



PLANNING BOARD
Monday, December 19, 2016
APPROVED MINUTES

You couldn't pick a better place.

OPENING: The meeting was called to order by Chairperson John Osorio at 7:40 PM.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Led by Mr. Osorio.

OPMA STATEMENT: Read by Mr. Osorio in compliance with the Sunshine Law.

ROLL CALL

- **Members in attendance:** John Osorio; Hugh Dougherty; Kevin McCormack; Steven Sweeney; Carolyn Jacobs; Sam Kates; Moly Hung; Marlyn Kalitan; and Sheila Griffith.
- **Professionals in attendance:** Paul Stridick, AIA, Director; Lorissa Luciani, PP, AICP, Deputy Director; Jacob Richman, PP, AICP, Planner; Stacey Arcari, PE, Planning Board Engineer; and James Burns, Esq., Solicitor.

Comments from the Public Not Related to Items on Tonight's Agenda: None.

Agenda Items:

16-P-0009

Block(s) 510.01 Lot(s) 1, 2 & 3
Zone: Institutional (IN)

Pennrose Properties, LLC

1721 Springdale Road
Cherry Hill, NJ

Relief Requested: A preliminary and final major site plan with bulk (C) variances, a partial street vacation, and lot consolidation to construct 160 multi-family, 100% affordable senior and supportive needs housing units in two (2) phases. The buildings are two (2) 30,103 SF (footprint), 2-3 story buildings with medical and administrative offices and a separate community center building accompanied by various site improvements.

Exhibits Submitted: A-1: Overall Color Rendering of Landscaping Plan; A-2: Phasing Plan – Phase 1; A-3: Elevation Renderings; and A-4: Community Annex Elevation.

Discussion: Applicant Pennrose Properties, LLC, applied for a preliminary and final major site plan with bulk (C) variances, a partial street vacation, and lot consolidation to construct 160 multi-family, 100% affordable senior and supportive needs housing units in two (2) phases. The buildings are two (2) 30,103 SF (footprint), 2-3 story buildings with medical and administrative offices and a separate community center building accompanied by various site improvements; located at 1721 Springdale Road, Cherry Hill, New Jersey (Block 510.01, Lots 1, 2 and 3) The property is owned by Jewish Community Properties, Inc.

Application was represented by:

- Richard Goldstein, Esq. – Attorney for the Applicant
- Jacob Fisher – Regional VP of Development for Pennrose Properties
- Jennifer Weiss – CEO of the Jewish Federation of Southern New Jersey
- William Parkhill, PE – Engineer for the Application from Midatlantic Engineers
- Steven Schoch, RA – Architect for the Applicant from Kitchen & Associates
- Andrew Feranda, PTOE – Traffic Engineer for the Application from Shropshire & Associates.

Mr. Goldstein introduced the application for a 160-unit affordable senior and supportive housing development which includes requests for variances (including an exception waiver from RSIS parking standards), a vacation of a portion of Evans Lane, and various site improvements. Mr. Goldstein gave an overview of the site characteristics and development history. It was noted that the proposed development is within the Institutional (IN) zone with a Senior and Supportive Housing (SSH) overlay. Mr. Goldstein stated that this proposed development will help forward Cherry Hill Township's affordable housing obligations. Mr. Goldstein explained that the site currently contains a 22,000 SF community center (which will remain) and that the back portion of the site is wooded. The site used to be occupied by the Bethel Baptist Church but now it is owned by the Jewish Federation of Southern New Jersey. The proposed 160-unit complex will be spread across two (2) new buildings which will be constructed in two (2) separate phases in addition to an extension of the Community Center. The applicant proposed a 100 foot conservation buffer easement with the adjacent property owners

along the northern border of the site as well as a conservation easement to keep conserving the wooded area at the back of the property. Mr. Goldstein noted the variances requested involving the proposed fencing, basin (though the basin is being improved), and from providing the minimum required amount of parking spaces. Lastly, Mr. Goldstein discussed the buffering and zoning requirements of the overlay zone and how the standards are strictest (in terms of buffering) than any other zone in the Township.

Mr. Fisher discussed Pennrose's expertise in developing similar housing projects like the one being proposed. Mr. Fisher affirmed that the Jewish Federation would be providing the on-site supportive services. Mr. Fisher explained that the proposal is for a 55 and older population (80%) and the other portion are for adults 21 and older with supportive needs (20%). It will be an independent living facility and all residents will have to be income qualified. Mr. Fisher anticipates that not all residents will have cars and that in other similar developments; a 0.5 car to residential unit ratio is likely. Mr. Fisher discussed the operations of the site ranging from security measures to trash/recycling (to be stored inside the buildings until trash day) to deliveries (via FedEx and UPS). While the Jewish Federation will handle the supportive services, Pennrose will be responsible for the management of the buildings and the maintenance of the site. Pennrose will meet all environmental requirements and will obtain Title 39. Pennrose will also obtain the proposed conservation easement and will enhance the buffer area on the southern side. Mr. Fisher stated that no façade signs are proposed but they are proposing a freestanding monument sign. Lastly, Mr. Fisher testified that Pennrose will be the administrative agent with regard to the income qualifying of potential residents.

