Township of Gloucester
Planning Board Agenda
JUNE 11, 2019

Salute to the Flag
Opening Statement
Roll Call
General Rules
Meeting will start at 7:00 P. M.
No new applications will be heard after 10:00 P. M.
All persons testifying before the Board must be sworn in.
The Board Chairperson reserves the right to hear applications in any order

MINUTES FOR MEMORIALIZATION

Minutes for Memorialization – May 14, 2019

RESOLUTIONS FOR MEMORIALIZATION

#181033CM
Richard F. Williams
Minor Subdivision
90 Day Extension
Block: 18501 Lots: 9 & 9.01

#1910135SPW
Bank of America
Admended Minor Site
Block: 9709 Lot: 1

#191017CM
William & Nadine Yackle
Minor Subdivision/Bulk C
Block: 13003 Lot: 3
APPLICATIONS

#191019M
Duane & Michelle Little
Zoned: R1

Minor Subdivision
Adjusting Lot Lines
Block: 20601 Lot: 21
Block: 20601 Lot: 21.01
Location: 1068 & 1070 Chewslanding Road,
Blackwood
Seeking to move property line in the rear of 1068
& add frontage (100 ft.)
to 1070 Chewslanding Rd.

T&M Associates
Study College Drive
Proposed Non-Condensation
Redevelopment
Zoned: CR-RD

Redevelopment Study & Preliminary Investigation Study
Block: 13103 Lots: 3, 3.01
4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 & 13

Meeting Adjourned
Chairman Dintino absent, Vice Chair Costa commanded the meeting.
Salute to the Flag.
Opening Statement made by Mr. Lechner.
Vice Chair Costa announces general rules of the meeting.
Vice Chair Costa requested a Roll Call.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Costa</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Guevara</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kricun</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councilman Hutchison</td>
<td>Absent</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>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hojnowski</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. MacPherson</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairman Dintino</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Boraske Esq.</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Bach</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Lechner</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vice Chair Costa asked that the Board Professionals be Sworn In.
Mr. Bach & Mr. Lechner were sworn in by Mr. Boraske.
Vice Chair Costa asked Mrs. Botsford to sit for Mr. Kricun. She agreed.

Minutes for Memorialization
Minutes from April 9, 2019.
Vice Chair Costa requested a motion to adopt the minutes.
Ms. Botsford made the motion seconded by Mr. Thomas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll Call</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. MacPherson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Resolutions for Memorialization

191007SPW  Site Plan Waiver
Caesar's Pasta, LLC  Block: 4202 Lot: 1
Zoned: BP

Vice Chair Costa asked for a motion to adopt the Resolution. Ms. Botsford made the motion seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Rossi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. MacPherson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Application for Review

#181033CM  Minor Subdivision
Richard F. Williams  90 Day Extension
Zoned: R2  Block: 18501 Lot: 9 & 9.01
Location: 917 & 919 Sicklerville Rd.
Extending deadline
From 6/15 to 9/3/19

NOTES:
Brandon Croker Esq. Comegno Law Group, P.C. representing Richard Williams. Mr. Williams was here in front of the Board on October 9, 2018. At that time the Board approved a minor sub division but imposed a number of conditions.
The completion of the conditions are taking longer than expected, so Mr. Williams is here to ask for extension of 120 days from the June 5, 2019 deadline. The completion date would then be October 3rd, 2019.

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 grant the extension. Mrs. McPherson made the motion seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Costa</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>Mr. Hojnowski</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. MacPherson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES:
Scott College Esq. from Riker, Danzig, Scherer, Hylander & Perrotti, LLP. representing Bank of America asking for a sit plan waiver. The property is 1.2 acres Zoned OR. Mr. College stated that there would be No Variances required and there would be No Major Improvements. Mr. College introduced Mr. Ahmad Kabose, Engineer who was sworn in as a professional proceeded to give a brief overview of the improvements. He stated that the sidewalks were non-compliant and would be replaced while ramping installed to make it easier for handicap access. The parking lot will be restriped.
Mr. Bach interjected stating that this seems to be minor work thus he recommends that the application be amended to project a Minor site Plan. In changing the designation, the project oversite is shifted to the municipal engineer to ensure and confirm its completion.

Vice Chair Costa asked if there were any question 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 adopt the amendment recommending it to Township Council.
Mrs. Rossi made the motion seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Roll Call:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Costa</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>Mr. Hojnowski</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. MacPherson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTES:
Chuck Pertrone, Esq. representing William & Nadine Yackle for a minor sub-
division dividing the property into two lots. The new lot will be 18,787 ft sq in area
and the remaining lot would be approx. 15,105 ft sq in area. In addition to the
minor sub-division we are requesting for Varience approval for increased lot depth
and side yard area set back of the sub division line.
Mr. Yackle approached the podium and answered questions by Mr. Pertrone
about the property and it usage. Mr. Yackle explained that he built the current
house. The sub-division would allow him to build a new house more of a rancher
type with a walk out basement to fit into the surrounding neighborhood.
Mr. Yackle stated he would agree to any conditions proposed by the Board.

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

Roll Call:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Costa</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>Mr. Hojnowski</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. MacPherson</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

General Correspondence

NONE

Vice Chair Costa asked for a motion to Adjourn the meeting.
Mr. Thomas made the motion seconded by Mrs. MacPherson.

Vice Chair Costa adjourned the meeting.
Meeting Adjourned.

Recording Secretary,

Christopher Nowak
WHEREAS, on May 14, 2019 consideration was given to the application of Bank of America, N.A. (hereinafter “Applicant”) for the property located at 1345 Chews Landing Rd., identified on the Tax Map for the Township of Gloucester as Block 9709, Lot 1 (hereinafter “the Property”), located in the Township’s OR – Office Residential District, for a Waiver of Site Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Land Development Ordinance of the Township of Gloucester (hereinafter “LDO”); and

WHEREAS, the Applicant proposes to make ADA upgrades to the existing parking lot, including new or improved curb cuts, ramps, restriping lot stalls, crosswalks, and new signage; and

WHEREAS, Scott Collins, Esq., appeared on behalf of the Applicant and Mr. Ahmad Tamous, PE, was sworn in, qualified and accepted as an expert in Professional Engineering, and testified in favor of the application; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Collins introduced the Application, identified the location of the Property, the requested relief, and summarized the proposed site plan waiver; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Tamous testified as to the proposed site improvements and the Applicant’s reasons for the proposed improvements; and further testified as to the uses surrounding the Property, explaining that it is next to the Township municipal building; that the existing sidewalk and crosswalk connects to the building; that the sidewalk is not currently compliant but the Applicant proposes to make the sidewalk compliant; that the Applicant is further proposing to construct a trash enclosure and add additional landscaping; that the existing sidewalk will be extended per Township Code requirements; that the Applicant is agreeable to restriping the entire parking lot as requested by the Board Professionals; and that the overall improvements are intended to ensure the parking lot is completely compliant with ADA requirements; and

WHEREAS, the Board and Board Professionals questioned and discussed with the Applicant and the Applicant’s witnesses several miscellaneous issues relating to the Property and the Application; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant agreed to all comments and conditions expressed within the Board Engineer Stephen Bach, PE, RA, PP, CME April 1, 2019 Review Letter, to the extent not already addressed by the testimony of the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant agreed to all comments and conditions expressed within Board Planner Kenneth Lechner, PP, AICP, March 18, 2019 Review Letter, to the extent not already addressed by the testimony of the Applicant; and
WHEREAS, the meeting was open to the public, and no members of the public appeared to testify; and

WHEREAS, prior to the Board voting on the Applicant's request for a site plan waiver, the Board Professionals recommended – and the Applicant agreed – to modify the requested relief from a site plan waiver to a request for minor site plan approval; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board having received reports from professionals and other advisors to the Board including, without limitation, the Zoning Officer, Board Engineer, Board Planner, County Planning Board, Traffic Commander, Fire Marshall, Tax Assessor, Water Department and Municipal Utilities Authorities and having heard testimony from the Board Planner and Board Engineer, makes the following factual findings and conclusions of law in approving the subject application for minor site plan approval:

1. The Applicant is Bank of America, N.A. The Property is 1345 Chews Landing Rd., identified on the Tax Map for the Township of Gloucester as Block 9709, Lot 1. The Property is located in the OR – Office Residential District.

2. To the extent required, public notice of the hearing was provided in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:55D-12.

3. Requested Relief: minor site plan approval for “ADA upgrades to the existing parking lot” that include sidewalk, curb cuts, ramps, and line striping.

4. The Application does not require any variances or other waivers.

5. The Board Planner, Kenneth D. Lechner, PP, AICP, issued a report dated March 18, 2019, incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein, recommending certain revisions, clarification and/or modifications to the plans with which the Applicant agreed to comply unless otherwise outlined or modified further herein, or to the extent that they had not been addressed through testimony.

6. The Board Engineer, Steven M. Bach, PE, RA, PP, CME of Bach Associates, PC, issued a report dated April 1, 2019, incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein, recommending certain revisions, clarification and/or modifications to the plans with which the Applicant agreed to comply unless otherwise outlined or modified further herein, or to the extent that they had not been addressed through testimony.

7. With regard to the requested preliminary/final minor site plan approval, through the evidence submitted and testimony presented by the Applicant’s witnesses, professionals, the Board’s professionals, and members of the public, the Board finds and concludes that the proposed minor site plan complies with all site plan and other standards, specifications, and requirements established by the LDO not addressed by variances and waivers as detailed herein, and that the Property is suitable for the proposed improvements given the size of the Subject Property and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after considering the foregoing facts, the Board further concludes that the Applicant has demonstrated that the Application will not have a deleterious effect upon the neighborhood, and has satisfied the standards necessary for approval and should therefore be approved subject to the specific and standard conditions stated herein and on the record; and

WHEREAS, a motion was duly made by Ms. Rossi and duly seconded by Mr. Thomas to APPROVE the Application as a minor site plan, and a roll call vote on the motion was recorded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those Eligible to Vote</th>
<th>Those in Favor</th>
<th>Those Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Costa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rossi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hojnowski</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. MacPherson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, the above relief is subject to the following conditions:

1. That the Application, all exhibits, testimony, map, and other documents submitted and relied on by the Applicant, are true and accurate representations of the facts relating to the Applicant’s request for approval. In the event that it is determined by the Board, on non-arbitrary, non-capricious and reasonable grounds, that the Application, exhibits, testimony, maps, and other documents submitted are not accurate, are materially misleading, or are the result of mistake, and the same had been relied upon by the Board as they bear on facts which were essential in the granting of the relief sought by the Applicant, the Board may review its approval and rehear the Application, if circumstances so require, or where a rehearing is necessary and appropriate in the interests of justice.

2. Upon discovery by the Board of clear and convincing evidence of a materially misleading submission, material misstatement, materially inaccurate information, or a material mistake made by the Applicant, the Board reserves the right to conduct a hearing with the Applicant present, for the purpose of fact-finding regarding the same. Should the facts at said hearing confirm that there had been a material fault in the Application, the Board shall take whatever action it deems appropriate at that time, consistent with the MLUL and case law, including but not limited to a reconsideration of its prior approval, a rehearing, a modification of its prior approval, or such other action as appropriate. In addition, at any time within 45 days after the adoption of this resolution, a party of
interest may appeal to the Superior Court for an order vacating or modifying any term or condition as set forth herein.

3. The Applicant shall indemnify and hold the Township harmless from any Claims whatsoever which may be made as a result of any deficiency in the Application, or as to any representations made by the Applicant, including but not limited to proper service and notice upon interested parties made in reliance upon the certified list of property owners and other parties entitled to notice, said list having been provided to the Applicant by the Township pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12(c), and publication of the notice of public hearing in this matter in accordance with the law.

4. The relief as granted herein is subject to the discovery of any and all deed restrictions upon the Subject Property which had not been known or had not been disclosed to the Board, but which would have had a materially negative impact upon the Board’s decision in this matter had they been so known, or so disclosed.

