



State of New Jersey

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS
STATE PLANNING COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SMART GROWTH

PO Box 204
TRENTON NJ 08625-0204

JON S. CORZINE
Governor

CHARLES A. RICHMAN
Commissioner

BENJAMIN L. SPINELLI
Executive Director & Secretary

**Camden County Cross-acceptance III Public Hearing
New Jersey State Planning Commission
Minutes of the Meeting Held September 18, 2007
Camden County Department of Public Works
Charles J. Depalma Complex
2311 Egg Harbor Road
Lindenwold, New Jersey 08021**

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Benjamin Spinelli, Executive Director in the Office of Smart Growth (OSG), called the September 18th 2007 meeting of the New Jersey State Planning Commission to order at 6:15 p.m. Mr. Spinelli proceeded to introduce the State Planning Commission (SPC) members in attendance. Susan Weber, State Agency Representative attended on behalf of the SPC. Mr. Spinelli then introduced Camden County Planning Department staff in attendance. Edward Fox, Planning Director for the Camden County Improvement Authority (CCIA) attended on behalf of the Camden County Planning staff. Mr. Spinelli then introduced staff attending on behalf of the Office of Smart Growth (OSG) and OSG's State Agency partners. The following people were in attendance on behalf of OSG: Kate Meade, Planner and Lorissa Whitaker, Principal Planner. The following people were in attendance on behalf of OSG's State Agency partners: Susan Weber, New Jersey Department of Transportation.

OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT

Mr. Spinelli announced that notice of the date, time and place of the meeting had been given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Spinelli asked everyone to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

OVERVIEW OF CAMDEN COUNTY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE & THE STATE PLAN

Mr. Spinelli provided an overview of the third round of the Cross-acceptance process. Mr. Spinelli stated that Camden County was the twenty second county to conduct a public hearing for the third round of the Cross-acceptance process. This dialogue included a breakdown of the

issues that were discussed at the internal, interagency and staff-to-staff meetings, as it related to Camden County. Mr. Spinelli also discussed the revisions to the State Development & Redevelopment Plan (State Plan). Mr. Spinelli stressed the importance of the policies and goals of the State Plan. The recent Plan Endorsement revisions were also discussed.

Mr. Spinelli also discussed issues specific to Camden County. The following issues were discussed: Route 42/Camden County College Area, the identification of existing preserved plans and appropriately locating COAH projects.

CAMDEN COUNTY CROSS-ACCEPTANCE REPORT PRESENTATION

Ed Fox, Planning Director for the Camden County Improvement Authority began the Camden County Cross-acceptance Report Presentation by stating that Camden County has been incredibly active in all three Cross-acceptance rounds. He also mentioned that Camden County was probably the most irascible county when it came to mapping issues. DEP identified areas for preservation that CCIA had previously identified for development. Compromises were made to ensure lands containing environmental features were adequately preserved. Camden's Cross Acceptance report suggests that the State Plan provide policy regarding racial integration and homeland security. Camden disagrees with the projections in the state plan. Projections provided show only trend. It will be difficult to attract development in Camden County, if trend projections show decline. DVRPC is working to develop projections based on the state plan scenario. Mapping issues were plentiful in Camden County, but these issues were worked out. Ed stated that he is very happy with the negotiations and sees no reason that future negotiations will go well.

Mr. Spinelli then opened the hearing to the public.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Commenter 1: Mr. Lipton, a land use lawyer who owns property in Ocean County, commented that every property owner should be noticed if the planning area they are in is being changed. Mr. Lipton addressed Mr. Fox and asked if mapping changes were resolved with the state. Mr. Fox replied that there are two kinds of mapping problems; technical problems that can be easily corrected with updated data, and areas where compromises must be made. Mr. Lipton asked for an example of compromises. Mr. Fox provided the following example: In many cases, DEP marked areas of environmental interest that are over one square mile as Planning Area 5. Many of these areas had previously been targeted for growth. These areas were reexamined to determine the most appropriate planning area. Mr. Spinelli commented that the bulk of county cross acceptance meetings had to do with policy. Local Municipalities can zone how they like, without referencing the State Plan. Mr. Fox commented that, in 2001, the CCIA did not recognize CES or HCS. Now there is more computerized data available, which has made the process easier. Mr. Lipton went on to say that he feels the Cross-Acceptance process was inefficient. He would like all maps to be block and lot specific. He also noted that there were thousands of landowners who should be notified of planning area changes. He stated that most people do not understand the process; nor do the planning boards or the municipal councils. Mr. Lipton also indicated that he would like to see all the information that was used to determine planning areas.

Commenter 2: Mr. Brett Ingram of Adams, Rehmann and Haddan asked about a planning area designation in Winslow Township. The designation says that the area is "Planning Area 2, Un-

sewered.” Mr. Spinelli replied that the OSG the county provided information confirming the whether the area was sewerred or unsewerred.

Commenter 3: Mr. Henry Gorenstein agreed with Mr. Lipton (commenter 1) that every property owner should be noticed. Mr. Fox replied that there are over 200,000 lots in Camden County. Mr. Gorenstein said that there are 200,000 property owners should be noticed. Mr. Gorenstein went on to state that he does not understand the map. He asked for clarification regarding Critical Environmental Sites (CESSs). Mr. Spinelli explained that CES's are not planning areas, but an indication that an environmentally sensitive exists in that area. Mr. Spinelli went on to repeat that the map has no regulatory authority. Mr. Gorenstein asked if he could find out what planning area his property was in, to which Mr. Fox indicated that he would assist Mr. Gorenstein.

Mr. Spinelli then asked if there was anyone else who wished to comment at this time.

STATE PLANNING COMMISSION (SPC) COMMENTS

The SPC members in attendance did not provide any comments.

ADJOURN

Mr. Spinelli adjourned the hearing at 7:00 p.m.