2009 Borough of Haddonfield Master Plan Reexamination Report

Introduction:

The Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1 et. seq., (hereinafter, the “MLUL”) requires the planning board of each municipality to conduct a general reexamination of its Master Plan and Development Regulations not less than every six (6) years. (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89). The planning board of each municipality is also required to prepare and adopt, by resolution, a report on its findings during the reexamination process. (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89). The planning board of each municipality is further required to provide a copy of that report to the County Planning Board and the Municipal Clerk of each adjoining municipality. (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89). The most recent Master Plan of the Borough of Haddonfield (hereinafter, "Master Plan") was adopted by the Planning Board of the Borough of Haddonfield (hereinafter, “Planning Board”) by resolution on March 11, 1984. The most recent general Reexamination Report of the Borough of Haddonfield’s Master Plan was adopted by the Planning Board by resolution dated October 7, 2003.

Required Elements of a Master Plan Reexamination Report:

The MLUL requires that all reexamination reports address the following items: (a) the major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last reexamination report; (b) the extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date; (c) the extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies, and objectives forming the basis for the master plan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density and distribution of population and land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of natural resources, energy conservation, collection, disposition, and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in State, county, and municipal policies and objectives; (d) the specific changes recommended for the master plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared; and (e) the recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment plans adopted pursuant to
the "Local Redevelopment and Housing Law" into the land use plan element of
the municipal master plan, and recommended changes, if any, in the local
development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the
municipality.

2003 Master Plan Reexamination Report:

The last Master Plan Reexamination Report (attached hereto as Appendix
1) was adopted by the Planning Board on October 7, 2003. At the time the
Borough of Haddonfield (hereinafter, "Haddonfield") was, as it is now, an almost
completely "built-out" community with virtually no vacant, developable land
available. The most significant land use issues within Haddonfield included the
significant loss of open space; the need to preserve existing open space; the
need to make the existing open space and public facilities more accessible to the
public; the development of properties in a manner inconsistent with existing
neighborhoods; the need for senior-citizen housing; and the need to improve the
safety of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

The 2003 Master Plan Reexamination Report listed the following
objectives: (1) maintenance of the visual attractiveness of Haddonfield; (2) the
preservation of Haddonfield's historic character; (3) the encouragement of single-
family residential uses; (4) a study of the desirability and practicality of expanding
the existing Historic District; (5) the development of a pedestrian and bicycle trail
along the Cooper River from Crows Woods to Evans Ponds subject to a study of
the potential environmental impact thereof; and (6) the maintenance and
improvement, as required, of public facilities including, but not necessarily limited
to, Borough Hall and the Public Library. The Borough should pursue the
following new objectives: (7) a study of the appropriateness of permitting new
twin homes as a conditional use; (8) a study of the appropriateness of adopting
day-light plane restrictions for new homes; (9) revision of the existing, and
adoption of new, business regulations designed to improve the efficiency, speed,
and flexibility of the current approval process for signage, merchandise displays,
and sidewalk restaurants and to improve overall user-accessibility; (10) a study
of the business district of the same scope as was conducted in the residential
areas of Haddonfield; (11) completion of the Long-Range Planning Committee's
review of the Conditional Use Amendments recommended in Ms. McKenzie's
Report; (12) further participation in the completion of the Haddon Avenue/PATCO
Hi-Speedline Corridor Study; (13) a study of the advantages and disadvantages
of obtaining Transit-Village Designation; (14) adoption of a Property Maintenance
Ordinance; (15) adoption of a Drainage/Stormwater Management Ordinance;
and, (16) prior to the adoption of the next Master Plan Reexamination Report, the
Borough should consider adoption of a new Master Plan in light of the fact that
the existing Master Plan is nearly twenty (20) years old.
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Borough Action Taken Pursuant to the 2003 Master Plan Reexamination Report:

Haddonfield has undertaken aggressive actions toward satisfaction of many of the objectives presented in the 2003 Master Plan Reexamination Report. The Planning Board has adopted a number of important documents and reports, including:

- Stormwater Management Plan (2005)
- Open Space Plan and amendment thereto (2005 & 2008)
- Downtown Area Master Plan (2007)
- Housing Element and Fair Share Plan (2008)

The response to the specific objectives and recommendations of the 2003 Reexamination Report is detailed below.

With respect to suggestion # 1: "....the maintenance of the visual attractiveness of Haddonfield;"

In 2007, the Planning Board reviewed and considered a proposed Amendment to the previously adopted Haddonfield Master Plan, known as the Downtown Area Element, also known as the Downtown Vision Plan. The amendment was prepared by Brown & Keener Bressi, Urban Design and Place Planners, Philadelphia, PA. The Planning board concluded that the Amendment represented an appropriate guide to future development of the downtown area in a manner which protects public health and safety and promotes the general welfare. Accordingly, the amendment was adopted on June 5, 2007. The Form-based zoning recommended by the Downtown Area Master Plan was intended to preserve the visual appeal of an historic retail area generally regarded as one of the most attractive in South Jersey. An ordinance implementing the Downtown Vision Plan was adopted May 19, 2008.

Additionally, the Borough amended its tree ordinance June 27, 2008 in order to better ensure appropriate maintenance and placement of those trees most critical to the town's visual attractiveness.

With respect to suggestion # 2: "...the preservation of Haddonfield's historic character;"

A program was begun in 2006 to send a letter to all residents within Haddonfield's Historic District from the Chairman of the Historic Preservation Commission to remind these residents that it is incumbent upon them to maintain the standards established for the district in order to preserve its distinct character. These letters are now sent annually.
With respect to suggestion # 3: “...the encouragement of single-family residential uses;”

The Planning Board maintains that Haddonfield’s ordinances and its actions fully support the continued dominance of single-family residences in the Borough.

With respect to suggestion # 4: “...a study of the desirability and practicality of expanding the Historic District;”

This is a topic which has been raised repeatedly over the years however no formal action has been undertaken to date.

With respect to suggestion # 5: “...the development of a pedestrian and bicycle trail along the Cooper River from Crows Woods to Evans Ponds subject to a study of the potential environmental impact thereof;”

A Parks, Recreation and Open Space element was added to the Master Plan in the spring of 2005. It encompassed both the Borough and the School District owned land and facilities (school district property is not typically included), as well as county parks along the Cooper River. Subsequently, the 2008 Open Space and Recreation Plan (OSRP) was developed to identify specific parcels that, were they ever to be placed for sale, would address the recommendations of the 2005 Master Plan element. The OSRP provides for linkages and pedestrian access and seeks to promote conservation of open space and historic sites. It proposed the creation of a “Haddonfield Greenway” to link open spaces with historic sites, including the dinosaur discovery site, historic homes and playing fields.

With respect to suggestion # 6:”...the maintenance and improvement, as required, of public facilities including, but not necessarily limited to, Borough Hall and the Public Library."

With the adoption of a referendum on November 4, 2008 requiring the borough to secure public approval before incurring expenses in support of the Public Library, any actions deemed appropriate must be first approved by the residents of the Borough. The Planning Board has no doubt that the Public Library’s future is one which will receive much attention over the next few years as concepts are formulated to address its many issues and challenges.

Borough Hall has received considerable maintenance attention in the last two years and its interior has been improved remarkably. Certain areas of the roof have also been addressed.
Several other projects have been undertaken and completed: the improvement of the Mountwell Playground, the installation of lights at the Little League field and soccer fields, a storage/maintenance structure at the football field, and a new pavilion in Crows’ Woods. Also new handicapped accessible restrooms were constructed at the Centennial Tennis Courts. The Haddonfield tennis teams are consistently among the best in the State. An elevator addition and handicapped accessible restrooms were constructed at the Mabel Kay Senior Center on Walnut Street, making the entire facility accessible to and useable by all. Also a new storage facility was added at the Centennial Field for the midget football program.

Most importantly, there was a major undertaking to improve King’s Court, resulting in an inviting and useful plaza suitable for events, gatherings and now serving as an important landmark for the Downtown District.

With respect to suggestion #7: "...a study of the appropriateness of permitting new twin-homes as a conditional use;"

Twin homes are currently not permitted outside of the Downtown District. There are a few residential streets or areas where twin homes predominate. Pursuant to a zoning amendment in 2002, existing twin homes may be reconstructed without a variance if they are destroyed by fire or other accident. The 1984 Master Plan and all ensuing planning documents and relevant new elements have emphasized the importance of maintaining Haddonfield’s single-family residential character, and the Board continues to support this goal. Nonetheless, allowing twin homes (which tend to be more affordable than single family dwellings) as either a permitted use or as a conditional use may be desirable in those neighborhoods that already contain twin homes.

With respect to suggestion #8: "...a study of the appropriateness of adopting day-light plane restrictions for new homes;"

The Planning Board has recognized that there have been times when our current property line restrictions and setbacks have not always adequately addressed a potential situation wherein a new home has interfered with an existing home’s access to light. This is not typically the case, however, and most new construction, when following our ordinances, do not pose a problem.

With respect to suggestion #9: "...revision of the existing, and adoption of new, business regulations designed to improve the efficiency, speed, and flexibility of the current approval process for signage, merchandise displays, and sidewalk restaurants and to improve overall user-accessibility;"
Much progress has been made on these suggestions since the last Reexamination Report. Previously, the Planning Board needed to approve all submissions for signage, merchandise displays and restaurants' outdoor seating. Signage is now reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission; if approved, the applicant's submission is satisfied. This has eliminated at least two weeks' time in the process. Additionally, merchandise displays and restaurants' outdoor seating now is reviewed by the Community Development Office, with subsequent review and approval from the Commissioners. Again, this change in the process has yielded considerable time savings for the applicants. These reviews take place annually, and so the approval process must repeat, ensuring that applicants/businesses do not abuse their approvals.

With respect to suggestion # 10: ...."a study of the business district of the same scope as was conducted in the residential areas of Haddonfield;"

The Downtown Area Element, also known as the Downtown Vision Plan, was incorporated into Haddonfield's Master Plan, representing an appropriate guide to future development of the downtown area in a manner which: a) maintains and enhances the liveliness, activity and success of the area; b) conserves and enhances the features of the downtown's core; c) identifies other parts of the Downtown area where infill residential and office development may be appropriate; d) establishes development regulations and design guidelines; e) recognizes that the patterns of architecture, building form and street design vary throughout the Downtown area, requiring different guidance from one area to another; f) provides for circulation improvements and parking policies that support enhanced walkability, making bicycling more practicable; and making parking more "user friendly". Additionally, ordinances to implement the Downtown element were adopted, allowing the Borough to better manage the area and continue to maximize its potential for the town.

With respect to suggestion # 11: ...."completion of the Long-Range Planning Committee's review of the Conditional use Amendments recommended in Ms. McKenzie's Report;"

The McKenzie Report has not received any further review.

With respect to suggestion # 12: ...."further participation in the completion of the Haddon Avenue/PATCO Hi-speedline Corridor Study;"

Haddonfield participated in reviewing PATCO's plans and provided input as required and appropriate. Haddonfield's Downtown Element and new zoning ordinances articulate guidelines for the PATCO parking lots, should they ever be subject to development.
With respect to suggestion # 13:..." a study of the advantages and disadvantages of obtaining Transit-Village Designation;"

Given changes in the economic climate, nationally, state-wide and in Haddonfield and its neighbors, it has not been appropriate to conduct a study as recommended. As discussed, the considerable work that has been done regarding our Downtown District has directed the Planning Board's interests to be more concentrated on the north side of the PATCO Hi-Speedline and a transit-village designation has not presented itself as an important objective. Nonetheless, a transit village designation should be considered if an opportunity presents itself and if such designation offers significant planning or financial benefits to the Borough and its residents.

With respect to suggestion # 14: ..." adoption of a Property Maintenance Ordinance;"

A Property Maintenance Ordinance was drafted, and read before two public hearings. It was subsequently passed and signed into law effective September 25, 2007 by the Commissioners. The ordinance specifies that, upon complaint from a resident, the Borough will attempt to contact the property's owner and provide the owner with timeframes during which the owner is expected to repair or maintain the property to meet the established criteria. Penalties may be imposed if the property owner does not comply.

With respect to suggestion # 15: ..." adoption of a Drainage/Stormwater Management Ordinance;"

In 2005, a proposed municipal stormwater management plan was read before two public hearings. It was subsequently passed and signed into law effective October 11, 2005 by the Commissioners.

With respect to suggestion # 16:....."prior to the adoption of the next Master Plan Reexamination Report the Borough should consider adopting a new Master Plan in light of the fact that the existing Master Plan is nearly twenty (20) years old."

While the Planning Board recognizes the age of the Master Plan, it maintains that there is no pressing need for a new Master Plan. Changes in the Borough have been minimal and Haddonfield's character and complexion remain fairly stable. The 1984 Master Plan, as supplemented by numerous additional elements and other planning documents, remains a valid and useful document in
managing Haddonfield’s future. However, preparation of a new Master Plan would be desirable if it could be accomplished with minimal expense to the Borough.

Transportation

Transportation and traffic within the Borough continue to be based on factors outside of the Borough. While the volume of traffic within the Borough has remained relatively constant, there has been a great deal of effort to reduce the speed of the vehicles on the road and to address pedestrian safety. There has been significant amount of study and action on the areas of traffic and pedestrian safety. There is an annual ‘Drive 25’ campaign and numerous ‘Speed/Volume Data Studies’ and other traffic calming reports. From those studies there have been numerous projects completed in the last six years.

A citizen-based committee (“TAPS” – Traffic & Pedestrian Safety) has been formed and meets regularly in order to identify new opportunities and improve current conditions to better ensure pedestrian safety.

Shoulder striping has occurred in many streets in town including, Grove Street, Coles Mill Road, Chews Landing Road, and Upland Way. Speed humps have been installed on several roads that have been used as a cut through such as Euclid Avenue, Belmont Avenue, and Roberts Avenue. Permanent speed tables and raised intersections have been installed on Maple Avenue and Lincoln Avenue. New sidewalks have been installed in several areas in town with a concentration in areas of the schools in town. Sidewalks have been installed along several blocks in the area of Elizabeth Haddon School.

The 2003 Reexamination Report stated work was currently undertaken on the Maple Avenue Bridge. The work on the Maple Avenue Bridge has been completed and both the ‘speed table’ and two speed bumps have been installed in an effort to slow traffic on Maple Avenue.

Major traffic improvements are proposed for the intersection of Potter Street and Ellis Street. This Project will improve traffic circulation by allowing a left turn from Ellis Street onto Potter Street. The bend in the road will also be lessened. This is part of an effort to calm traffic flow coming from Route # 561 onto Ellis and Potter Streets.

New Jersey State Development & Redevelopment Plan:

According to the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan, the Borough of Haddonfield is in a suburban ring around the City of Camden and is
in the Metropolitan Planning Area, Planning Area 1. This designation is consistent with the existing and foreseeable development within Haddonfield.

**Local Redevelopment and Housing Law:**

Haddonfield has a well-maintained housing stock and a viable business district, and therefore redevelopment is not a viable or desirable option for most of the Borough. However, in 2005 the Planning Board recommended, and thereafter the Borough adopted, a redevelopment designation for the 17.5 acre Bancroft property. Bancroft filed suit which was subsequently dismissed without prejudice with the understanding that the suit could be refiled when and if the Borough adopted a redevelopment plan. The 2008 Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for the construction of an appropriate amount of affordable housing should the Bancroft site redevelop.

It is conceivable that a limited number of other properties could redevelop, such as the PATCO parking lot, the Acme site, the Centennial Square Office Building, and the PNC property on Haddon Avenue. However, it is highly speculative whether redevelopment will occur within the next six years. Should opportunities present themselves, Haddonfield will consider increasing its stock of affordable housing, consistent with the regulations of COAH or any other applicable State Agency.

