

Florence, New Jersey 08518-2323  
June 24, 2013

The regular meeting of the Florence Township Planning Board was held on the above date at the Municipal Complex, 711 Broad Street, Florence, NJ. Vice Chairman Lutz called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. followed by a salute to the flag that was led by Kyle Sedor, a member of Boy Scout Troop #3.

Vice Chair Lutz then read the following statement: "I would like to announce that this meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act. Adequate notice has been provided and posted in the main hall of the Municipal Complex."

Upon roll call the following members were found to be present:

William Federico	Tim Lutz
James Molimock	Wayne Morris
Mayor Craig Wilkie	Council Representative Ted Lovenduski
Thomas McCue	Ray Montgomery

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Planner Barbara Fegley; Solicitor David Frank; Engineer Lee Philips

**ABSENT:** Millie Hamilton-Wood

**RESOLUTIONS**

**Resolution No. PB-2013-10  
Resolution of Memorialization  
Application of the Diocese of Trenton  
Minor Subdivision w/Lot Area Variance  
Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan  
Block 143.01, Lots 1 & 10  
In the RA Low Density and RC High Density Residential Zoning Districts  
Fifth Hearing Adjournment**

It was the Motion of Federico, seconded by McCue to approve Resolution No. PB-2013-10. All ayes.

**MINUTES**

It was the Motion of Lovenduski, seconded by Morris to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of May 22, 2013. All ayes.

**CORRESPONDENCE**

25.

- A. Letter from Burlington County Planning Board dated May 20, 2013 regarding Estates at Oak Mill Phase 3 subdivision. Block 156.09, Lots 21 & 22.
- B. Letter from Burlington County Planning Board dated May 24, 2013 regarding Estates at Oak Mill Phase 3.
- C. Letter from Burlington County Planning Board dated June 3, 2013 regarding Burlington Coat Factory, Block 160.01, Lot 1.01.
- D. Letter from Burlington County Planning Board dated June 13, 2013 regarding Dr. Scott Blum (Florence Family Dental), Block 96, Lots 1, 2 & 3.

It was the Motion of Morris, seconded by Lovenduski to receive and file Correspondence A-D. All ayes.

#### APPLICATIONS

PB 2012-06 for the Diocese of Trenton. Applicant is requesting Minor Subdivision, Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with bulk variances to subdivide property into three lots. One for the existing Riverbank Charter School, one for a 34-unit senior rental development, and the third for a single family home on property located at 1300 Hornberger Avenue, Roebling. Block 143.01, Lots 1 & 10.

David M. Roskos, Esquire

*Application received November 21, 2012 and continued at the request of the applicant until June 26, 2013.*

#### REPORTS/CORRESPONDENCE

Letter from applicant's attorney, David Roskos, dated May 30, 2013 requesting a continuance until the July 24, 2013 meeting of the Board.

It was the Motion of Federico, seconded by Montgomery to grant the continuance.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Federico, Lutz, Molimock, Morris, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery, McCue

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hamilton-Wood

PB 2013-02 for NFI Real Estate. Applicant is requesting Amended Final Site Plan approval to permit extension of the existing berm along the southerly (rear) lot lines of Lots 2.01 and 2.04 on property located on Route 130 North, Florence Township. Block 160.01, Lots 2.01, 2.03 and 2.04.

*Application received June 10, 2013.*

Victoria Fannon of Parker McCay appeared to represent the applicant. The Board is aware that the applicant has appeared before and received amended final site plan approval last year for a building addition to the previously approved plan, which incorporated about 1.6 million square feet. The purpose of this application is very simple. There was an existing berm that was approved previously. The applicant would like to extend the existing berm along the southerly rear property line. It would enhance the property and would provide an addition buffer. She said there were witnesses present to explain the application.

Solicitor Frank swore in Edward Brady from Taylor, Wiseman & Taylor and Michael Landsburg of NFI Real Estate. Solicitor Frank said Mr. Brady has been before the Board numerous times. He recommended Mr. Brady be deemed qualified. The Board concurred.

Ms. Fannon introduced the site plan as exhibit A-1. It is a color rendering of the previously approved NFI Warehouse site dated June 27, 2012. There was an overlay on the rendering. Mr. Landsburg explained the previous approvals had a landscape berm along the rear of the property to a point that he indicated on the exhibit. He said it runs to about the midpoint of building C. The applicant would like to enhance the buffer, taking into account some of the residences and the high school on that side of the site. The berm would wrap around building C and taper off in front of Building B. He felt this would enhance the buffer and provide for more separation between the site and the surrounding parcels. The rear berm was approved at 18' so it will continue at 18' and taper down along the side to about 12' and then further to 9'.

Mayor Wilkie asked if there was any effect on drainage. Mr. Brady said the drainage in the back of the site from the berm area travels to the west. With the existing berm area there was a swale and drainage pipe system. The Township Engineer, in his report, suggested extending the swale a little further up to the existing tree area off site. The applicant agreed to do that and he thinks it will help for taking any additional run off. The drainage that would come off the back of the berm on the east side will be picked up by an underground pipe tied into the existing piping system. The side slopes on the berm are 3 to 1.

