

### III. POPULATION AND HOUSING ANALYSIS

#### INTRODUCTION

National and statewide trends and pressures underlie many of the demographic shifts and changes which affect local counties and towns. Studies of these broad trends indicate that New Jersey and its constituent municipalities must consider new circumstances in their land use policy and decisions. Some key demographic factors which are anticipated to affect New Jersey and its local communities in the post-millennium era are summarized as follows:

- ◆ The predominant demographic trend will continue to be a more mature New Jersey. This maturation will be driven by the large baby-boom population born between 1946 and 1964 and now advancing into old age. In 1990 the oldest baby-boomer was 44 years old and the youngest age 26. In 2006 the old "boomers" have turned 60 and the "youngsters" are over 40.
- ◆ Many of this large population bulge in its middle and later years will begin to search for and purchase alternatives to detached single-family homes. Many, also, will be empty-nesters. A significant minority will be single, divorced or separated, and widowed. Single person households will create a sub-market for more affordable housing units. These units, particularly rentals, will be increasingly difficult to find in the luxury and near-luxury single-family home markets which predominate in much of Morris County.
- ◆ The large population bulge created by the baby-boomers in their later years will shortly be followed by shrinkage in the age 25 to 44-year-old cohorts. This companion trend will result in reduced markets for the larger move-up houses as the bottom of the home buyer pyramid shrinks. Current anecdotal data suggest a slow-down in the rate of large, single-family home construction. This demographic driven trend will probably be reinforced by rising interest rates and increased home heating costs over the long-term.
- ◆ Within the older age spectrum there will be continued growth in the ranks of the elderly who are 65 years old and over, as boomers move into the latter part of this decade. These pressures suggest strengthened demand for a variety of senior housing alternatives including age 55+ active adult communities, some health care related housing, and traditional senior housing for those over 65.
- ◆ Housing price increases and housing production are expected to slow from the more rapid growth rates of the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000s. They should advance more moderately in the next 10 to 15 years. Long-term energy cost increases may also play a significant role in scaling back home sizes to more moderate levels. Should interest rates continue their current rise, and additional environmental regulations like the Highlands legislation occur, housing production rates locally would also soften further.

## SUMMARY OF KEY POPULATION STATISTICS

- ◆ Rapid growth from 1960 to 1990; slowing through the 1990s and flattening post-2000
- ◆ Increased senior population 65 and over, with females outnumbering males 537 to 320 and a population of seniors approaching an all-time high of 17%
- ◆ Increase in all age groups over 35 years as a percent of total population
- ◆ Possible decline in the age 35 to 44 cohort without significant in-migration of new residents of these ages
- ◆ Minimal change in the overall male-female distribution of population
- ◆ Less increase in population density per square mile at 4.3% than Morris County as a whole at 15.4% since 1990
- ◆ Population gains among Hispanic, Latino, and Asian ethnic groups

## HISTORIC POPULATION TRENDS & PROJECTIONS

Between 1920 and 1980, only the Great Depression slowed the rapid growth rates of the Borough which were experienced each decade. By 1990 capacity constraints on the Borough's vacant land within the sewer service area and on its treatment plant slowed population growth to a virtual standstill. Between 1990 and 2000, the Borough resumed a small measure of growth largely in the outlying unsewered portions of the Borough. This spurt added 207 residents, bringing the Borough's total population to 5097. But, this amount of population growth was only one-seventh of the rate experienced during the typical previous inter-census periods.

<b>YEAR</b>	<b>POPULATION</b>	<b>CHANGE NUMBER</b>	<b>CHANGE %</b>
1920	969	-	-
1930	1278	309	31.9
1940	1343	35	2.7
1950	1724	411	31.3
1960	2371	647	37.5
1970	3729	1358	57.3
1980	4899	1170	41.4
1990	4890	- 9	- 0.2
2000	5097	207	4.2

