

**Cinnaminson Township Planning Board**  
**Regular Meeting Minutes**  
**Tuesday, May 12, 2026 – 6:30P.M.**  
**Cinnaminson Municipal Building, 1621 Riverton Road, Cinnaminson, NJ**

Ms. Lauro called the meeting to order and led the flag salute. She read the Sunshine and Public Statements.

Sunshine Statement: In accordance with Section V of the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 1975, notice of this meeting was posted on the Township Website and by advertising the Regular Meeting in the Burlington County Times and Courier Post newspapers on January 25, 2026. In addition, notice was filed with the Municipal Clerk.

This meeting is a quasi-judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments should be limited to issues that are relevant to what the Board may legally consider in reaching a decision, and decorum appropriate to such a proceeding must be maintained at all times. Please refer to the Rules Governing Public Comment Periods attached to this agenda.

**Roll Call:**

Present: Class II: Mr. Minton; Class IV: Mr. Gallagher, Ms. Lauro, Mr. McGill, Ms. Woodington;  
Alternate: Ms. Stewart.

Absent: Class I: Mr. Horner; Class I Designee: Mr. Roadside; Class III: Mr. Segrest;  
Class IV: Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Snyder

Also Present: Mr. Heinold, Board Solicitor; Mr. Barbadoro, Board Engineer; Mrs. Russell, Board Secretary

Ms. Lauro read the Board's policy: It is the policy of the Board that no application will be opened after 10:00P.M. It is the policy of the Board that no new testimony will be taken after 10:30P.M.

**Application**

Lakeview Memorial Park Association; Block 2507, Lot 1; 1300 Route 130, Cinnaminson – R3 Residential Zone  
Site Plan Approval for 10,000 sq. ft. Mausoleum Expansion and site improvements

James Burns, Attorney for the Applicant, with Dembo, Brown and Burns, shared a summary of the application. He described the site location and variance relief requested. The Applicant proposes an expansion to the existing mausoleum. The Applicant requests a variance for the number of parking spaces where twenty-eight (28) spaces exist and thirty-eight (38) are proposed where forty-four (44) are required by ordinance. Mr. Burns explained that testimony will be provided regarding the mausoleum use which will not generate a significant need for parking, with 38 spaces adequately addressing the mausoleum expansion. In addition, the proposed parking stall size is 9'x18', where 9.2' x 17.8' exists and 10'x20' is required. This is a pre-existing, nonconforming condition that will continue with new spaces. The pre-existing, nonconforming driveway aisle width existing is 24.2', 24.4' is proposed and 25' is required.

Mr. Burns introduced the witnesses for the Applicant, Bryan Mayer, Engineer with PS&S, and Lakeview Memorial Park Association Board Members, Ben Young and Bradford Smith. The witnesses were sworn by Mr. Heinold.

Mr. Burns described the proposed mausoleum addition, reporting the aesthetics of the proposed expansion will match the existing mausoleum. He explained the final architectural drawings of the addition are not yet completed. He introduced a photo of the existing mausoleum as Exhibit A-1.

## **Completeness/Notice**

Mr. Barbadoro recommended based on his review letter dated March 8, 2016 the application be deemed complete, contingent on submission of architectural plans when available.

## **Hearing**

Mr. Burns introduced the Applicant's Engineer, Mr. Mayer, who advised the Board of his educational background, professional experience and licenses held. Mr. Mayer was accepted as an expert witness by the Board.

Mr. Mayer described the location of the proposed mausoleum on the site and the surrounding area. He introduced the following exhibits:

A-2 – plan showing surrounding area

A-3 – closeup of existing mausoleum, road through center to the west and parking lot to the south and north

A-4 – proposed mausoleum expansion on the back of the existing building plus small bump-out front, 10 additional parking spaces and landscaping behind to match existing landscaping, and brick pavers to match the current pavers.

He noted the two stormwater basins, to control and treat runoff, which meet the DEP requirements. Mr. Mayer explained the existing parking stall size, what is proposed with 10'x20' required. The Applicant wishes to keep the stalls the existing size in order to maintain consistency. He reported the existing drive aisle width of 24', with 24.4' proposed and 25' is required. He noted that 24' is the acceptable industry standard. Mr. Mayer explained the variance requested for the number of parking spaces. Twenty-eight (28) currently exist and thirty-eight (38) total are proposed.