Vice Chair Lutz inquired about concerns raised by Engineer Phillips in his report. Engineer Phillips said there is a request for a waiver to not have to resubmit an environmental impact statement. There was a statement in the original application. He would like the applicant to discuss the impact of replacing trees with berm. As a whole this is not a big change to the initial project. Mr. Brady said there are two areas where the berm is going in. One is an existing wooded area and the other has field type vegetation. He spoke to Planner Fegley regarding the clearing of the trees. The number of trees was evaluated and it is about 200 trees that would be cleared. He agreed to do some tree compensation and would work with the planner on locations for the new trees. The seed mix being proposed has been adjusted to reflect the planner's suggestions. The

new mix would promote more tree growth. Even though there is an area being cleared for the berm there are still woods on the other side so there are still trees providing a buffer with the additional buffer. When Phase III is eventually developed the lighting for that area will be completely hidden. Planner Fegley spoke to the project's landscape architect regarding the number of trees being removed and the types and species of those trees. Planner Fegley was concerned about the tree removal and would like to work with the applicant on a reforestation plan to buffer the Tall Timber residents. She would also like to see some reforestation on the side of the berm similar to what is on the other berm.

Vice Chair Lutz asked if the new berm was being proposed because there is excess material at the site. Mr. Brady confirmed this was the case. Vice Chair Lutz wants to be sure proper depths are maintained. He is concerned about the vegetation. He likes the idea of the berm and the open space but the material is not a good for growing.. The soil in that area is highly acidic. Planner Fegley asked if there was an acid soil mitigation plan. It was provided as part of the soil erosion plans. The applicant agreed to test the soil. Planner Fegley would like the soil to be monitored during construction. Mr. Brady said there would also be a layer of top soil. Ms. Fannon said the applicant does agree to work with the board professionals regarding areas that would need to be reseeded. She does not want to plant in areas where it will not support vegetation. She would like to be able to move forward as quickly as possible.

It was the Motion of Federico, seconded by Morris to open the meeting to the public regarding Application PB#2013-02.

Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Morris, seconded by Federico to close the public portion. All ayes.

Solicitor Frank said he prepared a Resolution to memorialize the decision of the Board. He distributed copies to the Board. Ms. Fannon requested the waivers be included in the vote. Solicitor Frank said there were a few additional conditions generated from the Board's discussion this evening. Also, there must be a condition stating all previous conditions are still in place. The applicant must work with the Board's Planner and Engineer to develop an appropriate plan for vegetation on the berm and provide reforestation along the base of the berm. In addition, the applicant must comply with certain design comments of the Board Engineer's report concerning storm water management.

Engineer Phillips said one of his findings had to do with the pipe going under the berm. He will work with the applicant to be sure the pipe is sufficient. Solicitor Frank said the applicant is consenting to perform soil testing of the berm soils and the berm will have adequate top soil layers. In addition there are the usual conditions of approval. He will add what was decided tonight to the written document he provided. Tonight will be a two-step process; the application will be voted on, and then the resolution memorializing the Board's action can be adopted.

28.

It was the Motion of Lovenduski, seconded by Montgomery to approve Application PB#2013-02.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

AYES: Federico, Lutz, Molimock, Morris, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,  
McCue

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hamilton-Wood

Solicitor Frank said in regard to the written document he provided, the initial “whereas” clauses are a recitation of the approvals that were previously seen from the original application. The second page states the developer seeks to amend the previously granted amended plan to permit an extension of the previously approved earthen berm to extend an additional +/- 630’ on the southerly lot line and turning north along proposed Building C with a distance of about 800’. He added the discussion of the height and would like to include it in the document. He said the findings of fact are a recitation of the previously granted approvals. He continued through the document. He would be adding that exhibit A-1 was submitted. He advised that if all are in agreement it can be resolved this evening.

It was the Motion of Lovenduski, seconded by Federico to adopt the Resolution with the changes discussed.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Federico, Lutz, Molimock, Morris, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery

NOES: None

ABSENT: Hamilton-Wood

OLD BUSINESS

None at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

None at this time

OTHER BUSINESS

A. Public Hearing to consider whether all or a portion of identified parcels within a certain area along the Route 130 Corridor, and areas east and west of the corridor (as identified in Exhibit A of Florence Township Council Resolution No. 2013-112) should be designated as “An Area in Need for Redevelopment.”

A1. Preliminary Investigation of an Area in Need of Redevelopment U.S. Route 130 Corridor, Florence Township, Burlington County, New Jersey.

Mayor Wilkie said the report before the Board was drafted by Planner Fegley. It provided the history and background and summarized areas of concern. Florence Township is situated in the center of many activities, from the Pennsylvania Turnpike connection to the New Jersey Turnpike. There is rail line in the area and we are connected to Route 295. The river is right here. Over the years there were many discussions as to what is necessary to spur planned development along those areas. There were discussions twenty years ago when an overlay was presented. The Town ran water and sewer toward Burlington Township. There are still sections on Route 130 that do not have water and sewer. In 2009 Council identified certain locations along Route 130 that were in need of development. Council recently decided to look at Route 130 and the adjacent areas. A resolution was passed to do so. There is now a comprehensive report that looks at Route 130 and areas on Florence-Columbus Road and Cedar Lane. It brings into consideration things that need to be done so the town can work with the people to spur development along Route 130. There are two projects that are currently underway on and both are in the 2009 redevelopment area. There has been no other interest and something needs to be done. The Mayor said he commented recently that he wants to aggressively spur things along and move the community forward. That is part of what this investigation will do. Planner Fegley will provide testimony that will support the redevelopment area and address concerns anyone may have.