Ms. Weiss noted that the Jewish Federation currently provides an array of senior and supportive car services amongst three (3) other locations. The Jewish Federation will provide the same array of services to the proposed new development and acknowledged that some of these services are already provided at the existing community center. Ms. Weiss stated that these services will be offered from 9am to 5pm with sporadic evening and weekend hours. Ms. Weiss testified that there are no current parking issues at the community center. Ms. Weiss stated that maintenance garage next to the existing community center will remain. Ms. Weiss further noted that the Jewish Federation utilizes paratransit to transport people to and from these services if necessary and that people can also access the site via bus and/or pedestrian pathways. Ms. Weiss clarified that the language on the proposed monument sign is not final and that the "Springdale Seniors" text is just a placeholder. Ms. Weiss explained that the Jewish Federation held open houses with the neighborhood to show the proposed plans and that it was a positive experience. In regard to visitor parking, Ms. Weiss said that there will be no designated spaces for visitors but that the traffic engineer will attest to the adequacy of the parking. Ms. Weiss stressed that the proposed is not for an assisted living facility and Ms. Arcari noted the majority of units are one-bedroom units.

Mr. Parkhill submitted exhibit A-1 and gave an overview of the site and the proposed development. Mr. Parkhill explained that each of the two (2) buildings is comprised of 80 units (with 72 one-bedroom and 8 two-bedrooms). Of the 80 units in each building, twenty-one (21) per building are supportive housing units. It was noted that one (1) unit per building is designated for the live-in superintendent. The development is proposed to have 293 parking spaces where 352 are required. The proposal also calls for improvements to the existing stormwater management basin (plus the construction of one new basin) into a bio-retention basin. Access to the site will only be from Springdale Road. The access point will be controlled by a traffic light with full circulation access around the proposed buildings. Mr. Parkhill reiterated that all trash is stored inside in trash compactors. The applicant seeks a few design waivers with regard to bicycle storage, lighting, trash, and due to some of the proposed plant varieties. Mr. Parkhill stressed that there will be no light spillage onto any neighboring property. Mr. Parkhill explained that while the ordinance requires a four (4') foot meandering fence but the applicant will be proposing some fencing in some areas and denser landscaping in others. Mr. Parkhill explained that the project will be partially funded by NJHMFA's low income housing tax credits. Mr. Parkhill noted that they do not have enough funding to provide built-in irrigation for the landscaping; however, Pennrose's site managers will handle all landscaping maintenance. Additionally the applicant agrees to conduct a Night Light Function Test. The applicant proposed to vacate a portion of Evans Lane (a paper street) and that this vacation does not detrimentally impact the area, does not create variances, and does not go against the Master Plan. Mr. Parkhill stated that the applicant agrees with all comments provided by the Township and their consultants except as noted on the record. Mr. Parkhill explained some reasons as to why someone living in this development would not have or would not need a car. Mr. Parkhill further explained that except for the main entrance driveways from Springdale Road, there is no other vehicle or pedestrian access to the site. A discussion then ensued with regard to the proposed generators and buffering. The applicant will provide details to ensure compliance with the Ordinance requirement with regard to the screening of rooftop equipment and generators. Another discussion ensued regarding the visibility of the proposed buildings as it relates to the adjacent properties to the north as well a discussion involving trash/recycling operations and construction phasing. The applicant then submitted exhibit A-2 and it was noted that while Phase I only includes the first 80-unit building, the site will look complete with an expected finish date of the end of 2017. Phase II will be constructed once the applicant receives additional funding through NJHMFA and the applicant hopes to finish construction during 2019 and starting leasing in 2020. Lastly, a discussion ensued regarding the public walking path the meanders through the back of the site.

Mr. Schoch noted that the building have been designed to Ordinance design standards. Exhibit A-3 was submitted to showcase the massing and articulation of the proposed buildings. Mr. Schoch corrected a previous statement to note that

there will be sixteen (16) supportive housing units per building. Mr. Schoch explained that the supportive housing units function as a small home with easy access. The apartments will be fully functional and contain common spaces. The buildings have been designed to support function, active, and independent living. Mr. Schoch discussed the materials and colors of the buildings and how they will incorporate sustainability measures. The buildings will be full ADA accessible and the buildings will be accentuated by landscaping. Mr. Schoch detailed how the tops of homes that border the subject site to the north will be at about eye level with the tops of the proposed buildings. Exhibit A-4 was submitted to show the proposed community center annex which will help support the expanded senior and supportive care resident services.

