

TOWNSHIP OF EVESHAM

Planning Board

Minutes

7:00 pm

November 8, 2018

Municipal Building

Call to Order

Alternate Vice Chairman Cortland made the call to order at 7:23pm

Flag Salute

Statement of Conformance with Open Public Meetings Act

Alternate Vice Chairman Cortland made the statement of conformance with the Open Public Meeting Act and the Municipal Land Use Legislation

Roll Call

Present: Foster, McGoey, Mond, Zeuli, DiEnna, Cortland, Maratea

Also Present: Loughney, Arcari, Turan, Furey-Bruder, Kinney

Absent: Levenson, Menichini, Parikh, Marrone, Boulton

Meeting Minutes

August 16, 2018

Motion: McGoey

Second: Mond

Ayes: McGoey, Mond, DiEnna

B. REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING

UNFINISHED/NEW BUSINESS

1. Evesham Owner Urban Renewal, LLC PB 14-25SPF3 11-10-18

Amended Final Major Site Plan for Phase I

Route 70 East & North Locust Ave., Block 27.02, Lots 2.01- 2.11

Tri-Towne Redevelopment Project Area

Applicant is seeking amended final approval of Phase I for the eastern end of the existing building retail building with a day care center and an amendment to the NJDOT park area

Timothy M. Prime, Attorney for Applicant

Witnesses:

- Tyler Prime, Attorney

Exhibits: None

Applicant Attorney Overview:

- Day care center as part of Redevelopment Plan
- Retail and residential apartments
- Prior approvals pretty extensive

- Commercial portion was granted preliminary and final approval aka Shoppes at Renaissance Square, demolish 94,000 square feet of existing retail space and rehabilitate remaining
- Building expansion will be 84,189 square feet, to include a relocated Burger King, 2 new restaurants, a coffee shop with drive thru / 12,600 two story retail and office on each floor
- Residential portion (Residence at Renaissance) previously granted preliminary and final approval for 338 apartments scattered throughout 5 buildings
- Application is to partially amend prior approval adding a day care center where Burger King was previously approved
- Modify existing park improvements
- C-1 commercial zone, designed in accordance with Redevelopment Plan
- Reduction in impervious coverage, prior approval was 79.5 and will now be dropping to 79.1% coverage; less than 85% permitted in Redevelopment Plan
- Parking change from 938 spaces where 969 is required, variance previously granted remains in effect but now proposes a total of 943
- Engineer and Landscape Architects and Day Care Center Representative to deliver testimony and discuss how it will work

Corie Garrison, Executive Director, Children of America Day Care Center

- Sworn in by Board Solicitor
- 63 locations across USA, 7 in NJ
- Children of America in existence over 14 years, employed over 12 years
- Partnership with community very important
- Provide quality education for the children
- Parking lots usually connected to other stores
- All families are required to park in the lot and walk children to the day care facility; no drop off
- 2 doors to enter; 1st is open and 2nd door requires a pin code to be keyed in to unlock and enter; then escort children to the classroom
- Typically someone at front desk or in office to see who is entering
- Intercom at front door for safety of children
- Hours of operation proposed are to open at 6 or 6:30am and close at 6 or 6:30pm
- Number of students depends on what the state license grants to them thru child care licensing
- Typically, approved for 120-140 students; on average 80-100 kids per location

Board Comment:

- How many employees do you anticipate at this site?
- Depending on ratio; typically 20 employees
- Some full time and some part time
- Work 8 hour shifts; 9 hours total with an hour break
- Opening shift will leave by 3 and afternoon staff comes in from 3 – 6:30
- Board asked the hours of drop off and pick up
- According to Corie, heaviest drop off time is 8:30am, some parents drop off at 6:00am and stagger in between 6am and 8:30am then educational start of day begins
- If dropping late, ask for a courtesy call to ensure someone is at front desk
- Afternoon busiest time is 4:30pm which staggers throughout the evening