5. The Applicant must obtain approvals from any and all governmental and/or public agencies as required, whether federal, state, county or local, over which the Board has no control but which are necessary in order to finalize and/or implement the relief being granted herein, as well as any construction that may be a part of said relief. The Applicant is solely responsible for determining which governmental and/or public agencies, if any, such approvals are required.

6. The Applicant is further required to submit a copy to the Board’s Secretary of all approvals and/or denials received from such outside agencies, with a copy thereof to the Board’s Solicitor, Engineer, and Planner.

7. The Applicant must pay the costs of all professional review and other fees required to act on the Application, pursuant to the applicable sections of the Township’s land development ordinances, zone codes and any other applicable municipal codes, and the MLUL.

8. The Applicant assumes all risks should the Applicant fail to obtain any other construction or other municipal permits required with respect to the relief as granted herein during the statutory appeal period associated with the language of this resolution.

9. The Applicant must obtain any other construction or other municipal permits required with respect to the relief as granted herein.

10. The Applicant shall comply with all of the representations and stipulations as contained in the application and as represented through testimony in support of the application.
CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this resolution of memorialization being adopted by action of the Board on this 11th day of June 2019 represents a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Gloucester Township Planning Board consistent with its decision at a meeting held on the 14th day of May 2019.

KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY
A RESOLUTION OF THE GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MEMORIALIZING MINOR SUBDIVISION APPROVAL EXTENSION
FOR RICHARD F. WILLIAMS
APPLICATION NO.: 181033CM

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2019, consideration was given to the application of Richard F. Williams (hereinafter “Applicant”) for the property located at 917 Sicklerville Rd, identified on the Tax Map for the Township of Gloucester as Block 18501, Lots 9 & 9.01 (hereinafter “Property”), for an extension of minor subdivision approval in accordance with the requirements of the Land Development Ordinance of the Township of Gloucester (hereinafter “LDO”); and

WHEREAS, Mr. Brandon R. Croker, Esq., of the Comegno Law Group, P.C., appeared on behalf of the Applicant, summarized the history of the Application, and explained that the Applicant was previously granted minor subdivision approval that is set to expire on June 5, 2019 unless a deed perfecting the minor subdivision is recorded; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Croker represented that the Applicant intends to perfect the previously approved minor subdivision, but has been delayed both directly and indirectly in obtaining additional required government approvals despite diligently pursuing same; and

WHEREAS, the Board and Board Professionals discussed with the Applicant’s attorney the duration of the delay and the Applicant’s requested extension; and the Applicant’s attorney explained that while the Applicant had previously requested an extension from June 5, 2019 to September 3, 2019, the Applicant now requests an extension to October 3, 2019, to avoid the necessity of returning to the Board for additional extensions; and

WHEREAS, the meeting was opened to the public, and no members of the public appeared to testify; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board having received reports from professionals and other advisors to the Board including, without limitation, the Zoning Officer, Board Engineer, Board Planner, County Planning Board, Traffic Commander, Fire Marshall, Tax Assessor, Water Department and Municipal Utilities Authorities and having heard testimony from the Board Planner and Board Engineer, makes the following factual findings and conclusions of law in approving the subject application for minor subdivision approval extension:

1. The Applicant is Richard F. Williams. The Property is located at 917 Sicklerville Rd, identified on the Township of Gloucester Tax Map as Block 18501, Lots 9 & 9.01. The Applicant is the owner of the Property, which is located in the R-2 Residential Zoning District.

2. To the extent required, public notice of the hearing was provided in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:55D-12.

4. Decision on Minor Subdivision Extension Request.

a. The Municipal Land Use Law ("MLUL"), N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(d), provides that approval of a minor subdivision expires 190 days from the date on which the municipal resolution of approval is adopted unless a minor subdivision deed or a minor subdivision plan is filed perfecting said minor subdivision. N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(f) further provides that said 190-day time period may be extended by the Board if the developer was prevented, directly or indirectly, from recording the minor subdivision deed or plan because of delays in obtaining other required governmental approvals, and that the developer promptly applied for and diligently pursued the required approvals.

b. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(f), based upon the evidence submitted and representations of the Applicant’s attorney at the May 14, 2019 public hearing, the Board finds and concludes as a matter of law that the Applicant has diligently sought the required additional governmental approvals, but has been delayed, both directly and indirectly, from obtaining same. Therefore, the Applicant’s approval and time to perfect the minor subdivision is hereby extended from June 5, 2019 to October 3, 2019.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after considering the foregoing facts, the Board further concludes that the Applicant has demonstrated that the Application will not have a deleterious effect upon the neighborhood, and has satisfied the standards necessary for approval and should therefore be approved subject to the specific and standard conditions stated herein and on the record; and

WHEREAS, a motion was duly made by Mr. Thomas and duly seconded by Ms. MacPherson to APPROVE the Application as set forth above, extending the Applicant’s minor subdivision approval from June 5, 2019 to October 3, 2019, and a roll call vote on the motion was recorded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those Eligible to Vote</th>
<th>Those in Favor</th>
<th>Those Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Costa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rossi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hojnowski</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. MacPherson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, the above relief is subject to the following standard conditions:
1. That the Application, all exhibits, testimony, map, and other documents submitted and relied on by the Applicant, are true and accurate representations of the facts relating to the Applicant’s request for approval. In the event that it is determined by the Board, on non-arbitrary, non-capricious and reasonable grounds, that the Application, exhibits, testimony, maps, and other documents submitted are not accurate, are materially misleading, or are the result of mistake, and the same had been relied upon by the Board as they bear on facts which were essential in the granting of the relief sought by the Applicant, the Board may review its approval and rehear the Application, if circumstances so require, or where a rehearing is necessary and appropriate in the interests of justice.

2. Upon discovery by the Board of clear and convincing evidence of a materially misleading submission, material misstatement, materially inaccurate information, or a material mistake made by the Applicant, the Board reserves the right to conduct a hearing with the Applicant present, for the purpose of fact-finding regarding the same. Should the facts at said hearing confirm that there had been a material fault in the Application, the Board shall take whatever action it deems appropriate at that time, consistent with the MLUL and case law, including but not limited to a reconsideration of its prior approval, a rehearing, a modification of its prior approval, or such other action as appropriate. In addition, at any time within 45 days after the adoption of this resolution, a party of interest may appeal to the Superior Court for an order vacating or modifying any term or condition as set forth herein.

3. The Applicant shall indemnify and hold the Township harmless from any Claims whatsoever which may be made as a result of any deficiency in the Application, or as to any representations made by the Applicant, including but not limited to proper service and notice upon interested parties made in reliance upon the certified list of property owners and other parties entitled to notice, said list having been provided to the Applicant by the Township pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12(c), and publication of the notice of public hearing in this matter in accordance with the law.

4. The relief as granted herein is subject to the discovery of any and all deed restrictions upon the Subject Property which had not been known or had not been disclosed to the Board, but which would have had a materially negative impact upon the Board’s decision in this matter had they been so known, or so disclosed.

5. The Applicant must obtain approvals from any and all other governmental and/or public agencies as required, whether federal, state, county or local, over which the Board has no control but which are necessary in order to finalize and/or implement the relief being granted herein, as well as any construction that may be a part of said relief. The Applicant is solely responsible for determining which governmental and/or public agencies, if any, such approvals are required.
6. The Applicant is further required to submit a copy to the Board’s Secretary of all approvals and/or denials received from such outside agencies, with a copy thereof to the Board’s Solicitor, Engineer, and Planner.

7. The Applicant must pay the costs of all professional review and other fees required to act on the Application, pursuant to the applicable sections of the Township’s land development ordinances, zone codes and any other applicable municipal codes, and the MLUL.

8. The Applicant assumes all risks should the Applicant fail to obtain any other construction or other municipal permits required with respect to the relief as granted herein during the statutory appeal period associated with the language of this resolution.

9. The Applicant must obtain any other construction or other municipal permits required with respect to the relief as granted herein.

10. The Applicant shall comply with all of the representations and stipulations as contained in the application and as represented through testimony in support of the application.

ATTEST: 

KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY

GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING BOARD:

FRANK DINTINO, CHAIRMAN

CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this resolution of memorialization being adopted by action of the Board on this 11th day of June 2019 represents a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Gloucester Township Planning Board consistent with its decision at a meeting held on the 14th day of May 2019.

KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY
A RESOLUTION OF THE GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD
MEMORIALIZING MINOR SUBDIVISION WITH BULK VARIANCE APPROVAL
FOR WILLIAM & NADINE YACKLE
APPLICATION NO.: 191017CM

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2019, consideration was given to the application of William & Nadine Yackle (hereinafter “Applicant”) for the property located at 100 Lakeview Avenue, identified on the Tax Map for the Township of Gloucester as Block 13003, Lot 3 (hereinafter “Property”), for minor subdivision approval with bulk variances in accordance with the requirements of the Land Development Ordinance of the Township of Gloucester (hereinafter “LDO”); and

WHEREAS, the Applicant intends to subdivide existing Lot 3 (36,773 sf) into two (2) new residential lots designated as Lot 3 (15,105 sf) and Lot 3.01 (18,787 sf) which will require variances from the LDO requirements for lot depth, side yard deck setback, and rear yard setback in the R-3 Residential Zoning District, with no new construction or other improvements proposed at this time; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Charles D. Petrone, Esq., appeared on behalf of the Applicant, and presented the Applicant, Mr. William Yackle, who was sworn in and testified in support of the Application; and

WHEREAS, Mr. Petrone introduced the Application, identified the location of the Property, the requested relief, and summarized the proposed minor subdivision and required bulk variances; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant testified he and his wife have owned the Property for 20 years; that there is currently an existing single-family dwelling at the Property that he originally constructed; that the existing dwelling fits into the neighborhood very nicely and is located right at the lake and by the walking path on or near the Property; that the Applicant intends to put their final house on the new lot; that he will be constructing the new dwelling, which will be a rancher with walk out basement and approximately 2500 sf; that the existing dwelling will hopefully be purchased by his children; that it was always his intention to subdivide the Property, and he now has the financial ability to do so; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant further testified as to the surrounding uses in the area, explaining that it is all residential consisting of a mix of 2-story dwellings and rancher homes and that overall it is a nice community; that the proposed home will be the same masonry work as the existing home and will look nice and blend in with the community; that the proposed home will not be an eyesore; and that some lots nearby have similar non-conforming setbacks and depth requirements as the proposed subdivided lots; and that the dimensions of the proposed lots conform as closely as possible to LDO requirements and will be consisting with existing houses on properties adjacent to the Property; that the proposed lot sizes of approximately 33,000 sf are approximately 3.5x larger than the LDO’s minimum requirement; that it is impossible for him to comply with the LDO requirements for lot depth and rear yard open water setback due to the existing conditions and improvements at the Property, namely, the lake to the
rear of the Property; that the proposed 5 ft deck is going to mostly impact his own Property rather than the properties of his neighbors; that no clearing of trees will be required; and that the existing elevation will not have to be changed because the Applicant has the elevations he needs in order to subdivide the Property and build the new dwelling; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant submitted a Letter of Interpretation from the NJDEP confirming there are no wetlands on the Property; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant agreed to comply with all comments, conditions, and recommendations set forth within Board Engineer Stephen Bach’s May 2, 2019 Review Letter, to the extent not already addressed by the testimony of the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant agreed to comply with all comments, conditions, and recommendations set forth within Board Planner Kenneth Lechner’s April 22, 2019 Review Letter, to the extent not already addressed by the testimony of the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the meeting was opened to the public, and no members of the public appeared to testify; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board having received reports from professionals and other advisors to the Board including, without limitation, the Zoning Officer, Board Engineer, Board Planner, County Planning Board, Traffic Commander, Fire Marshall, Tax Assessor, Water Department and Municipal Utilities Authorities and having heard testimony from the Board Planner and Board Engineer, makes the following factual findings and conclusions of law in approving the subject application for minor subdivision approval:

1. The Applicants are William & Nadine Yackle. The Property is located at 100 Lakeview Avenue, identified on the Township of Gloucester Tax Map as Block 13003, Lot 3. The Applicant is the owner of the Property, which is located in the R-3 Zoning District.

2. To the extent required, public notice of the hearing was provided in accordance with the requirements of the Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:55D-12.

