August 23, 2018

Gloucester Township Planning Board
Chews Landing-Clementon Road, at Hider Lane
PO Box 8
Blackwood, NJ 08012-0008

Attn: Ken Lechner, Township Director / Planner

Re: Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan & Major Subdivision Review
Hill Creek, LLC / Southwind
Black Horse Pike & Erial Road
Block 10801, Lots, 6 & 10
Block 10899, Lots 2 & 3
Review No. 1
Bach Project No. GTPB-2018-07

Dear Board Members:

The above referenced development received Preliminary Major Site Plan and Subdivision Approval at a meeting of the Gloucester Township Planning Board in 2010. The applicant is currently seeking to comply with the resolution associated with Application No. 051024RACPPSP in support of the Preliminary Approvals. Additionally, the applicant has submitted an application for Final Major Site Plan and Subdivision Approval of the subject development.

Our office has received the following items in support of the above-referenced application:

1. Township of Gloucester Land Development Application for Revised/Amended Major Site Plan, Final Major Site Plan, Final Major Subdivision and Redevelopment Agreement, dated June 4, 2018.

2. Township of Gloucester Land Development Submission Checklist, not dated.


5. Resolution of the Gloucester Township Planning Board Memorializing Preliminary Subdivision and Site Plan with Waiver and De minimus Exceptions for Southwinds Development, LLC, Application No 051024RACPPASP


8. Elevation (11x17") of Apartment Building and Elevation (11x17) of Townhouse Building.

9. Drawings entitled "Final Site Plan for Southwind Development, Block 10801, Lot 10 and Block 10899, Lots 1-3, Gloucester Township, Camden County, New Jersey", prepared by Land Dimensions Engineering:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sheet</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date/Last Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cover Sheet</td>
<td>none, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Plan of Survey</td>
<td>2-9-04, 12-13-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Composite Subdivision Plan</td>
<td>May 2018, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>Subdivision Plan</td>
<td>May 2018, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>Subdivision Tables</td>
<td>May 2018, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Subdivision Tables</td>
<td>May 2018, none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D</td>
<td>Open Space Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3E</td>
<td>Ownership Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Composite Site Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A</td>
<td>Final Site Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B</td>
<td>Final Site Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C</td>
<td>Final Site Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Final Site Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Final Site Plan (Age Restricted)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Composite Grading and Drainage Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A</td>
<td>Final Grading and Drainage Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 7-11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B</td>
<td>Final Grading and Drainage Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 7-11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5C</td>
<td>Final Grading and Drainage Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 7-11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>Final Grading and Drainage Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 7-11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>Final Grading and Drainage Plan (Age-Restricted)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Composite Utility Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A</td>
<td>Final Utility Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B</td>
<td>Final Utility Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C</td>
<td>Final Utility Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D</td>
<td>Final Utility Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>Final Utility Plan (Age-Restricted)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Document Description</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Composite Landscape and Lighting Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A</td>
<td>Final Landscape and Lighting Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B</td>
<td>Final Landscape and Lighting Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7C</td>
<td>Final Landscape and Lighting Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 7-11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7D</td>
<td>Landscape and Lighting Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 7-11-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7E</td>
<td>Landscape and Lighting Plan (Age-Restricted)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F</td>
<td>Blenheim Erial Road Streetscape Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7G</td>
<td>Final Route 168 Streetscape</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Composite SESC Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A</td>
<td>Final SESC Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8B</td>
<td>Final SESC Plan (Apartment)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8C</td>
<td>Final SESC Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8D</td>
<td>Final SESC Plan (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8E</td>
<td>Final SESC Plan (Age-Restricted)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SESC Detail Sheet</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10A</td>
<td>Final Construction Details</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10B</td>
<td>Final Construction Details</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10C</td>
<td>Final Construction Details</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10D</td>
<td>Final Construction Details</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10E</td>
<td>Final Construction Details</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10F</td>
<td>Final Construction Details</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A</td>
<td>Profiles (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B</td>
<td>Profiles (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11C</td>
<td>Profiles (Townhome)</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Phasing Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13A</td>
<td>Fire Truck Maneuvering Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B</td>
<td>Trash Truck Maneuvering Plan</td>
<td>Jan 2007, 4-30-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SITE INFORMATION:**

**Applicant:** Southwind at Gloucester LLC  
15 Engle Street (Suite 104)  
Englewood, NJ 07631  
201-408-5546  
201-308-5525 (fax)  
jeremy@buildwithinreach.com

**Owner:** Crossroads Village LLC  
c/o Land Dimensions Engineering  
3 East High Street  
Glassboro, NJ 08028  
201-307-7800  
201-307-7805 (fax)
WAIVERS / EXCEPTIONS:

The following waivers / exceptions were requested, considered and granted at a meeting of the Gloucester Township Planning Board on December 14, 2010:

1. Exception from Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). Parking ratio for senior housing.

2. Exception from Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). Street Intersection Offsets.

3. Exception from Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS). Maximum grade of five (5%) percent for secondary streets within 50 feet of intersection at six locations throughout the project.

4. Waiver from Section 506.A6 requiring embankments greater than 3 feet shall not exceed 5:1 grade. The applicant agreed to work with the engineer to meet this provision of the ordinance and obviate the need for any waiver. However, the revised plans provide 3:1 embankments throughout the entire development.

5. Waiver from access from right of way at maximum of 10% grade to bottom of basin.

6. Waiver from Section 517.H requiring that basins adjacent to/readily visible to public shall provide side slope of 4:1 or flatter. The applicant agreed to maintain a 4:1 ratio above the water, but the slope will exceed that ratio below the water. Applicant agreed to work with the engineer to meet this provision of the ordinance and obviate the need for any waiver. However, much of the area above the water line on both basins maintain a 3:1 side slope and do not comply.

7. Waiver from Section 506.A requiring a minimum useable perimeter area with maximum grade of 5% for minimum of 25 feet for residential laws.

8. Waiver from Section 507.D requiring street tree spacing to be 40 feet on center (proposed 60 feet).

9. Waiver from Section 508 Lighting, allowing a mixture of lighting as proposed.

10. Waiver from Section 511 allowing for a Recreation and Open Space / Payment in lieu of improvements. As set forth in the resolution.
Preliminary/Final Major Site Plan & Major Subdivision Review
Hill Creek, LLC / Southwind
Black Horse Pike & Erail Road
Block 10801, Lots, 6 & 10
Block 10899, Lots 2 & 3
Review No. 1
Bach Project No. GTPB-2018-07
August 23, 2018
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CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL:

At the Planning Board meeting of December 14, 2010 the applicant agreed to provide the following items at Final Major Subdivision and Site Plan application as indicated in the corresponding resolution:

1. Easements to be provided on all plans. (paragraph 4a in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **Easements have not been provided on all plans.**

2. Lot numbers. (paragraph 4b in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **Lot numbers have been provided. As a condition of Final Major Subdivision approval the tax assessor shall review and approve the proposed lot numbers.**

3. Conformance with the Map Filing Law. (paragraph 4d in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **As a condition of Final Major Subdivision approval our office will review the final plans for conformance with the map filing law.**

4. The following certification is to appear on the plans: (paragraph 4e in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **The requested certification does not appear on the plans.**

"I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE STREETS, ROADS, LANES, OR ALLEYS AS INDICATED ON THIS MAP HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER. THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER TO MAINTAIN OR EXERCISE JURISDICTION OF SUCH STREETS."

5. Easements for retaining walls to be provided on all plans. (paragraph 5a in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **Easements for the retaining walls do not appear on the plans.**

6. Copies of all NJDOT Access permits. (paragraph 6b in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **The required permits have not been provided.**

7. Calculations for the length of need for guiderails. (paragraph 6c in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **Calculations have not been provided.**

8. Cross sections of County Route 706 be incorporated into plan set. (paragraph 6f in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **Cross sections have not been provided.**

9. Right of way dedication for the Black Horse Pike (NJSH Route 163). (paragraph 6g in resolution and Birdsall review letter). **Right of way dedication has not been shown on the plans.**
10. Embankments greater than 3-feet in height shall not exceed a grade of 5:1 in accordance with section 505A6. The applicant agreed to work with reviewing engineer relative to slope of embankments throughout the project. However, the applicant has designed the entirety of the project with 3:1 embankments with as much as a 22 foot vertical drop. Our office does not recommend such steep embankments.

11. Providing a residential lawn with a usable perimeter area with a maximum grade of 5% and with possible fencing. (paragraph 7m in resolution and Birdsall review letter). The plans have been revised to provide a usable perimeter area of ten (10') feet around the majority of the buildings. However, the northerly side of Building No. 10 has a 3:1 slope at the building foundation. We recommend that the 10’ perimeter area be provided in this area.

12. Revisions to the Stormwater Management Maintenance Plan. A revised Stormwater Management Plan has not been provided for review.


PRELIMINARY MAJOR SUBDIVISION AND SITE PLAN REVIEW:

The following comments regarding the previously approved Preliminary Major Subdivision and Site Plan application are contained in a letter prepared by Birdsall Engineering and dated December 7, 2010. The italicized comments below are from Bach Associates. The applicant has failed to fully address the underlined items delineated below:

1. The property consists of five (5) lots located in the Mingus Run Development Zone. It contains 56.2 acres of land fronting on the eastern side of the Black Horse Pike (N.J.S.H. Route 168) and the southwestern frontage of Blenheim-Erial-New Brooklyn Road (C.R. 708). The site is currently wooded and is bisected by two tributaries of the Mingus Run. Onsite wetlands and a stream corridor are present along the banks. A PSE&G high voltage transmission line also crosses the parcel.

The application proposes to develop the property with three, independent developments:

a. 221 multi-family garden apartments in 17 separate 3-4 story structure each containing 12-14 units, accessed from CR 708;

b. 158 townhouses accessed from the Black Horse Pike; and
c. 96-unit (100 in stormwater report) age-restricted, 4-story apartment building with
access on the Black Horse Pike as well as CR 706.