- Board asked maximum number of employees at any given time (approximate)?
- Corrie responded 10-15 depending on the day
- Plans show day care located near Plymouth Road, is site plan changed so it's closer to Locust?
- Leah explained if on Rt. 70, looking at shopping center, the day care center is all the way to the left on Plymouth side, where proposed Burger King was to be located
- The hours of operation are Monday – Friday only, no weekend hours

All professionals were sworn in by CherylLyn Walters, Board Solicitor:

Chirag Thakar, Arna Engineering, Professional Engineer

William Loughney, ARH Associates, Professional Engineer

Stacey Arcari, Environmental Resolutions, Planning Board Traffic Consultant

Chirag Thakar, Engineer:

- Referring to Exhibit A1 displaying
- Birds eye view, Manor building in the middle, to the left is existing shopping center and all the way to the furthest left is the location for the site plan amendment on Plymouth Road
- Due to the new tenant, requirements change for an outdoor play area
- Structure (footprint of existing building) isn't changing
- Square footage changed; Burger King was taking 3,000 square feet of existing space and Children of America now taking 10,000 square feet of existing space with 4,000 square foot outdoor play area
- In between outdoor play area and Plymouth Road a parking lot is still separating the building and the road
- Eliminating drive thru has allowed more parking spaces
- Stormwater and impervious coverage got better
- Modest amendments to architectural changes will be consistent with what is already proposed
- Trash enclosure currently shown on site plan needs to be relocated per Leah
- Children of America is not a big generator of trash; household type trash bins within the facility; do not operate as a fast food restaurant as previously proposed
- Agree to eliminate the trash enclosure and if need be at a future date, reinstate it in the area on the site plan should there be a need
- Leah commented that what may occur is property owner has their tenants contract with waste haulers; need to ensure that various tenants sharing trash enclosure have a shared contract
- Make agreements at the board level and then tenants move in and have their waste hauler drop off a dumpster and it look a mess
- Need to share and work out a solution
- Applicant agreed to work out the trash issue stated by Leah
- Black fencing is acceptable
- Questions regarding the sidewalk will be satisfied with whatever Leah is suggesting
- Required handrail is usually 4-4 ½ feet high for handicap ramp
- CME letter comments about the coordination with the Environment consultants, updates have been given and are accepted

- Environmental Resolutions Letter from Stacey; striping of parking spaces is a good suggestion
- Traffic consultant issued a supporting letter for traffic numbers which are still below and insignificant
- ARH letter regarding the drop off zone has been addressed; secure facility with no need for a drop off/drive by requirement
- Accept recommendation to increase light levels at front of the center; will brighten up the area
- Recommendation for additional signage is fine and will be added on to the plan

Thomas Bauer, Landscape Architect:

- Amended application regarding the changes to Rt. 70 Right of Way
- Making improvements to the space to accommodate more features for residential development
- Previously 3 ponds with a stream connecting has been opened up considerably to add some amenities
- 1 pond, 2 sitting areas, a walking path
- Center bay has incorporated an open lawn space for play/resting
- Tot Lot with a seating area
- Picnic area to the right designated with barbecues
- Far right bay of Rt. 70 Right of Way, added another pond, incorporated another picnic area, benches along the walking trail and added a dog park
- Additional amenities for the use of the people living in the community
- Feel that this plan is much better for people to gather and use the space
- Bike racks as trash receptacles have also been added

Board Comment:

- Do the walking trails go underneath the access area for the vehicles?
- No they do not
- Is there screening along Rt. 70 from the park like area?
- Parking lots are screened with evergreen hedges along the entire frontage
- Mr. Cortland asked if there is something to prevent children from wandering out onto Rt. 70?
- Along Rt. 70 is an open area with existing trees and proposed trees
- Plan shows existing trees that will be further developed with proposed landscaping
- Tot Lot is remote enough and has areas for parents to watch children
- Haven't provided any fencing
- Leah added that the changes were significant enough to come back to the board, and this is a concept sketch and if approved, they need to reconcile the planting plan with this approved sketch
- On the 3D plan, it looks like the Tot Lot in the darker blue area is about 60ft from Rt. 70?
- Closest part of walking plan is 80ft from Rt. 70, there is good distance out there
- Tot Lot is 40ft across and there will be grading

