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Introduction
The New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) requires that each municipality in New Jersey undertake a periodic review and reexamination of its local master plan. The purpose of the reexamination report is to review and evaluate the master plan and municipal development regulations on a regular basis to determine the need for updates and revisions. In addition, the preparation of a statutorily-compliant reexamination report provides a presumption of validity of the municipal zoning ordinance under the law. This document constitutes the master plan reexamination report for the Borough of Eatontown as required by the Municipal Land Use Law at NJSA 40:55D-89.

The Borough of Eatontown originally adopted its comprehensive master plan in 1986. After having adopted its 1986 Master Plan, the borough periodically reexamined and amended same a total of 25 times. As a result, the borough prepared a compendium of master plan documents and adopted such compendium as the 2007 Master Plan on July 23, 2007. The current document, which is hereinafter referred to as the 2018 Master Plan Reexamination Report, serves as the first reexamination of the 2007 Master Plan.

Requirements of the Periodic Reexamination Report
The Municipal Land Use Law requires that the Borough of Eatontown provide for the reexamination of the municipal master plan and development regulations at least once every ten years. The purpose of the reexamination is to review the progress of the municipality in achieving its planning objectives, and to consider the need for changes to ensure that the municipal plan is current and meets the needs of the municipality. The Eatontown Borough Planning Board is responsible for completing the reexamination and preparing and adopting by resolution a report on the findings of same.

The Municipal Land Use Law requires that the reexamination report describe the following:

- The major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last reexamination report (n.b., in the case of Eatontown, the major problems and objectives relating to land development at the time of the adoption of the 2007 Master Plan are described).
- The extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date.
- The extent to which there have been significant changes in assumptions, policies, and objectives forming the basis for the master plan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density and distribution of population and land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of natural resources, energy conservation, collection,
disposition, and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in state, county
and municipal policies and objectives.

- 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 regulation
  should be prepared.

- The recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment
  plans adopted pursuant to the “Local Redevelopment and Housing Law,” P.L.1992, c. 79
  (C.40A:12A-1 et seq.) into the land use plan element of the municipal master plan, and
  recommended changes, if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate
  the redevelopment plans of the municipality.

The 2018 Master Plan Reexamination Report addresses each of these statutory requirements.
The Problems and Objectives Relating to Land Development in Eatontown at the Time of the Adoption of the 2007 Master Plan

The major problems and objectives relating to land development in Eatontown at the time of the adoption of the 2007 Master Plan are reflected in the policies, goals and objectives it enumerates. These policies, goals and objectives are provided in the following subsections.

Policies
The policies of the Master Plan are as follows:
- To acknowledge the existing character of the Borough, and segments thereof, as created by existing development.
- To recognize environmental and man-made constraints upon, and potential for, future development.
- To permit the reasonable use of land within the context of existing constraints and the Master Plan or provide for transfer of ownership to a public body or association in accord with one or more accepted methods.
- To facilitate the social, economic, and political interaction of present and future residents of all portions of the Borough.
- To preserve the history of the Borough and maintain it as a heritage for present and future residents.
- To maintain a balance of uses and variety of types within each use category arranged to minimize conflict among them.
- To provide adequate facilities, services, and protection for development and persons in all portions of the Borough.

Goals
The goals of the Master Plan are as follows:
- To assure a high level of quality of life for present and future residents of the Borough.
- To provide for, and encourage the use of, all remaining vacant land consistent with neighborhood characteristics, land capability, fiscal balance, practicalities of the marketplace, and current aesthetic standards.
- To identify specific areas that should not be developed, either because of sensitivity or suitability for open space at an appropriate location.
  - Maintain open space in a quantity and at locations in accord with not less than accepted standards.
  - Provide conservation areas as well as passive and active recreation facilities.
– Consider the changing age composition within the Borough in designating facility-and activity-areas.
– Establish corridor links between major open spaces to the maximum extent feasible.
– Assure that present buffer requirements are both adequate and reasonable, and that they are consistently administered.
– Where feasible, utilize required buffers to provide linkage between major open spaces.

• To design and implement the road plan of the Borough to facilitate the movement of residents from one quadrant to others without using Routes 35 and 36 or the Route 35/Route 36 intersection; to discourage traffic from outside the Borough from using streets internal to residential areas; and, to assure that adequate parking is provided by all new developments.
• To support the commercial and industrial attractiveness of the Borough by facilitating continued viability of existing commercial development along Routes 35 and 36, and additional and upgraded development on vacant land within existing commercial areas. Infill of additional industrial development should also be encouraged and facilitated on Industrial Way West and East.
• To maintain the “Village Area” as the center of cultural, social, and political interaction within the Borough, and preserve the historical buildings within and around it.
• To provide for alternative housing types at locations where single family detached homes are not easily constructed or would be inappropriate development, and where there will be little or no adverse impact upon surrounding land.
• To assure that adequate facilities, access, and space exist for local government operations.
• To provide information to Borough agencies for use in carrying forward their specific functions and programs.

Objectives
The objectives of the Master Plan are as follows:
• Develop information regarding the fiscal impact of development within the various available zone districts of the Borough ordinance.
• Identify environmentally sensitive lands not now developed.
• Consider the quantity and location of existing open space. Identify areas requiring additional open space or not well served by existing open space locations.
• Provide the Recreation Commission with specific information on the age composition of the Borough, and other Borough agencies, with comparable information for use in determining facilities and equipment types to be installed at various locations.
• Explore the potential of linking open spaces:
  – Eighty Acre Park with lands of Monmouth County in the southeast portion of the Borough on the westerly side of Old Deal Road.
  – Open space within Deep Woods with environmentally sensitive lands to the West.
• Explore the potential for a one-way traffic system on Throckmorton/West/Broad and White Streets within the Village Area.
• Review the requirements of all non-residential zone districts, including buffering requirements, to assure that they remain both protective and reasonable.
• Re-examine the land use category assigned to:
  – Vacant parcels fronting on Route 36 to the West of the Route 35/Route 36 intersection.
  – West Street, Maxwell Road, Pine Brook Road, Industrial area.
  – The remaining vacant land fronting on Parker Road.
  – The industrial area East of Route 35.
  – The areas South of Weston Place, and West of Route 35.
  – The rear of lots fronting on the West side of Wall Street, South of the cemetery, and to the East of properties fronting on Route 35.
• Explore the potential of specifically encouraging continued building improvements within the Village Area.
The Extent to which Problems and Objectives Relating to Land Development in Eatontown at the Time of the Adoption of the 2007 Master Plan Have Been Reduced or Increased

As previously noted, the major problems and objectives relating to land development in Eatontown at the time of the adoption of the 2007 Master Plan are reflected in the policies, goals and objectives it enumerates. These extent to which the foundations of these policies, goals and objectives have changed is discussed in the following subsections.