Bach Comment: Revised to remove access to CR 706.

Associated parking facilities, stormwater management facilities and recreational
elements are also proposed; however, none of these developments are linked for cross
vehicular access.

This report will discuss site design and development as well as review the on-site and
off-site engineering. The report will compare this application, as submitted with the
Township Land Development Ordinance and the Residential Site Improvement
Standards (RSIS). Inconsistencies may be identified; however, at the direction of the
Township Planner, variances are not identified, only deviations from the Land Use
Ordinances or exceptions from the RSIS.

2. The subject application was heard before the Planning Board in August and September
of 2010. The Application has been amended to eliminate the Southwind Drive roadway
connection in between the townhouse and garden apartment components of the
developments.

3. The following comments are offered with respect to existing site conditions and
environmental constraints:

a. The Applicant has obtained the following approvals from the NJDEP:

i. Transition area Waiver;

ii. Major Stream Encroachment;

iii. Freshwater Wetland General Permits #2, #10A, #11 and #17.

The Applicant should be prepared to discuss what, if any, modifications to these permits
will be necessary as a result of the site redesign.

b. The Applicant’s Letter of Interpretation (LOI) verifying the wetland and buffer limits
has expired. The Applicant will be required to provide an extension as LOI’s are not
covered under the Permit Extension Act.

Bach Comment: Our office has not received any permits related to the subject
development. As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to
provide all required state permits at Final Major Subdivision Application. The
applicant shall provide any and all permits as required.
4. The following comments are offered with respect to the preliminary major subdivision:

a. Existing and proposed easements should be provided on the plan.
   
   **Bach Comment:** *As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide all required easements at Final Major Subdivision Application. The applicant shall provide any and all easements associated with the development.*

b. With the exception of Southwind Drive, the internal roads are private. As such, lot numbers will be required.
   
   **Bach Comment:** *As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required Lot Numbers. Lot numbers are shown on the plans and shall be verified by the tax assessor.*

c. Southwind Drive is to be dedicated to the Township of Gloucester as a public right of way. Southwind Drive’s current configuration provides no benefit to the general public, only to the proposed residents of the development. As such, there is no benefit to the Township to take responsibility or ownership of this road. We recommend this right of way remain private under the responsibility of the homeowner's association like the remainder of the roads.
   
   **Bach Comment:** *It was agreed upon at the meeting of the Planning Board that a portion of Southwind Drive would become a public right-of-way and be dedicated to Gloucester Township.*

d. A full review for conformance with the Map Filing Law will be required prior to the issuance of final approval.
   
   **Bach Comment:** *As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to conform with the Map Filing Law at Final Major Subdivision Application submission. Our office will review the Final Subdivision Plans as a condition of Final Major Subdivision approval.*

e. Should any of the roads be dedicated, the plans should include the following certification for the Township Clerk:
   
   **Bach Comment:** *As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required statement at Final Major Subdivision Application. As a portion of Southwind Drive will be dedicated to Gloucester Township, this note shall be added to the Subdivision Plans.*

   "I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE STREETS, ROADS, LANES, OR ALLEYS AS INDICATED ON THIS MAP HAVE BEEN APPROVED BY THE TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER. THIS APPROVAL DOES NOT CONSTITUTE AN ACCEPTANCE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER TO MAINTAIN OR EXERCISE JURISDICTION OF SUCH STREETS."
5. The following comments are offered with respect to the site plan and overall layout:

a. Retaining walls are necessary for the construction of the access road to the garden apartments. Easements are required for Township entry, inspection and maintenance in the event of an emergency. These easements must be finalized prior to the execution of final approval.

   **Bach Comment:** *As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required easement(s) at Final Major Subdivision Application. The easement(s) shall be shown on the Plans.*

b. Curbing and sidewalk has not been provided for the southernmost 180-feet of frontage on the Black Horse Pike or Southwind Drive, south of the PSE&G right of way.

   **Bach Comment:** Applicant has addressed.

c. Sidewalk easements required where the Black Horse Pike sidewalk and CR 706 sidewalk encroach beyond the right of way limits shall be formalized prior to the execution of final approval.

   **Bach Comment:** *As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required sidewalk easement(s). The sidewalk easements are shown on the plans. Legal Descriptions shall be provided.*

d. Crosswalks should be provided at the garden apartment buildings K and J.

   **Bach Comment:** No longer applies.

e. In accordance with the RSIS, 1.8 – 2.1 parking spaces are required per mid-rise apartment. 173 – 201 spaces will be required whereas 105 spaces have been provided.

   **Bach Comment:** *waiver was granted from residential site improvement standards parking ratio for senior housing.*

6. The following comments are offered with respect to traffic and on-site circulation:

   a. The application has eliminated the Southwinds Drive connection from the Black Horse Pike to Bienheim-Erial-New Brooklyn Road. The following items should be reevaluated and a revised traffic report provided:

      i. The assignment of trip traffic within the study area was evaluated using percentages. For example, 35% of the site traffic traveling to/from the north was estimated to be 35% of the total volume, while 23% of the trips were assigned to Almonesson Road.
ii. Trip generation must be reevaluated understanding that all of the Townhouse Traffic will be restricted to using the Black Horse Pike and all the garden apartment traffic will be limited to utilizing CR 706.

*Bach Comment: The applicant has adequately revised the traffic report to address this comment.*

iii. Additionally, the off-site impacts of the surrounding circulation notes should be re-evaluated. It is anticipated that there will be an increased strain on the existing signal located at the intersection of the Black Horse Pike and Blenheim-Erial-New Brooklyn Road.

*Bach Comment: The Applicant should include analysis of the Black Horse Pike / Clementon Avenue intersection in the traffic study.*

iv. "Age Targeted" values utilized in the report for the apartments should be re-evaluated with market values.

*Bach Comment: The applicant has adequately revised the traffic report to address this comment.*

v. Verification of unit types used in the report should be provided for the garden apartments.

*Bach Comment: The applicant has adequately revised the traffic report to address this comment.*

b. Copies of all NJDOT Access permits will be required.

*Bach Comment: As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required permit at Final Major Subdivision Application. Applicant shall provide.*

c. Calculations for the length of need of the guiderails should be provided in accordance with NJDOT design guidelines.

*Bach Comment: As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required calculations at Final Major Subdivision Application. Applicant shall provide.*

d. In accordance with RSIS 4.19(b), street intersections shall be 150-feet apart, whereas the offsets of Southwind Access SW, Southwind Two and Chapel Court with Southwind Drive do not comply.

*Bach Comment: A waiver was granted from residential site improvement standards for street intersection off-sets.*
e. The plans provide a Future Connection to Cleveland Avenue. Sidewalk has been provided on the connector road. The Board should discuss if pedestrian access is desirable.
   
   Bach Comment: The future connection to Cleveland Avenue has been removed.

f. Cross sections of CR 706 will be required by the County Engineering Department. We respectfully request that they be incorporated into the plan set for review and informational purposes.
   
   Bach Comment: As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required cross-sections at Final Major Subdivision Application. Applicant shall provide.


g. A right of way dedication should be provided for the Black Horse Pike in order to accommodate the Desirable Typical Section in accordance with the State’s plan for the Route at this location.
   
   Bach Comment: As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required right of way dedication for the Black Horse Pike at Final Major Subdivision Application. Applicant shall provide.

7. The following comments are offered with respect to grading, drainage and stormwater management:

a. The stormwater management system design meets the intent and requirements of the N.J.A.C. 7:8; however, the development may cause an increase in the groundwater elevation; an increase in the pond water surface elevation; and expansion of the wetland area. This could have an adverse effect on the existing, surrounding development.

   Bach Comment: Additional information is required to confirm compliance with stormwater requirements, namely NJAC 7:8. The infiltration basins and wet pond are not in compliance.

b. Retaining walls in excess of 30-inches in height must have a safety barrier. 36-inches in height incorporated at the top of wall in order to increase safety and prevent falls.

   Bach Comment: An aluminum fence is proposed at the top of the retaining walls. However, the height of the fence shall be shown on the plans and a detail of the fence provided.
c. In accordance with section 506A6, embankments greater than 3-feet in height shall not exceed a grade of 5:1 whereas a design grade of 3:1 is provided.

_Bach Comment_: **A waiver was requested. However, the applicant agreed to meet this requirement. The entirety of the site does not comply and all embankments greater than 3-feet in height are designed with a 3:1 design grade. The applicant shall comply or request a waiver from this requirement. Our office does not recommend any embankment of 3:1 within ten (10') feet of any building and furthermore recommend a fence be placed at the top of any embankment in excess of 3 feet in height that exceeds the required 5:1 design grade.**

d. In accordance with RSIS Table 4.6, the maximum grade of a secondary street within 50-feet of an intersection is 5%. The following intersections do not comply:

   i. Southwind Drive and Southwind Alley SW – west intersection;

   ii. Southwind Drive and Southwind One;

   iii. Southwind Drive and Southwind Two;

   iv. Southwind Drive and Southwind Three;

   v. Southwind Alley North and Southwind One;

   vi. Southwind Alley North and Southwind Two; and

   vii. Southwind Alley North and Southwind Three

_Bach Comment_: **A waiver was granted from residential site improvement standards for maximum grades of secondary streets within 50 feet of an intersection for all of the streets noted above.**

e. All stormwater management systems have been designed to incorporate the on-site perched water table and route any post-development flows directly through the drainage system.

f. Basin 1, Basin 7, Basin 8 and Basin 9 fall under the classification of a Class IV Dam. As such, the spillway servicing the Basin should be designed in accordance with the Dam Safety standards and the Residential Site Improvement Standards. This requires that the spill be designed to convey 150% of the 100-year storm, with a foot of freeboard to the top of the basin berm.