Solicitor Frank confirmed for the record that Planner Fegley was sworn in as a Board Professional at the beginning of the year. Planner Fegley confirmed she was previously sworn in.

Planner Fegley of Environmental Resolutions introduced herself and explained that she prepared the document that is on file. The Board members previously received the "Redevelopment Preliminary Investigation for the Determination of an Area in Need of Redevelopment." Planner Fegley said she planned to discuss the background of the investigation, the study area, the redevelopment process, consistency with the Township Master Plan and County and State Plans, and definitions and conditions necessary to establish an "Area in Need of Redevelopment". She would then provide property descriptions and how the parcels meet the criteria required for inclusion.

She said in 2009 a preliminary investigation was done. She noted on a map the areas that were determined to be "In Need of Redevelopment" at that time. These were marked in red. Block 160.01 was the largest area. The current study area was shown in heavy black lines. It included the general manufacturing area, the special manufacturing and the office park districts in the Route 130 Corridor area. She noted there was a change to the report regarding Block 165.07, Lot 16. She showed its location on the map. The parcel is near the entrance to the Estates at Crossroads and fronts on Florence-Columbus Road. The brown areas on the map were lots that were specifically excluded from the study area. These included DOT properties, New Jersey Turnpike property, Verizon properties, and there is a lot that belongs to a homeowner's association that is dedicated to open space and can never be developed. There is a residential lot not included and adjacent to that there are a lot of wetlands and transition areas that will not be developed.

Planner Fegley said the local Redeveloping and Housing Law allows a municipality to look at whether certain parcels of land constitute areas of redevelopment. It allows the Township to change, in the future, parcels that may be abandoned, decayed, underutilized, over utilized, that aren't productive and that are in need of redevelopment. The governing body first passes a resolution directing the Planning Board to initiate the investigation. A public hearing is held and the information is reviewed. The Planning Board then recommends to Council what the next step should be. The public is allowed to speak and comment on the plan. Then the results and recommendations are referred to the governing body to take action on whether or not to accept the Planning Board's findings. Upon the recommendation from the Board, the governing body can adopt a resolution declaring the area in need of redevelopment but before any action is taken a redevelopment plan must be prepared. The Board members are aware of several that have been done in the recent past. After the plan is prepared it comes to the Planning Board and is referred back to Council for Council to take action in the form of adopting an ordinance.

She then explained some of the definitions. Redevelopment is the clearing, replanning, development or redevelopment of areas. Redevelopment area can be just one lot or many lots and it is not necessary for each lot to meet the criteria of being in need of redevelopment. A particular lot or block in an area in need of redevelopment can be included if it is necessary for the overall redevelopment of the area. There could be a lot that really does not meet the criteria but in order for effective redevelopment to take place that lot should be included.

There are eight statutory criteria referred to as the A through G criteria. Planner Fegley explained she would refer to them as she outlines the lots in the study and identify what criteria each lot falls under.

"A" is that the generality of buildings are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, obsolescent or have other characteristics that are conducive to unwholesome living or working conditions. "B" is the discontinuance of the use of buildings previously used for commercial, manufacturing or industrial purposed or if those are abandoned and fall into such a great state of disrepair as to be untenable. "C" is land that is owned by the municipality, the county, housing authority, or unimproved vacant land that has remained so for a period of ten years and by reason of its location, soil condition, topography or other features is not likely to be developed through the means of private capital.

"D" are areas with buildings or improvements which by reasons of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, excessive land cover, deleterious land use or obsolete layout or any combination of these is detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare.

"E" is a growing lack or total lack of proper utilization of areas caused by the condition of title that results in stagnant or not fully productive condition of land. "F" are areas in excess of five contiguous acres where improvements have been destroyed by fire or other natural disasters in a such a way that the total assessed value has been materially

depreciated. “G” is for Urban Enterprise Zones. Florence does not have a UEZ, but these sites automatically qualify. The UEZ cannot be the sole reason to have it in the redevelopment area, another criteria must also be present. “H” is that the designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth principals. This also cannot be used alone.

She went on to discuss the consistency with Master Plans. The 1999 Objectives and the 2003 Examination Report looked at emergent issues in the Township which included new commercial development that occurred because of the Pennsylvania Turnpike Extension. Those facilities were related to travel services and for distribution, warehousing and trucking. The plan also noted that highway commercial zoning along Route 130 resulted in dividing many of the common ownership lots. The 2007 Master Plan identified that new commercial development along Route 130 increased in response to the opening of the Pennsylvania extension of the New Jersey Turnpike. Also, the New Jersey Transit Light Rail Station was anticipated to bring new opportunities for economic development. The WaWa, Roma Bank and the Haines Industrial Center were an encouragement to development. The Master Plan noted that commercial and industrial development failed to keep pace with residential development and created a burden on the tax base. The Master Plan discussed creating incentives and developing strategies to promote commercial development and to equalize the tax imbalance.

