

TOWNSHIP OF CLARK

Union County, New Jersey



HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN

FAIR SHARE PLAN

APPENDICES TO THE FAIR SHARE PLAN

Adopted by:

Township of Clark

Township of Clark Planning Board

November 20, 2017

TOWNSHIP OF CLARK

Union County, New Jersey



REVISED

HOUSING ELEMENT of the MASTER PLAN

Adopted by:
Township of Clark Planning Board
September 7, 2017

HOUSING ELEMENT
of the
MASTER PLAN

Township of Clark
Union County, New Jersey

September 7, 2017

The Original of This Report Was Signed and Sealed
In Accordance With N.J.S.A. 45:14a-12

Kevin O'Brien

Kevin O'Brien, P.P., A.I.C.P.
Shamrock Enterprises, Ltd.
NJ License #5348

Richard O'Connor

Richard O'Connor, P.E., P.P., C.M.E.
Grotto Engineering Associates, LLC
NJ License #33029

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Planning Board gives thanks to the selfless volunteers and staff who contribute so much to the Township:

MAYOR

Sal Bonaccorso

COUNCIL

President Angel Albanese

Vice President Alvin Barr

Steven Hund

Frank Mazzarella

Patrick O'Connor

William Smith

Brian Toal

PLANNING BOARD

Chairman Michael Kurzawski

Vice Chairman, Kevin Koch

Class I Member, Mayor Sal Bonaccorso

Class II Member, John Laezza

Class III Member, Councilman Frank Mazzarella

Class IV Member, Michael Altmann

Class IV Member, Matthew Casey

Class IV Member, Robert Tarantino

Class IV Members, Michael Triola

Alternate I, George Olear

Alternate II, Michael Bonaccorso

PO Brian Pereira, Police Dept. Rep.

Chief Frank Cerasa, Fire Dept. Rep.

STAFF

John Laezza, Business Administrator

Edie Merkel, Township Clerk

Joseph Triarsi, Township Attorney

Richard O'Connor, P.E., Township Engineer

Donna Mazzucco, Planning Board Secretary

Kelly Carey, Esq., Planning Board Attorney

Kevin O'Brien, P.P., Township Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Introduction.....	6
B. Clark Efforts in Affordable Housing.....	7
C. Mandatory Contents of the Housing Element.....	9
D. Demographic, Housing and Employment Analysis.....	10
D.1 Population Trends.....	10
D.2 Population Composition by Age.....	12
D.3 Population Composition by Race.....	17
D.4 Household Characteristics.....	18
D.5 Housing Unit Characteristics.....	19
D.6 Income.....	25
D.7 Housing Values.....	26
D.8 Housing Affordability.....	28
D.9 Employment Trends.....	31
D.10 Labor Force Characteristics.....	32
E. Affordable Housing Obligation.....	35
E.1 Rehabilitation Share.....	35
E.2 Prior Round Obligation.....	35
E.3 Third Round Obligation.....	35
E.4 Ability to Accommodate Affordable Housing Obligation.....	35
E.5 Anticipated Land Use Patterns.....	35
E.6 Availability of Existing &Planned Infrastructure.....	36

E.7 Economic Development Policies	36
E.8 Constraints on Development	36
E.9 Identification of Affordable Housing Sites.....	36
F. Land Use Plan Amendment.....	37
F.1 Land Use Plan Amendment	37
F.2 Updated Goals and Objectives	37
F.3 Recommendations for Land Use & Development.....	38
F.3.A Residential Zones.....	38
F.3.B Inclusionary Zones	39
F.3.C Noninclusionary Zoning Changes	42
G. Zoning Map.....	43

A. Introduction

The Township of Clark, Union County, has prepared this Housing Element and Fair Share Plan as an amendment to the Municipal Master Plan in accordance with the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1 et seq.) and the New Jersey Fair Housing Act (N.J.S.A. 52:27D-310 et seq.).

The Municipal Land Use Law requires that a municipal master plan include a housing element to enable the municipality to exercise the power to zone and regulate land use. The housing element is adopted by the municipal planning board and endorsed by the municipal governing body, and is drawn to achieve the goal of meeting the municipal obligation to provide for a fair share of the regional need for affordable housing.

This Housing Element and separate Fair Share Plan amends the Township's master plan to address current affordable housing planning requirements. It addresses the Township's cumulative fair share obligation for the period from 1987 through 2025, and supersedes and replaces the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan that was previously adopted by the Clark Township Planning Board on March 12, 2009 and endorsed by the Clark Township Council on April 20, 2009.

B. Clark Efforts in Affordable Housing

Clark Township received first round substantive certification on September 4, 1991. Due to insufficient vacant land, the Township received a vacant land adjustment and established a realistic development potential (RDP) of 23 units. Clark addressed its 23-unit RDP in its first round through zoning for 42 affordable units on four sites determined to be suitable for that purpose. The Township revised its Ordinance to accommodate the newly created R-B District-Multi-family Residential, which required twenty (20) percent of the total development to be set aside for low and moderate income households. Clark Township's Planning Board adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan on September 2, 1997, which addressed its 12-year cumulative obligation. The Township filed the plan with COAH on September 4, 1997 but did not petition at that time. COAH received Clark's resolution of petition on August 23, 1999. Three days later, the Township published a notice in The Star Ledger. No objections were received by COAH. On March 28, 2000, COAH issued a report requesting additional information from the Township. Subsequently, the Planning Board adopted an amended Housing Element and Fair Share Plan on February 12, 2001. The governing body approved a resolution endorsing the plan and re-petitioned COAH for substantive certification on March 1, 2001. The Township re-published a notice in The Star Ledger and again no objections were received by COAH.

The Planning Board adopted a third amendment to its housing plan on December 11, 2001 and re-petitioned COAH for substantive certification on December 17, 2001. On publishing a notice, COAH received two objections during the 45-day objection period. Mediation led to an agreement with Clark Developers to rezone Block 58/Lot 4 as an age-restricted affordable housing overlay zone permitting a maximum of 328 units with a 20 percent set aside for affordable housing. As a result of the agreement, the Planning Board adopted and amended the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan for the fourth time on August 24, 2004. Clark re-petitioned on September 13, 2004, with the only changes being the inclusion of the age-restricted overlay zoning on the Clark Developers property and an increase in permitted density on Block 57/Lot 1.

The Planning Board adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan on March 12, 2009 addressing the prior round and third round Fair Share. Due to the failure of the Council on Affordable Housing to conduct business, this plan was never certified.

The Township's previously anticipated prospective need for the period from 2004 to 2018 is no longer valid due to the fact that COAH's growth share methodology,

on which that calculation was based was twice invalidated by the Appellate Division and ultimately by the Supreme Court.

Due to COAH's failure to adopt new valid rules for the third round, the New Jersey Supreme Court ruled 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, 2015, ruling in In Re N.J.A.C. 5:96 and 5:97 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."

Under the New Jersey Supreme Court's March 10, 2015, ruling, municipalities are afforded an opportunity to file declaratory judgment actions in order to validate their affordable housing plans as compliant with constitutional affordable housing obligations. On July 7, 2015, the Township filed such a declaratory judgment action. The Township also filed a motion for immunity from builder's remedy lawsuits while it prepared this Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

The court granted the Township five months of temporary immunity from the filing of its declaratory judgment action on September 21, 2015. The original term of immunity was to end on December 8, 2015. However, it was subsequently extended by the Court, and, on August 4, 2016, the Township's fairness hearing on its proposed compliance plan and settlement with Fair Share Housing Center was held and its temporary immunity was further extended. A fairness hearing was held on December 21, 2016. On January 13, 2017, the Court entered an Order finding that the Settlement Agreement is "*fair to and adequately protects the interests of lower income persons.*" The Court extended immunity until the Final Compliance Hearing, now scheduled for October 3, 2017.

C.Mandatory Contents of the Housing Element

With the passage of the Fair Housing Act in 1985 (P.L. 1985, C.222), the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) was amended to require a Housing Element as a mandatory element of the municipal Master Plan. A variety of components must be incorporated into every Housing Element, summarized as follows:

- An inventory of the municipality's housing stock by age, condition, purchase or rental value, occupancy characteristics, and type, including the number of units affordable to low and moderate income households and substandard housing capable of being rehabilitated;
- A projection of the municipality's housing stock, including the probable future construction of low and moderate income housing, for the next six years, taking into account, but not necessarily limited to, construction permits issued, approvals of applications for development and probable residential development of lands;
- An analysis of the municipality's demographic characteristics, including but not necessarily limited to, household size, income level, and age;
- An analysis of the existing and probable future employment characteristics of the municipality;
- A determination of the municipality's present and prospective fair share for low and moderate income housing and its capacity to accommodate its present and prospective housing needs, including its fair share for low and moderate income housing; and,
- A consideration of the lands that are most appropriate for construction of low and moderate income housing and of the existing structures most appropriate for conversion to, or rehabilitation for, low and moderate income housing, including a consideration of lands of developers who have expressed a commitment to provide low and moderate income housing.

