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INTRODUCTION

The following section entitled Purposes and Organization of the Florence Township Master Plan was included as part of the original Master Plan of 1976 adopting the general purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law as the purposes of that Plan. The following section, entitled Goals and Objectives includes the goals and objectives adopted by the Planning Board since the 1976 Master Plan’s adoption reflecting Florence Township’s own particular circumstance. Taken together, they represent a statement of objectives, principles, assumptions, policies and standards upon which the constituent proposals for the physical, economic and social development of Florence are based.

Organization of the Plan (1976 Master Plan)

It is the intent and purpose of this master plan to assist the residents of Florence Township, Burlington County, New Jersey and others, in furthering the various objectives of the Municipal Land Use Law, Chapter 291, Law of 1975. These purposes are spelled out in Article I, Section 2 of that legislation, and they encompass a statement of policies for Florence. Throughout this document we will find recommendations and plans that are designed to convert these policies into action. For example, we will note that the land use plan element of this master plan is related to the statutory purpose of providing well-located, adequate space for a variety of land uses important to the people of Florence and New Jersey.

Poet William Blake observed that: “He who would do good to another must do it in minute particulars. General good is the plea of the scoundrel, hypocrite, and flatterer.”

Therefore, this master plan will seek to stress realistic proposals rather than easily made platitudinous pronouncements signifying little. The emphasis will be on specific measurement of a variety of planning matters. This document is organized as follows:

1. A statement of general principles, objectives, assumptions and policies on which this plan is based (I. INTRODUCTION).
2. A description and analysis of various aspects of Florence Township physical and developmental makeup pertinent to planning in Florence Township (II. DATA & STATISTICS ABOUT FLORENCE).
3. Specific plan elements intended to guide the future development of Florence (CHAPTERS III. Through IX.)

At the beginning of each Element a “Context” statement explains the origin of the Element.


The following are the objectives, principles, assumptions and policies that form the basis of the Florence Township Master Plan:

1. MANAGED AND BALANCED ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SHOULD BE ENCOURAGED IN THE TOWNSHIP. IN PARTICULAR TOWNSHIP POLICIES SUCH AS ZONING AND UPGRADING MUNICIPAL SERVICES SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENVIRONMENTALLY “FRIENDLY” COMMERCIAL AND OFFICE DEVELOPMENTS PROVIDING NEEDED SERVICES, JOBS AND A STRENGTHENED TAX BASE.
2. Improvements and expansion to the township’s water and sewer systems should be balanced with the existing need and coordinated with the township’s future land use policies.

3. More recreational facilities in Florence are needed as new residential development occurs. New development should contribute, on a fair share basis.

4. Township policies should manage housing growth at levels in step with the availability of municipal services.

5. Residential development standards should permit flexibility of design in order to promote the retention of open space and the preservation of critical areas.

6. Florence must comply with COAH’s “fair share” affordable housing requirements. It should do so in a manner that minimizes growth impacts and financial cost to the township.

7. The farmland area of Florence to the southeast of the Turnpike Extension and Route 130 represents an important and rapidly diminishing resource that should be protected and preserved from inappropriate development that will be harmful to its long term viability as an agricultural area.

8. The historic character and existing scale of the Roebling area of Florence should be preserved. In addition, the many individual historic sites throughout the township should be preserved.

9. The township’s land use plan should provide for a variety of land uses meeting the needs of the citizens of Florence.

10. Residential development should be generally confined to the area north of the New Jersey Turnpike in order to prevent “sprawl”, wasteful expenditures on infrastructure and harmful affects on agriculture. The highest density of housing development should be reserved for the older portions of the township close to the Delaware where infrastructure and services are available and where higher densities will be consistent with the existing scale and character of the development.

11. Wetlands, floodplains, water bodies and other environmentally sensitive areas should be protected from development.

12. The township’s development regulations should be designed to be flexible and streamlined while promoting visually attractive design and the preservation of critical areas.

13. The existence of a commercially viable town center in the area of Broad and Front Streets serving the needs of the residents is important to the township. The township should look for and support realistic ways that assist this area in becoming more economically viable.

14. The closing of the Roebling Plant, a site of strategic importance to the township, still adversely affects the township’s character and economic base. The township should look for ways to make this site more attractive to redevelopment and accessible to the waterfront and Route 130.

15. Many important changes are occurring to the road network in the Florence area. These changes will have important implications for the character and future development of Florence that may require changes to this plan. The township should remain active in monitoring the changes, influencing them where possible and changing township plans where necessary.
II. DATA & STATISTICS ABOUT FLORENCE  (1976 MASTER PLAN)

Context

The following sections were compiled as part of the original 1976 Master Plan.

Location and Physical Features

The location of Florence Township in the northern portion of Burlington County and its setting within the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission Jurisdiction are depicted in Maps II-1 and II-2. The township has about 3 miles of frontage on the Delaware River and an area of 9.65 square miles. The significance of U.S. Highway 130 traversing Florence, the Pennsylvania Extension of the New Jersey Turnpike being located within its borders, and Interstate 295 crossing its southern tip will be considered subsequently. It constitutes about 1.2 percent of the land in Burlington County.

Physical Features: To take into account the various physical features of Florence Township, specially prepared maps showing: topography and drainage (Map II-3); woodlands (Map II-4); septic limitations (Map II-5); prime agricultural land (Map II-6); and inventory composite (Map II-7); and land most suitable for development (Map II-8) are provided. Analysis of physical characteristics is presented on each map.

On an overall basis, we note that the general topography of Florence is level to gently rolling. But for the low marshy area of Florence, soil characteristics do not bar most potential development. The variations of soil conditions in the township are not so drastic as to significantly affect potential development.

History

“A little history is worth a volume of logic,” said U.S. Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes. Florence Township was incorporated on March 7, 1872. Its two parts, Florence and Roebling, are advantageously situated on the Delaware River. A group of Philadelphians organized the municipality.

Products originated in Florence have been of national and international significance. The foundry started in 1859 by Richard Jones, and now known as Griffin Pipe Products, Inc. has manufactured pipes and fire hydrants that are used throughout the world. Another factory was the steel plant built by Roebling in 1904. John Roebling, the famous wire rope manufacturer is commemorated in a portion of Florence Township. In this area, two story brick houses for Roebling employees were built. This town of wide, tree-lined streets was named the Village of Roebling. From its plant wire was manufactured for San Francisco’s Golden Gate Bridge and the George Washington Bridge. Recently, the Village of Roebling was included in the New Jersey Register of Historic Places as an example of a company town.
Existing Land Use

Considering the location, extent and intensity of the development of the township’s land, we note the following:

1. The section of the township known as Roebling is mostly used for residential purposes. About 65 of Roebling’s 463 acres consist of high density row housing. Specifically, the average dimensions of the lots are 15’ x 100’. The net density per acre for the Roebling area was designated as 51.8 dwelling units per acre. The area consisting entirely of row housing in Roebling (along Amboy and Railroad Avenues) was found to have a net residential density per acre of 103.5 dwelling units (see pages 25, 26 of the 1950’s plan prepared by Community Planning Associates). About 25% (119 out of the total 463 acres) was used by the Roebling plant. The finding of the 1950’s plan that the 181 acres (or 39 percent of the area) was undeveloped and has remained essentially unchanged as of this 1976 report. We should keep in mind the 1950’s plan finding that “much of this undeveloped land (i.e. 181 acres) is suitable for residential developments.”

2. Contrasting vividly with the Roebling area is the area that encompasses the township land south of Route 130. Involved are more than 3,000 acres used for agricultural purposes and low density housing. Much of this land is of prime agricultural character (see Map II-6).

3. West of the Roebling area is an area readily accessible from all parts of the township and centrally located in the developed portion of Florence. Only about one third of this area of 837 acres, known as Florence Station, is developed. Most of the residential lots in Florence Station average 50’ x 100’. Adjoining Florence Station is an area which includes a foundry installation of 61 acres and many nearby multi-family and two-family dwellings. About half of this 516 acre area is developed. The net density per acres was found to be 40.5.