**Recommendations**

The MLUL requires that the reexamination report address: “The specific changes recommended for the master plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulation should be prepared.” In arriving at its recommendations, the Board found it helpful to consult with the Vacant Land Analysis (attached as Exhibit B) which was prepared in August, 2009 in connection with COAH proceedings. The color map and parcel-by-parcel spreadsheet clearly demonstrate that Haddonfield is a fully developed community that has very little vacant developable land.

The Board recommends only one new element to the master plan: the "Green Buildings and Environmental Sustainability" element described by N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28(b)(16). In addition, in consultation with the Borough Engineer, further consideration should be given as to whether the Circulation Plan element should be updated. The 1984 Master Plan includes a Circulation Element (Section V-D) but it is very brief and requires more detailed review and perhaps revision.

There are a number of land-use related issues that warrant further study during the next six years. These issues fall within five general categories: (1)
Transportation & Circulation; (2) Environment and Renewable Energy; (3) Zoning Regulation; (4) Historic Preservation; and (5) Stormwater Management. A brief analysis of problems and goals follows.

1. Transportation & Circulation

Haddonfield is an eminently walkable community. The Board and Borough Commissioners should continue to review ways to enhance this desirable characteristic, such as by eliminating sidewalk gaps, especially on school routes, and by encouraging more use of bicycles through designated bike routes and paths and through the provision of bike racks in the downtown area.

It has also been suggested that the Borough consider creating a pocket park on Tanner Street, to encourage pedestrian access between the High Speed Line and the Downtown District.

There may be a need for traffic calming measures to control motor vehicle speed on roads in addition to Maple Avenue and Lincoln Avenue. The Borough should consider implementation of the recommendations in the 2004 NJDOT Traffic Calming Study. Further study is required on creating additional barrier free intersections.

Additionally, an educational initiative is recommended, particularly aimed at school age children, to improve their understanding of pedestrian and vehicle right-of-way rules and safety precautions, including the use of helmets while bicycling.

Finally, the ongoing problem of traffic congestion near the Borough’s schools remains a concern. Those high congestion times (the beginning and ending of the school day, and at lunchtime) need the attention of the Borough and its applicable committees (e.g., TAPS), in concert with the School Board, in order to identify solutions to the inherent problems and dangers presented at our schools.

2. Environment & Renewable Energy

In addition to recommending preparation of a green buildings and environmental sustainability element, the Board fully supports the implementation of the Greenways Project and Hadrosaurus Interpretative Trail described in detail in the Open Space and Recreation plan element as adopted in 2005 and amended in 2008. Funding should continue to be sought to bring these projects to fruition.

The Planning Board needs to further study the recommendation of the Haddonfield Shade Tree Commission that the Community Forestry Management Plan guide the Commission’s management of the Borough’s tree resources.
Finally, the Planning Board should seek input from the Environmental Commission on whether the 2008 amendment to the Land Use Code to protect trees ought to be further strengthened in light of the New Jersey Supreme Court’s decision in the Jackson Township case.

3. Zoning Regulation

Too much building coverage and impervious coverage remain a problem in the Borough’s residential areas. Most of the building lots are small and in too many instances the area of the lot occupied by buildings and impervious surfaces reduces light, air and green space. Of particular concern are the homes that are built which replace homes which have been torn down, especially with respect to their structural representation in the existing streetscape.

In addition, further study is needed to determine whether existing ordinances provide adequate modern standards for alternative energy structures and uses, such as solar panels and windmills.

Finally, an unresolved problem that continues to draw the attention of both the Planning Board and the Zoning Board concerns impervious cover requirements. For example, to what extent should these requirements apply to swimming pools and permeable pavers? Do they unnecessarily restrict the construction of detached garages, which are a desirable feature in many of our older residential neighborhoods? A joint committee of the Zoning Board and the Planning Board is currently wrestling with these problems, and it is anticipated that the committee may recommend changes in the Borough’s land use code.

4. Historic Preservation

The Board should consider targeted expansion of the Historic District, preceded by ample notice to all property owners within the proposed expanded district. No change should be recommended without first carefully considering the opinions of impacted property owners. Public sessions and workshops sponsored by the Historic Preservation Commission would be most helpful in educating owners of property slated for inclusion in an expanded Historic District.

The existing Historic Preservation ordinance and its implementation and administration should undergo a detailed review, preferably by a joint committee of the Planning Board and the Historic Preservation Commission with the assistance of a professional with expertise in historic preservation. The ordinance was adopted in 1971 and last amended in 1987, more than 20 years ago. Among the issues that should be considered are the following: (1) should the ordinance have a two-tiered set of standards, one for the existing district and a second, less stringent set for other areas in the Borough?; (2) should existing
historic preservation standards be revised?; (3) should the moratorium on demolishing structures within the district be extended from six months to one year?; (4) do property owners within the Historic District receive adequate notice that they cannot begin construction, renovation or repair projects without first submitting their plans to the Historic Preservation Commission?

Finally, it would be desirable to identify the boundaries of the existing Historic District, such as through special or augmented street signs or in some other readily visible manner. We believe the Historic District represents an asset to the Borough and should be treated as such.

5. Stormwater Management

Section 93 of the MLUL requires review of the existing Stormwater Management Plan at the time of the Reexamination Report. The Borough Engineer should advise the Board as to whether the 2005 Stormwater element and existing Borough ordinances contain mitigation standards that comply with current DEP regulations.
2003 Borough of Haddonfield Master Plan Re-Examination Report

Introduction:

The Municipal Land Use Law, N.J.S. 40:55D, (hereinafter, the “MLUL”) requires the planning board of each municipality to conduct a general re-examination of its Master Plan and Development Regulations not less than every six (6) years. (N.J.S. 40:55D-89). The planning board of each Municipality is also required to prepare, and adopt, by resolution a report on its findings during the re-examination process. (N.J.S. 40:55D-89). The planning board of each municipality is further required to provide a copy of that report to the County Planning Board and the Municipal Clerk of each adjoining municipality. (N.J.S. 40:55D-89). The most recent Master Plan of the Borough of Haddonfield (hereinafter, “Master Plan”) was adopted by the Planning Board of the Borough of Haddonfield (hereinafter, “Planning Board”) by resolution on March 11, 1984. The most recent general Re-examination Report of the Borough of Haddonfield’s Master Plan was adopted by the Planning Board by resolution on August 6, 1991.

Required Elements of a Master Plan Re-Examination Report:

The MLUL requires that all re-examination reports address the following items: (a) the major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last re-examination report; (b) the extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date; (c) the extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies, and objectives forming the basis for the master plan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density and distribution of population and land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of
natural resources, energy conservation, collection, disposition, and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in State, county, and municipal policies and objectives; (d) the specific changes recommended for the master plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared; and (e) the recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment plans adopted pursuant to the "Local Redevelopment and Housing Law" into the land use plan element of the municipal master plan, and recommended changes, if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the municipality.

1991 Master Plan Re-Examination Report:

The last Master Plan Re-examination Report (attached hereto as Appendix 1) was adopted by the Planning Board on August 6, 1991. At the time the Borough of Haddonfield (hereinafter, "Haddonfield") was, as it is now, an almost completely "built-out" community with virtually no vacant, developable land available. The most significant land use issues within Haddonfield included the significant loss of open space; the need to preserve existing open space; the need to make the existing open space and public facilities more accessible to the public; the development of properties in a manner inconsistent with existing neighborhoods; and, the need for senior-citizen housing; the need to improve the safety of vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

The 1991 Master Plan Re-examination Report listed the following objectives: (1) the adoption of an omnibus land use ordinance; (2) a study of the desirability and practicality of expanding the existing Historic District; (3) the development of senior-citizen housing; (4) the retention and acquisition of open space; (5) the development of a pedestrian and bicycle trail along the Cooper River from Crows Woods to Evans Ponds; (6) the adoption of a property maintenance ordinance; (7) the revision of the existing zone plan to more accurately reflect existing development; (8) the adoption of a revised housing element; (9) the encouragement of safe pedestrian, vehicular, and bicycle traffic; (10) the maintenance of the visual attractiveness of Haddonfield; (11) the preservation of the Haddonfield's historic character; (12) the
encouragement of single-family residential uses; (13) the expansion and preservation of housing opportunities within the business district; (14) the establishment of an appropriate balance of retail, office, residential, public and other uses in the business district in order to maintain its role as the center of the community; and, (15) the maintenance and improvement, as required, of public facilities to meet the needs of Haddonfield’s residents.

**Borough Action Taken Pursuant to the 1991 Master Plan Re-Examination Report:**

Haddonfield’s first step toward accomplishing the aforementioned objectives was the 1993 Algie & Regojo Study of the proposed expansion of the Historic District. That was followed in 1996 by a Carter Van Dyke Associates, Inc. report entitled, "A Plan for Historic Preservation," which formed the basis for the subsequent adoption of the Historic Preservation Element of the Master Plan.

Haddonfield next commenced what would turn out to be a several year-long study of the existing residential zoning plan in order to evaluate the appropriateness of the existing bulk, use and area regulations.

In 1996, Haddonfield adopted the Housing and Fair Share Elements of its Master Plan. The Housing Element made two significant recommendations. It recommended that a property maintenance code not be adopted and it recommended that the Land Development Ordinance of the Borough of Haddonfield (hereinafter, the "Land Development Ordinance") be reviewed for conformance with the Residential Site Improvement Standards. N.J.A.C. 5:21.

In 1997, the Historic Preservation Element (attached hereto as Appendix 2) of the Master Plan was adopted by Haddonfield. Two years later, in 1999, the Housing and Fair Share Elements (attached hereto as Appendix 3) of the Master Plan were re-adopted in accordance with the requirements of the New Jersey Council of Affordable Housing Substantive Rules and the MLUL. N.J.A.C. 5:93 & N.J.S.A. 40:55D-28. The Fair Share Element’s most significant recommendation was the development of senior-citizen housing within Haddonfield as a conditional use.

In 2000, Haddonfield adopted the Residential Land Use Element (attached hereto as Appendix 4) of its Master Plan.
The result of an exhaustive thirty (30) month-long re-examination study entitled, "The Residential Zoning Study," the 2000 Residential Land Use Element was essentially a re-examination report the scope of which was confined to the Land Use Plan Element of the existing Master Plan. The Residential Land Use Element recommended wholesale revisions and amendments to Haddonfield’s Land Development Ordinance.

In April, 2002 the Long-Range Planning Committee presented its recommendations and proposed amendments to the Borough Commission for its consideration in a report entitled, "Report of the Long-Range Planning Committee of the Planning Board of the Borough of Haddonfield" (attached hereto as Appendix 5). The recommended amendments to the Land Development Ordinance were further refinements of the recommendations of the Residential Land Use Element. The Long-Range Planning Committee's recommendations included the elimination of all of the existing residential zoning districts and the creation of twelve (12) new residential zoning districts designed to more closely reflect the character of existing neighborhoods; the creation of new setbacks for each new zoning district; the creation of new building and impervious coverage limitations for each new zoning district; and, clarification of the Borough's intent not to permit the deliberate tear-down and reconstruction of new single-family residences on nonconforming lots without variance relief from the Zoning Board of Adjustment. The amendments were drafted for each district to ensure that future development within those districts would preserve the character of the existing neighborhoods within those districts while at the same time allowing for modest changes to reflect today's changing living patterns.

After consideration, the Borough Commission referred the proposed amendments to the Planning Board for its report and recommendations thereon. The Planning Board confirmed that the amendments proposed by the Report of the Long-Range Planning Committee and the Residential Land Use Element were consistent with the Master Plan and it endorsed the adoption thereof. Shortly thereafter, in July, 2002 the Borough Commission adopted the proposed amendments to the Land Development Ordinance and the amendments became effective in September, 2002.

With the recent adoption of the amendments to the Land Development Ordinance, inappropriate development within the
residential zoning districts of the Borough has already begun to decline. Subdivisions which would have been permitted under the prior zoning ordinance have been prevented under the current ordinance. Total tear-downs have also decreased measurably. Applications for setback variances have decreased while applications for coverage variances have held steady, or increased slightly. The efficacy of the recently-adopted amendments to the Land Development Ordinance must be monitored in order to determine whether additional amendments are required to preserve and protect the economic, residential and historical integrity of this community.

During 2001 and 2002, after having first adopted a conditional use amendment to the Land Development Ordinance, the Borough's first senior-citizen housing facility, Lincoln Commons, was constructed, in conjunction with a private developer, and opened to the public.

**Transportation:**

Transportation within Haddonfield continues to be affected primarily by development outside of the Borough. While the volume of traffic has not significantly increased or decreased within Haddonfield, efforts have been made to increase both vehicular and pedestrian safety. Two "bump-outs" designed to both decrease vehicular speed and decrease the distance pedestrians must travel in order to cross key roadways have been designated for construction. One is already complete at the intersection of King's Court and King's Highway and another will be under construction by year's end in the vicinity of the intersection of Haddon Avenue and Rhoads Avenue. In the business district, pedestrian crosswalk markers have been installed within the cartway.

At the intersection of Warwick Road and King's Highway a new traffic signal has replaced the prior, outdated model. At the intersection of Chews Landing Road, King’s Highway West, and West End Avenue, the existing traffic signal is scheduled to be updated as well.

A joint Study by the Borough of Haddonfield and the Board of Education was conducted in order to examine the best methods of improving the traffic and parking situation at all of Haddonfield's public schools. Based in part on that study, a new off-street parking and drop-off area were
constructed at the J. Fithian Tatem School on Glover Avenue. Signage and crosswalk improvements were also made at the Central Middle School on Lincoln Avenue.

The Maple Avenue bridge is currently under construction by the New Jersey Department of Transportation as a result of the Borough's recommendations. The reconstructed bridge will include an experimental "speed table" designed to slow vehicular traffic on Maple Avenue, a County Road. Finally, the Borough has also recently created a Transportation and Pedestrian Safety Committee.

**New Jersey State Development & Redevelopment Plan:**

According to the New Jersey State Development and Redevelopment Plan, the Borough of Haddonfield is in a suburban ring around the City of Camden. This designation is consistent with the existing and foreseeable development within Haddonfield.

**Local Redevelopment and Housing Law:**

At this time, the incorporation of redevelopment plans, adopted pursuant to the "Local Redevelopment and Housing Law," into the Land Use Plan Element of the Master Plan is not appropriate. No properties are significantly in need of redevelopment and, thus, no changes are recommended to the Land Development Ordinance.

**Other Issues:**

There has been no significant dissipation of the natural resources within the Borough.

Existing open space in public hands continues to be preserved and maintained. Additional open space was purchased by the Borough, in part through funding provided by State Green Acres Funds, in part by the Haddonfield Foundation, and in part with Borough funds. The property, located on the corner of King's Highway East and Evergreen Lane is approximately 15,000 (fifteen thousand) square feet in area and has been dedicated for use as a public park, the Joseph M. and Edith G. D. Tatem Garden. The Borough has also acquired additional open space along the Cooper River wetlands.
The Board of Education and the Borough have maintained the number of active recreation playing fields in public hands.

The Borough is currently exploring various avenues to improve energy conservation; however, given the built-out nature of the community, it is anticipated that little can be done to affect the current situation.

The Borough continues to be a regional leader in recycling.

The Borough is currently in the process of studying the most appropriate method for improving the facilities of the public library as well as exploring avenues to improve Borough Hall including, but not necessarily limited to, improving ADA-accessibility.

In 2001, the Borough also completed construction of a new Public Works facility on Centre Street. This improved facility is large enough to provide space for all of Public Works' equipment and personnel in addition to the equipment and personnel of the Board of Education. This has helped to continue the well-established relationship between the Borough and the Board of Education.

In 2002, Elizabeth C. McKenzie, P.P., P.A., a consultant hired by the Borough, submitted a two (2) volume report. The first volume concerned Bancroft NeuroHealth and the various land-use issues related thereto. The second volume of Ms. McKenzie's report recommended the adoption of certain Conditional Use Amendments which would regulate new and existing schools, houses of worship, and cemeteries within Haddonfield. The Borough, through the auspices of the Long-Range Planning Committee, is further studying the recommendations contained in Ms. McKenzie's report. At the conclusion of its review, the Long-Range Planning Committee will submit its recommendations concerning the adoption of conditional use amendments to the Borough Commission.