3. Requested Relief: minor subdivision approval with bulk variances to create two residential lots from one existing residential lot in accordance with the minor subdivision plan submitted by the Applicant with the Application.

4. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the Property into two new lots ("Lot 3" and "Lot 3.01"). Lot 3 and Lot 3.01, as proposed, require the following variances:

   a. Lot 3:

      i. Relief from Township Code § 405 F – requiring a minimum lot depth of 125 ft whereas a lot depth of 118.58 ft is proposed.
ii. Relief from Township Code § 405 F – requiring a minimum side yard deck setback of 10 ft whereas 5 ft is proposed.

iii. Relief from Township Code § 405 F/505.1(4) – requiring a minimum rear yard open water setback of 100 ft whereas 30 ft is proposed.

b. Lot 3.01:

i. Relief from Township Code § 405 F – requiring a minimum lot depth of 125 ft whereas a lot depth of 101 ft is proposed.

ii. Relief from Township Code § 405 F – requiring a minimum side yard deck setback of 10 ft whereas 5 ft is proposed.

iii. Relief from Township Code § 405 F/505.1(4) – requiring a minimum rear yard open water setback of 100 ft whereas 30 ft is proposed.

5. The Board Planner, Kenneth D. Lechner, PP, AICP, issued a report dated April 22, 2019, incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein, recommending certain revisions, clarification and/or modifications to the plans with which the Applicant agreed to comply unless otherwise outlined or modified further herein, or to the extent that they had not been addressed through testimony.

6. The Board Engineer, Steven M. Bach, PE, RA, PP, CME of Bach Associates, PC, issued a report dated May 2, 2019, incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein, recommending certain revisions, clarification and/or modifications to the plans with which the Applicant agreed to comply unless otherwise outlined or modified further herein, or to the extent that they had not been addressed through testimony.

7. The Applicant agreed, as conditions of approval, to comply with all comments, recommendations, and conditions set forth in the Board Planner’s and Board Engineer’s Review Letters.

8. With regard to the requested bulk variances as detailed in Paragraph 4 above, through the evidence submitted and testimony presented by the Applicant’s witnesses, professionals, the Board’s professionals, and members of the public, if any, the Board finds and concludes that the Applicant has sustained the burden of proof to support the requested variances in accordance with the statutory requirements set forth in the MLUL, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(1); that is, due to the unique shape of the Property and existing improvements and conditions thereon, namely, the lake to the rear of the Subject Property, the strict application of the LDO requirements set forth at Township Code § 404 F/505.1(4) identified in paragraph 4 above would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, and exceptional and undue hardship upon, the Applicant, thus bulk variance
relief permitting the proposed minor subdivision as proposed by the Applicant is warranted.

9. In light of the evidence submitted and testimony presented by the Applicant’s witnesses, professionals, the Board’s professionals, and members of the public, if any, the Board finds and concludes that the Applicant has sustained the burden of proof to support the requested variances in accordance with the statutory requirements set forth in the MLUL, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2); that is, the requested deviations from the LDO requirements set forth at Township Code § 404 F/505.1(4) identified in paragraph 4 above advance several purposes of the MLUL, specifically: granting the variances will allow the Applicant to subdivide the Property as proposed, making appropriate use of open and available vacant land to allow for permitted residential uses, increasing property values, and improving the overall appearance and aesthetics of the Property and Township. N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2a; N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2c; N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2g; N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2i.

10. In light of the testimony and other evidence presented, the Board further determined that the Application can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and the purpose of the Master Plan and LDO in light of the Applicant’s proposed residential use, and because the requested variances involve no inherent public dangers or substantial public burdens and create no adverse impact on the neighborhood. N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70.

11. With regard to the requested minor subdivision approval, through the evidence submitted and testimony presented by the Applicant’s witnesses, professionals, the Board’s professionals, and members of the public, if any, the Board finds and concludes that the proposed minor subdivision complies with all minor subdivision and other standards, specifications, and requirements established by the LDO not addressed by variances and waivers as detailed herein, and that the Property is suitable for the proposed subdivision given the sufficient size of the Property and permitted residential uses in the R-3 Zone. See, e.g., Levin v. Livingston Twp., 35 N.J. 500, 510–11 (1961); Pizzo Mantin Group v. Randolph Twp., 261 N.J. Super. 659 (App. Div. 1993), aff’d, as modified, 137 N.J. 216 (1994).

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, after considering the foregoing facts, the Board further concludes that the Applicant has demonstrated that the Application will not have a deleterious effect upon the neighborhood, and has satisfied the standards necessary for approval and should therefore be approved subject to the specific and standard conditions stated herein and on the record; and
WHEREAS, a motion was duly made by Mr. Hojnowski and duly seconded by Mr. Thomas to APPROVE the Application as set forth above, including the proposed minor subdivision and requested variances, and a roll call vote on the motion was recorded as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Those Eligible to Vote</th>
<th>Those in Favor</th>
<th>Those Opposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Costa</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Rossi</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Thomas</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Hojnowski</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. MacPherson</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Botsford</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, the above relief is subject to the following specific conditions:

1. The Applicant shall comply with all terms, conditions, and recommendations contained within the Board Professionals’ Review Letters, including but not limited to the requirement that the flood plains be evaluated by a licensed professional engineer.

IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED, the above relief is subject to the following standard conditions:

2. Upon discovery by the Board of clear and convincing evidence of a materially misleading submission, material misstatement, materially inaccurate information, or a material mistake made by the Applicant, the Board reserves the right to conduct a hearing with the Applicant present, for the purpose of fact-finding regarding the same. Should the facts at said hearing confirm that there had been a material fault in the Application, the Board shall take whatever action it deems appropriate at that time, consistent with the MLUL and case law, including but not limited to a reconsideration of its prior approval, a rehearing, a modification of its prior approval, or such other action as appropriate. In addition, at any time within 45 days after the adoption of this resolution, a party of interest may appeal to the Superior Court for an order vacating or modifying any term or condition as set forth herein.
3. The Applicant shall indemnify and hold the Township harmless from any Claims whatsoever which may be made as a result of any deficiency in the Application, or as to any representations made by the Applicant, including but not limited to proper service and notice upon interested parties made in reliance upon the certified list of property owners and other parties entitled to notice, said list having been provided to the Applicant by the Township pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12(c), and publication of the notice of public hearing in this matter in accordance with the law.

4. The relief as granted herein is subject to the discovery of any and all deed restrictions upon the Subject Property which had not been known or had not been disclosed to the Board, but which would have had a materially negative impact upon the Board’s decision in this matter had they been so known, or so disclosed.

5. The Applicant must obtain approvals from any and all other governmental and/or public agencies as required, whether federal, state, county or local, over which the Board has no control but which are necessary in order to finalize and/or implement the relief being granted herein, as well as any construction that may be a part of said relief. The Applicant is solely responsible for determining which governmental and/or public agencies, if any, such approvals are required.

6. The Applicant is further required to submit a copy to the Board’s Secretary of all approvals and/or denials received from such outside agencies, with a copy thereof to the Board’s Solicitor, Engineer, and Planner.

7. The Applicant must pay the costs of all professional review and other fees required to act on the Application, pursuant to the applicable sections of the Township’s land development ordinances, zone codes and any other applicable municipal codes, and the MLUL.

8. The Applicant assumes all risks should the Applicant fail to obtain any other construction or other municipal permits required with respect to the relief as granted herein during the statutory appeal period associated with the language of this resolution.

9. The Applicant must obtain any other construction or other municipal permits required with respect to the relief as granted herein.

10. The Applicant shall comply with all of the representations and stipulations as contained in the application and as represented through testimony in support of the application.

ATTEST: KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY

GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING BOARD:

FRANK DINTINO, CHAIRMAN
CERTIFICATION

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this resolution of memorialization being adopted by action of the Board on this 11th day of June 2019 represents a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Gloucester Township Planning Board consistent with its decision at a meeting held on the 14th day of May 2019.

KENNETH LECHNER, SECRETARY
LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION CHECKLIST

Applicant must complete the following requirements to submit an application to the Planning Board or Zoning Board of Adjustment. No application shall be accepted without the items in the below checklist.

- Taxes Paid Certification.
- Land Development Application Form - completed, signed, and notarized.
- Filing Fees.
  - FILING FEE = Filing + Publication + Property Owners + Variance (if applicable)
- Escrow Fees.
  - ESCROW FEE = Engineer + Planner + Legal
- Signed Escrow Agreement.
- Signed W-9 Form.
- Disclosure Statement (Corporations, LLC, and Partnerships).
  - Corporations, LLC, and Partnerships must be represented by an attorney
- Twelve (12) copies of the development plan (signed and sealed).
- Seven (7) copies of the Ordinance Checklist ($17)
- Other reports (4 copies) - if applicable.
  - Drainage Calculations
  - Environmental Impact Statement
  - Traffic Impact Statement

CAMDEN COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

Land development applications for site plans and subdivisions require review and/or approval of the Camden County Planning Board.

NOTE: All municipal site plan and subdivision approvals are conditioned upon Camden County Planning Board Approval.

Camden County Planning Board
Charles J. DePalma Public Works Complex
2311 Egg Harbor Road
Lindenwold, NJ 08021
Phone 856.566.2978 Fax 856.566.2988
planningdivision@camdencounty.com
# TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER

Chews-Landing Clementon Road at Hider Lane
P.O. Box 8 Blackwood, NJ 08012
(856) 374-3511 Planning  (856) 374-3512 Zoning  (856) 232-6229

For Office Use Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission Date:</th>
<th>Application No:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APR 16 2019</td>
<td>19.019.M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taxes Paid Yes/No: \(\) Yes (Initial) $\_\_\_\_ Project # 13058

Escr. 4100. Escr. 13058

---

### LAND DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION

**1. Applicant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Duane Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1870 Chews-Landing Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Laurel Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Zip: NJ 08021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 856-963-1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:mlittle25@comcast.net">mlittle25@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2. Owner(s) (List all Owners)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name(s): Duane Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 1870 Chews-Landing Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Laurel Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Zip: NJ 08021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 856-963-1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Type of Application. Check as many as apply:**

- Minor Subdivision
- Preliminary Major Subdivision
- Final Major Subdivision
- Minor Site Plan
- Preliminary Major Site Plan
- Final Major Site Plan
- Conditional Use Approval
- General Development Plan

Legal advertisement and notice is required to all property owners within 200 feet.

**4. Zoning Districts (Circle all Zones that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ER</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>RA</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>SCR</th>
<th>R3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5. The following applicants are required to be represented by a New Jersey Attorney: Corporation, Partnership, Limited Liability Corporation and Limited Liability Partnership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State, Zip:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Name of Persons Preparing Plans and Reports:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name: Donovan Surveys</th>
<th>Name: ____________________________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address: 19 Hillcrest</td>
<td>Address: ________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession: Surveyor</td>
<td>Profession: _____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City: Stratford</td>
<td>City: ___________________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, Zip: NJ 08084</td>
<td>State, Zip: _____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 856-634-3030</td>
<td>Phone: (<strong><strong>) ______ Fax: (</strong></strong>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax: 856-634-3030</td>
<td>Email: __________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Location of Property:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street Address: 1900 Chews Landing Rd</th>
<th>Block(s): 20001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tract Area: _________________________</td>
<td>Lot(s): 21, 21.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Land Use:

Existing Land Use: Residential-No use changes

Proposed Land Use (Describe Application): 
Seeking to revise property line 100 feet by removing 100 feet from backyard of 1900 and add to front yard of 1070

9. Property:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Existing Lots: 2</th>
<th>Number of Proposed Lots: 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Are there existing deed restrictions? □ No □ Yes (If yes, attach copies)

Are there proposed deed restrictions? □ No □ Yes

10. Utilities: (Check those that apply.) — NA not affected by lot line

- [ ] Public Water
- [ ] Public Sewer
- [ ] Private Well
- [ ] Private Septic System

11. List of Application Submission Materials:

List all additional materials on an additional sheet. — See cover letter

12. List Previous or Pending Applications for this Parcel:

List all applications on a separate sheet.
17. Consent of Owner(s):

I, the undersigned, being the owner(s) of the lot or tract described in this application, hereby consent to the making of this application and the approval of the plans submitted herewith. I further consent to the inspection of this property in connection with this application as deemed necessary by the municipal agency. (If owned by a corporation, attach a resolution authorizing application and officer signature).