SOURCE: U.S. Censuses 1920-2000

<b>TABLE III-2 POPULATION 1990 &amp; 2000 &amp; PROJECTIONS TO 2010</b>					
<b>JURISDICTION</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>CHANGE 2000 to 2010</b>	
				<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
MENDHAM BOROUGH	4890	5097	5101	4	-
MENDHAM TWP.	4537	5400	5681	281	5.2
MORRIS COUNTY	421,353	470,212	491,346	21,134	4.5

SOURCE: 1990 & 2000 U.S. Census, Projection to 2010 by Morris County Planning Board

## RECENT POPULATION CHANGES

Between 1990 and 2000, the Borough's population grew by 207 persons, an increase of 4.2%. As a result of this growth, the density of population increased from 815 to 846 persons per square mile, a gain of 3.8%. The population of males in the Borough grew by 141, an increase of 6.2%, while the number of females increased by 66, only 2.5% growth. The median age in the Borough remained virtually stable at 41.7 years of age in 1990 and 41.9 years of age in 2000. In 1990 the Borough's senior population of persons 65 and over numbered 733. By 2000 this age group had increased to 857 persons and comprised 16.8% of the Borough's total population. Females in this age group outnumbered males by 537 to 320. Women age 65 and over constitute 10.5% of the Borough's total population.

<b>TABLE III-3 POPULATION DATA 1990 &amp; 2000</b>			
	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>CHANGE</b>
TOTAL POPULATION	4890	5097	207
LAND AREA (SQ. MI.)	6.0	6.0	0
DENSITY (PERSONS/SQ. MI.)	815	846	31
MALE	2269	2410	141
FEMALE	2621	2687	66
MEDIAN AGE	41.7	41.9	0.2

SOURCE: Morris County Planning Board, 2000 Census Profiles

## CHANGING AGE STRUCTURE

Consistent with national and regional trends related to the post-World War II baby-boom phenomenon, the Borough's historic pattern of age distribution shows decline, as a percentage of total population, in all age groups under age 34 for the 40-year period between 1960 and 2000. Likewise, all age groups over the age of 35 have increased as a percent of total population during the same period. Projecting to 2010, it appears that the 35 to 44 age cohort will begin to decline, in absolute numbers and percent of population, unless there is significant in-migration of new residents in this age group to take up the slack from the much smaller age 25 to 34-cohort, which follows in their footsteps.

<b>TABLE III-4                      HISTORIC PATTERN OF                      AGE DISTRIBUTION                      1960, 1970, 1980, 1990 &amp; 2000</b>										
AGE	1960	1970	1980	1990	2000	CHANGE 1960-2000		% of TOTAL POPULATION		
						No.	%	1960	1990	2000
Under 5	265	287	231	241	351	86	32.5	11.2	4.9	6.9
5-14	456	921	885	609	775	319	70.0	19.2	12.5	15.2
15-24	322	518	805	636	462	140	43.5	13.6	13.0	9.1
25-34	258	435	583	486	403	145	56.2	10.9	9.9	7.9
35-44	326	559	761	769	824	498	152.8	13.7	15.7	16.2
45-54	330	440	666	821	815	485	146.7	13.9	16.8	16.0
55-64	181	293	475	595	610	429	237.0	7.6	12.2	12.0
65 & over	233	276	493	733	857	624	267.8	9.8	14.9	16.8
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2371</b>	<b>3729</b>	<b>4899</b>	<b>4890</b>	<b>5097</b>	<b>2726</b>	<b>115.0</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

SOURCE: U.S. Censuses 1960 - 2000

## MALE/FEMALE DISTRIBUTION

The Borough's population distributed by gender shifted only slightly between 1990 and 2000. Males increased from 2269 to 2410, an increase of slightly under one percent (1%) from 46.4% to 47.3%. The number of females increased from 2621 to 2687 resulting in a percentage decline from 53.6% to 52.7% of total population.

<b>TABLE III-5 POPULATION BY SEX 1990 – 2000</b>				
	<b>PERSONS</b>		<b>%</b>	
	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>
MALE	2269	2410	46.4	47.3
FEMALE	2621	2687	53.6	52.7
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4890</b>	<b>5097</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>100.0</b>

SOURCE: Morris County Planning Board, 2000 Census Profiles

### **INCREASED POPULATION DENSITY**

Mendham Borough's relatively slow growth through the 1990s enabled it to hold its density of population at 850 persons per square mile, a modest increase of 35 persons per square mile (4.3%). In contrast, Morris County, which as a whole grew nearly four (4) times faster than the Borough, increased its overall population density by 15.4% from 853 persons per square mile to 984 persons per square mile during the same period.