In 2003, the Zoning Board of Adjustment of the Borough of Haddonfield granted the required approvals for the construction of 12 (twelve) townhouses near the intersection of King's Highway West and Washington Avenue in order to maintain an appropriate balance of business, office and residential uses in the downtown area. Several
similar projects have been proposed by other private developers as well. The Zoning Board has also zealously defended the existing residential uses in the business district from several attempts to obtain use variances.

In order to better integrate the PATCO station into the remainder of the business district as well as to provide a more thoughtful connection between Collingswood, Haddon Township and Haddonfield, the Borough has participated in the Haddon Avenue/PATCO Hi-Speedline Corridor Study. To assist with these efforts the Borough has already obtained a Smart Growth Grant and should seek additional funding as appropriate. The Borough should also consider seeking designation as a Transit-Village.

**Recommendations:**

The Borough’s 1991 Master Plan Re-examination Report listed numerous goals to be pursued by the Borough and the Borough has undeniably made significant progress toward achieving these goals. Therefore, the following objectives of the 1991 Master Plan Re-examination Report should be considered adequately addressed: (1) the adoption of an omnibus land use ordinance; (2) the development of senior-citizen housing; (3) the retention and acquisition of open space; (4) the revision of the existing zone plan to more accurately reflect existing development; (5) the adoption of a revised housing element; (6) the encouragement of safe pedestrian, vehicular, and bicycle traffic; (7) the establishment of an appropriate balance of retail, office, residential, public and other uses in the business district in order to maintain its role as the center of the community; and, (8) the expansion and preservation of housing opportunities within the business district.

The 1991 Master Plan Re-examination Report and the MPRNR also recommended the adoption of a property maintenance ordinance. While the 1996 Housing Element notes that the quality of the existing housing stock is excellent, there are occasional properties which require significant maintenance. For that reason, the adoption of a property maintenance ordinance is appropriate at this time.

The Borough should continue to pursue the following objectives, as stated in the previous Re-examination Report: (1) the maintenance of the visual attractiveness of
Haddonfield; (2) the preservation of Haddonfield’s historic character; (3) the encouragement of single-family residential uses; (4) a study of the desirability and practicality of expanding the existing Historic District; (5) the development of a pedestrian and bicycle trail along the Cooper River from Crows Woods to Evans Ponds subject to a study of the potential environmental impact thereof; and, (6) the maintenance and improvement, as required, of public facilities including, but not necessarily limited to, Borough Hall and the Public Library.

The Borough should pursue the following new objectives: (7) a study of the appropriateness of permitting new twin-homes as a conditional use; (8) a study of the appropriateness of adopting day-light plane restrictions for new homes; (9) revision of the existing, and adoption of new, business regulations designed to improve the efficiency, speed, and flexibility of the current approval process for signage, merchandise displays, and sidewalk restaurants and to improve overall user-accessibility; (10) a study of the business district of the same scope as was conducted in the residential areas of Haddonfield; (11) completion of the Long-Range Planning Committee’s review of the Conditional Use Amendments recommended in Ms. McKenzie’s Report; (12) further participation in the completion of the Haddon Avenue/FATCO Hi-Speedline Corridor Study; (13) a study of the advantages and disadvantages of obtaining Transit-Village Designation; (14) adoption of a Property Maintenance Ordinance; (15) adoption of a Drainage/Stormwater Management Ordinance; and, (16) prior to the adoption of the next Master Plan Re-examination Report the Borough should consider adopting a new Master Plan in light of the fact that the existing Master Plan is nearly twenty (20) years old.
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PLANNING CONCERNS:

In 1991, the Planning Board adopted a Master Plan re-examination report which found that there was little change in the Borough’s existing physical, economic, and social conditions, except for increased traffic and congestion and the re-institution of passenger railroad service to Atlantic City. The 1991 re-examination was primarily developed on information from the 1980 U. S. Census, as 1990 data were unavailable at that time. The report recommended continuation of the Master Plan’s current primary goals and identified several new objectives for the next six years. Several of these related to housing concerns: such as, the exploration of expansion of the local historic district; retention of open space; adoption of a property maintenance code; analysis of the existing zoning plan and fine tuning to deal with non-conforming uses, infill development, and property conversions; and the adoption of a revised housing element.

Since that time, the Borough has identified a proposed expansion area for the local historic district and is preparing an evaluation report for that area, and has conducted a non-conforming use study to identify such uses and structures in the Borough’s residential areas. It is also in the process of a study of the zoning plan to evaluate whether existing bulk, use and area requirements should be changed. In the past five years, the Borough has also acquired additional open space along the Cooper River wetlands.

The purpose of this report is to:

- identify whether any changes are warranted to the 1991 re-examination report, due to evaluation of population, housing, and employment trends from the 1990 U. S. Census and general land use trends in the past five years;
- provide sufficient background information for the fair share housing element; and
- make recommendations for the improvement of residential standards and proposals for the construction and improvement of housing within Haddonfield.

POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT ANALYSES:

The total population of Haddonfield, estimated at 11,628 in 1990, has been declining for the past few decades. There was a 0.6% decrease between 1960 and 1970; a 6.0% decrease between 1970 and 1980; and another 6% decrease from 1980 to 1990. This is an on-going trend in developed communities in New Jersey and across the nation as the general population is increasing in age, households are having fewer children, and the number of single households and “non-traditional” households are increasing. In a fully-developed community with a relatively fixed number of housing units, this trend is not unexpected. One interesting statistic is the 26% increase in children under 5 years of age in 1990 and the 24% decrease in children aged 5 to 24 years. This trend may have a significant impact on future school space in the Borough. Haddonfield also has a higher than average population of senior citizens (age 65 and over) representing 17% of the

Housing 1
total population, compared to 12% for Camden County. This indicates that senior housing issues, such as housing, energy, and maintenance, and property taxes expenses may be a greater concern in Haddonfield, especially given the age of the housing stock in the Borough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>-149</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 24</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>2,690</td>
<td>-860</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 64</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>4,833</td>
<td>+1,713</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 and over</td>
<td>1,931</td>
<td>1,994</td>
<td>+63</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12,337</td>
<td>11,628</td>
<td>-709</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median 37.5 39.8 2.3 6%

In 1990, Haddonfield had 63.7% of its persons aged 16 and over in the labor force compared to 66.3% in Camden County. Almost all were civilian laborers. The unemployment rate in 1990 for Haddonfield was 1.8% compared to 5.9% for the County. Most workers were employed in managerial and professional/special trades or technical, sales, or administrative support occupations. No significant changes in employment patterns are expected in the future.

In 1989, median household and per capita income in Haddonfield was considerably higher than Camden County. Median household income was 56% greater, and per capita income was 82% greater than the County. Household incomes over $50,000 accounted for 58% of Haddonfield households, but only 52% of Camden County households. Haddonfield includes 11% of all households in the County with incomes over $100,000, but only represents 3% of all the households in the County (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Haddonfield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under $5,000</td>
<td>7,520</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000 to 9,999</td>
<td>13,965</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to 14,999</td>
<td>12,370</td>
<td>1,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to 24,999</td>
<td>25,387</td>
<td>3,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to 34,999</td>
<td>26,473</td>
<td>4,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>36,423</td>
<td>7,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to 74,999</td>
<td>34,108</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to 99,999</td>
<td>12,584</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 and over</td>
<td>9,982</td>
<td>1,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Household</td>
<td>$36,190</td>
<td>$56,585</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LAND USE CHARACTERISTICS:

Land use patterns changed little between those identified in 1984 and today. By far, the primary land use in Haddonfield is single family residential uses, which constitute more than half of the Borough's land area. Most of these homes are detached units outside the general downtown business district and are designated as either low density or very low density residential areas in the 1984 Land Use Plan. Although single family detached units also represent the majority of residential uses in the downtown, this area contains a mixture of single family attached units, multi-family units, and condominiums, and are identified as medium density residential areas in the plan. Most of the downtown area along Kings Highway is also located within a state and national register historic district recognized for its local and regional historic and architectural significance. This area is also within a local historic district, which is an overlay zoning district created in 1971 where building alterations are locally reviewed for compatibility with established historic preservation standards.

HOUSING STOCK INVENTORY:

The 1990 U.S. Census indicated that 3,745 (81%) of the Borough's housing stock was owner-occupied, 746 (16%) was renter-occupied, and the remainder 161 (3%) were vacant. Although these figures were generally the same for 1980, moderate gains were made in the quality of housing in the ten year period. Of the 4,652 total units, only 6 lacked complete plumbing facilities and 0 lacked complete kitchen facilities in 1990, whereas 20 units had lacked complete plumbing facilities in 1980. (Kitchen facilities were not identified in the 1980 census.) In 1990, only .2% or 9 owner-occupied units had more than 1.01 persons per room, compared with the County which had 3.7%. In 1980, Haddonfield had a .3% or 18 units with more than 1.01 persons per room. Almost all of the housing stock in Haddonfield is on a public water and sewer system. In 1996, approximately 27 units remained on a private septic system (24 of these were on Lane of Acres), and none had private wells for drinking water. Approximately 59% of the housing stock in Haddonfield was built before 1940. According to Borough records, 40 certificates of occupancy for new structures were reported for 1990 through 1995 and 18 units were demolished. A comparison of 1985 and 1995 tax records also indicated that 46 structures were converted from triplex and duplex apartments to single family residences.

Housing in Haddonfield tends to be more spacious than that for the rest of Camden County. Figures for 1990 show little change from 1980 due to only minimal changes in the number of units and a slight increase in older householders with no children living at home. For all housing units, Haddonfield had an average of 2.55 persons per unit and 6.9 rooms per unit in 1990, while Camden County has an average of 2.76 persons per unit 5.9 rooms per unit. In terms of owner-
occupied housing units, Haddonfield had an average of 2.40 persons per unit, 7.5 rooms per unit, and a mean unit value of $186,900. By comparison, Camden County had an average of 2.95 persons per unit, 6.7 rooms per unit, and a mean unit value of $99,300. In terms of renter-occupied housing units, Haddonfield had an average of 1.51 persons per unit, 4.7 rooms per unit, and a median monthly contract rent of $587 in 1990. By comparison, Camden County has an average of 2.34 persons per unit, 4.1 rooms per unit, and a mean unit value of $440.

PROJECTION OF FUTURE HOUSING STOCK:

Haddonfield is located in the Camden Metropolitan Planning Area on the State Plan for Development and Redevelopment. The Borough is one of several municipalities in Camden County that is fully developed and the amount of vacant, developable land is de minimus. New housing starts are rare in Haddonfield. The 1996 Residential Zoning Study found that there were only 66 privately held vacant residually-zoned parcels, of which only 6 were legally buildable, either due to existing environmental conditions or current land development regulations. Many of these vacant parcels are too narrow to build upon and are not available for subdivision under the Municipal Land Use Law. None of these private vacant parcels are greater than 2 acres in size. Future housing development will most likely continue to be developed in the suburban fringes of the Camden metropolitan area outside Haddonfield.

The Site Improvement Advisory Board, which was created by state law in 1993, has completed a proposed set of statewide residential site improvement technical standards for the provision of streets and parking, water supply, sanitary sewers, and stormwater management. These technical standards have been developed in concert with the state Department of Community Affairs (NJ DCA) in order to ensure consistent engineering standards throughout the state for residentially developed land. The Borough’s Land Development Ordinance should be reviewed for conformance with these standards, which are expected to become effective in 1997.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The demographic data from the 1980 and 1990 U. S. Census indicate that Haddonfield is a maturing community with a decreasing, aging, and relatively affluent population base. The Borough’s land use data confirms that there is very little room left in Haddonfield for the construction of new housing, which is not unique in the older suburbs surrounding Camden City. Provision of future new housing will most likely occur in the suburban and ex-urban fringe of the metropolitan region. Historic preservation of the downtown and the surrounding neighborhoods is a primary goal of the Borough’s Master Plan, as is the maintenance of other existing single family detached neighborhoods in the Borough.

After consideration of the existing demographic and housing profiles, projected trends, and the findings of the 1984 Master Plan and the 1991 Master Plan Re-examination report, the following are recommended policies for the improvement of residential standards and proposals for the construction and improvement of housing within Haddonfield:
1. The maintenance of the predominantly single family residential character of Haddonfield through the continued use of proper zoning, land development regulation, and code enforcement is critical to the preservation of the community's existing character. Preservation of the existing village character within the local historic district should continue to be managed through these measures and the existing historic preservation program.

2. The Borough is currently undergoing two major studies which may yield findings that may have a profound effect on the Borough's future housing development, zone plan, and historic preservation program. These studies, however, are still in process and are not expected to be finished for several months. At this time, it is recommended that the historic district expansion study and the residential zoning study be completed and their recommendations evaluated for incorporation into this plan.

3. The Borough should continue to explore additional housing opportunities in Haddonfield to meet the needs of existing and future residents, including the feasibility of the development of senior citizen housing.

4. The property maintenance code for residential and non-residential uses recommended in the 1991 Master Plan re-examination may not be a cost-effective measure, given the relatively insignificant number of violations and the limited resources required to develop and implement a monitoring and enforcement system. At such time as maintenance does become an issue in the future, this recommendation can be re-evaluated.

5. The Borough should review the Land Development Ordinance for conformance with the state Residential Site Improvements Standards, which are expected to become effective in 1997.

COMPATIBILITY TO ADJACENT MUNICIPAL AND REGIONAL PLANS:

As part of this plan, land use development and zoning patterns in adjacent municipalities were reviewed for their compatibility with those in Haddonfield. None were found to have incompatible land use patterns, zoning, or development trends that would adversely impact existing residential development in Haddonfield or the Master Plan's housing goals. All of the following municipalities are, like Haddonfield, also fully developed communities that have only experienced minor changes in the past five years:

1. Cherry Hill Township: The majority of the Township's northern and eastern border is along the Cooper River, which is primarily publicly owned parkland. Low density residential neighborhoods flank the river, with only minor exceptions for the garden apartments at Kings Highway and a mixed use district in Batesville. Parkland, medium density residential, and mixed use development in Haddonfield is quite similar to that along the border in Cherry Hill. No major changes have occurred in the past five years other than the development of a handicapped accessible County park at Evans Pond, the conversion of the old Croft Farm into a cultural arts center, and the conversion of the key
tenant at the Brace Road shopping center from a K-Mart retail store to a Giant supermarket. Existing land use and zoning plans are not in conflict with those in Haddonfield.

2. **Tavistock Borough**: Tavistock is a small community of a handful of homes built around a golf country club on the southern end of Haddonfield. No major land changes have occurred or are anticipated in Tavistock. Existing land use and zoning plans are complimentary to Haddonfield’s adjacent very low density residential area on Lane of Acres.

3. **Barrington Borough**: The existing low density land uses and zoning plan in Barrington are compatible with those adjacent in Haddonfield. No major land changes have occurred or are anticipated.

4. **Haddon Heights Borough**: The existing low density land uses and zoning plan in Haddon Heights are compatible with those adjacent in Haddonfield. No major land changes have occurred or are anticipated.

5. **Haddon Township**: Low density residential development and zoning districts in the Haddonleigh, Crystal Lake, and Westmont neighborhoods are compatible with those in adjacent Haddonfield, as are the business uses along Haddon Avenue. The former Township sewage treatment plant on Coles Mills Road is being developed as a low-rise senior citizen apartment building. No significant impact to adjacent low density residential uses in Haddonfield is anticipated other than traffic impacts on this steep and narrow County Road.