In addition to the Township Master Plan there are County plans that are encouraging economic development. The Route 130 Delaware River Corridor Strategic Plan was dated December 1997 and it had a number of goals and objectives, not only for Florence. It included all the municipalities along Route 130 from Cinnaminson Township up to and including Florence. It talked about improving life in the corridor, encouraging development and redevelopment, educating municipalities about consensus planning and the need for strategic plans, including economic plans. It also explored alternatives for improved economics in the corridor. This would include grants, no cost loans and tax abatements. It also discussed redevelopment. Most of the constraints identified were local traffic conflicts along Route 130. Vehicles were traveling at a high rate of speed and other vehicles were slowing down to patronize businesses along Route 130. There were conflicts with truck routes. There were numerous curb cuts that provide access to many of the small sites. It also discussed sign clutter and the lack of landscaping, creating an unpleasing, harsh environment. Another point was the preponderance of small developed parcels under separate ownership. This had a limiting factor to assembling parcels for a cohesive larger scale development. The plan said there is an opportunity for a major industrial employment center between Route 130 and the Delaware River. It also said local governments could establish zoning incentives to encourage consolidation of small commercial properties and redevelopment into larger more cohesive development along Route 130. There are opportunities to encourage renovation and rehabilitation of outdated buildings. The Plan also talked about two new commercial nodes and target areas in Florence in particular. There was second part of the study done in 1998 that discussed what the corridor should be; its strengths and weaknesses. There was an Economic Development Plan prepared to encourage growth in support of the corridor-wide redevelopment zone.

She said she is discussing all of this because it is important to realize this it is not just Florence Township's goal. The County has prepared studies since 1997 with this vision. In 2010 there was a Ten Year Progress and Examination Report. It was determined that the vision remained the same.

Florence Township's plan is consistent with the State Development and Redevelopment Plan. It strives to revitalize the State's cities and towns. It conserves the State's natural resources and systems by connecting and concentrating development within the corridor. It promotes economic growth, development and renewal, and it ensures sound and integrated planning and implementation statewide.

At this point, Planner Fegley said she would discuss the applicability of the statute and the properties themselves. The first appendix in the report was Appendix A. It had the resolution authorizing the Planning Board to conduct the study. Appendix B had information on blocks and lots - dimensions, owners, addresses and assessment and improvement to land ratios. One indicator used to measure economic productivity is the ratio of the assessed value of improvements to the value of the land. It is the improvement ratio or improvement to land ratio or the IL ratio. A ratio of 1:1 or less can suggest that the land is not currently supporting a reasonable value of improvements or that the land would have a higher market value if the improvements were removed. This can be an indicator of a not fully productive condition of land potentially useful and valuable for contributing to and serving the public health, safety and welfare, which negatively affects surrounding areas. Appendix C is another chart that had information on tax liens, foreclosures and tax arrearages from 2005 to the present. Liens and tax arrearage are other indicators to measure that a property is not fully productive and that there is not as much value and they are not as much contributing to the public welfare. Appendix D had the specific criteria for A to G for each property included. There was also a column that talks about the inclusion of the parcel because of the generality of the area. This meant the specific A through G criteria wasn't met but the parcel was included because as a whole it would support redevelopment. Column BL was checked specifically if there were blight conditions and blight conditions are defined as deterioration or stagnation that negatively affects surrounding areas. There was a column for the IL, or improvement to land ratio. The NC column is there to note if none of the criteria were met.

She said she will discuss the properties in the same order as they are in the report, starting with Block 99.01. In that Block, Lot 29 was previously identified as an "Area in Need of Redevelopment" in 2009. Lot 20 happens to be directly in back of Lot 29 and is also owned by the same owner as 29. It really should have been included before because it is owned by the same company and is also used as storage in conjunction with the owner on Lot 29. Because of the common ownership and undersized lot condition it should be included under the "D" criteria. Next to Lot 20 is Lot 21, and that is an undersized lot for the Highway Commercial District, it is also incompatible with the zoning district. It is recommended for redevelopment because it is adjacent to the current redevelopment parcels and inclusion will assist in the redevelopment of the area of which it is a part. Lot

23 is Rite Aid. It is a current design that was constructed in 2005. It does not meet any of the statutory criteria and it is not being recommended for inclusion.

Block 109 Lots 6.01, 6.02, 10 and 12 were deemed to be “Areas in Need of Redevelopment” in 2009 under the “D” criteria. Lot 11 was not included in the redevelopment. It is owned by the owner of Illusions. It should have been included in 2009 under the “D” criteria. Lots 7.01, 7.02 and 8 have single family residences. The owner of Lot 8 and 9 is the same and there is only one house. While they are situated in the RA Residential District, their rear yards are adjacent to commercial uses. Lot 7.01 and 9 have commercial or former commercial uses adjacent to the side yard. Both lots are undersized. Roebing Bank only occupies part of the lot and there is unused commercial land to the north and east of the building. It is underutilized which is evident by the improvement to land ratio. Because the location is a gateway into Florence the entire block is underutilized and recommended for inclusion under the “D” and “E” criteria.