Date: 03/06/2019

Sworn and Subscribed to before me this __ day of March, 2019 (Year).

Signature: 

Print Name: Duane W. Little

Signature: 

Print Name: Marla C. Newsom

MARLA C. NEWSOM
Notary Public – State of New Jersey
My Commission Expires Aug 7, 2022


Complete each of the following sections:

A. Is this application to subdivide a parcel of land into six or more lots?
   - No
   - Yes

B. Is this application for a variance to construct a multiple dwelling of 25 or more family units?
   - No
   - Yes

C. Is this application for approval on a site or sites for commercial purposes?
   - No
   - Yes

D. Is the applicant a corporation?
   - No
   - Yes

E. Is the applicant a limited liability corporation?
   - No
   - Yes

F. Is the applicant a partnership?
   - No
   - Yes

IF YES TO ANY OF THE ABOVE:

1. List the names and addresses of all stockholders or individual partners owning at least 10 percent of it’s stock of any class or at least 10 percent of the interest in partnership, as the case may be. (Use additional sheets as necessary).

IF YES:

List the names and addresses of the stockholders of that corporation holding 10 percent or more of the stock or 10 percent or greater interest in that partnership, as the case may be. This requirement is to be followed by every corporate stockholder or partnership, until the names and addresses of the non-corporate stockholder and individual partners with 10 percent or more ownership have been listed. (Use additional sheets as necessary).

Signature of Applicant: 

Print Name: Duane W. Little

Date: 03/06/2019

19. Survey waiver certification:

As of the date of this application, I hereby certify that the survey submitted with this application, under the date of 11/14/19, shows and discloses the premises in its entirety, described as Block 210, Lot 21, and I further certify that no buildings, fences or other facilities have been constructed, installed or otherwise located on the premises after the date of the survey with the exception of the structures shown.

State of New Jersey,
County of Camden,

Duane W. Little of full age, being duly sworn to law, on oath and says that all of the above statement herein is true.

Name of property owner or applicant: Duane W. Little

Sworn and subscribed to
On this __ day of __, 2019 before the following authority.

Signature: 

Notary public: 

MARLA C. NEWSOM
Notary Public – State of New Jersey
My Commission Expires Aug 7, 2022
13. Zoning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Applications</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Fence Application</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front setback 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Setback from E.O.P. *1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front setback 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Setback from E.O.P. *2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear setback</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fence type</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side setback 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fence height</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side setback 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;E.O.P. = Edge Of Pavement.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot frontage</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pool Requirements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth</td>
<td></td>
<td>Setback from R.O.W.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot area</td>
<td></td>
<td>Setback from R.O.W.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building height</td>
<td></td>
<td>Setback from property line 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setback from property line 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance from dwelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distance = measured from edge of water.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R.O.W. = Right-of-way.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Setback = Measured from edge of pool apron.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Garage Application**
- Garage Area
- Garage height
- Number of garages
  (Include attached garage if applicable)
- Number of stories

**Shed Requirements**
- Shed area
- Shed height
- Setback from R.O.W.1
- Setback from R.O.W.2
- Setback from property line 1
- Setback from property line 2

14. Parking and Loading Requirements:
- Number of parking spaces required: _____________
- Number of parking spaces provided: _____________
- Number of loading spaces required: _____________
- Number of loading spaces provided: _____________

15. Relief Requested:
- Check here if zoning variances are required.
- Check here if exceptions to the application or municipal requirements are requested (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-51).
- Check here if exceptions to the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS, N.J.A.C. 5:21-3.1) are requested.
- Check here if waivers from the Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS, N.J.A.C. 5:21-3.2) are requested. [Such waivers require application to, and approval of the N.J. Site Improvement Advisory Board].

**NOTE:** If any of above are required, attach hereto separate exhibit(s) for each category of relief sought, stating the factual basis, legal theory, and whether they have been previously granted.

16. Signature of Applicant

[Signature]

[Date]

Signature of Co-applicant

[Signature]

[Date]
April 23, 2019

Duane Little
1070 Chews Landing Road
Laurel Springs, NJ 08021

RE: 1068 & 1070 Chews Landing Rd
Plan Type: Minor Subdivision
Block(s): 20601
Lot(s): 21 & 21.01

Dear Applicant/Agent:

Due to the nature of this specific application, a staff review concluded that the proposed activity will have no effect on any County facility and therefore will not need a Camden County Planning Board vote.

All fees regarding this matter have been paid in full. This letter may be considered a waiver of further review.

Thank you for the opportunity to be of service regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

Andrew Levecchia, PP/AICP
Planning Director

All revisions are made to said project after approval granted, said applicant must resubmit to Board for approval.

M-20-1-19
TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER
Inter-office Correspondence

TO: Planning Board
FROM: Kenneth D. Lechner, PP, AICP, Director/Planner
Dept. of Community Development
RE: APPLICATION #191019M Escrow #13058
Duane Little
BLOCK 20601, LOTS 21 and 21.01
DATE: May 20, 2019

The Applicant requests minor subdivision approval to re-subdivide Block 20601, Lots 21 and 21.01 within the R-1 Residential district. The property is located on the south side of Chews Landing Road west of Craig Drive.

The plan has been reviewed for conformance to the Land Development Ordinance of Gloucester Township and the following comments are offered for your consideration.

Should you have any questions regarding this application, do not hesitate to contact me at 374.3511.

Applicant/Owner: Duane Little, 1070 Chews landing Road, Laurel Springs, NJ 08021 (telephone #856-251-6138).
Surveyor: John Donovan, PLS, Donovan Surveyors, 19 Hillcrest Road, Stratford, NJ 08084 (telephone #856-627-0330).

I. INFORMATION SUBMITTED
1. Duane & Michelle Little Transmittal Letter dated 4/16/19.
2. Land Development Application Form with Checklist, dated 4/16/19.
3. Minor subdivision plan, as prepared by Donovan Surveyors, comprising one (1) sheet dated 02/15/19.
II. ZONING INFORMATION

R-1 Zone Requirements (§405.F):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Required</th>
<th>Proposed (Lot 21)</th>
<th>Proposed (Lot 21.01)</th>
<th>Complies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot size (min.)</td>
<td>1 ac.</td>
<td>0.851 ac.</td>
<td>1.253 ac.</td>
<td>no*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot size (min.)</td>
<td>1 ac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot frontage (min.)</td>
<td>125 ft.</td>
<td>121.38 ft.</td>
<td>30.33</td>
<td>enc / enc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot depth (min.)</td>
<td>200 ft.</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
<td>300 ft.</td>
<td>yes / yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building coverage</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>yes / yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot coverage</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>yes / yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PRINCIPAL BUILDING MINIMUM YARD DEPTHS AND HEIGHT LIMITATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard (min.) - dwelling</td>
<td>50 ft.</td>
<td>53.1 ft.</td>
<td>156.2 ft.</td>
<td>yes / yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard (min.) - dwelling</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td>11.8 ft. / 31.2 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td>enc / yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side yard (min.) - dwelling</td>
<td>25 ft.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear yard (min.) - wood deck</td>
<td>75 ft.</td>
<td>±212 ft.</td>
<td>±95 ft.</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Useable Yard Area (min.)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>≥ 25%</td>
<td>≥ 25%</td>
<td>yes / yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height (max.)</td>
<td>35 ft.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ = Scaled Data.
* = Variance required.

Variance Expiration: The applicant is advised that variances will expire unless construction commences within two (2) years of the date of the granting of the variance.

III. APPLICATION SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

The application has been reviewed for completeness in accordance with the Township of Gloucester Land Development Ordinance §817, Submission Checklist for minor subdivision requirements.

The Applicant has provided the checklist items or request a waiver.

IV. WAIVER COMMENTS

The Applicant requests a waiver from the following checklist requirements:

1. No application for development shall be considered complete until the applicant has calculated and delineated the area of wetlands based upon the methodology established by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection regulations (See §519) [Checklist #9].
   a. Minor subdivision notations state “no wetlands on lots 21 or 21.01.”

2. The names, addresses, block and lot numbers of all property owners within 200 feet of the development [Checklist #33].

3. Contours shall be shown at not more than two (2) foot intervals for areas with less than twenty (20%) percent slope, five (5) foot intervals for areas in excess of twenty (20%) slope [Checklist #57].

4. Proposed grades in sufficient numbers to illustrate the proposed grading scheme [Checklist #58].
5. Location and dimensions of man made and/or natural features such as railroad rights-of-way, bridges, dams, soil types, wooded areas, individual tree in excess of ten (10) inches D.B.H. outside of wooded areas and rock outcrops. [Checklist #59].

6. Locations of all existing and proposed watercourse, i.e., lakes, streams, ponds, swamps or marsh areas, or under drain [Checklist #60].

7. Flood plain limits as determined by the Master Plan and onsite evaluations by a licensed professional engineer [Checklist #61].

8. Within a distance of 200 feet of development show the names, locations and dimensions of all existing streets and existing driveways, and any connections by the development to existing streets, sidewalks, bike routes, water, sewer, or gas mains [Checklist #74].

The Applicant verbally requested a waiver from the following Article V, Performance and Design Standards:

9. To allow an "Iron Rebar" in lieu of a concrete monument as per §503.C(2), Monuments.

V. VARIANCE REVIEW COMMENTS

The Application as submitted requires the following variances.

§403, R1 District, Area, Yard, Height and Building Coverage,

1. Lot size (Lot 21): 0.851 ac. provided v. 1 ac. minimum required.

POSITIVE CRITERIA ("C1" and "C2" variances)

The Applicant must address and the Zoning Board of Adjustment consider the following in satisfying the positive criteria for the requested residential district setback variance:

2. The Board has the power to grant a variance where by reason of exceptional narrowness, shallowness, shape, or topographic conditions or physical features, or an extraordinary and exceptional situation affecting a specific property, the strict application of the zoning regulations would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the development of such property (basis 40:55D-70c(1)).

3. Also, the Board has the power to grant a variance when the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by the deviation of the zoning ordinance and the benefits would substantially outweigh the detriments (basis N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2)).

NEGATIVE CRITERIA

4. The Board should not grant a variance unless it is clearly demonstrated that said variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good and will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance (basis N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70).

VI. SUBDIVISION REVIEW COMMENTS

1. The Applicant should address the encroaching and shared driveway and access easements, if any as per §503.D, Easements/Restricted Covenants.
VII. LAND DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE COMMENTS

The Applicant is advised of the following additional requirements of the Land Development Ordinance:

1. A soil removal plan if soil is to be removed from the site for use or sale other than the premises subject to this application as per §801.C, Soil Removal.

2. A grading plan prepared and sealed by licensed professional engineer as per §814, Grading Approval.

3. Affordable housing requirement as per §902, Affordable Housing Fees and Procedures.

4. Before recording final subdivision plats or as condition of final site plan approval or as a condition to the issuance of a zoning permit pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:50D-65d, the furnishing of a performance guarantee, maintenance guarantee, and inspection fees as per §903, Guarantees and Inspections and §904, Certification or Guarantee Required, Estimate of Guarantee.

5. Requirements precedent to construction as per §905, Pre-conditions to Commencement of Construction.

6. Construction of off-tract improvements as per §906, Off-Tract Improvements Recapture.

7. A zoning permit is required prior to the issuance of any construction permits and prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy by the Construction Official the Applicant must acquire a Certificate of Zoning Conformity from the Zoning Officer as per §1102, Permits, General, §1103, Zoning Permit and §1104, Certificate of Zoning Conformity.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Applicant must address the above referenced underlined comments.

2. The Applicant is advised revised plans and support documents would not be accepted by this Department without sufficient escrows for professional services in accordance with the signed escrow agreement.