Existing Land Use Table and Map

Demography*

Economic Considerations

(Reserved)

(Reserved)

Also see HOUSING and FAIR SHARE PLAN ELEMENT
### III. COMMUNITY FACILITIES PLAN ELEMENT

Municipal Services and Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal/Public Works</td>
<td>(Reserved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Protection</td>
<td>(Reserved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Protection</td>
<td>(Reserved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>(Reserved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>(Reserved)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IV. RECREATION PLAN ELEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Local Recreation Facilities</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Recreation Proposals</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Recreation</td>
<td>Reserved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. UTILITY SERVICE PLAN ELEMENT  (adopted May 22, 1995)

Context

The following Wastewater Management Plan (WMP) was condensed and edited from the original plan prepared by Richard Alaimo Associates for the Township of Florence on February 1992 and revised through to March 1993. Those interested in the detailed information concerning that plan should refer to the original document.

The Potable Water Supply Plan (PWSP) was condensed and edited from the original Water and Sewer Master Plan prepared by Richard A. Alaimo Associates May 1990.

Wastewater Management Plan (Prepared February 1992, Revised March 1993)

Introduction

The Wastewater Management Plan was submitted to and approved by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and incorporated into the Tri-County Water Quality Management Plan. Florence Township, Burlington County, New Jersey, is poised for growth in this decade. This requires a sizable increase in sewer amenities.

The sewer utilities in Florence Township date back to the early 1900’s when the J.A. Roebling Steel Company installed sewer lines in a portion of the Township to serve the community of plant employees needed for its manufacturing operations. Later in the 1930’s additional sewer mains were constructed throughout the Township, a sewage treatment plant was constructed on Front Street overlooking the Delaware River. The sewage treatment plant has since undergone upgrades and modifications in the 1950’s and as late as 1994 in order to meet the increased community needs and compliance with the discharge permit.

Summary of Significant Activities

The expansion of the sewer service area is proposed to cover most of the vacant land east of the Route 130 corridor in the planning area. Based on current zoning ordinances, the wastewater flow to the Florence Township Sewage Treatment Plant is slated to increase by an additional 1.5 MGD from the current flow rate of about 1.0 MGD to 2.5 MGD. The corresponding increase in population within the planning area is projected to be 7,235.

Specifically excluded from the wastewater flow projection in the WMP is a proposed Food Distribution Center in the central western portion of the Township bounded by Route 130 and Burlington Township. The present planning status of this project precludes wastewater flow projections from being part of this planned expansion.
to the Florence Township Sewage Treatment Plant. Only the underlying GM zone wastewater flow projection of 426,050 gpd has been included as part of this WMP. An amendment to the WMP would be necessary to include an additional expansion to the Florence Township Sewage Treatment Plant to serve the Food Distribution Center. The Center has been projected to generate in the range of an additional 2 MGD of wastewater flow to be sent to the Florence Township Sewage Treatment Plant for Treatment.

**Basis for Service Area Delineation**

The service area delineations for the planning area are based on the current zoning ordinance applicable to Florence Township. Map V-1 delineates future sewage contributory areas.

**Future Flow Projections**

Population projections for the planning area were performed by Thomas A. Scangarello Associates. Based on current zoning regulations, the maximum buildout calculations determined the number of residential, commercial and industrial buildings that could be constructed on the vacant land. The total flow generated was then calculated after a population and/or flow rate was assigned to each building unit. It was also decided that sewer service shall not extend over the entire township. The sewer service area was subdivided into contributory basins as shown on Map V-1 and described on Tables 1 and 2. Future flows were then determined based on the ultimate land use. This has been calculated to be 1,493,500 gallons per day. The basis for equivalent flows as used is as follows:

- **Dwelling units:** 225 gpd, based on 3.46 persons per dwelling and 65 gpd per person.
- **Commercial space:** 0.125 gpd per S.F.
- **Industrial space:** 0.069 gpd per S.F. The industrial flow basis assumes seventy-five percent (75%) Warehouse and twenty-five percent (25%) office. 
  \[0.75 \times 0.05 \text{ gpd/SF} + 0.25 \times 0.125 \text{ gpd/SF} = 0.69 \text{ gpd/SF}\].

**Projected Flow Calculations**

Sewage flow projections presented in this Wastewater Management Plan were based upon permitted densities and lot coverage calculations prepared by Thomas J. Scangarello and Associates. These calculations exclude wetlands and flood prone areas consisting of floodways and flood plains as shown on Maps 5 and 6. Florence Township’s definition of developable lands exclude wetlands and wetlands buffers as
certified by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Freshwater Wetlands.

Table 1: Maximum Density Buildout Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crafts Creek Contributory Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R zone</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3 DU/acre</td>
<td>410 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>92,250 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA zone</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4 DU/acre</td>
<td>342 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>76,950 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC zone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>213,450 SF x .125 gpd/SF</td>
<td>26,675 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195,875 gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potts Mill Road Contributory Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R zone</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3 DU/acre</td>
<td>502 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>112,950 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA zone</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 DU/acre</td>
<td>40 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>9,000 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP zone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20% lot coverage</td>
<td>348,500 SF x .125 gpd/SF</td>
<td>43,575 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC zone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>381,150 SF x .125 gpd/SF</td>
<td>47,650 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213,175 gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township Regional (Florence-Columbus Road) Contributory</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R zone</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 DU/acre</td>
<td>50 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>11,250 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB zone, Approved flows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108,450 gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM zone</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>365,900 SF x .069 gpd/SF</td>
<td>25,250 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC zone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>137,225 SF x .125 gpd/SF</td>
<td>7,150 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP zone</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20% lot coverage</td>
<td>61,000 SF x 125 gpd/SF</td>
<td>7,625 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169,725 gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route 130 Contributory Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SM zone</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>1,204,450 SF x .069 gpd/SF</td>
<td>83,100 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC zone</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>747,050 SF x .125 gpd/SF</td>
<td>93,375 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP zone</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>20% lot coverage</td>
<td>601,125 SF x .125 gpd/SF</td>
<td>75,150 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>251,625 gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“In-town” Contributory Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A zone</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1 DU/3 acres</td>
<td>22 DU x 125 gpd/DU</td>
<td>4,950 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA zone</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4 DU/acre</td>
<td>243 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>54,675 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM zone</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>35% coverage</td>
<td>2,561,500 SF x .069 gpd/SF</td>
<td>177,025 gpd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>237,050 gpd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manufacturing Contributory Area</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM zone</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>45% coverage</td>
<td>6,174,624 SF x .069 gpd/SF</td>
<td>426,050 gpd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total projected Sewerage Flows: 1,439,500 gpd

Existing Facilities-Florence Township Treatment Facilities
The Florence Township (NJPDES NJ 0023701) treatment facility has a permitted capacity of 1.5 MGD and provides “secondary treatment using the trickling filter process. The current NJPDES permit requires the facility to remove ninety percent (90%) of the biological oxygen demand (BOD) and eighty-five percent (85%) suspended solids in the waste stream. The maximum acute toxicity concentration is restricted to fifty percent (50%) with an ammonia discharge limit set at 35mg/l. The treatment process consists of
primary sedimentation followed by a high rate biofiltration and secondary settling with recirculation. The effluent is polished in sand filters prior to chlorination and discharge.

Cumberland Farms Treatment Facility – Overview

This is a privately owned waste treatment facility in Florence Township. Waste products generated by Cumberland Farms in its dairy processing facility are pretreated and discharged into the Florence Township sanitary sewer system for additional treatment at the Florence Township sewage treatment plant. This facility operates under the terms of NJPDES Permit No. NJ0062081-SIU. The plant uses the activated sludge process to treat the dairy wastes. While the permitted discharge from the plant is 126,000 gallons per day, the plant has been averaging about 65,000 gallons per day.

New Interceptors and Truck Sewers

Two (2) new ten (10) inch sanitary sewer service force mains have been installed from Route 130 to the treatment plant along the Pennsylvania Turnpike access road and Burlington Township border. These force mains have been sized to receive wastewater from the areas along and east of Route 130 as well as portions of the in-town and general manufacturing contributory areas. These force mains will receive wastewater from future pumping station in the developable areas. Gravity sewers ranging in sizes from eight inch (8”) to twelve inch (12”) diameter will serve the proposed pump station. See map V-II for location of existing and proposed sewerage collection and pumping station systems.

Treatment Plant Upgrade and Expansion

At some point in the future the capacity of the existing Florence sewerage treatment facility will have to be increased to 2.50 MGD from the current 1.50 MGD discharge limit. While sufficient area is available for expansion activities, the actual need will be based upon the available capacity or more stringent permit limitations.

