



Community Planning
Landscape Architecture
Municipal Consulting
Streetscape Design
Economic Development
Parks and Recreation

Celebrating
25 **2001**
2026
Years in Business

Taylor Design Group, Inc.
131 Hartford Road
Mount Laurel, NJ 08054

T. 856.810.3443
W. TDGplanning.com

Michelle M. Taylor, AICP, PP
Scott D. Taylor, AICP, PP, LLA, LEED AP

Steven F. Lennon, LLA, PP
Holly M. Pasqua, Business Manager

Elaine A. Mills, LLA, ISA Cert. Arborist, LEED AP
Brandon Guy, LLA
Samuel Opal, AICP, PP

March 31, 2026

Planning Board
Township of Evesham
984 Tuckerton Road
Marlton, NJ 08053

**Re: Galleria II–Marlton ID: P26-04
Block 36, Lot 4.11
500 Route 73 South
Township of Evesham, Burlington County, New Jersey
Preliminary and Final Site Plan with variances and waivers
TDG Project No. 2019-109.70P, Planning Letter #1**

Dear Chair and Board Members:

Our office has received and reviewed the following submission items:

- **Land Development Application**, submitted by prepared by Cheryl Lynn Walters, Esq., on behalf of CP New Providence, LLC, dated January 16, 2026.
- **Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan**, prepared by Menlo Engineering Associates, consisting of 14 sheets, dated March 26, 2025, last revised January 13, 2026.
- **Minor Subdivision Plan**, prepared by Menlo Engineering Associates, Inc., consisting of 1 sheet, dated September 7, 2022.
- **Plan of Survey**, prepared by Control Layouts, Inc., consisting of 1 sheet, dated September 15, 2014, last revised August 29, 2022.
- **Architectural Renderings**, prepared by Albert Taus & Associates, Architects, consisting of 2 sheets, dated October 17, 2024.
- **Resolution No. 2022-PB-13**, Evesham Township Planning Board in the Matter of Evesham Township Raritan Realty Partners, LLC., Application No. P22-05, Decided on August 4, 2022, Memorialized on September 1, 2022, Minor Subdivision Approval with Ancillary Variance Relief.

At this time, we offer the following comments:

A. Site & Proposal

1. The 4.39 acre (191,329 SF) property is located along the southbound frontage of NJSH Route 73 south between Sunbird Drive to the north and Dutch Road to the south, within the Commercial-1 (C-1) Zoning District.
2. The subject tract contains a vacant 5,969 SF restaurant building, a vacant pad site, and typical site improvements including landscaping, lighting, and stormwater management. The site shares access, parking spaces, landscaping, lighting, stormwater, and other improvements with the adjacent parcel to the north, which contains a restaurant. The site also shares access with the site to the south.
3. The surrounding area contains the following:
 - a. North there is the commercial restaurant use, within the C-1 District.
 - b. East across Route 73, there are institutional uses and vacant residential uses within the LD, Low Density district.

- c. South across shared and connecting driveways, there are commercial retail and service uses within the C-1 District.
- d. West within Voorhees Township there are residential uses within the RR Rural Residential District.

See image below courtesy of Google Earth Pro © 2026.



- 4. The Applicant seeks preliminary and final site plan approval, with variances and waivers to permit the following three unit, multi-tenanted building on the site:
 - a. Unit 1: 4,061 SF footprint and 2,017 SF mezzanine;
 - b. Unit 2: 3,991 SF footprint and 1,969 SF mezzanine; and
 - c. Unit 3: 4,061 SF footprint and 1,979 SF mezzanine.
- 5. Some minimal changes to the site directly around the proposed structure are also proposed including reconfiguration of parking, loading, trash, stormwater, and sidewalk. The existing buffer between the site and the residences to the west is proposed to be removed and a larger stormwater basin added. Landscaping and building mounted lighting are proposed.
- 6. A monument sign is proposed at the edge of the existing pond, at the southeast corner of the site. The supporting structure is 13 feet high by 10 feet wide and there is a 48 SF sign cabinet of 6 feet high by 8 feet wide affixed to the supporting structure. A letter "G" of approximately 3 feet by 3 feet is also affixed to the supporting structure.
- 7. Templates of four (4) available wall sign types that are all 80 SF or less are also proposed. The templates signs provided vary in shape ranging from 18 feet long by 4.5 feet high to 29 feet long by 2.75 feet high. Each of the three (3) tenants are proposed to have one façade sign located on the façade facing Route 73. (See Architectural elevations)

