

Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment • Corporation for Supportive Housing • Fair Share Housing Center • 8 Habitat for Humanity Chapters • Housing and Community Development Network of NJ • Lutheran Office of Governmental Ministry • NAACP New Jersey State Conference • New Jersey Regional Coalition • Supportive Housing Association

**COAH SHOULD BE REPLACED WITH AN EFFECTIVE SYSTEM
THAT PRODUCES HOMES NEAR JOBS AND TRANSIT**

June 15, 2010 - Trenton, New Jersey- A wide range of civil rights, environmental, housing, religious, and supportive housing and special needs groups called on the Legislature to replace COAH with a strategy that will actually produce more homes near jobs and transit, instead of adopting the deeply flawed S-1.

The groups laid out the following policies:

- **Produce more homes than COAH – not fewer like S-1.** COAH has produced over 40,000 homes since 1986. That is not enough to meet the state's housing needs. Our plan would have produced more than double what COAH has produced. S-1 would have produced far fewer homes – about one-eighth of what COAH produced — especially because S-1 allows a \$10,000 payment instead of building housing.
- **A more transparent and simpler process – not a new COAH under a different name.** Basic rules should be established by legislative change and enforced. S-1 encourages towns to go through a process of submitting paper plans to be reviewed by DCA — similar to today's COAH process under a different name.
- **Homes in the right places.** S-1 would encourage sprawl development and discourage reuse and infill development, by making rural municipalities the most susceptible to builders' proposals. Instead, the proposal unveiled today would limit development in environmentally sensitive areas while encouraging reuse of existing developed land.
- **Recognize towns that are already diverse.** S-1 requires towns that are already racially and economically diverse, like Pennsauken and South Orange, to do more. We propose that towns should be "inclusionary" based on their existing affordability — not based on arbitrary criteria.

A more detailed comparison chart between S-1 and our proposal is attached.

Kelly Francis of the NAACP New Jersey State Conference and Camden County NAACP stated "We need to move forward in replacing COAH — not backward with S-1, which would be a de facto Jim Crow law."

Jeff Tittel, Sierra Club director, said that "We need a replacement for COAH that encourages new development in New Jersey through reusing shopping centers and office parks. S-1 puts a bulls eye on rural and environmentally sensitive areas like the Highlands and Pinelands."

David Zurheide, Executive Director of Newark Habitat for Humanity, said "Any replacement for COAH should make it easier for groups like Habitat for Humanity to build — S-1 makes it harder."

Alison Recca-Ryan, Executive Director of the Corporation for Supportive Housing, said “We can do better than COAH at encouraging supportive housing for people with special needs, but S-1 does worse.”

#

Press Conference, 6/15/2010
Speakers' Contact Information

1. David Zurheide, Habitat for Humanity, Newark Chapter, [973-624-3330](tel:973-624-3330) ext. 302
2. Kelly Francis, NAACP New Jersey State Conference and President, Camden County Branch NAACP, (609) 980-3692
3. Jeff Tittel, Sierra Club, NJ Chapter, (609) 558-9100
4. Allison Recca-Ryan, Corporation for Supportive Housing, (609) 392-7820
5. Brad Kennedy, Supportive Housing Association, (908) 879-2243
6. Judy Remington, Coalition for Affordable Housing and the Environment, (609) 456-1444
7. Nicole Plett, New Jersey Regional Coalition, (609) 915-8759
8. Dianne Brake, PlanSmart NJ, (609)393-9434

#

A comparison: our COAH reform proposal vs. S-1

<u>What's wrong with S-1</u>	<u>A better approach</u>
<p>Unfair distinctions among towns: Criteria for which towns are “inclusionary” that have nothing to do with what’s actually affordable.</p>	<p>Reward towns that have done a good job: Focus on a real and reliable measure of affordability and a town’s economic diversity — such as % of children on free and reduced price school lunch – and actual production of affordable units.</p>
<p>S-1 would have done less than COAH: S-1 would have produced a total of only \$767 million of investment in affordable housing, all through minor rehabilitation. COAH has resulted in over \$6 billion of investment and over 40,000 new homes, in addition to tens of thousands of homes rehabilitated.</p>	<p>Do more than COAH: Our plan, if it had been in place since 1986, would have produced over twice as much investment and as many homes as COAH – over \$12 billion in investment and over 80,000 homes.</p>
<p>S-1 won’t produce homes: 10% set-aside requirement can be met with a \$10,000 payment.</p>	<p>Make it work: Real requirement that every development in New Jersey should have a set-aside that results in homes with long term affordability for low- and moderate-income people.</p>
<p>Environmentally destructive: Relies too heavily on vacant, undeveloped land in rural areas</p>	<p>Focus on growth in the right places: Focus on reuse of existing developed land and infill while also requiring stronger environmental protections.</p>
<p>Too much bureaucracy: Focused too much on paper plans (similar to current COAH system) that do not actually produce housing.</p>	<p>Allowing the housing market to work: Stop the focus on developing paper plans. Instead require land use policies at the municipal level that actually produce homes through a wide range of alternatives, including special needs housing, Habitat for Humanity, and other innovative approaches.</p>
<p>No funding going forward for cities or anywhere else</p>	<p>Restore 2.5% non-residential development fee in June 2011, with local opt-out allowed.</p>