The existing outfall from the Florence treatment facility discharges directly to the Delaware River across from the sewage treatment plant. Discharge location. No change to this location is proposed.


The water utilities have been benefited in the past from the Township’s proximity to the Delaware River. The Township wells are located approximately two thousand feet (2,000’) from the Delaware River and are drilled into the Potomac-Raritan-Magothy (PMR) aquifer. Since the PMR aquifer is recharged from the Delaware River, an abundant quantity of good quality water is available from relatively shallow wells. Only minimal treatment for pH correction and disinfection are required prior to discharge into the potable water system.

The water and sewer utilities date back to the early 1900’s when the J. A. Roebling Steel Company installed water mains and sewer lines to serve the community of
plant employees needed for its manufacturing operations. During the 1930’s wells were drilled and water mains were constructed throughout Florence Township. Two (2) new wells for potable water supply and a water treatment plant were constructed in the 1950’s. In the late 1960’s one (1) million gallon elevated water storage tank was constructed on Cedar Lane. A partial upgrading of the existing distribution system was started in 1983 to relieve pressure deficiencies in existing service areas. The water plant was upgraded in 1988 by the addition of a lime treatment process designed to eliminate corrosive conditions; instrumentation was added to automate certain plant functions and a fifth well was constructed in 1994.

Water Demands

**Current Demands:** The following table provides an analysis of water demands for the past two (2) years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yearly Average</th>
<th>Peak Monthly Average</th>
<th>Peak Daily Flow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993 water demands, MGD</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>32,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 water demands, MGD</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>31,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The flows for the two (2) years show relatively unchanged average rates of water consumption. The differences in peak flows can be attributed to precipitation trends in each year.

**Future Flow Projections:** As with the WMP maximum density buildout calculations were performed to determine the number of residential, commercial and industrial buildings, which can be built on the currently vacant land based upon current zoning regulations. A population and/or flow rate was then assigned to each building unit and total water demand projections were calculated. As shown on Map V-III, the future water service area will extend over the entire township. The sewer service area will not be extended into the agricultural zone southwest of the Pennsylvania Turnpike extension, south of Route 130. Therefore, water capacity projections will exceed those for sewage capacities. The projections total 1.77 MGD. Therefore, the maximum total average flow rate projected for Florence Township is 2.77 for water (based upon the current zoning). The calculations on which these estimates are based are shown below in Table II.

**TABLE II: Maximum Density Buildout Calculations**

**Crafts Creek Contributory Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>DU per acre</th>
<th>DU x gpd</th>
<th>gpd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Zone*</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>410 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>92,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA Zone*</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>342 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>76,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC Zone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>213,450 SF x .125gpd/SF</td>
<td>26,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Potts Mill Road Contributory Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>DU per acre</th>
<th>DU x gpd</th>
<th>gpd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R Zone*</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>502 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>112,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA Zone*</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40 DU x 225 gpd/DU</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OP Zone</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20% lot coverage</td>
<td>348,500 SF x .125gpd/SF</td>
<td>43,575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC Zone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35% lot coverage</td>
<td>381,150 SF x .125gpd/SF</td>
<td>47,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213,175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V-5
Township Regional (Florence Columbus Road) Contributory Area

R Zone*  21 acres  3 DU per acre  50 DU x 225 gpd/DU  11,250 gpd
RB Zone  Approved Flows  482 DU x 225 gpd/DU  108,450 gpd
SM Zone  24 acres  35% lot coverage  365,900 SF x .069 gpd/SF  25,250 gpd
HC Zone  9 acres  35% lot coverage  137,225 SF x .125 gpd/SF  17,150 gpd
OP Zone  7 acres  20% lot coverage  61,000 SF x .125 gpd/SF  7,625 gpd

169,725 gpd

Route 130 Contributory Area

SM Zone  79 acres  35% lot coverage  1,204,450 SF x .069 gpd/SF  83,100 gpd
HC Zone  49 acres  35% lot coverage  747,050 SF x .125 gpd/SF  93,375 gpd
OP Zone  69 acres  20% lot coverage  601,125 SF x .125 gpd/SF  75,150 gpd

251,625 gpd

“In-town Contributory Area

AGR Zone  65 acres  1 DU/3 acres  22 DU x 225 gpd/DU  4,950 gpd
RA Zone*  81 acres  4 DU/acre  243 DU x 225 gpd/DU  54,675 gpd
SM Zone  168 acres  35% coverage  2,561,500 SF x .069 gpd/SF  177,025 gpd

237,050 gpd

Manufacturing Contributory Area

GM Zone  315 acres  45% coverage  6,174,625 SF x .069 gpd/SF  426,050 gpd

Sub Total:  1,493,500 gpd

Agricultural Area (Water Service Only)

Two hundred ninety (290) existing dwelling units on lots smaller than three (3) acres.
Six hundred twenty (620) additional dwelling units on remaining developable land a 1 DU/3 acres.

910 DU’s x 225 gpd/DU = 204,750 gpd

Projected Water and Sewer Flows = 1,493,500 gpd
Total Projected Water Demands = 1,698,250 gpd

The flow projections do not take into account the effects of the proposed site of the Regional Food Distribution Center. The site, which has been selected for feasibility review by the South Jersey Food Distribution Authority, is located half in Florence Township and half in Burlington Township between the Conrail tracks and the Delaware River. The flow estimates presented above may increase by as much as 2.0 MGD from the Food Distribution Center according to engineers for the developers. This report will not address those potential flows in detail due to the preliminary nature of the sites’ planning efforts. Map V-III delineates the future water service area.

Existing Water Facilities

Wells: The Township is currently served by five (5) wells which are all located within on thousand feet (1000’) of the Township’s water treatment plant at Sixth Street and Summer Street. Two of these wells were drilled in 1931, two were drilled in 1953, and one in 1994. Table III lists the characteristics of these wells. All five (5) wells draw from the Potomac-Raritan-Magothy (PRM) Aquifer.
TABLE III: Florence Township Well Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Well No</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year Drilled</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>1933</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth (feet)</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screen Diameter</td>
<td>18”</td>
<td>18”</td>
<td>16”</td>
<td>16”</td>
<td>16”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Original Guaranteed Yield (91om)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Yield (gpm)</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Township of Florence currently has diversion allocation rights from the DEP for a total of sixty million gallons per month (MGM). A peak monthly flow of approximately 32 MGM was reported in 1994. Therefore, an increase in peak monthly withdrawals of roughly ninety percent (90%) can be met.

Treatment: The water delivered from the Florence Township wells is of good quality. It is low in iron and manganese and requires little treatment. The treatment which was provided in the original Township treatment works consisted of aeration for carbon dioxide stripping and chlorination for disinfection. However, persistent problems with rusty water throughout the town led to the addition of a lime treatment facility in 1988. The lime treatment process raises both water pH and mineral content to prevent oxidation of iron in the distribution system and provide a thin protective coating on the pipes. The Township is currently in the process of upgrading the water treatment plant to provide, among other things, caustic soda addition for pH control and conversion of gaseous chlorine to sodium hypochlorite.

The water treatment plant also houses the high pressure pumps which are required to boost the treated water pressure prior to distribution. Each of the four pumps has a capacity of 600 gpm. Two of the pumps have auxiliary gasoline powered engines to run the pumps in the event of a power failure. The two (2) pumps with auxiliary gasoline powered engines to run the pumps in the event of a power failure. The two (2) pumps with auxiliary engines were installed in 1931. The other two (2) pumps were installed in 1948. The Township is currently in the process of replacing the booster pumps and installing an emergency generator to provide power to the booster pumps and other treatment processes.

Storage: The Township water distribution system includes a 1.0 MG elevated water storage tank. This tank was constructed in 1969 and is currently the only storage tank on line in the Township. Based upon the DEP requirement of one (1) gallon of storage for each gallon per day of average consumption, this tank is adequate to meet present demands. However, since it is the sole source of storage, it cannot easily be taken out of service for maintenance. Therefore, the Township is in the process of selecting a site to construct another 1 MG tank. This tank will be located in the area east of Route 130 to provide balanced pressure distribution and satisfy flow demands to this developing area.