Block 111 Lot 2 was approved for development in 2004 but no development has occurred. It is in the Neighborhood Commercial District. It is adjacent to parcels in Block 110 that were designated in 2009. It is recommended for redevelopment because it is adjacent to parcels that were identified and including it will assist in effective redevelopment under the “E” criteria.

Block 112 has most of the lots in the RA Residential District, however Lot 5.01 is Town Liquor and Lots 5.02, 6 and 7 contain residences. Town Liquor is almost entirely covered by building and paving and is a faulty design. It lacks provisions for stormwater management and it has just about 100 percent impervious coverage. The commercial location along Route 130 is consistent with the Highway Commercial Zone, but it is actually in the RA Residential Zone. Lot 5.02 is an undersized lot and lot 6 contains two residential units where only one is permitted in the RA District. Lot 7 appears to conform to RA standards but the location of the residences along a major artery on relatively small lots is incompatible with the development vision of the Township and the County in the Route 130 Corridor. The location of Lot 5.02, an undersized residential lot immediately adjacent to a higher intensity use, such as a liquor store, is also incompatible. Inclusion of the whole block is recommended under the “D” and “E” criteria.

Block 113 has only one lot. It is surrounded by paper streets. It is on Route 130 but Fifth Street, Sixth Street and Father Chukla Lane are there. It is also in the RA District but it appears to have some constraints. It is a vacant property but it slopes to a tributary of Craft’s Creek so it will most likely have wetlands, open water, transition areas and flood hazard areas. The constraints will be regulated by NJDEP. It is recommended for inclusion under the “C” and “E” criteria because it is undersized and is bordered by paper streets and likely contains environmental constraints. It is likely the development of the lot will not be achieved through private capital.

Block 147.01 is located north of Railroad Avenue and the Conrail rail line and east of Walker's Road. The block is entirely in the SM Zoning District. Lot 3.01 contains about 28 acres of vacant woodlands. The property was approved years ago for expansion by Ready Pac, which is on the adjacent lot. No activity has occurred. The Township Administrator spoke to Dennis Gertmenian of Foxdale Properties, the property owner, and he said no development has occurred because of the economy and the competition from nearby sites in the Haines Center. The Haines Center lots are not adjacent to residents and have good access to Route 130 and the Turnpike. He said the negative condition of the residential properties and the potential for conflicts with residents was a deterrent. There was concern about the access because there is a paper street and it would be right next to residences. The positives for expanding at the same location were that Railroad Avenue does have good frontage and access and the Township was always an advocate for development and supported industry. Lot 3.01 is recommended to be included in the redevelopment area under the "C" and "E" criteria due to lack of access to the site that would be through a residential neighborhood and underutilization of the land due to blighted residential properties in the vicinity. Lot 3.02 contains two commercial buildings and a machine shop that is in poor condition. That lot was also identified as being blighted. Lot 18, adjacent to it, is also blighted. It contains a former fabricating company in poor condition and tax information indicates that the property was also the subject of liens, foreclosures and tax arrearage. Lot 3.03 contains a single family home in poor condition with dumping in the rear. The house is boarded up with a tarp covering it. Lot 3.04, 5.01 and 5.02 each contain single family residences and some of the others contain twin residences. Lot 4.02 contains a vacant site that has rampant dumping on it. This was also identified as blighted. Three other residential lots in this vicinity have the subject of tax foreclosures and tax arrearage. Even the zoning ordinance recognizes that this area should be in the Special Manufacturing District at some point. In the event of abandonment or discontinuance of the residences for a period of a year they will revert to the SM District and be bound by those regulations. These areas are recommended to be included under the "A", "B", "C", "D" and "E" criteria.

The next area is Block 148.02, Lot 6.02. It is the grass island on Cedar Lane that is totally surrounded by roads. The lot is unlikely to be developed through private capital because it is surrounded by roadways; it falls under the "C" criteria. The property is under the same ownership as Block 146.06, Lot 6.01. That lot is about 46 acres in size and contains three underutilized or vacant warehouse buildings, some of them in dilapidated, obsolescent, deteriorating condition. The uses of most the buildings have been discontinued and the buildings are stagnant and not fully productive or valuable for contributing to or serving the health public safety and welfare. These are the "A", "B", "D" and "E" criteria. The Township Administrator reached out to Samuel Reckford, the Chief Financial Officer for the owner, RTL Services, Inc. Mr. Reckford state that Lot 6.01 contains three separate buildings; there were two old warehouses and one smaller building that was used for mechanical repairs. The area used to be the site of the former A&P, and Superfresh used it as a warehouse. The companies abandoned the site years ago. The property languished and there have been few viable tenants or any activity. RTL indicated that there have been a number of real estate brokers who tried to market the property there was little success. The site remains unattractive and underutilized and

there are no prospective changes in the foreseeable future. This area is recommended for redevelopment. Also, there is a very small lot in the northeast corner that is owned by a separate entity. It looks like it is a potential rail spur. This is not likely to be developed by private capital. All of the properties are located in the General Manufacturing District and recommended to be in the redevelopment area.