I have no further comments regarding this application at this time; however, we reserve the right to provide additional comments during the public hearing to advance the planning process.

cc: Duane Little
    John Donovan, PLS
    Stephen Boraske, Esq.
    Steven M. Bach, PE
May 29, 2019

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

Attn: Ken Lechner, Community Development Director

Re: Minor Subdivision
Duane Little
1066-1070 Chews Landing – Clementon Road
Block 20601, Lots 21 & 21.01
Review No. 1
Bach Project No. GTPB-2019-6
GTPB Application No. 191019CM

Dear Mr. Lechner:

We have received the following items submitted for the referenced project:

- Camden County Planning Board Application.
- Draft deeds for Block 20601, Lots 21 and 21.01.
- Drawing entitled “Plan of Minor Subdivision for Lots 21 & 21.01, Block 206.01, Gloucester Township., NJ”, prepared by Donovan Surveyors, dated 2-5-19, no revision.

SITE INFORMATION:

Owner/Applicant: Duane Little
1070 & 1068 Chews Landing Road
Laurel Springs, NJ 08021
856-261-6138
Mdlittle25@comcast.net
PROJECT SUMMARY:

This application is for the lot line adjustment between two (2) existing residential lots and creating two (2) new residential lots. Existing Lot 21 is a 49,090.10 sf parcel of land containing an existing one-story single family home and having frontage on Chews Landing – Clementon Road (CR 563). Lot 21.01 is an existing 42,613.17 sf flag lot parcel of land also containing a one-story single family home and being located behind Lot 21 with access to Chews Landing – Clementon Road from a bituminous driveway located on the southeasterly side of Lot 21. The application proposes to subdivide a 12,000 sf parcel of land from Lot 21 and incorporate it into Lot 21.01. Both properties are located within the Township’s R-1 Residential Zoning District. It shall be noted that no construction is proposed at this time for the either lot. The applicant is seeking a Minor Subdivision approval with bulk variances.

COMPLETENESS:

The applicant has requested waivers from the following Land Development Ordinance Submission Checklist items:

1. Checklist Item #9 – Calculated and delineated area of wetlands established by the NJDEP. Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.

2. Checklist Item #19 – Plats shall be presented on sheets of one of the following dimensions: 30” x 48”, 30” x 42”, 24” x 36”, 15” x 21” or 8 ½” x 13”. A boundary survey by a licensed New Jersey Land Surveyor, certified on a date within six (6) months of the date of submission. Waiver recommended for completeness only. A large amount of information is required on a Minor Subdivision Plan. Our office recommends a Minor Subdivision Plan be prepared on a 24” x 36” plan.

3. Checklist Item #57 – Contours shall be shown at not more than two (2) foot intervals for areas with less than twenty (20%) percent slope, five (5) foot intervals for areas in excess of twenty (20%) percent slope. Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.

4. Checklist Item #58 – Proposed grades in sufficient numbers to illustrate the proposed grading scheme. Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.

5. Checklist Item #59 – Location and dimensions of manmade and/or natural features such as railroad, rights-of-way, bridges, dams, soil types, wooded areas, individual tree in excess of ten (10) inches D.B.H. outside of wooded areas and rock outcrops. Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.
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6. Checklist Item #61 – Flood plain limits as determined by the Master Plan and onsite evaluations by a licensed professional engineer. Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.

7. Checklist Item #74 – Within a distance of 200 feet of the development show the names, locations and dimensions of all existing streets and existing driveways, and any connection by the development to existing streets, sidewalks, bike routes, water, sewer, or gas mains. Our office has no objection to a waiver being granted for this item.

The applicant has not requested the following waivers from the Land Development Ordinance Submission Checklist but they have not been provided:

1. Checklist Item #36 – Existing and proposed building coverage in acres of square feet and as a percentage of the lot. Waiver recommended for completeness only.

The above items must be provided or waivers granted prior to the application being deemed “Complete”.

VARIANCES/WAIVERS:

The applicant is requesting a variance for the following:

1. Min. Lot Area – §403 (F). The applicant is proposing lot areas of 37,090.10 square feet and 54,613.17 square feet where 1 acre (43,560 sf) minimum is required.

The applicant is requesting waivers for the following:

1. A waiver from Land Development Checklist Items 9, 19, 57, 58, 59, 61 and 74 as noted above.

REVIEW COMMENTS:

We have reviewed all information submitted for conformance with the Township’s Land Development Ordinance and offer the following comments for your consideration:

1. The plan must be revised to provide the classification as identified on the F.I.R.M., community panel number, and effective date.
2. The applicant's Land Surveyor is responsible for ensuring that all lots, dedications and easements have proper closure and shall submit lot closure reports to our office for review.

3. The Zoning Chart shown on the plan shall indicate lot coverage in acres or square feet and as a percentage of lot area.

4. Deeds were submitted by the applicant for Lots 21 and 21.01. However, the deed for Lot 21.01 is incomplete. A revised and complete deed shall be submitted.

5. A legal description for the revised access easement shall be provided.

6. Lots 21 and 21.01 appear to share a common driveway for Lot 21. The applicant shall provide documentation regarding the access easement and the access easement shall be labeled on the plan.

7. The location of any underground utilities servicing either lot shall be shown on the plan. Any and all easements required for the utilities shall also be shown on the plan.

8. A certification that the existing lot numbers will be unchanged by the tax assessor must be provided.

9. The Applicant shall obtain all required approvals from all other Local, State and Federal agencies having jurisdiction over this project.

Any approvals by the Board should be conditioned upon the applicant addressing the above outstanding items.

It shall be noted that any requirements noted above as "waived for completeness only" have been waived to allow the application to be deemed complete. These requirements shall be provided as part of the revised application materials unless waived by the Board at the scheduled meeting.

When plans are resubmitted for review they shall be accompanied by a point by point response letter keyed to the comments contained in this letter.
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We reserve the option to make additional comments as more information becomes available.

Very truly yours,
BACH ASSOCIATES, PC

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

Anthony P. DiRosa, PE, PLS
Associate

Cc: Gloucester Township Planning Board Members
Stephen Boraske, Esq., PB Solicitor
Duane Little, Applicant/Owner
John Donovan, PLS, Applicant's Professional
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TOWNSHIP OF GLOUCESTER
PLANNING TRANSMITTAL

April 17, 2019

Applicant: Duane & Michelle Little

Escrow: #13058
Application: #191019M
Block: 20601 Lot: 21 & 21.01
Zoned: R1

LOCATION: 1068 & 1070 Chews Landing Rd., Laurel Springs, NJ

TRANSMITTAL TO:

O Camden County Planning  O Tax Assessor  O MUA
O Steven Boraske, Esq.  O Aqua Water Co.  O Construction
O Steven Bach, Bach, Engineer  O New Jersey America  O Traffic/Polic
O Kenneth Lechner, Planner  O Fire District 1 2 3 4 5 6

STATUS OF APPLICATION – No Changes for Purpose of Construction. Seeking to move the property line in the rear of 1068 Chews Landing Rd., 100 ft. to add 100 ft. to the frontage of 1070 Chews Landing Rd.

☐ 1 Copy Minor Subdivision/checklist
☐ 1 Copy - Plan with Lot Line Adjustment
☐ 1 Copy - County Application
☐ 1 Copy - Environmental Impact Statement
☐ 1 Copy - Recycling Report
☐ 1 Copy - Stormwater Management Report
☐ 1 Copy - Proposed Erosion Control Plan
☐ 1 Copy - Environmental Impact Statement

SIGNATURE
Township of Gloucester  
Dept. of Community Development  
P.O. Box 8  
Blackwood, New Jersey 08012

Re: Application #191019M  
Duane & Michelle Little  
1068 & 1070 Chews Landing Road, Laurel Springs, NJ 08021  
Block 20601, Lots 21 & 21.01

Gentlemen:

In response to your transmittal regarding the above application, approval will have no effect on the sanitary sewer system.

Should you have any further questions, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

THE GLOUCESTER TOWNSHIP  
MUNICIPAL UTILITIES AUTHORITY

Raymond J. Carr  
Executive Director

RJC: mh
To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that the below resident does not have any tax or sewer liens on their property or any outstanding balances.

Name: Jack & Patricia Little
Address: 1068 Chews Landing-Clem Rd.
Block 20601 Lot 21

1-22-19

Date

Maryann Lussa
Asst. Gloucester Township Tax Collector
To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that the below resident does not have any tax or sewer liens on their property or any outstanding balances.

Name: Duane Little
Address: 1070 Chews Landing-Clem Rd.
Block: 20601 Lot: 21.01

1-22-19

Maurine L. Rosa
Asst. Gloucester Township Tax Collector
■ Plans as shown along with available information do not reveal any anticipated traffic problems.

☐ Stop signs/traffic control signs as shown must be installed upon or prior to any occupancy.

☐ Traffic Control signs as shown on plans are not enforceable by police unless properly included by Municipal Ordinance made through application of the site owner under New Jersey 39:5-1.

☐ Emergency contact numbers for site issues with twenty-four human contact should be provided to Police prior to start of construction.

☐ Other
Redevelopment Study & Preliminary Investigation Report

Block 13103, Lots 3, 3.01, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13

Prepared:
May 24, 2019

Prepared for:
Gloucester Township
Camden County, New Jersey

Prepared by:
T&M Associates
11 Tindall Road
Middletown, NJ 07748

The original of this document has been signed and sealed in accordance with New Jersey Law.

Stan Slachetka, PP, AICP
NJ Professional Planner No.: LI-03508

Jeffrey Cucinotta, PP, AICP
NJ Professional Planner No.: LI-06340
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Introduction

The purpose of this Redevelopment Study and Preliminary Investigation Report (hereinafter referred to as “the redevelopment study”) is to determine whether the properties identified as Block 13103, Lots 3, 3.01, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 (hereinafter referred to as “the Study Area,”) in Gloucester Township qualify as an area in need of redevelopment, as defined in the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, P.L. 1992, Chapter 79 (commonly and hereinafter referred to as the “LRHL”). The Study Area is shown on the accompanying municipal location map (Map 1) and aerial location map (Map 2).

This report is written pursuant to Section 6 of the LRHL (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6a), which states the following:

No area of a municipality shall be determined to be a redevelopment area unless the governing body of the municipality shall, by resolution, authorize the planning board to undertake a preliminary investigation to determine whether the proposed area is a redevelopment area according to the criteria set forth in Section 5 of P.L. 1992, C.79 (C:40A:12A-5). ... The governing body of a municipality shall assign the conduct of the investigation and hearing to the planning board of a municipality.

The Gloucester Township Council adopted Resolution R-19:02-080 on February 25, 2019 requesting that the Planning Board undertake a preliminary investigation of the Study Area to determine whether it qualifies as an area in need of redevelopment pursuant to the LRHL. This resolution is included in this report as Appendix A.

This report serves as the “statement setting forth the basis for the investigation,” which is required by the LRHL [N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6b(1)]. In accordance with N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6b(5):

After completing its hearing on this matter, the planning board shall recommend that the delineated area, or any part thereof, be determined, or not be determined, by the municipal governing body to be a redevelopment area. After receiving the recommendation of the planning board, the municipal governing body may adopt a resolution determining that the delineated area, or any part thereof, is in need of redevelopment.

It is noted that in directing the Planning Board to undertake the preliminary investigation and redevelopment study, the Township Council identified that the Study Area shall be subject to a non-condemnation redevelopment area designation. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A, the redevelopment area designation shall not authorize the municipality to use the power of eminent domain.
Study Area Description

The Study Area (see Map 2) is comprised of Block 13103, Lots 3, 3.01, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. The Study Area properties comprise approximately 17.65 acres of land area and have frontage on Davistown Road, Center Avenue and North–South Freeway (NJ Route 42). The Study Area is generally located in the central portion of the municipality and is situated approximately 0.4 miles to the northeast of Gloucester Premium Outlets. Land uses as confirmed by the site visits conducted on April 30 and May 11, 2019 are depicted in the photos in Appendix B (corresponding photo numbers from Appendix B are indicated in the descriptions below) and described as follows:

520 Davistown Road (Lot 3):

Lot 3 is held in common ownership with Lots 3.01, 9, and 10. This lot is developed with a contractor's shop/garage and associated parking and site improvements (see photos 3-1 through 3-5 in Appendix B). The shop building has three garage doors on the north side (photos 3-4 and 3-9), one on the west side (photos 3-13, 3-14, and 3-16), and three on the south side (photos 3-17 and 3-22). The project team did not access the inside of the building during the site visits.