This Housing Element and separate Fair Share Plan addresses these requirements.

D. Demographic, Housing and Employment Analysis

As required by N.J.S.A. 52:27D-310, all housing elements must contain a discussion of the municipality's demographic, housing, and economic characteristics. The following subsections fulfill this requirement by providing a profile of the Township of Clark with information from the US Census Bureau, the New Jersey Department of Labor and Workforce Development, and the North Jersey Transportation Planning Authority.

D.1 POPULATION TRENDS

The Township of Clark is a vibrant suburban community located in the south-central part of Union County. Access to various industries and the New York Metropolitan area made Clark an ideal town for those who desired the ease of suburban living. Clark is presently home to 15,144 residents.

The Township's population increased dramatically in the 1940s and 1950s, with a 109 percent increase between 1940 and 1950 and 180 percent increase between 1950 and 1960. These numbers clearly indicate the strong influence suburbanization and the Baby Boom period had on Clark Township.

As indicated in Table 1, the Township's population peaked in 1970 at 18,829. Since then Clark Township has been experiencing a gradual decline in population. The Township lost approximately 2,000 residents per decade in the 1970s and 1980s. However, the decline in the population lessened between 1990 and 2000, resulting in a loss of only 32 residents. Between 2000 and 2015 the Township saw a modest increase in population, reversing the trend from 1980 to 2000.

Union County has been experiencing similar population trends in the last few decades, but at a much slower rate than the Township. The County's population grew rapidly until 1970 with a 21 percent increase during the 1940's and a 27 percent increase during the 1950s. The County experienced their highest recorded population in 1970 with a total population of 543,116. The County's population also declined in the following two decades but increased by 5.8% in 2000. Between 2000 and 2015 the population increased again by 5%, reversing the trend of the 1970's and 1980's. The population hit a new peak in 2015, with 548,744 residents.

Table 1 Population Trends 1930 - 2015

Clark Township and Union County

Township of Clark			
Year	Population	Number Changed	Percent Changed
1930	1,474		
1940	2,083	609	41.32
1950	4,352	2,269	108.93
1960	12,195	7,843	180.22
1970	18,829	6,634	54.40
1980	16,699	-2,130	-11.31
1990	14,629	-2,070	-12.40
2000	14,597	-32	-0.22
2015	15,144	547	3.61
Union County			
Year	Population	Number Changed	Percent Changed
1930	305,209		
1940	328,344	23,135	7.58
1950	398,138	69,794	21.26
1960	504,255	106,117	26.65
1970	543,116	38,861	7.71
1980	504,094	-39,022	-7.18
1990	493,819	-10,275	-2.04
2000	522,541	28,722	5.82
2015	548,744	26,203	5.0

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

D.2 POPULATION COMPOSITION BY AGE

Clark Township has experienced a significant increase in the Baby Boomer population (age group 35 and 54), over the last decade. The 'Baby Boom' population (those born between 1946 and 1964) comprises approximately thirty percent of the population in both the Township of Clark and the County of Union, as shown in Table 2. The population in the Township under the age of 14 and over the age of 65 experienced a decrease in population while all other age groups saw significant advances.

The Township experienced a significant increase in the senior citizen population over the age of 55 in the last fifteen years. These age groups constitute approximately 31% of the Township's total population. The County has experienced a similar trend, but at a lower rate of 25% percent than the Township. The senior citizen population for the Township of Clark and Union County has increased significantly during the last decade. Yet, there are alarming trends. The over 65 population in the Township decreased by 19% while the County experienced a decrease of 1.5%. The trend for baby boomers to leave full sized homes with their attendant maintenance to find retirement housing is on the rise. Some of that relocation is to over age 55 communities, some to walkable urban areas, and others to out of state locations.

Nonetheless, the over 55 age group now consists of 31% of the Township's current total population, the trend indicates an increasing demand for services for senior citizens.

Table 2a Population Composition by Age 1990 - 2000

Clark Township

	1990		2000		Change	
Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 5	685	4.7	759	5.2	74	10.8
5 - 14	1,398	9.6	1,784	12.2	386	27.6
15 - 24	1,755	12.0	1,283	8.8	-472	-26.9
25 - 34	2,085	14.3	1,645	11.3	-440	-21.1
35 - 44	2,055	14.0	2,383	16.3	328	16.0
45 - 54	1,707	11.7	2,094	14.3	387	22.7
55 - 64	2,127	14.5	1,486	10.2	-641	-30.1
65 - 74	1,926	13.2	1,519	10.4	-407	-21.1
75 - 84	759	5.2	1,263	8.7	504	66.4
85 - over	132	0.9	381	2.6	249	188.6
TOTAL	14,629		14,597		-32	-0.2
Under 18	2,325	15.9	3,035	20.8	710	30.5
Over 65	2,817	19.3	3,163	21.7	346	12.3

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 2b Population Composition by Age 1990 - 2000

Union County

	1990		2000		Change	
Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 5	32,421	7.8	36,441	7.0	4,020	12.4
5 - 14	58,291	14.1	73,754	14.1	15,463	26.5
15 - 24	64,984	15.7	61,215	11.7	-3,769	-5.8
25 - 34	85,028	20.5	75,189	14.4	-9,839	-11.6
35 - 44	73,653	17.8	88,398	16.9	14,745	20.0
45 - 54	54,877	13.3	69,568	13.3	14,691	26.8
55 - 64	50,440	12.2	45,935	8.8	-4,505	-8.9
65 - 74	44,113	10.7	35,350	6.8	-8,763	-19.9
75 - 84	23,269	5.6	27,322	5.2	4,053	17.4
85 - over	6,743	1.6	9,369	1.8	2,626	38.9
TOTAL	493,819		522,541		28,722	5.8
Under 18	108,088	21.9	129,941	24.9	21,853	20.2
Over 65	74,125	17.9	72,041	13.8	-2,084	-2.8

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 2c Population Composition by Age 2000-2015

Clark Township

Age	2000		2015		Change	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 5	759	5.2	678	4.5	-81	-10.6
5 - 14	1,784	12.2	1,754	11.6	-30	-16.8
15 - 24	1,283	8.8	1,610	10.6	327	25.4
25 - 34	1,645	11.3	1,803	11.9	158	9.6
35 - 44	2,383	16.3	1,934	12.8	-449	18.8
45 - 54	2,094	14.3	2,602	17.2	508	24.2
55 - 64	1,486	10.2	2,207	14.5	721	48.5
65 - 74	1,519	10.4	1,188	7.8	-331	-21.7
75 - 84	1,263	8.7	948	6.3	-315	-24.9
85 - over	381	2.6	420	2.8	39	10.2
TOTAL	14,597			15,144	547	3.7
Under 18	3,035	20.8	3,069	20.2	34	1.1
Over 65	3,163	21.7	2,556	16.9	-607	-19.1

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

Table 2d Population Composition by Age 2000-2015

Union County

	2000		2015		Change	
Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 5	36,441	7.0	35,770	6.5	-671	-1.8
5 - 14	73,754	14.1	73,473	13.4	281	-0.3
15 - 24	61,215	11.7	70,321	12.8	9,106	14.8
25 - 34	75,189	14.4	71,025	12.9	-4,164	-5.5
35 - 44	88,398	16.9	77,330	14.1	-11,068	-12.5
45 - 54	69,568	13.3	83,527	15.2	13,959	20.0
55 - 64	45,935	8.8	66,385	12.1	20,450	44.5
65 - 74	35,350	6.8	38,023	6.9	2,673	7.5
75 - 84	27,322	5.2	21,298	3.9	-6,024	-22.0
85 - over	9,369	1.8	11,592	2.1	2,223	23.7
TOTAL	522,541		548,744		26,203	5.0
Under 18	129,941	24.9	131,582	23.9	1,641	1.2
Over 65	72,041	13.8	70,913	12.9	-1,128	-1.5

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

D.3 POPULATION COMPOSITION BY RACE

Clark Township has a largely homogeneous population as shown in Table 3. In Clark, almost all residents (95.1%) categorize themselves as being of one race, while less than 1% indicates that their heritage is comprised of two or more races. Of those of one race, 95.1 percent are white. Asians comprise the second-largest racial group at 1.8%. African Americans make up 1.2% of the total population.