B. Ordinance & Zoning

- 1. Variances are required from the following area and dimensional regulations:
 - a. 40 feet screening buffer width between C-1 and residential, 24 feet provided at narrowest point, 12 feet proposed along western property line between

enlarged/new basin and residential. (See §160 Attachment 1: Table 1 Screening Buffer Widths)

- b. 15 feet stormwater buffer width, 10.5 feet at parking lot and 12 feet along western property line.
- c. Plant materials per 100 feet of buffer length, two (2) shade trees, two (2) evergreen trees, plus 20 shrubs is not provided. Two evergreen trees are not provided per 100 feet; and the treatment is not appropriate for the intended buffering. (See §160-17.D(1)(c))
- d. No structure, activity, storage of materials or parking of vehicles shall be permitted within a buffer area. Stormwater controls are an activity. (See §160-17.C(2))
- e. 10 feet wide by 35 feet long loading space required, 14 feet by 33 feet provided. (See 160-32.D(4))

2. The C-1 District area and dimensional regulations are provided below:

Requirements	Standard	Existing	Proposed
Lot Area (Min.)	2-4.99 ac	4.39 ac	4.39 ac
Lot Width (Min.)	200'	367.64'	367.64'
Lot Frontage (Min.)	200'	367.64'	367.64'
Lot Depth (Min.)	200'	520.42'	520.42'
Front Yard Setback (Min.)	100'	305.3	298.7'
Side Yard Setback North (Min.)	30'	12.8' (E)	12.8' (E)
Side Yard Setback South (Min.)	30'	>150'	65.1'
Rear Yard Setback (Min.)	50'	138.2'	100.2'
Separation from Another Freestanding Bldg. (Min.)	20'	25'	76.8'
Building Height (Max.)	40'	35'	35'
Base Floor Area Ratio (Max.)	0.22	0.03	0.13
Building Coverage (Max.)	15%	3%	10%
Impervious Surface Coverage (Max.)	55%	46%	54%
Clearing Limit Ratio (Max.)	75%	-	17%
Gross Leasable Floor Area (Min.)	10,000 SF	5,969 SF (E)	18,082 SF
Floor Area Ratio (Min.)	0.22	0.03	0.13
Parking Front Yard (Min.)	100'	38.9' (E)	38.9' (E)
Parking Setback from Front Property Line (Min.)	100'	38.9' (E)	38.9' (E)
Parking Setback from Side Property Line North (Min.)	15'	0' (E)	0' (E)
Parking Setback from Side Property Line South (Min.)	15'	45'	45'
Parking Setback from Rear Property Line	15'	25.5'	25.5'
Buffer Adjacent to Residential (Min.)	40'	24' (E)	12' (V)
Perimeter Buffer Stormwater (Min.)	15'	>15'	10.5' & 12'
(V) Variance Required (E) Existing Non-conforming Condition			

3. The signage requirements are characterized on the site plan table. However, it appears that waivers [sic] (actually would be variances) are not required. Three (3) tenant spaces and three (3) tenant signs; and one (1) freestanding sign are permitted, as proposed. (See Architectural elevations)



C. Planning Comments

1. Testimony should be provided that demonstrates that the criteria pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70.c(2) can be satisfied. Under the “c(2)” criteria it is the burden of the applicant to prove:
 - a. The request relates to a specific piece of property;
 - b. A purpose of Zoning put forth in the Municipal Land Use Law would be advanced by a deviation from the requirements of the ordinance;
 - c. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good;
 - d. The benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment; and
 - e. The variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance.
2. Testimony should be provided regarding the need to remove all the well-established buffer material between the building and the residential neighborhood to the west to install an infiltration basin. Variances are required to permit the following:
 - a. Entire buffer to be approximately 12 feet wide where 40 feet is required;
 - b. Stormwater buffer width to be 10.5 to 12 feet wide where 15 feet is required;
 - c. A basin to be located within the required buffer width of 40 feet; and
 - d. No evergreen trees and limited evergreen shrubs are provided within the buffer between the stormwater basin and the residential properties.
3. §160-17.B(1)(a) requires screening buffers between incompatible uses, and 80% screening is required within 5 years, per §160-17.D(2). The existing 8-foot high wooden picket fence along the property line is in terrible disrepair and should be replaced with a new fence. A fence provided along the residential boundary, is consistent with §160-17.C(1).
 - e. Per §160-22.C(2) fences are not permitted to exceed six (6) feet in height. If the fence is removed and replaced, a new variance may be appropriate. We defer to the Board Attorney.
 - f. Additional fencing and screening shrubs, such as Inkberry Holly, should be required to fill gaps in the existing buffer plantings proposed to remain to the north and south of the basin renovation.
4. Evergreen trees should be incorporated into the undersized buffer between the basin and the residential properties to the west.
5. See additional landscape comments in “F. Landscape” below.
6. Testimony should be provided regarding the number of façade or wall signs that are proposed. The architectural plans illustrate that each tenant provides one (1) wall sign, which is permitted. If a variance is sought to provide more than one (1) sign per business, then testimony should be provided; and the architectural plans amended.