Most of the land area on this property that is not dedicated to the shop building is used for storage and parking of various construction equipment and vehicles, including but not limited to snow plow trucks, bulldozers, trailers, and large storage containers (see photos 3-3 through 3-13). The site visit on May 11 identified approximately 32 trucks in the parking area to the north of the building alone.

Additionally, the lot is home to storage of various additional construction equipment and debris, as evidenced by truck and vehicle parts and piles of tires strewn throughout the lot and surrounding the shop building on all sides (see photos 3-14 through 3-29).

In the western perimeter of the property there is a large area marked by pooling stagnant/murky stormwater runoff, with no formal or delineated differentiation from the parking and driveway areas of the property (see photos 3-30 through 3-35). NJDEP mapping does not identify any wetlands on this property.

Located approximately 100 feet to the south of and perpendicular to the shop building is the property lot line that separates Lot 3 from Lot 3.01. However, any major physical demarcation is essentially non-existent, and Lots 3 and 3.01 function as one lot/use.
540 Davistown Road (Lot 3.01):
Lot 3.01 is held in common ownership with Lots 3, 9, and 10. The site currently functions as a contractor yard and active excavation site ancillary to the uses on adjacent Lot 3. There are no improvements or buildings on site, though the site visit revealed storage of multiple heavy machinery/construction vehicles on site (see photos 3.01-1 through 3.01-5). The site is currently being actively cleared of all vegetation and being flattened, as evidenced by the large deposits of refuse, materials, and soil/organic material being sorted and sifted (see photos 3.01-6 through 3.01-11). This property is not directly accessible by any public right of way. However, it is technically not closed off to the public, as it can be accessed by Center Avenue via Lot 9 to the east and by Love Road via Lot 2 to the south.

500 Davistown Road (Lot 4):
Lot 4 is developed with a warehouse building and associated parking (see photos 4-1 through 4-6). The existing building has five loading bays on the north side and one on the east side. The property appears to be a normally functioning and well-maintained site. There is also a cell phone tower located in the northern part of the lot along Davistown Road (see photos 4-7 through 4-9). There is 50-foot-wide access easement along the eastern perimeter of Lot 4, which serves as the main form of vehicular access to Lots 3 and 3.01 from Davistown Road (see photo 4-1). The site visit revealed a Stevens Real Estate sign along Davistown Road identifying commercial and industrial space available (see photo 4-10), though Stevens’ online listings do not identify this property on their online database.

Center Avenue Right of Way:
The remainder of the Study Area properties are adjacent to and directly served by Center Avenue. As shown on the Gloucester Township tax maps, Center Avenue is a 16.5-foot-wide public right of way that extends from Davistown Road to the south until the northern boundary of Lot 9 (see photos C-1 through C-3). This right of way is undersized and provides limited access to many of the Study Area properties. The road is made of ground up brick, stone, granite, and other conglomerate material from Davistown Road until Lot 6 (see photos C-3 through C-5) and is gravel/unpaved from Lot 6 until Lot 9 (see photo C-6). There is no sidewalk along Center Avenue. In general, the southern half of the Center Avenue right of way (from Lot 6 to Lot 9) appears to have inadequate storm drainage, as evidenced by both the decline in grade from Lot 9 to the north towards Davistown Road and drain marks in the sand/gravel along Center Avenue.

752 Davistown Road (Lot 5):
Lot 5 is undeveloped and is owned by Gloucester Township and has frontage on Davistown Road to the north and Center Avenue to the east. The northern portion of the property along Davistown Road is a grassy area (see photos 5-1 and 5-2). There is no sidewalk along Davistown Road. The site visits also revealed evidence of some phragmites growth in this portion of the lot (see photo 5-3), though NJDEP mapping does not identify any wetlands on this property. Most of the lot along Center Avenue and to the south is an overgrown wooded area (see photos 5-4 and 5-5).
756 Davistown Road (Lot 6):
Lot 6 is also owned by Gloucester Township and is also an undeveloped/wooded lot (see photos 6-1 and 6-2). The only public right of way that provides direct access to Lot 6 is Center Avenue, of which Lot 6 has 50 feet of frontage. The site visits revealed a stack of cinder blocks and some minor debris deposits on the property (see photos 6-3 and 6-4).

758 Davistown Road (Lots 7 and 8):
Lots 7 and 8 are held in common ownership and are jointly assessed. The properties are developed with one inhabited residential structure that spans both lots (see photos 7-1 through 7-4). The residential building does not appear to show any signs of disrepair, though the front stoop/stairs and concrete walkway are slightly undermined (see photo 7-3). The front yard is maintained and landscaped. The rear and side yards in the south and west of the properties largely serve primarily as storage areas characterized by storage of (through not limited to) the following:

- Three detached storage sheds, each of which show signs of dilapidation, including:
  - One in Lot 8 along Center Avenue with overgrown vegetation in and around the shed and visible damage to the roof (photos 7-8 and 7-14);
  - One in the wooded southern part of the properties near Lot 9 strewn with garbage and overtaken by vegetation (photos 7-12 and 7-13); and,
  - One in Lot 7 along the property boundary shared with Lot 3, with damage to the side façade and graffiti tags (photo 7-20);
- Storage of numerous garbage and recycling cans along Center Avenue, which appear to serve more than just the one single family residential structure with which they share the property (photo 7-9);
- One large industrial size dumpster (photos 7-15 through 7-17);
- One tarp overhang structure (photos 7-6 and 7-15);
- Three gas grills (photo 7-6);
- One small boat and various crab traps and fishing equipment (photo 7-18)
- One abandoned car overtaken by vegetation and storage of other miscellaneous materials (photo 7-18); and,
- Loose power tools, ladder, bed frame, large safe, windows, bicycles, tires, janitor buckets, portable gas tanks, miscellaneous vehicle equipment, and debris (photos 7-14 through 7-17 and 7-19).

Additionally, these two properties are also characterized by a gravel access driveway that connects the southern terminus of Center Avenue to Lot 3 to the west (see photos 7-10 and 7-11).
768 Davistown Road (Lot 9):
Lot 9 is held in common ownership with Lots 3, 3.01, and 10 and is located at the southern terminus of Center Avenue. There was previously a single family detached residential dwelling at the northern end of the property by Center Avenue. Tax records indicate it was demolished in 2018. The property is now marked by completely excavated land (see photos 9-1 through 9-5). There is a line of steep grade change bisecting the majority of the property north to south where land has already been excavated/flattened and vegetation has already been removed (see photos 9-5 through 9-14). In some areas the grade differentiation is more than 10 feet between the upper (eastern) and lower (western) areas. There is also evidence of sediment erosion from rainwater at the southern end of Center Avenue (see photo 9-1).

766 Davistown Road (Lot 10):
Lot 10 is held in common ownership with Lots 3, 3.01, and 9. The property is currently a vacant and flat lot (see photos 10-1 through 10-6) with piles of excavated earth and vegetation along the southern lot boundary shared with Lot 9. There was previously a single family detached residential dwelling on this property. Tax records indicate it was demolished in 2018. The property is directly accessible from Center Avenue.

778 Davistown Road (Lot 11):
Gloucester Township acquired Lot 11 in 2016 after a tax foreclosure. The property is a flag shaped fenced lot with the “handle” piece not accessible or visible from Center Avenue (see photos 11-1 through 11-3). The property is a vacant lot with remnants of a building footprint/pad (see photo 11-4); tax records indicate the former structure was demolished in 2019. There are no other improvements on site. There are materials and debris strewn throughout the site, including liquid waste drums and containers, piles of concrete, cinder blocks, a Behr paint/materials can with pooling water, and miscellaneous building materials (see photos 11-5 through 11-8).

760 Davistown Road (Lot 12):
This property is developed with a single family detached residential structure with a detached two-car garage (see photos 12-1 through 12-4). There was a “For Sale” sign in the front yard during the site visits (see photo 12-3). The front yard’s landscaping is unkempt and overgrown, with loose tree branches and a mail box that has fallen over (see photo 12-5). The rear yard, which is not fully fenced in and is accessible from Center Avenue, is characterized by a grassy yard and a pad/foundation where an above-ground pool once stood (see photos 12-6 through 12-11).

786 Davistown Road (Lot 13):
This property is developed with a single family detached residential structure and a fenced in rear yard (see photos 13-1 through 13-3). This report notes the driveway in the side yard shows outdated paving (see photo 13-3). There are also damaged storm gutters on the second floor as seen from Center Avenue (see photo 13-4). The site appears to be well maintained, and there do not appear to be any concerns from a site plan perspective.
Land Use Analysis (Land Use Land Cover and MOD IV)

Existing land uses at the Study Area were evaluated through investigation of MOD-IV land use classifications and land use/land cover data as mapped by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) in 2012. Land uses were affirmed during the site visits conducted on April 30 and May 11, 2019.

According to NJDEP's land use/land cover (LULC) data, last updated in 2012, the land uses in the Study Area are categorized “Industrial”, “Residential (Low Density)”, “Forest” and “Old Field”. While “Industrial” and “Old Field” are dispersed throughout the Study Area, “Residential (Low Density)” and “Forest” are generally located in the eastern half of the Study Area.

The New Jersey Property Tax System, known as MOD-IV, provides for the uniform preparation, maintenance, presentation, and storage of statewide property tax information. MOD-IV is the mechanism to maintain and update all assessment records and produce all statutorily-required tax lists. As shown on Map 4, the MOD-IV values in 2019 that are represented within the Study Area include: Class 1 — Vacant on three properties; Class 2 — Residential on four properties; Class 4B — Industrial on two properties; and, Class 15C — Public Property on three properties.

Map 4 also shows the MOD-IV classifications for the properties in the immediate vicinity of the Study Area. Land in the immediate vicinity of the Study Area is classified as: Class 1 — Vacant on properties to the east, south and west; Class 2 — Residential on properties to the east and north; Class 4A — Commercial on two adjacent properties to the east; Class 4C — Apartments on two adjacent properties to the east; Class 15A — Public School on two properties to the south (n.b., these properties are associated with Camden County College); Class 15C — Public Property on properties to the north; and, Class 15D — Charitable on one property located to the east.
Zoning and Relationship to Zoning Ordinance

As indicated on the Gloucester Township Zoning Map, the Study Area is located within the BP (Business Park) and R-3 (Residential) zone districts. Specifically, Block 13103, lots 3, 3.01 and 4 are located in the BP (Business Park) Zone District, and Block 13103, lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 are located within the R-3 (Residential) Zone District.

Figure 5 depicts the zoning districts as they apply to the Study Area. Land use regulations for the zoning districts are outlined in the following subsections.

Principal Permitted Uses

The principal permitted uses of the BP (Business Park) Zone District include: office; office parks; research and engineering offices and laboratories; combinations of office and manufacturing and/or warehousing of goods and materials associated with the business; planned commercial development incorporating any of the aforementioned uses; governmental uses; public utility uses; and, warehousing and/or distribution of goods and materials in buildings not to exceed 50,000 square feet.

The principal permitted uses of the R-3 (Residential) Zone District include: single-family detached dwellings; public parks and recreation; conservation; municipal uses; and, houses of worship.