_Bach Comment_: **The calculations do not reflect the use of 150% of the 100 year storm. The required freeboard at each spillway is not provided.**
g. The Stormceptor CD Sizing Program indicates the design capacity of the Model STC 900 to be 0.636 cfs whereas the water quality design flow to be treated is 1.12 cfs in the stormwater report (subcatchment 14S: DA Basin 9). Additional methods of verification for water quality must be identified.

_Bach Comment:_ The Stormceptor CD unit has been removed from the plans. Details shall be provided for manufactured treatment devices if they are proposed.

h. For privately maintained basins, easements shall be provided to allow the Township to enter, inspect and maintain the basins in the event of an emergency situation, with all costs being charged to the owner.

i. In accordance with Section 517 H, basins near residential uses or readily visible to the public shall be aesthetically designed and provide side slopes of 4:1 or flatter. The basins have side slope of 3 horizontal to 1 vertical, for heights up to 18-feet. These slopes begin immediately adjacent to walkways and building foundations. Assurances of public safety should be provided.

_Bach Comment:_ A waiver was requested. The applicant agreed to maintain a 4:1 or flatter side slope above the water line of the basins and a 3:1 side slope below the water line of the basins. However, it does not appear that the areas above the water line have been designed at a 4:1 or flatter side slope. The plans shall indicate the slopes of all embankments greater than three (3') feet in height.

j. The 100-year water surface elevations should be delineated on the plan set.

_Bach Comment:_ The 100 year water surface elevations have been delineated on the plans. However, they do not correspond with the 100 year water surface elevation shown on the previously approved plan set.

k. Off-road profiles should be provided for review.

_Bach Comment:_ The off-road profiles have not been provided. The applicant shall provide.

l. An easement is required for the storm sewer connection from the adjacent Lot 4 (Walgreens).

_Bach Comment:_ The easement has not been provided. The applicant shall provide.
m. In accordance with Section 506A, residential lawns shall provide a usable perimeter area with a maximum grade of 5% for a minimum of 25-feet. The remainder of the lot shall not exceed grades of 10%. Additionally, embankments greater than 3-feet in height must not exceed a slope of five to one. This is not achieved for the majority of units.

**Bach Comment:** A waiver was granted from Section 506A requiring a usable perimeter area with a maximum grade of 5% for a minimum of 25-feet. However, our office recommends a minimum area of ten (10) feet wide with a maximum grade of 10% be provided around the perimeter of any building for public access. A 3:1 design grade shall not be proposed adjacent to any building foundation.

n. Preliminary earthwork calculations should be provided.

**Bach Comment:** As a condition of Preliminary Approval the applicant was to provide the required earthwork calculations at Final Major Subdivision Application. Applicant shall provide

o. The following comments are offered with respect to the stormwater management maintenance plan provided.

**Bach Comment:** The applicant has not submitted a revised Stormwater Maintenance Plan and therefore none of the comments below have been addressed. A Stormwater Maintenance Plan shall be submitted for review.

i. The stormwater maintenance plan identifies “The Township of Gloucester” as the responsible party for the drainage conveyance system. This should be corrected to state the homeowner’s association as the responsible party.

ii. A sample inspection log should be included.

iii. Chains used for fence locks shall replace (1) link each of chain with a padlock to be provided by the Township for access.

iv. All chains, gates and locks should be checked annually for damage and integrity.

v. The schedule of regular inspections and tasks should incorporate debris removal and sediment removal.

p. The grading adjacent to the following structures prevent vehicular access by emergency vehicles:

i. South and west wall of Building H;
ii. South wall of Building G;

iii. South wall of Building I;

iv. East wall of Building M;

v. North wall of Building P, and,

vi. South wall of Building O.

Additionally, all secondary means of egress should be identified and landing areas provided.

**Bach Comment:** Testimony was provided by the applicant's professionals regarding vehicular access by emergency vehicles to the above areas and was accepted by the board.

8. The following comments are offered with respect to landscape and lighting:

a. Additional plantings should be provided to supplement the proposed buffer to the south.

   **Bach Comment:** Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

b. Additional plantings should be provided to soften the visual impact of the high tension power lines from the internal roads. O

   **Bach Comment:** Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

c. Plantings are proposed within the existing treeline designated as "to remain". The Applicant should verify the plantings in the woods and revise as necessary.

   **Bach Comment:** Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

d. Tree conservation easements should be provided where existing trees are to be saved.

   **Bach Comment:** Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.
e. In an effort to improve the screening along CR 706, berms are recommended along the entire frontage. A landscaped berm, a minimum of 3-feet in height, should be attractively landscaped in accordance with the Applicant's current planting schedule. In addition to providing height, the berms would screen light spillage from vehicles in the parking lots fronting on the road. This area should also be serviced with an underground irrigation system.

_Bach Comment:_ Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

f. Buffer plantings, including a mix of evergreens, deciduous and flowering trees and shrubs, should be provided around all of the stormwater management facilities. These plantings should function with the split rail (safety) fencing wherever practical.

_Bach Comment:_ Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

g. In accordance with Section 507D, street tree spacing should be reduced to 40-feet on center. Additionally, all plantings shall be placed a minimum of 5-feet behind the sidewalks. Tree planting easements should be provided as necessary.

_Bach Comment:_ Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

h. Several discrepancies between the plantings depicted on the plan and the schedule have been identified. Understanding that the availability of certain species may be limited at various times throughout the year, substitutions in size and species often result. The Applicant is made aware that all planting substitutions will be subject to the approval of the Township Engineer and/or Planner. A note stating such should be added to the landscape plan(s).

_Bach Comment:_ Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

i. The lighting layout differs from that which is required in Section 508, however, the intent of the ordinance appears to have been met. The Applicant shall provide a verification that the lighting output is in compliance with Section 508 or request a waiver of compliance.

_Bach Comment:_ Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

j. The lighting output has not been provided for the decorative post mounted lights. This needs to be provided to assess the lighting of the Black Horse Pike and Blenheim-Erial-New Brooklyn Road.

_Bach Comment:_ Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.
k. Wall mount lighting for the apartments should be depicted on the plans.
   
   **Bach Comment:** Our office defers comments regarding Landscape and Lighting to the Township Planner.

9. In accordance with Section 506 A. 11, Retaining walls greater than 3-feet in height or walls supporting vehicular loads shall only be allowed where the design has been approved by an engineer. Additionally, all retaining walls in excess of 4-feet in height will require a building permit in addition to an engineering approval.
   
   **Bach Comment:** The applicant shall provide engineering calculations for any wall in excess of three feet (3') high.

10. Architectural Plans should be provided. Additionally, some assurance of bedroom count should be provided to ensure parking calculations as well as water demands are accurate as submitted.
   
   **Bach Comment:** Architectural plans have not been provided. The applicant shall provide architectural plans for review.

11. The Applicant shall submit to, and appear before, all other Local, State and Federal agencies having jurisdiction over this project.
   
   **Bach Comment:** Approvals from any outside agencies having jurisdiction over this project shall be submitted to our office as a condition of Final Major Subdivision approval.

12. The Board's attention is directed to Public Law 1975 Chapter 251, the Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Act Rules. All erosion prevention measures must be established on-site and maintained throughout construction.
   
   **Bach Comment:** Approval from the Camden County Soil Conservation District shall be submitted to our office as a condition of Final Major Subdivision approval.

13. In accordance with the Township Ordinance and the Municipal Land Use Law, any approvals granted by the Board shall be conditioned upon the Applicant posting a performance guarantee and an inspection fund in an amount to be determined by the Township Engineer.
   
   **Bach Comment:** Upon Final Major Subdivision approval, the applicant shall submit Engineer's Estimates for the development for review and approval by the Township Engineer and Township Solicitor and upon approval shall be utilized in the calculation of any performance bonds required for the project.
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ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM BACH ASSOCIATES:

General:

1. *The applicant shall confirm that the certified list of property owners as shown on the Cover is current.*

2. *The index of Sheets as shown on the Cover Sheet shall be revised to correctly correspond to the plan names.*

3. *The owner indicated on the Cover Sheet does not match the owner shown on the Land Development application. Clarification shall be made and if necessary the plans revised.*

4. *The property survey provided is more than 14 years old. Our office recommends that a certification be added to the survey that site conditions have not changed.*

5. *The applicant shall provide final floor plans for all proposed buildings.*

Site Plan and Overall Layout:

1. *Proposed Lot 114 is land locked. To eliminate the need for a variance the plans shall be revised to provide the minimum lot frontage of twenty (20') feet.*

2. *Any and all easements, including but not limited to the easements surrounding the existing high voltage transmission towers shall be labeled and dimensioned on the Subdivision Plans.*

3. *Our office defers review until all outstanding engineering items are addressed. Our office reserves the right to make additional comments upon revised plans.*

4. *Dimensions between buildings shall be shown on the plans.*

5. *Dimensions from proposed buildings to the closest property line shall be shown on the plans.*

6. *Our office recommends that all underground piping be shown on the Landscape Plan to confirm that no trees are proposed with close proximity of any proposed pipes.*

7. *The Landscape and Lighting Plan indicates the use of High Pressure Sodium (HPS) Lights. Our office recommends the use of LED lighting.*
8. The Planning Board previously discussed the necessity for a snow easement at a point to be determined before final. The applicant shall provide testimony.

9. The applicant shall provide testimony regarding the “future access” as indicated on the plans.

Traffic:

1. The applicant shall provide an additional stop sign and stop bar along the main access drive southbound approach prior to the crosswalk between buildings No. 2 and 3 of the Multifamily apartment section of the development.

2. The applicant shall verify the design of Southwind Drive meets Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) with regard to emergency access and the classification of Southwind Drive as a loop road.