Policies

Commentary on the extent to which the foundations of the policies of the 2007 Master Plan have changed is provided after each policy (n.b., *commentary is provided in italicized text*):

- To acknowledge the existing character of the Borough, and segments thereof, as created by existing development. *This policy remains valid.*
- To recognize environmental and man-made constraints upon, and potential for, future development. *This policy remains valid.*
- To permit the reasonable use of land within the context of existing constraints and the Master Plan or provide for transfer of ownership to a public body or association in accord with one or more accepted methods. *This policy remains valid.*
- To facilitate the social, economic, and political interaction of present and future residents of all portions of the Borough. *This policy remains valid.*
- To preserve the history of the Borough and maintain it as a heritage for present and future residents. *This policy remains valid.*
- To maintain a balance of uses and variety of types within each use category arranged to minimize conflict among them. *This policy remains valid.*
- To provide adequate facilities, services, and protection for development and persons in all portions of the Borough. *This policy remains valid.*

Goals

Commentary on the extent to which the foundations of the goals of the 2007 Master Plan have changed is provided after each goal (n.b., *commentary is provided in italicized text*):

- To assure a high level of quality of life for present and future residents of the Borough. *This goal remains valid.*
- To provide for, and encourage the use of, all remaining vacant land consistent with neighborhood characteristics, land capability, fiscal balance, practicalities of the marketplace, and current aesthetic standards. *This goal remains valid.*
• To identify specific areas that should not be developed, either because of sensitivity or suitability for open space at an appropriate location. This goal remains valid.
  – Maintain open space in a quantity and at locations in accord with not less than accepted standards. This sub-goal remains valid.
  – Provide conservation areas as well as passive and active recreation facilities. This sub-goal remains valid.
  – Consider the changing age composition within the Borough in designating facility-and activity-areas. This sub-goal remains valid.
  – Establish corridor links between major open spaces to the maximum extent feasible. This sub-goal remains valid.
  – Assure that present buffer requirements are both adequate and reasonable, and that they are consistently administered. This sub-goal remains valid.
  – Where feasible, utilize required buffers to provide linkage between major open spaces. This sub-goal remains valid.

• To design and implement the road plan of the Borough to facilitate the movement of residents from one quadrant to others without using Routes 35 and 36 or the Route 35/Route 36 intersection; to discourage traffic from outside the Borough from using streets internal to residential areas; and, to assure that adequate parking is provided by all new developments. While this goal remains valid, it should be augmented with a complimentary goal of establishing a walkable and bikeable community, safe and accessible for people of all ages and abilities.

• To support the commercial and industrial attractiveness of the Borough by facilitating continued viability of existing commercial development along Routes 35 and 36, and additional and upgraded development on vacant land within existing commercial areas. Infill of additional industrial development should also be encouraged and facilitated on Industrial Way West and East. This goal remains valid.

• To maintain the “Village Area” as the center of cultural, social, and political interaction within the Borough, and preserve the historical buildings within and around it. This goal remains valid.

• To provide for alternative housing types at locations where single family detached homes are not easily constructed or would be inappropriate development, and where there will be little or no adverse impact upon surrounding land. While this goal remains valid, it should be supplemented with the additional goal of maintaining and encouraging a diversity of housing types and continuing to address the borough’s affordable housing obligation.

• To assure that adequate facilities, access, and space exist for local government operations. This goal remains valid.

• To provide information to Borough agencies for use in carrying forward their specific functions and programs. This goal remains valid.
Objectives
Commentary on the extent to which the foundations of the objectives of the 2007 Master Plan have changed is provided after each objective (n.b., commentary is provided in italicized text):

- Develop information regarding the fiscal impact of development within the various available zone districts of the Borough ordinance. This objective remains valid.
- Identify environmentally sensitive lands not now developed. This objective remains valid.
- Consider the quantity and location of existing open space. Identify areas requiring additional open space or not well served by existing open space locations. This objective remains valid.
- Provide the Recreation Commission with specific information on the age composition of the Borough, and other Borough agencies, with comparable information for use in determining facilities and equipment types to be installed at various locations. This objective remains valid.
- Explore the potential of linking open spaces:
  - Eighty Acre Park with lands of Monmouth County in the southeast portion of the Borough on the westerly side of Old Deal Road. This objective remains valid.
  - Open space within Deep Woods with environmentally sensitive lands to the West. This objective remains valid.
- Explore the potential for a one-way traffic system on Throckmorton/West/Broad and White Streets within the Village Area. This objective remains valid.
- Review the requirements of all non-residential zone districts, including buffering requirements, to assure that they remain both protective and reasonable. This objective remains valid.
- Re-examine the land use category assigned to:
  - Vacant parcels fronting on Route 36 to the West of the Route 35/Route 36 intersection. This objective has been addressed.
  - West Street, Maxwell Road, Pine Brook Road, Industrial area. This objective remains valid.
  - The remaining vacant land fronting on Parker Road. This objective has been addressed.
  - The industrial area East of Route 35. This objective has been addressed.
  - The areas South of Weston Place, and West of Route 35. This objective has been addressed.
  - The rear of lots fronting on the West side of Wall Street, South of the cemetery, and to the East of properties fronting on Route 35. This objective has been addressed.
- Explore the potential of specifically encouraging continued building improvements within the Village Area. This objective remains valid.
The Extent to Which There Have Been Significant Changes in the Assumptions, Policies, and Objectives that form the Basis of the 2007 Master Plan

The extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies and objectives that form the basis of the 2007 Master Plan is discussed in the following subsections.

Changes at the Local Level

As indicated in the following subsections, there have been considerable changes at the local level since the adoption of the 2007 Master Plan.

Changes in Demographic, Housing and Employment Characteristics

Changes in demographic, housing and employment characteristics are discussed separately in the following subsections.

Please note that these subsections provide information from the 2010 US Census, 2011-2015 American Community Survey of the US Census Bureau (n.b., in cases when information from the 2010 US Census was unavailable, information from the American Community Survey has been provided), New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development, and North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority.

Demographic Characteristics

At the time of the 2000 US Census, Eatontown had a population of 14,008 residents (Table 1). This figure represents a 2.4 percent increase over the 13,679 residents that were counted at the time of the 1990 US Census. Since 2000, however, Eatontown has declined in population considerably. This is demonstrated by the US Census Bureau’s 2010 population estimate of 12,709 residents, which represents a 9.3 percent decrease in population between 2000 and 2010. A key explanation for this decline is the closure of Fort Monmouth, which is discussed later in this reexamination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eatontown</td>
<td>13,679</td>
<td>14,008</td>
<td>12,709</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>-9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau
The New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development estimates that the population of Eatontown Borough on July 1, 2017 was 12,376 persons, a further decline from the 2010 Census.