<b>TABLE III-6 TOTAL POPULATION &amp; POPULATION DENSITY 1980 – 2000</b>		
	<b>MENDHAM BOROUGH</b>	<b>MORRIS COUNTY</b>
TOTAL POPULATION		
1980	4899	407,630
1990	4890	421,353
2000	5097	470,212
% CHANGE	4.04	15.4
AREA IN SQUARE MILES	6.0	477.8
POPULATION PER SQUARE MILE		
1980	814	853
1990	815	882
2000	850	984

SOURCE: U.S. Censuses 1980, 1990 & 2000

## RACIAL & ETHNIC BREAKDOWN

The percentage of the Borough's population which identified itself as belonging to the white race declined from 97.8% of total population to 95.1%. The two (2) racial groups which showed the largest gains numerically were those who identified themselves as Asian or Pacific Islanders and those who identified themselves as Hispanic or Latino. Those of Hispanic or Latino origin increased from 54 to 125 in number. Asians and Pacific Islanders increased from 66 to 75. Those of Hispanic origin who identified themselves as White increased from 41 persons in 1990 to 105 persons in 2000. Hispanic and Latinos of other races increased from 10 to 18 persons between the Census dates.

TABLE III-7 POPULATION BY RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN, 1990 & 2000								
RACE	TOTAL PERSONS		%		HISPANIC ORIGIN		%	
	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000	1990	2000
WHITE	4783	4846	97.8	95.1	41	105	75.9	84.0
BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN	21	22	0.4	0.4	0	1	0.0	0.8
AMERICAN INDIAN, ALASKA NATIVE	3	0	0.1	0.1	2	1	3.7	0.8
ASIAN OR PACIFIC ISLANDER	66	75	1.3	1.5	1	0	1.9	0.0
HISPANIC OR LATINO		125		2.5				
OTHER RACES	17	27	0.3	0.5	10	18	18.5	14.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4890</b>	<b>5097</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

SOURCE: U.S. Census 1990 & 2000

## SUMMARY OF KEY HOUSING STATISTICS

- ◆ The vast majority of housing units in the Borough, 74.3%, are single-family detached houses. Another 16.3% are attached single-family townhouses, reflecting the Mendham Commons.
- ◆ Duplex and multi-family units represent 9.5% and 3.2% of the Borough's housing stock respectively.
- ◆ Between 1995 and 2004, 64 certificates of occupancy were issued for new single-family residences. This growth was offset by 17 single-family demolitions. Most of these demolitions occurred in 2003 and 2004 suggesting a trend toward the phenomenon of "tear-downs" where older homes are razed and replaced by larger new homes, sometimes referred to as "McMansions" or "starter castles".
- ◆ Fifty-five percent (55%) of the Borough's housing stock is in larger 4- and 5-bedroom homes. Such larger homes with an "extra" or "spare" bedroom offer the potential conversion to home office space.
- ◆ More than 95% of the Borough's housing was built in 1989 or earlier. This reflects the Borough's long established pattern of an existing Village with a mature housing stock. Of the Borough's total 1828 housing units in 2000 only 47 were vacant.
- ◆ Future growth in housing units is likely to stabilize or nearly stabilize as documented in the build-out analysis of this Master Plan.
- ◆ Home prices in the Borough have escalated rapidly since the year 2000 Census with nearly 1400 homes being valued at \$500,000 or more and 337 homes at one million dollars or more.

## HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS

In 2000, of the total 1828 housing units in the Borough, the vast majority, 1358 or 74.3%, were single-family detached houses. Single-family attached units were also a substantial part of the Borough's inventory at 16.3% reflecting the Mendham Commons development. The 9.5% balance of the Borough's housing stock was in duplex units and in multi-family structures. The changes in the numbers of attached units between 1980 and 2000 are not explained in the data but may be caused by changes in the Census sampling and survey questions which have occurred over the past two (2) decades.