Leah Fury-Bruder, Township Planner:

- Letter dated 9/28/18, provided overview of proposed changes

- Solid overview of what changes entail
- Children of America, as a Condition of Approval, we would like to see the revisions to the architecture
- DOT Right of Way park, with regard to the dog park, the fence should be a black decorative material and waste station areas need to be included
- Applicant got NJ DOT highway occupancy permit for the improvements within the Right of Way, incumbent upon them to get a revision to the permit if necessary

Behram Turan, Environmental Engineer:

- Letter dated 10/12/18, obtained consultant for the Childcare center who is familiar with project and site conditions; makes transition much easier
- Childcare center to obtain license from DOH and Department of Children and Families; processes to go thru required by DEP and DOH; they have state requirements and it has been agreed that they will provide the township with copies, in doing so it addresses all of our concerns
- Portions of it (indoor environmental health assessment) cannot be completed until all windows, doors, etc. are set up
- DEP will inspect playground area after constructed
- No issues from sampling
- Once everything is constructed and inspected by all state agencies, documentation will be provided to the Township
- Unrelated to the Childcare Center, they are continuing with the remediation associated with the former tailor at the property and keeping us informed and providing status updates
- No outstanding issues need to be addressed

Stacey Arcari, Traffic Engineer:

- Letter dated 10/11/18, Applicant has already addressed all of our concerns and we have no further comments

William Loughney, Board Engineer:

- Letter dated 10/11/18, minimal updates and improvements to the stormwater and grading that they added
- Addition of light to the front of the building accepted
- Applicant has agreed to provide signage as a fair warning there would be children in the area
- Agree there is no need for a drop off zone as the testimony provided that parents will walk children into the building

Board Attorney Comment:

- Operator please give testimony on the trash and any deliveries other than children
- How much trash does the center produce?
- About 10 classrooms, two trash cans in each
- Typically, one main trash can that gets full and one in the restroom that is only paper towels
- Approximately 10-12 full trash bags and then when compacted with everything else another 15-20 total (dirty diapers, etc.) at the end of the day
- Are there any deliveries to the center and how often?

- A food order is delivered once a week and depending on where they can deliver the truck will bring it to that location
- Some locations do a monthly food order if that is required, trucks will deliver to the front or the back of the location
- There is also an Office Depot delivery, Fed Ex, standard delivery as any other business; not every day
- School supplies are delivered once a month as well

Board Comment:

- Mr. DiEnna asked Leah to explain where he would view the parking area in relation to the play area (Tot Lot) associated with the day care on the Site Plan
- Leah explained that they didn't provide the details yet for the play area of the day care or what play equipment would be there or the surface of the play area
- Mr. DiEnna said he would like to get a sense of what it looks like
- Applicant advised that it is a synthetic turf
- Board attorney advised that the state has regulations and requirements and whatever is put in will have to comply
- How do you prevent a vehicle from jumping the curb into the play area
- There is a drop off between the play area and the parking lot
- The play area is elevation 92.2 and parking lot is at elevation 88
- The grades climb up 3-4ft and there is a flat area (embankment) to the play area
- There is a 6ft fence around the play area that you can see through
- Is there anything structural that would stop a vehicle?
- No there is just a 6 inch curb and the elevation change but nothing structural
- Leah advised that you are turning your car in and that you would have to go straight to run into the play area; there is a 90 degree bend
- There is physical, horizontal separation, roughly 25ft
- There could be 6ft posts filled with concrete
- Concern that people run vehicles through obstructions all the time
- Alternate Chairman Cortland asked Traffic Engineer to comment based on her experience with site plans such as this historically and is it accepted as safe in her professional opinion
- Stacey said there are numerous day care centers along Rt. 38 and major highways this is not an uncommon situation
- Stacey pointed out that this is very convenient because it's along a major highway
- They don't want a solid fence for safety reasons; visibility behind the fence
- Will see activity around and on the playground
- From a safety perspective it is difficult to comment if a vehicle can or cannot drive into it according to Stacey
- Board Solicitor commented that NJ Department of Community Affairs (DCA) oversees all of this and if they see a safety concern when they review the application they will revise
- Mr. Maratea would like to know material of the fence
- Applicant advised that they are proposing a vinyl fence 6ft tall
- Can a wrought iron face be put in place so that it's structural?
- So there would be some type of impediment to a vehicle
- Board Solicitor advised that this is subject to DCA review
- They have agreed to a black fence and DCA has to do their job with the rest