According to the 2010 US Census, Eatontown’s population is composed of 5,319 households (Table 2). The average household size of 2.32 is smaller than both Monmouth County’s and the State of New Jersey’s. It is noted that the percentage of population that is 65 years or older, 14.0 percent, is slightly higher than the percentages that are represented in Monmouth County and the State of New Jersey. Eatontown’s median household income, which was estimated to be $64,149 in 2011, is significantly lower than the estimated median household income in Monmouth County and the State of New Jersey. The median age of 39.6 years that describes Eatontown’s residents is lower than the median age of Monmouth County’s residents, but slightly higher than the median age of New Jersey’s residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borough of Eatontown</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>$64,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth County</td>
<td>233,983</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>$85,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3,214,360</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>$72,093</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau
Note: (*) 2011–2015 Five-Year American Community Survey Estimates of the US Census Bureau

With regard to the age-structure of Eatontown’s population, the 2010 US Census reported that there were 751 pre-school age children in Eatontown, which was about 5.9 percent of the total population (Table 3). School age children accounted for 2,272 residents, or about 17.8 percent of the total population. Working age individuals accounted for 7,912 residents, or about 62.1 percent of the total population. Finally, those aged 65 years or older accounted for 1,774 residents, which equated to about 14.0 percent of the 2010 population.
Table 3: Population by Age, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number (2010)</th>
<th>% of Total (2010)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-School Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 Years</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Years</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14 Years</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19 Years</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24 Years</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29 Years</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 34 Years</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 39 Years</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 44 Years</td>
<td>893</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 49 Years</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 54 Years</td>
<td>1,029</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 59 Years</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 64 Years</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 Years and Older</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau

Housing Stock Characteristics
According to the 2010 US Census, Eatontown had a total of 5,723 housing units (Table 4). This was a decrease of 610 units since the 2000 US Census. Of the total number of housing units in existence at the time of the 2010 US Census, 5,319 units, or 92.9 percent, were listed as occupied. A total of 51.0 percent of housing units were owner-occupied, while 41.9 percent of housing units were renter-occupied. The percentage of renter-occupied units is much higher than at the County level, where 25.1 percent of all occupied housing units are occupied by renters.

The 2010 US Census reported an average household size in Eatontown Borough of 2.32 persons, and an average family size of 3.02 persons. These sizes are lower than the corresponding figures for the County. Of the total number of households, family households accounted for 3,136, or 59.0 percent, and non-family households1 accounted for 2,183, or 41.0 percent.

With regard to the age of the housing stock, it is noted that the estimated median year of construction of Eatontown’s housing units was 1971. The median year of construction is much

1 A non-family household is present when a householder lives alone, or when the householder shares the home exclusively with people to whom he or she is not related.
more recent than that of the State, where the median year of construction was 1966, but not quite as recent as that of the County, where it was 1972.

In addition to the above, it is noted that the Borough’s housing stock is in fair condition. This is demonstrated by the fact that only 74 units (about 1.4 percent of all units) lacked complete plumbing facilities, and the same number of units (i.e., 74 units or about 1.4 percent of all units) lacked complete kitchen facilities. It is also noted that about 2.4 percent of all occupied units reported overcrowded conditions (1.01 occupants or more per room), according to 2011–2015 American Community Survey estimates.

With regard to the specific type of housing units in Eatontown, it is noted that 39.1 percent are single-family detached units and 8.3 percent are single-family attached units. Duplexes account for 5.1 percent of all units. Multifamily units account for a total of 42.6 percent of all units, with: 19.3 percent of units in structures containing from three to nine units; 14.9 percent of units in structures containing from ten to 19 units; and, 8.4 percent of units in structures containing 20 or more units. Finally, it is noted that mobile homes account for 5.1 percent of all units.
### Table 4: Housing Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Units (2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units</td>
<td>5,723</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner-Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter-Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>2,399</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Housing Units</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Units (2000)</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupancy/Household Characteristics (2010)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Household Size (Persons)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Households</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family Households</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Family Size (Persons)</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Structure Built (2011-2015)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 2014 or later</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 to 2013</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 to 2009</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 to 1999</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 to 1989</td>
<td>1,344</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 to 1979</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 to 1969</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950 to 1959</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940 to 1949</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 or Earlier</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Year Structure Built</strong></td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Units in Structure (2011-2015)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unit, Detached</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Unit, Attached</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Units</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or 4 Units</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9 Units</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 19 Units</td>
<td>861</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 49 Units</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or More Units</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Home</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat, RV, Van, Etc.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Condition of Units (2011-2015)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Complete Plumbing Facilities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacking Complete Kitchen Facilities</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau
Note: (*) 2011–2015 Five-Year American Community Survey Estimates of the US Census Bureau
Regarding housing values, it is noted that the median value of the owner-occupied housing units in Eatontown during 2010 was estimated to be $315,200. This is lower than the County median value of $385,100, and slightly lower the State median value of $315,900. Eatontown Borough’s estimated median gross rent of $1,145 is also lower than the County and State median gross rents of $1,238 and $1,192, respectively.

### Table 5: Value of Housing Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Value (Owner-Occupied Units)</th>
<th>Number (2011-2015)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 or More</td>
<td>351.00</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>1,230.00</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 to $299,999</td>
<td>822.00</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,000</td>
<td>118.00</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $149,000</td>
<td>77.00</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $49,999</td>
<td>251.00</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value</td>
<td>$315,200</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Median Rent</th>
<th>Number (2011-2015)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 or More</td>
<td>311.00</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 to $1,499</td>
<td>427.00</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,249</td>
<td>1,209.00</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 to $999</td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $499 (incl., no cash rent)</td>
<td>211.00</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$1,145</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011–2015 Five-Year American Community Survey Estimates of the US Census Bureau

Housing units that have a monthly cost of less than 30 percent of gross household income are considered affordable. In the Borough of Eatontown, a total of 59.6 percent of all owner-occupied housing units and 47.6 percent of renter-occupied housing units were estimated to be affordable (Table 6).
Table 6: Housing Costs as a Percentage of Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Costs of Owner-Occupied Units</th>
<th>Number (2011-2015)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30%</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>59.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or More</td>
<td>1,166</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Computed</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Costs of Renter-Occupied Units</th>
<th>Number (2011-2015)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 30%</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% or More</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Computed</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011–2015 Five-Year American Community Survey Estimates of the US Census Bureau

Employment Characteristics

The 2011–2015 American Community Survey (ACS) estimates that 6,513, or about 63.7 percent, of Eatontown Borough’s residents aged 16 and over were employed in the civilian labor force (Table 7). Of those who are employed in the civilian labor force: 35.5 percent are in management, professional, and related occupations; 21.2 percent are in service occupations; 25.4 percent are in sales and office occupations; 8.1 percent are in natural resources, construction, extraction, and maintenance occupations; and, 9.7 percent are involved in production, transportation, and material moving occupations.

Table 7: Occupation of Employed Civilian Population Aged 16 and Over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Number (2011-2015)</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management, Professional, Related</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1,383</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, Office</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources, Construction, Extraction, Maintenance</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, Transport., Material Moving</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011–2015 Five-Year American Community Survey Estimates of the US Census Bureau

In 1999, the median household income in Eatontown was $53,833. According to US Census Bureau estimates, it had risen to $64,149 by 2015 (Table 8). At first glance this may seem like a significant increase. However, it is noted that when these values are inflation-adjusted to 2015 dollars\(^2\), the median income has decreased by $13,147 or 17.0 percent.