Union County as a whole has lower percentage of white population at 57.9%, than the Township. Approximately 21.3% of the County's population is African American.

Hispanics and Latinos account for 29.4% of the total population in Union County, while they comprise 10.9% in Clark.

Table 3 Population Composition by Race

Clark Township

	2000 Number	2000 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent
One Race	14,496	99.3	15,001	99.1
White	13,956	96.3	14,404	95.1
Black/African American	44	0.3	177	1.2
American Indian	2	0.0	0	0.0
Asian	402	2.8	274	1.8
Native Hawaiian	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other race	92	0.6	146	1.0
Two or More Races	101	0.7	143	0.9
Hispanic	535	3.7	1655	10.9
Not Hispanic	14,062	96.3	13,489	89.1
Total Population	14,597		15,144	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

D.4 HOUSEHOLD CHARACTERISTICS

Significant household characteristics indicated by the 2000 Census, and displayed in Table 4, include:

- Family households dominate the Township and comprise approximately 70% of the total households.
- Of the Township's family households, approximately 60% are married households.
- Approximately 24% of the non-family householders live alone, of which more than 13% is senior citizens (age 65 and over).
- More than 30% of the Township's households include children under the age of 18 and about 28% include senior citizens (65 years or older).
- The average household size in 2000 in Clark Township was 2.63 persons per unit, which is lower than the Union County average of 2.88.

Table 4 Types of Households

Clark Township

	2000 Number	2000 Percent	2015 Number	2015 Percent
Total Households	5,637		5,610	
Family households	4,124	73.2	3960	70.6
Married couples, families	3,459	61.4	3,349	59.7
Other family	509	9.0	611	10.9
Nonfamily households	1,513	27.0	1649	29.4
Living alone	1,335	23.6	1,520	27.1
65 years or over	665	11.7	740	13.2
Children under 18	1,681	29.8	1,671	29.8
Adults over 65	2,150	38.1	1,548	27.6
Average size	2.56		2.63	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

D.5 HOUSING UNIT CHARACTERISTICS

Clark Township is a typical suburban town with the majority (81 percent) of residents living in owner occupied homes. The Township has fewer renter-occupied units, at 18.5 percent, as indicated in Table 5b. The Township, as well as the County, share similar housing characteristics. Year-round housing dominates the Township at 98.7 percent, which is nearly equal to the County average of 96.5 percent. However, the Township's housing tenure differs from that of the Union County, which has roughly 62 percent owner-occupied units and 38.4 percent renter-occupied housing units.

Table 5a Housing Unit Data - 2000

Clark Township and Union County

Year 2000	Clark Township		Union County	
Unit Type	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Occupied Year Round	5,637	98.7	186,124	96.5
Vacant	72	1.3	6,821	3.5
Total	5,709		192,945	
Tenure of Occupied Units				
Owner	4,592	81.5	114,638	61.6
Occupied Renter	1,045	18.5	71,486	38.4
Total	5,637		186,124	
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census				

Table 5b Housing Unit Data - 2015

Clark Township and Union County

Year 2015	Clark Township		Union County	
Unit Type	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Occupied all Year	5,610	97.9	186,175	92.8
Around Vacant	120	2.1	14,553	7.2
Total	5,730		200,708	
Tenure of Occupied Units				
Owner	4,460	79.5	109,992	59.0
Occupied Renter	1,150	20.5	76,183	40.9
Total	5,610		186,175	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census

The housing stock in Clark Township is in very good condition. Tables 5e and 5f display information that indicates substandard housing conditions. The age of housing stock is usually considered the most reliable indicator of substandard housing conditions, however, individual units should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Suburbanization had a strong influence on the formation of Clark Township. Approximately 81% of the houses in Clark Township were built between 1940 and 1970. The Township of Clark has newer houses in comparison to the County. Only 6% of the houses were built before 1940, which is much lower than the County where approximately 26% of the houses were built before 1940. Approximately 55% of the housing units in the Township were built before 1960. Construction has been minimal during the last two decades with 4.4% new homes built. Similar to the Township, the County has an older housing stock. Nearly 68.4% of the houses were built before 1960.

Table 5c Housing Unit Data - 2000

Clark Township and Union County

Year 2000 Characteristics	Clark Township		Union County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Year Built				
1999 - March 2000	27	0.5	1,030	0.5
1995 -1998	48	0.8	2,937	1.5
1990 -1994	26	0.5	3,289	1.7
1980 -1989	194	3.4	8,797	4.6
1970 -1979	516	9.0	15,799	8.2
1960 -1969	1,780	31.2	29,205	15.1
1940 -1959	2,752	48.2	81,542	42.3
1939 or earlier	366	6.4	50,346	26.1
Units in Structure				
One detached	4,587	80.3	102,794	53.3
One attached	99	1.7	7,951	4.1
2 units	167	2.9	29,415	15.2
3 to 4 units	80	1.4	16,704	8.7
5 to 9 units	93	1.6	7,785	4.0
10 to 19 units	255	4.5	7,754	4.0
20+ units	417	7.3	20,290	10.5
Other	11	0.2	252	0.1
Median rooms per unit	6.3		5.7	
Total Housing (2000)	5,709		192,945	
Total Housing Units (1990)	5,638		187,033	
Change: 1990 to 2000	101	1.8	7,256	3.7
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census				

Table 5d Housing Unit Data – 2015

Clark Township and Union County

Characteristics	Clark Township		Union County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Year Built				
2000 - 2015	222	3.9	14,635	7.4
1990 -1999	159	2.8	7,256	3.7
1980 -1989	239	3.4	8,797	4.6
1970 -1979	473	9.0	15,799	8.2
1960 -1969	1,855	31.2	29,205	15.1
1940 -1959	2,463	48.2	81,542	42.3
1939 or earlier	315	6.4	50,346	26.1
Units in Structure				
One detached	4,387	76.4	103,629	51.6
One attached	182	3.2	8,964	4.5
2 units	251	4.4	33,028	16.5
3 to 4 units	128	2.2	17,030	8.5
5 to 9 units	125	2.2	7,775	3.9
10 to 19 units	109	1.9	7,106	3.5
20+ units	557	9.7	22,705	11.3
Other	0	0	471	0.3
Median rooms per unit	6.3		5.5	
Total Housing (2000)	5,709		192,945	
Total Housing Units (2015)	5,610		200,708	
Change: 2000-2015	-99	-1.7	7,763	4.0
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census				

The majority of the housing stock in Clark is single-family detached homes, typical of a suburban community. Single-family detached homes are dominant, at 76%, in Clark Township. Other housing types include townhouses, two-family homes, multi-family houses and apartments, but are very limited. The Township differs from the County, which offers a more diverse housing stock mix to meet the needs of its residents, including single-family detached houses, two-family homes, multi-family homes and apartments

As mentioned earlier, the age of the housing stock is usually considered the most reliable indicator of housing conditions. Other indicators of housing condition — including lack of complete plumbing facilities, kitchen facilities and overcrowding- are not a problem within the Township. The County, however, has a larger old housing stock with approximately 6 percent suffering from overcrowded conditions and another 1.7% lacking complete kitchen and plumbing facilities. Table 5e & 5f display information that indicates substandard housing conditions.

Table 5e Housing Unit Data - 2000

Clark Township and Union County

Year 2000 Number of Units	Clark Township		Union County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Built before 1940	366	6.4	50,346	26.1
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	8	0.1	1,465	0.8
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	8	0.1	1,628	0.9
No telephone service	19	0.3	3,962	2.1
More than 1.0 persons per room 25		0.4	12,504	6.72
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2000				

Table 5f Housing Unit Data - 2015

Clark Township and Union County

Year 2015 Number of Units	Clark Township		Union County	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Built before 1940	315	5.5	45,2795	22.6
Lacking complete plumbing facilities	0	0	1,033	0.6
Lacking complete kitchen facilities	0	0	2,015	1.1
No telephone service	46	0.8	3,164	1.7
More than 1.0 persons per room62		1.1	10,917	5.9
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2015				

D.6 INCOME

Clark Township is a prosperous community with a median household income in 2015 at \$90,956 which is approximately \$18,000 higher than the state figure. Union County as a whole has a median household income and per capita income approximately equal to the State. The 2015 per capita income of the Township's residents, at \$41,459 is higher than the County as well as the State's per capita income.

