



**PLANNING BOARD**  
**Monday, October 8, 2018**  
**APPROVED MINUTES**

*You couldn't pick a better place.*

**OPENING:** The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairman Hugh Dougherty at 7:31 PM.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Led by Hugh Dougherty.

**OPMA STATEMENT:** Read by Hugh Dougherty in compliance with the Sunshine Law.

**ROLL CALL**

- **Members in attendance:** Betty Adler; Kevin McCormack; Carolyn Jacobs, Hugh Dougherty; Samuel Kates; Moly Hung; William Carter; Marlyn Kalitan; and Sheila Griffith.
- **Professionals in attendance:** James Burns, Esq., Solicitor; Jacob Richman, PP, AICP, Planner; and Natalie Barney, Community Development Supervisor.

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**

None.

**Agenda Items:**

**CONTINUED FROM MONDAY, OCTOBER 1, 2018 PUBLIC HEARING**

**2018 Cherry Hill Township Master Plan**

*Nature of Matters to Be Heard: The Planning Board will consider for adoption the following elements: a comprehensive reexamination report of the existing master plan and development regulations (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89(a) through (e)); a statement of objectives, principles, assumptions, policies and standards upon which the constituent proposals for the physical, economic and social development of the municipality are based (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28(b)(1)); a Land Use Element and its required components (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28(b)(2)(a) through (f)); an Economic Development Element and its required components (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28(b)(2)(a) through (b)); Plans For Place Subplan Elements (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28(c)); a specific policy statement indicating the relationship of the proposed development of the Township, as developed in these Master Plan Elements to the master plans of contiguous municipalities, the Camden County Master Plan, the State Development and Redevelopment Plan and the Camden County District Solid Waste Management Plan (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28(d)); and several appendices.*

*Presentations by the Planning Board's planning consultant (Group Melvin Design), economic development consultant (Urban Partners) and the Department of Community Development will be made on the following sections of the plan and the process by which it was created:*

1. Executive Summary
2. Chapter 1: Introduction;
3. Chapter 2: Demographics;
4. Chapter 3: Public Outreach;
5. Chapter 4: Vision & Goals;
6. Chapter 5: Land Use Plan Element;
7. Chapter 6: Economic Development Plan Element;
8. Chapter 7: Plans For Place Subplan Element;
9. Appendix A: Existing Conditions Report;
10. Appendix B: Public Outreach Report; and
11. Appendix C: 2007 Master Plan Reexamination Report.

**Presenters:** Robert Melvin, PP, AICP, Group Melvin Design; and Adam Tecza, PP, AICP, Group Melvin Design.

Solicitor Burns gave an overview of the Master Plan meeting that was continued from Monday, October 1, 2018 and explained that the purpose of the continuation was to allow additional time for the public to read through the proposed

Master Plan and provide comments pertaining to typos, grammar, and other proposed corrections/clarifications not inclusive of substantive changes to the document. Solicitor Burns stated that Group Melvin Design, the Township's Master Planning consultant would provide a presentation to highlight the minor changes and clarifications being made to the draft Master Plan.

Mr. Tecza began the presentation by reiterating that the presentation that was given in the prior hearing was more of an overview of the policies and visions included in the Master Plan but that the purpose of this presentation is to provide further clarification of what these policies and visions mean and what the process would entail should these ideas proceed towards a more concrete plan. Mr. Tecza explained that the neighborhoods noted in the Policy Toolkit section under the Housing Policy Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart (Figure 21) are not indicated or intended to be indicated in a negative fashion. The purpose of this section is to elevate the status/quality of Cherry Hill's neighborhoods and make them more attractive. Mr. Tecza added that although the intent of the housing policies are to elevate the neighborhoods, it does not mean that the neighborhoods are not changing compositionally such as in age composition, non-family households, renters, single occupant, race, home values, etc.