Block 155.47, Lot 12.01 is about 17 acres in size. It is the location of Cream-O-Land warehouse and office. The site was constructed in 1987 and the buildings and site appear to be maintained well. The improvement to land ratio is good. The aerial photograph does indicate the site is almost entirely covered with buildings or impervious area. Trucks are parking right to the property line. The Township Administrator contacted Cream-O-Land's CFO, Carl Swick and its Operations Manager, Scott Stoner, to ask what their current and future plans were. They said Cream-O-Land is locked in its current configuration and the only way to expand the operations is to move the facility or to build on the adjacent site, lot 12.02 that is totally vacant. The lot is about 50 acres and is woodland. It has frontage on Firehouse Lane and Cedar Lane. It is owned by RTL Services, Inc. Administrator Brook spoke to Mr. Reckford of RTL regarding Lot 12.02. Mr. Reckford said the site is restricted by the property shape and access. His company has owned it for a long time and no interest has been made in the purchase or development of the property as a whole. The Township noted that there are dumping issues at the site. It is vacant and does not appear to have impediments such as wetlands or floodplains, at least by what can be seen from the NJDEP maps. There is a 20' wide drainage easement to the New Jersey Turnpike Authority which basically traverses through the central part of the site in an east to west direction. This is an impediment of improvements. Because the Cream-O-Land site is excessively developed and in need of additional land to expand, but they do not own and cannot purchase part of the adjacent land, Lots 12.01 and 12.02 are recommended to be included under the "D" and "E" criteria.

Block 155.47, Lot 16 is a triangular 1.5 acre site. It is a convenience store of older design that does not have adequate provisions for stormwater management, landscaping or solid waste handling. Currently the stormwater just flows behind the building across the parking lot through unmarked parking spaces. There are trash dumpsters and things out there that are just sitting in parking spaces. It is overgrown. The use and bulk requirements of the lot are also incompatible with the GM Zoning District and the design is obsolete and unmaintained. This site is recommended for inclusion under the "D" criteria.

Block 155.51, is a vacant wooded site located north of the Haines Industrial Center with frontage on River Road in Burlington Township. It is bounded by the Florence Township line, the Pennsylvania Extension of the New Jersey Turnpike and the Conrail property. It would seem like the development of this would be easy but the problem is there is a rail crossing and it is difficult to work with Conrail. This property is included under the "C" and "E" criteria.

The next area is Block 158, portions of Block 159 and Block 159.01. Some of the lots have buildings on them. There has been difficulty developing the Haines Industrial Center. There was a meeting with Whitesell and the issues were that the property goes back to 1950's when it was farm fields and various companies assembled the lands. At one point Transworld Oil was going to develop it as a tank farm, and there were other potential uses. Then the Burlington County Food Distribution Center was targeted there in conjunction with the adjacent Burlington Township Land to be a huge food distribution center. The reality is that Whitesell spent over \$8 million to do all the required improvements to the site and not much developed. There are two retail lots near the Light Rail station. The lots were not maintained well and when Whitesell purchased them they cleared the lots and now they are vacant. Another issue that Whitesell raised regarding lack of recent development opportunities is related to the presence of more desirable vacant land which might be closer to ports in northern New Jersey and lack of visibility from the highway. There is also competition directly across Route 130 in the expansive redevelopment area which includes Burlington Coat Factory and NFI where economic incentives are available that are not available in the Haines Center. There are also a number of physical features that are limiting. There are wetlands, transition areas, buffers and flood hazard areas. There are also significant changes in topography of 20' or more in some locations. Some of the lots have irregular shapes and grading could be costly grading required to develop. The area is being recommended for inclusion using the "C" and "E" criteria.

Block 159, Lots 5.01, 5.02, 5.04, 5.05, 5.06 and 13.01 are located on the Harkins Drive cul-de-sac off of Route 130. Lots 5.02 and 5.06 were recently developed as Harkins Plaza. There is stormwater management, a modern design and landscaping. It does not meet the criteria for redevelopment. Lot 5.01 is a warehouse and light manufacturing company constructed in 1977 but it has tax arrearage and liens. It appears from the aerial view and site visit that tractor trailers from 5.04 and 5.01 can access Cedar Lane in a fairly dangerous situation. It is recommended to be included under "D" and "E" criteria. Lot 5.04 is the warehouse that was destroyed by fire in July, 2012. It has been left blighted and a hazard. It is being recommended under the "D" and "E" criteria. Lot 5.05 is very narrow. There is outdoor storage of vehicles and equipment in undesignated areas so it is being included under the "D" criteria. Lot 13.01 is the HAPCO gas station. The site was renovated in 2009. While that site does not have issues it is being recommended for inclusion under the generality of properties and all could benefit from joint improvements for access, stormwater management and such under the "D" and "E" criteria. Lot 5.03 is the Land O Lakes warehouse. The property has excessive front yard setbacks with extensive building walls that don't include any kind of landscaping along the frontage. It also appears tractor trailers are parking on unimproved areas at the rear of the site. There is no provision for stormwater management leading to faulty design under the "D" criteria. There are three lots, Lot 3, 4.01 and 4.02 that are already included in a redevelopment area. Lot 11 and Lot 8.02 are included in the proposed redevelopment area. Bung's is on 8.01. It is in good condition. It was constructed in 1999. While this lot would not specifically be recommended for redevelopment it is adjacent to this very narrow, shallow lot, Lot 3, that has already been included in a redevelopment area. The inclusion is necessary for the effective redevelopment of which it is a part.