- Mr. DiEnna wants to ensure that we didn't overlook anything and make sure we do our due diligence
- Applicant agreed as a Condition of Approval that they will work out some sort of protection for the children if the DCA doesn't require it and work with professionals at that time
- If DCA is comfortable with fence and doesn't require anything additional, Applicant will revisit something structural for the fence

Public Comment:

No Public Comment

Board Attorney Overview:

- Application for Amended Major Final Site Plan for Phase 1 for the redevelopment project
- Permit the use of a 10,009 sq. ft. day care facility in the building plus a 4,090 sq. ft. enclosed outside play area
- No variances; improving the impervious coverage condition and the number of parking spaces which previously received a variance
- Applicant agreed as a Condition of Approval that there are no dumpsters outside of trash enclosures
- Applicant will agree as Condition of Approval to construct another enclosure if the need arises and township later determines it necessary
- In meantime, applicant will coordinate amongst tenants for a shared use of an existing outside trash enclosure
- Applicant will also agree to review with the Board Professionals additional structural or barrier protection around the play area in the event that NJ licensing oversight doesn't require anything specific

Motion to Approve PB 14-25SPF3

Motion: McGoey

Second: Foster

Ayes: Foster, McGoey, Mondy, Zeuli, DiEnna, Maratea, Cortland

Alternate Chairman Cortland motioned to pause the meeting for a 5-minute break at 8:15pm; Meeting went back in session at 8:22pm

2. Evesham Township Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan Presentation

Leah Furey-Bruder, Township Planner

- Public hearing for the 3rd time and this time – this is it
- Element of the Master Plan adopted by the Planning Board
- Needs to be endorsed by Township Council which happens next
- Most of the plan is well underway
- This is adoption – a chapter of the Master Plan
- Tonight if in agreement it would be adoption in the way of resolution
- Viewed PowerPoint presentation
- Required contents of housing element
- Housing element is background

- Fair Share portion is how we are complying
- Townships Fair Share obligation
- Formalizing and providing details to what is already approved
- 1975 Mt. Laurel 1 was the Mt. Laurel decisions which set this in motion
- Determined that all growing municipalities have an obligation to provide their Fair Share of low and moderate income housing along with other development
- Mt. Laurel 2 followed because it was all in the courts as compliance was not coming to fruition
- Administrative agency to oversee – COA was created and charged with making rules to see that consistency was across the state
- Mt. Laurel 3 in 2015 – decision stating that COA was not functioning properly and moved rules back to the courts
- First round of COA rules created in 1986-1993
- Second round 1993-1999
- Third round was after the breakdown and not created until 2004
- Released Third Round rules which gave townships time to comply
- COA was charged with fixing the inefficiencies
- 2008 new set of rules were released and amended
- Towns trying to comply with growth-share methodology
- Overturned in 2010 and Evesham adopted a third round compliance plan
- Planning Board approved and court appointed special master approved but rules got overturned again
- Evesham filed in 2011 a Motion for a Stay for protection until rules were figured out against builders remedy litigation
- Town was purchasing land for Sharp Road housing and a variety of other things to make sure we were creating affordable housing opportunities
- COA was directed to use prior rounds to create rules and had draft rules in 2014 but deadlocked
- Fair Share housing center intervened and brought it back to courts in 2015 COA ruled defunct
- Since then, back at the courts, but needed to determine rules and numbers
- Evesham has done what we can to create affordable housing in a way that it was consistent with our variety of planning goals, trying to ensure that there was a balance
- Not undermining the financial feasibility of good development projects
- Included affordable housing where it made sense
- In 2015 Fair Share Housing Center sued Evesham to determine our compliance
- Came up with number 680, long process to come up with this number
- Fair Share Housing Center number started at 1,621
- Evesham were careful about the negotiations and did well for the town
- We can accommodate this number in a reasonable way that doesn't undermine all of our other planning efforts
- The 680 is a GAP number
- There is a GAP period 1999-2015 where there were no rules
- There were calculations that X amount of affordable housing was needed in that period and it wasn't created
- The GAP need and perspective need which is 2015-2025
- 680 is from period 1999 thru 2025