D. General Comments

1. The Applicant should provide testimony regarding building use and operation for all buildings and tenants, hours of operation for the public and for employees, the number of employees, and all site improvements. This should include anticipated or potential tenants.
2. Detailed testimony should be provided regarding the timing, route of travel, and frequency of deliveries and refuse pickups, and truck parking.
3. Given the proximity to adjacent residential uses, trash pickup and deliveries should be limited to daytime hours only to minimize impacts to nearby residents, such as 7 AM to 7 PM.



4. A prior plan indicated that the striped area located at the rear on the residential side of the parking lot was a loading zone. The area is not currently labelled. Testimony should be provided regarding the function of the striped asphalt in this location. If it is required for truck circulation, then turning templates should be provided.

If the striped asphalt area is not required, then the asphalt should be removed, the area scarified, 6-inches of topsoil added, and plant materials should be added to increase the residential buffer.

5. One (1) trash enclosure, finished with brick, is provided for the three (3) tenants. Trash containers are not permitted to be located on the site without an enclosure. The open, painted asphalt areas on the southwest corner offers an opportunity for random placement of unenclosed containers, which would negatively impact the site and the residential properties to the west. Testimony should be provided, as the one (1) enclosure does not seem sufficient to service the three (3) tenants' trash and recycling requirements. See image of the rear of the Galleria Design Center to the south with a number of exposed trash containers courtesy Google Street View © 2026.



6. No detail of the trash enclosure gates was provided. Trash enclosure gates should be constructed of a metal frame for durability, with a vinyl-fence panel or similar, in warm, muted colors to complement the building.
7. Stairs are proposed on the sidewalk near the southeast corner of the building. A railing detail should be provided consistent with the New Jersey Barrier Free Subcode requirements.
8. The location and screening of any proposed ground mounted mechanical equipment/ utilities should be provided. Testimony should be provided.

E. Building Comments

1. Testimony should be provided and the architectural plans should be revised to clearly indicate the proposed façade treatment materials and colors.
2. The architecture elevations appear to propose unfinished concrete block for the rear façade. As this façade will be visible from the residences to the rear, the rear façade should receive similar treatment to that proposed for the front and sides, which is brick. It should be noted that the rear facades and trash enclosures of the adjacent pad sites have full finish treatments that match the front facades.
3. The location and screening of any proposed roof mounted mechanical equipment should be provided. Testimony should be provided.

F. Landscape

1. Per §160-17.D(5) the basin spillway 'reno mattress structure' should be screened from the residences to the west and the circulation and parking areas of the site. Based upon its location and size, this may prove difficult. Testimony should be provided
2. Per §160-17.D(6) the trash enclosure should be screened to the extent possible.

3. Tree Removal and Replacement establishes that Planning/Zoning Board applications are subject to §62-56, per §144-3.A.(2). The Tree Replacements Requirements Table at §144-3.B.(8) does not apply. All references to §144 should be removed from the plan.

4. §62-56.E and §62-56.G require tree replacements only for trees disturbed within the “tree protection zone”, as defined at §62-56.E(3). The trees that are proposed to be removed are either within the improvement area or less than 10 feet from that area.

The applicant is permitted to remove trees, without replacement, within a defined building envelope measured from the approved improvements. All trees 24” or greater in diameter being removed must be replaced, however there are none.

The plans indicate that eight (8) replacement shade trees are proposed. As replacements are not required for the application due to the limitations of the tree protection zone, the 8 shade trees should be replaced with evergreen trees planted along the rear property line to reinforce the required screening, and some of the shrubs proposed along the property line should be shifted to the front of the basin.