Bulk and Yard Standards

The bulk and yard standards for the BP (Business Park) Zone District are shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Use Other than Planned Commercial Development</th>
<th>Planned Commercial Development</th>
<th>Pad Site within Planned Commercial Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Tract Area</td>
<td>5 Acres</td>
<td>10 Acres</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Area</td>
<td>5 Acres</td>
<td>2 Acres</td>
<td>1 Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Frontage</td>
<td>400 Feet</td>
<td>200 Feet</td>
<td>150 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Width</td>
<td>400 Feet</td>
<td>200 Feet</td>
<td>150 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Depth</td>
<td>400 Feet</td>
<td>300 Feet</td>
<td>200 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Tract Perimeter Setback</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Yard</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Side Yard</td>
<td>25 Feet</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Rear Yard</td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
<td>35 Feet</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Lot Coverage</td>
<td>60 Percent</td>
<td>70 Percent</td>
<td>70 Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Building Height</td>
<td>2 Stories</td>
<td>3 Stories (4 for Hotels)</td>
<td>2 Stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The bulk and yard standards for the R-3 (Residential) Zone District are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2: Bulk and Yard Standards – R-3 (Residential) Zone District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Single-Family Detached</th>
<th>Municipal or Open Space Use</th>
<th>House of Worship</th>
<th>Other Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Area</td>
<td>9,375 Sq. Ft.</td>
<td>1 Acre</td>
<td>0.5 Acre</td>
<td>2 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Frontage</td>
<td>75 Feet</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
<td>100 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Lot Depth</td>
<td>125 Feet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>125 Feet</td>
<td>200 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Building Coverage</td>
<td>20 Percent</td>
<td>30 Percent</td>
<td>30 Percent</td>
<td>30 Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Lot Coverage</td>
<td>40 Percent</td>
<td>75 Percent</td>
<td>75 Percent</td>
<td>75 Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Front Yard</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Side Yard</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
<td>20 Feet</td>
<td>10 Feet</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Rear Yard</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
<td>30 Feet</td>
<td>50 Feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Useable Yard Area</td>
<td>25 Percent</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max. Building Height</td>
<td>35 Feet</td>
<td>40 Feet</td>
<td>35 Feet</td>
<td>40 Feet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Context

Gloucester Township Master Plan

The Gloucester Township Master Plan was originally adopted in 1999 and last reexamined in 2005. As listed below, it includes several goals and objectives that are relevant to the redevelopment of the Study Area:

Selected Overall Goals and Objectives:

1. Guide the physical and economic development of the Township toward the goals [of the Gloucester Township Master Plan], thereby benefitting the public health, safety, and welfare.
2. Provide for the harmonious and efficient allocation and arrangement of land uses and the protection of property values in Gloucester Township and surrounding municipalities.
3. Preserve environmentally sensitive lands from development or other potentially damaging influences.
4. Preserve and enhance the character of the built environment through the encouragement of good design.

Selected Land Use Goals and Objectives:

1. Foster a well-balanced, diverse community with a mix of residential housing types, institutional, commercial, and industrial uses along with ample open space and public facilities.
2. Improve the quality of life for Gloucester Township residents, those persons who work in the municipality and visitors by following the principles of the Master Plan in its implementation in the zoning ordinance.
3. Preserve open space and promote the visual enjoyment of the land.
4. Protect environmentally sensitive land from development.
5. Direct new development and redevelopment to places in relation to their transportation and environmental capacities.

As can be seen above, there are several goals and objectives that are relevant to and support the redevelopment of the Study Area. Please note that while these goals and objectives have been provided in the 1999 adoption of the Gloucester Township Master Plan, they have been reaffirmed with the 2005 reexamination of same.
Interchange Redevelopment Plan
In 2006 the Township Council adopted the Cooper Medical Services Redevelopment Plan to govern the redevelopment of the former Jarnap Farm site, located across Route 42 from the study area. The redevelopment plan established the Interchange Redevelopment District (IR). The purpose of the IR District is to provide opportunities for comprehensively planned development including mixed land uses incorporating office, commercial, and residential uses.

In 2011, the Township amended the original redevelopment plan to reflect the completion of the Route 42 interchange and the expectation “that the development of the Redevelopment Area will involve a variety of commercial, professional, residential and mixed uses.” The Amendment included a change to the title of the Plan from the Cooper Medical Services Redevelopment Plan to the Interchange Redevelopment Plan to acknowledge the impact of the completed interchange on the intent and vision for the Redevelopment Area. In addition, the amended plan acknowledges the economic downturn as documented in the Permit Extension Act of 2008, and State and Federal Programs that were expanded to spur economic recovery, especially in redevelopment areas.

Route 42 & College Drive Land Use and Transportation Study
As part of the planning and development of the Route 42 interchange improvements, the NJDOT conducted a series of visioning workshops and design charrettes in 2007. The report summarizing the results of the charrettes and workshops was published in November 2007.

The “Preferred Interchange Concept” (i.e., new roads, bridge, round-a-bouts, etc.), which have been completed, are intended to facilitate the creation of a new “college town” organized along the reconfigured road network and new interchange east of Route 42 within the redevelopment study area. The college town concept envisions the creation of a new mixed-use retail/office/residential center serving the college and surrounding area.

Camden County Bicycle and Multi-Use Trail Network Plan
The Camden County Bicycle and Multi-Use Trail Network Plan was adopted by the Camden County Planning Board in 2014. Its purpose is to increase opportunities for Camden County residents to walk and bicycle for short trips by providing guidance on local mobility and accessibility improvements.

The Camden County Bicycle and Multi-Use Trail Network Plan envisions the development of a bicycle path within the right-of-way of Davistown Road, which the Study Area fronts upon. An on-road facility is envisioned along the portion of Davistown Road. As noted in the Camden County Bicycle and Multi-Use Trail Network Plan, this could be achieved with a combination of signage and pavement markings (incl., chevrons and striping).
Redevelopment Designation Statutory Requirements

Pursuant to Section 5 of the LRHL (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5), an area may be determined to be in need of redevelopment if it meets one or more of the following statutory criteria:

A. The generality of buildings are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, or obsolescent, or possess any of such characteristics, or are so lacking in light, air, or space, as to be conducive to unwholesome living or working conditions.

B. The discontinuance of the use of buildings previously used for commercial, manufacturing, or industrial purposes; the abandonment of such buildings; or the same being allowed to fall into so great a state of disrepair as to be untenable.

C. Land that is owned by the municipality, the county, a local housing authority, redevelopment agency or redevelopment entity, or unimproved vacant land that has remained so for a period of ten years prior to adoption of the resolution, and that by reason of its location, remoteness, lack of means of access to developed sections or portions of the municipality, or topography, or nature of the soil, is not likely to be developed through the instrumentality of private capital.

D. Areas with buildings or improvements which, by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light and sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, deleterious land use or obsolete layout, or any combination of these or other factors, are detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the community.

E. A growing lack or total lack of proper utilization of areas caused by the condition of the title, diverse ownership of the real properties therein or other similar conditions which impede land assemblage or discourage the undertaking of improvements, resulting in a stagnant and unproductive condition of land potentially useful and valuable for contributing to and serving the public health, safety, and welfare, which condition is presumed to be having a negative social or economic impact or otherwise being detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the surrounding area or the community in general.

F. Areas, in excess of five contiguous acres, whereon buildings or improvements have been destroyed, consumed by fire, demolished or altered by the action of storm, fire, cyclone, tornado, earthquake or other casualty in such a way that the aggregate assessed value of the area has been materially depreciated.

G. In any municipality in which an enterprise zone has been designated pursuant to the “New Jersey Urban Enterprise Zones Act,” P.L. 1983, c. 303 (C.52:27H-60 et seq.) the execution of the actions prescribed in that act for the adoption by the municipality and approval by the New Jersey Urban Enterprise Zone Authority of the zone development plan for the area of the enterprise zone shall be considered sufficient for the determination that the area is in need of redevelopment pursuant to sections 5 and 6 of P.L. 1992, c.79 (C.40A:12A-5
and 40A:12A-6) for the purpose of granting tax exemptions within the enterprise zone district pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 1991, c. 431 (C.40A:20-1 et seq.) or the adoption of a tax abatement and exemption ordinance pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 1991, c. 441 (C.40A:21-1 et seq.). The municipality shall not utilize any other redevelopment powers within the urban enterprise zone unless the municipal governing body and planning board have also taken the actions and fulfilled the requirements prescribed in P.L. 1992, c.79 (C.40A:12A-1 et al.) for determining that the area is in need of redevelopment or an area in need of rehabilitation and the municipal governing body has adopted a redevelopment plan ordinance including the area of the enterprise zone.

H. The designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation.

Furthermore, the LRHL permits the inclusion of parcels that do not meet the statutory criteria if they are necessary for effective redevelopment of the proposed redevelopment area:

A redevelopment area may include land, buildings or improvements which of themselves are not detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, but the inclusion of which is found necessary with or without change in their condition, for the effective redevelopment of the area of which they are a part (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-3.).

In preparing this report, the project team analyzed and considered the applicability of the aforementioned statutory criteria for redevelopment on the Study Area, pursuant to Section 5 of the LRHL (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5). A description of the site conditions existing in the Study Area, as well as discussion as to how the properties in the Study Area meet the relevant statutory criteria of the LRHL, is outlined in the following sub-sections.

The project team utilized the following resources and documentation in preparing this redevelopment study:

- Tax records (Gloucester Township tax maps, Gloucester Township Tax Assessor and Tax Collector office, MOD IV data, and historical assessment data);
- Gloucester Township Building/Code Encormencement records;
- GIS records (NJDEP, NJDOT, NJGIN, FEMA, Camden County);
- Historic aerials (www.historicaerials.com); and,
- Site visits (conducted on April 30 and May 11, 2019). Photos from the site visits are located in Appendix B.
“A” Criterion – Deterioration of Buildings
A property meets the “A” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“The generality of buildings are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, or obsolescent, or possess any of such characteristics, or are so lacking in light, air, or space, as to be conducive to unwholesome living or working conditions.”

During the site visits conducted on April 30 and May 11, 2019, the project team assessed the site/layout and physical building conditions of the Study Area properties in order to review the applicability of the “A” criterion to the Study Area. This redevelopment study finds that the generality of the building in the Study Area does not exhibit any of the conditions stated above to the extent to produce an unwholesome living or working environment. As such, this redevelopment study finds that none of the Study Area properties meet the “A” criterion for redevelopment.

“B” Criterion – Abandoned Commercial and Industrial Buildings
A property meets the “B” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“The discontinuance of the use of buildings previously used for commercial, manufacturing, or industrial purposes; the abandonment of such buildings; or the same being allowed to fall into so great a state of disrepair as to be untenable.”

There are only six properties within the Study Area that have buildings, including Lots 3, 4, 7, 8, 12, and 13. Of these six properties, only Lots 3 and 4 are used for non-residential uses. Neither of Lots 3 or 4 are abandoned properties, as they house active commercial uses. Additionally, neither of these properties have become vacant or abandoned, and have not fallen into a state of disrepair as to be untenable. As such, none of the Study Area properties meet the “B” criterion for redevelopment.
“C” Criterion – Public and Vacant Land

A property meets the “C” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“Land that is owned by the municipality, the county, a local housing authority, redevelopment agency or redevelopment entity, or unimproved vacant land that has remained so for a period of ten years prior to adoption of the resolution, and that by reason of its location, remoteness, lack of means of access to developed sections or portions of the municipality, or topography, or nature of the soil, is not likely to be developed through the instrumentality of private capital.”

This Redevelopment Study finds that Lots 6 and 11 meet the “C” criterion for redevelopment for the reasons discussed below:

Lot 6:

This property is land owned by Gloucester Township that has remained vacant for over ten years. In addition, Center Avenue, which is an unpaved and unimproved 16.5-foot-wide right of way, is the only public right of way that offers direct access to this property. Additionally, Lot 6 is approximately 7,500 square feet in area, which constitutes an undersized lot for the R-3 Residential Zone District. As such, it follows that due to the location and remote and secluded nature of this property, it is not likely to be developed through private capital.

Lot 11:

This property is land owned by Gloucester Township and is currently vacant, though the former structures on site were only recently demolished earlier in 2019. Additionally, Center Avenue, an unpaved an unimproved 16.5-foot-wide right of way, is the only public right of way that offers direct access to this property. In particular, the northern “flagpole” portion of the property immediately adjacent to the south of Lot 13 is especially remote and inaccessible from the right of way and offers a land area configuration that does not encourage or facilitate land development. As such, it follows that due to the location and remote and secluded nature of this property, it is not likely to be developed through private capital.