Required Capital Improvements
**Water System Improvements:** In order to provide enough water to meet the projected water demands and satisfy the DEP regulations, the Township’s wells must have a source capacity sufficient to meet the peak daily demand with the largest well out of service. Table IV provides an analysis of the future water needs for the Township.

**TABLE IV: Florence Township Well Capacity Analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average water demand, MGD</td>
<td>0.932 (647 gpm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peak daily demand, gpm</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available source capacity, gpm</td>
<td>1,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (deficit), gpm</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table IV indicates, the Township currently has sufficient well capacity to satisfy its demands but as developments come on line the available surplus will diminish. It can be projected that the Township will require a minimum of two (2) additional wells to satisfy future demands. Additionally, it will probably be necessary to apply to the DEP for additional diversion rights since the peak monthly flow will exceed 60 MG.

New wells should be no closer than 1,000 feet to any of the existing wells, but not so far away that the water quality of the well would suffer. Since the current raw water supply is very good in terms of low iron and manganese concentrations, the required treatment is relatively inexpensive. Moving the new well site too far from the Delaware River will probably result in iron concentrations above the maximum contaminant levels. A well siting study will be required in the future to determine the most appropriate location for future wells.

The recommended capacity of the future wells must also be determined. Wells with a capacity in the range of 500 gpm will minimize problems associated with new well drawdowns interfering with existing wells. Additionally, since the largest well cannot be counted in meeting the DEP regulations, two (2) 500 gpm wells will increase the Township’s required source capacity more than one (1) 1,000 gpm well.

It is recommended that all the wells required to serve the Food Distribution Center be located within that project, both in Burlington and Florence Townships. An interim municipal agreement can then be negotiated to determine how the municipalities shall divide responsibilities for providing water to the new buildings.

One or more emergency interconnections with the Burlington Township water utility are also recommended. Having such interconnections will lessen the requirements for source capacity for both Townships. A corresponding cost savings will be realized and the long term reliability of the systems will be enhanced.

The need for additional treatment capacity will be proportional to the need for additional well capacity. Peak water demands in excess of 2,000 gpm would require
additional capacity at the existing treatment plant. However, the degree of treatment required will depend on the quality of the water obtained from the new wells. Currently, only aeration, pH adjustment and disinfection are required. An iron bearing water will also require chemical addition and filtration. The exact nature of future treatment needs can only be determined upon further investigation of the aquifer.

Storage needs in the Township will increase from the present 1.0 MG to a maximum of 2.7 MG upon ultimate buildout. The additional storage capacity can be met with a 1.0 MG tank in the vicinity of Old York and Florence-Columbus Roads (the highest point in the Township) and a 750,000 gallon tank at a location to be determined east of Route 130. A storage tank to serve the Food Distribution Center will be required on their site. The size of this tank will range from 0.5 MG to 2.0 MG depending on the ultimate water demands of this development area.

Map V-IV shows a proposed water system improvement map. The distribution lines will be extended throughout all portions of the Township in a manner to assure maximum looping within the system. The diameters of the proposed water mains are based upon the estimated flow rates in the new service areas. It may also be required to temporarily install pressure boosting stations where indicated in order to meet the minimum pressure requirements in the remote areas until such time that a water tower is constructed near Florence-Columbus and Old York Roads to balance pressures in the areas of the new water mains.
VI. CIRCULATION PLAN ELEMENT (1976 Master Plan)

Context

The pattern and characteristics of the township circulation system are fundamental to community form and structure. Growth potential within Florence is influenced by regional access and adequacy of the local transportation system.

Classification

The classification of the existing road system, displayed on Map VI-1, includes the following:

1. Interstate 295 is a high-speed expressway connecting Mercer County with the Delaware Memorial Bridge. An interchange is located at county Route 656 in Mansfield Township of the Florence-Mansfield Boundary.

2. The Pennsylvania Extension of the New Jersey Turnpike is a limited access toll road connecting New Jersey with Pennsylvania. A partial interchange in Florence is designed to permit entrance to and egress from points in Pennsylvania.

3. The New Jersey Turnpike is a limited access road connection New York and New England with points south and west. The expressway is located outside the township along the southern boundary.

4. U.S. Route 130 assumes a more local role paralleling I-295. Commuters and shoppers utilize this heavily traveled arterial which connects Middlesex County with Salem County.

Traffic Volume

(Reserved)

Problems and Improvements

(Reserved)

Public Transportation

The relationship of Florence Township to major corridors of movement in New Jersey is graphically portrayed on Map VI-2. It is quite evident that Florence is not located within any of these transportation corridors which extend to Philadelphia and New York City. This factor has been significant in stabilizing the growth of Florence Township.

Development pressures can be expected to increase if expansion of the Rapid Transit Line includes a Willingboro-Burlington Extension. This Delaware River Port Authority project, only in the proposal states currently, is anticipated to include a station west of Florence in Burlington Township.

Circulation Plan Map

(Reserved)

VI-1
VIII. LAND USE PLAN ELEMENT  (Amendments through Aug. 1999)

Context

The following Land Use Plan element represents a continuing evolution of planning for Florence Township beginning with the 1976 “original Master Plan” and amendments through February 12, 1997.

Principles, Assumptions and Objectives (Sept 1999 amendment)

The following principles, assumptions and objectives address current priorities for land use and development in Florence Township.

1. In recent years, housing development has greatly outstripped commercial development further extending an imbalance that resulted from the closing of the Roebling Steel Mill, increasing the pressure on an already strained local tax base.

2. It is an important objective of this plan to restore the imbalance in land uses that is outlined in number 1. above by promoting commercial development in the Township.

3. Commercial development should be promoted in appropriate areas of the Township through zoning and the upgrading of municipal services.

4. The Township has undertaken an ambitious and costly program to meet its constitutional fair share obligation, which must be completed.

5. The Township’s remaining agricultural land and uses should be protected from the effects of development, especially residential, to the extent possible.

6. The unique character and historic heritage of Florence Township should be promoted and protected through the use of appropriate development controls.

7. Wetland areas should be protected because of their environmental importance.

8. The character of established residential areas and neighborhoods should be protected and promoted.

9. Future residential development should be limited to the portion of the Township north of the New Jersey Turnpike, except for very low density residential development. Public sewerage is not and should not be available in the traditionally agricultural, southern portion of the Township.

10. The older portion of the Township closer to the Delaware River which has existing infrastructure should be reserved as the location for the highest densities of housing development.
Major Considerations Relating to Residential Neighborhoods and Development

Among the main considerations in the development of the Future Land Use Plan is the objection to moderate future housing growth by providing flexible zoning requirements for those areas of the Township which are most suitable for residential development where necessary infrastructure is in place or planned to be extended, north of the New Jersey Turnpike. The AGR (agricultural) designated area is in the traditionally agricultural portion of the Township. That traditional and use pattern should be retained. Only very low density residential development should be permitted in AGR designated areas and sewers should not be extended into the area.

The older portion of the Township close to the Delaware River where infrastructure exists or can be easily extended is the appropriate location for the highest densities of housing development. Areas to the south and east of this core area will be reserved for lower residential densities, thus forming a north-south (and west-east) continuum of development intensity in the Township.

Residential development should be discouraged south of the barrier or edge created by the intersecting highways – Route 130 and the turnpike – for the following reasons:

1. The turnpike is an important organizing feature in Florence Township, especially in the role of providing a defining boundary to the agricultural area.

2. The turnpike forms a natural edge for a linear break in the continuity of development. A continuous barrier is formed which would cause further development to be unrelated and relatively inaccessible to the existing community.

The existing character of residential areas and neighborhoods should be protected and preserved.

Major Considerations Relating to Highway Commercial Development

The Route 130 Area. Commercial activity and development has remained stagnant or has declined in the Route 130 area in recent years. The potential exists for this to change with the anticipated construction of a new Turnpike Extension/Route 130 interchange by the New Jersey Turnpike Authority and the proposed extension of the water and sewer utilities into the area. Underscoring this, the Township has received a number of requests for rezoning along Route 130 that are summarized in a memorandum dated October 25, 1996 by the Township Administrator to the Planning Board Chairman. The Township Council has asked that these requests be considered by the Planning Board.
in the Board’s advisory and master planning role. These requests should be accommodated where possible, consistent with Master Plan goals. In general, Township land use policies for the Route 130 area should promote commercial development and redevelopment.

