercial core has continued to expand radially, while residential patterns have remained stratified. The construction of I-287 has reinforced this pattern. In fact, a new sector has emerged adjacent to the highway, as secondary commercial activity has been generated along portions of Ridgedale Avenue.

On a regional scale, however, the highway has contributed to the emergence of a Multiple Nuclei organization. At major interchanges along the roadway, the ease of access has created intense development pressures at these locations apart from local influences. This has been particularly felt where Madison Avenue bisects I-287. Here a professional office center has developed and pressures for additional development activity have intensified in recent years. The emergence of Morristown Memorial Hospital as an important regional facility can also be partly attributed to the enhanced access provided by Route 287. Thus, the areas around the Town of Morristown interchanges have emerged as distinct functional centers. Development here is strongly affected by regional trends, which extend beyond the boundaries of the Town.

Morristown's spatial organization with regard to the adjacent municipalities of Morris Township, Morris Plains and Harding Township also reflects a distinct pattern. In this context, Morristown can be viewed as a small urban center. While these adjoining communities reflect the outlying suburbs, Morristown is the center of activity and holds the greatest concentration of people. Exhibit 1-2,

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

graphically depicts this development pattern. In addition, Morristown has a greater concentration of low and moderate-income residents.

Consequently Morristown must bear a heavier cost of providing social services than these nearby municipalities.

1.1.10 State and Regional Overview

The State Planning Act, signed into law in 1986, summarized both the need and the objectives of planning in New Jersey in these words:

"New Jersey, the nation's most densely populated state, requires sound and integrated Statewide planning and the coordination of Statewide planning with local and regional planning in order to conserve its natural resources, revitalize its urban centers, protect the quality of its environment, and provide needed housing and adequate public services at a reasonable cost while promoting beneficial economic growth, development and renewal." (N.J.S.A. 52:18A-196)

The Act created the State Planning Commission and directed the Commission to prepare and adopt a State Development and Redevelopment Plan. It also set up a statewide planning process called "cross-acceptance" to see that government at all levels and the public participate in preparing and adopting the Plan.

The Preliminary State Plan was introduced in January 1989. After comparison with county and municipal plans and further discussion, in 1991 an Interim State Plan was published reflecting the revisions to the Preliminary Plan.

After more negotiation with counties and municipalities, a public hearing was scheduled during May of 1992 in each of the 21 counties. In accordance with the State Planning Act, the Commission was required to adopt the Plan no later than 60 days after the final public hearing which was held on May 11, 1992. It was officially adopted June 12, 1992. The State Planning Commission again went through this process in the late 1990's which culminated in the adoption of a new state Development and Redevelopment Plan in 2001.

In the original and current State Plan, it was specified that the Plan "should be used only to guide municipal and county master planning, State agency functional planning and infrastructure investment decisions." Further, it was said, "it is not appropriate to use the State Plan directly to formulate codes, ordinances, administrative rules or other 'regulations'. All New Jersey governments, and appropriate agencies thereof, are encouraged to review their plans with the goal to bring them into 'consistency' with Strategies, Objectives and Policies of the State Plan. Using the State Plan in this manner assures that the integrity of existing planning and regulatory processes is maintained, that planning is coordinated and integrated statewide, that the State Plan does not interfere with the prerogatives of governments and agencies in carrying out their responsibilities and that the State Plan does not delay regulatory or other processes."

The specific State Planning Goals and Objectives, as contained in the State Development and Redevelopment Plan are presented as follows:

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Goal #1 Revitalize the State's Cities and Towns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Urban Centers · Towns · Regional Centers
Goal #2 Conserve the State's Natural Resources and Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Villages · Hamlets
Goal #3 Promote Beneficial Economic Growth, Development and Renewal for All Residents of New Jersey	<p>Planning Areas "serve a pivotal role in the State Plan by setting forth Policy Objectives that guide the application of the Statewide Policies within each area and guide local planning and decisions on the locations and size of centers. The Planning Areas are:</p>
Goal #4 Protect the Environment, Prevent and Clean Up Pollution	<p>Metropolitan Planning Area (PA 1)</p>
Goal #5 Provide Adequate Public Facilities and Services at a Reasonable Cost	<p>Suburban Planning Area (PA 2)</p>
Goal #6 Provide Adequate Housing at a Reasonable Cost	<p>Fringe Planning Area (PA 3)</p>
Goal #7 Preserve and Enhance Areas with Historic, Cultural, Scenic, Open Space and Recreational Value	<p>Rural Planning Area (PA 4)</p>
Goal #8 Ensure Sound and Integrated Planning and Implementation Statewide	<p>Rural/Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area (PA 4B)</p> <p>Environmentally Sensitive Planning Area (PA 5)</p> <p>Environmentally Sensitive/ Barrier Islands Planning Area (PA 5B)</p>

The State Plan identifies the types of compact forms of development that are desirable and necessary to assure efficient infrastructure and protection of natural and environmental resources. The Plan also identifies regions within which there are critical natural and built resources that should be either protected or enhanced to achieve the goals of the State Planning Act. The compact forms are called "Centers" and the regions are called "Planning Areas."

The Plan contemplates five types of centers

The State Plan also identifies Critical Environmental Sites (CES), Historical and Cultural Sites (HCS), Parks and Natural Areas and Military Installations.

Morristown is identified in the State Plan as an Existing Regional Center in the Metropolitan Planning Area. The Town received official designation as such by the State Planning Commission in 1995.

The following criteria are intended as a general guide for identifying Regional

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Centers. Local conditions may require flexible application of the criteria to achieve the Policy Objectives of the Planning Area:

1. It functions (or is planned to function) as the focal point for the economic, social and cultural activities of its region, with a compact, mixed-use (for example, commercial, office, industrial, public) core and neighborhoods offering a wide variety of housing types; and
2. It has access to existing or planned infrastructure sufficient to serve projected growth; and
3. It has, within the center boundary, an existing (or planned) population of more than 10,000 people in Metropolitan and Suburban Planning Areas and more than 5,000 people in Fringe, Rural and Environmentally Sensitive Planning Areas; and
4. It has (or is planned to have) a gross population density of approximately 5,000 persons per square mile excluding water bodies (or approximately three dwelling units per acre) or more within the center boundary; and
5. It has (or is planned to have) within the center boundary, an employment base of more than 10,000 jobs in Metropolitan and Suburban Planning Areas and more than 5,000 jobs in Fringe, Rural and Environmentally Sensitive Planning Areas; and
6. It is near a major public transportation terminal, arterial

intersection of interstate interchange capable of serving as the hub for two or more modes of transportation; and

7. It has a land area of one to twenty square miles.

The Town's Center Designation will expire in 2008. Beginning in 2006, the Town began the process of petitioning for Plan Endorsement from the Office of Smart Growth of the Department of Community Affairs.

In addition to Morristown's relationship to the State Development and Re-development Plan, it is also important to be aware of how Morristown relates to nearby municipalities from a planning and zoning perspective. The communities that have the most direct relationship with Morristown are Morris Township, Harding Township, Mendham Township, Randolph Township, The Borough of Morris Plains, Hanover Township and the Borough of Madison. Other municipalities in the immediate region that also interact with Morristown but less directly include Parsippany Township, the Boroughs of Chatham and Florham Park, Long Hill Township, Chester Borough and Township and Mendham Borough. All of these municipalities are less densely developed than Morristown. In fact the communities to the south and west of Morristown are rural-suburban in character with large tracts of open space. The municipalities to the north and east are more suburban in terms of their development pattern and generally include many non-residential uses, (commercial, industrial etc) and higher density residential development than is found to the south and west of

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Morristown.

The existing road and rail network links most of these communities directly to Morristown and the traffic impacts that Morristown experiences, particularly during peak traffic conditions, can be traced to vehicles originating in many of these municipalities. As already noted in The State Development and Redevelopment Plan, Morristown serves the role of a regional center and many of these municipalities lack extensive “centers” themselves and the variety of cultural, financial and social services found in a center.

Consequently they rely on Morristown to satisfy the needs of many of their residents. Only one of these municipalities, however, borders Morristown and that municipality is Morris Township. Actually, as already noted earlier in this document, Morristown and Morris Township were one municipality until the middle of the 19th century. And these two municipalities still function as one municipality in certain respects sharing the responsibility for the local school system, operating a joint library and sharing certain youth recreation programs, such as baseball, football, soccer and softball.

But in terms of planning and zoning issues the two municipalities operate independently of each other. However, the NJ Municipal Land Use Law requires municipalities to be cognizant of what is happening beyond their own municipal boundaries and particularly how planning and zoning decisions may affect their immediate neighbors.

Exhibit 1-3 is a composite zoning map that delineates the relationship between Morristown and Morris Township’s zoning, particularly along the common

boundary separating the two communities. For the most part the Morris Township zoning districts that adjoin Morristown fall into one of two categories – single family residential or the Open Space/Government Use Zone. There are exceptions however, such as the Industrial zoning of the Township that abuts Ridgedale Ave. But Morristown’s portion of Ridgedale Ave adjacent to the Township is also zoned for non residential purposes and is therefore compatible with Township’s zoning. Generally, where the Township’s residential zoning abuts a Morristown residential zone, the allowed densities are lower in the Township. In most cases this is acceptable since the difference in densities is not substantial and the actual development patterns reflect a gradual transition that is common as one moves outward from a densely developed core.

Any proposed changes along the Morristown, Morris Township boundary should attempt to correct the few minor inconsistencies that exist between the two municipalities. However, where the development pattern is already established any such change will have no practical effect. So, any contemplated change must first be evaluated with respect to the planning goals and objectives that have been established by Morristown in this document but these changes must also consider if there will be a negative impact on the Township as well.

PART 1

SECTION 1.2.0

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.2.0 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

1.2.01 Introduction and Purpose

The Town of Morristown is a community that historically has accommodated both a vibrant commercial environment and a diverse residential population.

As Morristown approaches the 300th anniversary of its founding, the important questions to be answered involve two key issues:

- Morristown's "physical form" in the twenty-first century and
- The "quality of life" that Morristown visitors and residents alike, will experience.

The specific planning goals and objectives delineated herein will significantly influence both how Morristown's physical form will be shaped and what quality of life Morristown will be able to offer.

As a starting point, the Town of Morristown accepts and adopts, by reference, the planning purposes outlined in 40:55 D-2 of the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), as well as the applicable goals and statewide policies of the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. The MLUL purposes provide the broad general framework for successful planning in both the State of New Jersey, in general, and the Town of Morristown, specifically. These purposes, however, are intended to be broad in nature and do not target in any detail the unique issues and circumstances that affect the Town of Morristown. Consequently it is

necessary to be more definitive with respect to the Town's planning goals and objectives, if Morristown is to clearly identify its twenty-first century destination and how it intends to get there.

Many of these goals and objectives were first enunciated in the Town's 1978 Master Plan and earlier planning documents. Others, however, reflect the changes that have occurred in during the last two decades of the twentieth century, the first decade of the twenty-first century and the challenges anticipated during the second decade of the twenty-first century.

The goals and objectives are divided into ten separate categories with each goal having one or more objectives that suggest how the goal in question will be achieved. Some of the objectives apply to more than one goal. This is done for emphasis in order to identify those objectives that are multi purpose in nature and to illustrate the interrelation-ship among the various goals that have been identified. Again, these specific goals and objectives are tailored to fit the Town of Morristown, but are grounded in the purposes of the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law, as previously referenced.

Finally, these goals and objectives have been formulated and tested via an intense review by the Planning Board and with input from other municipal officials and the general public. Although these goals and objectives reflect a general consensus about Morristown's future, there obviously were dissenting opinions that have not been accommodated.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

This doesn't in any way threaten the validity of the goals and objectives as stated herein. It does, however, require that the Town periodically consider these dissenting opinions and determine if changing circumstances warrant any reconsideration. The vehicle to do this is the Master Plan Re-examination process that is required to occur every six years by the NJ Municipal Land Use Law.

Until such time then as the goals and objectives contained herein are re-examined and possibly altered, they will constitute the planning policies of the Town of Morristown and must be reflected in the various elements of this Master Plan, in any implementing ordinances adopted by the governing body, and in the decisions of the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.2.02 QUALITY OF LIFE

- GOAL:** To maintain an environment in Morristown that is conducive to attracting and retaining a diverse population and a vibrant business community.
- Objective #1:** Preserve the human scale of Morristown, and its “small town flavor”, as well as the physical and historic characteristics of the Town, while at the same time recognizing that it is a regional commercial center and is the County Seat.
- Objective #2:** Encourage the private investment and commitment needed to make the Town more pleasant and efficient as a place to live and work.
- Objective #3:** Preserve and protect the existing Town Green and its environs, which are major elements of the community’s identity. Enhance other green space in the community that will allow those areas to serve as focal points in their neighborhoods.
- Objective #4:** Relieve congestion in the Central Business District by providing improved access and alternative means of transportation. Minimize the amount of non-residential traffic into residential neighborhoods.
- Objective #5:** Protect the residential areas of the community from inappropriate intrusions.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Objective #6: Work toward making Morristown a handicap accessible community to the greatest extent possible and be cognizant of the problems associated with the special needs population

1.2.03 LAND USE

GOAL: **To encourage a balanced and appropriate land use pattern.**

Objective #1: Preserve the human scale of Morristown and its small town flavor as well as its landmarks and heritage so vital to its identity, where appropriate and realistic.

Objective #2: Respond to regional development trends in a manner most responsive to the community's continued well being and viability as a Designated Regional Center.*

Objective #3: Preserve the viability of Morristown as a Designated Regional Center and County Seat by maintaining its diversity as a residential, commercial, professional, cultural, and service center. In addition, its role as a center should continue to be encouraged only to the extent that the Town tax base is not jeopardized.

Objective #4: Establish a pattern of land uses, which will promote the highest degree of health, safety, efficiency and well-being for all segments of the community and which will ensure a positive relationship between land used for residential, commercial and other uses.

Objective #5 Control the commercial and high-density residential growth in the Town through the approval of redevelopment projects along the Speedwell Avenue-Spring Street-Morris Street corridor.

1.2.04 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

A) GOAL#1: **To respect the portions of the natural environment still remaining in and around Morristown.**

Objective #1: Conserve open space and other valuable natural resources through the proper use of land and facilities.

Objective #2: Maintain and supplement the public park and street tree resources that exist within the Town and encourage the protection of trees on privately owned land.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Objective #3: Protect the environmentally aesthetic and sensitive resources of the community.

Objective #4: Encourage the use of green building technology on future projects and specifically on redevelopment projects.

*The NJ State Planning Commission approved Morristown's Designated Regional Center application in 1996.

B) GOAL #2: To encourage the protection of air, water and other natural resources of the community and to minimize the impact of other pollutants.

Objective #1: Control non-point source water pollution within Morristown to protect the Great Swamp, Whippany River, and Passaic River Watersheds. Additionally, actively participate in regional water quality forums for areas that impact Morristown.

Objective #2: Insure that the criteria and controls in the Storm Water Management Plan are enforced.

Objective #3: Encourage the use of mass transit facilities and/or transportation alternatives that minimize the use of the internal combustion engine.

Objective #4: Maintain an effective recycling program.

Objective #5: Encourage patterns of land use and other controls to minimize the impact of noise.

1.2.05 CIRCULATION

GOAL: To promote efficient and safe pedestrian and vehicular mobility within the Town

Objective #1: Correlate the land use pattern and corresponding traffic movements to the ability of the street network to efficiently and effectively move vehicles throughout the community.

Objective #2: Concurrent with the redevelopment along the Speedwell Avenue-Spring Street-Morris Street corridor, conduct traffic studies to determine the effect of the development on traffic flow and make recommendations to improve the street network to permit effective traffic movement.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Objective #3: Provide an effective barrier-free network for pedestrian movements.

Objective #4: Provide a sufficient amount of off street parking in appropriate locations.

Objective #5: Establish an internal mass transit system that services the Central Business District and high-density residential areas within the community and which connects to the regional transit network.

1.2.06 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

GOAL: To retain and enhance Morristown's position as the financial, cultural, business and historical center of Morris County and as one of the premiere business environments within New Jersey.

Objective #1: Install and encourage streetscape and other aesthetic improvements throughout the Town.

Objective #2: Encourage businesses that are technologically oriented and that will compete effectively in the twenty-first century.

Objective # 3: Provide the infrastructure needed by the types of business that Morristown is most likely to attract.

Objective # 4: Encourage the adaptive reuse and development of underutilized and "brownfields" properties.

Objective #5: Provide sufficient housing for a workforce to staff the financial, cultural, business and historical endeavors in the Town.

1.2.07 POPULATION

GOAL: To encourage controlled growth in the resident population base of the community, maintain Morristown's diversity, and do so without threatening the single family and two family neighborhoods within Morristown.

Objective #1: Provide for an appropriate level of low and moderate income housing as defined by the Town's Third Round COAH obligation.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Objective #2: Encourage high density residential development in the redevelopment zones along the Speedwell Avenue-Spring Street-Morris Street corridor.

Objective #3: Encourage constant population density levels in the R-1, R-2 and R-3 single family zones. Significant increases should be discouraged.

Objective #4: Encourage a balance of housing types.

1.2.08 BUILDING COMPATIBILITY

A) GOAL #1: **To ensure that heights of buildings are consistent with the role that buildings will play within the neighborhood and the role that the neighborhood plays within the community.**

Objective #1: Evaluate the impact of buildings on adjoining areas in terms of shadow effect, scale and mass.

Objective #2: Consider the historical importance of surrounding buildings in determining the appropriate height of new or renovated structures.

B) GOAL #2: **To ensure that building facades in Morristown reflect the unique character of the community and are compatible with the design characteristics of Morristown's historic district.**

Objective #1: Encourage the use of design standards to guide the construction, reconstruction or alteration of all buildings within the community. General design standards will be appropriate for most buildings, historic standards will be appropriate for others.

Objective #2: New buildings should be encouraged to reflect the historic character of the community, rather than to attempt to replicate it.

1.2.09 HISTORIC PRESERVATION

GOAL: **To protect the key elements of Morristown's historic architectural fabric so that the unique character of the community is not lost**

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

- Objective #1:** Discourage demolition and redevelopment in those portions of the community where the predominant architectural style is historically significant.
- Objective #2:** Make certain that where development occurs, particularly in the CBD and other non-residential or high density residential zones, any new structures will be compatible with the existing predominant architectural style of the neighborhood.
- Objective #3:** Encourage the protection of historic and architecturally important buildings via facade easements and other preservation methods.
- Objective #4:** Encourage the adaptive reuse of historically or architecturally important structures that can no longer be used for their original purpose because of economic factors or functional obsolescence, provided the exterior design of the building is not adversely altered.