<b>TABLE III-8</b>			
<b>UNITS IN STRUCTURE* 1980, 1990 &amp; 2000</b>			
	<b>1980</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>
DETACHED (1)	1116	1274	1358
ATTACHED (1)	283	306	298
ATTACHED (2)	140	66	58
ATTACHED (3 OR MORE)	24	48	47
ATTACHED (5 OR MORE)	26	48	67
OTHER	-		
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1589</b>	<b>1777</b>	<b>1828</b>
* Numbers in parenthesis refer to the number of units in a structure. For example, an attached (1) is a single family townhouse, and an attached (2) is a two-family dwelling, and an attached (3) and attached (5) or more structures are apartments.			

SOURCE: U.S. Census 1980, 1990, & 2000

## TRENDS OF OCCUPANCY CERTIFICATES & DEMOLITION PERMITS

The Borough's adopted 2005 Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, which has been submitted to the Council on Affordable Housing for certification, documents the 10-year historical trend of residential growth, offset by demolitions, in single-family homes. Between 1995 and 2004, the Borough's Construction Official issued 64 certificates of occupancy for new single-family residences, an average of nearly 13 new homes per year. Demolitions totaled 17 over the 10-year time span. It is noted, however, that nine (9) of the demolitions, or more than half, occurred in 2003 and 2004. This possibly suggests an increased trend toward "teardowns" where older homes are razed and replaced by larger, new ones, sometimes referred to as "McMansions" or "starter castles".

**TABLE III-9  
10-YEAR HISTORIC TREND OF CERTIFICATES OF OCCUPANCY  
&  
DEMOLITION PERMITS**

	'95	'96	'97	'98	'99	'00	'01	'02	'03	'04
CO's ISSUED	8	6	7	8	10	6	6	6	4	3
DEMOLITIONS	-3			-1	-2	-1		-1	-5	-4
<b>NET</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>-1</b>	<b>0</b>

SOURCE: Borough of Mendham, Construction Official

## NUMBER OF BEDROOMS

Review of the 2000 U.S. Census housing data indicates that 4 and 5-bedroom homes comprise almost 55% of the Borough's housing stock. A large increase in the number of 4-bedroom homes between 1990 and 2000 is noted in the Census data. This increase from 552 to 678 is possibly explainable by bedroom additions to existing houses and construction of new 4-bedroom houses. Given their additional living space, these 678 homes plus 292 five-bedroom houses, would tend to have a greater propensity for conversion of an unneeded or "spare" bedroom for a home office. The Planning Board is aware of the home office/home business phenomenon and is looking closely at the trend for its local land use implications.

**TABLE III-10  
OCCUPIED UNITS BY NUMBER OF BEDROOMS**

NO. OF BEDROOMS	OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS		RENTER-OCCUPIED UNITS		TOTAL UNITS	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1	21	1.4	97	37.7	118	6.6
2	196	12.9	73	28.4	269	15.1
3	359	23.6	65	25.3	424	23.8
4	656	43.0	22	8.6	678	38.1
5 OR MORE	292	19.2	0	0.0	292	16.4
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1524</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>1781</b>	<b>100.0</b>

SOURCE: U.S. Census 2000

## AGE OF HOUSING

The 2000 Census reports that 1744 dwelling units or 95.4% of the Borough's housing was built in 1989 or earlier. Only 84 units are reported to have been built since 1990. This recent housing inventory amounts to only 4.6% of the total and reflects the Borough's long-established pattern of an existing Village with a mature housing stock. Given the anticipated slowed rate of housing starts projected to 2013 in the Housing Element of this Master Plan, the average age of the Borough's housing inventory will continue to increase unless development of the deNeufville property occurs.