Haddonfield is located within the Camden Metropolitan Planning Area on the State Plan for Development and Redevelopment because of its proximity to that central city and its fully-developed and older suburban community character. It is similarly identified in the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission’s 2020 Plan.
FAIR SHARE ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The Borough of Haddonfield received a substantial certification of its Housing Plan from the state Council on Affordable Housing (COAH) on June 26, 1989. This six year certification expired on June 26, 1995. Haddonfield is required to file an adopted Housing element and a Fair Share element, in response to the revised 1993-1996 affordable housing index, in order to continue its certification.

FAIR SHARE ALLOCATION:

The New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing’s projected need index for the 1986 to 1992 period was based on housing construction trends of the early 1980s, which was coincidentally one of the state’s greatest growth periods in history. The goals for the 1993 to 1999 period, for which Haddonfield must be certified, have been adjusted to reflect the 1990 U. S. Census data and to meet more normal growth patterns. The Borough’s current obligation is 255 units. Its inclusionary component, assuming vacant land, is 192 units. Its rehabilitation component, which is geared for indigenous or local need, is 63 units. In the Borough’s first certification, the Council accepted Haddonfield’s assertion and documentation that it was fully-developed and waived the standard “vacant land” requirement. A re-examination was done in 1999 accounting for the Borough’s survey of deterioration. They then took the number found by the Borough for housing units that are deteriorated (89) and applied that percentage of those units that are likely to occupied by low-and moderate income families. The new current obligation was lowered to 248, thus only requiring the calculated need to 56 units. This new exemption then removed 192 inclusionary units from the Borough’s total 248 unit obligation. Even so, the Borough must provide at least 56 units through rehabilitation and consider other programs to effectuate its affordable housing rehabilitation (indigenous) component, where feasible. A description of Haddonfield’s regional affordable housing allocation is found in the Appendix.

EVALUATION OF LOW & MODERATE INCOME REHABILITATION (INDIGENOUS) COMPONENT HOUSING MEASURES:

The following is a review of some traditional and innovative measures that Haddonfield has considered or has implemented in its commitment to provide its fair share of its rehabilitation component for low and moderate income housing:

Fair Share 1
1. **Rehabilitation of Substandard Units:** The Borough continues to participate in the county-administered CDBG program which provides funding for low and moderate income families in Haddonfield. Since April, 1990 (the date of the last U.S. Census), $77,613 of CDBG funds have been used to rehabilitate 9 substandard units. The following is a list of COAH CDBG cases from April 1, 1990 to the present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Completion Date</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td>93/02/25</td>
<td>$8,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13008</td>
<td>92/02/26</td>
<td>$8,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13009</td>
<td>92/10/29</td>
<td>$24,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13009</td>
<td>92/10/29</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td>91/12/18</td>
<td>$10,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td>91/12/18</td>
<td>$8,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td>91/11/27</td>
<td>$8,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13009</td>
<td>93/07/28</td>
<td>$54,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13000</td>
<td>95/01/12</td>
<td>$42,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From 1981 to 1988, Haddonfield spent $272,855 to rehabilitate 44 substandard units, and these numbers have been computed in the 1990 Census figure. The number of qualifying units continues to decline due to Haddonfield's strong historic preservation program and continuing code enforcement. For example, the 1990 U.S. Census indicated that only 6 units lacked complete plumbing facilities; 0 units lacked complete kitchen facilities; 6 owner-occupied units had 1.01 or more persons per room; and 2 renter-occupied units had 1.01 or more persons per room. If all of these units were separate, the 1990 U.S. Census would register only 14 substandard units. Be that as it may, Haddonfield has been committed to meeting a realistic rehabilitation obligation through continuation of its successful CDBG program.

2. **Zoning for Inclusionary Development:** This tool is an effective way of providing units in municipalities where there is vacant developable land. Due to the lack of vacant developable land in Haddonfield, this alternative may not be effectual for Haddonfield. Some municipalities also provide for a contribution towards low and moderate income housing as part of their development approval process. Haddonfield's de minimis amount of new construction would make this alternative provision unrealistic, as well.

The Borough could create an overlay zone for already developed areas to provide for inclusionary housing. However, given the relatively small amount of vacant residentially zoned land, the uniquely restrictive historic preservation design controls in the downtown and surrounding neighborhood historic district, and the high property values of developed land outside the historic district, the actual effect of such overlay zoning would be minimal. Any new development fostered through this overlay zone would be incremental at best, and would depend on ever-increasing land acquisition costs and construction costs. Return-on-investment opportunities would have to be balanced against housing market values and any set asides to low to moderate income households.

**Fair Share 2**
However, the development of an affordable housing conditional use in the Land Development Ordinance could provide opportunities for meeting a portion of the Borough’s affordable housing needs, while maintaining its historic village character. Ideally, a prime location for such a conditional use would be near the downtown. Because the amount of vacant or underutilized land in the central business district is limited and because the erosion of the business district for housing would also be a threat to the local tax base, the best location would be just outside the downtown business district in a residential zone. Heavy traffic and noise would pose significant daytime nuisances for residents in the downtown business district. The lack of any nighttime activity in this area could make evenings lonely and insecure for its residents.

The residential zones surrounding the downtown are zoned for and are primarily developed with single family detached homes. There are a few larger parcels, approximately 1 to 1.5 acres in size, that do include some underutilized land or buildings that could be developed for additional housing, if the provisions of the existing land development ordinance were modified to permit it. These lots are outparcels or associated with private school buildings. Disruption of the single family residential zoning requirements in these zones to allow the development of multi-family housing should be permitted to fulfill a documented public purpose, such as affordable housing for families, people with special needs, or senior citizens. Standard multi-family housing, i.e. with young children, would be difficult to build in these small sites due to building design, privacy design, parking, yard, and other design features required. For these reasons, it is recommended that these conditional uses be restricted to people with special needs or senior citizen residents of Haddonfield. The development of senior citizen housing could provide for approximately 25% or 16 units of its rehabilitation component, i.e. indigenous need. The balance of any additional units will be used to address the Borough’s unmet need. Residency for this type of use may be restricted to Haddonfield residents.

The development of any housing on these parcels would, by definition, be more dense than average density in the Borough. To minimize its impact on surrounding residences, this affordable housing should be no more than 3 stories tall, scaled to have an appearance compatible with neighboring buildings, with ample off-street parking to impact the existing neighborhood minimally. The best location for these conditional uses would be in the residential zone having the highest density, i.e., R-4 zone, within a short walking distance, such as 500 to 600 feet, of the downtown. In order to be effective, the conditional use amendment should provide a minimum lot size, density and apartment size, building cover, hard surface cover, parking, and other design features associated with this form of development.

There is at least one vacant site that meets this minimal lot size of 1 to 1.5 acres within this zone. The site of a former school on Lincoln Avenue that has an adjacent vacant lot, both in Block 41, is one site. The following is a general description of the Lincoln Avenue site which is proposed for development:
The site is composed of Lots 15 and part of Lot 16 in Block 41, which have a total area of approximately 1.5 acres with frontage on Lincoln Avenue. The site is currently zoned for single family detached housing on 5,000 square foot lots. Development on this site would require a use variance, if the recommended conditional use amendment were not adopted. The surrounding uses include a Borough park to the south, single family detached homes to the east and west, and a mixture of single family detached and attached homes to the rear along Haddon Avenue. The site is just outside the Central Business District (CBD) zone. The site has accessibility to public water and sewer and is not constrained by steep slopes, wetlands, or floodplains. Although the neighborhood contains older buildings, the proposed Historic Preservation element of the Master Plan did not include the site or the surrounding area as a historic district. A more detailed description of this site is included in Appendix A1.

Haddonfield’s 1991 Master Plan Re-examination report and the 1996 Housing Element recommend that the Borough encourage the development of senior citizen housing to meet the growing senior resident housing needs. Although many of the surrounding communities have development dedicated to senior housing, Haddonfield does not. The Borough of Haddonfield has continued to explore the feasibility of the development of senior housing through inclusionary zoning. It has also evaluated several other proposals for both the rehabilitation of existing units and the construction of new units. (An inventory of Borough-initiated efforts and developer proposals is included as item A6 in the Appendix.) Haddonfield has been committed to providing senior citizen housing for those that cannot afford market rate housing.

3. **Municipally Sponsored New Construction, Gut Rehabilitation, and Other Innovative Programs:** Due to the lack of administrative personnel and the relatively low number of qualifying units in the Borough, Haddonfield works with Camden County (see above) to manage its CDBG (housing improvement) rehabilitation program. The development of a NJ DCA Neighborhood Preservation Program (NPP) to fund rehabilitation and housing upgrades on a general neighborhood basis, which has been beneficial in other neighboring communities, would prove inefficient in Haddonfield due to the small percentage of existing substandard units in the Borough.

4. **Purchase of Existing Units:** Given the relatively low number and distribution of substandard units in the Borough, the purchase and management of existing qualifying units would not be feasible in Haddonfield.

5. **Creation of Accessory Apartments:** Haddonfield is currently undergoing a residential zoning study which includes an identification and evaluation of accessory units throughout the Borough. The primary focus of the study is to determine whether there are discernible areas of sufficient diversity of housing use, area, and bulk standards that would warrant revision of the land use ordinance to encourage redevelopment of existing stock to include such things as accessory apartments. The study’s preliminary findings suggest that the extent of these existing non-single family detached housing units is
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minimal and that most of these diverse areas are also within the existing state, national, and local historic district, which may preclude the substantial alteration and redevelopment of historic structures which may be required to produce accessory apartments meeting stringent State requirements.

6. **Provisions of Alternative Living Arrangements and Other Innovative Programs:** Haddonfield's residential zoning study (see above) may identify alternative housing programs which could work within a fully-developed community with historic preservation restrictions. This report will not be finished until mid-year 1997.

The Bancroft School in Haddonfield, a private school for physically and developmentally handicapped children and adults, offers room and board for its students and is licensed for 166 beds. It currently provides four on-campus apartments with a total of 18 beds, three on-campus group homes with 23 beds, and one off-campus group home on Edgepark Drive with another 5 beds. Another group home managed by a local hospital on Ellis Street contains 4 beds (in a total of 4 bedrooms) for individuals with traumatic brain injuries. The Haddonfield Presbyterian Home provides housing for 52 senior residents, each with his or her own separate bedroom. Haddonfield has a strong tradition of providing homes for children and adults with special needs. Senior housing needs, however, are still under-provided.

7. **Regional Contribution Agreements:** The Borough does not have the funding or the funding mechanisms necessary to support a regional contribution agreement for transferring its fair share provision to another municipality. At this time, Haddonfield is committed to meeting its contribution within its own municipal limits.
FAIR SHARE PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Borough of Haddonfield, not unlike other inner-core suburban communities in the Camden metropolitan area, is a fully-developed municipality with little or no room left for future development. Most future development is expected to be incremental in nature and be structured in the form of redevelopment, that is, alteration or demolition of existing fabric for new uses. Haddonfield, however, is unique in that most of its downtown and much of its surrounding downtown residential area is located within a local, state, and national register historic district. Redevelopment within the historic district tends to be a particularly difficult process given the highly restrictive design parameters with local, state, and federal historic preservation review authorities.

Whereas other municipalities might be able to provide additional residential and non-residential downtown development through full-scale or selective redevelopment, Haddonfield’s thriving downtown business district and other neighborhoods have some of the highest downtown market values in the region. Private sector acquisition of land for low and moderate income residential redevelopment in Haddonfield is not a realistically cost-effective opportunity given the moderate return on investment for these ventures.

The following recommendations are made in review of the COAH fair share need requirements, the 1994 Master Plan, 1991 Master Plan Re-Examination Report, and the 1996 Master Plan Housing Element:

1. Haddonfield is a fully-developed municipality with a de minimus amount of vacant developable land remaining for market rate housing, let alone low to moderate rate housing. Any future development would, therefore, constitute redevelopment, which would be highly restricted given existing federal, state, and local historic preservation regulations and current high land acquisition costs. The Borough should continue to be excused of its inclusionary obligation of 192 units due to the lack of vacant developable land.

2. The Borough should continue its CDBG rehabilitation upgrade program in association with Camden County to bring all eligible units up to code.

3. Provision for senior housing in Haddonfield is needed, given the lack of dedicated facilities for this population. The Borough should encourage the development of senior housing and continue to explore the feasibility of such developments with interested developers. It should also consider creation of a conditional use provision in the Land Development Ordinance that would permit the construction of a senior housing facility if the proposed development meets all of the required conditions. It is recommended that such a conditional use amendment include provisions for: location, e.g. within the R-4 residential zones and within a short walking distance, e.g. 500 to 600 feet, of the CBD zone density, e.g. no more than 40 units per acre, minimum apartment size, minimum lot size, acres, height, and other requirements for frontage, building and hard surface coverage, parking, setbacks, architectural and landscape design, income qualification, and age restriction.
4. The Borough should endeavor to complete the residential zoning study and evaluate implementation of its findings, some of which may include innovative housing development measures to meet affordable housing concerns.

5. The Borough should endeavor to complete the historic district expansion study and evaluate implementation of its findings, some of which may include additional design restrictions on historic properties.

6. The Borough Commissioners should present a resolution the New Jersey Council on Affordable Housing for certification of this plan and the 1996 Housing Element.
APPENDICES

A1. POTENTIAL SENIOR CITIZEN HOUSING FAIR SHARE SITES MAP:
See attached.

A2. INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICE AREAS AND CAPACITY MAP:
Not applicable. Most of Haddonfield is serviceable by public water and sewer service.

A3. 201 & 208 APPLICATIONS:
Not applicable. See above.

A4. MASTER PLAN:
1. 1984 Master Plan (see attached)
2. 1991 Re-examination Report (see attached)

A5. OPEN SPACE INVENTORY:
Not applicable. Haddonfield’s lack of vacant developable land was documented in the Borough’s last certification.

A6. COAH CALCULATION OF REGIONAL FAIR SHARE OBLIGATION:
The following chart identifies the Borough’s affordable housing obligation, as determined by COAH:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRE-CREDITED NEED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous Need</td>
<td>60 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Re-allocated Present Need (regional)</td>
<td>20 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Present Need 1993</td>
<td>87 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Prospective Need 1993-1999 (regional)</td>
<td>97 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Total Need 1993-1999</td>
<td>178 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Prior Cycle Prospective Need</td>
<td>127 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Demolitions</td>
<td>4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Filtering</td>
<td>-43 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Residential Conversions</td>
<td>-14 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Spontaneous Rehabilitation</td>
<td>-4 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Pre-Credited Need</td>
<td>248 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALCULATED NEED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Reduction</td>
<td>0 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Prior Cycle Credits</td>
<td>0 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20% Gap</td>
<td>0 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=Calculated Need</td>
<td>248 units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REHABILITATION COMPONENT
Indigenous Need 60 units
- Spontaneous Rehabilitation -4 units
= Rehabilitation Component 56 units

INCLUSIONARY COMPONENT
Calculated Need 248 units
- Rehabilitation Component -56 units
= Inclusionary Component 192 units
(excused due to demonstrated lack of vacant developable land and deteriorated units)

A7. INVENTORY OF SENIOR HOUSING INITIATIVES AND PROPOSALS:

1. Senior Housing Site Analysis: Study.
2. Haddonfield Manor Apartments (Linden Street) and Kingsway Apartments (Potter Street): Rehabilitation.
4. Lincoln Avenue Site: Rehabilitation/New Construction.
5. Presbyterian Church Site (Chestnut Street): New Construction.
7. Former Travellers Insurance Building (Chestnut Street): Rehabilitation.
8. Ellis Street Site: New Construction.
9. Lincoln Avenue Site: New Construction (see A1. above)
April 28, 1992

Ms. Patricia Keppel  
Borough Hall  
242 Kings Highway East  
Haddonfield, NJ 08033  

Re: Master Plan Re-Examination Report

Dear Pat:

Enclosed please find a copy of the Master Plan Re-Examination Report as adopted by the Haddonfield Planning Board last year. I have compared this against the copy that you have in your office, which is stamped as having been received on May 16, 1991. There were several minor changes which were made by the Planning Board to that May 16 draft, and the enclosed document is the final form which was approved by the Planning Board.