1.2.10 HOUSING

- GOAL:** To protect the key elements of Morristown housing opportunities so that a broad spectrum of people will be attracted to Morristown and those here will choose to remain.
- Objective #1:** Adopt a Housing Element to this Master Plan which provides for meeting the Town's Third Round COAH obligation.
- Objective #2:** Permit high-density residential development in the redevelopment zones along the Speedwell Avenue-Spring Street-Morris street corridor.
- Objective #4:** Encourage ownership of the residences built along this corridor.
- Objective #5:** Undertake aggressive initiatives to require new developers to make up the affordable housing shortfall resulting from earlier administration's failures to meet their housing obligation.
- Objective #6:** Encourage developers to provide on-site affordable housing.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Objective #7: Encourage continued home ownership in the single-family and two-family neighborhoods of the community.

Objective #8: Allow building conversions and infill development only where the character of the neighborhood will not be adversely altered.

Objective #9: Encourage housing for special needs populations, such as senior citizens, in areas where appropriate.

1.2.11 COMMUNITY FACILITIES

GOAL: To provide for the variety of public and quasi public buildings, structures and other facilities that will enhance the quality of life for Morristown residents and visitors.

Objective #1: Maintain and expand, as needed, the recreation opportunities and facilities on both a Town-wide and neighborhood basis.

Objective #2: Encourage the availability of various cultural and other public purpose facilities that will enhance the health, safety, welfare and quality of life of the community.

Objective #3: Provide that community facilities and the use of those facilities are compatible with the neighborhoods within which they are located.

PART 1

SECTION 1.3.0

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.3.0 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ISSUES

1.3.01 Introduction

Section 1.0 of Part 1 provides a broad overview of the history of Morristown, the history of the planning process in the community, the purpose of a master plan and other information of importance and general interest. That material helped shape the contents of Section 2.0, of Part 1 (Goals & Objectives)

Section 2.0 as already noted, provides a broad framework and foundation, in the form of a series of goals and objectives, for the decisions and recommendations contained in Part 2 of this document. The goals and objectives were also important in identifying the various planning and development issues contained in this section and identified herein as Exhibit 3-1. Note that Exhibit 3-1 has been reconfigured in this re-examination for ease of formatting. The Issues, Background Information and Problem Statement in the 2003 Master Plan is shown in black print. The changes in problem statements identified as part of this reexamination is shown in red.

The planning and development issues listed in Exhibit 3-1 were selected from a larger list that was distilled from a variety of sources, such as past Master Plan Reexamination Reports, rezoning requests, and related documents. These issues were discussed during the course of several Long Range Planning Committee meetings, as well as at two public forums that were held at Morristown High School in May of 2001. The issues were further clarified in a series of public hearings attendant to the re-examination of the Zone Map and Zoning Schedules. These issues, some broad in nature and others more specific, have been translated into policy decisions contained in Part 2 of this document.

This document, particularly this section, together with Section 1.2.0 of Part 1 and Section 2.3.0 of Part 2, brings the Town into compliance with the statutory requirements described herein.

In summary, Morristown since the preparation of the last reexamination report in 1997, has been experiencing a renaissance. So, the general concern of economic stagnation" associated with the time frame stretching from the late 1980's to the mid and late 1990's is no longer an issue. This revitalization has gained momentum in the early twenty-first century, during the second term of Mayor Cresitello, with the designation of seven redevelopment zones in the center of Town and along the Speedwell Avenue-Spring Street-Morris Street corridor.

However, many of the same concerns raised in 1997 relative to historic preservation, traffic congestion, preservation of Morristown's " human scale", the expansion of Morristown Memorial Hospital etc are still of concern today. At the same time, other issues have been resolved or substantially addressed. For example the appearance and vitality of the business district has been enhanced,

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

some vacant land has been preserved as permanent open space and several hundred residential units have been introduced into the business district providing new housing opportunities and increasing the amount of disposable income available to businesses in that part of the community.

In terms of various changes relative to the assumptions, policies and objectives that have guided the Town's planning efforts, several are important. The introduction of Mid-Town Direct rail service, which enables passengers to travel directly by rail from Morristown into Manhattan, has made Morristown an even more attractive place to live than it was previously. Next, the State Redevelopment and Development Plan was revised in 2001 and the State Plan continues to designate Morristown as a regional center. Morristown also has been designated a "Transit Village Community" by the NJ Dept of Transportation, which has brought the Town some statewide attention, as well as increased interest from prospective developers.

An issue that has come to the forefront dealing with the Town providing affordable housing to meet its third round obligation as defined by the Council On Affordable Housing (COAH). It appears that the Town had not met COAH's second round obligation and, as a result, the Town will be required to meet its new, third round obligation as well as make up its second round shortfall. As of this writing, COAH's computation of third round obligations has been successfully challenged (by others) in the Appellate Division. A more complete discussion is found in Section 2.6.0 "The Housing Plan"

EXHIBIT 3-1

1 Split Zoning

Many properties are split between two zones. In many cases it appears to be intentional in order to protect lower intensity uses from higher intensity ones. In some cases, however, the split zoning seems to have been inadvertent.

The 2007 re-examination of the Zone Map has eliminated inadvertent split zones. The split zones remaining are to buffer lower density uses.

2 Elimination of Industrial and Light Industrial Zones.

The question was raised about whether Morristown in the 21st century should continue to have these zones. Are they still relevant to Morristown as it currently exists.

These two zones were proposed to be eliminated in the 2003 Master Plan but not adopted in an ordinance by the Town Council in 2003. The Zoning Map approved by the Town Council on September 11, 2007 eliminated these zones.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

3 Allow Bed & Breakfast (B&B) Operations

Hotels and motels are allowed in Morristown in selected non-residential zones and a B&B fits under the definition of a hotel. The question to be answered is whether they should be allowed elsewhere and under what conditions.

The Land Uses approved on September 11, 2007 did not expand the use of B&Bs.

4 The need for a “Public Purpose Zone”

Publicly owned properties (local, state, county, federal, board of education) are located in many different zones and are generally not available for development. The existence of these publicly owned properties therefore create a false impression of the development potential of certain zones.

The PP zone was proposed in the 2003 Master Plan but not adopted in an ordinance by the Town Council at that time. The Zoning Map that was approved on September 11, 2007 created two zones to address this issue.

Lands which have a public use and cannot be developed (lakes, rivers, national parks, properties dedicated for public use with deed restrictions) are zoned PPU-that is Public Property Undevelopable.

Lands which have a public use but which, under the proper circumstances, can be otherwise developed (Town Hall, the Library) are zoned PP-that is Public Purpose.

5 Redevelopment Sites.

The George Washington School and Vail Mansion are to be developed under the redevelopment plans adopted for each property. This should be reflected in the Land Use Plan and on the new zoning map.

The February, 2002 revisions to the Zone Map designate the Vail Mansion as RZ-1 and the George Washington School as RZ-2. The Zoning Map, which was approved on September 11, 2007 designated the George Washington School Redevelopment (which is completed) be zoned RC (Cluster Residential). It further created additional Redevelopment Zones for the following:

- The Speedwell Redevelopment
- The Center/Coal Redevelopment
- The Spring Street Redevelopment
- The Lafayette/Fire House Redevelopment
- The Morris Street Redevelopment
- Epstein’s Redevelopment
- The Vail Mansion Redevelopment.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

6. Building Height

The M-1 and CBD Zones allow 5 stories as the maximum height (The Cattano Avenue M-1 allows 6 stories). Should the 5-story provision be reduced to 3 or 4 stories in certain locations? Should other zones, where the height limit is 3 stories, be changed to allow 4 and 5 stories?

The Revision to Schedule I (Land Uses), which was approved on September 11, 2007 provides:

- An M-1 Zone with an allowable building height of 6 stories
- A CBD-1 Zone with an allowable building height of 3 stories
- A CBD-2 Zone with an allowable building height of 6 stories

The locations of these zones are shown on the Zone Map.

7. CBD Mid-Rise Apartments

The only housing units currently allowed in the CBD zone are garden apartments, which is not realistic. The Board of Adjustment has approved mid rise apartments in the CBD via the use variance provision. Should mid-rise apartments be allowed, and under what provisions?

The Revision to Schedule I (Land Uses) that was approved on September 11, 2007 allow, as a permitted use in the CBD-1 Zone, all uses permitted in the RG Zone. In addition to garden apartments, the Revision recommends that all uses permitted in the RT-1 and RT-2 be permitted, which, in turn, permits all uses in the R-3 Zone.

8. Parking Requirements

The parking needs of the community vary from location to location. The perception is that there is a shortage of parking but the reality is that the parking resources of the community are not evenly distributed. Not every site, especially in the CBD, can provide sufficient on-site parking. In some instances, valet or stacked parking may be appropriate.

The Town is requiring developers to conform to zoning ordinance or RSIS standards, as appropriate. .

In certain instances, robotic parking devices may be appropriate.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

9. The Concept of Downzoning

In certain instances the current zoning may allow for more development than is appropriate. Reducing the amount and intensity of development that is permitted is referred to as downzoning. Downzoning should be permitted only where it is legally defensible.

The Zoning Map, Schedule I and Schedule II, which was approved on September 11, 2007, established the H-1 District for the hospital on Mount Kemble Avenue. The requirements of Schedule I and Schedule II represent a downzoning from present requirements.

10. Historic Preservation Element

The Master Plan should have a Historic Preservation Plan Element that meets current statutory requirements.

The 2003 Master Plan, in Section 2.4.0 included a Historic Preservation Plan Element.

This re-examination includes changes to Section 2.4.0 recommended by the Historic Commission.

11. The TVC Zone Expansion

The TVC Zone was initially created to allow for high-density transit oriented development in the vicinity of the Morristown Train Station. This Zone consists of 9 acres and the issue to be decided involves whether the zone should be extended and by how much.

The Zoning Map which was approved September 11, 2008 contains no expansion of the TVC Zone from that shown on the February, 2002 map.

12. Convent Mews

The zoning in this area does not reflect the fact that multifamily residential units have existed at this location for many years.

The Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007, designates Convent Mews in the RC (Residential Cluster) Zone.

13. Should the RT areas be downzoned to allow only one and two family structures rather than one, two, three and four families as is currently allowed?

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Many of the RT areas have become overly congested and some RT areas are still predominately one and two family neighborhoods. Downzoning may be appropriate in some neighborhoods but not in others.

The 2003 Master Plan recommended the creation of the RT-1 Zone (one and two family housing) and the RT-2 Zone (one to four family housing). These recommendations were not enacted into legislation by the governing body.

The Zoning Map, Schedule I and Schedule II, which was approved on September 11, 2007, established the RT-1 and RT-2 Zones. The locations of the proposed zones are shown on the Zone Map.

14. Franklin Corners Neighborhood

This neighborhood is fragile and a potentially threatened part of the community because of the higher density uses that surround it and which have made some encroachments.

The Proposed Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007 buffers the Franklin Corners area by a reduction of the M-1 (mid-rise apartment) along Elm Street and the designation of the municipal building as a PP Zone.

15. Designation of RT Area-Vicinity of Madison Street

This area has very small lots and is predominantly one and two family.

The 2002 revisions to the Zone Map show this area as a RT Zone. The Zoning Map, which was approved on September 11, 2007, shows this area as an RT-1 Zone.

16. Designation of RT District-Vicinity of Mt. Kemble Avenue and Wetmore Avenue

This area has a substantial number of undersized lots and is predominantly one and two family

The 2002 revisions to the Zone Map show this area as a RT Zone. The Zoning Map, which was approved on September 11, 2007, shows this area as an RT-1 Zone.

17. Designation of RT District-Vicinity of Phoenix/Western/Budd

This area has a substantial number of undersized lots and is predominantly one and two family

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

The 2002 revisions to the Zone Map show this area as a RT Zone. The Zoning Map, which was approved on September 11, 2007, shows the Phoenix and Western areas as a RT-1 Zone and the Budd area as an R3 Zone.

18. Designation of RT District-Vicinity of Pine Street

This area is close to the train station and has a number of three and four family structures.

The 2002 revisions to the Zone Map show this area as a RT Zone. The Zoning Map, which was approved on September 11, 2007, shows this area as an RT-3 Zone. .

19. Designation of RT District-Vicinity of Jersey Avenue, Cottage Place, most of Abbett Avenue, Garden Street, etc.

This area is a predominantly one and two family neighborhood, although there are also several non-residential and non-conforming uses located there.

The 2002 revisions to the Zone Map show this area as a RT Zone. The Zoning Map, which was approved on September 11, 2007, shows this area as an RT-1 Zone. .

20. Designation of RT District-Vicinity of Speedwell Avenue, Early Street, Grant Street, etc.

This area is a predominantly one and two family neighborhood. Certain portions of this area have very small lots.

The 2002 revisions to the Zone Map show this area as a RT Zone. The Proposed Zoning Map which was approved September 11, 2007, shows the Early Street and Speedwell Avenue as a Redevelopment Zone. The 2007 Zoning Map shows the Grant Street area as an RT-1 Zone.

21. Designation of RT District-Vicinity of Olyphant Place.

This is a small fragile neighborhood, any increase would be inappropriate.

The 2002 revisions to the Zone Map show this area as a RT Zone. The Zoning Map, which was approved on September 11, 2007, shows this area as an RT-1 Zone. .

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

22. Designation of RT District-Vicinity of Abbett Avenue and Whippany Street.

This area is predominantly three and four family.

There is no such intersection.

23. Designation of RT District. Vicinity of Morris Street

The possibility of designating this area RGR was discussed given the type of development proposed for the George Washington School property but was rejected.

The Zoning Map which was approved September 11, 2007, shows the northerly side of Morris Street as RGR and RC Districts and the southerly side of Morris Street as a Redevelopment Zone. .

24. Designation of Senior Citizen Buildings on Early Street

These structures are a special purpose public use (subsidized housing) but are not in conformity with the RT Zone requirements.

The Zoning Map which was approved September 11, 2007, designates the three Housing Authority properties "Housing Authority"

25. Hospital Zone-Retain Status Quo or Permit Expansion

The Morristown Memorial Complex affects Morristown in both negative and positive ways. The question to be resolved is how much more expansion is appropriate and how should it occur.

This has largely become a moot question. The hospital has expanded westward to the Interstate Highway.

The Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007, includes the expanded area in the H (Hospital) Zone.

Any future hospital expansion should be vertically, rather than horizontally.

26. ORC Zone

The ORC Zone encompasses most of Washington Street and Maple Avenue. These streets have different characteristics which may warrant some modifications of this zoning district.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

The Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007, includes boundaries of the ORC Districts along Washington Street and Maple Avenue, as well as a third ORC District, along the western side of Elm Street.

27. Flagler Street Downzoning.

A portion of this area is in the M-1 Zone but the existing development pattern is more consistent with the RG Zone.

The Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007 shows the portion of Flagler Street which is shown in the M-1 Zone on the 2002 Zoning Map as in the "Housing Authority" area.

28. Loyola/Morristown Field Club Downzoning.

This area is in the RC Zone. The amount of development permitted may be inappropriate.

The Proposed Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007, shows the Morristown Field Club and the Loyola area in the RC Zone.

29. Prospect Street/Clinton and Clinton Place Street Downzoning

This area is in the M-1 Zone. The amount of development permitted may be inappropriate.

The Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007 designates much of this area as RT-1 (One and Two Family Residential)

30. Madison Avenue/South Street Zoning.

This area is in the OB Zone which allows a building height of 5 stories.

This item does not include a Problem Statement.

The Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 2007, designates the Madison Avenue area west of I-287 an OB-1 Zone (3 story maximum building height) and the area east of I-287 as an OB-2 Zone (6 story maximum building height)..

31. Jimmy's Restaurant Rezoning

This property is in the OB Zone which prohibits restaurants. It adjoins the B Zone which does allow restaurants. This use has also been the source of some negative impacts affecting the adjoining residential areas.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

This has become a moot point. Jimmy's has been demolished and the Planning Board has approved a branch of Commerce Bank for the location.

32. Blair House and Hamilton Court Apartments

These properties are in the OB Zone and as such are non-conforming uses. The M-1 Zone might be a more appropriate designation.

The Zoning Map which was approved on September 11, 1997, designates these properties an M-1 Zone.

33. Willow Hall Site

This site has been approved for condominium development while preserving Willow Hall and the outbuildings.

The Passaic River Coalition has indicated a desire to purchase the entire site. The Town needs to pay attention to actions by the Coalition to determine if rezoning is appropriate.

PART 1

SECTION 1.4.0

SOCIO-ECONOMIC DATA

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.4.0 SOCIO - ECONOMIC DATA

1.4.01 Analysis of 2000 Census Data

The information derived from the 2000 census provides a snapshot taken on April 1, 2000, of the socio-economic characteristics of Morristown which existed at that time. As of the date of this document, slightly more than three years later, the assumption is that those characteristics are still very similar.

To begin, Morristown had a total population in 2000 of 18,544 residents. This represents an increase of 1,275 above the 1990 census figure of 17,269. By comparison, the 1980 population was 16,614 and the 1970 figure was 17,662. So after experiencing a population decline from 1970 to 1980 and a slight increase from 1980 to 1990, which did not quite reach the 1970 total population figure, Morristown has experienced an increase of approximately 8%, bringing Morristown's total population

to the highest level in the history of the Town.

Morristown is a diverse community and that is very clear from a review of the census data. Sixty-seven percent of the community is identified as being white (compared to 87.2% for Morris County and 72.6% for the State of New Jersey) but 17% is African American and Asians account for nearly 4% of the population. In addition, the total Hispanic population is 27% of all Morristown residents and a variety of other ethnic categories are represented as well.

Some other interesting comparisons involving Morristown, Morris County and New Jersey follow in Exhibit 4-1.