A variety of sources have indicated that highway commercial uses (retail, service and office uses) are the types of uses that are most likely to be attracted to highly visible sites on Route 130 near the new interchange. These sources include:

- Requests for rezoning to HC Highway Commercial by individual property owners.
- Advice from the Township Zoning Official based upon inquiries to his office from prospective developers.
- Recommendations from the Township Zoning Board of Adjustment based upon their experience with use variance applications.

In order to promote development by high quality retail, service and office uses, it is important that the area be attractive to the public. Land use policies that promote such attractiveness, especially as visible from Route 130, should be a part of the zone plan for the area. Following are the land use objectives for the Route 130 area.

- To permit a wide variety of commercial uses along Route 130 and, in particular, implement requests for rezoning to commercial zoning where possible and consistent with the Master Plan goals.
- To promote development/redevelopment of individual sites along Route 130 in a manner that will promote its overall attractiveness for high quality highway commercial uses.
- To protect the ability of existing special manufacturing uses in the subject area to continue to operate and to expand to the extent possible consistent with the above objectives.

Special Manufacturing in Highway Commercial Areas on Route 130. The overall objective of the future Land Use Plan for the Route 130 area is to permit a wide variety of high quality commercial uses in the areas designated for HC Highway Commercial, including more than one principal use per lot. Permitted uses should include “special manufacturing” uses in the area indicated as SM Special Manufacturing Overlay district on the Future Land Use Plan Map under the conditions outlined below.

Highway commercial and special manufacturing uses are not inherently harmonious uses in the same zone district. The former caters to the public and as a result
is concerned with attractiveness and image. The latter is not open to the public and is mainly concerned with efficient utilization of its site for purposes of production. These distinctions can be reconciled by either:

- Reserving the areas of the HC Highway Commercial district nearest to Route 130 for highway commercial type uses that cater to the public while permitting special manufacturing uses further back from the highway, or
- Screening the special manufacturing uses that are located close to the highway from the view of the highway and adjacent existing highway commercial uses.

Where special manufacturing uses are either set back or screened, as outlined above, site plan requirements not directly related to public health and safety concerns should be waived.

**Major Considerations Relating to Agricultural Area**

There are many reasons that justify a strong farmland protection policy for Florence Township. The diversification that agriculture brings to Florence and the region is a hedge against unforeseen events. Dispersed production helps as a hedge against such unforeseen occurrences as floods. The pleasures of a rural environment should be available to people who live in a high density area such as Roebling. Because urban development may have harmful effects on the continuation of productive farming in a metropolitan area, Florence must provide for the preservation of the entire agricultural district so that it can be devoted to such long-term use. Because of their urban fringe location, the loss of Florence’s farmlands can be considered a serious social as well as economic loss. As senior associate at the Conservation Foundation in Washington, D.C., Robert G. Healy put it in his thoughtful book, *Land Use and the States*, “The vineyards outside San Jose or the orange groves near Orlando might be moved with little aggregate loss of production. For the residents of these places, however, there would be a loss of amenity.”

Soil erosion hazards are a condition in Florence. In the areas where this condition is present it should be reflected in the township’s zoning ordinance.

**Mayor Considerations Relating to Special Manufacturing and General Manufacturing Areas**

SM Special Manufacturing and GM General Manufacturing are land use designations for categories of land uses that have long played an important part in the Township’s history. The relative importance of these land uses has declined in recent decades with the closing of the Roebling Steel Mill and the increase in housing development in other parts of the Township. However, they are still central to the
character and economic well-being of the township and the region.

The Future Land Use Plan designates a number of areas for SM Special Manufacturing and GM General Manufacturing. In most cases they are designated on the Future Land Use Plan only in areas where there is an established and use pattern of such uses. This is because both of these categories pose special concerns for neighboring less intensive land uses, especially residential areas. The category of general manufacturing poses special concerns because it can have significant offsite impacts: noise, dust, odors and visual. Two of these areas merit particular consideration in this plan.

The old Roebling Steel Mill. Of special concern is this area’s proximity to the historic village of Roebling to which the old mill had historic association. In addition, the closing of the old mill, together with the abandonment of most of its facilities and a designation a portion of the site as a superfund site, have created special problems for the future use and redevelopment of the area. Despite the site’s abandonment as a manufacturing area, it continues it’s GM General Manufacturing designation to permit the widest possible options and incentives for its clean-up and redevelopment.

The SM and GM Areas on the Southeastern Boundary with Mansfield Township. The Burlington County Resource Recovery Facility is located in the GM designated portion of this area, south of I-295. Although it is an essential public facility, the Recovery Facility is also very objectionable to adjacent homeowners. As a result, future residential development is inappropriate in the areas adjacent to the facility because of unavoidable impacts from it. The fact remains, however, that there are many existing residences in the general area in both Florence and Mansfield townships. It is a goal of this plan to minimize impacts on these residences by designating the future land use for the adjacent area (north of I-295) as SM Special Manufacturing.

SM is the most appropriate future land use for the area north of I-295 because it is less likely to result in offsite impacts than permitted by a GM designation. In addition, it is intermediate in the permitted intensity of development between the Recovery Facility in the GM area and the existing homes to the east, north and west. This type of transition is especially important because of the general openness and flat topography in the area. GM General Manufacturing as a category of land use is inappropriate in this area because it would permit an extension of potentially high impact uses in an area where a transition to less intensive impact is more appropriate.

On the positive side, this area on the north side of I-295 has attributes for special manufacturing types of uses not fully recognized in previous township master plans. These attributes include proximity to an interchange on the newly completed I-295, together with a convenient connection to the anticipated new Route 130/Turnpike Extension interchange. In addition, the openness and relatively flat topography which characterize the area make it very visible. The future pattern and character of development in this area will exert a strong influence on the character of the entire area in
both Mansfield and Florence Townships. This visibility from the interstate and from some of the main roadways into and through Florence and Mansfield Townships can be an important attribute to commercial uses that need high visibility, a characteristic more common to SM than GM uses. It is hoped that these attributes may lead to long awaited replacement for the economic benefits lost to the Florence region with the closing of the Roebling Steel Mill.

**Affordable Housing** (April 1999 Amendment)

The following provisions and zone districts are included in the Future Land Use Plan for the implementation of the Township’s affordable housing program, which is more fully described in the Housing Element & Fair Share Plan. These provisions are designed to fulfill the Township’s *Mt. Laurel* obligation as determined by the Council on Affordable Housing.

In accordance with the *Mt. Laurel* housing obligation as required by the Council on Affordable Housing and with adequate infrastructure available, a density of six (6) units per acre will be allowable in the RB zone with a 20% set aside for low and moderate income housing. In lieu of the 20% set aside, the township should permit developers to contribute to the Housing Trust Fund.

In order for the Township to implement the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan portion of this Master Plan the following land use/zoning designation are recommended for inclusion as part of the Land Use Plan.

**RB, Medium to High Density Residential Zone**

This zone should be structured so as to permit densities consistent with Council on Affordable Housing regulations so as to enable developers to provide an onsite affordable housing component of 20 percent of their development in exchange for increased density (six dwellings per acre, 20 percent affordable housing set aside).*

**RD, High Density Residential Zone Municipal Affordable Housing** (February 1990)

The purpose of this district is to provide multi-family dwelling units so as to comply with the substantive rules and regulation of the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing and the Fair Housing Act. All development in the “RD” Residential District shall be restricted to low and moderate-income families in accordance with the substantive and procedural rules and regulations of the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing.

1. **Permitted principal uses**- Multi-family residential with onsite public water and sewer only.
2. **Density requirements**- Densities should be sufficient to fulfill the township’s affordable housing obligation consistent with the carrying capacity of the specific site.
3. **Additional regulations**- All regulations established by the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing in their substantive rules.

**Florence Township Municipal Construction Projects** (April 1992, February 1994 Amendment)

Florence Township is proposing two municipally-supported construction projects as part of its Housing Element and Fair Share Plan. One of the projects will have at least 8 but not more than 12 units of affordable housing in a conversion of the Roebling Inn, a historic structure located at Third and Riverside Avenues in the Historic District. The other project is a 25 (24 affordable and 1 superintendent) unit project to be constructed on a site on Hornberger Avenue just outside the Historic District.