Grading:

1. Our office recommends the addition of a guiderail along the stone path in the rear of lots 25, 26, and 27 as there is a seven foot (7’) vertical drop at a 3:1 side slope on the northeasterly side of the path.

2. The ground spot elevations on the corners of many of the proposed buildings is the same elevation as the finished floor elevation. Our office recommends a minimum of eight inches (8”) between the finished floor and the rear building corners.

3. The sidewalk elevation at the corner of some buildings exceeds the finished floor elevation. Our office recommends that the sidewalk elevation not exceed the finished floor elevation in any location.

4. The sidewalk adjacent to apartment building No. 11 is higher than the adjacent building and does not have the appropriate two percent (2%) slope away from the building. The grading shall be revised.

5. The ground adjacent to the northerly side of Building No. 10 immediately drops off with a vertical difference of 22 feet at a slope of 3:1. Our office recommends an area of 10’ with a maximum slope of 10% be provided from the building to the top of slope and a fence be provided along the entirety of the top of slope.

6. Spot elevations shall be provided at all building corners.
7. The ground in the rear of Building 21 is higher that the basement floor elevation and shall be revised to meet International Building Code - 2000 18.03.3 Site Grading which states "The ground immediately adjacent to the foundation shall be sloped away from the building at a slope of not less than one unit vertical in 20 units horizontal (5-percent slope) for a minimum distance of 10 feet measured perpendicular to the face of the wall or an approved alternate method of diverting water away from the foundation shall be used.

8. The grade difference between the finished floor elevation and the sidewalk at the street has a vertical difference of approximately three (3') feet at Building 23. The plan shall indicate any steps that would be necessary to accomplish this grade difference.

9. The grading on the southwesterly corner of building 19 would require quite a number of steps as there is a vertical difference of more than seven feet (7') from the back corner of the building and the adjacent sidewalk along the parking area. The required steps shall be shown on the plans to determine the need for steps and railings in this area.

10. Buildings No. 10 and 11 indicate ground floor elevations that are ten (10) foot lower than the finished floor elevations. However, the grading for these units does not indicate walk out basements and would therefore not reflect the ten (10) foot difference.

11. Additional spot elevations shall be provided in the area of the clubhouse.

12. Spot elevations shall be shown at all four (4) corners of any handicap parking areas.

Stormwater Management:

1. The applicant shall perform a minimum of two (2) in-situ infiltration tests for each infiltration basin in accordance with the NJ Stormwater BMP Manual, Appendix E, last revised September 2009, to confirm infiltration capability for the proposed infiltration basins. It appears that there may not be any test pits performed within the footprint of Basin 4 and 5, though the Stormwater Management Report refers to soil borings not identified on any plan. An Infiltration Testing Location Plan shall be provided with an overlay of the basin boundaries, confirming which test pits are within the proposed infiltration areas. Additional test pits and infiltration tests shall be provided as applicable.
2. **Infiltration tests shall be performed at a depth of either eight feet (8') below the proposed bottom of basin or twice the depth of the maximum potential water depth in the proposed BMP, whichever is greater, in accordance with the NJ Stormwater BMP Manual, Appendix E, last revised September 2009.** The infiltration tests for proposed Infiltration Basin 4 were performed from a sample taken between elevation 75 to 77 which is above the proposed bottom of basin, elevation 73. The applicant shall provide testimony regarding the strata below the bottom of Basin 4 to support any waiver requests. The applicant shall also provide a soil boring location map. Basin 4 and Basin 5 do not show any soil borings within their footprints on the grading and drainage plans. Additional infiltration tests shall be performed as applicable.

3. **A note shall be added to the Grading and Drainage Plans stating the following: A minimum of two (2) post construction in-situ infiltration tests shall be performed at each infiltration basin in accordance with the NJ Stormwater BMP Manual, Appendix E, last revised September 2009, and results shall be submitted for review and acceptance by the Township Engineer.**

4. **Notes shall be added to the Grading and Drainage Plans indicating the use of heavy equipment shall be prohibited within the basin bottom areas in order to minimize compaction of the sub-soils where infiltration is proposed.**

5. **The time of concentration calculations shall be revised to reflect a maximum of one hundred feet (100') of sheet flow length for use in calculations via NRCS segmental method per Chapter 15 of the USDA National Engineering Handbook, last revised May 2010.** The applicant shall also provide additional information regarding the use of woods cover for sheet flow in an impervious area, i.e. Subcatchment 4S. Impervious, in the Basin 1 calculations.

6. **Separate hydrographs shall be provided for impervious and pervious areas for all drainage areas. It appears that some basin calculations have separate hydrographs while others use combined hydrographs. The calculations shall be revised accordingly.**

7. **It shall be noted that contributing drainage areas for wet ponds shall be at least 20 acres per NJDEP BMP Manual Chapter 9.11. Basin 1 has a contributing drainage area of 17.7 acres which does not meet the standard. Additional documentation shall be provided regarding the ability for the pond to meet the standards and a waiver shall be requested if necessary.**
8. **Additional details shall be provided for the construction of the proposed rip rap aprons within Basin 1.** It appears that the incoming pipe inverts are above the normal permanent pool elevation of the basin and the rip rap aprons are to be constructed with 3 to 1 slopes towards the bottom of the basin. Our office recommends construction of the rip aprons on a level surface, above the permanent pool elevation.

9. **The plans shall be revised to incorporate basin access via curb cuts and basin access roads at a slope not greater than 5 to 1.** If alternate methods of basin access are proposed the applicant shall provide testimony and revise the plans accordingly.

10. **Anti-seep collars shall be provided along outfall pipes at Basins 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, in accordance with NJAC 5:21-7.8(d)1.iii.** A detail has been provided but it is unclear where they are to be installed on the plans.

11. **Emergency spillways shall have a minimum of one foot (1') of freeboard above the water surface elevation, with the emergency spillway flowing at the design depth in the basin in accordance with NJAC 5:21-7.8(d)4(6).** The emergency spillways at each basin do not comply and shall be revised accordingly.

12. **Anti-vortex devices shall be provided in accordance with NJAC 5:21-7-8(d)1.ii.** The outfall structure details shall be revised as necessary.

13. **The basin dewatering calculation for Basin 3 shall be revised to account for dewatering of the groundwater recharge volume in lieu of the water quality storm.**

14. **A groundwater mounding analysis shall be provided in accordance with NJAC 7:8-5.4(a)2.iv for the proposed infiltration basins.**

15. **Additional testimony and information shall be provided regarding infiltration basin dewatering.** The calculations within the Hydrological Report indicate the use of 0.5 inches per hour which is the minimum accepted value. The actual tested rates are lower than 0.5 inches per hour for each basin. It does not appear that the infiltration basins will comply with the dewatering requirements. It shall also be noted that the subsoils are described as clay, clayey loam, and loam. These subsoils may not be suitable for infiltration basin design. The tested infiltration rates of the subsoils are less than 0.5 inches per hour. Alternate basin designs may be required unless calculations are provided that confirm infiltration basins are viable as proposed.

16. **Our office defers to the Camden County Soil Conservation District (CCSCD) regarding review of downstream stability from point discharges such as basin outfalls via piping.** Calculations shall be provided for review by the CCSCD.
17. The applicant should demonstrate how aeration of proposed wetponds will be achieved. Our office recommends a permanent fountain aeration devise be installed in each proposed wetpond.

18. A Stormwater Management Maintenance Plan prepared in accordance with Chapter 8, Maintenance and Retrofit of Stormwater Management Measures, Chapter 9.5 Standard for Infiltration Basins, and Chapter 9.11 Standard for Wet Ponds of the New Jersey Stormwater Best Management Practices Manual shall be provided. In accordance with Chapter 9.5 the maintenance plan shall indicate the approximate time it would normally take to drain the maximum design storm runoff volume below the bottom of the basin or recharge area. This normal drain or drawdown time should then be used to evaluate the actual performance of each basin/recharge area. If significant increases or decreases in the normal drain time are observed, the basin and/or recharge area bottom surface, subsoil, and both groundwater and tailwater levels must be evaluated and appropriate measures taken to comply with the maximum drain time requirements and maintain the proper functioning of the basin and/or recharge area. A log sheet shall be provided in the Basin Maintenance Plan for tracking dewatering times of each basin and recharge area.

19. The applicant shall provide additional information regarding the construction of permanent features such as the wet pond within the Atlantic City Electric ROW/Easement areas is permitted. Testimony shall be provided regarding Atlantic City Electric access requirements to their infrastructure.

APPROVAL PROCESS:

If the Board grants approval to this project, the following conditions apply.

1. A cost estimate of all site improvements must be submitted to the Township Engineer for review. Upon review, the Township Engineer will forward the required performance bond and inspection escrow amount to the Township. Performance guarantees and inspection escrows shall be posted with the Township Clerk in the amounts approved by the Board.

2. This plan set may be subject to the review and approval of the following outside agencies. Evidence of these approvals must be submitted to the Township Planning Department and this office prior to the final signature of plans.

   a. Gloucester Township Fire Marshall
   b. Gloucester Township MUA
   c. Aqua New Jersey
   d. Camden County Planning Board
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e. Camden County Soil Conservation District
f. Any and all agencies having jurisdiction

3. Prior to the issuance of a final Certificate of Occupancy, an as-built grading plan shall be submitted in digital and/or paper form, showing foundation grades, elevations at fifty (50) foot intervals along property lines, high point elevation, and centerline of swale elevations in accordance with §506.7.

4. Twelve (12) sets of plans must be submitted upon final approval for signatures.

Our office has no objection to Amended Preliminary Major Site Plan and Major Subdivision approval. However, we do not recommend Final Major Site Plan or Major Subdivision approval at this time.

When plans are resubmitted, they are to be accompanied with a point-by-point response. We reserve the right to make additional comments pending the receipt of revised plans.