At your earliest convenience, please circulate this to the Clerks of all surrounding municipalities, and also send a copy to the Camden County Planning Board, as required by N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89. It is important that this be done, since the following section of statute provides that in the absence of the adoption of such a report, a rebuttable presumption exists that the municipal development regulations are no longer reasonable.

Please copy the Commissioners, the municipal and board solicitors, and me with those transmittal letters. Thank you for your prompt and careful attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. REISNER, III

Encl.

JHR/m
BOROUGH OF HADDONFIELD

MASTER PLAN RE-EXAMINATION REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION:

The Planning Board of each municipality is required to conduct a general re-examination of the municipality’s Master Plan and Developmental Regulations every six (6) years. This requirement is imposed upon the municipality by the Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-89). The most recent Master Plan of the Borough of Haddonfield was adopted by the Planning Board by resolution on March 11, 1984. This periodic review of the Master Plan is therefore overdue. Since the Municipal Land Use Law also provides that in the absence of the adoption of a re-examination report by the Planning Board, there is a rebuttable presumption that the Municipal Land Use Regulations are no longer reasonable, it is necessary and appropriate for the Haddonfield Planning Board to conduct this re-examination of the 1984 Master Plan.

Under the Statute, the Planning Board is required to prepare and adopt by Resolution a report on its findings during the re-examination process, and to provide a copy of that report to the County Planning Board and the Municipal Clerk of each adjoining municipality. The Statute requires that the re-examination report shall state:

a. The major problems and objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last re-examination report.

b. The extent to which such problems and objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date.

c. The extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies and objectives forming the basis for the Master Plan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density and distribution of population and land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of natural resources, energy conservation, collection, disposition, and recycling of designated recyclable materials, and changes in State, county and municipal policies and objectives.

d. The specific changes recommended for the Master Plan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies and standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared.

II. PLANNING IN HADDONFIELD:

The Haddonfield Planning Board was established by ordinance in 1956, and charged with exercising those powers allowed to planning boards under State law.
The first Master Plan for the Borough was prepared by the Planning Board with the assistance of the Government Consulting Service, in 1959.

Thirteen years later, in 1972, the Planning Board, assisted by Herbert H. Smith & Associates, prepared an update to the 1959 Plan. This was considered a supplement to the prior Master Plan, and not a new Master Plan itself.

The Municipal Land Use Law, adopted in 1975, expanded and clarified the statutory requirements for municipal master plans, and required that they be reviewed every six years, and updated as necessary. This statutory requirement prompted the Planning Board to begin preparation of a new Master Plan in 1982. The Planning Board retained Carl C. Lindbloom as its planning consultant. The 1984 Master Plan is the result of those efforts.

Since the adoption of the Master Plan, the Borough Commissioners have retained the Ragan Design Group to prepare a revision to the housing element of the Master Plan. This document is dated September 6, 1988. It was distributed to but never adopted by the Planning Board as a formal part of the Master Plan. The revision specifically identifies the developable vacant land located in the Borough of Haddonfield.

III. DEVELOPMENT CONDITIONS IN HADDONFIELD IN 1984:

In 1984, the Planning Board identified six major plan goals for the Borough. Those goals each contained certain sub-objectives, which are expressly set out in the Master Plan. Those six primary goals were as follows:

1. Maintain the visual attractiveness of the community and preserve the Historic character of the central area.

2. Maintain the predominantly single-family residential character of the Borough.

3. Continue to expand housing opportunities in the Borough to meet established needs for existing and future residents.

4. Establish an appropriate balance of retail, office, residential, public and other uses in the business area to maintain its role as the center of community activity.

5. Provide for the safe and convenient movement of vehicles and persons within the Borough, and

6. Maintain and adjust community facilities and services to meet the charging needs of Borough residents.

The Planning Board recognized in 1984 that the Borough of Haddonfield was an almost completely built-up community, with little or no vacant land available for
additional development. The sub-objectives set forth in the Master Plan indicate that the Planning Board's intention was to preserve and protect the economic, residential and historical integrity of the community. Additionally, in light of the demographics of the community, it recognized that there is a need for the development of senior citizen housing. The Plan also recognized that as for vehicular traffic, the municipality is largely at the mercy of the State and county, which control the major roads and highways that surround the Borough and which feed traffic into it. Lastly, the Plan recognized the need to protect and preserve existing open space in the community and to make the existing open space and public facilities more available to the community.

IV. CHANGES IN HADDONFIELD SINCE 1984:

A. DEVELOPMENT:

There have not been any substantial changes in the Haddonfield community since 1984. There have been a number of incremental changes, which have had an impact on the central business district. The main office of Midlantic National Bank/South, formerly located at 110 Kings Highway East, has been closed with the loss of that employment base and those employees as customers of the retail businesses in the central business district. The commercial base has become a little narrower than formerly, with a growing emphasis on gift shops and similar businesses. There continue to be occasional vacancies in store fronts, usually on the periphery and not in the center of the business district.

There continues to be an occasional in-fill development in the residential areas. Where conforming vacant lots exist, there has been occasional single-family development. Since 1984, the Borough on average has issued approximately seven construction permits per year for the construction of new single family homes. Two five house developments have occurred since 1984, being the developments at the former American Legion property and the development on the parcel behind Greenfield Hall (Historical Society of Haddonfield). No other major residential development has occurred in the Borough of Haddonfield.

What little open space does exist in private hands continues to be available for development. Some of this development has been curtailed by the slightly larger lot size requirements imposed by ordinance following the adoption of the 1984 Master Plan. Nevertheless, the incremental development of conforming vacant building lots continues.
B. TRANSPORTATION:

The continued growth in Cherry Hill, Voorhees and Evesham have continued to affect the traffic and congestion problems in Haddonfield. Since 1984, a number of developments in Cherry Hill (Uxbridge, Chanticleer, Park Place, Tavistock, etc.) and Voorhees (Main Street, the Beagle Club, etc.) have continued to generate additional traffic impact on the Haddonfield area. This trend will continue as the homes in additional developments (such as the Sergi Farm development in Cherry Hill) are constructed.

A number of improvements to the local road network have occurred, which has been intended to somewhat ameliorate the congestion problem. At the same time, the improvements also have tended to attract additional traffic. The improvements made in nearby communities since 1984 include the reconstruction of Kings Highway during the late 1980's, the widening of the Haddonfield-Berlin Road and other changes to various streets and intersections. Within the Borough, the repaving of Kings Highway in 1990 has improved that road.

The impending reconstruction of Route 70 (Marlton Pike) in Cherry Hill will continue to cause traffic to flow through the Borough. Haddonfield can expect that this additional traffic will impact the community during the entire Route 70 reconstruction project.

Another transportation change which has occurred is the re-instituted of passenger railroad service to Atlantic City. The trains, run both by Amtrak and New Jersey Transit, operating on the single track that runs through the Borough next to the speedline and in the old PRSL right of way. (Railroad passenger service was last run on this route in 1966, prior to the construction of the Patco Speedline.) There is no station in Haddonfield where the trains could stop, so there is no substantial impact on the Borough by reason of the resumption of that train service.

The traffic and congestion problems in the Borough of Haddonfield since 1984 have not improved, and if anything, have gotten incrementally worse. Where the Borough is able to control or influence decisions concerning the road network serving town, emphasis should be placed on improving safety and smooth traffic flow, rather than on increasing the speed of the traffic, or increasing the volume capacity of the highways.

C. OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

Under the State Plan, Haddonfield is recognized as being in a suburban ring around the City of Camden. This designation is consistent with the existing development in the community.
Since the 1984 Master Plan, there has been no dissipation of the natural resources in the Borough. The existing open space in public hands continues to be preserved and maintained. The Board of Education and the Borough have increased the number of active recreation playing fields on the public lands. Because of the built up nature of the community, there are no design or planning changes which can be implemented to improve energy conservation in the Borough.

Haddonfield continues to be a regional leader in recycling. The Borough has recently gone on-line with curbside plastics recycling. It continues to recycle glass, metals and paper.

D. CONCLUSION:

The Planning Board concludes that there has been no substantial change in the development conditions in the Borough of Haddonfield since the adoption of the 1984 Master Plan. The municipality continues to be completely developed with the conditions affecting the Borough being in the nature of incremental change, rather than any dramatic developments.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Planning Board, upon consideration of the 1984 Master Plan and the conditions in which the municipality finds itself in 1991, does not recommend any major changes to the Borough Master Plan. However a number of minor concerns exist, and need to be addressed to more effectively implement the existing Master Plan and improve the quality of community development regulations. The Planning Board therefore makes the following recommendations concerning planning in Haddonfield:

1. The 1984 Master Plan should generally continue to remain in full legal force and effect at this time, and until a subsequent general revision of the Master Plan is hereafter determined to be necessary. The Master Plan goals set forth in the 1984 Master Plan, are hereby revised and adopted as set forth on the attachment to this report.

2. The omnibus land use ordinance should be completed and enacted as a unified whole. The zone plan, as set forth in the present land use ordinance, is substantially satisfactory.

3. The Borough should continue with its study to determine the practicality and desirability of expanding the Historic District into adjacent and architecturally significant portions of the Borough adjacent to the existing Historic District.

4. The Borough should continue to explore the possibility of encouraging the development of senior citizen housing.
5. The Borough should more aggressively seek to retain open space, whether in public or private hands, and where possible, acquire additional vacant land for the general benefit of the community.

6. The Borough should consider developing a pedestrian and bicycle trail along the Cooper River from Crows Woods to Evans Pond, in order to provide better linkage among public parks.

7. The Borough should consider adopting a property maintenance ordinance to insure the continued protection of the quality of the commercial and residential character of the community.

8. The Borough should refine the existing zone plan to more accurately reflect existing development in the community and analyze non-conforming uses and structures, to determine if additional fine-tuning of the zone plan is appropriate.

9. The Planning Board should adopt a revised housing element as part of the Borough Master Plan.

10. The Borough should plan in a manner that will encourage pedestrian traffic and the use of bicycles within the community.
ATTACHMENT TO

MASTER PLAN RE-EXAMINATION REPORT

REVISED MASTER PLAN GOALS-1991

1. Maintain the visual attractiveness of the community and preserve the historic character of the central area.

   The visual attraction of Haddonfield is due, in part, to its physical sense of order. This sense of order is a product of use compatibility and scale; and these factors should be a primary consideration in Master Plan development and its implementation.

   The standards of the Haddonfield Historic District help maintain the physical sense of order in the central area of the Borough. The District should be expanded where appropriate.

2. Maintain the predominantly single-family residential character of the Borough.

   Maintain and amend zoning as necessary to insure that additional residential development is consistent, in terms of design and density, with existing residences.

   Encourage home improvement and maintenance.

   Preclude the possibility of inappropriate land uses in residential areas.

3. Continue to expand housing opportunities in the Borough to meet established needs for existing and future residents.

   Future housing needs may be satisfied through such means as the preservation of housing in the business district, and the development of senior citizen housing.

4. Establish an appropriate balance of retail, office, residential, public and other uses in the business area to maintain its role as the center of community activity.

   Contain the business area within its present use boundaries.

   Develop a detailed design plan for the future development of the business area.

   Maintain residential uses on upper floors.

   Provide for future parking needs without impacting Borough streets.

   Establish lighting and landscape design standards for parking areas and design review criteria for site plan review.
5. Provide for the safe and convenient movement of vehicles and persons within the Borough.

Road improvements should be made primarily for purposes of safety, rather than for facilitating through traffic flow.

In all road improvements, the impact on community character and the environment should be a major concern.

The detailed design plan for the business area should include traffic improvement recommendations, including pedestrian and bicycle traffic.

Proposals for bike paths and pedestrian ways throughout the Borough should be developed. Primary among these should be a trail along the Cooper River linking parks, schools, neighborhoods, and historic areas.

6. Maintain and adjust community facilities and services to meet the changing needs of Borough residents.

Future open space and recreation improvements should reflect recent trends in population characteristics such as smaller households, a growing number of elderly residents, etc.

Protect and preserve existing open space areas and acquire additional land for public use.

The present use of public school facilities should be maintained by making excess space available for community purposes and programs for all age groups.
MASTER PLAN
of the
Borough of Haddonfield
1984

The Planning Board
Borough of Haddonfield
Camden County, New Jersey
March 1984
RESOLUTION OF
HADDONFIELD PLANNING BOARD
ADOPTING REVISIONS TO MASTER PLAN

WHEREAS, the Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-1 et seq) adopted in 1976 provides that:

(1) A municipality must adopt a land use plan element of a master plan in order to regulate land development within the municipality;

(2) The Planning Board is vested with the responsibility for the preparation and adoption of a master plan and revisions thereto;

(3) The master plan and development regulations must be reexamined every 6 years.

WHEREAS, the Borough of Haddonfield adopted its initial Master Plan in 1959 and subsequently amended the Master Plan in 1972;

WHEREAS, the Haddonfield Planning Board together with its planning consultant, Carl G. Lindbloom, has been engaged in extensive review and updating of its Master Plan since October, 1982; and

WHEREAS, a duly noticed public hearing with respect to the review, preparation and adoption of a revised Master Plan was held on February 23, 1983; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Board has completed its review and preparation of the Master Plan; and
WHEREAS, on March 11, 1984, at its regular monthly meeting the Planning Board of the Borough of Haddonfield did unanimously vote to adopt the Master Plan which is attached to this resolution as Exhibit "A".

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning Board of the Borough of Haddonfield

1) That the Planning Board adopt the Revisions of the Master Plan of the Borough of Haddonfield in the form and content contained in Exhibit A;

2) That a copy of the revisions of the Master Plan be sent to the Camden County Planning Board and to the Municipal Clerks of each adjoining municipality.

HADDONFIELD PLANNING BOARD

[Signature]
Chairman

[Signature]
Secretary

REPORT CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION
   A. Purpose of Planning and the Master Plan
   B. The Master Plan Defined
   C. Planning Activity in Haddonfield
   D. Plan Revision Methodology

II. SUMMARY OF BASIC DATA FINDINGS
   A. Regional Considerations
   B. Population, Housing and Employment
   C. Existing Land Use
   D. Circulation and Transportation
   E. Community Facilities and Services

III. BASIC DATA ANALYSIS
   A. Regional Considerations
   B. Population, Housing and Employment
   C. Existing Land Use
   D. Circulation and Transportation
   E. Community Facilities and Services
   F. Housing Need

IV. PLAN GOALS
   A. Purpose and Importance of Goals
   B. Prior Plan Goals
   C. Proposed Plan Goals

V. MASTER PLAN DESCRIPTION
   A. Plan Approach
   B. Land Use Plan
   C. Housing Plan
   D. Circulation Plan
   E. Business Area Plan
   F. Utility Service Plan
   G. Community Facilities, Recreation and Conservation Plan
   H. Energy Conservation and Storm Water Management Plan
   I. Area Plan Conformance

VI. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION
   A. Introduction
   B. Legal Requirements
   C. Periodic Plan Review
   D. New and Revised Ordinances and Programs

VII. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY
INTRODUCTION

A. Purpose of Planning and the Master Plan

Community planning is a concept which refers to the continuous advisory process of guiding land development, and redevelopment, in accordance with established policy toward pre-determined goals. It represents a conscious effort to shape the physical environment. Its ultimate objective is the welfare of those who live and will live in the community insofar as control of the physical environment will contribute to that end.

Urban planning is comprehensive in approach. It considers all physical, social, economic and aesthetic factors having an impact on community life and their potential for change. Each of the many aspects to be examined must be analyzed in light of its relationship to the whole, and in forming final proposals, all planning considerations must be adjusted to each other. Only then will the recommendations for any specific question begin to make sense.