Table 6 Income Data - 1989 - 2015

Clark Township, Union County and New Jersey

	Clark Township	Union County	New Jersey
1989 Median Household Income	\$50,095	\$41,791	\$40,927
1999 Median Household Income	\$65,019	\$55,339	\$55,146
2015 Median Household Income	\$90,956	\$69,594	\$72,093
1989 Per Capita Personal Income	\$20,422	\$19,660	\$18,714
1999 Per Capita Personal Income	\$29,883	\$26,992	\$27,006
2015 Per Capita Personal Income	\$41,459	\$35,308	\$36,582
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000, 2015			

D.7 HOUSING VALUES

The Township of Clark had a relatively affordable housing stock in 2000, with approximately 79 percent of its housing unit values falling in the range of \$150,000-\$299,999. Table 10 details the owner-occupied housing unit values in 2000. The 2000 US Census data indicates that the median housing value in Clark was \$217,500, which was \$28,700 more than the County's median housing value of \$188,800. The home sale market has changed in northern and central New Jersey towns between 2000 and 2003. The 2003 data indicates that the average home sales price in Clark was \$311,670, which was \$86,278 more than the average sales price in 2000, representing an increase of 38.3% in three years.

Table 7a Housing Values - 2000 - 2015

Clark Township

Clark Township	Clark Township 2000		Clark Township 2015	
Value Range	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$50,000	0	0.0	110	2.5
\$50,000 to \$99,999	32	0.7	62	1.4
\$100,000 to \$149,999	307	6.9	53	1.2
\$150,000 to \$199,999	1,466	32.9	68	1.5
\$200,000 to \$299,999	2030	45.6	396	8.9
\$300,000 to \$499,999	610	13.7	2737	61.4
\$500,000 to \$999,999	5	0.1	1,003	22.5
\$ 1,000,000 or more	0	0.0	31	0.7
Median (dollars)	217,500		412,600	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000, 2015

Table 7b Housing Values - 2000 - 2015

Union County

Union County	Union County 2000		Union County 2015	
Value Range	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than \$50,000	666	0.7	2,343	2.1
\$50,000 to \$99,999	4,849	5.0	1,283	1.2
\$100,000 to \$149,999	21,352	22.0	3,601	3.3
\$150,000 to \$199,999	26,728	27.6	9,382	27.6
\$200,000 to \$299,999	22,869	23.6	26,878	24.4
\$300,000 to \$499,999	14,807	15.3	390758	36.1
\$500,000 to \$999,999	4,981	5.1	21,998	20.0
\$ 1,000,000 or more	736	0.8	4,749	4.3
Median (dollars)	188,800		345,500	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census 2000, 2015

D.8 HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Housing affordability remains a problem with certain segments of Clark's population. Cost-burdened households are defined as households that spend more than 30 percent of their income on housing related costs. The Township of Clark and Union County follow similar traits for homeowner and renter cost burdens. For both, the Township as well as the County, renter households share greater cost burden than homeowners. As indicated in Table 10a, housing costs are a problem for approximately 28% of the homeowner households and 34% of renter households in the Township. Housing costs are a problem for 56% of the renters in the County, which is much higher compared to the Township.

Table 8a Housing Affordability - 2000 - 2015

Clark Township

Clark Township	Clark - 2000		Clark - 2015	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Monthly Owner Costs as a Percent of Household Income				
Less than 15 percent	1,208	27.0	596	35.8
15 to 19 percent	586	13.1	285	17.1
20 to 24 percent	819	18.3	156	9.4
25 to 29 percent	481	10.7	178	10.7
30 to 34 percent	366	8.2	39	2.3
35 percent or more	966	21.6	409	24.6
Not computed	24	0.5	21	0.4
Cost burdened households	1332	29.7	448	27.9
Gross Rent as a Percentage of Income				
Less than 15 percent	137	13.1	160	14.8
15 to 19 percent	263	25.1	162	14.9
20 to 24 percent	149	14.2	96	8.9
25 to 29 percent	74	7.1	110	10.1
30 to 34 percent	56	5.3	74	6.8
35 percent or more	299	28.6	482	44.5
Not computed	69	6.6	66	6.3
Cost burdened households	355	33.9	559	51.3
Median Gross Rent (1999)	\$941		\$1276	
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census				

Table 8b Housing Affordability - 2000 - 2015

Union County

Union County	Union County 2000		Union County 2015	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Monthly Owner Costs as a Percent of Household Income				
Less than 15 percent	27,416	28.3		
15 to 19 percent	15,814	16.3	21,140	27.7
20 to 24 percent	14,766	15.2	10,919	14.3
25 to 29 percent	10,783	11.1	9,016	11.8
30 to 34 percent	7,346	7.6	7,347	9.6
35 percent or more	20,390	21.0	27,985	36.6
Not computed	473		386	
Cost burdened households	27,736	28.6	35,332	46.2
Gross Rent as a Percentage of Household				
Less than 15 percent	13,711	19.2	7,687	10.5
15 to 19 percent	11,009	15.4	8,163	11.2
20 to 24 percent	9,327	13.1	8,488	11.6
25 to 29 percent	7,699	10.8	8,013	11.0
30 to 34 percent	5,307	7.4	6,342	8.7
35 percent or more	20,789	29.1	34,234	46.9
Not computed	3,565	5.0	3,256	
Cost burdened households	26,096	36.5	37,490	55.6
Median Gross Rent (1999)	\$752		\$1,174	
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census				

The 2015 median gross rent in Clark was \$1,246, which was \$72 more than the County's median gross rent of \$1,174. The median room per housing unit is higher in the Township, averaging at 6.3 rooms per unit compared to the County's median of 5.5. The higher median house value as well as the median gross rents can be associated with the suburban character of Clark as well as the larger size of homes.

D.9 EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

Covered employment in the Township has fluctuated over the past fifteen years, registering a high of 7,889 jobs in 2015 and a low of 6,474 jobs in 2002. Between 2000 and 2015 the Township gained 133 jobs. The lack of forward progress after the economic downturn after September 2001, as well as the lingering effects of the Great Recession, the lack of real progress in employment is not surprising. There was in total a 10.5% increase in employment between 2000 and 2015.

The County has experienced much better employment trends than the Township. The County's employment rate grew 33.6% in the period from 2000 to 2015, while suffering from the same economic storms as the Township.

Table 9a Covered Private Sector Employment

Clark Township

Year	Number of Jobs	Average change	Average Percent Change
2000	7,756		
2001	7,484	-272	-3.51
2002	6,474	-1,010	-13.5
2003	6,779	305	4.71
2004	7,134	355	5.23
2015	7,889	755	10.5

Table 9b Covered Private Sector Employment

Union County

Year	Number of Jobs	Average change	Average Percent Change
2000	209,558		
2001	206,448	-3,070	-1.46
2002	202,267	-4,221	-2.04
2003	210,031	3,543	1.75
2004	200,328	-1,939	-0.96
2015	267,803	67,475	33.6

Source: NJ Dept. of Labor, US Census Bureau

D.10 LABOR FORCE CHARACTERISTICS

Clark Township residents are employed in a variety of occupations. Over 42% of the Township's employees work in management, professional and related occupations, followed closely by 26% of the employee population working in sales and office positions. The remaining labor force is engaged in service occupations (14.5%), production/transportation/material moving occupations (8.3%), and construction/extraction/maintenance occupations (8.3%). Although at different percentages, the employment characteristics in Clark follow the proportions of occupations of Union County. The Township has a larger number of workers in the management, professional & related occupations than the County.

Table 12 also identifies the class of workers found in Clark Township and Union County. As expected, the largest sector of workers for both the Township and the County are in the private sector, representing 72.7 percent and 86.6 percent, respectively. Government is the second highest employee class for both the Township and the County. However, the Township at 23.6% has a higher percentage of Government employees than the County, which is at 13.4%. Clark Township has no unpaid family workers.

The Township of Clark's commutation patterns generally follow the same trend as Union County as a whole. Approximately 85% of the Township's labor force drives alone to work, 4.1% carpool and 6.4% use public transport. Nearly 2% of the Township's population work at home. In the County, 69% of the workforce drives to work, 7.7% carpool while approximately 10.5% use public transport. The County's labor force uses public transport and ridesharing at a much higher rate than the Township's labor force. Union County has seen an increase in work from home employees while the Township has seen a decrease.