\(^2\) The 1999 median household income of $53,833 has the same purchasing power as $77,296 in 2015.
Table 8: Household Income, 2011–2015 (in 2015 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; $10,000</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $44,999</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $124,999</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or More</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Household Income (Dollars)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$64,149</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011–2015 5-Year American Community Survey Estimates of the US Census Bureau

With regard to the number of jobs that are located within the Borough, it is noted that the New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development indicates that there was an average of 14,249 jobs located within the municipality during 2015, which is the latest data available. This represents an increase of approximately 2.8 percent over the 2005 average of 13,861 jobs. The Department of Labor and Workforce Development’s basis for this information is jobs that are covered by public unemployment and disability insurance.

**Population, Households and Employment Projections**

With regard to anticipated population, household and employment trends, it is noted that the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority projects: a total population of 15,360 residents in 2040, which represents a 0.6 percent increase over the population of 12,709 reported by the 2010 US Census; a total of 6,350 households in 2040, which represents a 0.6 percent increase over 5,319 households reported by the 2010 US Census; and, a total population of 21,050 jobs in 2040, which represents a 1.3 percent increase over the average of 14,196 jobs reported by the New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development in 2010.
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Table 9: Population, Households and Employment Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2040</th>
<th>% Change (Total)</th>
<th>% Change (Annualized)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>12,709*</td>
<td>15,360</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>5,319*</td>
<td>6,350</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>14,196+</td>
<td>21,050</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NJTPA
Note: (*) 2010 US Census; (+) New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development

Zoning Board of Adjustment Annual Reports
During the period from 2015 through 2017, the Eatontown Borough Zoning Board of Adjustment reviewed a total of 56 applications, with: 13 applications having been reviewed in 2015; 22 applications having been reviewed in 2016; and, 21 applications having been reviewed in 2017.

Of the applications reviewed in 2015, 12 were approved and one was denied. Among the approved applications were: two use variances; one parking variance, and, 9 miscellaneous bulk variances. The application that was denied was for a bulk variance.

Of the applications reviewed in 2016, 20 were approved, one was denied, and one was carried forward to 2017. Among the approved applications were: two use variances; and, 18 miscellaneous bulk variances. The application that was denied was for a use variance. The application that was carried forward was for a bulk variance.

Of the applications reviewed in 2017, 20 were approved, one was denied. Among the approved applications were: two use variances; 17 miscellaneous bulk variances; and one application to permit the conversion of a garage into living space. The application that was denied was for a use variance.

With further regard to the applications reviewed in 2016 and 2017, it is noted that: 11 applications were for post-construction, non-compliant property improvements that were installed without permits in 2016; and, 5 applications for post-construction, non-compliant property improvements that were installed without permits in 2017.

Adoption of Billboard Regulations
In December 2017, the borough adopted Ordinance 10-2017, which amended certain parts of Chapter 89 of the Borough Code to provide standards related to billboards, and specifically the regulation of billboards in the commercial zones. Said ordinance permits billboards as a conditional use for those properties fronting on Route 35 and located in the B-2 and B-5 zones.
and outlines specific design requirements therefore. While complete details are found in Ordinance 10-2017 and Chapter 89 of the Borough Code, it is interesting to note that no part of a billboard shall be: within 1,000 feet of another billboard; or, within 250 feet of an existing residence of residential zone boundary.

Adoption of Regulations for Keeping Chickens
In June 2017, the borough adopted Ordinance 03-2017, which amended Chapter 89 of the Borough Code to provide standards related to the keeping of chickens on residential lots. Said ordinance permits: the keeping of up to five female chickens on residential lots of at least 5,000 square feet; and, an additional female chicken for every 1,000 square feet of additional space for a maximum of 12 chickens on lots of at least 12,000 square feet. Ordinance 03-2017 prohibits the keeping of male chickens (i.e., roosters) on residential lots of less than five acres.

Adoption of Amendments to the PBO-88 (Professional and Business Office) Zone District
In December 2017, the borough adopted Ordinance 07-2017, which amended Chapter 89 of the Borough Code to add more flexibility to allow the development of fast food restaurants as a conditional use in the PBO-88 (Professional and Business Office) zone district.

Changes at the County Level
Since the adoption of the 2007 Master Plan, there have been several changes at the county and regional level, including the adoptions of the Monmouth County Future Wastewater Service Area Map and Monmouth County Master Plan, and the Monmouth County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan. The following subsections provide information about changes at the county/regional level.

Monmouth County Master Plan
The Monmouth County Planning Board adopted a new master plan for the county in 2017. The 2017 Monmouth County Master Plan addresses a range of growth-management related issues at the county-level. Of particular relevance to Eatontown, the plan notes that Eaton Crest Electrical Substation, which is located in Eatontown, has been expanded, and that Jersey Central Power and Light (JCP&L) has built a new, 1.8-mile, 34.5 kV electrical line through the borough. These improvements have been made as part of JCP&L’s Infrastructure Investment Campaign, which is intended to increase electrical supply and improve the stability thereof throughout the region. The 2017 Monmouth County Master Plan also discusses issues related to Fort Monmouth’s closure and pending redevelopment, which is discussed later in this reexamination report.
Monmouth County Future Wastewater Service Area Map
In accordance with the Statewide Water Quality Management Planning rules (N.J.A.C. 7:15-3.4), the Monmouth County Future Wastewater Service Area Map was adopted on April 11, 2013. This amendment map delineates for a Future Wastewater Service Area (FWSA) for Monmouth County. The entirety of Eatontown is located in the FWSA. Specifically, the borough is located in the Two Rivers Water Reclamation Authority Service Area.

Monmouth County Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan
Monmouth County adopted an updated Multi-Jurisdictional Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan (HMP) in 2015 to meet the requirements of the Disaster Mitigation Act of 2000. Monmouth County employed a multi-jurisdictional approach to develop the plan, and every municipality in the county was invited to participate as an equal partner with the county. The Plan identifies natural hazards that could affect the county’s jurisdictions, evaluates the risks associated with these hazards, identifies the mitigation actions to lessen the impacts of a disaster on Monmouth County communities, and prioritizes them based on the municipal master plans and other planning documents.

As part of its participation in the HMP outreach process, the Borough of Eatontown has updated and supplemented its list of recovery actions to include the following:

- Address flooding vulnerabilities of Husky Brook and associated drainage issues.
- Install backup generators to run and operate emergency evacuation shelters.
- Elevate and/or acquire flood-prone residential structures, with particular focus on those on FEMA’s repetitive loss list and severe repetitive loss list.

Progress toward completing each of the above-listed recovery actions is reviewed annually, and an annual progress report is prepared. This progress report indicates that:

- Dredging of Husky Brook is ongoing, and all studies have been completed and the borough is exploring funding opportunities in the form of grants and municipal budget appropriations.
- All studies of needs for emergency generators have been completed and the borough is exploring funding opportunities in the form of grants, municipal budget appropriations and school district budget appropriations.
- All flood-prone structures have been identified. Funding is needed to facilitate elevation and/or acquisition.