Mr. Mayer explained that, based on the building size and use of the site, parking is not an issue. He reported that only one funeral is held at a time, and most parking occurs on sides of roads. Parking at the mausoleum is typically used by visiting families. Mr. Mayer reported his conversation with Mr. Barbadoro regarding the number of stalls required based on the size of the expansion. He confirmed there are no objections to the comments of Mr. Barbadoro's review letter. He is prepared to address any questions.

Mr. Burns introduced Ben Young, Lakeview Memorial Park Association Board Member. Mr. Young explained the operation of the existing mausoleum where only one funeral is scheduled at a time. He reported the expansion is required as existing niches are rapidly selling out. Mr. Young described the design options that are currently under negotiation with the contractor and will be decided based on budget considerations. He notes the base design will be mirror the existing mausoleum and will include a connector hallway, public bathroom, mechanical room, and storage area that could be converted to niches if needed.

Mr. Young addressed stormwater connection runoff. The proposed mausoleum will be back approximately 600' to 1000' and will be a total of 9,600 sq. ft.. The new exterior will be similar brick, stucco and marble and finalized drawings will be provided. Mr. Young reported that stormwater for the expansion already in place. He stated that solar panels are a consideration but may not be in budget. He addressed the removal of trees and the conditions of those that were removed. Removed trees were dead and have been replaced by eighteen (18) trees throughout the site. Most trees were removed from underbrush and the overgrown woods. He noted the site is basically 50 acres of open space.

Mr. Burns introduced Bradford Smith, President of Lakeview Memorial Park Association. Mr. Smith explained that parking on the site does not function like a shopping center, where thousands of people are in and out every day. Rather a handful of people visit loved ones and funerals are scheduled one at a time. During funerals, people arrive and park, the service is conducted and they leave the site prior to the begin of the next scheduled funeral. Funerals are well timed and scheduled. Mr. Smith confirmed receipt of Mr. Barbadoro's review letter and reported there are no issues with the comments in the letter. He added that typically when a burial is taking place inground, visitors park along the roadways rather than in the mausoleum lot area and at most, four funerals are held per day. Therefore, the proposed parking is more than sufficient for the level of activity taking place on site.

Mr. Barbadoro reviewed the variances and waivers requested. He asked if additional lighting is proposed and if not, will need a variance be needed. Mr. Smith explained the cemetery is open only during daylight hours with the gates closed from dusk to morning. As no one is present in the evenings, no new lighting is proposed, therefore a variance is requested given the unique situation of the site and how it functions.

Mr. Barbadoro reviewed the requested landscape waiver. He references section F2 of his letter regarding a tree removal plan. The Applicant confirmed they will work with Mr. Barbadoro to supplement trees in other places. Under section F6, the required shade trees in parking lot will be supplemented in other places on the site. Mr. Burns acknowledged agreement with this plan. Mr. Smith reports that eighteen (18) trees have been planted on the site over the last two years through a memorial tree program. Trees are purchased in memory of a loved one and memorialized with a name plaque. This is a popular program.

### **Hearing Open to the Public**

Ms. Lauro opened the hearing to the public.

- Dave Tedrich, 424 Willow Drive, Cinnaminson – commented that he as watched the cemetery change from his kitchen window. He asked for the existing square footage of the mausoleum and the proposed addition. Mr. Mayer explained that the exact size of the expansion is yet to be determined but is estimated at 10,113 square foot where roughly 16,000 square foot exists.
- Brian Ollinger, 494 Willow Drive, Cinnaminson – lives down the block form the cemetery. He asked if there will be consideration of noise during maintenance and building, stating that maintenance has begun as early as 5:00AM. Mr. Burns states the Township ordinance does not allow noise before 7:00AM. Mr. Minton suggests any matter of noise be reported to the Police Department, making it a matter of record. Mr. Ollinger asked about run-off from the stormwater basins as he has seen runoff along the curblin on Willow Drive. Mr. Mayer reported the basin does not discharge toward Willow Drive.

### **Hearing Closed to the Public**

Since there we no further comments or questions, Ms. Lauro closed the hearing to the public.