Mr. Tecza addressed concerns raised by Township residents pertaining to the possible usage of the "In Need of Rehabilitation" designation in certain neighborhoods and elaborated upon the State requirements for a how a property or area can be designated. Mr. Tecza stressed that it is not an eminent domain power and instead allows the municipality to incentivize rehabilitation of older homes through tax abatements. Mr. Tecza explained how this power has been used in other communities in New Jersey to help revitalize their housing stock. Mr. Tecza addressed the recommendation that the Township explore multi-unit development (such as through accessory dwelling units, duplexes, house-plexes, etc.) in single-family zones in order to help reduce the pressure on the single-family housing stock. Mr. Tecza stated that multi-unit forms can look similar to single-unit forms without compromising the look and integrity of a single-family neighborhood. Mr. Tecza stressed that the Master Plan does not recommend apartment complexes in single-family zones. Mr. Tecza noted that multi-unit development can be permitted by way of conditional measures. Mr. Tecza stressed that because these recommendations are included in the Master Plan does not mean that they will be utilized or will be appropriate for certain areas; the Master Plan just provided the municipality tools to supports property owners in their effort to invest in their homes and provide flexibility for the future such as through the possibility of having a more divers housing stock. Lastly, Mr. Tecza addressed Township residents' concerns pertaining to traffic and reiterated that most traffic is "through" traffic but that conducting a Township-wide Traffic Study could help identify where the traffic is coming from and address ways to alleviate traffic impacts that the community faces.

Mr. Melvin went through all of the clarifications/corrections that were made to the Master Plan (based upon comments that were received) and stressed that the recommendations that were made in the Master Plan are not immediate actionable items. In order to proceed with any of the recommendations noted in the Master Plan, it would require further professional studies and public input. Mr. Melvin noted that the recommendations are a toolkit for the Township. Mr. Melvin identified all areas of the Master Plan where changes were made (non-substantive) including clarifications on permitted uses, neighborhood policies, and the process for implementation of any policies/visions. Mr. Melvin reiterated that the changes that were made in the Master Plan were only for clarification purposes only and that there has not been any substantive Amendments added to the Master Plan.

**Public Discussion:** Christopher Benedetto of 2 Thackery Lane requested that the Master Plan include more mentions of the Cherry Hill Township school system in terms of improving and preserving them so that it will attract more millennial families. Mr. Benedetto suggested the Master Plan recommend the formation of public-private partnerships to promote investment in the school system. Mr. Melvin stated that he appreciates the comment but noted that the Planning Board does not address education as that is more of a matter for the Board of Education. The Master Plan addresses the Land Use Element.

Cary Hillebrand of 45 Knollwood Drive asked whether the Township has the will to follow through on good planning principles and plans.

Oi Kam Acheson of 9 Meehan Boulevard (Clementon, NJ) stated that she is a licensed massage therapist and runs an independent business in Cherry Hill. Ms. Acheson stated that she was concerned about any limited being places on massage therapists and where they could operate their business.

Patricia Magnus of 14 St. Moritz Lane reiterated comments from the previous hearing regarding the inadequacy of the public outreach process. Ms. Magnus stated that she is concerned about the Township handing out PILOT's and tax abatements. Ms. Magnus added that she is also concerned about the stresses from commercial development and the encroachment of car dealership's off-site vehicle storage lots into residential neighborhoods. Ms. Magnus stated that she wants to see more sustainable design and stormwater management practices in the Township as well as the promotion of multi-modal transportation options. Ms. Magnus stated that the tax comparison statements made earlier in order to compare taxes and home values with other municipalities by the Township's professionals should be stricken from the record.

Dawn Higgins of 207 Rhode Island Avenue read a statement prepared by the Council of the Cherry Hill Civic Association. Ms. Higgins stated that she appreciated the Board allowing the public an extra week to review the Master Plan. Ms. Higgins stated that she believes there is a perception problem with regard to the neighborhoods located in the western half of Cherry Hill Township. Ms. Higgins recommended that only owner-occupied multi-unit properties should be allowed and that the Township should encourage public outreach and input on planning matters.

Greg Bruno of 107 West Miami Avenue of 107 West Miami Avenue read a statement prepared by the Erlton North & Windsor Civic Association. Mr. Bruno disagreed with the notion that millennials do not want single-family homes. Mr. Bruno stated that the section in the Master Plan that includes the mention of 16 neighborhoods in the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart" should be removed as it gives the perception that these neighborhoods are less desirable. Mr. Bruno believes that the Township should broaden its advertising of the residential abatement program and enforce current restrictions on boarding houses. Mr. Bruno added that he opposes some of the multi-unit development visions/policies.