Changes at the State Level
Since the adoption of the 2007 Master Plan, there have been several changes at the state level. The following subsections provide information about changes at the state level.
Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority
In 2005, the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission voted to close Fort Monmouth and relocate the bulk of its operations to the Aberdeen Proving Grounds in Maryland. In response thereto, former Governor Jon Corzine signed into law the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Act in 2006, which established the Fort Monmouth Revitalization Planning Authority (FMRPA). In 2008, FMRPA adopted a redevelopment plan, known as the Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan, to guide the redevelopment of the closed military installation.

After having adopted the Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan, the activity of FMRPA ceased. In 2010, former Governor Chris Christie signed into law the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority Act, which created the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority (FMERA) to guide the investment, growth and integration of Fort Monmouth into Eatontown, Tinton Falls and Oceanport through the implementation of the Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan.

The Borough has reviewed several amendments to the redevelopment plan since its adoption. The Council and Planning Board have provided input and comments to the FMERA

Green Buildings and Environmental Sustainability Element
Many New Jersey municipalities have made efforts to reduce their carbon footprint, decrease greenhouse gas emissions, encourage the use of renewable energy sources, conserve energy, and minimize the use of natural resources. Federal and state programs have been established to assist municipalities to address these goals. In the private sector, the US Green Building Council, a private organization, has established the Leadership for Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) certification programs to encourage and standardize the certification of buildings which are energy efficient and incorporate sustainable environmental design concepts.

Recognizing the importance of green building and sustainability, the New Jersey Legislature amended the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) in 2008 to add the “Green Building and Environmental Sustainability Plan Element” to the list of optional elements of municipal master plans. The scope of the new element is as follows: “A green buildings and environmental sustainability plan element, which shall provide for, encourage and promote the efficient use of natural resources and the installation and usage of renewable energy systems, consider the impact of buildings on the local, regional, and global environment; allow ecosystems to function naturally; conserve and reuse water; treat storm water on site; and optimize climatic conditions through site orientation and design.”
State Strategic Plan
The NJ State Planning Commission is now staffed by the Office of Planning Advocacy (OPA) which is within the Department of State. The OPA has released a draft State Strategic Plan to supersede the current State Development and Redevelopment Plan. Public Hearings were held in February, March, and September of 2012. The draft State Strategic Plan is based upon a criteria-based system rather than a geographic planning area. The draft State Strategic Plan has not been adopted by the State Planning Commission at this time and was put on hold following Hurricane Sandy.

The Borough of Eatontown should continue to monitor the progress of the new plan and its implication for future planning in the Borough.

Redevelopment Case Law
There have been several recent court decisions concerning the use of criteria for determining an area “in need of redevelopment” pursuant to the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law (LRHL). The most significant of these decisions is the NJ Supreme Court’s decision in Gallenthin vs. Paulsboro, which reevaluated and set guidelines for the use of the statutory criteria for determining an area in need of redevelopment. The New Jersey Legislature also held hearings in 2010 on legislation to update the NJ Redevelopment and Housing Law. In 2013, Assembly Bill 3615 became law and is intended to protect property owners by limiting the redevelopment powers of municipalities under the LRHL. This amendment raises the standard for a blight finding to one in which the property must be unproductive.

Performance and Maintenance Guarantee Requirements
On January 15, 2018, former Governor Chris Christie signed into law Assembly Bill 1425/Senate Bill 3233, which implemented amendments to the requirements of the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) for performance and maintenance guarantees.

These amendments limit the authority of municipalities to require performance guarantees for private improvements in a development. Specifically, as a result of these amendments, municipalities may now only require developers to post performance guarantees that cover improvements that are required by an approval or developer’s agreement, ordinance or regulation to be dedicated to a public entity and that have not yet been installed, unless the guarantee is for privately owned perimeter buffer landscaping that is required by either local ordinance or as a condition of approval. Before the amendments, a municipality had the broad authority to require a developer to furnish performance guarantees for the cost of any improvement that the municipality deemed necessary or appropriate.
In addition to the above, it is important to note that the amendments result in the elimination of the following items from the list of improvements that may be subject to a performance guarantee requirement: culverts; storm sewers; sewerage disposal other than sanitary sewers; erosion control and sedimentation devices; other on-site improvements; and, landscaping. The amendments also confer municipalities with the authority of adopt ordinances that require two additional types of guarantees, namely: “temporary certificate of occupancy guarantees”, which may be required upon issuance of a temporary certificate of occupancy to guarantee the installation of improvements that must be completed prior to the issuance of a permanent certificate of occupancy; and, “safety and stabilization guarantees”, which may be required, by ordinance, in order to provide the municipality with a source of funds to return an associated property to a safe and stable condition, or otherwise implement measures to protect from access to an unsafe or unstable condition.

There were also amendments to MLUL requirements for maintenance guarantees. Previously, a municipality could require a developer to post a maintenance guarantee for any improvement. However, as a result of the amendments to the MLUL, a municipality may only require a developer to post a maintenance guarantee for improvements that are the subject of a performance guarantee, or for the following private stormwater management-related improvements: basins; in-flow and water quality structures within the basins; and, the outflow pipes and structures.

Finally, the amendments to the MLUL permit the municipality to require that a developer post money in escrow to cover fees associated with the municipal engineer’s inspection of improvements completed by the developer. Previously, the municipal engineer was prohibited from performing inspections if there were insufficient funds to cover said inspection fees.

The MLUL outlines requirements for performance and maintenance guarantees at NJAC 40:55D-53.

New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing (COAH)
COAH originally adopted affordable housing rules for the third-round period in 2004. However, an Appellate Division decision in 2007 stayed COAH from reviewing any plans as part of a petition for substantive certification and resulted in a remand of the 2004 rules back to COAH to revise them consistent with the Appellate Division decision. COAH subsequently adopted revised third round rules in 2008.

In 2010, the Appellate Division invalidated COAH’s 2008 third round rules, and the “growth share” methodology upon which they were based. In 2013, the New Jersey Supreme Court
upheld and modified the Appellate Division’s 2010 decision that invalidated COAH’s third round rules. As a result, COAH was then charged with the task of adopting new affordable housing rules.

COAH has since failed twice to adopt new affordable housing rules for the third-round period. Due to COAH’s failure to adopt such rules, the New Jersey Supreme Court concluded on March 10, 2015 that there no longer exists a legitimate basis to block access to the courts, which was the original intent of the COAH process. The New Jersey Supreme Court’s March 10 decision notes that: “parties concerned about municipal compliance with constitutional affordable housing obligations are [now] entitled to such access, and municipalities that believe they are constitutionally compliant[,] or that are ready and willing to demonstrate ... compliance [with such obligations,] should be able to secure declarations that their housing plans and implementing ordinances are presumptively valid in the event they ... must defend [themselves] against exclusionary zoning litigation.”