### **Comments of the Board**

There were no comments from Board members.

### **Determination**

Mr. Heinold reviewed the requested variances for quantity of parking spaces, parking stall size and drive aisle conditions. He noted the requested landscape waivers and the conditions of approval for supplemental planting. He explains this is a straight forward site plan approval for expansion of the mausoleum. Architectural plans must be submitted and the landscape plan must be resolved with Mr. Barbadoro. Mr. Minton adds the fire

marshal will review the final plan. A variance for lighting is discussed and it is determined a variance is needed as no new lighting is needed for the site.

Motion Mr. Minton, seconded by Ms. Woodington, to approve the application based on the conditions as described.

**Roll Call:**

Those voting in favor: Mr. Gallagher, Mr. McGill, Mr. Minton, Ms. Woodington, Ms. Lauro;  
Alternate: Ms. Stewart.  
Those voting against: None  
Those abstaining: None Those recusing: None  
Those absent: Mr. Horner, Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Roadside, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder.

**Courtesy Review - Board of Education Capital Project - Eleanor Rush School, Memorial School, New Albany School**

- Mr. Minton was recused and left the dais.

**Presentation**

Dr. Stephen M. Capello, Superintendent of Cinnaminson Schools, explained the application for review by the Board for Capital Projects at the five schools to be voting on by referendum in September. He describes the proposed improvements as follows:

Memorial School - proposed parking lot expansion, playground, classroom addition, and related improvements.

Eleanor Rush School – parking lot expansion, gym addition and related improvements.

New Albany School - parking lot expansion, playground, gym and classroom addition and related improvements.

Middle School - new wood shop/storage area, classroom and Esports arena and related improvements.

High School - new stadium complex, concession stand with bathrooms and related improvements.

Dr. Capello explained the significant growth of the school system over the last 10 years with a 25% student increase and its impact on every facet of school system. Particularly impacted are the elementary and intermediate schools, which were designed to accommodate a significantly smaller population. He reported efforts in 2020 to address space needed for full day kindergarten and additional rooms required. He explained the preschool program in the Cinnaminson school district. Based on Department of Education standards, the preschool numbers are double the current first grade with 400 students to be accommodated in preschool rooms which are capped at fifteen (15) students per room. The program has been terrific for the district and residents but does bring about square footage issues.

Dr. Capello stated that the Memorial School was fully reopened after many years and is used as an early child education center. Additionally, retail space has been rented for the preschool program. The district has tried to meet the needs without the need for community support where possible. The proposed expansion will meet the needs of the students going forward.

Dr. Capello introduced Brooks Garrison, of Garrison Architects, the Architect of record for Cinnaminson Schools and Matt Walsh, of PS&S, Civil Engineer who has worked on the project plans. Mr. Garrison and Mr. Walsh were sworn by Mr. Heinold.

Mr. Garrison introduces exhibit A-1, a packet including a fact cover sheet describing issues addressed by referendum and public vote, and preliminary concept plans for each school. He explains that this presentation is part of the planning and zoning requirement under law to receive DOE approval. This is the preliminary stage of the overall project as the referendum has not occurred. Plans have been submitted to the DOE.

Mr. Garrison described the projects for each school and the referendum which consists of two questions. He presented information based on approval of both questions. Proposed improvements at Memorial School are an 8,186 sq. ft. addition including classroom spaces for pre-k, a mechanical room and vestibule, and will have same appearance as existing building. Several projects are proposed for the Eleanor Rush School including site circulation and parking improvements, a 9,430 sq. ft. eight classroom addition, with a similar exterior. An addition to the left will house a gymnasium and a new bathroom. Currently one multi-purpose room exists. Site improvements at the Middle School will address drop-off issues on New Albany Road with an additional parking lot and an addition at the rear to include eight classrooms and a proper gym with bathrooms and a secure vestibule entrance area. This will meet the need for additional classroom space and support the physical education curriculum. The vestibule entrance can be locked off from the school to allow for use after hours and can be used for additional purposes. A stand alone building is proposed for the High School to be used as a concession stand with bathrooms, a new turf field and track surface.