**Exhibit 4-1
Census Data Comparisons**

	<u>Morristown</u>	<u>Morris County</u>	<u>New Jersey</u>
Hispanic Population	27.1%	7.8%	13.3%
Median Age	35	37.8	36.7
Owner Occupied Housing	39.5%	76.0%	65.6%
Less Than A 9 th Grade Education	7.6%	3.5%	6.6%
Married Residents	40.5%	62.1%	54.6%
Resided In Same House In 1995	45.5%	61.1%	59.8%
Native Born	67.6%	84.6%	82.5%
Foreign Born (Region of Birth)			
Europe	15.3%	30.2%	23.9%
Asia	9.4%	33.8%	27.8%
Latin America	72.5%	30.7%	43.0%
Mean Travel Time To Work	24.3 Min.	29.4 Min.	30 Min.
Median Household Income	\$57,562	\$77,340	\$55,146
Per Capital Income	\$30,086	\$36,964	\$27,006
Average Household Size			
Owner Occupied	2.62	2.88	2.81
Renter Occupied	2.30	2.21	2.43

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

	<u>Morristown</u>	<u>Morris County</u>	<u>New Jersey</u>
Housing Units Built Before 1939	33.2%	15.3%	20.1%
3 or more Vehicles Per Household	10.2%	20.7%	14.7%
Median Value Of Owner Occupied Housing	\$224,000	\$257,400	\$170,800
Median Rent Per Month	\$914	\$883	\$951

There are a variety of conclusions that can be reached from the figures presented in Exhibit 4-1. First, in many categories Morristown is more similar to the statewide average than the averages for Morris County. Morristown’s Hispanic population is substantial and far above the percentages for Morris County and New Jersey. Morristown also has a substantial number of renters, far in excess of the Morris County and New Jersey figures and Morristown residents are more transient than residents in other parts of the state. Also, far fewer Morristown residents are married than is true for Morris County and New Jersey as a whole and the percentage of foreign-born residents is much greater. The median and per capita incomes for Morristown are higher than the New Jersey figures but not the Morris County numbers. In summary, these figures provide a general overview of Morristown and how the community compares statistically to Morris County and New Jersey. For a more in depth review of the 2000 Morristown census figures they are presented in Appendix 3.

1.4.02 Housing and Related Data

The New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) indicates in NJSA 40:55D-28 that a Housing Plan element is a standard component of a municipal master plan but does not make a Housing Plan element mandatory. However, the MLUL also indicates in 40:55D-62 “Power to Zone”, that a municipality may adopt or amend a zoning ordinance only after the

Planning Board has adopted the Land Use Plan element and the Housing Plan element of a master plan. So, although 40:55D-28 does not make a housing plan mandatory, 40:55D-62 does so. Another state statute – NJSA 52; 27D – 301 (the Fair Housing Act) sets forth the contents of a municipal Housing Plan element and this statute is referenced in 40:55 D-28 of the MLUL, which describes what a Housing Plan element is to include.

The Fair Housing Act is the state statute that is involved with affordable housing in New Jersey and stipulates how each municipality is to address this issue. The Fair Housing Act was the State Legislature’s response to the Mt. Laurel decision and subsequent decisions by the Supreme Court regarding the affordable housing issue. The NJ Council On Affordable Housing (COAH) was established via this statute and has been the state agency responsible for bringing each New Jersey municipality into compliance with the Fair Housing Act. Recently the NJ Supreme Court upheld several challenges to the Fair Housing Act and COAH’s administration of it. Had these challenges been successful, partially or entirely, COAH authority in this area could have been significantly altered.

In the initial response to the provisions of the Fair Housing Act, COAH calculated, via a complex formula, the affordable housing responsibility of each municipality in New Jersey, in terms of the number of affordable units that needed to be accommodated.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

COAH also established a series of rules and regulations governing how each municipality must respond to its specific obligation.

In Morristown's case, the initial affordable housing obligation number, also known as the "pre-credited need", was calculated in the mid 1980's by COAH, at over 900 units. Morristown chose, as did many municipalities in New Jersey, not to respond to this issue because of the devastating effect that this number of units would have on the community. Subsequently, COAH as required by statute, released a revised set of affordable housing obligation numbers, for each municipality, covering the 1993 to 1999 time frame. This time, based on an adjustment to the formula and other related factors, Morristown's pre credited need number was reduced to 317.

As part of the master plan program that has produced this document, Morristown decided it was appropriate to address the affordable housing issue and retained David Kinsey PP/AICP to assist with that effort. It should also be noted that at the time it was decided to address this issue, COAH was responding to the statutory requirement of determining another set of pre-credited need figures for each municipality. These new figures would be defined as belonging to the 1999 - 2005 cycle or time frame. As of the date of this report, these figures have not been released.

PART 1

SECTION 1.5.0

EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING CONDITIONS

SINCE 2003

1.5.0 EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING CONDITIONS

1.5.1 Introduction

The format for presenting the re-examination of this section differs from other Sections since the original document does not lend itself to simple editing.

However, since Section 1.5.0 contains a wealth of data regarding land use and zoning conditions as they existed in 2003, they are included as an Appendix.

The major problems related to land use identified in the 2003 Master Plan and the extent to which those problems have been

addressed in this re-examination are presented in Exhibit 3-1 of Section 1.3.0

1.5.2 Trends in Land Use Since the 2003 Master Plan

Unquestionably the most significant trend in land use since the 2003 Master Plan is the naming of the seven Redevelopment Zones, encompassing about 50.75 Acres or 2.6% of the Town's total acreage.

The redevelopment areas as envisioned at the time of this re-examination are as follows:

NAME	ESTIMATED RESIDENTIAL UNITS	ESTIMATED COMMERCIAL AREA	ACREAGE	PERCENT OF TOWN AREA
Carriage House	59	0	6.53	0.34
Center/Coal	180	20,000	9.56	0.50
Epsteins	250	99,000	5.54	0.29
Firehouse	186	0	1.68	0.09
Speedwell Ave.	800	70,000	15.72	0.82
Spring Street/ Morris Street.*	300	53,800 R 60,000 C	8.6 +/-	0.4
Highlands (Transit Village)	214	8,000	4.34	0.23
Vail Mansion	<u>36</u>	<u>4,800</u>	<u>3.43</u>	<u>0.18</u>
TOTAL	2,025	315,600	55.4	2.83

*Includes a 145 room hotel

The figures in the above table indicate the impact on existing land use of the proposed redevelopment. Assuming 2.5 persons per dwelling unit, a population increase of about 5060 can be expected at build-out of these

redevelopment projects (about 10 years). This figure represents a 28% population increase. Thus, this population increase will be concentrated in about 2.8% of the Town's acreage.

This concentration will have a profound impact on the Town's infrastructure.

1.5.03 Changes in Existing Land Use Since 2003

Based on the recommendations of the 2003 Master Plan, in 2007 The Planning Board approved a revised Zoning Map. That map was subsequently adopted by the Town Council as the Zone Map in a Land Use Ordinance. Schedule I (permitted Uses) and Schedule II (Area, Bulk and Yard Requirements) were adopted at the same time.

One of the objectives in the preparation of the 2007 Zone Map was to have the zoning reflect the existing land uses, or those uses which were being contemplated by major developers. Thus, the 2007 Zone Map generally reflects existing land uses.

A notable exception to meeting this objective is in the area of Twombly Court, near the eastern end of Franklin Avenue. In this instance the Town Council decided that a Residential Cluster development, and the vacant tract east of it would be designated R-2 to act as a buffer to an abutting R-2 Zone.

Another departure from the land uses recommended in the 2003 Master Plan was defining public purpose tracts as either PP or PPU, rather than PP only. This change was made to distinguish between public purpose lands which were not developable (PPU) because they are waterways or have deed or other legal restrictions and public purpose lands that did not have such restrictions (PP). This distinction was made to preclude state or other review agencies incorrectly estimating acreage in Morristown available for development to meet COAH obligations.

PART 1

SECTION 1.6.0

TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING INFRASTRUCTURE

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.6.0 TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING INFRASTRUCTURE

1.6.01 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The Town of Morristown developed a series of Goals and Objectives as part of the Master Planning process. These Goals and Objectives will guide development and capital spending decisions that determine the future of Morristown. A summary of those Goals and Objectives related to the Circulation element is as follows:

- Improve the Speedwell Avenue-Spring Street-Morris Street Corridor to accommodate redevelopment zones
- Relieve congestion in the CDB by providing improved access and alternative means of transportation.
- Encourage residential development adjacent to the railroad station
- Encourage work-home development
- Minimize the amount of non-residential traffic in residential neighborhoods.
- Make the public areas handicap accessible.
- Encourage the use of mass transit facilities or other transportation alternatives.
- Correlate land use with the ability of the street network to efficiently move vehicles.
- Provide an integral pedestrian network.
- Provide adequate parking to support the land use.
- Establish an internal mass transit system.
- Provide a transportation infrastructure to support the community.

completed, a series of recommended transportation improvements were developed. Each of these transportation improvement recommendations is consistent with the Goals and Objectives.

After the assessment of existing facilities, needs, and problems were

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.6.02 INVENTORY OF EXISTING TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

A. ROADWAY SYSTEM

Roadway Network Inventory

Morristown lies at the crossroads of several key highways and arterials in Morris County that serve both local and longer-distance through travel. Several of these principal roadways passing through Morristown are Interstate 287, U.S. Route 202, and State Route 124. The most heavily traveled of these is I-287, which passes through the eastern edge of the Town. I-287 is one of the State's principal north-south Interstate routes and is part of the National Hi-Priority Truck Network. It connects with the New York Thruway near the New Jersey/New York border, and terminates at its southern end in Perth Amboy, New Jersey. I-287 also connects I-80, located 2 miles north of Morristown, with I-78, some 15 miles to the south. The Average Daily Traffic on I-287 is 122,000 vehicles.

I-80 is northern New Jersey's principal east-west thoroughfare, providing access to eastern destinations such as the city of Paterson, many of the region's major employment centers, New York City, and even the New England states via the George Washington Bridge, and to Pennsylvania to the west. I-78 serves a similar function connecting Pennsylvania to Newark and New York City via the New Jersey Turnpike and Holland Tunnel, and provides efficient access to Newark Airport.

Figure 6-1 depicts Morristown within the regional context. The I-287 corridor is now home to significant concentrations of office space and also serves as a major trucking thoroughfare. It is believed that truckers use the I-287/NJ-31/US-202 corridor as a means of avoiding tolls associated with the

New Jersey Turnpike and the George Washington Bridge.

State Route 24 connects to I-287, just north of the Morristown town limits. SR-24 is a significant transportation corridor, since it connects I-287 with I-78. The interchange with I-78 is near the border of Chatham and Summit. The Chatham area has significant concentrations of office and commercial development, and SR-24 serves as the major corridor from central and western Morris County to the Chatham area.

Commuters from western Morris County travel through Morristown via Route 202, Sussex Avenue or Route 124 to access SR-24, I-287 or I-80.

Roadway Functional Classification

Figure 6-2 is a useful reference for the designated functional class of roadways in Morristown. The proper classification of roads is important not only because it describes the role that each roadway plays in a community's overall transportation system, but also because state and federal officials use it to determine their respective funding allocations.

The functional class of a road indicates whether its primary role is that of facilitating the movement of through traffic (as interstate highways do) or that of providing access to local properties (as local or residential roadways do). The intermediate classifications between interstate highways and residential roads are principal arterials, minor arterials, and collectors. As one "goes down" the functional class scale, the property access role of a road becomes more significant. The New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT), working with local jurisdictions, designates the functional

Exhibit 6-1: Regional Location Map



classification of all roads in the state. For roads within the Town of Morristown, four state functional classes apply. They are Interstate Highways, Urban Principal Arterials, Minor Arterials, and Urban Collectors. All other roads that are not so designated are regarded as local roads, which primarily serve to provide access to land parcels. They are characterized by low traffic volumes and slower travel speeds.

Principal Travel Corridors

Over time, the principal travel patterns through the Town of Morristown have changed significantly. Before I-287 was constructed, U.S. 202 carried north-south traffic directly through town, via Speedwell

and Mt. Kemble Avenues. It served the north communities of Morris Plains, Parsippany-Troy Hills, and Boonton, and the south communities of Bernardsville, Far Hills, and Bridgewater.

Today the predominant regional travel patterns in Morristown are east-west. Large numbers of travelers pass through Morristown in the morning to reach I-287 for employment destinations in Essex, Hudson, and Bergen counties and New York City, and returning in the evening. The Town itself is also a large employment destination.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Morristown now has two major east-west travel corridors namely, the Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor and the Washington Street/South Street corridor. Speedwell Avenue (U.S. 202) forms the western segment of this corridor, accommodating both east-west and north-south traffic through Morristown. Near the town Green, Speedwell Avenue meets Spring Street at Headquarters Plaza. Spring Street is used as a bypass around the town Green, for commuters passing through Morristown. Spring Street terminates at its junction with Morris Street.

Morris Street serves as the main roadway connector for neighborhoods northeast of Morristown, as well as a connector to northbound I-287. Its eastern section is designated one-way in the eastbound direction and is used to access I-287 northbound. Drivers who want to go south on I-287 must turn from Morris Street to Ridgedale Avenue, where the I-287 southbound on-ramp is provided. This corridor will experience traffic due to the Speedwell Avenue and Spring Street redevelopment projects. The relocation of Early Street to a new intersection with Spring Street and Speedwell Avenue should result in a level of service no worse than what exists today, the additional development notwithstanding. Further, the development of the Exxon Tract in Florham Park will have a further impact on traffic on Speedwell Avenue. Since Speedwell Avenue is a state highway, close coordination with the NJDOT will be necessary.

Lafayette Street parallels Morris Street, and serves as its westbound one-way pair. Traffic from both northbound and southbound I-287 have off-ramps onto Lafayette Street. Thus, Lafayette Street is a significant thoroughfare for commuters from I-287 to the center of Morristown. East of I-287, Morris Street becomes CR 510.

The other east-west corridor runs along Washington Street and South Street. South Street is designated as SR-124 and Washington Street is the “old” SR-24, now CR 510. Commuters from communities to the west and south of Morristown use this corridor to get to I-287. Madison Avenue, which intersects with South Street, is the continuation of SR-124. Madison Avenue has ramps for both northbound and southbound I-287. South Street has ramps for northbound I-287 only.

The two principal travel corridors for Morristown come together at the Green, in the heart of the Central Business District (CBD). The Green functions as a traffic circle with traffic moving in a counter-clockwise direction. The Green is bounded by N. Park Place, W. Park Place, S. Park Place, and E. Park Place, with traffic signals at every junction. The Green itself is a park containing walking paths and typical park features including benches. Commercial businesses, such as banks, restaurants, and retail activities, line its perimeter.

The Speedwell Avenue- Spring Street- Morris Street corridor is the primary focus of the re-examination of the Traffic Circulation Plan.

Although the review and approval of specific intersection designs are part of the Redevelopment Plan and Site Plan approval processes the following specific design recommendations should be incorporated into the approval process.

- The realignment of Early Street to the intersection of Speedwell Avenue and Spring Street.
- Adding additional travel lanes on Speedwell Avenue between the new
- Early Street intersection and Sussex Avenue.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

- Reconstruction and realignment of the intersection of Spring Street and Morris Street.
- Improving Prospect Street and extending it to Early Street

A substantial portion of the traffic studies for the site plan approval process will be an evaluation of the traffic impact of the improvement on nearby residential streets and ways to minimize the impact.

The actual design of these improvements will be part of the site plan approval process for the associated redevelopment project.

C. PARKING FACILITIES

The Parking Portion of the Master Plan reexamination was prepared by the Morristown Parking Authority

MORRISTOWN MASTER PLAN UPDATE

PARKING

There are three major projects that will positively impact the Morristown public parking supply over the next few years. Two projects are under construction and one is expected to break ground in November 2007. The following is a brief summary of these projects:

1. Vail Mansion Public Parking - As a participant in the Vail Mansion redevelopment initiative, the Morristown Parking Authority (MPA) financed and will operate 95 new public parking spaces at the Vail Mansion. 33 of these spaces will be located just steps from South Street along the horseshoe-shaped entrance drive and 62 more spaces will be located in an on-site parking deck.

The new spaces will primarily serve South Street and Pine Street businesses and restaurants, the adjacent Community Theatre,

and the Train Station that is located a modest 1100 foot walk straight down King Street.

**Net Public Parking Gain: 95 spaces
Estimated to be on-line: December 2007**

2. DeHart Street Parking Garage – As an integral component of the Epstein’s Redevelopment, an award winning smart growth project, the Morristown Parking Authority is financing and developing a 30,000 SF office building and parking garage. The parking garage will contain 781 public parking spaces and will replace the MPA’s 204 space Maple Avenue parking deck that was demolished in 2006.

The new spaces will serve businesses and restaurants around the Town Green, South Street, Market Street, DeHart Street, and Maple Avenue, as well as portions of the Epstein’s redevelopment program itself.

**Net Public Parking Gain: 577 spaces
Estimated to be on-line: April 2008**

3. Highlands at Morristown Station – This is a New Jersey Transit sponsored “Transit Village” development that will include 415 parking spaces dedicated for commuter use. The site of the development is

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

NJ Tranist's 298 space commuter parking lot on Lafayette Avenue.

**Net Public Parking Gain: 117 spaces
Estimated to be on-line: Early 2009**

In total, these projects will provide a net increase of 789 parking spaces to critical areas of the Morristown central business district.

Parking Improvements or Goals - Short and Mid Range

It is expected that public parking development will abate somewhat after completion of the three major parking projects mentioned in the previous section. One of the reasons for this conclusion is that the Morristown Parking Authority, the primary developer of public parking in Morristown, issued over \$27,000,000 in parking revenue bonds in 2007. Financial projections accompanying the bond issue documents indicate that any surplus income generated by the MPA over the next few years will be dedicated to cover the associated debt service expense.

Parking and Redevelopment - Some projects, such as the Speedwell Redevelopment and the Lafayette Avenue Firehouse may include public parking elements. These public parking facilities should be sized to accommodate the local public parking demand as well as any new public parking demand that will be generated by the project.

In cases where redevelopment projects will displace public parking, the public parking should be replaced by the redeveloper because many adjacent businesses or businesses within a reasonable walking distance of the project may rely on that public parking supply on a day to day basis.

The MPA may be available to participate in these redevelopments as advisor, operator, or developer depending on the individual circumstances or needs of each project.