In its March 10 decision, the New Jersey Supreme Court established a transitional process to not immediately allow exclusionary zoning actions to proceed in court. The decision notes that: “[during the first thirty days following [June 8, 2015] ..., the only actions that will be entertained by the courts will be declaratory judgment actions filed by any [municipality] ... that either (1) had achieved substantive certification from COAH under prior iterations of Third Round Rules before they were invalidated, or (2) had “participating” status before COAH. Assuming [that] any such [municipality] ... waits and does not file a declaratory judgment action during [the] ... thirty-day period, an action may thereafter be brought by a party against [the municipality] ..., provided the action’s sole focus is on whether the [municipality’s] ... housing plan meets its Mount Laurel obligations (a constitutional compliance challenge). The court’s evaluation of a [municipality’s] ... plan that had received substantive certification, or that will be submitted to the court as proof of constitutional compliance, may result in the [municipality’s] ... receipt of the judicial equivalent of substantive certification and accompanying protection as provided under the [Fair Housing Act] ....”

The borough has filed a declaratory judgement action but, as of the preparation of this reexamination report, the matter remains unresolved. The Eatontown Borough Planning Board should monitor the status of the declaratory judgement action.

Amendment to contents of the land use element of the master plan.
In 2017, the NJ Legislature adopted a change in the land use element of the master plan. The amendment is effective January 1, 2018. An additional component of the land use element is now required. The element must now contain a statement of strategy concerning smart growth including potential locations for the installation of electric charging stations, storm resiliency with
respect to energy supply, flood prone areas, and environmental infrastructure; and environmental sustainability. Subsequent revisions of the land use element of the master plan must address this additional scope.
Specific Changes Recommended for the Master Plan and Development Regulations

The following subsections outline specific changes, which are recommended to be made to the municipal master plan and development regulations. Please note that these recommendations have been made with the benefit of information and input received at various meetings with the: Eatontown Borough Environmental Commission; Eatontown Borough Shade Tree Commission; Beautify Eatontown; Eatontown Police; Zoning Board of Adjustment Ordinance Review Committee; Eatontown Borough Recreation Department, Eatontown Borough Health Department; and, the Historic Preservation Committee. Notes prepared during these meetings, as well as information received from these entities, are provided in the separate volume entitled Technical Report: Reexamination Report Stakeholder Outreach Summary.

Changes to the Master Plan

Several changes to the borough’s master plan are recommended. These are described in the following subsections.

Master Plan Goals

As has been discussed previously in this reexamination report, it is recommended that the additional goal of maintaining and encouraging a diversity of housing types while continuing to address the borough’s affordable housing obligation be added to the list of goals that was identified in the 2007 Master Plan. The entire set of master plan goals, with the aforementioned additional goal, is provided below:

Goals

- To assure a high level of quality of life for present and future residents of the Borough.
- To provide for, and encourage the use of, all remaining vacant land consistent with neighborhood characteristics, land capability, fiscal balance, practicalities of the marketplace, and current aesthetic standards.
- To identify specific areas that should not be developed, either because of sensitivity or suitability for open space at an appropriate location.
  - Maintain open space in a quantity and at locations in accord with not less than accepted standards.
  - Provide conservation areas as well as passive and active recreation facilities.
  - Consider the changing age composition within the Borough in designating facility-and activity-areas.
  - Establish corridor links between major open spaces to the maximum extent feasible.
– Assure that present buffer requirements are both adequate and reasonable, and that they are consistently administered.
– Where feasible, utilize required buffers to provide linkage between major open spaces.

• To design and implement the road plan of the Borough to facilitate the movement of residents from one quadrant to others without using Routes 35 and 36 or the Route 35/Route 36 intersection; to discourage traffic from outside the Borough from using streets internal to residential areas; and, to assure that adequate parking is provided by all new developments.
• To establish a walkable and bikeable community, safe and accessible for people of all ages and abilities.
• To support the commercial and industrial attractiveness of the Borough by facilitating continued viability of existing commercial development along Routes 35 and 36, and additional and upgraded development on vacant land within existing commercial areas. Infill of additional industrial development should also be encouraged and facilitated on Industrial Way West and East.
• To maintain the “Village Area” as the center of cultural, social, and political interaction within the Borough, and preserve the historical buildings within and around it.
• To provide for alternative housing types at locations where single family detached homes are not easily constructed or would be inappropriate development, and where there will be little or no adverse impact upon surrounding land.
• Maintain and encourage a diversity of housing types and continue to address the borough’s affordable housing obligation.
• To assure that adequate facilities, access, and space exist for local government operations.
• To provide information to Borough agencies for use in carrying forward their specific functions and programs.

Land Use Element
The regional business designation of the master plan is amended to incorporate mixed use development as contemplated by Ordinance 10-2016 as a smart growth tool to provide more balanced land use options, create a community with a sense of place, reduce auto use and spur economic revitalization.

Green Buildings and Environmental Sustainability Element
The Borough should prepare a green buildings and environmental sustainability element, which, concurrent with Municipal Land Use Law, can provide for, encourage, and promote the efficient use of natural resources and the installation and usage of renewable energy systems, consider the impact of buildings on the local, regional, and global environment; allow ecosystems to function naturally; conserve and reuse water; treat storm water on site; and, optimize climatic conditions through site orientation and design.
Historic Preservation Element
During the preparation of this reexamination report, the Historic Committee identified several historic sites, which are not yet identified in the borough’s existing Historic Preservation Element. These are described in the separate volume entitled Technical Report: Reexamination Report Stakeholder Outreach Summary and include:

- Sun Eagles County Club Clubhouse (Block 501, Lot 1)
- Fields Cemetery (Tess Court)
- Locust Grove Cemetery (Block 2302, Lot 2)
- White Ridge Cemetery (Earliest Section; Block 3001, lots 7 through 9)
- Brower House (Block 301, Lot 16)
- Fred G. Steelman School (Block 301, Lot 51)
- Eatontown Museum (Block 303, Lot 18)
- Eaton’s Mill Site (Block 401, lots 36 through 39)
- Wolcott’s Tenants’ House (Block 802, Lot 29.01)

In addition to the above, during the preparation of this reexamination report, the Historic Committee recommended that the existing historic district be expanded to include the area bound by the western side of Route 35, Route 71, and Lewis Street. The Historic Committee also recommended that 24 and 29 Route 35 be removed from the historic district, because the buildings at these addresses have been demolished.

It is recommended that the Historic Preservation Element be amended according to the recommendations of the Historic Preservation Committee that have been outlined above.

Natural Resources Inventory
As indicated in the 2007 Master Plan, a Natural Resources Inventory was prepared by the Eatontown Environmental Commission in 1979 and subsequently updated in 2001. No further updates to the Natural Resources Inventory have been prepared subsequent to the adoption of the 2007 Master Plan.

Given the availability of new and improved digital geographic data on natural resources and other environmental features from a variety of state and federal entities, it is recommended that the borough prepare an update to its Natural Resources Inventory. Such an update should include information about surface water features, which may facilitate future stormwater management efforts and planning within the borough.
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Plan

The 2007 Master Plan emphasized the importance of promoting non-motorized forms of transportation and walking and bicycling in particular. For instance, the Circulation Plan Element called for promoting the design and improvement of streets and roads that support walking, bicycling. Additionally, and more thoroughly, the Open Space, Recreation and Conservation Element states that:

> Walking and bicycle paths should be developed in the larger park areas and the corridor connections between them. The Borough should study and develop a plan to promote interconnectedness for pedestrians and cyclists between the parks, neighborhoods, schools, and activity areas in the Borough. The development of safe and aesthetically pleasing routes or paths through a system of greenways that reconnect the four quadrants of Eatontown should be actively promoted by the Borough.