Block 159.01 is owned by the Route 130 Truck Plaza and houses Sal Son Trucking. The site has a poor appearance with excessive paving. There are trucks and cabs and containers parked throughout the site in undesignated areas with no curbing and there is no stormwater management. At times some of the containers are stored on unpaved portions of the site. The design is a faulty and obsolete layout and should be considered under the “D” criteria. Lots 1.02 and 1.03 contain an electrical testing company and storage area. There is excessive setback and poor circulation. None of the parking is paved and the employees are parking in the rear on unimproved surfaces. The Route 130 streetscape is unattractive with no landscaping or amenities. Basically the other portions of the site are all obsolete layout and faulty design and should be included under the “D” criteria.

Block 15.02 Lot 6.02 was included in the 2009 Redevelopment Study. Lots 9 and 10 are vacant and of similar undersized condition as 6.01 for the Highway Commercial Zone and Special Manufacturing Overlay District. They are owned by the same party which makes them more readily developable. However, there is still lot 6.02 that is undersized and determined to be an incompatible land use in the 2009 study. All the lots are recommended to be included under the “E” criteria.

Block 161.01, Lot 2 is a small triangular parcel. Planner Fegley wondered why the Turnpike did not purchase it with the rest of the lots. It is very small; its location, size and shape have restrictions and it is not likely to be developed through private capital. It should be considered under the “C” criteria.

Block 162 contains Tuscan Dairy Processing. It is 10 acres but it is almost entirely covered with building and paving. Access to the site is gated. Aerial photos show the impervious coverage and there are trailers, sometimes two deep, so circulation is an issue. It has no provision for stormwater management, landscape or buffers. The intensity of this use has spilled onto Lot 4.02. It is owned by the Turnpike and the trucks are parking and causing ruts and tracking dirt onto the roadway. In addition, in Lot 5 there is a small retail center. Space is being rented for offices. It is recommended it be included under the “D” criteria. Lot 1.01 is totally vacant. Some of it appears to be wetlands. It is owned by Dean Northeast, LLC, the same owner as Lot 4.02. Lots 2 and 3 are adjacent to the area. Lot 2 is a very small undersized lot. Lot 3 is adjacent to it. Overall you would have a fairly larger lot but not necessarily in that zone because it is still the HC/SM District. The house on one lot is in poor condition and considered blighted. It has a history of tax liens and arrearage. It is recommended to be included under the “A”, “C”, “D” and “E” criteria. Lot 5 is the Florence 130 Plaza commercial center. This contains Deliverance Church, office space and vacant space that is advertised for lease. The property is of faulty design in that there is no buffer from it to the adjacent lot. The building is almost immediately on the property line. Church use of Highway Commercial property is not normally a sign of viable retail. There are safety concerns about too many curb cuts so close in close proximity. This is recommended under the “D” criteria to be included. Lot 1.02 is underutilized and should be included under the “D” criteria.

Block 163.01 is located in the HC/SM Zoning district. There are parts to the east and west of Cathy Lane. Lot 3.02 contains the Stangel Motel, which is in poor condition and in need of redevelopment under the “A” and “D” criteria. Lots 15.02, 15.03 and 16 are single family residences. Lot 3.03 also contains a single family residence. These residences in the Highway Commercial District are incompatible land uses under the “D” criteria. Lot 15.02 has a history of tax arrearage and liens. Lot 18 has a number of commercial and office uses and storage. It also includes outdoor storage of vehicles and equipment in yard areas and on grass. It has faulty arrangement and obsolete layout of a Highway Commercial District property and should be included under the “D” criteria. Lot 9 is in poor condition and was formerly a realtor’s office on an undersized lot. It appears to have been a residence in 1912, but now it is just in poor condition and basically of no use and should be considered under the “A” and “D” criteria. Lot 20 is very undersized for the Highway Commercial District. It contains a building originally constructed as a residence in 1930. It was a tarot card/psychic readings store. Lot 2 is also a very small lot that originally contained a residence. It is in poor condition. They should be included under the “D” and “A” criteria. Lot 3.01 contains three buildings with mixed uses including storage, office space and truck repair. The largest building is in poor condition. It is a steel building and has cracks in it, there is mold, the parking lot is gravel and earthen and there are ponding conditions. It should be considered under the “A” and “D” criteria. There are a couple lots that are in good condition. Lot 3.05 is Mending Hearts Church and the church offices. Lot 3.06 is a former machine shop and warehouse and Lot 3.07 is vacant and contains a cell tower. All of these should be included for effective redevelopment of the area of which they are a part.

Block 163.02 is the Wawa and its parking area. It used to be two lots but was consolidated into one. This is not recommended for redevelopment. Lot 13.05 is Burger King. There is excessive parking and land coverage. It lacks stormwater management and is recommended under the “D” criteria. Lot 13.02 was approved as the site of a hotel, but nothing has happened. The road was constructed and utilities were constructed but nothing further occurred. There is a history of tax liens and arrearage. This is recommended to be included under the “E” criteria. Lot 7 is a well-maintained farm and single family dwelling. Lot 8 is vacant. Both are in the HC District and they are recommended to be included. Both appear to have potential wetland issues in the future if there is any development. They are to be included under the generality of criteria for the effective redevelopment of the rest of the lots.