* developers have entered into voluntary agreements with the township to make contributions to the Housing Trust Fund in lieu of building affordable units in their developments. These agreements are supported by this Master Plan because they were the result of the COAH mediation process and they will help to substantially lower the cost of the affordable housing program to the township.

The Hornberger Avenue site is situated between the library and the Roebling Public School. Farther to the west are Holy Assumption R.C. Church and Elementary School, Trinity Methodist Church and the Residential “RA” district. This low-density residential district whose purpose is to provide a moderate growth area for single-family residential dwellings and accessory uses. The site is bounded on the south by the Green Acres tract and Conrail Railroad.

The zoning on the other side of the railroad is Residential “RA”, Park “P”, and Neighborhood Commercial. The purpose of the Neighborhood Commercial district is to allow for small areas throughout the Township where retail and service businesses may be located primarily for the convenience of the residents of the immediate neighborhood.

The zoning to the north and east of the Hornberger Avenue side is Residential “RC”. The RC is a high-density residential district whose purpose is to provide for multiple dwelling units such as apartments and townhouses. The side also adjoins a municipal parking area and fronts on Hornberger Avenue, which has 66 feet of right-of-way with 30 feet of cartway. The side is accessible to the public transportation, commercial areas and within walking distance to recreation/parks, schools and churches.

The Roebling Inn site is also well suited to the provision of affordable housing. Now vacant, the Inn is in need of substantial restorations and improvement so as not to negatively impact the well-established residential neighborhood surrounding the site to restore the historic structure. Opposite the three-quarter acre site is Riverside Park, an excellent amenity for neighborhood residents.

The Inn is proposed to be renovated to provide at least 8 units of senior citizen
rental housing. The proposed housing sponsor is planning to accommodate up to 12 total units by renovating all three floors and the carriage house on the site. Exterior improvements have been approved by the New Jersey Office of Historic Preservation. The completion of the project will contribute to the stabilizing of the Roebling area.

The Planning Board considered the suitability of these sites according to the substantive rules and regulation of the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing (N.J.A.C.5:92 11 et seq.). A suitable site must be adjacent to compatible land uses, have access to appropriate streets and be environmentally suitable. COAH regulations also provide that low and moderate income housing may not be structured on parts of a site rendered environmentally unsuitable for such housing because of the presence of inland (freshwater) wetland, flood hazard areas and slopes in excess of 15 percent (N.J.A.C. 5:92-8.2 (b) 3.ii.). Neither site is encumbered by and of the foregoing environmental constraints. Both properties are suitable for Mount Laurel housing and will be consistent with Florence’s planning goals of:

- Providing for construction of affordable housing in conformance with the requirements of the Council on Affordable Housing.
- Working to preserve the existing unique character and heritage of Florence Township through the use of appropriate development controls.

Based on all of the above, the Hornberger and Roebling Inn sites should be included in the RD High Density Residential Zone. To accommodate each development, the maximum density for the RD zone should be 16 dwelling units per acre. In addition, a 4.6 acre tract which has been acquired by the Township as part of the Green Acres “swap” of land, should be designated a part of the Park Zone.

**Preservation of Wetlands** (May 1989 Amendment modified March 1994)

The Master Plan also reflects the Planning Board’s concerns with preservation of wetlands. Wetlands are special land areas of transition between terrestrial and aquatic systems where the water table is usually at or near the surface of the land and the land is covered by shallow water. Wetlands are where land saturation with water is the dominating factor determining the nature of soil development and the types of plant and animal communities living in the soil and on its surface.

Wetlands provide many important benefits including pollution filtration, flood prevention, soil erosion and sediment control, and habitat for wildlife including habitat for threatened and endangered species. The alteration and destruction of wetlands by draining, filling or other methods has an adverse effect on environmental quality and ecological systems. Reflecting the concern to preserve and protect wetlands and associated wetlands buffers in their natural state for the health and benefit of Florence Township, the Board has determined it necessary to amend development policy to encourage preservation of important wetlands.
“Adult Uses”

It is recognized that some commercial uses involve the sale of sexually explicit materials, which although perhaps not obscene in the legal sense, are nevertheless highly offensive to many members of the Florence Township community. It is further recognized that these uses, commonly known as “adult” uses, because of their very nature, are deemed to have serious objectionable operational characteristics. These can have a particularly negative impact when those uses are located near residential areas, schools, parks and places of worship. In addition, such uses should not be located near each other, or be permitted to concentrate in one area, because such concentration could result in the blighting of this area. Therefore, special regulation of these objectionable “adult” uses is deemed necessary to ensure that adverse effects will not contribute to the blighting or compromising of neighborhoods in the Township of Florence.

It is the considered judgment of the Planning Board that the location of “adult” uses should be:

1. Limited to sites in the HC Highway Commercial district south of the New Jersey Turnpike that are at least 1,000 feet away from:
   - any residential district (not including the AGR Agricultural district), school, place of worship or park.
   - any other “adult” business; and
   - any similar district or use in any contiguous municipality.

2. Subject to regulation as conditional uses.

Further standards and regulations which mitigate the negative effects of “adult” uses are supported. In no way is the fact that the Township of Florence may choose to regulate “adult” uses, or to prohibit or allow them in the various zoning districts, to be construed as approval of, or condoning of, those uses.

Cluster Development  (Aug. 1999 Amendment)

A number of clustered residential developments were constructed in Florence Township primarily in the 1990’s. During that period, clustering was a necessary part of the Township’s affordable housing program because sites involved in the inclusionary part of the program contained substantial critical areas especially wetlands. Now that the Township has satisfied its affordable housing requirement, clustering is no longer a necessary part of the Township’s development regulations. Clustered developments create issues of concern to the Township associated with the maintenance of open space areas. One concern is the cost of maintenance; another is the reliability of homeowners associations to maintain open space areas.
Florence Township Land Use Designations (Sept 1999 Amendment)

The following represents the future land use designations the location of which are shown on the Future Land Use Map. Map VIII-1. established for the Township of Florence: (Sept 1999 Amendment)

a. Low-Density.
   1. Permitted principal uses. Single-family residential detached homes, golf courses, municipal buildings, public parks and playgrounds, elementary, intermediate and secondary schools, firehouses and churches.

   2. Permitted residential density:
      a. One unit per acre with on-site septic and well.
      b. Two units per acre with public sewer and water.

RA. Low-Density Residential

1. Permitted principal uses. All principal uses permitted in the R district.

2. Permitted residential density: Four dwelling units per acre.

RB. Medium-to High-Density Residential

1. Permitted principal uses. Single-family detached with public water and sewer, single-family residential attached (atrium or patio and townhouses and duplexes) with public water and sewer only, multi-family residential with public water and sewer only.

2. Permitted residential density: Six units per acre with twenty percent set aside for low-and moderate-income housing.

RC. High-Density Residential

1. Permitted principal uses: Uses permitted in the RA and RB districts and groups of apartments, townhouses and condominiums.

2. Permitted residential density: Twelve dwelling units per acre.

RD. High-Density Residential

1. Permitted principal uses: Multifamily affordable residential with public water and sewer, Senior Citizen Community Center and Township Administrative Offices.

2. Permitted Density: Maximum gross density eighteen units per acre.

AGR. Agricultural District
1. Permitted principal uses: Single family residential dwellings, farms and farm buildings.

2. Permitted Density: One dwelling unit per three acres.

**HC. Highway Commercial**

1. Permitted principal uses: Retail sales, restaurants, bars, taverns and nightclubs, department stores, garden centers, banks, offices, theaters and bowling alleys, automobile sales, car washes, service stations, all local commercial uses, and hotels and motels.

2. Minimum lot area: Sixty thousand square feet.

**NC. Neighborhood Commercial**

1. Permitted principal uses: Uses permitted in the RA District, local retail activities, local service activities: restaurants, bars and package stores, banks, professional offices, service stations, dwelling quarters in the same building as the commercial use.

2. Minimum lot area: Twenty thousand square feet.

**OP. Office Park**

1. Permitted principal uses: General office building, offices of professionals, churches, public and private schools, club or lodge, convalescent home, medical center and sanitarium, child-care center, funeral parlor, and a single apartment in connection with a business.