During the preparation of this reexamination report, there were calls from various master plan subcommittee members, as well as from members of the Eatontown Environmental Commission, to promote the development of pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the borough. Accordingly, this reexamination report recommends that a specialized pedestrian and bicycle facilities plan be prepared to plan for the development of new and enhancement of existing facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, including, but not limited to, on-street facilities, sidewalks, and trails.

In addition, the Borough Complete Streets policy (Resolution # 200-2014) which is a means to provide safe access for all users of roadways should be further implemented. The Borough Complete Streets Advisory Committee has secured two state sponsored grants to assist the Borough to further develop the goals of complete streets.

Although this report contains recommendations for changes and revisions to the master plan and its underlying goals and objectives, the conclusion of this reexamination report and process is the current master plan is sufficiently current and appropriate such that a new comprehensive master plan is not warranted at this time.

Circulation Plan Element

A common thread of most of the public meetings in Borough Hall is the complaint about current traffic congestion and safety issues. The Borough contains several important state highways and regional traffic has a major influence on the ability to navigate through the Borough for daily shopping and commuting. Traffic-related improvements are needed in certain areas of the Borough to address these current concerns.
A comprehensive Circulation Plan Element should be prepared that builds upon the traffic and circulation plans of the 2007 Master Plan and recognizes the changes in residential, commercial and industrial development since that time. The plan element should provide a technical foundation for needed improvements and enhancements to the Borough road network. The element should address vehicular, pedestrian and bicycle linkages and needs. Truck movements which serve local businesses should also be studied and recommendations offered. The regional traffic patterns should also be evaluated as they relate to the municipal road network. Finally, emergency/evacuation circulation needs should be addressed in the plan. The recommendations should be incorporated into an action plan listing short- and long-term priorities, time frames, projected costs and possible funding sources.

More specifically, the Circulation Plan Element should address the following:

- Providing connections between existing sidewalks and between residential areas and commercial areas;
- Providing access to public transit, where appropriate;
- Traffic calming measures for residential areas to protect the quality of life of the Borough’s neighborhoods;
- Methods of pedestrian and bicycle connections to link the four quadrants of the Borough;
- Specific design standards aimed to achieve designing and constructing roadways within Eatontown Borough with the minimum improvements necessary to provide safe travel;
- Pursuing funding from state agencies for traffic studies, design, and construction of roadway improvements.

Changes to Development Regulations

To facilitate the implementation of the proposed land use plan and increased efficiency in land use administration, the following amendments to Chapter 89 (i.e., the zoning ordinance) are recommended:

- Zoning Chart—Attachment 27, Impervious Coverage: The chart provides a range of lot sizes. Clarify whether the percent figure or the square footage applies.
- Fences for Corner Lots: Provide some flexibility in location and fence height to increase the useable yard area of a corner lot. Consider a “street side yard” setback for the fence setback for the non-front street frontage.
- Zoning Map: The borough should adopt the new map. The colors on any new map should be better distinguished than they currently are, and zone district labels are needed.
• Auto Repair and Gasoline Stations: This use is permitted as a principal permitted use and subject to a list of standards like a conditional use. As a result, auto repair and gasoline stations should be established as a conditional use.
• Rear Decks on Occupied Multifamily Dwelling Units: Homeowners in new or established townhome developments, sometimes wish to add rear decks or patios to their residences. In instances where the zoning standards do not allow such improvements, and since the restriction applies to multiple units, a change in the setback requirement should be considered rather than addressing multiple variance applications.
• Signs: Regulations for signs should be revised to better address temporary signs and the free-standing and wall-mounted signs of multi-tenanted buildings.
• Solar Power: Regulations should be updated to provide regulations for roof-mounted and pole-mounted solar panels. Residential and commercial structures should be addressed.
• Outdoor Storage: Regulations to limit outdoor storage at commercial establishments should be provided.
• Accessory Structures: Definitions relating to accessory structures on residential lots should be revised to address typical circumstances.
• Grading: Grading regulations should be updated to address current practices.
• Buffer Requirements: Buffer requirements should be reviewed, revised and clarified in collaboration with the Eatontown Borough Engineer.
• Native Species: Amend existing landscaping requirements to require that plantings of native species be required in new development. The use of non-native species should not be promoted.
• Maintenance of Stormwater Management and Control Facilities: During the preparation of this reexamination report, members of the Eatontown Environmental Commission expressed concern about the maintenance of stormwater management basins within the borough. It is therefore recommended that Article XIA of the Chapter 89, entitled “Stormwater Management and Control”, be evaluated to identify opportunities to strengthen maintenance requirements. It is also recommended that enforcement of requirements for the maintenance of stormwater management basins be strengthened.
  – Per the Zoning Board recommendation in the 2016 annual report (dated March 14, 2017), it is recommended that ordinance be amended to add a “post-construction” zoning permit under Chapter 89-14 (Application Fees). The recommend amount was one hundred dollars.
  – Per the recommendation of the Zoning Board in the 2017 Annual Report (dated March 12, 2018): “the single-family homes near Borough Hall currently located in the B-2 zone, be rezoned to an R-10 zone.” The Zoning Board further recommended the following: Single family homes along Throckmorton Avenue, Kelly Lane, Broad Street and White Street should be granted property improvements administratively and not be
handicapped for a non-conforming use, residential in a business zone requiring Board approval.”

- Allow electric charging stations for electric automobiles and trucks in the appropriate business and light industry zones as an accessory use.
- Billboard regulations, as necessary, based on the applications reviewed by the Planning and Zoning Boards.

In addition to the above, this reexamination report recommends the following zone changes:

- **Route 35 corridor.** One of the goals of the master plan is: “To support the commercial and industrial attractiveness of the Borough by facilitating continued viability of existing commercial development along Route 35 and 36”. In that the regard the Borough planning and zoning office has observed difficulty in matching new development proposals along the north and south segments of Route 35 corridor to the current zoning scheme. Retail development is evolving in and internet and digital age and office development has been limited. Therefore, the Planning Board should review the current land uses along the north and south segments of Route 35 and the consistency with the permitted uses of the applicable zone district such as B-1, B-2, MB-R, PBO-88 and others. Recommendations for changes to the Borough Land Use Plan Element should be developed to provide consistency with current uses and be forwarding looking for the Borough’s vision for the corridor.

- **Broad Street commercial area.** The Planning Board endorses the recommendation of the Zoning Board of Adjustment to amend the ordinance to provide some opportunity for single family homes located in the B-2 zone, as non-conforming uses, to be able to achieve property improvements or additions without Zoning Board approval. There are several non-conforming single-family homes along Throckmorton Avenue, Kelly Lane, Broad Street and White Street.