Kenneth Altenburg of 322 Chelton Parkway yielded his time to Greg Bruno. Mr. Bruno stated that he supports the Erlton Streetscape Plan as well as the proposal to increase the buffer between residential and commercial properties and to permit the usage of permeable pavers. Mr. Bruno reiterated that he would like to see light rail along Route 70 and also extend rail lines where feasible. Mr. Bruno stated that he is concerned about car dealership encroaching into residential neighborhoods.

Judy Amorosa of 152 Sheridan Avenue stated that she would like to remove the mention of the neighborhoods noted in the in the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart" due to the possibly "Area in Need of Rehabilitation" designation. Ms. Amorosa questioned how the designation power works to declare a property an Area in Need of Rehabilitation to which Mr. Melvin referenced prior testimony given on the matter. Mr. Tecza added that the reason the noted neighborhoods are included in the chart is due to the fact that they all share similar characteristics, specifically that they have housing stocks over fifty (50) years old and that is one of the State statute requirements for designated an Area in Need of Rehabilitation. Ms. Amorosa requested that additional clarifying language be added to the Master Plan that specifies what the municipal powers are for designating areas as such.

Anne Einhorn of 1017 Edgemoor Road asked for clarification on how housing and related demographic data was acquired to which it was explained that the data was gathered by census tract. Ms. Einhorn stated that she is concerned about the Area in Need of Rehabilitation proposal in the Master Plan and added that she believes it devalues the neighborhoods located in the western portion of Cherry Hill Township. Ms. Einhorn stated that there needs to be more public outreach in the Master Planning process and similarly related matters.

Brian Everett of 15 East Miami Avenue stated that he does not believe a new municipal building is an immediate concern and instead the Township should focus on rehabilitating school buildings and homes. Mr. Everett stated that he supports making the housing stock more affordable as well as supporting multi-modal transportation options in the Township. Mr. Everett stated that the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart" should be removed from the Master Plan.

Leslie Frank of 64 Ivy Lane questioned that data obtained with regard to the Township's housing stock and also noted that she was concerned about the quality of the school system. Ms. Frank also expressed concern with regard to the possibility of multi-unit housing forms in single-family zones.

Anthony DePasquale of 114 Maine Avenue stated that he concurs that there are homes in the Cherry Hill's western neighborhoods that do need repairs; however, he does not support upzoning single-family residential properties to multi-unit permissible properties. Mr. DePasquale also expressed concerns with the school system and the apparent lack of coordination with the Planning Board; however, Ms. Jacobs stated that the governing body does coordinate and work with the Board of Education.

John Fox of 902 East Tampa Avenue reiterated previous public comment in that he believes the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart" should be removed from the Master Plan.

Rena Margulis of 28 School Lane (with Deborah Overholt of 6506 Coventry Way in Mount Laurel) addressed the Board. Ms. Margulis stated that she is concerned about the 16 neighborhoods that are mentioned by name in the Master Plan as it relates to the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart." Mr. Tecza stated that the Area in Need of Rehabilitation designation is only one possible tool in the toolkit and that the reason the neighborhoods are mentioned by name is that they all share the same characteristic of having housing stock over 50 years old which is outlined in the State statute concerning declaring properties as an Area in Need of Rehabilitation. Mr. Tecza added that there are seven (7) action items that can be met in order to declare a property as an Area in Need of Rehabilitation and that having housing

stock over 50 years old is one of them. Ms. Margulis detailed her concerns related to the permissibility of massage therapists in the Township to which Mr. Tecza stated that a clarification was added to the Master Plan to create two (2) distinct categories of use with Licensed Massage & Bodywork being one type of use and spa-related services being the other. Mr. Tecza stressed that the uses will continue to be allowed but by separating the uses into separate categories, the Township can mitigate the possibility of unforeseen uses popping up in spa-service related uses. It shall be noted that while Ms. Overholt was sworn in, she did not provide any testimony.

Martin McCarthy of 202 Sheffield Road reiterated previous public comment in that he believes the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart" should be removed from the Master Plan and instead just note that there are neighborhoods that have housing stock over 50 years old.