Mr. Heinold explains that this process is a courtesy review by the Planning Board and is presented similar to a site plan application. Under Municipal Land Use Laws (MLUL), the Board of Education presents the project and the Board may offer input that is non-binding. The Board cannot impose conditions or compliance, and any actions taken will be memorialized but this is truly a courtesy review to gain input and to give the public a chance to comment.

### **Public Hearing**

Ms. Lauro opened the hearing to the public.

- Marty Hagerty, 307 Nathan Drive, Cinnaminson – Ms. Hagerty asked for the price of the proposed changes. Mr. Garrison stated that materials are available on the district website and the tax payers will vote on September 15<sup>th</sup>. He further explained that referendum question #1 will cost \$399 per average tax household and question #2 will cost \$160 per average tax household. He reported the total budget for the project is \$75 million dollars. Mr. Garrison explained the formula for calculating and the state's allowance for 40% amount as a loan. He noted the School Board has considered the proposed changes carefully, coming up with the two questions. The plans have been submitted to the DOE and there will be additional presentations that will discuss the costs in more detail.

He explained the State determines the school model and the proposed changes comply with the model as closely as possible. It was determined that the cost per tax household is based on an average home assessed at \$236,538.

- Mike Goins, 100 Purnell Avenue, Cinnaminson – asked if the long range plan has also been submitted to the Planning Board. Mr. Garrison stated that is not a requirement. Mr. Goins noted N.J.A.C. 6A:26 requires submission to the Planning Board to ensure it meets the requirements of the Master Plan. Mr. Garrison explained they are here to present the proposed improvements and those were submitted. He explained the District and the Governing Body are two government bodies that work together, and either body may offer comments to the other. The design professionals and DOE comply with the Master Plan and work together in the best interest of the public.

## **Hearing closed to the public.**

Since there were no further comments or questions, Ms. Lauro closed the hearing to the public.

### **Comments from the Board**

- Mr. Gallagher asked if the growth strategy is sufficient for the Middle School. Mr. Garrison explained the Middle School and High School do not need additional space. Both utilize specialty classrooms that do not count as homerooms so other rooms can be used to accommodate students. The elementary schools do not have those types of spaces and so require additional space. With the addition of pre-k, the early childhood areas require expansion. Additionally, there are private choices for Middle School and High School student families.
- Mr. Gallagher asked if students will be accommodated in the various areas during the various expansion projects. Mr. Garrison replied that the Superintendent can better address this question. He added the plan is for the additional spaces to accommodate the early childhood.
- Ms. Stewart asked about the construction timeline and Mr. Garrison explained they are in the preliminary stages. If the referendum passes in September, the projects will go out to bid within 6 months with a timeline of 18 months per addition. Mr. Garrison reported the time of year will be taken into consideration and the projects will most likely be separate contracts. This will minimize the impact on the students and the surrounding neighborhoods during construction. He added that safety and education will be prioritized.
- Ms. Woodington asked if the cottages at New Albany School will remain. Mr. Garrison explained that student accommodation will be in the new construction. The cottages may be used as offices or one-on-one spaces.

Mr. Heinold reminded the Board that the schools are permitted uses and asked Mr. Garrison to speak to need and how the improvements are to be laid out on each site.

Mr. Garrison explained the Memorial School existing sanitary sewer is not in good condition and will be replaced. The additional parking spaces and front drop-off area will be repaved.

- Ms. Stewart asked where the parking be added. Mr. Garrison explained the new parking lot will be in the back, expanding the existing parking, but further back. There will be twenty-two (22) additional spaces with access from Riverton Road.

Mr. Garrison explained there are eighty-four (84) parking spaces at the Rush School with one hundred and fifty-six (156) proposed. The expansion of lots will be toward the back and will add a circular area with parking spaces. If Question #2 is passed, seventeen (17) to eighteen (18) spaces will be added out front.

The New Albany School site contains wetlands in the wooded area that will be delineated and buffers will be detailed. There will be access from New Albany Road, sidewalks and driveway will be extended and circulation out front will be improved. Seventy-two (72) spaces exist and will be expanded to two hundred (200) spaces that will eliminate traffic issues. There will be improvements to landscaping, lighting and stormwater.