The primary product of the planning process is the Master Plan. This document presents for all to see and comment on:

1. Fundamental statements of policy in the form of principles and objectives regarding future development of the community;

2. Text and maps relating the policy statements to a physical design; and

3. General considerations of the ways and means by which plan proposals may be achieved.

The Master Plan provides a basis for an intelligent course of action by enabling the planning board and governing body to consider specific projects upon which they must act in terms of a clear overall picture of the end product desired. It also enables public and private agencies to relate their development to the design principles and objectives expressed in the plan.
The first Master Plan of the Borough, adopted in 1959, contained the following description of planning in its introduction:

"What is planning and what is a plan? Whether we choose to acknowledge it or not, all of us engage in some form of planning in relation to our daily lives. Basically, planning is merely the process of determining intelligently and with deliberation, a course of action for the future. In relation to community development, it involves an assessment of future needs and the development of basic policy, objectives, and standards. In addition, it involves an understanding of trends and relationships. A plan may be regarded as a general framework, or guide for the future physical development of the community and should be regarded as the main point of reference in the making of pertinent decisions. Although the term master plan is used in the statutes to describe the mapped and written proposals recommending the municipality's physical development, it should not be thought that such a plan is a final and conclusive statement. On the contrary, the master plan, although a comprehensive statement at a certain point in time of the community's problems, needs, goals, and even aspirations, is also a part of a continuous process of study, and is subject to the adjustments and changes necessary in the dynamic age in which we live."

B. The Master Plan Defined

Under State law (40:55D-28) the responsibility for the preparation of a Master Plan rests with the Planning Board. The Master Plan is adopted (or amended) by the Planning Board after a public hearing. A current Master Plan is required for any community wishing to regulate land development through zoning controls.

The Master Plan must include a statement of objectives upon which the plan is based; a specific policy statement indicating the relationship of plan proposals to the plans of neighboring communities, the County, and other appropriate jurisdictions; and nine plan elements as follows:

- Land Use
- Housing
- Circulation
- Utility Service
- Community Facilities
- Recreation
- Conservation
- Energy Conservation
- Storm Water Management
An adopted Master Plan must be reviewed at least once every six years, and the zoning ordinance must be consistent with the Land Use Element of the Master Plan.

C. Planning Activity in Haddonfield

The Haddonfield Planning Board was established in 1956 and charged with exercising those powers pertaining to Borough growth and development, including the preparation of a Master Plan.

The first Borough Master Plan was prepared by the Planning Board, with the assistance of its Master Plan consultant the Government Consulting Service, in 1959. This document was comprehensive in scope, provided the basis for zoning changes, and served the community well for many years.

In 1972, the Planning Board, with the assistance of planning advisor Herbert H. Smith Associates, prepared an update of the 1959 Plan. This plan was considered a supplement to the 1959 Plan and was entitled "Policy Plan for the Future of Haddonfield". The Policy Plan established guidelines for future development, but was not as specific as the 1959 Plan. However, the 1972 plan did represent an extension of the 1959 Plan and provided support for the establishment of the Historic District zoning and other zone amendments.

The 1975 Municipal Land Use Law made extensive changes in required Master Plan format and content and required that municipal Master Plans be reviewed, and updated where necessary, at least every six years. This prompted the Planning Board in 1982 to initiate the preparation of a new Master Plan.
D. Plan Revision Methodology

Once the decision to prepare a new Master Plan was made, the Planning Board hired Carl G. Lindbloom, a planning consultant, to assist in that effort. Work began in October, 1982 and plan preparation was organized into three phases:

1. Basic data survey;
2. Data analysis and goal development; and
3. Plan proposals.

Phase One, an inventory of existing conditions and growth factors, may be defined as research into the internal and external factors affecting development in the Borough. The internal factors, over which the Borough may exercise some control, include: existing local developments and trends (land use, circulation and community facilities); population composition and growth; economic base, physical building conditions and aesthetic conditions. The external factors, over which the community has very limited control, include the actions of local governments in the area, actions of regional governments and agencies, and related regional development and growth trends.

Phase Two, an analysis of Phase One data and the preparation of plan goals, provides the direction needed for plan development in Phase Three.

Phase Three, the actual development of plan proposals, may include the testing of alternative plans until agreement is reached on a final plan. The Master Plan format must follow the Land Use Law as to the inclusion of specific plan elements, but the Planning Board is not otherwise limited in the preparation of plan proposals.

Completion of the Master Plan signals the start of a fourth phase: the preparation or revision of local ordinances, and other measures, to implement the Plan.

This report includes a summary of Phase One, completed in January, 1983; much of the Phase Two report, completed in June, 1983; and the full text of Phase Three, Master Plan proposals.
II. SUMMARY OF BASIC DATA FINDINGS

This section summarizes all of the background data findings from Phase One of the Master Plan program. A full report on these findings was published in January, 1983, and is on file at the Planning Board office.

Phase One of the Haddonfield Borough Master Plan presented basic data findings for five planning topics. These topics were regional considerations; population, housing and employment characteristics; existing land use; circulation and transportation, and community facilities and services. The major findings of each topic are summarized below:

A. Regional Considerations

1. The Camden County Planning Board and the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission recognize Haddonfield as a developed community and anticipate no major growth for the Borough over the next two decades. The State Development Guide Plan places Haddonfield and its neighboring municipalities in a "growth area".

2. The land use and zoning patterns of surrounding municipalities are dominated by the single-family detached home. Commercial land uses however, have been decentralizing in the area of Haddonfield in recent years, and this trend is expected to continue.

3. The Borough is threatened by a series of negative external influences as a result of the regional development pattern. These external influences include the increased use of Haddonfield's roadways by the region's commuters; the increased competition of regional shopping malls, and the redevelopment of the Garden State Race Track.
B. Population, Housing and Employment

1. Haddonfield's 1980 population was 12,337, a 6.0 percent decline since 1970. Similar population declines were experienced in all surrounding communities with the exception of Cherry Hill which continued to expand, although at a reduced rate. Also, the Borough's population is close to its 1958 level of 12,975 persons.

2. Haddonfield's average household size shrank to 2.70 persons in 1980, a 12.0 percent drop from 1970. This decline is consistent with the national trend and, in part, explains the Borough's population loss during a period when its housing unit count increased.

3. The 1980 Census shows an increase of 349 units in the Borough's housing units during the 1970's. Over 76.0 percent of these new units came in the form of multi-family housing, including townhouses, apartments and conversions. Of the 4,614 housing units in 1980, 85.6 percent were classified as single-family detached units.

4. Haddonfield's population will continue its gradual decline. A 1990 population of 11,542 is projected, assuming a continuation of present trends.

5. The median age of Haddonfield's residents was 38.0 years in 1980, 7.5 years higher than the Camden County figure. The population of the Borough is gradually aging, as the 1970's saw Haddonfield lose residents under 25 years of age while its elderly population grew.

6. The 1979 median household income in Haddonfield was $26,688 while the same figure for Camden County was $18,056.

7. Over 82.0 percent of the Borough's housing is owner-occupied, and almost 90.0 percent of the Borough's units were constructed prior to 1960. The median home value was $68,100 in 1980, while the median contract rent was $267.
8. Haddonfield's covered employment (1973-1981) grew by 12.0 percent, while the City of Camden lost 27.7 percent of its workers and Cherry Hill gained over 55.0 percent over the same period. For the period 1976-1981 the service job category increased by 71 percent while retail jobs declined by 24 percent.

C. Existing Land Use

1. Single-family residences occupy just over half of Haddonfield's 2.78 square miles. Other residential land uses account for an additional 4.8 percent of the Borough.

2. Public and semi-public lands cover almost 40 percent of Borough land area. These lands include municipal facilities, parking, parklands, and streets and railroads. The final category, streets and railroads, covers 18.4 percent of the Borough.

3. Only about 34 acres of vacant land remain in Haddonfield; 28 acres are privately owned and are scattered throughout the Borough in small parcels.

D. Circulation and Transportation

1. Traffic volumes on Borough roadways have increased by over 52 percent since 1959.

2. A recent traffic study by the DVRPC indicates that approximately 56 percent of the Borough's vehicular trips originate and terminate outside of Haddonfield.

3. Mass transit in Haddonfield consists of five bus lines and the PATCO high speed rail line. The 1,218 parking spaces at the Haddonfield PATCO station are being used to capacity while up to 30% of spaces at adjacent stations go unused.

E. Community Facilities and Services

1. Park and recreation facilities in Haddonfield have been upgraded substantially since 1959 and now total approximately 140 acres. This figure is only slightly below the park standard recommended by the State of New Jersey.
2. Haddonfield's residents receive adequate services in the form of police and fire protection, water supply, library and municipal services, and sewage and refuse disposal.

3. Public school facilities were rated as adequate by the 1979 Educational Facilities Master Plan. Enrollment figures have shown a 32.3 percent decline since the 1970-71 school year and a continued decline to 1,717 students is forecast through 1989.

### EXISTING LAND USE

#### HADDONFIELD BOROUGH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>(%) Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-Family</td>
<td>880.34</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to Four Family</td>
<td>102.64</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Family</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>995.73</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>22.34</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial (excluding office)</td>
<td>19.98</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>60.67</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Facilities</td>
<td>26.86</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>147.08</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads &amp; Railroads</td>
<td>327.74</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>14.81</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Public</td>
<td>59.66</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camden County Parklands (Undeveloped)</td>
<td>112.81</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td>688.96</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lands</td>
<td>33.84</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,779.20</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. **BASIC DATA ANALYSIS**

This section provides an analysis of the basic data summarized above. This analysis summary is organized along the same planning topics used in Phase I. A full report on the basic data analysis was published in June, 1983, and is on file at the Planning Board office.

A. **Regional Considerations**

The regional considerations section of Phase I presented two major findings concerning Haddonfield. The first concerns the Borough's classification as a "growth area" by the State Development Guide Plan (SDGP). The Borough Planning Board is aware that certain obligations attach as a result of that designation and that a portion of Haddonfield's future land development must address those obligations.

The second major point brought out by the regional study is the major influences presented by the Borough's neighboring communities. As mentioned earlier, regional influences have both positive and negative effects on the Borough. The most important influences are traffic considerations, the business areas' competition for shoppers and the possibility of additional regional development impacts.

B. **Population, Housing and Employment**

An analysis of the Borough's population, housing and employment characteristics provides a number of planning considerations for Haddonfield's future. While the absolute number of persons, housing units and jobs has varied only slightly since 1970, the Borough has experienced a number of internal adjustments that will affect its land use, municipal services and finances over the next two decades.
To begin with, Haddonfield's population is aging while its household size is on the decline. These trends substantiate the need for senior citizen housing in the Borough, and also suggest that future housing units should be built with less total floor area and fewer bedrooms. The two trends also suggest that the orientation of services in the community be changed; for example, the aging population points to a need for additional passive recreation facilities, rather than the active recreation areas developed after the "baby-boom" years.

The housing characteristics of Haddonfield indicate that the changing demographics have already had an effect on the Borough's housing market. Multi-family housing, which is generally occupied by younger and older householders, accounted for more than three quarters of the residential development in the Borough since 1970. Another major trend is the aging of the local housing stock; almost 90 percent of the Borough's units were constructed prior to 1960. Finally, owner-occupied housing continues to be preferred in Haddonfield; in 1980, 8 of 10 units were owner-occupied and the vacancy rate was only one percent.

The most noticeable trend concerning employment characteristics is the changing portions of job categories comprising the local labor market. Retail jobs, and facilities, have been declining while the service (office) job category has experienced tremendous gains. The focus of Borough employment is the business district and these job category changes reflect the changing character of the district. The demand for office use is a function of regional need, accessibility, and amenity. Major office expansion, however, could crowd out other business district uses and in so doing lessen the area's multi-use function and its desirability for Haddonfield residents.

C. **Existing Land Use**

It is unlikely the municipal land use pattern will change significantly over the next decade. The single-family home and public and semi-public facilities will continue to be the major land uses in the Borough. However, pressure to change the existing land
use pattern will be felt. These pressures have been discussed earlier, and include the increasing demand for multi-family housing and offices.

D. Circulation and Transportation

With the increasing urbanization and growth of non-residential development in the region, circulation and transportation considerations will continue to gain in importance. Unfortunately, the Borough's role in the regional transportation picture is, and will be, a limited one. The majority of the Borough's circulation problems are located along county roads and road improvement decisions will be made by the County. Similarly, mass transit, which also has an important effect on local residents, is run by several quasi-public agencies with little accountability to the Borough.

Traffic volumes on a given road are a function of roadway capacity. In a built-up area such as Haddonfield, the ability to increase roadway capacity, without damage to community amenity, is limited. For Haddonfield, road improvements should be limited to eliminating unsafe conditions rather than speeding traffic flow. The problem of regional traffic is being considered by the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission and will require a regional solution.

The above comments do not mean that Haddonfield's hands are completely tied as far as circulation and transportation are concerned. The Borough could consider, in high volume areas, the removal of on street parking, eliminating left hand turns and the use of peak flow lanes to improve traffic flow. These practices need not be used twenty-four hours a day, as most traffic problems are limited to the morning and evening peak hours.

E. Community Facilities and Services

The study of community facilities and services indicates that the Borough is currently providing adequate services for its residents and that major improvements or expansion projects for
public facilities are unnecessary. The Borough should continue to monitor school enrollment trends, and adjust its facilities and services to address the changing demographic profile of the community.

F. Housing Need

The purpose of this section is to determine Haddonfield's future housing need, including its fair share of the regional need for low and moderate income housing units. This section describes the three-step methodology used to determine that need. The steps include: 1) identifying the housing region, 2) determining regional housing need, and 3) allocating the regional need to the municipalities concerned.

1) The Haddonfield Borough Housing Region is defined here as those municipalities within a 30-minute driving time from the center of Haddonfield. Since this definition covers almost all of Burlington and Gloucester Counties, as well as all of Camden County, the three county areas will be considered the housing region for the purposes of this report. The use of data compiled at the county level will insure statistical accuracy and facilitate data collection in general.

The three county housing region covers 875,526 acres, 265,405 of which are in SDGP*growth areas. All of Haddonfield Borough lies in a growth area, and the Borough's 1,779.2 acres represent 0.67 percent of the regional SDGP growth area.

2) The next step in a housing need study is to determine the future housing need of the region for the 1984-1990 period. Future housing need is calculated here by forecasting future employment growth in the region and then converting the future jobs into housing units. The proposed forecast period of 1984-1990 is intended to relate to the Master Plan re-examination time frame of six years.

*State Development Guide Plan
Future employment levels can be calculated from past trends. During the nine years between 1973 and 1981 the region experienced average annual employment gains of just over 4,900 jobs. Projecting this gain on a straight-line basis yields a 1984 employment level of 287,944 jobs and a 1990 level of 317,449. By 1990, the region is expected to have increased its employment base by 29,505 jobs.

The conversion of jobs to housing units is relatively simple, as the relationship of households to jobs is well documented and easily calculated. In 1970, the ratio of households to jobs in New Jersey was 1.0584. By 1980, this ratio had dropped to 1.0326. The declining household/job ratio indicates that jobs are being added at a faster rate than housing units. The ratio of housing units to jobs added during the 1970's was 0.8873. By applying this ratio to the anticipated employment levels of Haddonfield's housing region, one projects future housing needs while concurrently recognizing the changing relationship of households to jobs in the state.

Applying the conversion factor of 0.8873 to the projected employment growth, the region's future housing needs are calculated. As indicated below, the 29,505 jobs indicates a need for 27,227 additional housing units.

Housing Need Summary
Haddonfield Borough Housing Region
(1984 to 1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covered Job Growth</td>
<td>29,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Units/Job</td>
<td>0.8873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Unit Need</td>
<td>26,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy and Loss (4%)</td>
<td>1,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Housing Need</td>
<td>27,227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) The municipal allocation of the regional housing need is the final step in the housing need study. Haddonfield Borough's responsibility concerning the regional need is based on the Borough's proportional share of the regional growth area (as determined by the State Development Guide Plan). As established earlier, Haddonfield has 0.67 percent of the regional growth area,
making the Borough responsible for that portion of the regional housing need. With this in mind, the Borough's fair share of the regional housing need is 182 units or about 30 units per year. To put this figure into some perspective, the Borough gained an average of 35 units per year in the 1970-1980 decade. Although the demand for housing in the Borough is expected to remain high over the next six years, only 28 acres of privately held land are classified as vacant and available for development.