5. The applicant should provide a revised Tree Replacement (and buffer) plan showing the proposed improvements (buildings, pavement, utilities, stormwater basin berms, etc.) with the “tree protection zone” offsets indicated, per §62-56.E(3). A revised chart should be provided.
6. It should be noted that the Thuja plicata ‘green giant’, Green Giant arborvitae is not native, which is inconsistent with the provided ‘screening buffer & landscape requirements’ tables, which states that ‘all’ materials are native. This statement should be modified.
7. 6 Arborvitae trees are proposed to be planted under or too near shade trees for the evergreen trees to achieve their desired size, health, or screening capacity. The locations should be adjusted to achieve maximum screening.
8. Tree protection fencing should be shown on the demolition, site, and grading plans at the limit of grading/clearing adjacent to all vegetation to remain. Tree protection should be provided for the existing trees surrounding the development in the parking lot islands.

All existing trees, parking island trees, and groups of vegetation should be shown on the existing conditions plan, and those to remain should be shown on the site plan.

9. The existing vegetation proposed to remain along the south side of the building should be addressed as follows:
 - a. The entire hedgerow, including the stand of trees at the west end, are within the PSE&G overhead utility easement. Trees that will grow taller than 30 feet should be eliminated.
 - b. The mix of existing vegetation should be edited to remove all dead/damaged plants and invasive species, including honeysuckle, euonymus, and privet shrubs. The remaining shrubs should be pruned for health and to be contained within the curb line. All trash is to be removed and bed edges should be established for a clean appearance. Bedlines should be shown.
10. The plans propose ‘Grow Low’ Sumac at the monument sign. A more diverse planting with year-round interest should be provided for this prominent area.
11. A curb cut is proposed for basin access. The access route should be shown on the plan. If a stabilized surface is proposed, it should be noted and a detail should be provided. This may negatively impact the landscape plan.



12. Two Sourgum trees are proposed to be planted along the edge of the pond. Due to the steepness of the bank in this area and adjacent overhead wires, we suggest a smaller species, such as Redbud, be planted slightly to the south where the ground more level and underground utility locations permit.
13. Some proposed tree locations appear to conflict with the existing lighting to remain. The locations of the light fixtures should be provided on the landscape plan.

G. Lighting

1. The applicant proposes 3,500 and 4,000° Kelvin LED Correlated Color Temperature (CCT) lights, which emit a cooler, more bluish light, similar to that used for car dealerships and athletic fields. The LED lights be less than 3,200° Kelvin to reduce potential glare impacts.
2. In particular, the LED lights on the rear of the center are specified at 4,000° Kelvin and mounted at 15 feet high. The Board and the applicant discuss the hours that the lights will operate and consider a potential reduction overnight to security levels and/or the utilization of timers and/or motion sensors to activate the lights only when necessary after hours.
3. The lighting reduction after hours should be clearly specified, such as all lights off after closing with motion activation, or all lights reduced to 25% dimming with motion activation, etc. Notes should be added to the plan.
4. The existing freestanding light located at the southwest corner of the parking and loading area should have a house side shield to reduce the light spill onto neighboring residential properties.
5. The wall mounted lights are 27 inches in height. These lights are utilized on other centers in Evesham and cause glare because the light source is visible. The Board and the Applicant should discuss the treatment. Testimony should be provided.
6. An existing light pole along the south perimeter drive is proposed to be removed but is not proposed to be replaced. The photometrics for this area do not account for the shadow that will be cast by the vegetation to be preserved which will intercept the light from the building-mounted lights. This should be addressed.

If you have any questions or require additional information regarding this application, please do not hesitate to contact our office.

Very truly yours,
Taylor Design Group, Inc.



Michelle Taylor, PP, AICP
President

Ec: Kevin Rijs, PP, AICP, Director of Community Development
Jennifer Newton, Administrative Officer/ Board Secretary
Louis I. Karp, Esq., Board Attorney
Rakesh Darji, PE, PP, CME, Board Engineer
Stacey Arcari, PE, PP, PTOE, Board Traffic Engineer
Eric Snee, LSRP, Board Environmental Scientist
CP New Providence, LLC/Irv Cyzner, Applicant's Representative, Irv@cyznerproperties.com,
Rich@cyznerproperties.com
Cheryl Lynn Walters, Esq., Applicant's Attorney, cwalters@ndglegal.com
Albert A. Taus, AIA, RA, NCARB, Applicant's Architect, albert@atausarchitects.com
William A. Lane, PE, Applicant's Engineer, blane@menloeng.com