- Prior round compliance 1987-1999 cumulative 1st and 2nd rounds Evesham complied and the number was 534 and it was satisfied
- Court order indicating that there was a judgement of compliance in 1999
- With prior rounds it was brought to Evesham's attention that due to the type of units that were utilized to comply, Evesham hadn't matched out the bonus credits available
- For this round we were able to shift some around to get the township some additional credits
- Still satisfaction of the 534 number
- The housing element is required by the NJ Fair Housing Act
- The housing element was intended to set the stage for the Fair Share Plan and help to determine the number
- Intended to inform and provide foundation for Fair Share Plan
- Information that includes housing stock, estimate, age, condition, purchase and rental value, occupancy characteristics, housing type, projection of housing stock and general estimate of how much housing may be expected until 2025, demographic information, etc.
- US census from 2010 was used
- American Community Survey done by census bureau but only a sample of population much larger margin of error but 2012-2016
- NJ Department of Labor has employment information that is pretty up to date which is all included in the document
- Fair Share Gap present need and perspective need number for 1999-2025 is 680
- Parameters for compliance based on previous COA rules still apply (page 15)
- Low/Moderate income split obligation
- Of the units produced 50% low income at least; others can be moderate
- Can have more low than moderate but not more moderate than low
- 25% of 3rd round obligation must be rental units (minimum of 170)
- Evesham Plan includes 442 so we are good
- Minimum Family Rental requirement; minimum of 50% of rental obligation must be family; general average population
- Minimum is 85 and we have 235
- Family Units; minimum of 50% of housing unit must be Family Housing units not age restricted or special needs; need 255 and we have 328
- Age restricted; maximum of 25% of the Fair Share obligation may be satisfied with age restricted units; maximum is 170 and we have 147
- COA rule allows for rental bonuses for up to the rental obligation
- Evesham's rental obligation is 170 therefore, we can claim 170 rental bonuses
- Exhibit used "Appendix C "Evesham Township Third Round Fair Share Compliance Summary Table"
- This outline is how Evesham is complying; 100% Affordable Housing Projects
- 8 from Elmwood House, Sharp Road MEND Apartments, 104 units in total but shifted credits so third round we are using 78 of the units
- Habitat for Humanity is building 1 unit already under construction
- Cornerstone at Marlton; new zone "Workforce Residential" on Executive Drive
- Low income cash credits; very competitive; 64 Family Rental Units
- Beneficial Bank Property (Evesboro-Medford Road and North Elmwood) 11 acres; vacant mostly wetlands; C2 commercial zoning district
- Significant wetland constraints