Applying the existing proportion of regional low and moderate income households to the projected local housing need establishes the number of low and moderate income units needed. Based on the region's median household income of $19,500, 22.2 percent of the regional households are considered low income while an additional 16.5 percent are considered moderate income. According to these calculations, Haddonfield's projected 1984-1990 housing need of 182 units should include 40 low income units and 30 moderate income units.

This housing need study methodology is somewhat (but necessarily) formulistic and the results are inappropriately precise figures. The number of units needed during the study period should represent a planning guide, not a legislative mandate. The danger in precise numbers is the potential for deterring a community from exceeding its number, or perhaps forcing unsound development just to achieve that number. For this reason, a range of 150-200 units for the 1984-1990 period is recommended, of which between 50 and 80 should be allocated for low and moderate income households.

**Housing Need Summary**

**Haddonfield Borough**

**1984-1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Housing Unit Need</th>
<th>182 Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Unit Allocation</td>
<td>40 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22.2% x 182 Units)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Income Unit Allocation</td>
<td>30 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended Need Range</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>150 - 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low and Moderate Income Units</td>
<td>50 - 80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. PLAN GOALS

A. Purpose and Importance of Goals

The development of plan goals and objectives is a most important phase in the master plan process. In addition to being a requirement of the Municipal Land Use Law, plan goals give some direction to the development of a new master plan. Goals and objectives also provide a basis for future revisions of a plan by the community. Unfortunately, the formulation of goals and objectives is often neglected or omitted by many communities. In other communities, master plan goals become too general and provide no meaningful direction to the development or revision of a plan. Plan goals should be developed after several factors are considered, including the basic data findings of a community (the possible); the wishes of local residents (the desirable), and the dictates of sound planning practice (the practicable). Finally, the formulation of goals should address and describe the physical, social, economic and aesthetic considerations envisioned by the plan.

B. Prior Plan Goals

Until the present time, the most important planning documents concerning the Borough of Haddonfield were the 1959 Master Plan of Development and the Policy Plan for the Future of the Borough of Haddonfield (1972). Each presented goals and objectives aimed at directing the Borough's future development. Though separated by thirteen years, the two plans expressed comparable concerns, indicating that the Borough has undergone no major planning policy changes since the late 1950's.

The primary concern of the two plans centered around Haddonfield remaining a desirable single-family residential community. Both plans suggested that residential areas be maintained and protected from incompatible land uses. Also suggested was the need to remove or correct problems, such as traffic congestion, that would diminish the value and enjoyment of residential life in the Borough.
The 1959 and 1972 documents concurred that the Kings Highway Business District was a particularly attractive asset to the community and the region. Neither plan suggested the expansion of the CBD, but both recognized the need for improved parking, amenities and appearance if the area was to survive as a major retail facility.

The 1959 Master Plan sought to promote the safe and convenient movement of vehicles and persons in and through the Borough. The 1972 plan agreed, as both recognized the threat that poor vehicular access posed for the future of Haddonfield.

A final category addressed by the two plans was community facilities. Each saw local facilities as basically adequate with the exception of recreation facilities, which were considered in need of considerable expansion by both plans. A suggestion that the Borough and the Board of Education work closely in addressing recreational needs was noted in 1959 and in 1972.

In summation, the two plans were basically in agreement as to Haddonfield's future. Each plan recognized the Borough's residential, commercial, social and historic attributes and urged their preservation. The 1972 plan differed in one noteworthy way from the earlier plan and this concerned future residential development. Recognizing changing demographic and economic conditions, the 1972 Plan saw the need for housing types that differed from the single-family detached unit. The Plan mentioned that townhouses, apartments and senior citizen housing would be in demand in the future, taking care to point out, however, that no future residential development should alter significantly the Borough's population composition. Alternate housing types have been provided since 1972, and the current master plan basic data report anticipates additional demand for this type of housing.
C. Proposed Plan Goals

1. Maintain the visual attractiveness of the community and preserve the historic character of the central area.

   The visual attraction of Haddonfield is due, in part, to its physical sense of order. This sense of order is a product of use compatibility and scale; and these factors should be a primary consideration in Master Plan development and its implementation.

   The standards of the Haddonfield Historic District help maintain the physical sense of order in the central area of the Borough. The District should be expanded where appropriate.

2. Maintain the predominantly single-family residential character of the Borough.

   Maintain and amend zoning as necessary to insure that additional residential development is consistent, in terms of design and density, with existing residences.

   Encourage home improvement and maintenance.

   Preclude the possibility of inappropriate land uses in residential areas.

3. Continue to expand housing opportunities in the Borough to meet established needs for existing and future residents.

   Future housing needs may be satisfied through such means as the provision of housing in the core area and the business district, and the development of senior citizen housing.

4. Establish an appropriate balance of retail, office, residential, public and other uses in the business area to maintain its role as the center of community activity.

   Contain the business area within its present use boundaries.

   Develop a detailed design plan for the future development of the business area.

   Maintain residential use on upper floors.
Provide for future parking needs without impacting Borough streets.

Establish lighting and landscape design standards for parking areas and design review criteria for site plan review.

5. Provide for the safe and convenient movement of vehicles and persons within the Borough.

Road improvements should be made primarily for purposes of safety, rather than for facilitating through traffic flow.

In all road improvements, the impact on community character and the environment should be a major concern.

The detailed design plan for the business area should include traffic improvement recommendations.

Proposals for bike paths and pedestrian ways should be developed.

6. Maintain and adjust community facilities and services to meet the changing needs of Borough residents.

Future open space and recreation improvements should reflect recent trends in population characteristics such as smaller households, a growing number of elderly residents, etc.

Protect and preserve existing open space areas and expand in new high density housing areas; add small passive open space areas in the business area.

The present use of public school facilities should be maintained by making excess space available for community purposes and programs for all age groups.
V. MASTER PLAN DESCRIPTION

A. Plan Approach

The 1983 Master Plan proposals, as described here, are based on the basic data findings and analysis, and in particular the recommended plan goals which were developed from the basic data analysis, and the following:

1. The Master Plan is structured into separate plan elements in accordance with the Municipal Land Use Law. However, the plan is treated as a continuation of the planning process as developed by the 1959 and 1972 plans. In addition, the 1983 plan recognizes that the general pattern of land use has been established and major deviations from that pattern would be inappropriate.

2. The 1983 plan recognizes that the community is a very special place by virtue of its existing urban form (a dynamic core containing a healthy balance of shopping, jobs and community services for the surrounding residences it serves); its historic identity; and its visual attractiveness. All plan proposals are intended to preserve and/or strengthen these features while reflecting the recommended plan goals.

B. Land Use Plan

The Land Use Plan is the most important of the several plan elements because the Land Use Law requires that the zoning ordinance either be substantially consistent with the land use plan or designed to effectuate such plan (40:55D-62a). For this reason the Land Use Plan Map is precise in its location of the various land use categories. As illustrated by the Land Use Plan Map, there are three primary land use categories: Residential, Commercial and Community Serving. This map graphically describes the plan concept of the traditional balanced community: a core area of commercial and community serving and higher density residential use surrounded by residential development with the higher densities adjacent to the core area services.
This concept also reflects very closely the existing pattern of development which is retained and reinforced by this plan. The following is a general description of the several sub-categories of land use within the three primary categories:

RESIDENTIAL LAND USE

**Very Low Density** - This relatively small area is located along the southern boundary of the Borough, adjacent to the Borough of Tavistock. This area requires a separate density category because of its present unique character of development. It consists of 28 lots (27 developed) on approximately 70 acres or 4% of the Borough, and the only access is from a 2,200 foot long cul-de-sac roadway known as Lane of Acres. Further subdivision of these lots would not be desirable because of the limited access available. This area has an average gross density of one lot for every 2.5 acres and a minimum lot size of 60,000 square feet would maintain the present character of development.

**Low Density** - This category refers to the outer ring of residential development, predominantly single-family detached homes on individual lots, with densities of two to five units per gross acre. This use represents the largest land use category in the Borough, occupying about 988 acres (including abutting streets) or about 56 percent of the Borough total. This large land area is consistent with the goal of maintaining the predominantly single-family residential character of the community. Except for a few scattered duplex or attached units, and a few scattered vacant lots, this area is now completely developed as designated.

**Medium Density** - This category refers to the ring of residential development surrounding the central business district. This area includes single-family homes on individual lots, attached units on separate lots, and larger homes containing several dwelling units. The overall density of development is in excess of 5 units per gross acre and only a few vacant lots remain. This area is
interspersed with public and semi-public facilities and is within walking distance of the business district and the high-speed line. This use category totals about 232 acres (including streets) or about 13 percent of the Borough.

COMMERCIAL LAND USE

Although the commercial land use area is not large in comparison with residential or community service use area, is it much more complex in terms of use characteristics and therefore requires several specific use categories. The six categories described below total approximately 149 acres or 8 percent of Borough area.

Special Business - This category is limited to three small existing business areas that are removed from the core area. Two are located on Grove Street and one on Kresson Road. As small business areas located in residential areas, appropriate use restrictions and bulk development standards will be necessary to insure compatibility with adjacent residential areas.

Mixed Use District - This category is limited to the area north of Mt. Vernon and Merion Avenues on the west side of Haddon Avenue. This area is developed with a mixture of high density residential uses, office uses, and retail business uses. This area is removed from the central business district.

Commercial District - This small area is located opposite the Mixed Use District on Haddon Avenue. It also contains a mixture of uses and includes automobile-oriented uses. Future development here is limited by a lack of lot depth. Both districts constitute a major gateway to the community and the appearance of future development and improvements should reflect that role.

Office District - This area is located north and west of the central business district. It includes the high-speed line parking areas and is developed largely with office uses. This location, adjacent to the central business district and within walking distance of the high-speed line, makes this area most appropriate for office and multi-family residential uses. Within this district certain areas may be appropriate for continued retail commercial use.
Residence-Office District - This category has three locations at the edges of the central business district. The purpose of this district is to provide for limited office use, in areas appropriate for such use, while retaining the residential character of the area and providing a transition between residential areas and more intensive core area development.

Central Business District - This district is the largest of the commercial use categories and is the central focus of community life. It includes a mixture of retail and service uses, offices, high density residential uses, and public and semi-public facilities. The high speed line and its parking facilities abut the CBD; and many of the historic structures which give the Borough its distinctive character are located here. This area is most appropriate for multi-family residential development. Because of the importance of this area to the community, and the need to maintain an appropriate balance of business, residential, and community serving uses, more detailed proposals for this area should be developed as a separate plan element.

COMMUNITY SERVING LAND USE

Parks, Open Space and Recreation Areas - This category includes all existing public and private open space and recreation areas, and proposed open space expansion. Because of the developed nature of the community there is virtually no potential for expansion over that shown. However, much of the existing open space is undeveloped and offers great potential for recreational use and park and open space improvement. This category totals approximately 246 acres or about 14 percent of the Borough.

Public and Semi-Public Facilities - This category includes churches, cemeteries, municipal facilities, schools and other similar facilities used by the public. While there is some overlap with the open space and recreation category, this category is focused on a building use as opposed to an open space use. This category totals approximately 95 acres or about 5 percent of the Borough.
C. Housing Plan

The Housing Plan Element of the Master Plan is concerned with the provision of housing appropriate to the present and future needs of Borough residents. The Land Use Plan Element has designated appropriate areas for residential use by type and general density category; this plan element includes specific proposals for those areas in terms of meeting future housing needs.

Although the basic data study projects a continued slight decline in Borough population, the declining household size requires additional dwelling units. In addition the housing need study projects a need range of 150 to 200 units, of which between 50 and 80 should be allocated for low and moderate income households. Based on study findings, most of these units should be small in size and designed for use by senior citizens. The need range of 150 to 200 total units over the next six years, or an average of 30 units per year, reflects, in part, current demand.

The Land Use Plan Element has designated two residential areas, a low density area and a medium density area. There are scattered vacant parcels in these areas and several underdeveloped parcels. These areas could accommodate an estimated 50 to 80 additional single-family detached units.

The core area of the Borough is most appropriate for needed senior citizen housing units. Specific site locations in the core area should be judged on the basis of meeting senior citizen needs for proximity to public transportation, shopping, and community facilities. This plan element encourages the retention of all existing housing units in the core area.
D. Circulation Plan

The Circulation Plan Element of the Master Plan is concerned with all roadways and streets serving the Borough and with all related aspects of circulation and transportation. Because the Borough is largely developed, the basic circulation pattern and road classification has been established. However, some modifications and improvements, particularly in the core area, are proposed.

The basic data survey found that many of the Borough roadways are burdened by excessive vehicular trips originating and ending outside the community. This through traffic has created problems at several key intersections and in the central business district. However, improvements at these intersections to increase capacity could have the negative effect of encouraging additional through traffic. The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission study (Phase I, May 1983) recommended that a number of regional road improvements be made, and alternative routes be created to reduce Borough through traffic. Most of these recommendations are endorsed by this Plan, but no local improvements (other than safety-related) should be made until related regional road improvements are approved.

1. Increase the capacity of the major north/south arteries such as Marlton Pike, White Horse Pike and Black Horse Pike.

2. Improve Kings Highway corridor intersections (Potter/Grove, Haddon, Tanner, Warwick, Chews Landing) as recommended by TOPICS program and interconnect traffic signals along entire corridor.

3. Implement essence of other TOPICS recommendations, both within and outside of Borough.

4. Improve intersection of Crystal Lake Road and Haddon Avenue and use as alternate route around Haddonfield.

5. Signalize Park Drive and Haddonfield Road.

6. Improve capacity of Haddon Avenue through Collingswood.

7. Increase parking fees or improve bus service to Haddonfield PATCO Station.

8. Study the connection of Kings Highway to Brace Road, before the Ellisburg Circle.

9. Extend Park Drive through to Brace Road.
E. Business Area Plan

The Business Area Plan Element of the Master Plan is not a required plan element under the New Jersey Land Use Law. However, because of the importance of this relatively small area as the central focus of community life, a separate plan element is appropriate and is recommended.

A separate plan element also permits a closer examination of the area and provides the opportunity for specific design proposals. Because this area will probably require adjustments in such design proposals, as they are carried to execution, a separate plan element will make the plan revision and updating task that much easier.

The development of a detailed Business Area Plan Element is a major undertaking and should be undertaken following Master Plan adoption. The purpose of this initial effort is to provide the framework and general design direction for detailed plan development. Adoption of the Master Plan will include adoption of this plan element which sets the parameters for additional plan development.

The detailed plan should include an illustrative design which shows the location of existing and proposed buildings, parking areas, landscaping and buffer areas, roads and walkways. A map of existing conditions has already been prepared and will provide the base map for that plan. The plan should include as appropriate the following subjects, which are discussed in greater detail on the following pages.

1. Use Area Designations
2. Passive Open Space Area Designations
3. Pedestrian Circulation Linkage
4. Parking Area Improvements
5. Landscape Improvements
6. Building Design Criteria
7. Circulation Changes
Use Area Designations - The business area represents a large area and a multitude of uses. It may be appropriate to have a further delineation of such use areas. For example, the core area should be zoned to limit ground floor use to those stores which emphasize window shopping and retail sales. The upper floors should be reserved for residential uses. Services such as copying, dry cleaning and other miscellaneous non-retail uses then become peripheral to the core retail area.