Private – Public Parking Areas - There may be opportunities to increase public parking through cooperative public – private programs with local property owners. For example, let's assume that there is a parking lot located in an active area of the central business district that is largely vacant and off limits for public parking during week days, a church parking lot as an example. If the owner of the lot is interested, the lot could be turned into a public parking lot (during week days only) and the revenue collected would be split between the lot owner and the operator. Such an arrangement is extremely efficient because it can provide benefit to the property owner (income), local businesses, and local parkers without a major financial investment.

The MPA is currently operating a successful “private – public” parking area behind the Verizon building on Maple Avenue. Additional private – public lots located throughout the central business district would have an overall positive impact on parking conditions in Morristown.

“Consolidated” Parking Areas - In 2002 the MPA, in cooperation with a Town committee, developed a plan that would have increased parking capacity adjacent to the Library on South Street by about 60 spaces. The plan would have been accomplished by “consolidating” five small irregularly shaped parking areas into one large efficient parking area that would have been shared by all. The plan was approved by 4 of the 5 property owners but was ultimately rejected by one key property owner, the Library.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Even though this plan was not approved, the potential benefits are so evident that the Town and MPA believe that future “consolidator” projects should be sought, identified, and implemented.

A review of off-street parking inventory maps (from the 2001 Wiley Engineering parking study) shows some areas with clusters of separate parking lots adjacent to one another. These areas pose opportunity for parking consolidation. Some potential areas for consolidation include: Town Hall parking lot with adjacent parking lots; parking lots off Madison Street (both sides) south of South Street, and; the strip of parking lots behind commercial buildings on the north side of Washington Street between Mills and Atno.

Sustainable Design – The Morristown Parking Authority is a progressive public body that has embraced sustainable design. Its new 30,000 SF office building is a LEED certified “green” building and its new DeHart Street parking garage is equipped with photovoltaic roof panels that will significantly reduce the garage’s energy consumption needs. Additionally, bicycle racks have been installed in various parts of downtown Morristown courtesy of the MPA.

In the coming years, it is recommended that new parking projects and mixed use projects that include parking incorporate sustainable design elements to the most practical extent possible. As the MPA has shown with its latest building program, parking does not have to be ugly or totally utilitarian. By incorporating sustainable design elements into future parking projects both motorists and the local environment will derive benefit.

Parking Improvements or Goals – Long Range

After completion of public parking at Vail Mansion, the DeHart Street garage, and the train station, the public parking supply in Morristown will be 3,859 spaces. This parking supply is 1,632 spaces, or 73.3% greater than the Morristown public parking supply in 1976 (2,227 spaces). This growth represents an average annual increase in public parking of about 2.4%. The 2.4% annual rate exceeds the 2.0% growth rate in vehicle traffic that Morris County has experienced over the same time period.

Assuming the 2% vehicular growth rate continues over the next 25 years, the public parking supply may need to grow to over 5,785 spaces in the year 2032 just to keep pace with growth in vehicle travel. This translates to an average of about 77 new spaces added each year.

Therefore, providing additional public parking should be a priority when new development programs in Morristown are under consideration. It should also be noted that in 2032, the MPA’s 495 space Ann-Bank parking garage will be 46 years old and may be nearing the end of its useful life.

D. AVIATION FACILITIES

Aviation is a component of the transportation network in the Town of Morristown and Morris County. It includes several forms of air transportation from helicopters to small commercial airlines. Morristown Municipal Airport (MMA) in Hanover Township is the largest airport in Morris County. The airport is located at the intersection of NJ-24 and Columbia Road (CR-510), approximately 3.5 miles from the Morristown Green. There are two air-shuttle services and one helicopter service offered at the airport. The two

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

airplane shuttle services, Northeast and Lynstar, offer charter service. Helicopter service is offered between the MMA and Mid-Town Manhattan; although none of these is owned or operated by a public agency.

All bus routes that serve the Town of Morristown have no routes or stops that come close to the MMA. Thus, the only mode of transportation between the airport and the Town of Morristown is the automobile.

There is no direct bus or rail transit between the Town of Morristown and Newark International Airport.

E. EMERGENCY SERVICES

Emergency services facilities in Morristown include Police Headquarters on South Street, firehouses on Speedwell Avenue and Morris Street, and the ambulance squad building located near Early Street. There is also a police station located at Headquarters Plaza. Generally, all these departments encounter heavy traffic during peak periods and find it difficult to maneuver around the town during these times.

Fire Services

The Town has designated a Redevelopment Area between Lafayette Area and Lackawanna Place. The redevelopment will include a structure housing a new Fire Headquarters and Ambulance Service on the first level, several levels of parking above the Fire House/Ambulance Squad, some retail space and several levels of dwelling units above the parking and retail space.

The Fire Headquarters house all of the Town's fire equipment and fire companies as well as administrative offices, equipment storage and dormitory space.

A developer has been designated and the plans are in the design development phase.

Ambulance Services

The Ambulance Squad will be co-located with the Fire Headquarters.

F. BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES **Bicycle and Pedestrian Element of Morris County Plan**

Redevelopment plans in the design development phase include pedestrian-friendly sidewalks and bicycle racks.

The designation of dedicated bicycle lanes in the redevelopment areas is under consideration.

The Morris County Department of Planning and Development adopted an updated Bicycle and Pedestrian Element on December 3, 1998, as part of the Morris County Master Plan. For the Town of Morristown, they included an inventory of existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities, recommended improvements to existing facilities, and recommendations for new facilities. A map of the Town's bicycle and pedestrian trails is shown as Exhibit 6-9.

There are currently two multi-use paths in the Town -- Patriot's Path and Traction Line Recreational Trail. Patriot's Path begins near Speedwell Lake, at Speedwell Avenue, and terminates near Foster Fields in Morris Township. The Traction Line Recreation Trail begins near the Morristown National Historic Park and parallels the NJ Transit Morristown railroad corridor to the Town of Madison. Future multi-use paths include an extension of the Patriot's Path into Hanover Township, a connection from the Traction Line Recreational Trail to the Morristown Rail

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Station, a connection from the Traction Line Recreational Trail to the Loantaka Brook Reservation in eastern Morris Township, and a connection to the railroad station from Patriot's Path.

Morristown recently revitalized some of their extensive sidewalk system. There are five shared roadways within the Town of Morristown. Shared roadways are roads without a designated bicycle lane, sidewalk, or path due to insufficient road width. These roads may also include signs and striping. Morristown has five shared roadways today. They are Ford Avenue, Franklin Street, Turtle Road, Washington Avenue, and Speedwell Avenue (north of Speedwell Lake), where sidewalks were recently installed. The Morris County Master Plan has no recommendation for additional shared roadways.

Bicycle Facilities and Field Observations

Most of the roadways comprising Morristown's travel corridors are not bicycle compatible. They consist of either four narrow travel lanes or two lanes with turn bays and on-street parking. During peak periods, these roads are heavily congested and at non-peak hours vehicle operating speeds are too fast to be considered desirable or safe for most cyclists. Consequently, many bicyclists illegally use sidewalks rather than ride on area roadways, particularly along the Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor.

There is a notable lack of bicycle parking within the community. There are only two bicycle racks within the study area: at the Public Library on South Street and at the train station. Both these racks are outdated. The bicycle rack at the library is located behind the building, very small and difficult to see, and has a limited storage capacity of six bicycles. Four bicycle racks exist at the

Morristown Train Station and appears to be used by a few transit customers. In addition, there are six bicycle lockers for rent to patrons who want extra security. Specific observations are included in the following paragraphs.

South Street

South Street is not bicycle compatible. Between I-287 and Elm Street, South Street is four travel lanes with no shoulder. Exclusive turning lanes complicate bicycle through movements at several intersections, and the outermost lane is too narrow to accommodate bicycle and car traffic simultaneously. The Public Library provides one of two bicycle racks within the entire downtown area, it is very small and does not provide for adequate theft protection. There are few storm grates within the bicycle travel area, and those within the roadway are bicycle friendly.

Washington Street

Washington Street provides a moderate level of bicycle accommodation. Along the western segment of the roadway, the two travel lanes are wide, providing enough width between passing and parked vehicles for cyclists to traverse the roadway. Bicycle accommodation is reduced east of the intersection with Atno Avenue, where a westbound exclusive right turn lane conflicts with bicycle through movements.

Between Western Avenue and the Green, Washington Street provides four narrow travel lanes, effectively eliminating bicycle accommodation. Storm grates along Washington Street are bicycle friendly. There is a significant lack of bicycle storage facilities in this area. One likely destination for younger cyclists is the Morristown High School, located along Atno Avenue. The school has no bicycle racks, and posted

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

signage states: “Unauthorized skateboards, bicycles and roller skates are prohibited in school grounds.”

Morris Street

Morris Street provides a minimum level of bicycle accommodation between I-287 and the Green. Morris Street is a one-way roadway east of the intersection with Ridgedale Avenue, and a two-lane roadway between the intersections with Ridgedale Avenue and Pine Street. It is the latter segment, between Ridgedale Avenue and Pine Street that bicycle accommodation is provided, with wide travel lanes and bicycle friendly storm grates. Morris Street is four lanes wide west of Pine Street and the outermost lane does not provide enough width to support side-by-side bicycles and automobiles. Field observations indicated that many cyclists preferred riding along the sidewalk instead of along the outermost travel lane on Morris Street.

Spring Street

Spring Street, between Morris and Speedwell, does not provide bicycle accommodation. Although storm grates pose no problems along the roadway for bicyclists, the four narrow travel lanes cannot support simultaneous use by both bicycle and vehicular traffic.

Speedwell Avenue

Speedwell Avenue does not accommodate cyclists between the Green and Flagler Street. The four narrow travel lanes include channelized turning lanes that conflict with bicycle through movements. Speedwell Avenue west of Flagler Street is reduced to two travel lanes that can accommodate bicycle and vehicular traffic simultaneously; however, bicyclists could be better

accommodated if a shoulder stripe was added in this segment of roadway.

Martin Luther King Avenue

Martin Luther King Avenue is two lanes wide throughout the study area, providing ample width to support bicycle and vehicular traffic together. However, bicycle compatibility is decreased south of Coal avenue, as there are no lane markings and non-bicycle friendly grates along this segment of the roadway.

The Green

The Green does not provide bicycle accommodation. The three to four travel lanes around each side of the Green are narrow and cannot support simultaneous bicycle and vehicular traffic. Cyclists use pedestrian crosswalks and sidewalks to navigate through the Green. There are no bicycle parking facilities within the Green.

Pedestrian Facilities Inventory

With its compact downtown and well-developed network of roadways, Morristown possesses a variety of pedestrian amenities, including sidewalks, crosswalks, ramps, and pedestrian phases at signalized intersections, many of which are ADA compliant. The Morristown Partnership has initiated a program to upgrade the pedestrian areas in the central business district. The program targets streetscape improvements through sidewalk upgrades, better delineation of pedestrian and vehicular travel facilities, and more human-scale lighting system.

The following paragraphs describe pedestrian facilities along Morristown’s major roads and intersections.

South Street

- Mid-block crosswalks are present across South Street at Community Place and Pine

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Street, utilizing a yield sign within center of roadway and standard crosswalk designation.

- Downtown segment of South Street provides very wide sidewalks with few obstacles to pedestrian mobility.
- ADA compliance provided at most crosswalks.

Morris Street

- Mid-block pedestrian crossing on Morris Street between the intersections with Elm Street and Pine Street, directly in front of the Morristown train station.
- Pine Street: pedestrian accommodations are provided by crosswalks, sidewalks, ADA compliant ramps, pedestrian signal heads and push button activation.
- Spring Street: Crosswalks are provided across Spring Street and Morris Street.

Washington Street

- Mills Street / Hillcrest Avenue: Good sidewalks and crosswalks. Pedestrian signal heads are provided across the intersections, with push button activation for crossing Washington Street.
- Atno Avenue: The Morristown High School is located along Atno Avenue, near the intersection with Early Street. There are very good sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signal heads with push button activation, as well as ADA compliant ramps at the intersection.
- Western Avenue: Adjacent to the Morris County courthouse and offices, this intersection provides excellent pedestrian accommodation with sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian signal heads with push button activation, and ADA compliant ramps.

- Court Street: include pedestrian signal heads, crosswalks, sidewalks and ADA compliant ramps.
- Schuyler Place: this unsignalized intersection provides excellent pedestrian accommodation, there are sidewalks and crosswalks, with ADA compliant ramps, across both approaches of Washington Street, accompanied with the centerline yield to pedestrian signs.

Speedwell Avenue

Speedwell Avenue provides consistently adequate pedestrian accommodation, including many intersection and mid-block pedestrian crossings, and wide sidewalks along both sides of Speedwell Avenue from the Green to Flagler Street.

- Cattano Avenue: there are good sidewalks and crosswalks along and across this intersection, respectively, with ADA compliant ramps, pedestrian signal heads with push button activation.
- Spring Street: this wide, three legged intersection provides a high level of pedestrian accommodation, with a wide pedestrian refuge island that also serves to delegate vehicular movements. There are full crosswalks and sidewalks, with ADA compliant ramps, accompanied with pedestrian signal heads to assist movements across Spring Street and Speedwell Avenue.
- Early Street: Three legged intersection with good crosswalk, sidewalks, ADA compliant ramps, pedestrian signal heads. Crossing Guard stationed between 7:15 and 7:45 AM as well as 2:30 to 3:00 PM to accommodate Morristown High School students traveling to and from destinations along Martin Luther King Avenue.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

- Flagler Street: This unsignalized, 3 legged intersection has a crosswalk across the east and north side, the east side is a mid-block crossing of Speedwell Avenue, using a pedestrian sign within the center of the roadway. There is good accommodation at this location, with sidewalks and ADA compliant ramps at each crosswalk. The Neighborhood House, a local youth center, is located along Flagler Street.
- Sussex Avenue: Wide three-legged intersection provides a moderate level of pedestrian accommodation. Crosswalks are on the west and south sides of the intersection, accompanied by ADA compliant ramps.
- Vail Place: Good crosswalks, sidewalks and ADA compliant ramps
- Orchard Street: Good crosswalks and sidewalks lack any ADA compliant ramps
- Henry Street: Crosswalk across Henry and a mid-block crossing of Speedwell Avenue.
- Logan Place, Lakeside Place and Speedwell Place: Good crosswalks are across these side streets.
- In the area of heavy pedestrian traffic, especially from Spring Street to Sussex Avenue, any roadway/sidewalk improvement project should consider provisions that limit pedestrian crossings to designated crosswalk areas only.

Martin Luther King Avenue

Facilities include adequate sidewalks and crosswalks along Martin Luther King Avenue.

Spring Street

Spring Street connects Speedwell Avenue to Morris Street. While this heavily traveled roadway offers pedestrian accommodation

with sidewalks and crosswalks, there is no buffer area between the walkway and the roadway. Traffic moves quickly along this roadway, the lack of any horizontal buffer is uncomfortable to pedestrians.

The Green

Excellent pedestrian accommodation is provided in the vicinity of the Green, including wide sidewalks along the inner and outer travel lanes of Park Place, generous crosswalk provisions, and pedestrian refuge islands and pedestrian signal heads at all four signalized intersections at the four corners of the Green. Pedestrian push button activation is not provided and unnecessary at these four intersections, as they are timed to control of vehicular traffic around the Green; all red-time is allocated to pedestrian movements.

Pedestrian Field Observations

South Street

Because the signalized intersections at Madison Avenue and James Street are spaced far apart, illegal pedestrian crossings are normal on the four-lane segment of South Street, specifically between the Kings Supermarket and the three high-density residential apartment buildings. A police traffic director is posted at the Kings Supermarket driveway during peak shopping periods.

Morris Street

Morris and Spring Street attract significant volumes of pedestrians. This area is densely populated, offers a number of social service and employment offices, and has become a staging area for temporary employment services.

- At Pine Street: Illegal pedestrian crossings occur at Morris Street across the long block between this intersection and Spring Street, by

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

pedestrians traveling to the Mid-Town Shopping Center located along the westbound travel lanes.

- At Lackawanna Place and Elm Street: crosswalk across Lackawanna is set back away from the intersection, increasing frequency of illegal pedestrian crossings.

Speedwell Avenue

- At Clinton Place: while this is a one-way alleyway, pedestrians would benefit with the addition of a crosswalk across Clinton.
- Despite the existence of a signed crosswalk near Early Street, illegal pedestrian crossings exist between Sussex Avenue and Early Street. There have been several pedestrian/vehicular accidents in the last several years, along this stretch of Speedwell Avenue.

Martin Luther King Avenue

- Lacks pedestrian crosswalks and ADA compliant ramps at street corners.

Elm Street

- Lacks pedestrian crosswalks at Hill Street and Franklin Street intersections.

The Morristown Police Department recently purchased a line-stripping equipment through a series of grants, to better maintain crosswalks throughout the Town. They also adopted a special chevron design, to more easily and effectively define crosswalk areas.

G. INTERMODAL FACILITIES

Circulation Plan guidelines dictate that the plan should be intermodal in scope. Quite simply, 'intermodal' means the use of more

than one form of transportation when traveling. Trips can be made using a wide variety of travel modes, such as auto, truck, train, bus, rail, walking, etc.

Intermodal connections can help alleviate traffic congestion and improve air quality by reducing the dependence on single occupant automobile travel, by improving the ability to transfer between modes when traveling from origin to destination. Examples include park and ride lots that encourage carpooling, providing transit service between population and employment centers and airports, and intermodal facilities that accommodate transfer between a variety of modes including rail, bus, auto, and bike.

The planning process can encourage intermodal travel by (1) improving connections that encourage transfer between modes, (2) providing greater choice rather than relying on a single predominant mode, and (3) through coordination and collaboration among transportation agencies, organizations, and service providers.