2. Minimum lot area: Two acres.

**GM. General Manufacturing**

1. Permitted principal uses: Offices, manufacturing plants and wholesale distribution centers and warehouses.

2. Minimum lot area: Sixty thousand square feet.

**SM. Special Manufacturing**

1. Permitted principal uses: Offices, distribution centers and warehouses, manufacturing of light machinery, fabrication of products, preparation of food and beverages, laboratories, manufacture of products, and lumberyards and building material storage and sale areas.

2. Minimum lot area: Fifty thousand square feet.
SMO. Special Manufacturing Overlay

1. Permitted principal uses: In addition to the uses permitted in the Highway Commercial Zone the uses permitted in the Special Manufacturing Zone in accordance with certain conditions.

2. Minimum lot area: For highway commercial uses same as the Highway Commercial Zone and for special manufacturing uses same as the Special Manufacturing Zone.

P. Park

1. Permitted principal uses: Open space areas for recreational activities and purposes.

2. Minimum lot area: Not applicable.

H. Historic District

1. Permitted principal uses: The same uses as are allowed in those districts which comprise the Historic District.

2. Minimum lot area: The same as allowed in the district which comprise the Historic District.
IX. HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT  (ADOPTED September 1991)

Context

This Historic Preservation Element was prepared by the Florence Township Historic Preservation Commission in August 1991 and adopted by the Florence Township Planning Board in September 1991.

Introduction

Examination of the historic resources in the township of Florence indicated the need to create an awareness of these resources and a method of their basic protection. Prior efforts of the Historic Commission to protect properties listed on the state and national registers by reviewing building permit applications proved problematic because of the large number of homes in the Roebling Historic District and the frequency of permits required for even small jobs. Therefore an alternative, less regulatory approach is being sought for the protection of these assets.

The technique proposed for the preservation of historic resources in Florence Township is not the review of building permits by the historic commission. The proposed technique is the review of certain types of development applications, which might affect historic resources, as they come before the zoning and planning boards. When the boards review applications, they should consider an application’s effect upon historic resources at that time. Therefore, the purpose of this plan element is to enable planning and zoning board members to give consideration to the historic resources by making them aware of the township’s unique sites. The Historic Commission will be available to testify should any question arise during the board deliberations.

The standards used to assess the worthiness of historic sites are: 1) sites associated with significant events in local, state or national history. 2) sites associated with significant persons in local, state or national history. 3) sites with significant architectural merit and 4) sites that have yielded or are likely to yield important historical information.

Attached is a list of all properties that the historic commission considers to be historic resources in Florence Township. The list provides the name, location, and significance of each resource. A field inspection and photographic survey are being carried out by the historic commission in an effort to document these resources. Finally, it should be noted that all available historic materials were reviewed in preparation of the plan element.

The historic commission hopes everyone will benefit from a better understanding of the township’s many unique historic resources.

Municipal Land Use Law of N.J.

IX-1
Article #3 of the Municipal Land Use Law provides for a Master Plan and Plan Elements, Element #10 of that article deals with Historic Preservation Elements:

“(10) A historic preservation plan element (a) indicating the location, significance, proposed utilization and means for preservation of historic sites and historic districts, and (b) the standards used to assess worthiness for historic site or district designation.”

**Florence Sites**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Methodist Episcopal Church, Broad &amp; Second Sts.</td>
<td>Congregation dates from 1938 making it the oldest surviving church in Florence Township. The church was started by a group of farm families in the rural village known as High Banks prior to the development of Florence by the Florence City Company in 1849. Only the Duffy/Second Street School is an older institution dating from 1836. The existing Greek revival building, which replaced an earlier one, was built in 1881, a late date for that style. The building is on its original site and in excellent condition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>St. Stephen’s Episcopal Church, Second St. near Spring St.</td>
<td>This small church, built in 1859, is an excellent example of the Carpenter’s Gothic style and is on its original site and in excellent condition. This building was constructed in just two months and intended to be only the temporary chapel, but the small congregation never built a larger house of worship.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>St. Stephens Rectory, Third Street near Chestnut</td>
<td>This fine residence was designed by the noted Burlington and Philadelphia architect William D. Hewitt. The building was erected in 1883 in the stick style. Hewitt and his older brother were partners in a firm that included Frank Furness. The Hewitt and Hewitt firm is remembered for: The Philadelphia Zoo, the Bellevue Stratford Hotel, and the Bourse among others. Furness is locally remembered for the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts and the Library of the University of Pennsylvania. William Hewitt also designed the Providence Presbyterian Church of Bustleton, which is on the state and national registers. The rectory was sold about 1986 to a private couple who make it their home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Baptist Church, Front &amp; Church Sts.</td>
<td>Congregation was organized in 1875 and first met in the “Library” at the corner of Front and Foundry Streets. The neat little Gothic church was erected in 1879-80 on a lot donated by R. D. Wood and Co. The building has been added to several times over the last century. The neighboring parsonage was completed in 1888 and a small mission building was erected at the intersection of Route #130 &amp; Florence-Columbus Road in 1889. (Removed circa 1950.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The Mohican Boat Club Building, Riverview Ave

Significance: In the days before television and the automobile social clubs proliferated and while there are still Elk and Moose among us, their numbers are far fewer. Several of these clubs erected buildings. The Red Men Club built a large brick building at the corner of Third and Broad Street that many residents will recall after its conversion to the Florence Movie Theater.

When Florence was founded as a resort town in 1849, its main business was tourism and the attraction was fresh air and clean water away from the city. A place to rent canoes was needed and several were established along the river front. Over the years the Town changed from a tourist destination to a year round community and this canoe rental business changed into a canoe club with an emphasis on social occasions. The Mohicans seemed to have converted an existing building into a social club prior to 1900. They added a dining room, kitchen, and a large meeting room with a dance floor that could accommodate 100 people. The club held variety shows, dinner dances, and large open house parties on holidays – especially July fourth. It would be noted that the canoes were kept in a separate small building at the water’s edge and that the foundation for the canoe house still exists as a cement wall jutting out of the riverbank. The club faded in the 1940’s and the building was sold and converted into apartments.


Significance: The first school in Florence Township was a Quaker Sunday School, called a Preparatory Meeting, begun in 1750 in the Bustleton area. That meeting was closed after 102 years, but by then another school had started. The School we call The Duffy School actually began over 150 years ago when Florence was known as High Banks. In 1836 local farmers William Durell, Harry Hale and William Hays erected a schoolhouse on the second street site. Durell alone had a dozen children the census reveals. At first Durell paid the teachers salary, but soon the students were charged three cents a day for their education. After the development of Florence as a town the old village school was replaced on the same site in 1854 and again in 1871. This later substantial brick building was enlarged in 1907 and greatly enlarged again in 1924. The current Italian Revival style building was designed by P.L. Fowler and built by Thomas M. Day, so the Duffy Building is 120 years old and the site has been a town school for 155 years. (written in 1991.)