Mr. Garrison reported the High School concession building will be adjacent to the field and the existing pedestrian bridge will stay allowing two ways to access the school for safe passage.

Mr. Garrison concluded with the additional need for square footage, increased population and site constraints, these are the most logical layouts to achieve what is required. The proposed improvements will have minimal impact on the site and will work with the interior workings.

Mr. Barbadoro asked about the track surface at the High School. Mr. Garrison reported the field will be astroturf with a rubberized track.

Mr. Garrison stated information can be found on the school district website and additional question and answer opportunities will be held June 9<sup>th</sup>, July 21<sup>st</sup> and August 25<sup>th</sup>. He thanked the Board for the opportunity to present the plans and hear comments from the Board and public.

**Additional comments from the public:**

- Mike Goins, 100 Purnell Avenue, Cinnaminson – asked if the additional parking spaces and wetlands are in flood zones. Mr. Garrison reported if there is a problem with the DEP the layout will be adjusted to make sure it does not conflict with the wetlands and DEP permitting will be required on the site.

**Motion/Findings on Capital Project**

Mr. Heinold reiterated this is a courtesy review. Testimony was provided as to the demands based on population. The layout was discussed relative to a planning perspective and as this is a permitted use and according to the experts, is consistent with the Master Plan.

Motion Mr. McGill, seconded by Ms. Stewart, that the improvements as presented are consistent with the Master Plan.

**Roll Call:**

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Gallagher, Mr. McGill, Ms. Woodington, Ms. Lauro; Alternate: Ms. Stewart.
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Those absent:	Mr. Horner, Mr. Maradonna, Mr. Roadside, Mr. Segrest, Mr. Snyder.
	Those recusing: Mr. Minton

- Mr. Minton returned to the dais.

**Resolutions**

There were no resolutions to consider.

**Approval of Minutes**

**Approval of January 27, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Motion by Mr. Minton, seconded by Mr. Gallagher, to approve the minutes of the January 27, 2026 Regular Meeting. The minutes were approved by those members eligible to vote.

**Approval of February 10, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Motion by Mr. Gallagher, seconded by Ms. Woodington, to approve the minutes of February 10, 2026. The minutes were approved by those members eligible to vote.

**Approval of March 10, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes**

Motion by Ms. Woodington, seconded by Ms. Stewart, to approve the minutes of the March 10, 2026 Regular Meeting. The minutes were approved by those members eligible to vote.

### **Meeting Opened to The Public**

Ms. Lauro opened the meeting to the public.

- Susan Bruce, 500 North Pompess Avenue, Cinnaminson – Ms. Bruce shared her interest in developing a 501(c)(3) to explore and promote the river city aspect, trails of cities along the Delaware River, education and environmental protection. Mr. Minton reported he is gathering information from several departments per Ms. Bruce's request. Ms. Bruce is interested in flooding along the Pompeston Creek which took out her basement after a previous storm. Mr. Minton believes those issues have been handled and there has not been additional flooding since.
- Marty Haggerty, 307 Nathan Drive, Cinnaminson – asked if there had been any update on the Caplan concept plan or project timeline. Mr. Minton stated an application has not been filed although a 200' list has been requested. She asked if the concept plan, adopted by ordinance, will be the same as the plans submitted. Mr. Minton explained there may be issues that cause the plans to change. Mr. Heinold explained the application will be available for review ahead of the hearing where the public will be able to appear and present testimony or express concerns.

### **Meeting Closed to the Public**

Since there were no further comments or questions, Ms. Lauro closed the meeting to the public.

### **Correspondence**

Mrs. Russell reported there was no correspondence to discuss.

### **Discussion Items:**

There were no items to discuss.

### **Comments of the Board**

- Mr. Minton reported there are no applications pending for the May 26<sup>th</sup> meeting, which may be canceled. He anticipates applications to be heard at the June 9<sup>th</sup> meeting.
- Mr. Minton announced that he was pleased to see resident, Mr. Davis, in attendance at the meeting.

### **Adjournment**

Motion by Ms. Woodington, seconded by Ms. Stewart, to adjourn the meeting. The voice vote by the Board was unanimous in favor of adjournment.

Prepared by:



Beverly G. Russell, RMC  
Board Secretary  
Approved: June 23, 2026