- Not desirable for commercial and not deep enough
- Zoning ordinance to rezone the property for semi-detached duplex type units
- Fee simple ownership; 4 units
- Evesham Senior Apartments at 16 Stow; Applicant is an affordable housing developer already owns and applied for low income tax credits for senior round for financing; site plan approved in June
- Inclusionary, Age Restricted and Independent Assisted Living/Memory Care Units; site called Homestead at Evesham will have a name change to Hawthorne Senior Residences
- Site is already zoned for inclusionary assisted living facility
- Reducing set aside from 21% to 15% and adding flexibility to types of units they can have there to make it work
- Yield 24 affordable units
- Brightview is already constructed and has 17 affordable units; 6 more within a year in Phase 2 and already approved
- Artis Senior Living (302 Lippincott) already constructed near Marlton Crossing; Memory Care facility; 6 affordable units
- Capital Seniors; proposed for 3 and 5 Executive Drive; only concept plan at this point; need affordable housing units and payment in lieu from this site to go into Affordable Housing Trust Fund
- Supportive and Special Needs; group homes all over town; 14 of them with 47 bedrooms that came into existence after 1999 with low and moderate income individuals in them
- Bancroft doesn't apply due to non-low income patients
- Oats Integrated Care, Community Options, Community Options at 38 Fourth Street under construction
- Market to Affordable – upfront payment or monthly subsidy
- Either present day value upfront payment to landlord in exchange for a 30 year deed restriction on a rental unit or bring money to table at closing for market rate unit; buy unit down to an affordable price and put a 30 year deed restriction on it
- Have draft manual; 3 units at 37 South Maple; appendix to plan that will outline how the market to affordable will function
- Spending Plan that outlines money in affordable housing trust fund and set aside adequate funds to make it happen
- Market research shows 39 units on the market under \$175K in Evesham; analysis to determine what low to moderate income can afford
- Taking household income and what is 30% of it – assumption that one shouldn't spend more than 30% of your income on your housing
- If someone wanted to do the program, get income qualified, find unit on the market for \$160K, town needs to bring \$40K to the table to make it affordable and put deed restriction on it and we get the credit; when they sell it, they sell it also to some who is income qualified for 30 years
- 10 proposed at Wiley Mission
- 19 proposed throughout the town
- Inclusionary Zoning – affordable housing as part of overall development
- Whitebridge credited for third round already in existence
- 46 units; one owned by Township trying to sell; others privately held
- 10 units Westbury Chase

- 6 units within the development and 4 units elsewhere in town (all associated with Westbury Chase)
- Evesboro Downs; unit purchased as inclusionary back in the 1990's
- Fieldstone Barclay Chase project; 2 occupied already
- 33 Affordable units
- Renaissance Square approved and under construction; 34 affordable units there
- Harvest House; approved but not under construction; 8 affordable units there
- McKenna Site paid to create units elsewhere and are funding a group home
- Winding Brook on Sharp Road; 6 Affordable units there
- Berkshire Woods; 6 units have c/o's and 4 are occupied
- Public Works yard; when public works moves in 18 months and completely out (501 Evesboro-Medford Road), township no longer needs the site; already anticipated and will do Redevelopment Plan and provide for Inclusionary Housing there
- Evesham obligation was 680 and we are accounted for 704
- Rehabilitation share (Present Need) is 94 but when entered into Settlement Agreement in August, it was agreed that if we provide documentation that the number was something less, they would be open to it
- Rehabilitation number was arrived at via a proxy – not feasible to go out and survey every unit in town in a whole state
- For proxy, used data that estimates number of units with deficient kitchens, deficient plumbing, crowded and over 50 years old; crowded means more than 1 human per room in the house
- Tax Assessor agreed that maybe 1 house met the above as all houses in Evesham didn't meet the criteria
- Township Planner and ARH mapped variables by census block group in the town to determine large number of deficient kitchens are in part of town where Care One is located where they have congregate facility
- Compared data where numbers were calculated for entire state to more recent data and there are wide variations; need for rehabilitation
- 2002-2012 township had a rehabilitation program run by Department of Community Development; 16 units were rehabilitated; all had kitchens and all had bathrooms
- Fixed income families that need some help with a/c or heating systems, roof, etc. – acknowledge there is a need and survey data didn't properly capture it
- Proposal is to show that we have completed 16 and will fund 30 more
- Easier to manage than 94 in an 8 year period
- Affordable Housing Trust Fund – around \$2 Million currently
- Money comes from developers who are doing commercial development
- Pay 2.5% of equalized assessed value into the fund; State regulation
- In increase in value – reduction in value of previous use deducted
- All residential pays 1.5% of equalized assed value if not inclusionary (no affordable housing on site)
- Payments in lieu – come into trust fund from developers
- Sobileski Site (North Elmwood) 30 acre farm with house on it
- Worked out settlement agreement number of units will be less than what they asked for but they agreed to make a payment to affordable housing trust fund which will help substantially
- In order to spend the money we need a spending plan approved by the court