Block 165.01, Lot 1 is the First Baptist Cemetery. It is not recommended to be included. There are two lots that are very long and narrow. The first is Lot 2.06, the Paws N Claws Veterinary Clinic and Lot 19, Olde Town Gardens. Both are only 75’ wide but 367’ deep. There is limited frontage for Highway Commercial but excessive depth. There is concern for site circulation and the entrances onto Route 130 are too close in proximity to each other. Both lots have portions of the parking not paved. Both are recommended under the “D” criteria. Lots 17 and 2.05 are the Northview Motel. It has an obsolete style, is in deteriorating condition, there is a lack of maintenance and it has a generally run-down appearance. The property is recommended under the “D” criteria. Lot 3 is a residence. The roof has a tarp on it. It might be vacant. It is recommended because it

appears to be vacant, it appears to be substandard or unsafe and uninhabitable and it is in need of repair. The property is also incompatible with the zoning district. It is recommended to be included because of these issues and because the adjacent parcels, 2.11 and 2.01 help to make it more of a usable parcel in the district as opposed to this triangular lot on its own, which is deficient in a number of bulk requirements.

Block 165.04 includes the Liquor Barn and Wayside Florist. There are also two single family residences and ground-mounted solar panels on the grounds. In the rear there is extensive dumping or stockpiling of materials which are adjacent to a relatively new development of single family homes. Behind the residences on the property there are a number of trailers, recreational vehicles and equipment behind a fence that is in poor condition. The site has an obsolete, faulty arrangement and deleterious land use with so many uses on the site in an uncoordinated manner and would be consistent with the "D" criteria. Lot 63 is vacant but it is recommended to be included for the overall redevelopment of the area of which it is a part.

Block 165.07, Lots 16 and 17 were considered. Lot 16 was taken out because of wetlands and a transition area. Lot 17 is recommended to be included under the generality of the area.

Block 166, Lot 9.01 and Lot 11.01 are owned by the same person. Lots 9.02 and 11.02 are the same owners. Lot 9.01 is a single family residence in poor condition. It is an incompatible land use on the Route 130 Highway Commercial District. It is recommended for inclusion under the "A" and "D" criteria. The next site over is a residence that was constructed in 2008 but has not been completed. It is also not compatible with the zoning district so it is recommended to be included under the "D" criteria. Adjacent to that is the Mallard Creek commercial area. That is a relatively new design. It is not recommended to be included. Finally is Roma Bank in the Highway Commercial District. This site is not being recommended for inclusion.

In summary, the report reflects the properties Planner Fegley believes should be included in the redevelopment area. She reviewed the H Criteria, which states the designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation. The State's Regional Center Planning Implementation Agenda and the Burlington County study also support this type of strategic revitalization and redevelopment planning. Smart growth principles encourage development in areas that are already developed or adjacent to developed mix uses. Designation of the site as an "Area in Need of Redevelopment" will assist in the reuse of vacant and underutilized buildings and redevelopment of the area in accordance with smart growth. Over the years the Township has actively worked to implement these planning principles when evaluating revitalization in the Township. Declaring the specified lots in the study area as an "Area in Need of Redevelopment" will help strengthen the Township.

At this time there was a short recess. The Board was asked if it had any questions regarding the redevelopment study. There were no questions or comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

It was the Motion of Montgomery, seconded by McCue to open the meeting to the public. All ayes.

Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Federico, seconded by Montgomery to close the public portion of the meeting. All ayes.

Solicitor Frank said the Board was here this evening to receive the detailed report from Planner Fegley and provide a recommendation to the governing body as to whether or not the Board feels certain properties should be included in an "Area in Need of Redevelopment." The planner noted there was one change to the properties she recommended for inclusion. She noted other properties that did not need to be included.

It was the Motion of Wilkie, seconded by Federico to accept the preliminary investigation as presented.

Upon roll call the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Federico, Lutz, Molimock, Morris, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery,  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Hamilton-Wood

Solicitor Frank said he took the liberty of preparing a memorializing resolution. He briefly outlined the resolution. He said it will recommend that Planner Fegley's report be adopted as the Board's recommendation to the government body with regard to areas designated "In Need of Redevelopment," but he added that it is excepting the property Planner Fegley removed.

Motion of Wilkie, seconded by Montgomery, to adopt the resolution.

Upon roll call, the Board voted as follows:

YEAS: Federico, Lutz, Molimock, Morris, Lovenduski, Wilkie, Montgomery  
NOES: None  
ABSENT: Hamilton-Wood

It was the Motion of Lovenduski, seconded by Federico to open the meeting to the public. Seeing no one wishing to be heard, it was the Motion of Lovenduski, seconded by Wilkie to close the public comment. All ayes.

Motion of Lutz, seconded by Morris to adjourn at 9:36 p.m. All ayes.

---

Wayne Morris, Secretary

WM/ak