Exhibit 6-10 lists Intermodal facilities in Morristown along with an assessment of their condition and the service(s) provided.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Exhibit 6-10: Intermodal Facilities Assessment

Facility Type	Location	Assessment
Park and Ride Lot	Morris Street west of Lafayette Avenue	Pedestrian crosswalk provided across Lafayette Avenue and direct access to train platform
	Lafayette Avenue near Lackawanna Place	Good access to train station
Bicycle Racks	South Street @ public library	Limited capacity and hidden behind library
	NJ Transit Train Station	4 bike racks and 6 bike lockers used by a few patrons
Crosswalks Mid-block (of unsignalized intersections)	Morris Street at King Street	Crosswalk painted
	Speedwell Avenue near Early Street	Crosswalk painted with 'Yield to Pedestrian' cones
	South Street at Community Pl.	Crosswalk painted with 'Yield to Pedestrian' cones
	South Street at Pine	Crosswalk painted with 'Yield to Pedestrian' cones
	Washington at Schuyler (2)	Crosswalks painted with 'Yield to Pedestrian' cones
	Elm Street at Franklin	Crosswalk painted with 'Yield to Pedestrian' cones
Transit Service to Airports	Morristown Municipal Airport	No service from Town of Morristown to Morristown Municipal Airport
	Newark International Airport	NJ Transit bus service (# 302) from Newark Penn Station to Newark International Airport Northeast Corridor to Newark International Airport via Newark Airport Mono rail
PowerCommute: use of electric-powered cars between train station and participating work sites	NJ Transit train station and several large companies in Town of Morristown	Demonstration program sponsored by NJDOT and others has concluded. TransOps (local transportation management association) has taken over program administration of 10 electric cars. Charging stations with parking spaces are available at train station and at 10 work sites.
Morristown & Erie (M&E) Railway: provides freight transportation for a number of businesses in Morris and Essex Counties	Freight rail station in the north central section of the Town of Morristown	M&E Railway operates four lines in Morris County that are all connected by trackage rights over NJ Transit railways. The "Whippany Line" and "NJ Transit" lines run within the Town of Morristown.
Morristown Train Station and bus stop	Bus stop at the northwest corner of Morris Street and Elm Street (across from train station)	Frequent bus service provides train-bus commuters convenient transfer between these two travel modes

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.6.03 EXISTING CONDITIONS TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT

Circulation Plan guidelines recommend a technical analysis of the existing transportation system. This assessment of existing traffic conditions will help to determine how well the existing transportation system can handle the current level of demand. The assessment identifies deficient roadways and intersections, and establishes the baseline of performance for comparison with the future year 2025 traffic projections. The existing conditions assessment is based on a data collection effort that included traffic counts at key intersections and roadways within the Town of Morristown. These data were reviewed to determine the AM and PM peak hours and analyzed using standard highway capacity analysis techniques.

The capacity analysis was based on *Highway Capacity Manual (HCM)* updated October 1994, and *Software (HCS)* version 2.1, to calculate the level-of-service (LOS). LOS is the standard performance measure for roadways, and LOS is defined in the HCM as a “qualitative measure describing conditions within a traffic stream, and their perception by motorists and/or passengers.” LOS is divided into six categories, ranging from LOS A (free-flow traffic) to LOS F (traffic flows break down, over capacity conditions). The performance measures used to determine LOS are speed, average delay, and density.

The results of the capacity analysis are depicted in Exhibit 6-11. In general, traffic counts under congested conditions may reflect throughput rather than true demand. To account for this difference, the counts at some locations were adjusted to reflect the differences between intersection and mid-block counts. The initial results of the HCS Analysis are depicted in Exhibit 6-11 along with a second set of “Field Observations.” The field observations columns reflect both the results of the capacity analysis tempered

with observations of queuing and travel performance during the data collection effort. The assessment of true demand is therefore reflected in the field observations columns.

For example, the HCS analysis of several intersections along the Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor indicates operations of LOS C or better, but the ‘Field Observations’ indicate Failed conditions. Consider the intersection of Spring Street and Water Street. The HCS analysis shows LOS B. However, long delays and queuing at the turning movement from westbound Spring Street to Water Street were observed, particularly during the PM peak period. Consequently, the field observation of this intersection is listed as ‘Fails.’

The completed traffic analysis concentrates on the 2 major travel corridors in Morristown -- Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor along the northern edge, and the Washington Street/South Street corridor along the southern edge -- and the Green.

The Speedwell and Washington corridors serve east-west travel routes and are used for multiple trip purposes including, through travel between I-287 to the east and outlying municipalities to the west, providing access to and from the areas centered around the Morristown Central Business District (CBD), and for local circulation within the town. These purposes, along with significant pedestrian traffic and on-street parking that are essential to successful small business operations, represent the inherent conflict between mobility and access needs. The area of the Green functions as a traffic circle, which in addition to serving the same menu

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

of travel needs, also connects the Speedwell and Washington corridors.

A review of Exhibit 6-11 indicates that the vast majority of intersections in Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor currently fail during both the AM and PM peak hours. Furthermore, field observations indicated the PM commute is heavily congested in both directions. The Washington Street/South Street corridor performs better and although several intersections in the vicinity of the CBD fail during the AM peak hour, the analysis indicates some excess capacity to accommodate the future growth in travel. Conditions at the Green are worse during the PM peak than the AM peak.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

Exhibit 6-11 - Existing Year Conditions Assessment

		EXISTING YEAR 2000			
		HCS Analysis		Field Observation	
		AM Peak Hour LOS	PM Peak Hour LOS	AM Peak Hour LOS	PM Peak Hour LOS
<i>Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor</i>					
Speedwell Avenue	Sussex Avenue	F	F	Fails	Fails
	Early Street	C	F	Fails	Fails
	Spring Street	F	C	Fails	Fails
Spring Street	MLK Avenue	B	B	Marginal	Marginal
	Water/Center Streets	B	B	Fails	Fails
	Spring Place	F	F	Fails	Fails
	Morris Street	F	F	Fails	Fails
Morris Street	Lafayette Avenue/Pine Street	B	C	Sufficient	Sufficient
	Blechley Place/Lackawanna Place/Elm Street	F	F	Fails	Fails
	Ridgedale Avenue	F	B	Fails	Marginal
Lafayette Avenue	Ridgedale Avenue	C	C	Fails	Fails
<i>Additional Intersections at the Green</i>					
Speedwell Avenue	E. Park Place/N. Park Place	C	F	Sufficient	Marginal
Morris Street	E. Park Place/S. Park Place	D	F	Marginal	Marginal
<i>Washington Street/W. Park Place/South Street Corridor</i>					
Washington Street	Phoenix/Atno Avenues	B	C	Marginal	Sufficient
	Western Street	C	C	Fails	Sufficient
	Court Street/Cattano Avenue	B	B	Fails	Marginal
	N. Park Place/Bank Street/Market Street	C	D	Fails	Marginal
W. Park/Place	S. Park Place/South Street	B	B	Sufficient	Sufficient
	Miller Road	B	B	Sufficient	Sufficient

Based on standard HCS LOS
(ABCDEF)

Observed intersection
performance
(Sufficient, Marginal, Fails)

PART 1

SECTION 1.7.0

OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE COMPONENTS

1.7.0 OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE COMPONENTS

1.7.01 Overview

The infrastructure of a community is important with respect to how the community functions. The most visible part of a community's infrastructure the transportation network is analyzed in detail in Section 1.6.0 of Part 1.

However, beyond the roads and rails that service Morristown, there are other less visible components of the infrastructure network that are also important. In many instances these other components are as important as the visible transportation network. These components directly and indirectly affect a variety of land use decisions that impact the Town. Most of these components, unlike the transportation network, are not readily visible and are generally not given much thought by the public. The infrastructure components to be discussed in this section include the sewerage disposal system, the storm drainage system, the water supply system, the electrical power network, the solid waste collection system, the street light network and telephone/cable/ internet services.

1.7.02 The Sewerage System

The Town of Morristown is an almost fully sewerred community with all land uses connected to a central sewage collection and disposal system, except for four properties still serviced by septic systems. The collection system is generally adequate and for the most part operates by gravity, except for several force mains that exist in the southeast portion of the Town. There are a number of problem areas within the Town caused by aging sewer pipes but they are being addressed on an as

needed basis. The Morristown sewage collection system consists of an intricate pipe network, which includes some pipes estimated to be nearly 100 years old. Overall, however, the collection system, as already noted, is in good condition and does not impose an impediment to future development and redevelopment within the community.

Likewise, the sewage treatment plant that is connected to the collection system, which is actually located in Hanover Township, is in good condition and does not currently impose any impediments to development or redevelopment activities within the Town. Morristown upgraded its sewage treatment plant in the early 1990's at a cost of 63 million dollars. The plant ultimately can handle 6.48 million gallons of sewage per day. It is currently approved for 3.45 million gallons per day. On average it operates now at 2.85 million gallons per day. There are some infiltration and inflow (I & I) problems that add several hundred thousand gallons to the system during rain events but those I & I problems are being addressed. And even with the I&I problems there is still sufficient capacity to accommodate additional connections.

The Town is currently going thru the mechanics of renewing its operating permit.

At complete build-out of the several redevelopment projects, approximately 0.5 MGD of sewage will be added to the system, well within the capacity of the WWTP. The Department of Public Works is currently evaluating possible

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

“choke points” in the system and undertaking necessary repairs and renovations.

1.7.03 The Water Supply System

Morristown at one time owned and operated its own potable water supply system. However, the responsibility for the system was transferred in the 1970's to the Southeast Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority (SMCMUA). This entity operates a regional system that includes Morristown, as well as portions of Morris Plains, Morris Township, Hanover, Harding and Mendham Townships.

The SMCUMA services over 16,000 connections, that are supplied by one reservoir and thirteen wells, which draw from the Central Passaic Buried Valley Aquifer. The SMCMUA also purchases water from other water supply purveyors. The 1994 Water Supply Element of the Morris County Master Plan indicates that the average daily demand on this system is 8.6 million gallons per day or a per capita demand factor of 159.3 gallons per day. Determining Morristown's per capita demand using this figure may not provide a completely accurate picture but this per capita figure translates into a daily demand in Morristown of approximately 3 million gallons per day.

The water supply system also includes many fire hydrants throughout the community for fire fighting purposes. As of the date of this report that hydrant network is in good condition.

The SMCMUA diversion rights allocation is approximately 360 million gallons per month or 12 millions gallons per day. It appears then that the water

system supplying Morristown has sufficient excess capacity to meet Morristown's needs. However, recent drought condition experiences raise some concern about the long term adequacy of this water supply. This is an issue that requires further study and analysis on a regional level and is beyond Morristown's area of expertise. Suffice it to say, that for the immediate future there do not appear to be any potable water limitations that will impede development and redevelopment activities within Morristown. However, if drought conditions do persist on a long term basis, it could have an impact on the number of future connections that may be allowed.

1.7.04 Storm Drainage System

Morristown has an extensive storm drainage system. In addition to many miles of subsurface pipe, there are also several detention and retention facilities connected to this system but many are on private property. There are also a number of seepage pits throughout the community that can be considered to be part of the storm drainage system. A number of localized drainage problems exist in the Town that have been the subject of previous studies and have been partially addressed as of the date of this document. Included among these problems are siltation conditions affecting water courses, catch basins and other parts of the storm drainage system.

The surface runoff in the Town drains primarily in the direction of the Whippany River and the remainder, of the runoff, which comes from an area bordered by Mt Kemble Ave (Rt 202) and South St, flows in the direction of

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

the Great Swamp. Since the adoption of the 1978 Master Plan, the issue of how stormwater runoff affects surface water quality has become a concern nationwide. In Morristown, concerns have been raised about how stormwater runoff affects the water quality of both the Whippany River and the Great Swamp. However, no in depth studies have been undertaken to date, which quantifies this impact.

Although the storm sewer system is extensive, not all sections of Morristown have subsurface drainage facilities. In many instances, the subsurface pipe network is minimal and stormwater travels on the surface for long distances. Examples of this can be found in such locations as Hill St, Abbett Ave and Frederick St. It should also be noted that the storm drainage system is not the full responsibility of the Town and that the State of New Jersey and Morris County share in some of the responsibility.

The newly adopted Storm Water Management Plan is included as Section 2.7.0

1.7.05 Miscellaneous Infrastructure Components

In addition to the primary infrastructure components discussed earlier in this section, as well as in Section 6.0 of Part 1 (Transportation & Parking Infrastructure), there are a number of other components that need to be mentioned. First, the electrical power network is provided by Jersey Central Power & Light (JCP&L). However, as a result of the deregulation of the electrical power industry, there is the possibility that JCP&L will no longer be the exclusive provider of electricity in the

Town. Suffice it to say, that since electric power generation is not localized and it is organized and distributed at a regional level, it is an infrastructure component over which Morristown has virtually no control. As of the date of this document, however, it appears that the electrical power demand associated with Morristown's current and future needs can be met and will not be an impediment to future development and redevelopment within the community.

A sub category of the electrical power network involves the public street lights that can be found throughout the community. Morristown's thoroughfares are well illuminated and for a number of years a program has been underway which has been responsible for installing lights that are more compatible with the historic character of the community.

Another infrastructure component includes the telephone/cable/internet service industries which have been changing so rapidly that the comments herein may be outdated shortly after the adoption of this document. Suffice it to say that these communication/entertainment infrastructure components, supplemented by satellite communication services, provide Morristown residents and businesses with state of the art capabilities, albeit at a price that many cannot afford.

Finally, solid waste collection and disposal is more of a "service" than an infrastructure component, but this service is dependent on a means of collection and a facility where the material can be sent. Consequently, it can be defined as being part of the

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

community infrastructure for the purpose of this document.

Currently, Morristown's Dept of Public Works collects only residential refuse in the community and disposes of it at an authorized landfill in Parsippany. A sub part of this component is recycling which will be addressed in detail in the Recycling Element, Section 2.5.0 of Part 2. The solid waste generated by non-residential development in the Town is not collected by the Morristown Dept of Public Work. Each non-residential use contracts individually with a solid waste collection contractor who then has the responsibility to dispose of the material collected.

PART 1.0

SECTION 1.8.0

NATURAL FEATURES ANALYSIS

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.8.0 NATURAL FEATURES ANALYSIS

1.8.01 Introduction and Overview

Morristown is often viewed as being a “fully developed” community but the accuracy of that statement depends on how one defines “fully developed”. It is true that Morristown does not have large tracts of vacant land capable of being subdivided into hundreds of building lots and most of the new construction in recent years has been in the form of the redevelopment of existing developed properties. So given these facts, Morristown could be defined as being “fully developed”. However, Morristown is not “fully developed” in the sense that it has been paved and developed from boundary line to boundary line. There is still a surprising amount of undeveloped acreage (approx 15% of the total land area) left in the community. But most of it is “protected” open space and is not available for development. This protected open space, together with underdeveloped private properties, such as the Loyolo Retreat House and certain public and quasi public uses, such the Evergreen Cemetery and the Thomas Jefferson School, contain many natural features that add to the quality of life in the community. This section provides a general analysis of those features but it is not an in depth, detailed investigation. However, The Morristown Environmental Commission will make available the findings of such an investigation of the Town’s natural features. And when that material is prepared, the intent is to incorporate it in this document. Until such time, however, as that material is incorporated herein, the information included and referenced in this section is sufficient to support the various policy decisions that are included in Part 2 of this document. Again, if

Morristown were a community that still had large tracts of vacant land available for development, then a more detailed analysis of the natural features of the community would be warranted. But in an “urban/ suburban” community like Morristown, such an analysis, although useful and interesting, is not essential to the planning process.

The material presented in this section has been derived from past master plan documents and other publications. No original research or data collection was undertaken in the preparation of this material. And the items discussed in this section are limited to soils; topography and geology, surface water features, wetlands and floodplains; vegetation and wildlife and air quality. Exhibit 8-1 presents a broad graphic representation of some of these physical characteristics of the community. As already noted, when material produced by the Environmental Commission becomes available it will supplement and/or replace the contents of this section and the maps that will be included will be more detailed and precise.

1.8.02 Soils

The Morris County Soil Survey, prepared by the United States Dept of Agriculture in cooperation with Rutgers University and the NJ Dept of Agriculture indicates the presence of 15 soil types within Morristown. The soil survey indicates that most of Morristown has soils that are part of the Riverhead - Urban land - Pompton Association, which are described as being soils formed in organic deposits, glacial lake sediment or glacial outwash. However, a small portion of the

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

community near its western boundary contains soils of the Edneyville Parker Califon Association, which are described as soils formed in old glacial deposits or in material from weathered bedrock.

Much of the land in the Town is identified as being in one of four urban soils categories. These soils are located for the most part in the fully developed portions of the community. But in addition to these urban soils categories, the Town also has within its boundaries a variety of other soil types, which are listed and briefly described as follows:

- Alluvial land - (found in several flood prone areas)
- Minoa silt loam - 0-3% slopes
- Minoa silt loam - 3-8% slopes
- Netcong gravelly sandy loam - 8 to 15% slopes
- Parker -Rock outcrop complex - 20 to 25% slopes (found in the vicinity of Fort Nonsense)
- Parsippany silt loam, sandy loam substratum
- Preakness sandy loam - 0 to 4% slopes
- Riverhead gravelly sandy loam - 3 to 8% slopes
- Rockaway gravelly sandy loam - 8 to 15% slopes
- Rockaway - Rock outcrop complex - 25 to 45% slopes (found in the vicinity of Cory Rd)
- Whippany silt loam, sandy loam substratum 0-3% slopes (found in the vicinity Footes Pond)

Many of the listed soils have severe constraints associated with them, which is why some of the properties where these soils are found have not been developed or only partially

developed. For a complete understanding of the constraints associated with these soils consult the Morris County Soil Survey.

1.8.03 Topography and Geology

Morristown lies within the Appalachian Geologic Province with the fault line separating two divisions of this province bisecting the community. These two areas known as the "Highlands" and the "Piedmont Plateau" account for the varied topographic conditions in the Town, with the highest elevation found in the vicinity of Fort Nonsense and the lowest in both the Whippany River and Spring Brook River basins. The area around the Whippany River is known as the "Terminal Moraine". This feature was formed by the forward edge of the Wisconsin Glacier when its advance was terminated 30,000 to 40,000 years ago. The Terminal Moraine averages about a mile in width and extends through Morristown and several adjoining municipalities. It is relatively level and is comprised of light porous soils.

For the most part topographic conditions have not been an impediment to development in Morristown and many of the remaining steep slopes, that have not been disturbed, are located within "protected" properties. However, there are still "unprotected" steep slopes within Morristown which should be studied in more detail in order to determine how they can be protected as well.

1.8.04 Surface Water, Wetlands & Floodplains

Morristown is bisected by one major waterway, the Whippany River, and is drained by several other smaller

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

watercourses. In addition, several water bodies dot the landscape and include the following:

- Pochohantas Lake
- Speedwell Lake
- The two ponds at Burnham Park
- Foote's Pond

Flood plain areas and wetlands are associated with these water features but they are not extensive. The most significant flood plain area occurs in the Whippany River basin and severe flooding has impacted this area historically, with the most recent severe flood having occurred in 1998.