If there are any questions or if any additional information is required please contact this office.

Very truly yours,
BACH ASSOCIATES, PC

Steven M. Bach, PE, RA, PP, CME
President

Cc: Gloucester Township Planning Board Members
    Edward Brennan, Esq. (PB Solicitor)
    Southwinds at Gloucester, LLC, Applicant
    Robert Mintz, Esq., Applicant’s Attorney
    Larry Di Vietro, PP, Applicant’s Engineer
    Andrew Hogg, PE, Applicant’s Engineer
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Gloucester Township Community Development and Planning
1261 Chews Landing Road
Gloucester Township, NJ 08021
Attn: Kenneth Lechner, PP, AICP, Director/Planner

Re: Second Architectural and Planning Review
Final Major Site Plan – Application #181022E
Crossroads Village, LLC (Southwinds at Gloucester, LLC)
Blackhorse Pike (Block 10801, Lot 10; Block 10899, Lots 1-3)
BW Mingus Run Redevelopment Zone

October 9, 2018
(via email)

Dear Mr. Lechner:

We have reviewed the following revised application materials as part of the above-referenced application:

- Floor Plans and Elevations, prepared by Robert E Zampolin, AIA, of the firm Zampolin & Associates
- Colored Architectural Renderings, consisting of four (4) sheets, no title block, undated

We offer this letter as a supplement to our original architectural and planning letter dated August 23, 2018, and the applicant’s response to comments 2-6 in our prior letter as they relate to the Blackwood West Redevelopment Plan and the Gloucester Township Land Development Ordinance. We offer a status update to our original comments in the attachment and new table columns titled “ Applicant Response (10/2/2018)” and “Redevelopment Planner Follow-up Response (10/9/2018).”

If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

T&M ASSOCIATES

STAN SLACHETKA, PP, AICP
REDEVELOPMENT PLANNER

SCS:JAC:lkc
Enclosure

cc: Stephan Boraske, Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt, and Fader, Board Solicitor
Steven Bach, Bach Associates, P.C., Board Engineer
Jeremy Teicher, jeremy@buildwithinreach.com
Bob Mintz, Freeman & Mintz, Applicant’s Attorney, bob@freemanandmintzpa.com
Lawrence M. DiVietro, Jr., PLS, PP, AICP, Land Dimensions Engineering, Applicant’s Planner,
larry@landdimensions.com
Mark Keener, AICP, PP, AIA, Stromberg/Garrigan Associates, mkeener@s-ga.com
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2. Redevelopment Plan Purpose and Objectives

The Objectives section of the Redevelopment Plan states that the plan: “is intended primarily as a means of revitalizing the commercial core of Blackwood with a secondary emphasis on residential development, redevelopment and rehabilitation. New residential development is intended mainly for vacant areas at the periphery of the redevelopment area that will provide additional customers for retail businesses [and to] facilitate the development of high-quality housing types not presently offered in Gloucester Township.” Another stated purpose is to “Improve the functionality of streets and parking [and to] provide for pedestrian access from neighborhoods to businesses and public recreation.” The Redevelopment Plan presents a clear expectation that direct, convenient, connection to retail, services, and amenities is an important element, necessary to attract the expected user.

- Redevelopment Planner Comment (8/23/2018): The applicant should demonstrate how this objective is to be achieved.
  - Redevelopment Planner Follow-Up Comment (10/9/2018): Continuing comment. The applicant shall provide testimony at the Board hearing on how the plan achieves this objective. Particular focus should be on the linkages, especially pedestrian linkages, to the retail, services and amenities in the surrounding Blackwood neighborhood.

3. Design Concepts

The design concepts presented on pages 11 through 16 of the Redevelopment Plan relate to the design standards of the Redevelopment Plan in much the same way as the Land Use Plan relates to the zoning regulations (see Appendix A). The design concepts use pictures and illustrations to describe and illustrate the architectural elements that can be used in new and infill construction. Key recommendations intended to guide design of multi-family buildings relate to building facades, building form, location of parking lots and garages, pedestrian mobility, and landscape design features. These design concepts are not requirements per se, but rather are intended to serve as helpful suggestions to assist applicants and designers to understand and meet the provisions of the relevant Development Regulations. Relevant design concepts and corresponding images represented in the Redevelopment Plan include the following:

A. Avoid long, unrelieved flat facades (page 13): “The two-story elements of the design are closest to the sidewalk, with the three-story elements recessed.”
B. Façade design (page 13): “This building is also notable for the demonstration of the horizontal three module approach to traditional buildings that have a clearly defined base, middle, and top or cornice.”

C. Mix two- and three-story heights in same building grouping (page 13): “This example of a townhouse development shows a means of mixing two- and three-story designs together in one project.”

D. Vary building form (page 13): “The two-story elements of the design are closest to the sidewalk, with the three-story elements recessed. The three-story recess is tied together with the roof line of the two-story portions to create a well-scaled project.”

E. Massing and scale of apartment buildings (page 14): “The design of apartment buildings can incorporate some of the same concepts in townhouse design in terms of massing and scale of the buildings.” The applicant shall provide architectural design renderings for the proposed apartment buildings.

F. Parking at rear or side (page 14): “In the redevelopment area, townhouse garages and parking lots should be located to the rear of the buildings and access provided by alleys or parking lot driveways intersecting secondary streets.”

G. Garages not prominent feature (page 14): “Three-story townhouses allow for the inclusion of garages on the first floor with two stories of living space above them.”

H. Use fences and low walls to distinguish different areas and create sense of privacy and domain (pages 15-16): “Though this building is set back only 12–15 feet from the sidewalk, the fencing demarcates public and private areas and landscaping is used to soften the edges of the building... Masonry walls should be used to screen parking areas from public view and should be supplemented by landscaping.”

- Redevelopment Planner Comment (8/23/2018): The applicant shall demonstrate how these design concepts are incorporated into the proposed development and building design or indicate why this was not feasible.

  o Applicant Response (10/2/2018): No response.
  o Redevelopment Planner Follow-Up Comment (10/9/2018): Continuing comment. The applicant shall provide testimony at the Board hearing.
4. Development Regulations—Redevelopment Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.0: Specific Intent, page 29: The district provides for integration of retail sales and services. This is also a Redevelopment Plan Objective listed on Page 3.</td>
<td>The Redevelopment Plan provides no detail as to how this expectation is to be met. It could be accomplished by a continuous illuminated sidewalk to each of the two commercial nodes. The Site Plan labeled “Open Space Plan” appears to show the sidewalk network as an integral element of the design. The applicant shall demonstrate how and when the project will build new walkable connections in the district.</td>
<td>No response.</td>
<td>Continuing comment. The applicant shall provide testimony that outlines specifically how linkages and integration of retail sales and services will be attained, and shall revise the plans accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.5: Fences, walls, gazebos, mail kiosks and other street furniture, page 29. As recommended by Design Concepts for the Redevelopment Plan (pages 14–15).</td>
<td>The Redevelopment Plan describes desirable design attributes and provides examples that may be useful models to accomplish a preferred design approach, which also is a Township requirement for apartment buildings in some instances. This is addressed below in 2.5 General Provisions of the Land Development Ordinance §512.A.11.</td>
<td>No response.</td>
<td>No response required. This was included for reference to reviewers as well as the applicant. See comment 2.5 General Provisions of the Land Development Ordinance §512.A.11 below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **E.6: Clubhouse.**  
Any development in the M-RD district composed of semi-detached, townhouse dwellings and/or multi-family dwellings shall include a separate clubhouse or community center for residents (2,500 sf. minimum). | The clubhouse/community center building on the Site Plan labeled “Open Space Plan” indicates an intention to meet this standard.  
The applicant shall provide floor plans for the propose clubhouse building. | Clubhouse plans, and conceptual façade study have been submitted along with colored rendering. | Addressed. |
| **F.2: Additional Requirements:** Apartment buildings shall have a strong relationship to a public or private street with parking generally located to the sides and rear of the building. Alternatively, apartment buildings may be designed around a pocket park development in the M-RD district composed of semi-detached townhouses. | It appears that the Applicant does not meet this standard. Most of the parking fields on Sheets 4A-B are located on the principal streets directly in front of the buildings. Furthermore, the renderings provided as part of the submittal and stamped “Received June 18” omit the parking lots planned for the multi-family buildings shown on Sheets 4A-B and therefore misrepresent the street front design and appearance of the project as depicted by the Site Plans.  
The applicant shall revise the plans accordingly or seek variance relief. | Parking has been added to color rendering. Site design issues regarding location to be addressed by applicant’s engineer. | Continuing comment. The revised architectural renderings show parking areas, but the site plan issue regarding the parking areas as they relate to the residential buildings still remains. As such, a variance will be required. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F.3: Additional Requirements:</td>
<td>It appears from Site Plan on Sheets 5A-B that the Applicant does not meet this standard. Furthermore, the renderings show garages quite dominant on the front of most units.</td>
<td>Due to site grading issues, garage must be located along front of units.</td>
<td>Continuing comment. A variance will be required. The applicant should provide testimony on the nature of the site conditions created the hardship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to garages for semi-detached and townhouse dwellings shall be from mid-block alleys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Additional Redevelopment Plan Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pages 37-38</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Apartment and Commercial Building Design <strong>Requirements:</strong> “In addition to designing buildings to the extent feasible utilizing the design guidelines contained herein, the following design requirements should be used in the design of apartment, commercial and mixed-use buildings.”</td>
<td>The renderings show design intent consistent with Plan guidance with respect to materials, horizontal delineation of base/middle/top, and window-to-wall ratio. Some elevations do not correspond to the Township ordinance requirement for variation in the frontage.</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td>The intent of the redevelopment plan is addressed through the following plan revisions:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.1:</strong> The front elevation of a building facing a street should be the primary contribution to the design. It shall be the primary focus of the architect’s design and the relative allocation of expense and workmanship by the developer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.3:</strong> The first story of the building should generally constitute the base of the design for any building three stories or higher. The design of the base, as well as the quality and durability of its materials, should be emphasized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.4:</strong> In addition to the base, the design shall include a middle field section and a cap on the top. The middle of the building shall be differentiated from the base by a horizontal transition line.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.9:</strong> The openings on the building elevation shall remain within a void-to-solid ratio of no more than 4.5 to 5.5 with each facade measured independently.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The revised elevations and renderings show design elements corresponding to the provisions of the plan:

1) Enduring materials (stone veneer base with upper walls have appearance of masonry or fiber cement siding; painted wood trim milled to traditional shapes; standing seam roof elements)

2) Craftsman-like, traditional construction and ornament (columns, shutters, dormers, and cornices with classic proportions and authentic dimensional characteristics).