8. St. Paul Baptist Church, Fifth and Eyre Streets

Significance: Congregation organized in 1910 shortly after the first black citizens were moved to Florence to find work in the pipe foundry. The Church was built in 1920 and enlarged several times as the congregation grew. A parsonage, located on West Fourth Street was purchased in 1943.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hughes House (Doctors Off.)&lt;br&gt;Front near Chestnut Street</td>
<td>Birthplace of Governor Richard Hughes. The Hughes family lived here circa 1905-1915. They then moved to Burlington where Mr. Hughes became Mayor followed by his son who became Mayor and later Governor and Chief Justice of the New Jersey Supreme Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>W.B. Lewis House, Front and Pine Sts.</td>
<td>Last of the Grant Victorian houses built in Florence during the 1850’s. William B. Lewis was a former ambassador to Spain who moved to Florence from Philadelphia. The Mansard Styled third floor may have been added to an existing farmhouse built in 1792. Later the Emmons family operated several popular businesses from the property. The Township High School and athletic field were formerly orchards of the Emmons Farm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Omar Jackson Sr. Home, Riverview and Winter Street</td>
<td>Built Circa 1830 this Modest farm house was part of the large Omar Jackson Sr. farm which was then sold to the Florence City Company in 1849.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Omar H. Jackson Home, Riverview &amp; Summer Sts.</td>
<td>Original house circa 1800 is was the homestead of the Jackson farm. Across Summer Street was a large two story barn which was demolished about 1980. The Jackson house was extensively remodeled in the early 20th century by local store owner Carl Weber.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>James Jackson Home, Front near Summer (Opposite Bank)</td>
<td>This home was built between 1800-1840 and also a part of the Jackson farm. This home was extensively remodeled early in the 20th century. Today it looks like a Colonial Revival House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Durell Farm House, Front &amp; Chestnut Sts.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance: William Durell owned the largest farm in the area and eventually he sold it to the Florence City Company in 1849. The Durell farm, containing 170 acres and many out buildings, was purchased from the County Sheriff after Israel Kinsman defaulted on his purchase of the farms of Harriet Haines and Rebecca Gaskill. Road returns as late as 1870 still mention Durell’s Lane which ran in a straight line from the farm to the intersection of what is now Route #130 and Cumberland Boulevard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>15. Durell Farm, Second near Chestnut Sts.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance: Now a duplex residence, this was formerly a barn for the Durell farm. The barn was built prior to the establishment of Florence City in 1849.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>16. Parker House, Front near Broad Sts.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance: This is the finest example of an historic commercial building in Florence Township. This Mansard style Victorian building was erected circa 1875 as an Ice Cream Parlor for residents and Steamboat visitors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>17. Site of Eastern Hygeian Home Front at Oak St.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance: from 1867 to 1876 this was the site of a nationally famous health resort and medical college operated by Dr. R. T. Trail. He published a nationally circulated magazine, The Gospel of Health. Many famous people stayed here to improve their health or to take one of the medical courses offered. It is believed that Edgar Allen Poe stayed here. The Kellogg’s kept a journal of their stay and it relates how they sought to partake of clean food and water. Later they invented corn flakes as a healthy alternative to bacon and eggs for breakfast. Ellen Beard Harman taught here, she became famous during the Civil War as one of the first women doctors in America. She also headed a reformism movement in women’s clothing urging women to shed their tight corsets and bustiers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>18. Site of Florence Hotel &amp; Stemboat Landing, Front at Broad Streets</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance: This site was the center of activity in the old days of Florence. The beautiful hotel was built with columns over five stories tall in the Greek Revival style and featured a spacious verandah overlooking the Delaware River. Built by the Florence City Company in 1849-1850, it operated as a weekend get-a-way for the people of Philadelphia who arrived by steamboat. Later, it was attractive to many sportsmen who came to hunt and fish the river and its tributaries. It served as the Township municipal building until destroyed by fire circa 1980.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19. Hays/Rubarb House</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>20. Library Hall.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21. School House, Wilbur Henry Dr. and Chestnut Sts.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22. Fourth Street School, Fourth and Church Street</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Roebling Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>23. Village of Roebling Historic District, Second to Eighth Avenues (Approx.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Roebling Historic District includes the housing and small commercial district adjacent to the industrial plant built 1905-1911 as currently listed on the State &amp; National Registers of Historic Places. Charles G. Roebling planned a complete town for the companies workers, many of whom were enticed to leave their rural homes in Eastern Europe for steady employment in America. Virtually all of the original housing survives in this unique context. (Imagine being on a planning board in 1905!)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24. Roebling Main Gate, Main St. &amp; Second Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance: This building stands as the architectural link between the two great achievements of Charles Roebling’s career – the town and the plant. In the beginning neither was possible without the other and many residents can recall looking for their father or husband from among the many thousands who exited through that gate at the end of the day. The gate house is a stucco covered brick structure of rectangular plan with Main Street running through a covered passageway framed with semi-elliptical wood joists supporting a cross gable roof. The right half of the building was the employment office and the left half was a station and magistrates office. Additional office space, in the form of a metal skinned building was added to the left rear section circa 1980 during an attempt to revive part of the steel business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25. Roebling School, Hornberger Avenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance: Superintendent of school Maja Mathis is credited with prevailing upon the Roebling family to pay for the construction of a school in Roebling. Construction was begun about 1914 and when it was finished it was the largest school building in the country at least until the second World War. In his manuscript Washington Roebling stated that the family paid $30,000.00 as their share for the project. The architects were Klemann &amp; Fowler. The property has been nominated to the State and National Registers of Historic Places in 1991.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26. Holy Assumption Parish Buildings Hornberger &amp; Parish Lane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Significance: Begun in 1912-3 by a group of Immigrants from Hungary they first worshipped at the Roebling Boarding House under the incorporated name of St. Emericus Hungarian Church. The congregation grew to include others and the cornerstone for the existing church was laid in 1922 when the name was changed to The Roman Catholic Church of the Holy Assumption. Later the Convent &amp; Friary were added. The Holy Assumption School’s first year was 1923-4 in which 170 students attended classes in the basement of the church. The church was enlarged in 1947 to accommodate the growing congregation and the growing student body.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX-8
Florence Stations Sites

27. Florence Freight Station, Railroad Ave.
Significance: Victorian era railroad station, not, however, the passenger station which has been demolished. The building has been renovated and serves as a private railroad library. Now it appears to be a rental property. Florence Station also formally included; Whorell’s store, Zeily’s Produce shipping establishment, a Baptist Church, a school house (Now a bar.) and the Townships first auto dealership, the original Wilson showroom and Irvin’s Hotel.

Bustleton & Other Sites

28. Crooked Billet Tavern, US #130 Near Potts Mill Road
Significance: The oldest building in Florence Township. A Tavern license was first granted for this property in 1746 to Issac Gibbs. A later proprietor, Solomon Rockhill filed a claim against the new United States government for losses he incurred by being forced to quarter and feed the troops of General Pulaski in October of 1778. The tavern is said to have gotten its name because a man was killed there after being hit on the head with a billit of wood. (A former owner stated that the Daughters of the American Revolution refused his application for certification as a historic place because the Crooked Billet had prostitutes during the Revolution. He said he applied to the Moorestown chapter. He also stated that a teacher from the Roebling School, who lived nearby, perhaps it was Mrs. Masic, used to bring her classes out to tour the building.) This building is clearly eligible for the State and National Registers.

29. Tallman/Von Thaden house, Old York near Florence-Columbus Rd.
Significance: Dated 1752 this building is a good example of a pre-Revolutionary patterned brick farmhouse. The front façade is done in Flemish Checker and the other facades are in common bond.

30. Hancock/Staub House, Burlington-Columbus Rd.
Significance: Said to be the finest pre-Revolutionary dwelling in the township.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Hancock/Carty House, Old York Rd. near Suttons Bridge</td>
<td>Good example of pre-Revolutionary brick farm house on its original site. This house dates to about 1750, but the Hancock family was one of the first to settle in the Township in about 1690 at a location called Hancock’s Bridge. This farm appears to have been part of the original Godfrey Hancock farm. He was one of the signers of the “Concessions and Agreements” along with William Penn in 1676.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Bustleton School House/ Lower Mansfield Meeting House, Bustleton-Burlington Road near Cedar Lane</td>
<td>Built in 1878, the date is in the bricks. It served as the rural school house for more than 50 years. Some of the school children have scratched their names in the side of the building, one reads “B. Carty 1884”. The 1849 map of Burlington County places the Lower Mansfield Meeting House at this location and the current owner stated that when they bought the property in 1968 one of the Rainers told him the school was build on the old foundation of a wooden meeting house that had burned. The Quaker records indicate that William Fowell and Thomas English were appointed the first overseers of the meeting on January 1, 1753. By 1783 the Quakers had opened a Preparative Meeting at this site, which means they were teaching school here. The membership declined later and the meeting was closed about 1850. Also notable on this property are the foundations to a privy and a 200 year old white oak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Cedar Hill Cemetery, Cedar Lane near U.S. #130</td>
<td>This cemetery is denoted on the old maps as the Lower Mansfield Burial Ground which dates back to 1752 when the congregation was first organized. The cemetery also reported to be an old Indian Burial ground. Located nearby was the Lower Mansfield Meeting House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Hunt Brothers Circus Site, U.S. #130 at Cedar Lane</td>
<td>After a decade of working in various circus acts Charles T. Hunt formed his own show in 1892. His traveling circus moved to Florence from Broad Street in Hamilton Township in 1942 where it continued to operate until about 1970. The property has a big top arena, elephant house, worker housing and many other buildings for exotic animals. The property is currently for sale as the “Big Top Industrial Park”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>