TABLE III-11 YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT: 2000		
YEAR STRUCTURE BUILT	NUMBER	%
1999 TO MARCH 2000	18	1.0
1995 TO 1998	30	1.6
1990 TO 1994	36	2.0
1980 TO 1989	344	18.8
1970 TO 1979	541	29.6
1960 TO 1969	253	13.8
1940 TO 1959	255	13.9
1939 OR EARLIER	351	19.2

SOURCE: U.S. Census, 2000

## AVERAGE HOME VALUES

In 1990 the average value of single-family detached and attached housing units was reported by the Census at \$286,979. The 2000 Census reports that the median dollars of value for owner-occupied units had increased to \$397,000. This represents a gain of more than 38% over the decade.

Units valued at \$500,000 or more comprised only 12.5% or 161 of the Borough's homes in 1990. By the 2000 Census, the number of homes valued at \$500,000 or more had increased to 351 and constituted more than 25% of the total number of homes in the Borough.

<b>TABLE III-12 VALUE OF OWNER OCCUPIED UNITS: 2000</b>		
<b>VALUE</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>%</b>
LESS THAN \$199,999	81	5.8
\$200,000 TO \$299,999	304	21.8
\$300,000 TO \$499,999	657	47.2
\$500,000 TO \$999,999	219	15.7
\$1,000,000	132	9.5
<b>MEDIAN (DOLLARS)</b>	<b>\$397,000</b>	

SOURCE: U.S. Census, 2000

The recent Borough revaluation program has established new home values throughout the Borough which place 1371 homes or 82.9% at assessed valuations of \$500,000 or more. Homes valued at \$1,000,000 or higher totaled 337 or 20.1%. No homes valued at less than \$300,000 were found. The average home value in the Borough after revaluation is \$865,260.

<b>TABLE III-13 ASSESSED VALUE OF CLASS 2 &amp; 3e RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES: 2006</b>		
<b>VALUE</b>	<b>NUMBER</b>	<b>%</b>
LESS THAN \$299,999	0	0.0
\$300,000 TO \$399,999	82	5.0
\$400,000 TO \$499,999	201	12.2
\$500,000 TO \$599,999	289	17.5
\$600,000 - \$699,999	269	16.3
\$700,000 - \$799,999	264	16.0
\$800,000 - \$899,999	129	7.8
\$900,000 - \$999,999	83	5.0
\$1,000,000 - \$1,999,999	250	15.1
\$2,000,000 - \$2,999,999	55	3.3
\$3,000,000 - \$3,999,999	13	0.8
\$4,000,000 OR MORE	19	1.1
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>1654</b>	<b>100.0</b>

SOURCE: Borough Assessor's Office, 2006

## OCCUPANCY & VACANCY PATTERNS

As the Borough's number of occupied units has increased from 1460 in 1980 to 1781 in 2000, the number of vacant units has declined steadily from 129 to 47 over this 20 year time frame. Renter-occupied units have remained steady in the mid-200s for the past 20 years, reaching a high point of 266 rental units in 1990. In contrast, owner-occupied units increased by more than 300 from 1224 in 1980 to 1529 in 2000, strengthening the Borough's home ownership base.

<b>TABLE III-14 OCCUPIED &amp; VACANT UNITS</b>			
	<b>1980</b>	<b>1990</b>	<b>2000</b>
OCCUPIED UNITS	1460	1687	1781
OWNER-OCCUPIED	1224	1421	1529
RENTER-OCCUPIED	236	266	252
VACANT UNITS	129	90	47

SOURCE: U.S. Census 1980, 1990 & 2000

## TOTAL GROWTH OF HOUSING UNITS

As the Borough's housing stock has doubled since 1970 from 988 housing units to 1828 units, the rate of growth has slowed dramatically, reflecting the flattened population growth curve. As forecasted in the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, the Borough's housing supply is likely to stabilize at no net growth, barring dramatic rezonings or extensive redevelopment at higher densities. Both are unlikely scenarios. The build-out analysis which follows in the Land Use Element below documents the approaching growth stabilization which is likely to occur.