Table 10a Labor Force Characteristics

Clark Township

Occupation	Clark 2000		Clark 2015	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Management, professional, & related	2,572	37.0	3,379	42.8
Service	749	10.8	1,140	14.5
Sales and office occupations	2,402	34.5	2,067	26.2
Farming, fishing, & forestry	0.0	0.0	1	0.0
Construction, extraction, & maintenance	596	8.6	652	8.3
Production, transportation, & material moving	636	9.1	651	8.3
Class of Worker				
Private wage and salary workers	5,564	80.0	5,732	72.7
Government workers	1,021	14.7	1,859	23.6
Self-employed workers	370	5.3	263	3.3
Unpaid family workers	0	0.0	35	0.4
Commuting to Work				
Drove alone	5,860	86.1	6,562	85.5
Carpooled	436	6.4	315	4.1
Public transportation	265	3.9	492	6.4
Walked	30	0.4	64	0.8
Other means	5	0.1	83	1.1
Worked at home	210	3.1	160	2.1
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	24.3		28.6	
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census				

Table 10b Labor Force Characteristics

Union County

Occupation	Union County 2000		Union County 2015	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Management, professional, & related	86,482	35.4	96,333	35.9
Service	32,436	13.3	46,790	17.4
Sales and office occupations	69,268	28.4	65,913	24.6
Farming, fishing, & forestry	141	0.1	229	0.0
Construction, extraction, & maintenance	18,555	7.6	23,009	8.5
Production, transportation, & material moving	37,315	15.3	38,529	14.3
Class of Worker				
Private wage and salary workers	201,538	82.5	221,168	82.6
Government workers	31,341	12.8	35,841	13.4
Self-employed workers	10,906	4.5	10,462	3.9
Unpaid family workers	412	0.2	332	0.1
Commuting to Work				
Drove alone	169,325	71.0	180,385	69.0
Carpooled	27,686	11.6	20,233	7.7
Public transportation	25,294	10.6	27,348	10.5
Walked	7,729	3.2	8,382	3.2
Other means	2,880	1.2	15,336	5.9
Worked at home	5,692	2.4	9,604	3.7
Mean travel time to work (minutes)	28.7		30.7	
Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census				

E. Affordable Housing Obligation

The Township's affordable housing obligation is described in the following subsections.

E.1 REHABILITATION SHARE

The rehabilitation share is a measure of existing overcrowded and deficient housing that is occupied by low- and moderate-income households. Clark's rehabilitation share is 53 units as established by a settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center that was approved by the Court.

E.2 PRIOR ROUND OBLIGATION

The prior round obligation covers the period from 1987 through 1999. The Township's prior round obligation is 93 units, as specified by COAH and acknowledged by Fair Share Housing Center.

E.3 THIRD ROUND OBLIGATION

The third round obligation is a measure of the Township's share of the existing and anticipated need for new housing units for low- and moderate-income households formed within the housing region in which Clark lies between the years 1999 and 2025. The Township's third round obligation is 170 units as established by a settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center that was approved by the Court.

Based on the above, the Township's total new construction obligation is 263 units (Prior Round Obligation of 93 + Third Round Obligation of 170 = 263). The Fair Share Plan is designed to address the entire 263 unit obligation.

E.4 ABILITY TO ACCOMMODATE AFFORDABLE HOUSING OBLIGATION

Clark anticipates that future development and growth will predominantly be limited to redevelopment activity (incl., reconstruction of existing housing, converting former retail and industrial sites), as well as infill development and expansions as may be permitted under the Township's zone plan.

E.5 ANTICIPATED LAND USE PATTERNS

Clark is a developed community. The anticipated land use pattern is expected to be consistent with the adopted land use plan and zone plan of the Township.

E.6 AVAILABILITY OF EXISTING AND PLANNED INFRASTRUCTURE

The Township is a fully developed community in State Planning Area I and has a developed infrastructure. Water and sewer service are available within the Township.

E.7 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICIES

The municipal Master Plan articulates the economic goals, objectives and development policies of the Township.

E.8 CONSTRAINTS ON DEVELOPMENT

The Township of Clark is fully developed with a very small amount of vacant developable space.

E.9 IDENTIFICATION OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING SITES

The Township has identified sites for the production of affordable housing to meet its prior round obligation and prospective need obligation (including the RDP and unmet need) for affordable housing.

Ten sites have been proposed for inclusionary zoning that would allow the development of high density multifamily housing in order to meet the obligation. The sites, along with specific details on how each site can be developed, have been identified in the chart titled - "Summary of Proposed Fair Share Plan." Each site has also been identified by a number which corresponds to the location on the map titled "Proposed Affordable Housing Sites." The chart and map are in the Fair Share Plan.

The proposed sites include: underutilized sites that have some vacant land; sites that would require demolition of existing buildings; infill sites; redevelopment sites as well as supportive and special needs group homes located throughout the Township. In the next section (F) details concerning the rezoning of these sites are given.

F. Land Use Plan Amendment

F.1 LAND USE PLAN AMENDMENT

This Land Use Plan Amendment is written to implement the Fair Share Plan of the Township by adding inclusive affordable housing as a principal use in a number of districts.

F.2 UPDATED GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The goals of this Amendment aim to: 1) preserve neighborhood character; 2) encourage housing diversity; and 3) create opportunities for very low, low and moderate income housing in fulfillment of the Township's constitutional obligation to satisfy its fair share of the regional need for affordable housing, consistent with all of the terms of its settlement with Fair Share Housing Center. This Reexamination effort is focused on these three goals. Specific recommendations related to Goals 1, 2 and 3 are outlined below.

Goal #1: Preserve the character of the Township's single-and two-family residential neighborhoods. Composed primarily of small-lot, single-family homes, these traditional neighborhoods are a significant component of the Township's appeal.

Objective:

Ensure that new infill development in these neighborhoods considers and respects the context (established scale and character) of surrounding homes as much as possible given available land use tools.

Goal #2: Continue to encourage housing diversity to accommodate the needs of people of various ages and income levels in the community, in accordance with State requirements and local/regional needs.

Objectives:

- a) Continue to implement the vision of the 2010 Master Plan Reexamination.
- b) Provide diverse housing opportunities to allow residents to downsize and age in place.
- c) Explore potential links from high density development in the DTV (Downtown Village) zone to train stations and transit hubs in nearby towns.
- d) Review the mixed-use and residential development standards in the DTV zone and the RA and RB(multifamily) zones to remove barriers to investment and provision of a variety of housing types to better serve the needs of empty nesters, young families and Millennials.
- e) Monitor implementation of the Township's Housing Element & Fair Share Plan.

Goal #3: Create opportunities for very low, low and moderate income housing in fulfillment of the Township's constitutional obligation to satisfy its fair share of the regional need for affordable housing, consistent with all of the terms of its settlement with Fair Share Housing Center.

Objective: Identify sites that are suitable, available, developable and approvable for inclusionary residential development and rezone such sites at densities that warrant requiring a set-aside of very low, low and moderate income housing.

F.3 RECOMMENDATIONS FOR LAND USE & DEVELOPMENT

Based on the goals and objectives discussed above, specific changes are being recommended for land use and development as part of this update and reexamination report. These recommendations are listed below in this document.

F.3.A Residential Zones

To achieve Goal #1, the Township has set reasonable standards for building dimensions and coverage that will continue to allow the construction of reasonably sized homes and additions to existing homes while limiting the type of out-of-scale homes that have compromised neighborhood character. The primary focus of this recommendation is the Township's single family residential Zones.

Residential building mass is a major concern. More specifically, residents and Township officials were concerned that infill development pressures were leading to the construction of new or expanded houses that were out-of-scale and/or out-of-character with existing neighborhoods. The potential for incongruent housing development remains a major issue and is often viewed as disruptive to the established character of many neighborhoods.

The Township encourages positive residential design elements and greater flexibility for homeowners to undertake additions to existing residences. The Township should continue to monitor the residential floor area provisions over time to balance the needs of homeowner investment with neighborhood character.

The Township has set reasonable standards for building dimensions and coverage that will continue to allow the construction of reasonably sized homes and additions to existing homes while limiting the type of out-of-scale homes that have compromised neighborhood character.