- All these programs in the Housing Plan which need some financial assistance because Affordable housing doesn't work unless it is subsidized in some way
- Spending Plan is an appendix to the plan
- Implementation Schedule is self-explanatory as everything is already underway
- Administrative Agent – Township has had one since 1990's
- Had contract with Housing Affordability Service; provide service to municipalities due to work involved with marketing, selection, applicants, income qualification, filing documents, etc.
- As Evesham's needs have grown, we got a new one
- Council appointed CDP&H out of Cranberry; highly qualified affordable housing professionals
- Contract with the town; maintain a waiting list of eligible people; entered contract with developers to do marketing for the affordable units; found buyers, ran a lottery
- Administrative Agent also helped to write the manual for the Market to Affordable Program – huge team effort
- Lots to do to implement in terms of compliance
- Went to court August 23 for Fairness Hearing
- Judge agreed plan was good and fair
- Underserved class people in need of affordable housing
- Evesham has until sometime in January to get all compliance underway
- Have to adopt Ordinance implemented and introduction to Council
- Have to adopt Spending Plan
- Tons of documentation and organization needs to be in place for proof to court

Board Comment:

- Mr. Zeuli commented on the many hours that went into the presentation by Leah, our Solicitor and the current council
- There is not another group in another state that went through the group like Leah and her group did; the Plan is realistic, obtainable, reasonable and fair
- Started with 1600 units which was unrealistic, unobtainable or not fair
- Many negotiations to figure out; gathered facts and more research for over 2 years to get to here
- Kudos to Leah for the work that she has done for a Plan that will actually come to fruition
- What is the difference between rental housing and family units?
- Leah said that rental is an umbrella and family rental is under it – no restrictions; number of bedrooms required
- Family Unit means available to families (whether rental or for sale) not otherwise restricted
- Mr. DiEnna stated that we would be remiss if we didn't recognize that Leah put this together with the possibility that we would have to comply to an unknown number and complimented her ability to play "three dimensional chess"
- The Affordable Housing Sites MAP shows color depicted units as such:
 - Green line is Pinelands area
 - One little red dot in Pinelands
 - Yellow sites are 100% Affordable Housing Sites
 - Red are group homes or single affordable unit by itself
 - Purple are inclusionary areas

- All North of Pinelands boundary
- Board Attorney commented that so much planning has gone into this obligation and Leah's foresight was invaluable so that all applications before both Boards provided for the numbers and Evesham will be able to comply
- Board Attorney very proud to be associated with our town and Board as Evesham is lightyears ahead of most municipalities with respect to compliance and with respect to creating a reasonable, obtainable plan; commend Leah and the Board

Public Comment:

No Public Comment

Board Attorney Overview:

- Presentation of Third Round Element of the Master Plan
- This is one of the pieces of the Master Plan puzzle which is completely within the Planning Boards purviews
- The Board adopts and Council takes action after that with a Resolution
- Need a motion to adopt if so inclined the Third Round Housing Element and Fair Share Plan

Motion to Adopt

Motion: DiEnna

Second: Zeuli

Ayes: DiEnna, Zeuli, Mond, McGoey, Foster, Maratea, Cortland

Motion on Resolution:

Motion: Mond

Second: McGoey

Ayes: DiEnna, Zeuli, Mond, McGoey, Foster, Maratea, Cortland

Resolution:

PB16-12

Motion: McGoey

Second: Mond

Ayes: DiEnna, Mond, McGoey

PB17-04 Site Plan

Motion: DiEnna

Second: McGoey

Ayes: DiEnna, McGoey

PB17-04

Motion: DiEnna

Second: McGoey

Ayes: DiEnna, McGoey

Communications/Organization:

- Next meeting: November 26, 2018

Meeting adjourned at 9:22pm