- **R-20 Zone-Senior Use.** The Planning Board reviewed the current zoning of an undeveloped tract in the R-20 zone district in Block 2002 located at the intersection of Wyckoff Road and Route 36. The lot has frontage on major roadways and is near the Monmouth Mall. Despite these attributes the tract remains undeveloped. The property is approximately 6 acres in area, wooded and the western portion of the lot is constrained by freshwater wetlands.

The Planning Board concluded the property is unlikely to be developed with single family residences on 20,000 square foot lots. The Board does not favor townhomes and
multifamily structures at this location since the tract is impacted by the traffic congestion at this intersection. In addition, the Board believes commercial development of the tract would have negative impact the adjoining residential development and would degrade the capacity of the Route 36-Wyckoff Road intersection. The R-20 zone currently allows public and private schools on a minimum lot size of 5 acres.

The Planning Board proposes the Land Use Ordinance (Chapter 89) be amended to allow senior care facilities such as assisted living and congregate care as a conditional use in the R-20 zone. To protect the adjoining residential area, the recommended conditional use requirements are a minimum tract area of five (5) acres, a building height of not greater than 3 stories, and adherence to the Borough buffer requirements. A conditional use standard to limit this use to tracts which are adjacent to a state highway should also be provided.

This recommendation would apply to the entire R-20 zone in the Borough. This recommended use is compatible with the other permitted uses in the R-20 zone district, will minimize potential traffic impacts, and provides limit to the impact through a height limitation and addresses a buffer to the adjoining residential area. The balance of the R-20 zone district is completely developed except for a tract on the east side of the Borough and there are few large R-20 tracts in the municipality.

The above recommendation is consistent with the goal of the master plan which states the following: “To provide for and encourage the use of, all remaining vacant land consistent with neighborhood characteristics, land capability, fiscal balance, practicalities of the market place and current aesthetic standards.”

Finally, this reexamination report recommends that green building and infrastructure techniques, as described in Appendix 1, be broadly promoted in the borough’s development regulations. Specific recommendations include:

- Downspout Disconnection
- Rain Gardens
- Bioswales
- Permeable Pavements
- Green Roofs
- Increasing Tree Cover
- Open Space Preservation
Recommendations Concerning the Incorporation of Redevelopment Plans

At this time, the Borough has not prepared, nor has it adopted, any redevelopment plans based upon NJSA 40A:12A-1 et. seq. (Local Redevelopment and Housing Law) that would need to be incorporated into the Master Plan or require changes to the Borough development regulations. However, please note that the Fort Monmouth Economic Revitalization Authority (FMERA) has adopted the Fort Monmouth Reuse and Redevelopment Plan under N.J.A.C. 19:31 C-3 which includes land in Eatontown Borough. The land use regulations of FMERA govern land use, design and development for the lands located in the Borough which are or were owned by the federal government for Fort Monmouth.

Although the Borough determined that the “Downtown Village Area” of Eatontown was as an “area in need of redevelopment” in October 2002, a redevelopment plan has not been prepared. The Planning Board urges the Borough Council to revisit the planning studies that are associated with this area.
Appendix 1: Description of Green Building and Infrastructure Techniques
Green Building and Infrastructure Techniques

Green building and infrastructure techniques use permeable surfaces (e.g., porous concrete, gravel, mulch, etc.), landscape formations (e.g., channels, depressions), plant material, or other technologies to reduce stormwater runoff by promoting natural infiltration. Their use can promote resiliency by mitigating flooding (i.e., reducing the risk and impacts of flooding) and helping the Borough to quickly recover from storms. In addition, they provide numerous co-benefits, not the least of which are: reducing long-term maintenance and operation costs of stormwater infrastructure; and, capturing runoff pollution (e.g., particulate matter, heavy metals) and preventing their entry into sensitive terrestrial waterways.

This reexamination report has recommended the promotion of green building and infrastructure techniques in the Borough’s development regulations. Recommended green building and infrastructure techniques are described in the following subsections.

Downspout Disconnection

Downspout disconnection refers to the rerouting of rooftop drainage pipes to specialized containment devices (e.g., rain barrels, cisterns) and permeable areas, instead of traditional stormwater drainage systems. This allows stormwater runoff from building roofs not only to infiltrate soil, but also to be collected for later use (e.g., watering lawns and gardens), which reduces demand on public water supplies.
Rain Gardens
Rain gardens are shallow, vegetated basins that absorb stormwater runoff from impervious surfaces (e.g., rooftops, sidewalks, and streets). Runoff is channeled into rain gardens, and is then used by plants, infiltrated into the ground, and evaporated. They may be installed in a variety of locations and can be an attractive element of site design. In addition, it is important to note that rain gardens can be installed in a variety of locations. Indeed, they may be installed in any properly graded unpaved space, and in parking lots and paved areas through the construction of specialized planter boxes that collect and absorb runoff.
Bioswales
Bioswales are open, linear channels with vegetation, mulching, or xeriscaping that slow stormwater runoff and attenuate flooding potential while conveying stormwater runoff away from critical infrastructure. While they convey stormwater runoff away from critical infrastructure, their permeable surface permits the natural infiltration of stormwater. They are often used as an alternative to, or enhancement of, traditional stormwater drainage systems.
Permeable Pavements

Permeable pavements help to reduce stormwater runoff, which helps to improve the quality of terrestrial waters and mitigate flooding. With traditional (i.e., impervious) pavement, stormwater runs into drains and inlets, which places a burden on such infrastructure, and may result in the discharge of pollutants (e.g., sediment, oil residue, etc.) into terrestrial waters. Permeable pavements, however, infiltrate, treat, or store rainwater where it falls. Key examples of permeable pavements include pervious concrete, porous asphalt, and permeable interlocking pavers.

Permeable Pavement (Source: EPA)
Green Roofs

Green roofs are roofs that are covered with substrate and vegetation that enable the infiltration of rainwater. This not only minimizes stormwater runoff but leads to reduced building operating costs and energy consumption by providing improved insulation of the roof surface and absorbing less heat on the roof surface (i.e., increasing the roof surface albedo over traditional roof surfaces). Flat and low-pitched roofs are most suited to green roof development and retrofitting therewith.

Green Roof (Source: EPA)
Tree Cover
Increased tree cover in developed areas is an important example of green infrastructure. Trees reduce and slow stormwater by intercepting precipitation in their leaves and branches. In addition, their root systems help to aerate soil, which facilitates natural infiltration of stormwater and reduces runoff. Trees also purify the air and can help to cool developed areas by providing shade, and through evaporative cooling and increased latent heat flux (i.e., the dissipation of sensible heat).
Open Space Preservation

Preservation of open space areas within and adjacent to developed areas can help to mitigate the water quality and flooding impacts of stormwater. Indeed, natural open space areas promote increased groundwater recharge, lower stormwater runoff, and reduced levels of nutrients and sediment in terrestrial waters. They also help to cool developed areas through evaporative cooling and increased latent heat flux. The use of building coverage and impervious surface limits, tree-save requirements, and noncontiguous clustering are key ways to promote open space preservation through development regulation.