<b>TABLE III-15 TOTAL HOUSING UNITS</b>		
<b>YEAR</b>	<b>HOUSING UNITS</b>	<b>% CHANGE</b>
1970	988	-
1980	1589	60.8
1990	1777	11.8
2000	1828	2.8

SOURCE: U.S. Census 1990 & 2000

## SUMMARY OF BOROUGH'S FAIR SHARE HOUSING PLAN

The Borough of Mendham has participated in the Council of Affordable Housing (COAH) process of substantive certification of its Fair Share Housing Plan since the program's inception in 1986. The Borough's original substantive certification for the Round I period of 1987-1993 was granted on May 20, 1987.

This grant of substantive certification was based upon construction of the Mendham Area Senior Housing (MASH) complex. MASH is a 40-unit age-restricted project for which the Borough received Round I prior cycle credit for 28 of the units completed in 1980. Washington Township received credit for four (4) of the units. In Round II (1987-1999) the Borough received additional credit for eight (8) units which were completed in 1989. At the time of Round II, substantive certification COAH determined that the eight (8) units completed in 1989 were in excess of the Borough's obligation and may count toward a future obligation. The MASH senior housing complex is subject to 40-year affordability controls.

The second component of the Borough's Fair Share Plans for Rounds I and II was rehabilitation of existing units. In the Round II petition for substantive certification, the Borough chose to address its rehabilitation component through three (3) units of rehabilitation and three (3) units of new construction (i.e. three (3) of its MASH units). At the time of certification in June 1996, the Borough received credit for three (3) units of rehabilitation that met COAH criteria and were completed in 1991 and 1992. An additional four (4) units were completed between 1995 and 1999. The average expenditure for all Round II units is \$5,954 (only two (2) units met the average COAH minimum of \$8,000 for crediting). A detailed breakdown of all units rehabilitated with Community Development Funds is presented below.

<b>TABLE III-16</b> <b>UNITS REHABILITATED UNDER PRIOR</b> <b>COAH FAIR SHARE PLANS</b> <b>ROUND I (1987-1993) &amp; ROUND II (1987-1999)</b>				
<b>ADDRESS</b>	<b># OF UNITS</b>	<b>DATE OF FINAL INSPECTION</b>	<b>CD GRANT AMOUNT</b>	<b>FAIR SHARE PLAN ROUND #</b>
17 MAPLE AVE.	1	6/10/81	\$2,700	I
3 OLD ORCHARD TERR.	1	10/13/81	\$1,900	I
2 PARK AVE.	1	5/2/84	\$4,330	I
12 COLD HILL ROAD	1	3/2/86	\$2,696	I
32 E. MAIN STREET	1	11/1/86	\$5,000	I
20 LAKE ROAD	1	10/3/91	\$6,950	II
13 HILLCREST AVE.	1	2/3/92	\$3,600	II
2 ASTER TERRACE	1	6/18/92	\$13,815	II
11 ORCHARD ST.	1	8/25/95	\$3,600	II
7 HIGHFIELD CIRCLE	1	12/8/95	\$4,000	II
7 ADAMS PLACE	1	3/25/97	\$5,566	II
4 HAMPTON ROAD	1	6/23/99	\$4,150	II

SOURCE: Morris County Department of Community Development

In addition to the rehabilitation funds from Morris County Community Development, the Borough's Chief Financial Officer reported that the Borough had collected \$195,153.59 in development fees as of October 26, 2004. From these funds the Borough had disbursed \$53,887 for rehabilitation activities as of the same date. Most of these funds were allocated for work on the MASH units.

As documented in the Borough's Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, August 2005, the Borough has no rehabilitation share obligation for purposes of Round III (1987-2014).

In its petition for third Round substantive certification, the Borough has documented that it has a remaining prior round obligation (1987-1999) of zero units. Its growth share forecast for non-residential and residential growth between 2004 and 2014 is for 12 units of affordable housing. In the Borough's compliance plan, there are 31 surplus credits for past housing activity and therefore, the Borough does not foresee the need to rezone sites beyond the Village Cluster to generate affordable housing. Therefore, its Round III fair share obligation of 12 units is fully off-set by credits and reductions as presented in detail in the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan which was adopted by the Planning Board on November 14, 2005 as part of the Master Plan.