Wetlands can still be found in selected areas of the community but have generally not been an impediment to development, because many wetland areas were filled and destroyed in years past, before the value of these areas was fully understood. The remaining wetland areas in the Town are generally located in protected areas like Foote's Pond and along Pochohantas Lake.

1.8.05 Vegetation and Wildlife Habitat

Morristown still contains pockets of undisturbed and undeveloped parcels of lands. These pockets of open space range from less than an acre (Jersey Ave Park) to substantial amounts of acreage (50 acres or more) in the vicinity of Speedwell Lake and Pocahontas Lake. These areas vary in terms of their value as wildlife habitat in direct proportion to their size, type of vegetative cover, as well as proximity to roadways and intensive development.

Many of the wooded areas in Morristown are typical of the maple, oak, ash association found throughout northern New Jersey. Non-native invasive species are also present but in

some cases can actually add to the habitat value. Low lying wetland areas that still remain in the Town are also productive habitat areas and accommodate many of the types of native vegetation typically found in this type of environment. Finally, the street tree resources and large trees located on many of the residential lots in the community are important in terms of their positive visual impact and the diverse habitat opportunities that they offer. With respect to the fauna still present in Morristown, the number of species is surprisingly diverse but physically limited to a small percentage of the Town. Small mammals, such as raccoon, possum and squirrel are still to be found and even larger mammals such as deer are present as well. In terms of other forms of wildlife – birds, reptiles etc, they exist in certain niches within the community and usually adapt better to man-made intrusions than many of the mammals do.

In summary, Morristown still has many "green" areas within its boundaries that add to the quality of life in the community both in terms of aesthetics, as well as being habitats where a surprising amount of fauna can be found. As already noted the Environmental Commission will at some point in the future produce a more detailed analysis of Morristown's flora and fauna which can then be incorporated into this document.

PART 1

SECTION 1.9.0

HISTORIC RESOURCES

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

1.9.0 HISTORIC RESOURCES

1.9.01 Introduction

As noted throughout this document, Morristown is a community with a unique and extensive history, which dates to the pre-Revolutionary era of this country. But Morristown is not a community frozen in time.

Consequently, there are few physical examples left of its colonial past. It does, however, still possess a multitude of structures, which date from the 19th and early 20th centuries. These structures, together with more recent construction, create a visually exciting and dynamic landscape that has few equals in New Jersey or elsewhere in the country.

It is essential that this unique mix of structures be protected and added to carefully in the years ahead. Section 4.0 in Part 2 of this document provides more information about how that can be accomplished. But first, Section 9.2 herein provides some information about where the historic resources of the community are more fully described. This section also includes a map (Exhibit 9-1) which depicts the limits of the Morristown Historic District. This district is listed on both the State and National Registers of Historic Places and is discussed in more detail in Section 4.0 of Part 2. Finally, section 9.3 herein, summarizes one of the information resources (The Bertland Survey No.1) listed in section 9.2 in order to provide a better understanding of the historic attributes still to be found in Morristown.

1.9.02 Inventory of Cultural and Historic Resources

The following information constitutes an inventory of the Town's significant cultural and historic sites and objects.

A. Morristown District Nomination Form/1973 Survey

A State and National Register District nomination involving a small, centrally located portion of the community was prepared in 1973 by a number of Morristown area historians including Barbara Hoskins, Carl Scherzer, Bill Chambers and others. Criteria used were those in effect at the time for such nominations; copies of the form are on file in the Joint Free Library of Morristown-Morris Township, Local History Department and with the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission, as well as at the State Historic Preservation Office in Trenton and with the Keeper of the Register, National Park Service, Washington DC. The information contained in that nomination is adopted herein by reference.

B. Bertland Survey No.1

A survey in 1981 by Dennis Bertland, commissioned by the Town and the Morris County Historical Society, led to the creation of what is formally known as the Extended Register District in 1985.

Criteria again were those in effect at the time for such nominations; forms covering both the initial survey and the subset of surveyed sites actually nominated are available at the Joint Free Public Library of Morristown-Morris Township, as well as in the

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

files of the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission and at the State Historic Preservation Office in Trenton. The information is adopted herein by reference and summarized in section 9.3 herein.

C. Acroterion Survey

A County-wide survey conducted by the preservation firm Acroterion was completed by The Morris County Heritage Commission in 1987. The Morristown portion depends heavily on the Bertland work and thus criteria are similar, though less rigorous, and the area covered is broader. The report is available at the Joint Free Library of Morristown-Morris Township, as well as at the Morris County Library and the Heritage Commission office. The information contained in that survey is adopted herein by reference.

D. Bertland Survey No. 2

A survey by Dennis Bertland, authorized by the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission in 1993, was designed to complete Mr. Bertland's coverage of the entire Town. Criteria used were those of Register eligibility; results are in the files of the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission. The information contained in that survey is adopted herein by reference.

E. Dykema Map

A Town-wide map prepared by Historic Preservation Commission member James Dykema indicates the age and condition, in 1993-94, of every structure, as well as the locations of street furniture, monuments, etc., which were not covered in the earlier surveys. The Dykema map is in the files of the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission. That map is adopted herein by reference.

F. Commission Database

A database compiled by Morristown Historic Preservation Commission former member Timothy Cutler consists of three parts:

1. Properties in the Original District, with block and lot identifications;
2. Properties in the Extended District, with block and lot identifications;
3. A list of other properties which were deemed significant according to recognized historic preservation criteria.

1.9.03 The Bertland Survey No. 1 - A Summary

The 1981 Bertland Survey is a massive document, which provides an overview of the types of structures which existed in Morristown at the time the survey was conducted and which for the most part still exist as of the date of this document. The Bertland Survey also provides an in depth analysis of individual structures considered to be of historical and/or architectural importance. The purpose of this section is to briefly discuss some of the building styles included in the Bertland Survey in order to put the importance of Morristown's historic resources in the proper context. If a more comprehensive review of these resources is desired, it is suggested that the complete survey be consulted.

The Bertland Survey catalogues a variety of design types. In addition to recognizing standard 19th - century elaborate forms like Queen Anne and Italianate, the Bertland Survey establishes an elaborate typology of more modest house designs generally

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

referred to as “worker housing”. Morristown’s wealth of worker housing tends to cluster in pockets, for example on the north side of James St., along Washington St., and behind the high school. The basic forms are:

- A. The East Jersey cottage, a small house, usually of three bays, gables at the ends and the entrance placed asymmetrically. There are most often 1½ stories, but sometimes two or even one, and the foundation may be adapted to the slope of the property, creating a version described as a bank house. A front porch extends the width of the house. Small rectangular windows characterize the half-story variant. An example of this form is located at 45 James Street.
- B. An unnamed form, developed during the Greek Revival period (here about 1820-1840), but continuing to be built right up to the beginning of the 20th century. These houses have the gable end to the street, and may have a later porch or a small front entry. They are difficult to date because of an almost total lack of architectural detail; often the only sign of their Greek Revival heritage is the presence of small returns at the ends of the soffits. These houses exist now on James St., Catherine Lane., Washington St., Ridgedale Ave., and behind the high school. An example of this form is located at 14 Hill Street.
- C. Multi-family worker housing is rare, but pockets remain at the intersection of Maple Ave., and Market St., on Madison St. (somewhat altered), and on Maple Ave. near James St. Examples are

located at 6, 8 and 10 Maple Avenue.

With respect to the Queen Anne and Italianate forms mentioned earlier Queen Anne houses vary widely in pretension and elegance. An elaborate one is located at 44 Miller Road. Italianate forms predominate among the large early houses on Maple and MacCulloch Ave. 64 Maple Avenue is an example of this style.

Morristown also has many Colonial Revival style structures, representing a reaction against the excessive darkness and decoration of the end of the 19th century. They are characterized by monumental scale, light body colors, large, chunky pillars on the front facade, classical forms of gable definition, and perhaps Palladian windows. The style came into use just at the turn of the 20th century, and lasted up until WWI. An example is located at 1 Whippany Road.

The scope of the Bertland Survey did not extend to cover those styles considered to belong to the 20th century. But Morristown has a wealth of those too, and are described as follows:

- A. The “foursquare,” a comfortable box of two stories built most frequently between 1910 & 1920, usually divided in two horizontally with clapboard on one part and shingles on the other one, half dark and the other light. There is a generous front porch, a hip roof, and dormers, sometimes on all four sides or sometimes a shed dormer. An example is located at 36 Colonial Road.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

- B. "Colonial Revival revival," small neighborhoods of houses built after WWI, in Dutch versions (with gambrel roofs and facing benches on the small entry porch), "Tudor" (dark beams in the gables), or plain two-story boxes, perhaps with stonework on the first floor. The entire Washington Ave area is a storehouse of these gems and a specific example can be found at 10 Sunset Place.

Bertrand also reviews and describes a number of non-residential structures in Morristown. A summary of these descriptions follows:

Next to dwellings, commercial structures are the most numerous buildings in Morristown. Throughout the region in the 18th century and well into the 19th century, commercial buildings—often also the residence of their owners or keepers—resembled dwellings in their form, scale, and general appearance. Traditional house types and later the popular N-type were adapted for commercial uses. For example, documentary evidence indicates that Morristown's Dickerson, Arnold, and O'Hara Taverns, long gone 18th century structures, all were N-types. As late as 1872, the Italianate detailed, brick building erected to house a bank on Washington Street (106:10), resembled an urban side-hall dwelling of the period, a four-bay L-type. Perhaps the oldest surviving commercial building in Morristown, dating in part at least to shortly before 1850, #47 South Park Place, has a domestic scale.

In the middle of the 19th century, commercial buildings began of the 19th century, commercial buildings began to be erected in Morristown with a decidedly undomestic scale and appearance. First appearing on and around the Green they were masonry,

usually flat roofed, three or four-story structures of larger size and more vertical proportions than was built earlier in town. The first floor housed stores—now mostly altered—fronted by plate glass display windows; the upper floors were occupied by offices or apartments. Typically the facades are elaborately detailed in the various styles popular during the Victorian era. Large cornices, either bracketed or treated as entablatures, appear at roof lines and boave store fronts as a feature common to most of the extant examples. While most of the facades are symmetrical with a regular fenestration on the upper floors, a few later 19th century examples exhibit asymmetry. Commercial buildings of this kind were erected well into the first quarter of the 20th century in Morristown. The facades—with a regular fenestration for the most part—are detailed with varying degrees of elaboration. Of the many styles then popular, the Italianate, the Queen Anne, and the Classical Revival were employed most frequently, often in an amalgamation that can be described as the local High Victorian.

While not as numerous as residential or commercial structures, buildings with institution functions are an important component of Morristown's townscape, often times punctuating the streetscape.

Churches constitute one category of institutinal use. Documentary evidence indicates that in the 18th century Morristown's two congregations, the Presbyterians and the Baptists, occupied churches of a kind common throughout the region at that time. They were simple meeting houses of rectangular form, with gable roofs and with the principal entry centered on one of the long walls. The addition of a classically detailed tower with entry and belfry at one gable end of the Presbyterian Church reflected the emergence of

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008

another type of church in the region. In this later type, also a simple rectangular, gable-roofed structure, one gable-end wall is treated as the principal facade with one or two entries and frequently a belfry or projecting bell tower..

In the third quarter of the 19th century the church architecture of Morristown began to exhibit considerable variety both as to plan and to style. In response to Revival Architecture of the period, European churches of the Middle Ages began to be taken as models, quite loosely at first, for local church construction. For example, the Episcopal Church built on the corner of Morris and Pine Streets has a cross-shaped plan and the Second

Presbyterian Church on South Street sprouted transepts at its south end.

These excerpts from the Bertland Survey provide a glimpse of Morristown's rich and varied historic and architectural fabric. This fabric was woven over more than two centuries, continually changing, but always retaining the core historic character that makes Morristown what it is.

As Morristown moves forward into the twenty-first century, the historic resources documented herein will continue to play an important role and section 4.0 of Part 2 of this document addresses how that can be accomplished

PART 2

THE PLAN ELEMENTS

PART 2

SECTION 2.1.0

THE PLAN ELEMENTS - AN OVERVIEW

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

2.1.0 THE PLAN ELEMENTS - AN OVERVIEW

2.1.01 The Relationship of Parts 1 and 2

This document is divided into two parts. Part 1 – The Background Information element, contains a variety of information, data and observations that provide the foundation and framework for what is presented in Part 2 of this document. Part 1 draws primarily on existing data and information. Some original research, however, has been included, particularly in connection with the existing land use analysis and the transportation and parking infrastructure evaluation in Part 1. The intent is for Part 1 to evolve as additional material about the Town and its environs becomes available, whether it be original research conducted by the Town, or relevant material from published sources. In particular, the intent is to utilize the Town's Geographic Information System (GIS) capability to keep certain information, such as existing land use data, updated and to add new information when feasible and available. As new material is added to Part 1 or existing information is updated, it will be essential to analyze how the material in Part 2 is impacted. The NJ Municipal Land Use Law requires such an evaluation or reexamination of the Master Plan every six years but given the dynamic nature of Morristown more frequent evaluations may be needed.

Part 1 and Part 2 then, are very much connected. The material in Part 1 supports the contents in Part 2. So, if the material in Part 2 is updated revised and/or expanded, the impact on the contents of Part 2 must be

considered. Conversely if changes are being considered to any of the Part 2 elements, the support and basis for such changes must be grounded in the contents of Part 1. As an example, a Part 2 change might necessitate a modification to the goals and objectives section; otherwise the validity of the Part 2 change could be questioned.

In summary, Part 1 and Part 2, together, comprise the Morristown Master Plan. Although the contents of Part 2, particularly section 1.2.0 – The Land Use Plan – will often be described as the “Master Plan”, this is obviously incorrect. The Master Plan is intended to be “comprehensive” and that means the background information contained in Part 1 cannot be separated from the conclusions and policies presented in Part 2.

2.1.02 The Purpose and Scope of the Part 2 Plan Elements

The NJ Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) lists a number of plans and sub plans that can be contained in a master plan document. However, all but the land use plan element and a statement, of objectives, principles, assumptions etc. are optional. A housing plan is also required but that requirement is not contained in the MLUL; it is contained in the state statute governing the NJ Council On Affordable Housing (COAH) and its activities. Finally and most important, the MLUL indicates that the purpose of a municipal master

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

plan is “to guide the use of lands within the municipality in a manner which protects public health and safety, and promotes the general welfare”.

Part 2 of this document includes five plan elements – a Land Use Plan element (the basis for a revised zoning map), a Circulation and Parking Plan element (the basis for future capital improvement projects), a Historic Preservation Plan element (the basis for design decisions by the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment), a Housing Plan element (the basis for eventual COAH substantive certification) and a Recycling Plan element. Several remaining plan elements will be added to Part 2 of this document at a later date.

All of the plan elements, as noted several times in this document, are intended to work together; not to work against each other. Consequently, the Land Use Plan, as an example, recognizes the limitations of the transportation network servicing Morristown. It also recognizes the importance of historic preservation relative to the character of the community. These two factors, the transportation network limitations and historic preservation influenced the decision to recommend the reduction of the allowed building height in selected areas of the community.

In summary, the contents of Part 2 should be viewed as an interconnected series of recommendations, ideas and proposals that constitute the planning policies of the community. The implementation of these policies will be accomplished principally via amendments to the Town’s land use and other regulations, enforcement of those regulations, decisions by the Planning Board and Board of Adjustment

and by the expenditure of municipal funds. These implementation efforts will be discussed in more detail in Part 3 of this document. Suffice it to say, that this document alone, and particularly the contents of Part 2, will be powerless to effect any change unless the recommendations, ideas and proposals herein are translated into the implementation efforts just mentioned.

PART 2

SECTION 2.2.0

THE LAND USE PLAN

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

2.2.0 THE LAND USE PLAN

2.2.01 Introduction

The Zone Map approved by the Town Council on September 11, 2007 represents the first major revision to the Land Use Plan and Zone Plan since 1978.

2.2.02 Policy Decisions

Early in the preparation of the map documents it was decided that the Zone Plan and Land Use Plan would be combined into a single document.

This policy decision required a lot-by-lot determination of the existing use and adjusting zone lines to reflect that use. As a corollary to that policy, the zone lines were adjusted to accommodate known or expected development projects.

A. Building Height In the CBD Zone

The Morristown Central Business District (CBD) is an exciting mix of a variety of uses that contribute a vitality to the community, which is missing in many other municipalities. The term “Central Business District” can be defined in a number of different ways depending on one’s perspective. Generally it most often refers to the areas that are included within the boundaries of the Central Business District (CBD) zone but this term is sometimes stretched to include areas adjacent to the CBD zone that are zoned B, OB, ORC or M-1. For the purpose of this discussion “Central Business District” means the CBD zone and none of the adjoining zoning districts.

The CBD radiates in several directions from the Town Green. In effect the Town Green can be considered the center of the CBD and portions of Speedwell Ave, Washington St, Morris St and South St. are the primary arteries that link the center of the CBD with its component parts. These streets for the most part are narrow and allow for one lane of traffic or at most two in each direction. And traveling through the CBD at certain times of the day, given the traffic volumes and the capacity of the roads, can be tedious and time consuming. The buildings within this area come in a variety of shapes, sizes and architectural styles. Furthermore, the uses in these buildings include a broad range of retail, office and service commercial businesses, as well as many public and quasi public uses, normally found within a business district of this size and scale.

Buildings in the CBD range from single story structures to buildings five stories and higher. Although there is no definitive pattern as to how these buildings are distributed throughout the CBD, many of the single story buildings are located along South St. Obviously a single story building in a zone that allows for multi-story structures constitutes an underutilization of that particular property. Anticipating that many of these single story structures, as well as some two and three story buildings may be likely redevelopment candidates, the issue of building height in the CBD zone has been the subject of much discussion. The maximum building height permitted by Morristown’s land use regulations in the CBD zone, for many years and as of the

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

date of this document, has been five stories. It has been determined, however, that the average existing building height in the CBD zone and in portions of adjoining zones, is approximately two stories. As part of the Circulation Plan element of this document, an assumption was made that, if during the next 25 years an average of one additional story were added throughout this area, the level of service of most intersections within the CBD would be reduced substantially (see Circulation and Parking Plan)

It also has been determined that the uniqueness and attractiveness of the CBD is partly attributable to a number of 19th century and early 20th century, two and three story buildings that are architecturally interesting and sometimes historically important (note: all of the CBD is located in the Morristown Historic District which is listed on both the State and Federal Registers of Historic Places). The demolition of these buildings would be a significant loss to the character of the CBD specifically and to the entire community as a whole. Although the five-story provision in the CBD zone by itself, will not cause the removal of these buildings, that height provision could eventually contribute to the demise of many of these structures.