Mr. Feranda acknowledged that he performed the traffic analysis for the subject project. Mr. Feranda gave an overview of the existing infrastructure along Springdale Road. The analysis included an evaluation of traffic during weekday peak hours as well as the weekend during religious services. Mr. Feranda discussed the proposed traffic impact that the proposed development would create in terms of trip counts and needed parking. Mr. Feranda discussed the studied of needed parking spaces per unit for similar style developments and that they are in line with the amount of proposed parking spaces. Mr. Feranda believes in his professional opinion that an exception waivers from RSIS parking standards can be reasonably granted without a detrimental impact. The applicant is proposing thirteen (13) ADA parking spaces where seven (7) are required which are in addition to the existing ADA spaces associated with the existing community center building. Mr. Goldstein noted each building has multiple access points and Mr. Schoch noted that elevators are centrally located in each building.

Ms. Luciani went through Community Development review letter dated December 5, 2016, and asked that the applicant update their bulk standards chart. Mr. Goldstein agreed to work with Community Development to provide acceptable planting species. Ms. Luciani noted that the project is subject to a Treatment Works Approval (TWA) and noted that the applicant has provided adequate testimony in its relief requests. Ms. Arcari went through ERI's review letter dated December 7, 2016 and discussed the utilities and design waivers. Ms. Arcari requested the applicant to work with PSE&G on the gas lines and with the Fire Marshal with regard to the locations of fire hydrants.

Public Discussion: Richard Ingelido of 216 Highgate Lane questioned some of the setbacks requirements as well as needed clarification on the protection of trees in the woods at the back of the site. Mr. Ingelido noted his concerns about light spillage, views of the property from the surrounding residences, site maintenance, and ownership of the vacated portions of Evans Lane.

Micah Ford of 129 Ashford Lane noted his concerns about parking on-site and the findings of the traffic analysis. Mr. Ford also expressed concerns about the possibility of people parking off-site in the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Goldstein agreed to a condition that residents of the site will not park off-site. A discussed ensued regarding the adequacy of the parking and Traffic Engineer's analysis.

John Brown, Esq., Council for the Church of the Lord Jesus Christ Apostolic Faith questioned what intrusion, if any, into the wooded area at the back of the lot the development would create. Mr. Brown expressed concern of the erosion of the wooded buffer. The applicant noted that while some of the woods are being cut down, a large portion will remain due to a conservation easement (about 200' of woods will remain to the rear property line). Mr. Brown also questioned if there are any existing dedicated easement with Evans Lane. Ms. Luciani explained that a full title search will be required prior to any recommendation of approval for the partial vacation of Evans Lane.

Mindy Rosen of 6 Fairhaven Court stated that she supports the application as her son has disabilities. Ms. Rosen stated that she is thrilled with the application as it will provide supportive housing for adults with disabilities.

Linda Newman of 11 Pavilion Road (Voorhees) supports the application as well as her son also has disabilities.

James Wallace of 160 Weston Drive asked whether there are restrictions on who may be able to stay with the senior and supportive housing residents. Mr. Fisher explained the leasing requirements and noted that it permits a spouse, child, and/or pet. Mr. Luciani noted that the income qualification is another requirement prior to a lease being signed. Mr. Wallace added that he believes a fence would be a benefit as not all neighbors have fences and that he has personally seen people cutting through their properties and into the woods.

Mr. Murphy of 16 Highgate Lane questioned if any market analysis has been done. Mr. Fisher noted that their analysis shows an aging population and a low amount of rental units in Cherry Hill. Ms. Weiss noted that the three (3) complexes that the Jewish Federation runs has multi-year waiting lists. Mr. Murphy inquired as to whether the units would open up to other populations of people should the units not lease. Ms. Weiss stated that the Ordinance requires the units be for seniors and supportive needs residents only and that such residents will be screen thoroughly. Ms. Weiss added that this complex is a not a residential treatment facility. Mr. Fisher added that Pennrose is invested in this project to make sure everything is run properly.

Dan Tyske of 26 Buxton Road questioned the requirements regarding the performance bond and site investments. Ms. Luciani elaborated on the bonding requirements, the minimal impact of the proposed residential lighting, as well as the minimal visual impacts the site would create.