3) Massing is varied and shows emphasis of individual residences within each building grouping.

**First story:** The base of all buildings and each column shows a stone base with a capstone or coping course at varying heights.
B.10: The minimum requirement for fenestration on residential facades shall be 20% of the total area.

These items should be memorialized in the board resolution if the application is approved.

6. **Land Development Ordinance Provisions**

The Redevelopment Plan regulations supersede the Gloucester Township Land Development Ordinance. As noted in the Redevelopment Plan, "where the design and performance standards in the Redevelopment Plan and LDO conflict, the standards contained herein shall apply to the subject property." The General Provisions of the municipal Land Development Ordinance apply unless they conflict with the development regulations adopted or amended as part of the approved Redevelopment Plan. As such, the following provisions located in Section 512: Residential Building Design Standards shall apply to the current application:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.A. Apartments.</strong> The following standards shall be used in the design of apartment buildings:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.A.2.:</strong> Apartment buildings shall not exceed 240 lineal feet through the long axis of the building.</td>
<td>The five 28-unit buildings shown on Sheets 4A-B are well in excess of this length and therefore do not meet this standard.</td>
<td>No response.</td>
<td>Continuing comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.A.4.: Each unit above the ground floor shall have a balcony or terrace of at least 60 square feet in area.</strong></td>
<td>Balconies shown on the renderings provided appear to be approximately 3 feet by 6 feet, or 18 square feet, rather than the required 60 square feet.</td>
<td>Balconies have been increased in size 5 ft x 12 ft, total: 60 ft</td>
<td>Addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.A. Apartments.</strong> The following standards shall be used in the design of apartment buildings:</td>
<td>Four story building has been redesigned with three story component, as well as breaks within building façade.</td>
<td>Partially addressed. The applicant shall provide an architectural rendering of the four-story building, which shall depict the relationship of the proposed building, landscaping, street trees, etc. to the streetscape and existing buildings across the Black Horse Pike.</td>
<td>Addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.A.7.</strong> Double loaded, rectangular, slab-configured structures are expressly prohibited.</td>
<td>Though the phrase “slab-configured” is not defined, the four-story building shown for the Age-restricted apartment building (Sheet 4E) does not appear to follow this requirement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.A.10.</strong> The exterior of the building shall be designed to visually break up any façade in excess of 50 lineal feet. A minimum of a 4-foot deep offset shall be provided in each 100 lineal feet of façade length. The design should distinguish between the base, middle, and top of the building.</td>
<td>The buildings shown on Sheets 4A–B do meet this standard on the primary street-facing façade, but do not for the rear-facing elevations. The renderings provided do show architectural delineation of base, middle, top.</td>
<td>Projections along building façade have been increased. Gable roof and hip roofs break up building massing, as well as 8'-0&quot; covered entry elements along front façade.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.A.11.</strong> Where an outdoor living space is required, adequate visual screening from all other neighboring dwelling units, outdoor living spaces, parking areas and roadways</td>
<td>The applicant does not identify how the balconies will be adequately screened.</td>
<td>Screening at outdoor living areas will be accomplished with landscaping.</td>
<td>Continuing comment. The applicant shall provide landscape plans or other documentation that indicates how</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**512.A. Apartments.** The following standards shall be used in the design of apartment buildings:

- shall be provided. Screening may be accomplished with plant materials, masonry structures or wood fencing a minimum of 4 feet in height. Architectural elements, such as masonry walls and fences, shall be compatible in both style and materials with the dwelling unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>screening will be provided.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>512.C. Townhouses. The following standards shall be used in the design of townhouse buildings:</td>
<td>Though building forms indicated on the Site Plans and the renderings do not appear to meet this standard, the requirement conflicts with, and is therefore superseded by, the Redevelopment Plan, which clearly anticipates a dominant street frontage. We recommend the applicant demonstrate how the project achieves the varied appearance and distinctiveness of individual townhouses intended by the ordinance. Setting back townhome façade not possible due to site grading issues.</td>
<td>Continuing comment. The redevelopment plan clearly anticipates a street frontage defined by building facades. As the redevelopment plan supersedes Township development regulations, the redevelopment plan provisions prevail. However, we recommend that the Township request the applicant to demonstrate how the project achieves the varied appearance and distinctiveness of individual townhomes intended by the ordinance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**512.C. Townhouses.** The following standards shall be used in the design of townhouse buildings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.C.2. Stagger Roof Lines.</strong> The roof lines of at least 30% of the number of units, which are attached in a structure, shall be staggered in height by not less than 5% of the height of the roof lines of the remaining units in such structure...</td>
<td>The building forms in one of the four untitled renderings show a roof ridgeline that varies, but with gradual slope, rather than breaking 5% or more at a unit.</td>
<td>Hip roof has been increased in height creating breaks in roof massing.</td>
<td>Addressed but with additional comment. Though the ordinance requirement has been addressed in that a varied roof form has been achieved, strict compliance with ordinance would result in distinct stepping of the ridge lines, rather than gradual change in pitch shown on the plans. It is worth noting, however, that the architectural expression of the front-facing gables and perpendicular ridge beams shown in the drawings attached to the 10/2/2019 letter from the Applicant’s Architect expresses the degree of varied form that may be the actual intent of the ordinance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>512.C.3. Screen Outdoor Living Space.</strong> Where an outdoor living space is included for a unit, it shall be provided with adequate visual screening... accomplished with plant materials, masonry structures or wood fencing...</td>
<td>The site Plans and renderings offer no indication that the proposed design complies.</td>
<td>Screening at outdoor living area will be accomplished by landscaping.</td>
<td>Continuing comment. The applicant shall provide revised landscaping plans that depict proposed screening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gloucester Township Community Development and Planning
1261 Chews Landing Road
Gloucester Township, NJ 08021
Attn: Kenneth Lechner, PP, AICP, Director/Planner

Re: First Architectural and Planning Review
Final Major Site Plan – Application #181022E
Crossroads Village, LLC (Southwinds at Gloucester, LLC)
Blackhorse Pike (Block 10801, Lot 10; Block 10899, Lots 1-3)
BW Mingus Run Redevelopment Zone

Dear Mr. Lechner:

We have reviewed the following materials as part of the above-referenced application:

- Site Plans prepared by Land Dimensions Engineering, dated April 30, 2018
- Site Plan Revised Sheets, prepared by Land Dimensions Engineering, dated July 11, 2018
- Architectural Renderings, no title block, undated

This review focuses specifically on the architectural features and urban design principles as described in the Redevelopment Plan to assess to what degree the site plans and renderings submitted to the Township are responsive to the provisions of the Redevelopment Plan. In preparing this review, T&M Associates, serving as the Township’s Redevelopment Planner and Architect, engaged Mark Keener, AICP, PP, AIA, of the firm Stromberg/Garrigan & Associates to assist in the review of the application.

The development regulations governing land use, site layout, and building design for the site are found in the Blackwood West Redevelopment Plan, which supersedes the Gloucester Township Land Development Ordinance except in certain circumstances as noted in the review comments below. Accordingly, the following review addresses the Purposes and Objectives, Design Concepts, and Development Regulations in the redevelopment plan that are relevant to this application and those provisions of the Land Development Ordinance that also must be addressed by the applicant.

We offer the following comments regarding the above application and supplemental materials:

1. Project Description

The subject property is within the Mingus Run Redevelopment Zone (M-RD) district of the Blackwood West Redevelopment Area and is comprised of Block 10801, Lot 10 and Block 10899, Lots 1-3. The subject property is bound by Erial-Blenheim Road to the north and east, by a single family detached residential neighborhood to the south, beyond which lies Church Street, and the Black Horse Pike to the west. The site is bisected by a stream and associated wetlands as well as by a power line right access easement.

The applicant is requesting Final Major Site Plan approval for a development that consists of a 478-unit residential development (including 220 multi-family apartment units, 158 townhomes, and a 100-unit age-restricted apartment building), a 2,500 square foot clubhouse, pool and tot lot area, and associated site improvements.
2. Redevelopment Plan Purpose and Objectives

The Objectives section of the Redevelopment Plan states that the plan: “is intended primarily as a means of revitalizing the commercial core of Blackwood with a secondary emphasis on residential development, redevelopment and rehabilitation. New residential development is intended mainly for vacant areas at the periphery of the redevelopment area that will provide additional customers for retail businesses [and to] facilitate the development of high quality housing types not presently offered in Gloucester Township.” Another stated purpose is to “improve the functionality of streets and parking [and to] provide for pedestrian access from neighborhoods to businesses and public recreation.” The Redevelopment Plan presents a clear expectation that direct, convenient, connection to retail, services, and amenities is an important element, necessary to attract the expected user. The applicant should demonstrate how this objective is to be achieved.