Another consideration relative to the future of the CBD involves light, air and open space. Given the narrowness and orientation of the streets in the CBD zone, the light, air, and open space associated with this area would be greatly diminished if a significant number of properties were developed or redeveloped to the five-story maximum,

thus creating a “canyon” effect throughout much of the CBD.

Given all of these factors, traffic issues and architectural character, as well as light, air and open space - it has been determined that allowing a six story building height in the vicinity of the Epsteins Development at the Green but lowering the maximum building height for the remainder of the CBD would be desirable. It was further determined that there is a need for a transition from the height permitted in the Epsteins development at the Town Green and the lower buildings further away from the Green. Accordingly, a CBD-2 Zone was created allowing up to six story buildings and a CBD-1 Zone, restricting building heights to three storied.

B. The Hospital Zone

The Town and the Hospital have had some experience in working together to address issues related to the future of the hospital complex. However, many of the issues that the Town and the Hospital began to address over twenty-five years ago have not been fully resolved and are still of concern today.

Prior to 1978 Morristown did not have a Hospital Zone. Consequently, Morristown Memorial Hospital was classified a non-conforming use in a residential zone. In order to make the hospital a conforming use and facilitate the future expansion of the hospital complex, the hospital zone was created. Subsequent to the creation of that zone, the Town again helped facilitate the growth of the hospital by adjusting certain zone requirements.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

There are two locations within Morristown that have been designated for hospital and hospital related purposes. One location, on Mt. Kemble Ave. near the Town's southern boundary has been designated H-1 (Hospital Zone Modified). The other location, between Franklin St. and Madison Avenue, east of Rt. 287, is in the H (Hospital) Zone

With regard to the Mt. Kemble Branch (the H-1) Zone, the Planning Board and town administration have taken the position that that further expansion is to be curtailed. Accordingly, the Zoning Ordinance adopted on September 11, 2007 includes dimensional requirements that tend to restrict greater density at the site.

The Planning Board, town administration and the hospital management are in general concurrence that Hospital Zone shown on the September 11, 2007 Zoning Map is the horizontal limit of expansion that the hospital will seek and the Town will allow in the near future. Specifically, expansion of the Hospital Zone west of I-287 will be neither sought nor permitted.

Given that horizontal expansion of the Hospital Zone is being curtailed. The question of vertical expansion remains. It is the sense of the authors that the hospital will seek vertical expansion beyond the limits permitted by the new Zoning Ordinance.

Given the changes over the years in the H and H-1 Zones, it may be that some inconsistencies have crept into Schedules I and II of the Zoning Ordinances. A detailed, historic review

of these two Zoning Ordinances will be conducted as a priority work item.

C. The Public Purpose Zones

The Zone Map adopted September 11, 2007 designated two Public Purpose Zones.

Public Purpose Zones are meant to delineate parcels whose primary use is public in nature. They are meant to depict to the casual observer that parcels which appear vacant or with limited development have restrictions on more intensive developments.

For purposes of further clarification, Public Purpose Zones are classified as PPU (Public Purpose Undevelopable) or PP (Public Purpose).

Public Purpose Zones are those parcels that, although having a public use today, could, at some future time, be changed to another use by Town action alone. An example of such a use is the Town Hall Building.

Public Purpose Undevelopable Zones are those parcels that have a public use today and could not be changed to another use by Town action alone. Examples of this use include Speedwell Lake and the Morris County Complex.

D. The East End of South Street

The first half of South Street as it extends in a southeasterly direction from the Town Green is in the CBD-1 zone. Beyond Elm St., however, the remainder of South St., to the point where it meets Rt. 287, is divided among several zoning districts.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

The RC Zone

In 1979 the Town Council established the R-C (Low Density Residential-Cluster Option) Zone. This zoning district requires a minimum lot size of approximately a quarter acre for single-family detached residences. It also permits townhouses, as a conditional use, at a density of approximately five units per acre. The Windmill Pond neighborhood is an example of the type of development permitted under this zoning provision. In addition to the Windmill Pond area, two other tracts are included in this zone. One tract immediately adjoins Windmill Pond and has accommodated the Morristown Field Club facilities for many decades.

F. Redevelopment Areas

In 1997 Morristown initiated a process, authorized by state statute, to determine if a portion of the municipality could meet the criteria to allow this section of the community to be designated as “an area in need of redevelopment.”

As of this writing, five redevelopment zones are being considered, as follows:

- Speedwell Avenue
- Spring Street
- Center/Coal
- Lafayette (Fire House)
- Carriage House (Morris Ave)

These Redevelopment Zones are shown on the Zoning Map dated September 11, 2007.

F. The TVC Zone

In 1999, Morristown established the Transit Village Core Zone (TVC). The purpose of this zone is to encourage, in

the vicinity of the Morristown Train Station, mid-rise, high density, mixed use construction. The intent is to allow for more growth in this part of the community that will take full advantage of the proximity of mass transit facilities. At the time that the TVC zone was established, some discussion involved the possible expansion of the zone at a later, undetermined date

Construction of the TVC Zone began in March, 2008.

G. The ORC Zone

The ORC (Office-Residential Character) zone was established by the Town Council in 1979 based on the recommendations contained in the Master Plan of that time period. Since the late 1970's the ORC zone, which encompasses most of Washington Street, Maple Avenue and Elm Street has succeeded in maintaining the residential appearance of large segments of those two neighborhoods, while at the same time allowing for the adaptive reuse of many of the structures in those neighborhoods for office purposes. An ordinance amendment in 1989 added a further requirement that every structure should have a residential component, thereby emphasizing that a residential presence in these two areas is as important as the residential appearance. In short, many of the Victorian era structures that are found along these three streets, owe their continued existence to the creation of the ORC zone.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

Bed and Breakfast (B and B) Operations

The issue of whether and where to allow B and B operations in Morristown has been the subject of much discussion for many years. It would seem, on initial observation, that Morristown with a plentiful supply of 19th and early 20th century structures would be a logical setting for this type of land use. And yet in the early 1990's the possibility of allowing B and B operations as a permitted or some other type of allowed use was rejected.

The issue sat dormant for a while, until it was resuscitated as part of the 2003 master plan program. However, it was discovered that many of the same issues that led to the rejection ten years previous were still of concern. Those issues involve potential impacts on residential areas from noise, traffic, transients and other nuisance factors associated with a non-residential use. And that is at the heart of the problem, B and B operations especially those that take advantage of the ambiance associated with historic structures – may seem to be residential but are in fact commercial in nature providing lodging to those visiting a location on a relatively short-term basis. The question was again asked is there a way to incorporate a land use such as this one, that can be an asset to a community like Morristown by promoting tourism, without destroying what makes Morristown an enjoyable place to call home?

The decision was made, in 2003, that Morristown should encourage B and B operations under very controlled conditions

As part of this reexamination, The Town Administration and Planning Board discourage B and B operations.

H. The Industrial (I) and Light Industrial (LI) Zones

Morristown is no longer a community that should encourage the location of industrial uses within its borders. Morristown is a financial, governmental and cultural center, not an industrial center. Morristown's size, road network, fragile residential neighborhoods and related factors, preclude the possibility of any quality industrial operations finding Morristown a logical location. Hence to continue to allow industrial uses as permitted uses in certain locations within the community is not advisable. The decision then is to eliminate the (I) and (LI) zones with the caveat that a unique use in the (I) zone – The Morris and Erie Railroad - be afforded some protection via a "grandfather" provision. The (LI) zone will be designated R-3 as is most of the neighborhood nearby. The areas currently in the (I) zone will be incorporated into the adjoining (B) zones. Exhibit 2-1 reflects these changes.

This reexamination continues the elimination of the I and LI Zones.

J. Residential Development In the CBD and B zones

Residential development in these

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

zones should be allowed as a permitted use. However, there should be restrictions prohibiting the use of ground level floor space for residential purposes throughout most of these two zones; a maximum density similar to the M-1 zone (50 units/acre); the availability of sufficient parking and compliance with the Housing Plan Element and Fair Share Plan, at such time as one may be adopted by the Town of Morristown.

K. The Early St. Senior Housing Complex

This parcel has been designated “Housing Authority” on the new Zone Map

L. The M-1 Zone - Prospect and Clinton Streets

The boundary of this M-1 Zone was reevaluated during the reexamination. The revised Zone District is shown on the revised Zone Map.

M. The RT Zone

The current zoning map of Morristown includes nine separate areas that are zoned RT. The RT zone is defined as a moderate density residential zone and allows one to four family structures at varying densities up to a maximum of approximately 15 units per acre. This zoning district is viewed as a transition zone between the single-family residential neighborhoods (R-1, R-2 and R-3 areas) and the more intensively developed areas of the community, both residential and non-residential (i.e. M-1, CBD, OB etc.)

Several issues were discussed in connection with the future of these areas. First, the existing congestion in these neighborhoods, primarily but not exclusively in the form of on street parking problems was evaluated. Secondly, the existing land use pattern in each area was reviewed to determine the extent of multifamily development. Finally, the location of each RT area in relation to single-family residential neighborhoods, the central business district, the Morristown Train Station etc. was considered.

After careful consideration the decision was made to split the RT zone into two zones – The RT-1 and RT-2. The RT-2 will allow one to four family structures, just as the RT zone currently does. The RT-1 zone will only allow one and two family structures. The purpose behind this decision is to prevent further congestion in these areas, better protect the adjoining single-family residential neighborhoods and to allow for some redevelopment at an appropriate scale. It was also decided that the RT-1 zone should contain a grandfather provision that will allow existing three and four family structures to be modified and upgraded without the need for a use variance.

The revised RT-1 and RT-2 zones are shown on the Zone Map dated September 11, 2007

O. Franklin Corners Neighborhood

This portion of Morristown, defined as including Franklin St, Franklin Pl., Revere Rd., Hamilton St., Hill St., Ford Ave and Green Hill Road, has been the subject of much redevelopment interest for many years. A number of projects have been constructed in this area via the use variance route.

However, much of this neighborhood is still zoned R-3, with smaller portions zoned RT. An in depth review of this neighborhood and subsequent discussions considered a number of alternative zoning arrangements including retaining the status quo.

At one time it appeared that this neighborhood might make a complete transition from a predominantly single-family residential area to a more mixed-use pattern consisting of office uses, as well as higher density residential development. And although there are some existing office uses and multifamily complexes in this area, single-family residences are still an important part of this neighborhood and in recent years there have been examples of non-single family structures reverting or being converted to single-family use. This is also a neighborhood that is impacted by a variety of high intensity uses, virtually on every side. Rt. 287 borders the neighborhood to the east, mid-rise office and residential structures line the southern boundary and the NJ Transit rail line borders the neighborhoods on the north.

Given all the facts associated with this neighborhood, the decision was made to retain the existing R-3 zoning pattern. In addition, the decision was made to modify the RT zone in the vicinity of Hill St., as described herein under the section entitled “The RT zone”. These decisions are aimed at protecting this neighborhood from further inappropriate residential development and encouraging additional reversions and/or conversions of existing structures to single-family residential use.

P. The Parsons Village/Convent Mews Multi-Family Complex

This portion of Morristown, located behind a series of mid rise office buildings adjacent to Madison Avenue, is partly zoned R-2 and partly OB. Consequently, both of these residential complexes are categorized as non-conforming uses. It was decided that both complexes should be zoned appropriately so that they will be conforming rather than non-conforming. It appears that the RG zone is the appropriate designation for this area but further study will be needed to determine if the RG standards need to be adjusted to reflect the existing conditions associated with these complexes.

R. The intersection of Washington Street and Atno Avenue

Questions raised since the adoption of the September 11, 2007 adoption of the Zoning Ordinance have prompted a re-evaluation of the

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

easterly end of the ORC Zoning District at the intersection of Washington Street and Atno Avenue.

On examination, it was determined that the uses on three lots are more appropriate for the Business (B) Zone, rather the ORC Zone as presently designated. Therefore, this Re-examination recommends that Block 79, Lots 5, 6 and 7 be designated in the B Zone.

2.2.30 The Land Use Plan Map

The Land Use Plan map (Exhibit 2-1) will serve as the basis for a new zoning map and it incorporates many of the policy decisions discussed in Section 2.2. The Land Use Plan map, contained herein, is common with the current zoning map.

PART 2

SECTION 2.3.0

THE CIRCULATION AND PARKING PLAN

2.3.0 THE CIRCULATION AND PARKING PLAN

2.3.01 INTRODUCTION

The Circulation and Parking Plan Element presents a list of Short-Term/Operational Improvements and a list of Long Term Improvements and the Traffic Assessment of year 2025 conditions. The future year analysis assumes the completion of capital improvements recommended by the Town and includes both background traffic growth and proposed new development in accordance with the amended Land Use Element.

2.3.02 SHORT AND LONG TERM OPERATION IMPROVEMENTS

Based on assessment of existing traffic conditions, a series of preliminary recommendations were developed. These recommendations include both short-term operational improvements (Exhibit 3-1) and long-term capital improvements (Exhibit 3-2). These improvements are intended to address the problems and deficiencies identified and the assessment of existing traffic conditions. From this list of preliminary recommendations, a final set of recommendations was tested and evaluated.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

2.3.30 FUTURE CONDITIONS TRAFFIC ASSESSMENT

The future year assessment completes the analysis portion of the Circulation Plan. This assessment combines the results of the existing conditions assessment with the future traffic projections and proposed roadway and intersections improvements, and is integrated with the recommendations of the Land Use Plan.

Impact of Recommendations

Based on the results of the existing conditions assessment, a series of short- and long-term improvement projects was proposed. (See Exhibits 3-1 & 3-2) The following 4 long-term capital improvements were tested and used to evaluate future traffic conditions:

1. West Park Place - change from one-way facility to two-way facility
2. Lafayette Avenue - change from one-way facility to two-way facility
3. Realignment of Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street intersection and Speedwell Avenue/Early Street into one intersection, or,
4. Full one-way pairing of Speedwell Avenue/E. Park Place/Morris Street (eastbound) and Spring Street (westbound).

The methodology of the future year analysis consisted of 3 incremental phases. Phase 1 implemented the four build projects recommended. The local roadway network was modified to reflect these projects and traffic flows were adjusted accordingly. Phase 2 estimated the background growth rate for traffic in the study area. The background growth rate accounts for increases in regional and local travel due to population growth and development in the surrounding areas. Data extracted from the North Jersey Travel Demand Model projected an average growth of 12.5 percent in Morristown traffic volumes from 2000 to 2025, so the adjusted intersection counts

from Phase 1 were increased by 12.5 percent to reflect the background growth. For Phase 3, the traffic impacts of the possible land use changes proposed for the Town were estimated and added to the adjusted traffic flows and intersection counts from Phase 2.

Two land use scenarios for the future year build-out in the Central Business District were considered. The first scenario consisted of 20% retail, 60% office, and 20% residential. The second scenario consisted of 20% retail, 30% office, and 50% residential. The developable area within the Town is 4.6 million square feet, of which 70% is allowed building coverage. This means that the developable area, excluding areas without building coverage, is 3.22 million square feet. Today's developments can be calculated to occupy an average of 1.9 stories. Projected new developments would add 1.1 more stories for a future total of 3 stories on average. Since the existing developed area stands at 6.12 million square feet, the future build-out will be about 9.66 million square feet. The difference between the two of 3.54 million square feet is broken down into percentages of retail, office, and residential land uses to calculate trips generated for each scenario.

Trip generation for each scenario was calculated using the ITE Trip Generation Manual, 6th Edition. The scenario that generated the greatest number of new trips was selected for further analysis. In this case, the first scenario generated 5,808 total trips during the PM peak hour, compared with 4,643 total trips for the second scenario. A trip distribution matrix was developed based on origin/destination data from base year traffic counts and the development scenario were applied to the intersection counts.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

Based on the 2025 traffic projections, HCS analysis was performed to determine the projected future level-of-service (LOS) at each intersection. Since several of the intersections have been modified or reconfigured, appropriate assumptions were made to undertake the HCS analysis. Similar lane widths, signal timings, and truck volumes from the existing year analysis were applied to the 2025 future year analysis. The results of the 2025 HCS analysis are shown in Table 8.

Results indicate that failing conditions (LOS F) will continue to prevail along the Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor. Several intersections with acceptable existing LOS degrade under future conditions, those that failed previously continue to fail, and one intersection improves -- from LOS B to LOS A. Conditions along the Washington Street/W. Park Place/South Street Corridor are projected to deteriorate significantly; the majority of intersections are projected to fail. Intersections at the Green are also projected to fail in the 2025 analysis year.

So despite the proposed improvements, roadway performance in Morristown is expected to worsen significantly by 2025. This future condition is the result of several factors working in combination, namely:

- 12.5% growth in background traffic
- Significant number of new trips created by proposed development near the train station and in the CBD
- Need to retain on-street parking.
- Inability to widen street and intersection in the Town's developed urban core
- Need to accommodate the competing interests between local and through travel.

Overall, little or no opportunity exists to add capacity to the existing street system.

In particular, traffic management options in Morristown are limited by having only two true east-west routes. The Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor and the Washington Street/South Street corridor must serve both mobility and access needs. Capacity analysis indicates the Speedwell Avenue corridor fails under existing conditions and the Washington Street corridor is projected to fail based on the 2025 future scenario.

A. Transportation Improvement Initiatives

Several options are recommended for further study to address these anticipated deficiencies and are listed as follows:

1. Construct new I-287 ramps in the vicinity of Hanover Avenue. Southbound I-287 traffic with destinations west of Morristown and along Sussex Turnpike or CR 510 (SR 124) currently travel through the central business district (CBD). These vehicles can be rerouted via an exit on I-287 southbound to Hanover Avenue, a 4-lane county road that provides direct access to destinations west of Morristown. There is an existing bridge structure over the Whippany River that could carry an exit ramp from I-287.
2. Similarly, I-287 traffic northbound could be diverted to Hanover Avenue with the construction of a ramp to provide for the traffic pattern that currently utilizes South Street to Washington Street and Lafayette Avenue to Sussex Turnpike via Morris Street and Speedwell Avenue.