Barbara Tyske of 26 Buxton Road requested that the woods be preserved as much as possible and that she is concerned about the potential impacts to the environment and due to the proposed lighting.

Brad Molotsky of 11 Manor House Drive stated that she supports the application and believes it to be a benefit to the community.

Mr. Goldstein gave closing remarks and noted that the site could be development more intensely based upon the Ordinance requirements but has instead paired it back in order to conserve the woods as much as possible and so an adequate buffer is in place. Mr. Goldstein stated that he believes adequate testimony has been provided to support the variance and waiver requests.

Motion: Following the reiteration of the conditions by Solicitor Burns, John Osorio made a motion, which was seconded by Sam Kates, to approve the application with the conditions as stated. Affirmative votes by Osorio, Dougherty, McCormack, Jacobs, Sweeney, Kates, Hung, Kalitan, and Griffith. The application is approved unanimously.

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

Adoption Meeting Minutes from November 21, 2016. Sam Kates made a motion, which was seconded Marlyn Kalitan, to adopt the Meeting Minutes from November 21, 2016. Affirmative votes by Osorio, McCormack, Sweeney, Hung, Kates, Kalitan, and Griffith. Minutes are approved.

RESOLUTIONS

15-P-0022

Leo Lui

Block(s) 178.01 Lot(s) 5

1502 Route 38

Zone: Highway Business (B2)

Cherry Hill, NJ

Relief Requested: A minor site plan with bulk (C) variances to renovate a vacant one-story office building into a security systems retailer/distributor store and make various site improvements.

Motion to Ratify: Sam Kates made a motion which was seconded by Moly Hung, to memorialize the resolution for Leo Lui. Affirmative votes by Osorio, McCormack, Sweeney, Hung, Kates, Kalitan, and Griffith. Minutes are approved. The resolution is memorialized.

Following the memorialization of the Leo Lui Resolution, Paul Stridick recused himself from the remainder of the meeting.

Resolution Authorizing Planning Board to Enter Executive Closed Session to Discuss Pending Litigation

Advanced Recovery Systems, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. Cherry Hill Township and Paul Stridick, in his capacity as Administrative Officer and Director of the Cherry Hill Township Department of Community Development, Defendants, Superior Court of New Jersey, Docket No. CAM-L-3428-16.

Motion to Ratify: Following Solicitor Burn's explanation that the Planning Board may enter a closed executive session to discuss pending litigation, Sam Kates made a motion which was seconded by John Osorio, to memorialize the resolution in order to enter into a closed executive session. Affirmative votes by Osorio, Dougherty, McCormack, Jacobs, Sweeney, Kates, Hung, Kalitan, and Griffith. The resolution is memorialized and the Board entered closed executive session at 11:05 PM.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (CLOSED) TO DISCUSS THE PENDING LITIGATION AND TO CONSIDER A CONSENT ORDER AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT OF SAID LITIGATION (NO FORMAL ACTION WILL BE TAKEN)

Advanced Recovery Systems, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. Cherry Hill Township and Paul Stridick, in his capacity as Administrative Officer and Director of the Cherry Hill Township Department of Community Development, Defendants, Superior Court of New Jersey, Docket No. CAM-L-3428-16 to consider the Consent Order and Settlement Agreement.

Motion to Reenter the Open Public Session: John Osorio made a motion which was seconded by Kevin McCormack, to reenter the open public session of the Planning Board meeting. An all in favor vote was cast by the Board and the Board re-entered the open public session at 11:24 PM.

RESOLUTIONS – OPEN PUBLIC MEETING

Resolutions Considering the Execution of the Consent Order & Settlement Agreement

Advanced Recovery Systems, LLC, Plaintiff, vs. Cherry Hill Township and Paul Stridick, in his capacity as Administrative Officer and Director of the Cherry Hill Township Department of Community Development, Defendants, Superior Court of

New Jersey, Docket No. CAM-L-3428-16, to execute the Consent Order and Settlement Agreement and authorize James W. Burns, Esq., Planning Board Solicitor and John H. Osorio, Esq., Planning Board Chairman to sign and/or take appropriate action on behalf of the Cherry Hill Township Planning Board regarding said Consent Order and/or Settlement Agreement.

Motion to Ratify: Hugh Dougherty made a motion which was seconded by Sam Kates, to memorialize the resolution for the execution of the Consent Order & Settlement Agreement. Affirmative votes by Osorio, Dougherty, McCormack, Jacobs, Sweeney, Kates, Hung, Kalitan, and Griffith. The resolution is memorialized.


Meeting Adjourned: at 11:24 PM.

ADOPTED:

ATTEST:



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



JOHN OSORIO, CHAIRMAN