The Blackwood West Redevelopment Plan is intended to provide a more flexible development review and approval process than can be achieved by application of the Township’s Land Development Ordinance so that, “the municipality can be more responsive to changing circumstances and private sector interest in redevelopment parcels.” Therefore, the Board’s review of the application and its evaluation of the architectural design elements should be undertaken in this context.

3. Design Concepts

The design concepts presented on pages 11 through 16 of the Redevelopment Plan relate to the design standards of the Redevelopment Plan in much the same way as the Land Use Plan relates to the zoning regulations (see Appendix A). The design concepts use pictures and illustrations to describe and illustrate the architectural elements that can be used in new and infill construction. Key recommendations intended to guide design of multi-family buildings relate to building facades, building form, location of parking lots and garages, pedestrian mobility, and landscape design features. These design concepts are not requirements per se, but rather are intended to serve as helpful suggestions to assist applicants and designers to understand and meet the provisions of the relevant Development Regulations. Relevant design concepts and corresponding images represented in the Redevelopment Plan include the following:

A. Avoid long, unrelieved flat facades (page 13): “The two-story elements of the design are closest to the sidewalk, with the three-story elements recessed.”

B. Façade design (page 13): “This building is also notable for the demonstration of the horizontal three module approach to traditional buildings that have a clearly defined base, middle, and top or cornice.”

C. Mix two- and three-story heights in same building grouping (page 13): “This example of a townhouse development shows a means of mixing two- and three-story designs together in one project.”

D. Vary building form (page 13): “The two-story elements of the design are closest to the sidewalk, with the three-story elements recessed. The three-story recess is tied together with the roof line of the two-story portions to create a well-scaled project.”
E. Massing and scale of apartment buildings (page 14): “The design of apartment buildings can incorporate some of the same concepts in townhouse design in terms of massing and scale of the buildings.” The applicant shall provide architectural design renderings for the proposed apartment buildings.

F. Parking at rear or side (page 14): “In the redevelopment area, townhouse garages and parking lots should be located to the rear of the buildings and access provided by alleys or parking lot driveways intersecting secondary streets.”

G. Garages not prominent feature (page 14): “Three-story townhouses allow for the inclusion of garages on the first floor with two stories of living space above them.”

H. Use fences and low walls to distinguish different areas and create sense of privacy and domain (pages 15-16): “Though this building is set back only 12-15 feet from the sidewalk, the fencing demarcates public and private areas and landscaping is used to soften the edges of the building... Masonry walls should be used to screen parking areas from public view and should be supplemented by landscaping.”

The applicant shall demonstrate how these design concepts are incorporated into the proposed development and building design or indicate why this was not feasible.

4. Development Regulations—Redevelopment Plan

A.0: Specific Intent, page 29: The district provides for integration of retail sales and services. This is also a Redevelopment Plan Objective listed on Page 3.


The Redevelopment Plan describes desirable design attributes and provides examples that may be useful models to accomplish a preferred design approach, which also is a Township requirement for apartment buildings in some instances.

This is addressed below in 2.5 General Provisions of the Land Development Ordinance §512.A.11.
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E.6: Clubhouse. Any development in the M-RD district composed of semi-detached, townhouse dwellings and/or multi-family dwellings shall include a separate clubhouse or community center for residents (2,500 sf. minimum).

The clubhouse/community center building on the Site Plan labeled “Open Space Plan” indicates an intention to meet this standard.

F.2: Additional Requirements: Apartment buildings shall have a strong relationship to a public or private street with parking generally located to the sides and rear of the building. Alternatively, apartment buildings may be designed around a pocket park development in the M-RD district composed of semi-detached townhouses.

It appears that the Applicant does not meet this standard. Most of the parking fields on Sheets 4A-B are located on the principal streets directly in front of the buildings. Furthermore, the renderings provided as part of the submittal and stamped “Received June 18” omit the parking lots planned for the multi-family buildings shown on Sheets 4A-B and therefore misrepresent the street front design and appearance of the project as depicted by the Site Plans.

The applicant shall provide floor plans for the propose clubhouse building.

F.3: Additional Requirements: Access to garages for semi-detached and townhouse dwellings shall be from mid-block alleys.

It appears from Site Plan on Sheets 5A-B that the Applicant does not meet this standard. Furthermore, the renderings show garages quite dominant on the front of most units.

The applicant shall revise the plans accordingly or seek variance relief.

5. Additional Redevelopment Plan Requirements

Pages 37-38

B: Apartment and Commercial Building Design Requirements:
"In addition to designing buildings to the extent feasible utilizing the design guidelines contained herein, the following design requirements should be used in the design of apartment, commercial and mixed-use buildings."

B.1: The front elevation of a building facing a street should be the primary contribution to the design. It shall be the primary focus of the architect’s design and the relative allocation of expense and workmanship by the developer.

B.3: The first floor of the building should generally constitute the base of the design for any building three stories or higher. The design of the base, as well as the quality and durability of its materials, should be emphasized.

The renderings show design intent consistent with Plan guidance with respect to materials, horizontal delineation of base/middle/top, and window-to-wall ratio. Some elevations do not correspond to the Township ordinance requirement for variation in the frontage.

See notes below regarding Township
B.4: In addition to the base, the design shall include a middle field section and a cap on the top. The middle of the building shall be differentiated from the base by a horizontal transition line.
B.9: The openings on the building elevation shall remain within a void-to-solid ratio of no more than 4.5 to 5.5 with each facade measured independently.
B.10: The minimum requirement for fenestration on residential facades shall be 20% of the total area.


The Redevelopment Plan regulations supersede the Gloucester Township Land Development Ordinance. As noted in the Redevelopment Plan, “where the design and performance standards in the Redevelopment Plan and LDO conflict, the standards contained herein shall apply to the subject property.” The General Provisions of the municipal Land Development Ordinance apply unless they conflict with the development regulations adopted or amended as part of the approved Redevelopment Plan. As such, the following provisions located in Section 512: Residential Building Design Standards shall apply to the current application:

512.A. Apartments. The following standards shall be used in the design of apartment buildings:

512.A.2.: Apartment buildings shall not exceed 240 linear feet through the long axis of the building.

512.A.4.: Each unit above the ground floor shall have a balcony or terrace of at least 60 square feet in area.

512.A.7.: Double-loaded, rectangular, slab-configured structures are expressly prohibited.

512.A.10.: The exterior of the building shall be designed to visually break up any facade.

The five 28-unit buildings shown on Sheets 4A-B are well in excess of this length and therefore do not meet this standard.

The applicant shall revise the plans or request a design waiver.

Balconies shown on the renderings provided appear to be approximately 3 feet by 6 feet, or 18 square feet, rather than the required 60 square feet.

The applicant shall revise the plans accordingly or request a design waiver.

Though the phrase "slab-configured" is not defined, the four-story building shown for the Age-restricted apartment building (Sheet 4E) does not appear to follow this requirement.

The applicant should seek clarification and, depending on response, modify design or pursue relief from requirement as part of final submission.

The buildings shown on Sheets 4A-B do meet this standard on the primary street-facing facade, but do...
in excess of 50 linear feet. A minimum of a 4-foot deep offset shall be provided in each 100 linear feet of facade length. The design should distinguish between the base, middle, and top of the building.

512.A.11.: Where an outdoor living space is required, adequate visual screening from all other neighboring dwelling units, outdoor living spaces, parking areas and roadways shall be provided. Screening may be accomplished with plant materials, masonry structures or wood fencing a minimum of 4 feet in height. Architectural elements, such as masonry walls and fences, shall be compatible in both style and materials with the dwelling unit.

512.C. Townhouses. The following standards shall be used in the design of townhouse buildings:

512.C.1. Vary Facade Setback. The front facade of at least 40% of the number of units in a structure shall be set back not less than 4 feet behind the facades of the remaining units.

512.C.2. Stagger Roof Lines. The roof lines of at least 30% of the number of units, which are attached in a structure, shall be staggered in height by not less than 5% of the height of the roof lines of the remaining units in such structure.

512.C.3. Screen Outdoor Living Space. Where an outdoor living space is included for a unit, it shall be provided with adequate visual screening. accomplished with plant materials, masonry structures or wood fencing.

not for the rear-facing elevations. The renderings provided do show architectural delineation of base, middle, top.

The applicant shall revise the plans accordingly or request a design waiver from the requirement to offset every 50 to 100 feet.

The applicant does not identify how the balconies will be adequately screened.

The applicant shall demonstrate compliance with this requirement.

Though building forms indicated on the Site Plans and the renderings do not appear to meet this standard, the requirement conflicts with, and is therefore superseded by, the Redevelopment Plan, which clearly anticipates a dominant street frontage.

We recommend the applicant demonstrate how the project achieves the varied appearance and distinctiveness of individual townhouses intended by the ordinance.

The building forms in one of the four untitled renderings show a roof ridgeline that varies, but with gradual slope, rather than breaking 5% or more at a unit.

The applicant shall demonstrate how this objective will be achieved.

The site Plans and renderings offer no indication that the proposed design complies.

The applicant shall demonstrate how this objective will be achieved.

We recommend the above comments be addressed prior to the Board acting on the site plan application.
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If you have any questions or need additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very truly yours,

T&M ASSOCIATES

[Signature]

STAN SLACHETKA, P.E., AICP
REDEVELOPMENT PLANNER

SCS:JAC.dk
Enclosure

cc: Stephan Boraske, Florio, Perrucci, Steinhardt, and Fader, Board Solicitor
Steven Bach, Bach Associates, P.C., Board Engineer
Jeremy Teichman, jeremy@buildwithinreach.com
Bob Mintz, Freeman & Mintz, Applicant’s Attorney, bob@freemanandinz.com
Lawrence M. DiVietro, Jr., PLS, PP, AICP, Land Dimensions Engineering, Applicant’s Planner,
larry@landdimensions.com
Mark Keener, AICP, PP, A1A, Stromberg/Garrigan Associates, mkeener@ks-ga.com
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TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING BOARD

Tuesday October 09, 2018

Chairman Reagan calls the meeting to order.
Salute to the Flag.
Opening Statement made by Mr. Lechner.
Chairman Reagan is Absent
Vice-Chair Costa requests a Roll Call.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dintino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Guevara</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kricun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Washington</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Hutchison</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Costa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Bradley</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Reagan</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Boraske</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Roorda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lechner</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vice-Chair Costa announces general rules of the meeting.
Vice-Chair Costa asks that the Board Professionals to be Sworn in.
Mr. Bach & Mr. Lechner were Sworn in.