Mary Beth Neiman of 19 Daytona Avenue requested the Township review the GIS data layer on the "How Zoning Will Change" Map to correct errors where necessary. Ms. Neiman asked for clarification on the improvement abatement program and the "controlled flipping" of houses. Ms. Barney stated that Zoning Ordinances and form-based codes will help to ensure "flipped" homes still complement the look and character of the surrounding neighborhood. Ms. Neiman stated that she is concerned about the clustering of apartment buildings and the potential effects on the school system.

Jane Glassman of 4 Santa Anita Place stated that she is concerned about the outside perception of the older neighborhoods that are noted in the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart."

Kelly Brennan of 203 Elkins Road stated that she is not concerned about the possibility of the Township utilizing the "Area in Need of Rehabilitation" designation and she supports being able to rent out homes as a financial aid tool. Ms. Brennan stated that she is concerned about road infrastructure and wants to see more sustainable/green construction in the Township.

Janice Ortega of 51 Churchill Road stated that she prefers having single-family units as opposed to multi-unit developments.

Patricia Magnus of 14 St. Moritz Place stated that she is concerned about the possibility of Township Municipal Building moving to Kings Highway to which Mr. Melvin stated that what the Master Plan provides are just annotated conceptual drawings and not actual plans for development.

Greg Lenaz of 16 Rose Lane stated that he believes his neighborhood could use some redevelopment/rehabilitation but thinks the primary reason for this is due to renters. Mr. Lenaz stated that he wants to see stricter enforcement of tenant-occupied properties and their respective landlords. Mr. Lenaz reiterated previous public comment in that he believes the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart" should be removed from the Master Plan.

Following Mr. Lenaz's testimony, Mr. Dougherty asked if any other members of the public wished to speak. Seeing none, Mr. Dougherty asked for a motion to close the public comment portion of the hearing. An all in favor was cast by the Board thus closing the public comment period.

**Board Discussion:** Mr. Carter stated that he appreciates the hard work from everyone on the Master Plan and asked whether the designation of the 16 neighborhoods could be "word-smithed." Mr. Melvin clarified that no neighborhoods are being formally designated as an Area in Need of Rehabilitation through the Master Plan and that such an action would have to follow State statutes. Mr. Hung asked Mr. Melvin to affirm (or to not affirm) that the data listed in the executive summary, particularly related to demographics and housing stock, are just facts about the Township and that they are not intended to be condescending. Mr. Melvin confirmed that this was the case. Mr. Hung also asked for affirmation from Mr. Melvin as to the example of areas elsewhere in New Jersey that have been designated as Areas in Need of Rehabilitation were desirable prior to and after the designation. Mr. Melvin affirmed this statement as well. Mr. Hung asked whether the noted neighborhoods in the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart" could be removed and still proceed with the vote on whether to adopt the Master Plan. Solicitor Burns stated that if the Board wants to make that kind of change then a vote could not take place. Mr. Melvin added that the removal of the neighborhood names from the chart would not prohibit future use of the Rehabilitation designation. Mr. Tecza stated that he Master Plan notes this designation as just a potential tool the Township could use and that if the Township wanted to proceed with utilizing the designation, the appropriate public outreach process would have to be followed. Ms. Jacobs stated that she was not comfortable with eliminating the Policy Toolkit's "Neighborhood Sample Implementation Chart." Mr. Dougherty concurred with Ms. Jacobs sentiments. Mr. Dougherty added that this Master Plan provides action items and details to address the noted policies and visions whereas the 2003 Master Plan provides no specifics for implementation. Mr. Dougherty commended the professionals for providing details.

**Motion:** Ms. Adler made a motion, which was seconded by Ms. Jacobs to adopt the 2018-2028 Cherry Hill Master Plan. Affirmative votes were cast by Adler, McCormack, Jacobs, Dougherty, Hung, Carter, Kates, Kalitan and Griffith. Motion passes unanimously.

**Resolutions:**

None.

**Meeting Adjourned:** at 10:54 PM.

**ADOPTED:** 11/5/18

**ATTEST:**



---

**LORISSA LUCIANI, PP, AICP  
PLANNING BOARD SECRETARY**



---

**JOHN OSORIO, CHAIRMAN**