Passive Open Space Area Designations - The only passive open space areas in the business area are the Kings Court walkway and the point park in front of the library. Additional small passive park areas would add to the attractiveness of the area and would reinforce its function as the community center. Such open space could also function as pedestrian access to rear parking areas, as does Kings Court. Three such walkway possibilities include the area between the First Baptist Church and the Exchange Building on the south side of Kings Highway; Lantern Lane on the north side of Kings Highway; and a walkway from the west side of Tanner Street to the municipal parking lot.

Pedestrian Circulation Linkages - In addition to the above linkages, which would also function as landscaped open space areas, pedestrian connections to rear area parking facilities should be provided. This can be accomplished through municipal acquisition of title or easement. Municipal control is important to ensure that such linkages will be preserved into the future. All such linkages should be paved, lighted and maintained.

Parking Area Improvements - Most of the parking lots, public and private, are located at the rear of the uses they serve; and their appearance reflects that location. Most are barren, inadequately lit, unattractive areas of poorly marked spaces and confusing circulation patterns, and show a lack of pedestrian consideration. A design plan should include proposals for correcting these deficiencies and providing for consolidation of these lots and/or improved connections between lots. On-street parking should be reserved (and enforced) for short-term use only; interim lot areas should be designated for longer-term parking.
Landscape Improvements - A design plan should include proposals for both hard and soft landscape improvements. Hard landscape refers to street furniture and to the materials used in hard surfaces such as walks, drives, walls, etc., and soft landscape refers to natural plant materials and areas. Both are very important in the design of an attractive urban area. Particular attention should be given to the design of passive open space areas, the proposed pedestrian circulation linkages, and the parking lots.

Building Design Criteria - Although much of the business area is within the existing, or proposed expanded, historic district, there are no specific design guidelines for new or remodeled buildings not in the historic district. Although the front facades of most structures are attractive, the rear facades present a very different appearance.

There are two possible approaches in using the design criteria to improve the appearance of the business area. The first involves amending the existing site plan review requirements by incorporating building design criteria into the site plan review standards and by requiring site plan review for all exterior improvements in the business area. The second approach calls for revisions to the zoning ordinance in the establishment of a separate business area design district and requiring a special design review for all exterior improvements in that district. In this case, the design criteria might be adopted by the Planning Board as a Master Plan amendment and referenced by the design district as recommended guidelines to be followed.

Circulation Changes - The plan should include proposals to improve traffic circulation in the business area. These proposals would be more site specific than those in the Circulation Plan Element of the Master Plan. For example, they might include changes in permitted turning movements and on-street parking areas.
F. Utility Service Plan

The Utility Service Plan element of the Master Plan is concerned with the adequacy, for present and future development, of water supply and distribution, sewerage treatment, solid waste disposal, and provisions for other related utility services.

The Borough sewage plant is presently operating satisfactorily; however, the present proposal is for the County Utilities Authority to take all Borough sewage for treatment at a new regional facility to be located on the Delaware River. The projected level of development in the Borough can be accommodated by the present facility should the County proposal not be implemented.

The existing Borough water supply is adequate to meet the level of development projected by this plan. However, a long-range improvement program should be developed for the water storage and supply system to upgrade inadequate mains, eliminate dead-end mains, and to implement an improvement and maintenance program on the wells.

G. Community Facilities, Recreation and Conservation Plan

The Community Facilities, Recreation and Conservation Plan element of the Master Plan is concerned with all public and semi-public facilities necessary to meet the educational, cultural, safety, health and general welfare needs of present and future Borough residents. Although most such facilities have already been established, the need for new and improved facilities and services will continue. The purpose of this plan element is to recommend the necessary facilities and services in the proper quantity and location to serve the future land use pattern.

Community facilities (public and semi-public uses), parks, and open space areas are shown on the Master Plan Map.
These uses total 336 acres or 19% of the Borough. Proposals for the Haddonfield Historic District are illustrated on a separate map and are discussed here under the Conservation section of this plan element.

Community Facilities (public and semi-public uses) - As noted in the Land Use Plan, this category is focused on building use as opposed to an open space use and includes municipal facilities, schools, churches, cemeteries, etc. This category totals approximately 90 acres or about 5 percent of the Borough. As shown on the Land Use Plan, all of the public and semi-public uses are existing facilities; no new facilities are proposed. Most of these uses are concentrated in the central or eastern portions of the Borough in close proximity to Kings Highway. Additional such uses are located within the CBD area, but are not identified separately.

All of these facilities, in addition to their functional role, serve an important role in strengthening community identity. These facilities are all well located to serve the community; this plan recognizes their importance and the appropriateness of their central location. No changes are proposed.

Although the public school enrollment is expected to continue to decline, no changes in existing school building use in serving local educational needs are proposed. This does not preclude, however, the use of school facilities for other community cultural and recreational purposes. The neighborhood school concept should be retained and additional appropriate uses found for underutilized areas.

Parks, Open Space, and Recreation Areas - As noted in the Land Use Plan, this category refers to all public and private open space-recreational facilities. This category totals approximately 246 acres or about 14 percent of the Borough. As shown on the Land Use Plan, virtually all of this acreage is existing; and only minor additions to the existing open space inventory is proposed. The few additions proposed are largely small vacant parcels contiguous to existing public open space areas.
Although the Master Plan basic data study found that virtually all of the open space areas are located east of the High Speed Line, there is no land available west of the High Speed Line for additional open space use. In any case, the higher density use areas (residential and commercial) of the Borough are located near the open space areas.

This plan recommends that existing open space areas be preserved and be more fully utilized for active and passive use. Funding for open space improvements, such as the State Green Acres Program, should be sought by the Borough. The Borough should develop a detailed recreation facilities master plan which would set forth specific recommendations for all Borough-owned open space areas and would provide the basis for funding requests.

**Conservation Areas** - The Haddonfield Historic District was established in 1971. It is located in the core area of the Borough, including much of the business district and both sides of Kings Highway from Chews Landing Road east to the Borough line, a distance of over one mile. This area, including streets, covers approximately 200 acres or about 11 percent of the community. The Historic District Ordinance, which regulates building appearance in the district, has been most successful in maintaining the historic environment. An expansion of the district is proposed as shown on the attached map. This area, including streets, would add an additional 100 acres to the existing Historic District.

The existing 200-acre Historic District is listed on the State (1980) and National (1982) Register of Historic Places. The proposed expansion would not affect that listing. The proposed expansion will round out the historic core of the community and will include areas that have an important relationship to the core area. It is recognized, however, that such an expansion could cause administrative (additional workload) problems and this should be a consideration in the review of the existing Historic District regulations. In any case, the Planning Board recommends that the
Historic District be expanded judiciously to include areas that may be considered (in the future) for inclusion in the State or National historic district register. Boundaries should also be adjusted to include the rear lot lines of lots facing streets in the Historic District.

H. Energy Conservation and Storm Water Management Plan

The Energy Conservation and Storm Water Management Plan Element of the Master Plan is concerned with the use of planning and development regulations to conserve energy and to control the storm water impact of development.

Energy Conservation - Energy conservation considerations are in two parts, existing development and future development. Recommendations for existing development are concerned primarily with energy conservation measures in building renovation and/or additions, such as improved insulation and more efficient heating and cooling facilities. Recommendations for new development are concerned primarily with passive solar considerations such as minimizing north facing glass and maximizing south facing glass; effective use of landscaping, appropriate roof overhangs, etc.

The existing, and proposed future, character of development in Haddonfield presents some unique problems in energy conservation. Because the community is fully developed it will experience very limited new development. Energy conservation controls for such development will have little impact. Because the community includes an extensive historic district in its core area, the requirements of some energy conservation methods (i.e., solar access standards, solar devices, etc.) could conflict with historic preservation guidelines. In energy conservation proposals, whether for existing or new development, primary consideration must be given to the maintenance of the existing form and character of the community.

Other recommended energy saving activities within the authority of a community include:
o A thorough review of all public facilities in terms of the use of energy and the type of energy sources.

o An energy audit and development of plans to improve the energy efficiency of all public buildings.

o An evaluation of Borough vehicles and other machinery in terms of fuel usage and the possibility of using increased amounts of renewable fuels.

o The development of energy efficient means of solid waste disposal, maximizing the recycling of energy through resource recovery when possible.

**Storm Water Management** - The Municipal Storm Water Management Act, effective February 12, 1981, amended the Municipal Land Use Law requiring all municipalities to prepare a Storm Water Management Plan as part of the local Master Plan. However, such plans are required only after development of storm water management regulations by the Department of Environmental Protection, and only after a State grant has been made available for preparation of such a plan.

The purpose of storm water management regulations are to: (1) offset potential flooding and pinpoint pollution problems; (2) encourage water recharge; (3) protect the integrity of stream channels; (4) reduce soil erosion from new development; and (5) to protect the adequacy of bridges and culverts.

The storm water management regulations have been developed by the Department of Environmental Protection, but it is unlikely that grant funds for local plan preparation will be available except to the large developing communities with severe storm water management problems. In the small developed communities, such as Haddonfield, with very limited new development, storm water management regulations will have little regional impact. However, such communities should address storm water management as part of all site plan review action. This Plan recommends that a revised site plan ordinance include storm water management review and regulation.
There is a potential for major new development in Cherry Hill Township along the Cooper River. The storm water impacts of such development could prove detrimental to existing and future Borough facilities adjacent to the River. Such new development will require public notice and the Borough should review all such proposals for storm water impact.

I. Area Plan Conformance

The Municipal Land Use Law requires that all local Master Plans include a specific policy statement indicating the relationship of proposed development, as presented in the Master Plan, to the Master Plans of contiguous municipalities; to the County Plan; and to related comprehensive guide plans (40:55 D-28d).

Municipal Master Plans and Zoning

The preparation of the Haddonfield Borough Master Plan included consideration of the master plans and zoning ordinances of surrounding communities. A brief description of these considerations is now provided.

Cherry Hill Township - Cherry Hill runs the entire length of Haddonfield's eastern border. Lands in the Township to the north of the Ellis/Potter Street intersection are zoned Institutional to reflect county ownership of lands along the Cooper River. This is consistent with the proposed land use plan's Park, Recreation and Open Space classification for the same area.

Lands in Cherry Hill to the south of Ellis Street are zoned for medium density residential. This is not consistent with the Borough's Park classification, but since the Cooper River forms a natural boundary, the existing Cherry Hill zoning should not have a negative impact on the Borough.

Tavistock Borough - The southernmost portion of Haddonfield abuts the Borough of Tavistock. Tavistock has zoned lands along the Haddonfield border for recreational uses, namely the Tavistock
Country Club. This is consistent with Haddonfield's "very low density residential" area along Lane of Acres.

**Haddon Heights/Barrington Boroughs** - The Boroughs of Haddon Heights and Barrington form the southwest border of Haddonfield. Both municipalities have zoned lands in the area of residential densities of one unit per 20,000 to 40,000 square feet, which is consistent with Haddonfield's low density area between Kings Highway and Warwick Road.

**Haddon Township** - Haddon abuts the Borough to the northwest. Lands along the border of Haddon are zoned for residences at densities ranging from one unit per 10,000 to 40,000 square feet. This is consistent with the Borough's low density areas.

**Camden County Land Use Plan** - Camden County, through its 1972 Land Use Plan, recognizes the Borough as a developed municipality and anticipates its primary land use will be low to medium density residences. This is consistent with the Borough's land use plan.

**State Development Guide Plan (SDGP)** - This report places the Borough in its growth area classification. This category identifies areas near employment centers with adequate infrastructure facilities and a relative absence of farms and open space. The growth area classification is the most appropriate SDGP category for Haddonfield Borough. However, the Borough is completely developed; and major "growth" of the Borough is neither anticipated nor planned.

As indicated above, Haddonfield's existing and proposed land uses are relatively consistent with the planning efforts of surrounding municipalities, Camden County and the State.
VI. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

A. Introduction

Plan implementation refers to the various measures available to the Borough to insure execution of the Plan. These involve both legal and informal measures. The informal measures include educating the public, and governmental officials responsible for the day-to-day decisions that have an affect on Borough development, of the existence of a Master Plan. The legal measures, which are also known as land use controls, include site plan review, zoning and subdivision regulations, building and housing codes, and the like. There are also additional aids to plan implementation in the form of capital improvement programming and various State and Federal programs for specific projects.

The adoption of the Master Plan does not signify an end to the local planning effort. Planning is a continuing process through time in a community alert to its changing needs. State law requires a periodic review of the Plan and of the data supporting the Plan, with the necessary updating of various proposals or elements of the Plan. Data of the kind used in the planning process become invalid or obsolete as time passes. New data, therefore, must be acquired, analyzed and interpreted into an updated Plan as conditions require. In addition, a major feature of a continuing planning program is that more detailed proposals may be developed for various elements of the Plan.

A community needs an aggressive, positive policy for improvement. This policy must operate at three levels: the level of the individual citizen; the level of the various businesses and developers who are responsible for major improvement activities; and finally, at the public level of elected, appointed and hired officials who are responsible for the review and approval of development activities.

Daily decisions, as they are formed week after week, month after month, and year after year, are in the end those which create the community as it exists at a given point in time. There
have been all too many instances of logical, even inspired, plans which failed to change the community in any effective way, in the course of time. To be effective, a Plan must live in the minds of those who make daily decisions to insure that those decisions are constantly working toward the final goal.

B. Legal Requirements

The Master Plan, upon adoption by the Planning Board, gives the community the legal basis for control over future development. The major points which are contained in the Municipal Law (chapter 291, Laws of N.J. 1975) are summarized as follows:

The location and design of new streets created through the process of land subdivision or site plan approval may be required to conform to the provisions of the Circulation Plan element of the Master Plan. (40:55 D-38b(2)).

Where the Master Plan provides for the reservation of designated streets, public drainageways, flood control basins, or public areas, the Planning Board may require that such facilities be shown and reserved in subdivisions and site plans in locations and sizes suitable for their intended use. The reservation powers are effective for a period of one year after approval of a final plan. The municipality must compensate the owner for such action. (40:55D-44).

Whenever the governing body or other public agency proposes to spend public funds, incidental to the location, character or extent of a capital project, such proposal must be referred to the Planning Board for review and recommendation. No action shall be taken without such recommendation or until 45 days have elapsed after such reference. (40:55 D-31).

All of the provisions of a zoning ordinance, or any amendment or revision thereto shall either be substantially consistent with the Land Use element of the Master Plan or designed to effectuate such plan element. (40:55D-62).
C. **Periodic Plan Review**

To ensure that an adopted Master Plan is kept current it should be reviewed periodically and revised where necessary. The new Land Use Law requires a periodic reexamination, at least every six years. This requirement reads as follows:

> Periodic examination. The governing body shall, at least every 6 years, provide for a general reexamination of its master plan and development regulations by the planning board which shall prepare a report on the findings of such reexamination, a copy of which shall be sent to the county planning board and the municipal clerks of each adjoining municipality. The 6-year period shall commence with the adoption or termination of the last general reexamination of such plan and regulations. The first such reexamination shall be completed within 6 years after the effective date of this act. (40:55D-89).

D. **New and Revised Ordinances and Programs**

As discussed in the various Plan elements, some additions and revisions to the present zoning ordinance are necessary to implement the Master Plan. Although these changes could be accomplished as revisions to the present ordinance, it is recommended that a completely new ordinance be drafted as part of a comprehensive land development ordinance which would incorporate revised subdivision, site plan, and related development regulations. The following recommendations are intended to serve as a guide in the preparation of the Land Development Ordinance:

**Zoning Map** - A new map should be drafted using the lot line base prepared for the Master Plan. The new map should include revised zone boundaries in conformance with the Land Use Plan map of the Master Plan. It should also indicate the boundaries of the Historic District. This can be accomplished by using a shading or tone on the map to show the extent of this district and that it is an "overlay" zone which includes parts of other zone districts.
possible funding approach is the establishment of a Special Assessment District (the enabling legislation for such district is currently pending in the State Senate). In such districts, the owners of property are assessed, by the Borough, and the funds from such assessment are only used for improvements within the district.
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