Minutes for Memorialization

Minutes from September 11, 2018.
Vice-Chair Costa requested a motion to approve the minutes
Mr. Dintino made a motion seconded by Mrs. Rossi.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dintino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair Costa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolutions for Memorialization

#171062RDMPFSe
Aqua New Jersey
Spring Hollow/Blackwood
Well #20 Treatment System

Block: 18403  Lot: 19/20
Location: 567 Berlin-Cross Keys Rd.
Extension of Resolution

Vice-Chair Costa asked for a motion to approve the Resolution.
Mr. Dintino made a motion seconded by Mrs. Rossi.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Dintino</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair Costa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application for Review

#181033CM
Richard F. Williams
Zoned: R2

Block: 18501  Lots: 9
Location: 917 Sicklerville Rd.
Sicklerville
Minor Subdivision/Bulk C

NOTES:
Mr. Brandon Croker Esq. of the Comegno Law Group, P.C. approached the podium.
Mr. Croker stated the applicant requests a minor subdivision approval to permit the subdivision of an existing lot 180' x 212' into two (2) lots with dimensions of approx. 90' x 212'each. In connection with the application, the applicant requests a bulk variance relief from the 100' frontage requirement set forth in the Twp. Zoning Ordinance to permit the proposed 90' lot frontage.
Mr. Croker expressed that the division of the original lot would not cause any detriment to the surroundings. There are No Wetlands and an Engineer will walk the site to observe any irregularities and survey the land grading. A grading plan will have to be submitted prior to final approval.
Further discussion focused on sidewalks to be in place before the deed is issued or after purchase and an established wooden fence that might be encroaching on another property.

Vice-Chair Costa asked if there were any questions from the Board?
None
Vice-Chair Costa asked if there were any questions from the Public?
None
Vice-Chair Costa asked for a motion to approve the Application. Mr. Kricun made a motion seconded by Mr. Dintino.

Roll Call:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dintino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Guevara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kricun</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Washington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair Costa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#181034SPW
Laurel Hill Plaza Association
Zoned: HC

Block: 14402 Lots: 29.01
Location: 200 College Drive
Clementon
Site Plan Waiver Handicap Parking Renovations & Improvement proposed for 2 Commercial Buildings

NOTES:
Mr. Brian Lozuke, Esq. of Mattleman, Weinroth & Miller, P.C. approached the podium. He is representing Laurel Hill Association seeking a site plan waiver with respect to the proposed handicapped parking site improvements. The improvements are within the Plaza Zoned HC containing a two building strip mall. The plan waiver relates to improvements for handicap accessibility.
- Change parking lot striping to decrease total parking from 209 to 196 increasing width of 5 handicap parking spots.
- Improve handicap ramps by decreasing length & aligning straight instead of on an angle complying with ADA requirements.

Mr. Lozuke expressed that the Variance is Substantiated. The Engineer Letter was reviewed and all concerns can be addressed.

Mr. Lechner had concerns about Number of trash receptacles for the respective shops.
- Can Number of bins be reduced?
- Can enclosures be built even though limited space in this area?

Mr. Antonio Association President stated he would immediately contract the services of a company to manage the property upkeep and maintenance of the trash enclosures. Mr. Bach requested that a performance Guarantee be associated with this project to ensure the work actually gets completed. Mr. Lozuke agreed.

Vice-Chair Costa asked if there were any questions from the Board?
None
Vice-Chair Costa asked if there were any questions from the Public?
None

Vice-Chair Costa asked for a motion to approve the Request for the Extension. Mr. Kricun made a motion seconded by Mr. Dintino.
Roll Call:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dintino</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Guevara</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kricun</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Washington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair Costa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this time an additional professional was sworn in.
Mr. Stan Slachetka, PA. Licensed Planner was sworn in as an additional reappointed Township Board Professional.

#181022E-PFSPFSPa  
Southwinds @ Gloucester LLC  
Zoned: MRD  

Original Date: 8/28/18  
Postponed to: 10/9/18

Final Major Subdivision  
Revised Preliminary & Final  
Major Site Plan (Amended)  
Block: 10801 Lot: 10  
Block: 10899 Lots: 1-3  
Location: 553-557 N. Blk Hrse Pk.  
220 Multi-Family Apartments  
100 Unit Apartment for Affordable  
COAH Rental Housing

NOTES:
Mr. Robert Mintz Esq. from Freeman & Mintz Law Firm, approached the podium representing the applicant Southwinds @ Gloucester, LLC. Mr. Mintz named the accompanying partners who will be testifying: Jeremy Teicher-Developer, Andrew Hogg-Engineer, Robert Zamolim-Architect, Larry Divietro-Prof. Planner, David Homer-Traffic Engineer. All approached the podium, all sworn in and identified themselves, the Board acknowledged all as professionals in their fields.
Mr. Mintz stated Mr. DiVietro brought a few renderings developed under his supervision w/ duplicates for audience viewing at the same time as originals are being presented.
Mr. Mintz described and marked the following renderings:
Mr. Mintz continued to state this is a continuance from the August meeting with Notice that was adjourned. He met with a number of concerned residents at the end of that meeting outside the meeting area so that their concerns would be heard and possibly addressed in the revisions presented currently.
Mr. Mintz stated the area is considered the Blackwood West Redevelopment Plan and after a Litigation Settlement the preliminary approval was granted and the Southwinds @ Gloucester, LLC was designated as the Developer, permitting the building of 497 units on @56 acres. The Litigation incorporated regulations that allowed only 8.5 Units/Acre and required open space totaling of 25.8% of the total acreage. The Litigation also produced a change in the age restriction housing to include affordable housing units within that category along with front parking and front entrance garages where applicable.
In hindsight, the regulations modified the number of units from the original plan by reducing the number of town houses to 158 Units and 220 Multi-family Units.

Mr. Mintz continued to discuss the changes made in the original plan in detail from the preliminary approved plan.

Mr. Mintz called Mr. DiVetro for testimony. Mr. DiVetro described the renderings in detail while an associate simultaneously indicated the areas being described on the rendering copies for the public audience to follow. In this testimony he described the modifications of the project design and the overall placement of buildings, sidewalks, green spaces, storm runoff, access roads, etc.

Mr. DiVetro continued with his testimony. He stated:
- The property is Virgin with No structures to be demolished and the project could introduce about 1000 new residents facilitation of high quality housing.
- This population will stimulate new business development and with that commercial buildings stimulate new business usages especially in the down town and surrounding Blackwood areas.
- The project development complies with all requirements of the master plan and needs No Variances.
- There is No impact on the schools since there has been an 18% reduction of school age children in this area over the last 10 years.
- The applications with outside agencies needed to be approved and then the agency plans will be brought back to the Board for final approval.

Mr. Mintz introduced the traffic engineer David Horner.

Mr. Horner described his stake in the project and what he has investigated. He stated that the development of this project will only produce 30 additional cars to access Erial Rd. and there are No Issues with the DOT and the Black Horse Pike access. The information was derived from the comparison of a 2007 traffic study of the area and a recent 2018 updated traffic study, Exhibit A8.

Mr. Mintz introduced Robert Zamolin-Project Architect. Mr. Zamolin acknowledges the plans were developed under his supervision. Mr. Zamolin continued his testimony describing the renderings A-3 to A-6 in detail from an architectural standpoint.

Mr. Kricun asked for clarification on the Affordable Housing.

Mr. Boraski read the condition of approval and the information previously mentioned on the subject of affordable housing.

It's noted there is No significant deviation from the preliminary plan and all concerns mentioned in the Board review letter will be addressed and complied.

Further discussion briefly continued with Fire company access to the buildings and if the buildings will have fire sprinklers.

Vice-Chair Costa asked if there were any questions from the Board?

None

Vice-Chair Costa asked if there were any questions from the Public?

There were a number of township residents that gave testimony with varying concerns about the project and its impact on the area. Fourteen residents not all living in the immediate area, voiced concerns about the following:
- Traffic impact & gridlock/ Traffic Light on Erial Rd. & Blackwood-Clementon Ave.
- School impact
- Sidewalks being completed
- Taxes
Affordable Housing Issues and Low Income
Criminal Activity increase above what is already present
Fencing /Block wall for buffer or to prevent walk through into surrounding neighborhood
Disturbance to wildlife
Fire Lane
Price range of Units

After all the residents asking to speak had that opportunity, Mr. Mintz responded to their concerns as briefly as possible.

Vice-Chair Costa closed the public portion of the meeting.
Mr. Kricun stated that he would personally speak with the Mayor about the residents’ concerns.

Vice-Chair Costa asked for a motion to approve the Application.
Mr. Kricun made a motion seconded by Mr. Dintino.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Dintino</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Guevara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kricun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Washington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-Chair Costa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondence

Letter of Interpretation
Applicant: Winslow CCUM 4 LLC
Winslow Cross Creek Development (Phase V)
Location: Erial Rd., Rt. 706
Block: 2903 Lot: 12A

Vice-Chair Costa requested a motion to adjourn.
Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Kricun seconded by Mrs. Rossi.

Meeting Adjourned.

Recording Secretary,

Christopher Nowak