F.3.B. Inclusionary Zones

1. DTV Zone (Downtown Village)

To achieve Goal #3, the Township should adjust the principal permitted uses in the DTV zone to include mixed use commercial and inclusionary residential development with a required set-aside for affordable housing. Four story buildings will be allowed, with first floor retail and parking, a second floor of either commercial or residential uses and a third and fourth floor of residential uses. All residential development will be required to be inclusionary(i.e., require an affordable housing set-aside).

The DTV zone is the zone dedicated to developing a 'downtown' look and feel with higher buildings, setbacks closer to the street, and mixed use commercial and residential development.

The DTV (Downtown Village Zone) should be updated to reflect current market and design standards for mixed use inclusionary development. The existing DTV zoning policy only allows two and one half stories or 35 feet. The Township should consider the following recommendations:

- 1) Increasing the permitted height in the DTV from 2 1/2 stories to 4 stories.
- 2) Increase density to 32 units per acre.
- 3) Require inclusionary housing (20% in for-sale projects and 15% in rental developments) be provided within any new construction or reconstruction of any property in the zone.
- 4) Adjust bulk standards to promote the "look and feel" of a downtown.

The entire DTV zone along Westfield Avenue from the Rahway border west to beyond Brandt Avenue shall be included.

This includes:

Block 77; Lots 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 17, 18, 54.

Block 78; Lots 1, 2, 3, 4.

Block 81; Lots 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49.

Block 91; Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 5.01, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 34, 35, 36, 37.

Block 92; Lots 1, 2, 4, 7.

Block 105; Lots 1.01, 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 26.01.

Block 106; Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 7, 7, 7, 9, 11.

Block 116; Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

Block 117; Lots 1, 2, 3.01, 3.02, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

Block 122; Lots 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14.

Block 123; Lots 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.

Block 124; Lots 1, 2, 3, 4.

Block 131; Lot 24.

Block 133; Lots 13, 14, 15, 15.01.

2. RB - 16 Zone (Multiple Family Residential District)

As another way to achieve Goal 2, the Township should establish a new RB - 16 zone which will include several affordable housing sites. These sites, which are identified in the Fair Share Plan, are: Raritan Gas Station (Site #3), Westfield and Raritan (#4), Schieferstein Site (#5), and the Temple site at Walnut and Valley.

The existing R - B Multiple-Family Zone is an inclusionary development zone. The zone permits townhouse and garden apartment developments, at a density of eight (8) dwelling units per acre. This zone also requires setting aside twenty (20) percent of the total development for affordable housing.

The RB - 16 zone standards should be revised to allow:

Density increased to 16 units per acre.

Height increased to 40 feet.

The new RB - 16 zone will reflect the increased density.

These properties shall be included in the RB - 16 zone: Block 34 Lot 25; Block 63 Lots 45, 47, 49, 51; and Block 36 Lots 13, 14, 15.

3. RB - 20 Zone (Multiple Family Residential District)

Another new R-B zone - the RB - 20 zone should be implemented for the Walnut Site (also known as the Evening Realty site) at Walnut and Valley. This zone should be revised to allow three floors of inclusionary residential development at 20 units to the acre, with a height of 45 feet.

This zone shall include the following properties: Block 155, Lots 7 and 10.

Another property is also suited for the RB-20 zone - the Westfield and Terminal site. This is currently zoned CI but will be zoned RB-20. This site includes the property at Block 57 Lot 6.01.

4. R-SH (Age Restricted Senior Housing Overlay Zone)

This existing overlay district provides a location for senior housing development and currently includes Lots 2, 3, 4, 8 and 10 of Block 57.

This allowed the senior housing project to be developed away from the industrial uses on Terminal Avenue and adjacent to townhouses and single-family residential development across Featherbed Lane in the R400 zone.

The overlay district would be restructured to a by-right district for senior citizen multi-family housing with an inclusionary set aside requirement of twenty (20) percent. Senior citizen housing would be permitted at a density of 32 units per acre.

F.3.C. Noninclusionary Zoning Changes

1. R-TH (Residential Townhouse) to CI - (Commercial Industrial)

An area currently zoned R-TH Residential Townhouse should be placed in the C-I Commercial Industrial zone. Several properties at the northwest corner of the intersection of Featherbed Lane and Westfield Avenue are currently zoned R-TH. It was thought that these properties would serve as a transition from the industrial properties facing Terminal Avenue to the single-family homes on the south side of Westfield Avenue. Recently the industrial properties facing Terminal have received approval to expand their parking onto the R-TH zoned lots.

Given the commercial expansion, it makes sense to remove those properties from the R-TH zone and place them in the C-I zone so that the accessory parking areas will be conforming and in the same zone as the principal use.

Properties affected include: Lots 70, 71, 72, 73 and 74 in Block 60.

2. R-100 to R-TH (Residential Townhouse)

There are five existing single-family homes facing the north side of Westfield Avenue between the Garden State Parkway and Emerald Place, currently in the R-100 Residential District. Due to their isolation from other single-family residential properties to the west and north, their exposure to busy traffic on Westfield Avenue and their proximity to the Garden State Parkway to the east, and the municipal complex to the south, an alternative, transitional use would be more appropriate.

The purpose of the Townhouse Residential (R-TH) district is to permit moderate-density residential development that provides an appropriate transition between low-density residential uses and higher intensity uses.

Townhouses permitted at moderate densities (8 units per acre), would be an appropriate transitional use at this location.

This part of the R-TH District would include Block 68, Lots 26, 27, 28, 29, and 30.

ZONING DISTRICT MAP


LEGEND

ZONES

- CG GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
- CI COMMERCIAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
- NSI NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE COMMERCIAL DISTRICT
- CO COMMERCIAL OFFICE DISTRICT
- COH COMMERCIAL OFFICE, MULTI-STORY DISTRICT
- DTV DOWNTOWN VILLAGE DISTRICT
- GC GOLF COURSE DISTRICT
- LC LIGHT COMMERCIAL INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT
- O CONSERVATION DISTRICT
- P PUBLIC DISTRICT
- R-60 ONE-FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, 6,000 S.F.
- R-75 ONE-FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, 7,500 S.F.
- R-100 ONE-FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, 10,000 S.F.
- R-150 ONE-FAMILY DETACHED RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, 15,000 S.F.
- R-A MULTIPLE-FAMILY APARTMENT RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
- R-B MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
- RB-16 MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (16 UNITS/ACRE)
- RB-20 MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (20 UNITS/ACRE)
- R-TH RESIDENTIAL TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT
- R-SH AGE-RESTRICTED SENIOR HOUSING DISTRICT

OVERLAYS

- (COR) CORPORATE OFFICE RESEARCH OVERLAY DISTRICT



ZONING DISTRICT MAP
TOWNSHIP OF CLARK
 UNION COUNTY, NEW JERSEY
 SCALE: 1" = 600'
 MAY 5, 2005
 GEORGE ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, LLC
 1000 W. 10TH STREET, SUITE 200
 NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08901
 PREPARED FOR THE TOWNSHIP OF CLARK

NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	05/05/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
2	05/12/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
3	05/19/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
4	05/26/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
5	06/02/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
6	06/09/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
7	06/16/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
8	06/23/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
9	06/30/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
10	07/07/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
11	07/14/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
12	07/21/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
13	07/28/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
14	08/04/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
15	08/11/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
16	08/18/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
17	08/25/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
18	09/01/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
19	09/08/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
20	09/15/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
21	09/22/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
22	09/29/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
23	10/06/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
24	10/13/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
25	10/20/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
26	10/27/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
27	11/03/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
28	11/10/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
29	11/17/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
30	11/24/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
31	12/01/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
32	12/08/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
33	12/15/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
34	12/22/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
35	12/29/05	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
36	01/05/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
37	01/12/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
38	01/19/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
39	01/26/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
40	02/02/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
41	02/09/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
42	02/16/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
43	02/23/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
44	03/01/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
45	03/08/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
46	03/15/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
47	03/22/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
48	03/29/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
49	04/05/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
50	04/12/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
51	04/19/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
52	04/26/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
53	05/03/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
54	05/10/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
55	05/17/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
56	05/24/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
57	06/01/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
58	06/08/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
59	06/15/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
60	06/22/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
61	06/29/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
62	07/06/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
63	07/13/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
64	07/20/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
65	07/27/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
66	08/03/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
67	08/10/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
68	08/17/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
69	08/24/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
70	08/31/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
71	09/07/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
72	09/14/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
73	09/21/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
74	09/28/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
75	10/05/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
76	10/12/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
77	10/19/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
78	10/26/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
79	11/02/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
80	11/09/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
81	11/16/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
82	11/23/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
83	11/30/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
84	12/07/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
85	12/14/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
86	12/21/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
87	12/28/06	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
88	01/04/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
89	01/11/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
90	01/18/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
91	01/25/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
92	02/01/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
93	02/08/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
94	02/15/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
95	02/22/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
96	02/29/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
97	03/06/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
98	03/13/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
99	03/20/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT
100	03/27/07	ISSUED FOR PUBLIC COMMENT