Construct the Route 24 extension from I-287 to Speedwell Avenue (Route 202) or beyond to Sussex Turnpike. This was originally planned to be an extension of Route 24 Freeway that was abandoned some years ago. It is suggested that a 4-lane undivided road be considered with at-grade intersections.

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

Exhibit 3-3 - Future Conditions Intersection Summary

		<i>EXISTING YEAR 2000</i>				<i>FUTURE YEAR 2025</i>	
		<i>HCS Analysis</i>		<i>Field Observation</i>		<i>HCS Analysis</i>	
		<i>AM Peak Hour LOS</i>	<i>PM Peak Hour LOS</i>	<i>AM Peak Hour LOS</i>	<i>PM Peak Hour LOS</i>	<i>AM Peak Hour LOS</i>	<i>PM Peak Hour LOS</i>
<i>Speedwell Avenue/Spring Street/Morris Street corridor</i>							
Speedwell Avenue	Sussex Avenue	F	F	Fails	Fails	F	F
	Early Street	C	F	Fails	Fails	F*	F*
	Spring Street	F	C	Fails	Fails		
Spring Street	MLK Avenue	B	B	Marginal	Marginal	B	B
	Water/Center Streets	B	B	Fails	Fails	A	B
	Morris Street	F	F	Fails	Fails	F	F
Morris Street	Lafayette Avenue/Pine Street	B	C	Sufficient	Sufficient	D	D
	Blechley Place/Lackawanna Place/Elm Street	F	F	Fails	Fails	F	F
	Ridgedale Avenue	F	B	Fails	Marginal	F	F
Lafayette Avenue	Ridgedale Avenue	C	C	Fails	Fails	F	F
<i>Additional Intersections at the Green</i>							
Speedwell Avenue	E. Park Place/N. Park Place	C	F	Sufficient	Marginal	F	F
Morris Street	E. Park Place/S. Park Place	D	F	Marginal	Marginal	F	F
<i>Washington Street/W. Park Place/South Street Corridor</i>							
Washington Street	Phoenix/Atno Avenues	B	C	Marginal	Sufficient	B	F
	Western Street	C	C	Fails	Sufficient	D	E
	Court Street/Cattano Avenue	B	B	Fails	Marginal	B	C
	N. Park Place/Bank Street/Market Street	C	D	Fails	Marginal	F	F
W. Park/Place	S. Park Place/South Street	B	B	Sufficient	Sufficient	F	F
	Miller Road	B	B	Sufficient	Sufficient	C	F
		based on standard HCS LOS (ABCDEF)		observed intersection performance (Sufficient, Marginal, Fails)		based on standard HCS LOS (ABCDEF)	

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

3. Evaluate trade-off between on-street parking and new off-street parking. If off-street parking facilities are provided in certain areas, some on-street parking along critical roadway segments or intersection approaches can be eliminated, which would effectively add to total roadway capacity without incurring new road construction costs. In performing this evaluation the merchant's perception of the significant impact of losing on-street parking and the potential loss of convenient parking must be considered.
4. Implement physical and operational improvements at high accident locations.
5. Appropriate locations for traffic calming improvements should be identified. Several factors contribute to this need.
 - One is the existence of numerous pedestrian-vehicular conflicts, as documented in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities section. Traffic calming can create a safer environment for pedestrians, who are vital to a successful downtown

business, entertainment and residential center.

- Another is the level of recurring peak hour congestion. Some motorists who are frustrated by roadway congestion use residential or local access streets to bypass congested areas. These local streets in turn become congested themselves, which render them inhospitable for walkers and bicyclers. Traffic calming strategies can help restrain the flow and speed of traffic through local streets and neighborhoods, which would invite more people to walk or bicycle to nearby destinations.

B. Parking Improvements

Refer to Section 1.6.0 for the 2008 reexamination of the Parking Plan.

PART 2

SECTION 2.4.0

THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

2.4.0 THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION PLAN

2.4.01 Introduction and Statement of Purpose

This element of the Master Plan involves the historic character of Morristown and the efforts needed to protect and preserve it. The Master Plan goal and the four objectives associated with historic preservation, as presented in Part 1, Section 1.2.0, serve as a guide for this element.

Historic Preservation must be an essential element of the comprehensive land-use planning process in Morristown. The community has an interest, recognized by the courts and our national government, in preserving its architectural heritage. Morristown, which was settled well before the Revolutionary War, retains a wealth of visible and tangible artifacts from the past, including buildings, landscapes, and archeological remains, which tell the story of its rich history. A history that includes not only a prominent role in the Revolutionary War but one that includes many events and famous people of the 19th and 20th centuries as well. These resources deserve protection from development, decay, and destruction; only through the planning process can vital historic and cultural resources be saved for the benefit of future generations.

In 1973 and again in 1985, nominations were made which resulted in the establishment of the

Morristown Historic District as already noted in Part 1 of this document. This district, consisting of more than 700 properties, is listed on both the State and National Registers of Historic Places. In addition to properties physically located within the district, several sites outside of the district, which are either currently on the Register or are Register-eligible in their own right, are listed as well. However, please note that many other historic and architecturally significant buildings exist within other parts of the community which are not listed on the State and Federal Registers. Furthermore, the current limits of the Morristown Historic District do not necessarily represent what may be the configuration of a locally adopted historic district at some point in the future. The current district boundaries only represent the limits of the historic district that has been approved by the Federal government and the State of New Jersey.

It is also crucial to understand that Register listing imposes absolutely no restrictions on a private owner's property rights, including the right of demolition; such regulations may be imposed only through the passage of a municipal ordinance creating a local historic district, drafted in accordance with State statutes. Furthermore, the limited protections that are provided by Register listing concern only projects which are implemented in some way with public funds. If such a project is proposed, it must be certified

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

through formal review procedures administered by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that no negative impact on historic resources will occur.

In keeping with state and federal laws, which mandate protection of historic sites, buildings and districts for the public good, Morristown has committed itself to augmenting the Master Plan by incorporating historic preservation into the land-use planning process. New Jersey's Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) provides enabling legislation, which attaches historic preservation review to the planning and zoning process at the local level. The statute states that the purpose of the preservation law is: **"To promote the conservation of historic sites and districts, open space, energy resources and valuable natural resources in the State and to prevent urban sprawl and degradation of the environment through improper use of land."** Finally, as required by the MLUL each of the Plan elements contained in this document includes a statement about that element's impact on the historic preservation goal identified herein.

As just stated, the Planning Board and municipal government of Morristown embrace the historic preservation goal included in the Municipal Land Use Law, but in addition the Town further adopts the following policies to be pursued in furtherance of the principals of that goal:

1. That it is in the public interest to identify and preserve sites and districts of historic importance;
2. That the designation of historic sites and districts consider not only the age of the site or structure but its historic, archeological or architectural significance from a local, regional statewide or national perspective;
3. That the inclusion of sites or districts in this Historic Preservation Plan element of the Master Plan be based on the prior identification of such sites or districts by the Historic Preservation Commission of the Town of Morristown;
4. That in recognition of the continued and competing forces of development and redevelopment and the vulnerability of the Town's historic, architectural and cultural heritage to these forces, the Town is desirous of pursuing a growth management program which, among other things, will protect Morristown's outstanding historic, architectural and cultural resources;
5. That the Town of Morristown considers it advantageous to foster and administer a mechanism for the preservation of its historic, architectural and cultural resources, and that in furtherance of this result certain enabling provisions and protective measures may be adopted;

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

6. That the Town will entrust the principal responsibility for local preservation to the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission, with the understanding that the Commission will inform the public and all municipal authorities of its recommendations and activities in accordance with the powers delegated by Town legislation.

2.4.02 Establishment of the Morristown Historic Preservation Commission

As specified by State enabling legislation in 1981, Morristown's Municipal Ordinance 0-2-90 established a Historic Preservation Commission of seven members divided into four Class "C" members (residents of the Town) and three Class "A" or "B" members (members with expertise in design, architectural history, or local history). The Commission has been constituted, and has been operating since 1991.

Initially, the Historic Preservation Commission has been empowered to pursue certain duties and activities with respect to the Municipal Master Plan. This element of the Master Plan supports the evolution of the current Historic Preservation Commission into one that has the full authority provided in the state statute.

2.4.03 Historic Preservation Components of the Master Plan

As support context for a municipal historic preservation ordinance,

State legislation requires two kinds of material to be incorporated into a municipal master plan:

An inventory of all the municipality's significant cultural and historic sites and objects, which has been included in Part 1 of this document.

A statement of the criteria of significance by which items in the inventory were identified in Morristown. The specific criteria which have been and should continue to be used in identifying the important contributors to Morristown's historic fabric are as follows:

- "Significant" is defined as important within the context of Morristown's architectural, historic, or cultural development. Each resource identified in the items listed in Section 9.0 of Part 1 shall be deemed significant.
- An identified resource shall be at least 50 years old at the time of its identification; or else it shall be deemed by the Commission to bear a significance great enough to compensate for lesser age;
- An identified resource shall be preponderantly intact and in original condition; or shall be deemed by the Commission to have been changed sympathetically; or shall have been changed in such fashion that the integrity of the resource can be restored;

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

- A site of historic, cultural, or archaeological significance may itself deserve identification, even if no artifacts remain or no significant event continues to take place there;
- Architectural resources are not limited to buildings, but may include such other aspects of the built environment as sidewalks and walkways, curbs, treadways, walls, fences, aprons, street lights, alarm boxes, manhole covers, as well as monuments, graveyards, and designed landscapes;
- The criteria for identification may include but are not limited to those in force in the present, past and future for nomination to the State and National Registers of Historic Places.

Following are selected examples of buildings that meet, or at one time met, the above referenced criteria. In the first group (Group A) are examples of buildings that have been altered in either a positive or negative manner. The second group (Group B) is a list of buildings that may or may not be threatened but which shouldn't be lost or altered inappropriately. Photographs of selected properties from both groups are included herein as Exhibits 4-1 to 4-3.

Group A

- Provisi's Restaurant – South Street – The removal of wooden porches and the installation of an aluminum

and glass curtain wall has had a negative impact.

- Peapack-Gladstone Building – South Street – A sensitive addition clearly differentiates new and old construction, does not try to duplicate original design.
- The Peck School – South Street – Utilitarian, boxy additions built in front of the mansion have had a negative impact.
- The Gap Building – Park Place – Although the design of the building and building materials are compatible with those of other buildings in the area, nearly 80% of the original building had to be demolished during a rehabilitation and reconstruction project.

Group B

- The Mount Kemble Home – Mt. Kemble Avenue – Early 19th century structure on Historic Registers individually. It is architecturally significant because it is one of the few buildings left in Morristown from this period that has not been subjected to inappropriate modifications. The social services history associated with this site is also important.
- Early Commercial/ Industrial Buildings, Auxiliary Buildings and Barns such as exist in the vicinity of Elm St, King St, Blachley Pl, Cattano Ave and

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

Budd St.

- Morristown Club - Elm St- Early 19th century building; good example of Federal Period design.
- Pereaux Building - South St - Early 19th century building; good example of Federal Period design.
- James St - Wood frame early 19th century clapboard building.
- The former Liberty Street School - This building is very close to its original condition.

2.4.04 A Summary of Morristown's Historic Preservation Strategy

It should be emphasized that properties, sites and other resources are included in the inventories referenced herein only for purposes of recognition. Just as is true of the State and Federal Register listing, no protection is offered and no regulations are imposed by these inventories. Any protections and regulations would be the function of an ordinance eventually to be adopted by the Town Council. No resource will be designated for protection under the ordinance without public notice and hearing.

Further, the inventories make no distinction concerning differences in significance between individual resources. Some may eventually be determined to be inappropriate for protection, for instance, if they have been subject to major irreversible renovation. In determining the

designation of properties under the ordinance, the Commission may recommend the establishment of one or more districts. The boundaries of such districts are likely to include properties that are not historic resources; special provision may be made in the ordinance for such properties, which may be subject to some regulation in order to minimize any negative effects on the historic context, but may not be subject to the same controls as "contributing" sites.

As we begin to take the next steps in Morristown relative to historic preservation, it is important to realize that even in a vibrant community like Morristown, which is subject to continuing development pressures, we can balance historic preservation with the economic realities that encourage growth, expansion and redevelopment. It is difficult but not impossible to do so. Encouraging the adaptive reuse of buildings, as the Town did in the 1970's via the ORC zone is one way. Allowing Bed & Breakfast operations in selected areas and with realistic controls is another. It is also important to understand how building height standards can threaten or help protect an historic structure. Allowing a five story height, in an area of 2½ and 3 story buildings of historic significance, poses a threat to those buildings. Restricting the height to better reflect existing conditions, can help protect such structures but of course doesn't guarantee their preservation. Another important part of the historic preservation equation is the issue of design standards, which involves not only the shape and

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

placement of buildings but the materials and textures that are used as well as color and other design components. Design guidelines such as those prepared by the Morristown Partnership will be important in helping to ensure that additions to the Morristown landscape in the future will be compatible with the remnants of bygone eras.

All of these techniques, if applied correctly, can ensure that the historic preservation goal described in this document will be implemented over time and can help achieve other Master Plan goals as well. Among these other goals is the economic benefit that can be derived from the increased tourism that a community like Morristown is capable of attracting. The economic success of other municipalities in New Jersey, like Flemington, Lambertville and Cape May, as well as places outside of New Jersey like Portsmouth, New Hampshire, and Lowell, Massachusetts, has been due in no small measure to the historic preservation efforts undertaken by those communities.

In summary, historic preservation is an important element of this Master Plan and the future of this community. To ignore Morristown's historic character and fabric will rob future generations of the uniqueness that we still find here today. **MUCH HAS BEEN LOST BUT MUCH IS STILL HERE AND MUCH CAN STILL BE PRESERVED WITHOUT JEOPARDIZING THE ECONOMIC VITALITY OF THE COMMUNITY.**

PART 2

SECTION 2.5.0

THE RECYCLING PLAN

2.5.0 THE RECYCLING PLAN

2.5.01 Statutory Requirements and Provisions

The NJ Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) specifies that one of the elements of a municipal master plan can be a recycling plan. The MLUL requires that a recycling plan incorporate:

The State Recycling Plan goals, including provisions for the collection, disposition and recycling of recyclable materials designated in the municipal recycling ordinance, and for the collection, disposition and recycling of recyclable materials within any development proposal for the construction of 50 or more units of single-family residential housing or 25 or more units of multi-family residential housing and any commercial or industrial development proposal for the utilization of 1,000 square feet or more of land.

The MLUL does not make this a mandatory master plan element but the NJ Statewide Mandatory Source Separation and Recycling Act of 1987

does. Consequently, this element is being included for the first time in a Morristown Master Plan in order to bring the Town into compliance with that statutory provision.

2.5.02 Solid Waste Collection and Recycling In Morristown

As already noted, in Section 7.0 of Part 1 of this document, residential solid waste in Morristown is collected by the Morristown Dept of Public Works. The collections occur twice weekly. All other land uses in Morristown must contract individually with private contractors for this service.

Solid waste collection and disposal is regulated in Morristown by Chapter 109 of the Revised General Ordinances of the Town. This chapter was originally adopted in 1976 and has been revised several times, most recently in 2008. In chapter 1.9, section 19-7 regulates recycling within the community. These ordinance provisions are consistent with the New Jersey Solid Waste Management Plan and the Morris

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

County Solid Waste Management Plan dated March 2007.

Recyclables are picked up weekly with a specific schedule for glass, cans, and plastics and another schedule for mixed paper. The Morristown Dept of Public Works collects brush, metal, appliances etc on a more limited schedule.

Each resident is provided with a list of instructions which includes the pickup schedule.

In addition to the collection of recyclables, the Town maintains a recycling center on Lake Rd which is open six days a week. Residents are permitted to bring yard waste to the recycling center. Residents, businesses and institutions are permitted to bring glass, cans, plastics, mixed paper, metals, appliances, computers and electronics to the recycling center. The Dept of Public Works collects leaves that have been raked to the curb in April, October, November and December of each year. The collected leaves are taken to the Morris County Municipal Utilities Authority leaf composting facility.

2.5.03 Recommendations

The Morristown recycling operation in Morristown has been in existence for many years and provides a valuable service to the community. In terms of actual accomplishments the Town recycles a substantial amount of material.

It is recommended that the Town compare the Municipal figures with the state averages to determine whether this program can accomplish more.

The Planning Board and Board of Adjustment often require proposals for new development within the Town to address the recycling issue and many but not all new development projects have done so. The reason for lack of full compliance is the lack of any requirements pertaining to recycling in the Town Land Use Regulations.

In order then to ensure that future development is designed to accommodate the recycling of solid waste, the Land Use Regulations of the Town should require the following:

- A. Each application for residential development must include provisions for the collection, disposition, and recycling of recyclable materials. Each single family unit or unit within a two-family dwelling should provide at least twelve square feet of floor area conveniently arranged and located as a holding area for a four week accumulation of materials. Such an area may be within a laundry room, basement or garage. Each multi-family unit or accessory dwelling unit must provide at least three square feet of area conveniently arranged and located to hold a one week accumulation of recyclable materials. Each multi-family complex must also provide bins in a convenient location or locations in a common area as drop-offs for storing recyclables until collection occurs. The holding area shall provide for truck access and loading if feasible and shall be suitably screened from view and setback from property lines.
- B. Each application for a nonresidential use which utilizes

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

1,000 square feet or more of land must include provisions for the collection, disposition and recycling of recyclable materials. Each application shall quantify the amount of recyclable material it will generate as part of its weekly operation including newspapers, white high-grade paper, glass, and aluminum. The application shall provide a storage area sized to contain a one week accumulation of recyclable material. The storage area shall be designed for truck access for pick up of materials if feasible and be suitably screened from view if located outside a building.

Finally, in addition to the proposed subdivision and site plan review requirements, just discussed, it is recommended that the Town require that new construction, not subject to site plan or subdivision review, also be designed to accommodate the recycling of solid waste.

PART 2

SECTION 2.6.0

THE HOUSING PLAN

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2

Morristown Master Plan Re-Examination 2008 – Part 2