Lot 5:

While Lot 5 is publicly owned, there is currently insufficient evidence available to designate the property in need of redevelopment pursuant to the “C” criterion. This property is owned by Gloucester Township and has remained vacant for over ten years. During the site visits the project team observed Common reed (Phragmites Australis) mixed with other herbaceous vegetation on the northern portion of the property close to Davistown Road. No clear signs of hydrology were observed, and NJDEP mapping does not identify any wetlands on this property, but there is the potential for wetlands to be observed onsite. In order to definitively assess if the nature of the soil on Lot 5 is of concern and might impact the ability for this property to be developed through private capital, more information on the nature of the soil would be needed. This could be verified by preparation of a wetlands delineation before a designation pursuant to the “C” criterion can be recommended.
“D” Criterion – Obsolete Layout and Design
A property meets the “D” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“Areas with buildings or improvements which, by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or lack of design, lack of ventilation, light and sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, deleterious land use or obsolete layout, or any combination of these or other factors, are detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the community.”

During the site visits conducted on April 30 and May 11, 2019, the project team assessed the site/layout and building conditions of the Study Area properties in order to review the applicability of the “D” criterion to the Study Area. This Redevelopment Study finds that Lots 3, 3.01, 7, 8, 9, and 10 meet the “D” criterion for redevelopment for the reasons discussed below:

Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10:

As previously discussed, Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10 are commonly owned and the land uses taking place on each property are associated with each another, as the sites effectively function as one site with no obvious physical demarcation separating the three lots from one another.

Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10 all exhibit obsolete layout, a condition resulting from the lack of direct and easy access to Davistown Road, which is the nearest improved public right of way. As previously discussed, northern access to Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10 from Davistown Road is as follows:

- Lot 3 is most easily and directly accessible from Davistown Road via an access easement through adjoining Lot 4. Lots 3 and 3.01 used to be one tax lot and were previously subdivided. Access from Lot 3 to Lot 3.01 as it remains today is unmarked, only partially improved, and requires traveling through the existing industrial uses and storage areas to the north of the site through a relatively haphazard and chaotic site circulation pattern. This represents faulty arrangement/design and serves as a site layout that is obsolete and no longer facilitates adequate use of Lot 3 or access to Lot 3.01.
- Lot 3.01 is landlocked and is not directly accessible by any public right of way. Northeastern site access from Center Avenue is via Lot 9 to the east, which requires traversing a steep grade decline. Northern site access from Davistown Road is via the access easement on Lot 4 and also through the parking lot and storage yard area on Lot 3. The landlocked configuration of Lot 3.01 as it remains today is evidence of the obsolete layout of the site.
- Lots 9 and 10 are only directly accessible by a public right of way at the southern terminus of the 16.5-foot-wide Center Avenue right of way, which is undersized/narrow, unpaved, and otherwise unimproved.

Apart from the indirect and disjointed northern access to these three properties from Davistown Road, Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10 also are accessible (albeit indirectly) from
Love Road and the access road to Route 42 via an existing informal stone driveway on Lot 2 adjacent and to the south.

In addition to the obsolete layout of these three properties resulting from the lack of direct and easy access, Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10 also exhibit deleterious land uses that could be detrimental to the safety of the community. The tenants of Lots 3.01, 9, and 10 are actively excavating soils from the sites, as evidenced by various piles of stones, rocks, and debris throughout the properties. The tenant is also actively flattening the terrain on Lot 9, with a line of steep grade change that bisects the majority of the property north to south where land has already been excavated/flattened and vegetation has already been removed. This line of drastic grade change is marked by unstable slopes and a grade differentiation of more than 10 feet in some areas between the upper (eastern) and lower (western) areas. There is no fencing or other means of controlling access to these three properties and the various heavy machinery and equipment storage, debris piles, and exposed and unstable slopes on site. These conditions serve as an attractive nuisance and a potentially hazardous condition to people accessing the site.

The various contractor, excavation, and storage activity taking place on Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10 is visible and accessible with no buffering or screening from Love Road, a highly trafficked roadway. For these reasons, Lots 3, 3.01, 9, and 10 exhibit obsolete design and layout and deleterious land uses, which adversely impact adjoining areas.

**Lots 7 and 8:**

As previously discussed, these properties are commonly owned, with the existing single family detached residential structure spanning both lots. This Redevelopment Study finds that Lots 7 and 8 exhibit dilapidation and deleterious land use that are detrimental to the safety and health of the community, as described below:

As previously described in detail earlier in this Redevelopment Study, the rear and side yards in the south and west of these two properties largely serve primarily as storage areas characterized by the following: numerous garbage and recycling cans; an industrial size dumpster; a tarp overhang structure; three gas grills; one small boat overtaken by vegetation; various crab traps; fishing equipment; one abandoned car overtaken by vegetation; loose power tools and equipment; a bed frame; a large safe; windows; bicycles; tires; janitor buckets; portable gas tanks; miscellaneous vehicle equipment; and, other various debris and materials not specifically identified. Additionally, these two properties have three detached storage sheds, each of which show signs of dilapidation, overgrown vegetation in and around the shed areas, visible damage to roofing, strewn garbage, damage to side façade, and graffiti tags.

This intense and uncontrolled storage of debris and materials are strewn throughout most of both Lots 7 and 8. Some materials are stored along the Center Avenue right of way or along the access driveway that links Center Avenue to Lot 3 and are directly accessible to the public. These conditions serve as an attractive nuisance to the public and represent a deleterious land use having an adverse impact on adjoining areas.
“E” Criterion – Condition of Title and Diverse Ownership

A property meets the “E” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“A growing lack or total lack of proper utilization of areas caused by the condition of the title, diverse ownership of the real properties therein or other similar conditions which impede land assemblage or discourage the undertaking of improvements, resulting in a stagnant and unproductive condition of land potentially useful and valuable for contributing to and serving the public health, safety, and welfare, which condition is presumed to be having a negative social or economic impact or otherwise being detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the surrounding area or the community in general.”

It is noted that this redevelopment study identifies no issues with the Study Area property related to the condition of its title that would impede land assemblage or discourage the undertaking of improvements, and as such there is no stagnant or unproductive condition of the land apparent. For these reasons, none of the Study Area properties meet the “E” criterion for redevelopment.

“F” Criterion – Fire and Natural Disasters

A property meets the “F” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“Areas, in excess of five contiguous acres, whereon buildings or improvements have been destroyed, consumed by fire, demolished or altered by the action of storm, fire, cyclone, tornado, earthquake or other casualty in such a way that the aggregate assessed value of the area has been materially depreciated.”

There are no records of impacts on properties in the Study Area from fire events, storms, cyclone, tornado, earthquake, or other casualty that would warrant application of the “F” criterion. As such, none of the Study Area properties meet the “F” criterion for redevelopment.

“G” Criterion – Urban Enterprise Zone

The “G” criterion for redevelopment under the LRHL relates to municipalities designated as an Urban Enterprise Zone under the Urban Enterprise Zone Act of 1983. It is noted that Gloucester Township is not located within an Urban Enterprise Zone. For this reason, none of the Study Area properties meet the “G” criterion for redevelopment.
“H” Criterion – Smart Growth Consistency

A property meets the “H” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“The designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation.”

Smart growth is an approach to planning that directs new growth to locations where infrastructure and services are available, limits sprawl development, protects the environment, and enhances and rebuilds existing communities. The New Jersey Office for Planning Advocacy (the "OPA") has developed the definition of a “Smart Growth Area” to include an area classified as one of the following:

1. Metropolitan Planning Area (PA1) in the State Plan;
2. Suburban Planning Area (PA2) in the State Plan;
3. A designated center in the State Plan;
4. An area identified for growth as a result of either an initial or advanced petition for plan endorsement that has been approved by the State Planning Commission;
5. A smart growth area designated by the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission; or,
6. A Pinelands Regional Growth Area, Pinelands Village, or Pinelands Town as designated by the New Jersey Pinelands Commission.

This Redevelopment Study recognizes that the Study Area properties are in the Metropolitan Planning Area (PA-1) in the New Jersey State Plan. The State has designated this area to provide for much of the State’s future development, with an emphasis on revitalizing cities and towns, promoting growth in compact forms, stabilizing older suburbs, redesigning areas of sprawl, and protecting the character of existing neighborhoods.

In addition to the OPA’s definition of smart growth areas shown above, the OPA also defines smart growth as “well-planned, well-managed growth that adds new homes and creates new jobs, while preserving open space, farmland, and environmental resources. Smart growth supports livable neighborhoods with a variety of housing types, price ranges and multi-modal forms of transportation.” Smart growth may exhibit one or more of the following characteristics:

- Mixed land uses
- Compact, clustered community design
- A wide range of housing choices and opportunities
- Walkable neighborhoods
- Distinctive, attractive communities offering a sense of place
- Open space, farmland, and scenic resource preservation
- Development directed to existing communities and infrastructure
- Sustainable design
- A variety of transportation options
An analysis of the applicability of the "h" criterion also typically involves a review of the existing land use arrangements within the study area to determine if they currently reflect the principles or characteristics of smart growth and how these conditions are related to some specific adverse impact on the community. In addition, a municipality proposing to designate an area in need of redevelopment pursuant to the smart growth principals should determine if such principals are adopted in the master plan.

As described in the preceding sections of this report, the existing redevelopment area along College Drive and the area adjoining new interchange on Route 42 had previously been the target of smart growth planning efforts on behalf of the Township. However, the Study Area was not included in these plans. Neither have such smart growth planning efforts been applied directly to the properties within the Study Area in the Township's Master Plan. Based on the foregoing, this Redevelopment Study finds that none of the Study Area properties meet the "H" criterion for redevelopment.
Needed for Effective Redevelopment

The LRHL permits the inclusion of parcels that do not meet the statutory criteria in a redevelopment area if they are necessary for the effective redevelopment of the area:

“A redevelopment area may include land, buildings, or improvements which of themselves are not detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare, but the inclusion of which is found necessary with or without change in their conditions, for the effective redevelopment of the area of which they are a part (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-3).”

This Redevelopment Study finds that **Lots 4, 5, 10, and 12 are needed for the effective redevelopment of the area** for the reasons discussed below:

**Lots 4, 5, and 12:**

Including these properties collectively in a redevelopment area is crucial for providing a safe, direct, and adequately designed connection from Davistown Road to the other properties in the Study Area. A redevelopment project would require adequate linkages to Davistown Road in order to be feasible. Until a specific redevelopment plan is adopted, it cannot be determined if either or both the Center Avenue right of way or the access easement through Lot 4 would be the most appropriate linkage to Davistown Road. But it is clear that the effective redevelopment of the area is contingent upon the potential roadway widening and/or reconfiguration of these existing linkages. It also is uncertain how the potential wetland areas on Lot 5 may affect development of and access to the area. Including all three of these properties would offer a degree of flexibility in determining the safest, most direct, and appropriate option.

In addition, including Lots 4, 5, and 12 in the redevelopment area would provide for a more contiguous tract of land, would increase flexibility in the design of a redevelopment project, and would enable any potential roadway network configuration or alignments that may be required as part of a redevelopment project in the rest of the area.

Furthermore, the southern half of Lot 12 serves as a barrier to the northern “flagpole” portion of Lot 11, which otherwise would be mostly undevelopable as a single tract of land. Including Lot 12 in a redevelopment area would provide for more adequate access to the northern portion of Lot 11 and would help facilitate assemblage of a more continuous and contiguous tract of land.

**Lot 10:**

This Redevelopment Study finds that all of the properties immediately adjacent to Lot 10 are recommended for a Redevelopment Area designation. Redevelopment of all properties adjacent to Lot 10 and along the Center Avenue right of way in a manner that excludes Lot 10 could potentially create a land-locked parcel of land that otherwise would not be practicably or feasibly developable. Conversely, including Lot 10 in a redevelopment area would help facilitate assemblage of a more continuous and contiguous tract of land.
Redevelopment Study Conclusions

Based on the assessment discussed above, this analysis finds that the Study Area properties meet the statutory criteria for redevelopment as identified in Table 3 below and in Map 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block 13103, Lot</th>
<th>Redevelopment Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Needed for Effective Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Needed for Effective Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>D, Needed for Effective Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Needed for Effective Redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A: Township Council Resolution R-19:02-080