TOWNSHIP OF CLARK

Union County, New Jersey



REVISED FAIR SHARE PLAN

Adopted by:
Township of Clark Planning Board
September 7, 2017

FAIR SHARE PLAN

Township of Clark
Union County, New Jersey

September 7, 2017

The Original of This Report Was Signed and Sealed
In Accordance With N.J.S.A. 45:14a-12

Kevin O'Brien

Kevin O'Brien, P.P., A.I.C.P.
Shamrock Enterprises, Ltd.
NJ License #5348

Richard O'Connor

Richard O'Connor, P.E., P.P., C.M.E.
Grotto Engineering Associates, LLC
NJ License #33029

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Planning Board gives thanks to the selfless volunteers and staff who contribute so much to the Township:

MAYOR

Sal Bonaccorso

COUNCIL

President Angel Albanese

Vice President Alvin Barr

Steven Hund

Frank Mazzearella

Patrick O'Connor

William Smith

Brian Toal

PLANNING BOARD

Chairman Michael Kurzawski

Vice Chairman, Kevin Koch

Class I Member, Mayor Sal Bonaccorso

Class II Member, John Laezza

Class III Member, Councilman Frank Mazzearella

Class IV Member, Michael Altmann

Class IV Member, Matthew Casey

Class IV Member, Robert Tarantino

Class IV Members, Michael Triola

Alternate I, George Olear

Alternate II, Michael Bonaccorso

Chief Frank Cerasa, Fire Dept. Rep.

PO Brian Pereira, Police Dept. Rep.

STAFF

John Laezza, Business Administrator

Edie Merkel, Township Clerk

Joseph Triarsi, Township Attorney

Richard O'Connor, P.E., Township Engineer

Donna Mazzucco, Planning Board Secretary

Kelly Carey, Esq., Planning Board Attorney

Kevin O'Brien, P.P., Township Planner

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Introduction.....	5
B. Plan Purpose and Goals.....	5
C. Determination of Housing Need	5
D. Municipal Options for Providing Affordable Housing	6
E. Bonus Credits.....	6
F. Clark Township Affordable Housing History	7
G. Affordable Housing Sites	8
1. Woodcrest at Clark.....	9
2. Westfield and Terminal.....	9
3. Raritan Gas Station.....	10
4. Westfield and Raritan.....	11
5. Schieferstein Site	12
6. Jack's Tavern	13
7. A & P Site.....	13
8. Downtown Village District.....	13
9. Walnut Site.....	15
10. Group Homes.....	16
Chart Summary of Proposed Fair Share Plan.....	17
Map of All Proposed Affordable Housing Sites	18

A. Introduction

This Fair Share Plan uses the methodology for determining a municipality's affordable housing obligation identified in the Second Round and Third Round Rules as determined by the Supreme Court and relies on the most recent housing and socioeconomic data available.

B. Plan Purpose and Goals

This Fair Share Plan will describe specific projects, programs, strategies and funding sources to meet the Township's affordable housing obligation, while also complying with COAH's Second Round Rules for substantive certification and the Fair Housing Act. The overriding goal of this Fair Share Plan is to provide a framework for the Township of Clark to take affirmative steps towards providing a realistic opportunity to achieve its fair share of the present and prospective regional need for low and moderate-income housing.

C. Determination of Housing Need

The Township has based its fair share obligation on the methodology provided in the May 16, 2016 report "New Jersey Low and Moderate Income Housing Obligations for 1999-2025 Calculated Using the NJ COAH Prior Round (1987-1999) Methodology," prepared by David N. Kinsey, PhD, FAICP, PP for Fair Share Housing Center (hereafter, the "Kinsey Report"). Kinsey reported a prior round obligation of 93, a rehabilitation share of 53, and a third round obligation of 243 for a total of 389 affordable units (a 336 new construction obligation and a 53 unit rehabilitation share). During the course of mediation, the Township and Fair Share Housing Center agreed to settle on 170 units as the Township's third round obligation, a 30 percent reduction in the 243 units calculated by Dr. Kinsey.. This agreement reduced the Township's combined prior round and third round obligations to a total of 263 new units, with a 53 unit rehabilitation share.

D. Municipal Options for Providing Affordable Housing

The Prior Round Rules allowed municipalities to address their affordable housing obligations through a variety of mechanisms. A municipality may meet its rehabilitation share either through a rehabilitation program or by creating new units, or both.

According to the New Jersey Supreme Court's March 10, 2015, decision (In re N.J.A.C. 5:96 and N.J.A.C. 5:97), a municipality may address its third round fair share obligation, through a combination of techniques, including, but not necessarily limited to: municipally sponsored construction, inclusionary zoning, alternative living arrangements, the creation of accessory apartments, age restricted housing, extensions of expiring affordability controls, rehabilitation of existing homes, and redevelopment.

The Court also allowed municipalities some discretion in proposing innovative affordable housing techniques that create a realistic opportunity for meeting the fair share obligation.

Clark Township will be using inclusionary zoning to provide affordable housing. It will also contribute to the purchase of group homes for the developmentally disabled. Clark will also create the Clark Home Improvement Program (CHIP). The CHIP was created by the Township to assist properties occupied by very low, low and moderate income households to correct all existing interior and exterior health, safety and code violations in conformity with current standards.

E. Bonus Credits

Pursuant to Clark's settlement agreement with Fair Share Housing Center, the Township will be entitled to claim rental bonus credits for eligible rental units up to the amount of the rental obligation (25 percent of the fair share obligation), as provided at N.J.A.C. 5:93.

F. Clark Township Affordable Housing History

Clark Township received first round substantive certification on September 4, 1991. Due to insufficient vacant land, the Township received a vacant land adjustment and established a realistic development potential (RDP) of 23 units. Clark addressed its 23-unit RDP in its first round through zoning for 42 affordable units on four sites determined to be suitable for that purpose. The Township revised its Ordinance to accommodate the newly created R-B District-Multi-family Residential, which required twenty (20) percent of the total development to be set aside for low and moderate income households. Clark Township's Planning Board adopted a housing element and fair share plan on September 2, 1997, which addressed its 12-year cumulative obligation. The Township filed the plan with COAH on September 4, 1997 but did not petition at that time. COAH received Clark's resolution of petition on August 23, 1999. Three days later, the Township published a notice in The Star Ledger. No objections were received by COAH. On March 28, 2000, COAH issued a report requesting additional information from the Township. Subsequently, the Planning Board adopted an amended housing element and fair share plan on February 12, 2001. The governing body approved a resolution endorsing the plan and re-petitioned COAH for substantive certification on March 1, 2001. The Township re-published a notice in The Star Ledger and, again, no objections were received by COAH.

The Planning Board adopted a third amendment to its housing plan on December 11, 2001 and re-petitioned COAH for substantive certification on December 17, 2001. On publishing a notice, COAH received two objections during the 45-day objection period. Mediation led to an agreement with Clark Developers to rezone Block 58/Lot 4 as an age-restricted affordable housing overlay zone permitting a maximum of 328 units with a 20 percent set aside for affordable housing. As a result of the agreement, the Planning Board adopted and amended the housing element and fair share plan for the fourth time on August 24, 2004. Clark re-petitioned on September 13, 2004, with the only changes being the inclusion of the age-restricted overlay zoning on the Clark Developers property and an increase in permitted density on Block 57/Lot 1.

The Planning Board had adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan on March 12, 2009 addressing the prior round and third round fair share obligations, as they were understood to be at that time. Due to the failure of the Council on Affordable Housing to adopt valid third round Rules, this plan was never certified.

G. Affordable Housing Sites

Clark Township has proposed ten sites for inclusionary zoning that would allow the development of high density multifamily housing in order to meet Clark's Fair Share Plan. The sites, along with specific details on how each site can be developed, have been identified in the chart titled - "Summary of Proposed Fair Share Plan." Each site has also been identified by a number which corresponds to the location on the map titled "Proposed Affordable Housing Sites." The chart and map are in the back of this document. No other sites were proposed by developers. The Township diligently reviewed all proposals and included them in the list below.


Below is a description of each of the ten sites, which are keyed to the number on the accompanying Township wide map and chart.

1. Woodcrest at Clark

This site is in the R-SH Age Restricted/Senior Housing Overlay. This is situated on Westfield Avenue at Terminal Avenue and has previously been called the Clark Developer's Site. This project consists of properties on Block 57, Lots 2, 3, 4, 8, and 10. The zone requires a 20% set aside for low and moderate income households of 55 years and over. The zone allows a density of 32 units an acre and has 328 units of age restricted housing, including 65 affordable units. Every unit is handicapped accessible.


2. Westfield and Terminal

The Westfield Avenue and Terminal Avenue site (Block 57 Lot 6.01) is one parcel between Woodcrest and the Clark Nursing Home. It is currently an industrial property. It will be included in the RB-20 zone, allowing a density of 20 units per acre. This would allow 23 total units, including 5 affordable units.



3. Raritan Gas Station

The Raritan Gas Station Site (Block 34, Lot 25) is currently vacant and previously had a gasoline station on the property. With .8 acres and a development density of 16 units per acre this site could accommodate 12 units including 2 affordable units. The site is one property away from the intersection of Madison Hill Road, with an intervening dentist's office. Another commercial building is on the western side, with single family homes to the rear.



4. Westfield and Raritan

The Westfield and Raritan Site (Block 63, Lots 45, 47, 49, 51) has one vacant property, another with a vacant and uninhabitable home, both of which face Raritan Road. There is also a home facing Westfield Avenue. A bank is located on the corner of Raritan and Westfield, which is surrounded by the proposed site. The Westfield Avenue property could provide access from that street. If developed at 16 units per acre the 2.5 acre site could accommodate 40 housing units, including 6 affordable units. The 16 unit per acre density is justified by the surrounding commercial properties and the high traffic streets.



5. Schieferstein Site

The Schieferstein Site (Block 36, Lots 13, 14, 15) on Madison Hill Road between Rainbow Drive and Amelia Drive is 4.5 acres. It is currently zoned R-B Multi Family which allows 8 units per acre. Using a density of 16 units per acre the site would accommodate 72 units, including 11 affordable.



6. Jack's Tavern

The Jack's Tavern site (Block 77 Lots 11 - 15, 17, 18) formerly had a building with a tavern and a Laundromat which has been razed. Several other buildings and uses currently exist: a vacant diner, an auto parts and repair facility, a residence used for the auto parts business, and a commercial building. If all of the properties at this 1.8 acre site were bundled together and redeveloped into housing, 58 housing units could be placed here including 9 affordable units. Density of 32 per acre would be appropriate given the commercial nature of Westfield Avenue and the nearby retail that would be supported by additional housing.

The higher density is also justified by allowing 4 story buildings, with retail and parking on the first floor, either residential or office uses on the second floor and residential uses on the third and fourth floors. All residential development shall be inclusionary (i.e., shall have an affordable housing set-aside requirement, as set forth in the Summary of Proposed Fair Share Plan).

7. A & P Site


The former A & P site of 3.6 acres takes up an entire block at the south end of the DTV - Downtown Village Zone and the Westfield Avenue corridor near the border with the City of Rahway. The block has been improved with commercial and residential buildings. The residences are nonconforming in the DTV zone. Two very recent developments on this block include the new 7 - 11 convenience store at Westfield and Lincoln, and the newly renovated Investors Bank at Westfield and Joseph. These will be excluded from this site since they are recent and contribute to the Downtown Village. They will also support new housing and residents by providing needed services. The rest of the block will be placed in the affordable housing zone which would allow three stories of residential above one level of commercial and parking for a total of four stories, with a required 15 percent set aside, assuming that all of the affordable units will be rental units, and a permitted residential density of 32 units per acre. The density of 32 units an acre is justified by the downtown nature of the area and the wide extent of commercial buildings in the Westfield Avenue corridor. This block can accommodate 116 housing units, including 18 affordable. This site would also allow four story buildings, with first floor parking and retail, and second, third and fourth floor residential.

8. Downtown Village District

The DTV (Downtown Village) District is a zone district that runs along Westfield Avenue from Madison Hill west to beyond Brandt Avenue. The entire zone district of 20.9 acres will be an affordable housing zone that allows up to four stories, where 2.5 stories are currently allowed. This zone excludes the two large partly vacant sites discussed elsewhere - The Jack's Tavern site and the A & P site (sites 6 and 7 above).


The DTV District will consist of retail and commercial first floors, with either commercial or residential second floors and residential third and fourth floors. All residential development will be inclusionary (i.e. require an affordable housing set-aside, as set forth in the Summary of Proposed Fair Share Plan). At 32 units to the acre, 668 total units, including 101 affordable units, could be built in this District.

Map of Sites 6, 7, and 8.



9. Walnut Site

The Walnut Site (Block 177 Lots 7, 10), an 8.26 acre site at the corner of Valley Road and Walnut Avenue will be zoned for inclusionary residential development at a density of 20 units per acre, yielding 168 housing units, of which 27 units will be affordable. The Walnut site is also known as the Evening Realty site, but will be referred to as the Walnut site in this and other Township documents.



10. Group Homes

Clark Township has a total of three group homes, all run by the Arc of Union County. Two of the three-bedroom group homes were counted in the prior round. One is located on Union County Parkway and the other on Oak Ridge Road. An additional three-bedroom group home has been opened recently.

Clark Township is proud of its continued partnership with the Arc of Union County and has had recent correspondence with the Arc concerning additional group homes. The Township will assist the Arc in providing up to three additional three-bedroom group homes within the Township.

This strategy will result in nine units of affordable housing plus nine rental bonuses.

Clark Township -- Summary of Proposed Fair Share Plan

Prior Round Obligation	93
Third Round Obligation Per Settlement	170
Total	263
Rental Obligation	66
Maximum Rental Bonus	66
Maximum Age-Restricted Housing	65

Map #	Site Name	Block/Lot	Total Area (acres)	Proposed Density	Total Units	Setaside %	Total Affordable Units	Rental/For Sale	Very Low Units pre-2008	Very Low & Moderate Units
1	Woodcrest at Clark (A/R) (1) (2)	57/2, 3, 4, 8, 10	11.36	32	328	20%	65	Rental	33	32
2	Westfield and Terminal	57/6.01	1.17	20	23	20%	5	Rental	3	2
3	Raritan Gas Station	34/25	0.8	16	12	15%	2	Rental	1	1
4	Westfield and Raritan (2)	63/45, 47, 49, 51	2.56	16	40	15%	6	Rental	3	3
5	Schieferstein Site	36/13, 14, 15	4.56	16	72	15%	11	Rental	1	5
6	Jack's Tavern (DTV)	77/11-15, 17, 18	1.84	32	58	15%	9	Rental	1	4
7	A&P Site (DTV) (2)	105/2, 6, 8, 13-16, 19-22, 26.01	3.65	32	116	15%	18	Rental	2	9
8	DTV (Downtown Village District) (2)	Entire District Excluding #68.7	20.9	32	668	15%	101	Rental	13	50
9	Walnut Site	155/7, 10	8.28	20	168	16%	27	Rental	4	13
	Group Homes	various			9		9	Rental	9	0
	Rental Bonus Credits (see below)	various					63			
	Totals				1,494		316		33	119

Low and Moderate Income Split and Very Low Income Units

Minimum Low Income Units Required	127	Proposed	134
Maximum Moderate Income Units Required	126	Proposed	119
Minimum Very Low Income Units Required	33	Proposed	33
Total Very Low Income Units Constructed	9		
Remaining Very Low Income Units to be Built	24		

Rental Bonus Credits

Maximum Rental Bonus = 66	
Site Name	Total Rental Bonus Credits
Group Homes	9
Schieferstein Site	11
Walnut Site	27
Jack's Tavern	9
Raritan Gas Station	2
Westfield and Terminal	5
Total	63

NOTES (1) Woodcrest at Clark contains 66 total affordable units, with 65 eligible for credit
 (2) Excluded from calculation of Rental Bonus Credit

KOB V14.082917

Township of Clark Fair Share Plan, September 7, 2017

**Summary of Fair Share Plan
Proposed Affordable Housing Sites**
Township of Clark
Union County, NJ
April 2017



Township of Clark Fair Share Plan, September 7, 2017