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RESOLUTION MC-16: 5114
On Motion Of: Dana M. Burley
APPROVED: June 14th, 2016

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF CAMDEN, COUNTY OF CAMDEN,
DIRECTING THE CITY PLANNING BOARD TO CONDUCT A PRELIMINARY
INVESTIGATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER BLOCK 619, LOTS 46, 47, 48,
49, 51, 73, 75, 78, AND 79, BLOCK 621, ALL LOTS, BLOCK 623, ALL LOTS,
BLOCK 625, LOTS 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129,
AND 131, BLOCK 642 LOT 1, AND BLOCK 643, ALL LOTS IS AN AREA IN
NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT AS DEFINED IN N.J.S.A. 40A:12-6

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Camden seeks to undertake a
redevelopment effort within the City; and

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 authorizes the governing body of any
municipality, by Resolution, to have its Planning Board conduct a preliminary
investigation to determine whether any area of the municipality is a redevelopment area
pursuant to the criteria contained in N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Camden considers it to be in the best
interest of the City to have the City’s Planning Board conduct such an investigation
regarding Block 619, Lots 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 73, 75, 78, and 79, Block 621, all lots,
Block 623, all lots, Block 625, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127,
128, 129, and 131, Block 642, Lot 1, and Block 643, all lots, which parcels are currently
in private ownership, as described and delineated on the official Tax Map of the City of
Camden; and

WHEREAS, such preliminary investigation will be designed to evaluate such
area to determine whether designation of these properties as an “area in need of
redevelopment” is in conformance with statutory criteria and the City’s efforts toward
redevelopment, pursuant to the Master Plan; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Camden, County of
Camden, that:

1. The Planning Board of the City of Camden is hereby directed to conduct a
preliminary investigation to determine whether the aforementioned parcels are an area
in need of redevelopment according to the criterion set forth in N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5.

2. The Planning Board of the City of Camden is hereby directed to study the
aforementioned parcels, to develop a map showing the boundaries of the proposed
redevelopment area, to provide public notice and conduct public hearings pursuant to
N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 and to draft a report/Resolution containing its findings.

3. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 the redevelopment area shall authorize
the municipality to use all those powers provided by the Legislature for use in a
redevelopment area including the power of eminent domain (“Condemnation
Redevelopment Area”) with respect to the following properties:

Block 619, Lots 47, 48, 49, 73, 75, 78, and 79, Block 621, Lots 51, 52, 53, 55, 56,
58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 79, 80, 81, 83, 87, 91, 93, 95, 96, 98, 99, 105, 107,
110, 111, and 112, Block 623, Lots 71, 72, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 84, 86, 87, 89,
103, 107, 109, 111, 113, 114, 119, 121, 122, 136 and 140, Block 642, Lot 1, and
Block 643, Lots 2, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, and 45.

4. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 the redevelopment area shall authorize
the municipality to use all those powers provided by the Legislature for use in a
redevelopment area other than the use of eminent domain (“Non-Condemnation
Redevelopment Area”) with respect to the following property: Block 619, Lots 46, and
51, Block 621, Lots 48, 49, 50, 59, 66, 76, 78, 82, 88, 92, 94, 97, 100, 104, 106, 108,
118, 123, 137, 138, 139, and 141, Block 625, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102,
5. The results of such preliminary investigation shall be submitted to the City Council for review and approval in accordance with the provisions of the New Jersey Redevelopment and Housing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1, et seq.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to N.J.S.A. 52:27B:23, a true copy of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the State Commissioner of Community Affairs, who shall have ten (10) days from the receipt thereof to veto this Resolution. All notices of veto shall be filed in the Office of the Municipal Clerk.

Date of Introduction: June 14, 2016

The above has been reviewed and approved as to form.

[Signature]
MARC A. RICONDINO
City Attorney

[Signature]
FRANCISCO MORAN
President, City Council

ATTEST: [Signature]
LUIS PASTORIZA
Municipal Clerk
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF CAMDEN, COUNTY OF CAMDEN, DIRECTING THE CITY PLANNING BOARD TO INCLUDE BLOCK 619, LOT 45 IN THE PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION AUTHORIZED BY RESOLUTION MC-16:5114, TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE AFOREMENTIONED PROPERTY IS PART OF AN AREA IN NEED OF REDEVELOPMENT AS DEFINED IN N.J.S.A. 40A:12-6

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Camden seeks to undertake a redevelopment effort within the City; and

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 authorizes the governing body of any municipality, by Resolution, to have its Planning Board conduct a preliminary investigation to determine whether any area of the municipality is a redevelopment area pursuant to the criteria contained in N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution MC-16:5114, adopted June 14, 2016, the City Council of the City of Camden directed the Planning Board to conduct such an investigation regarding Block 619, Lots 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 73, 75, 78, and 79, Block 621, all lots, Block 623, all lots, Block 625, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, and 131, Block 642, Lot 1, and Block 643, all lots, which parcels are currently in private ownership, as described and delineated on the official Tax Map of the City of Camden; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Camden considers it to be in the best interest of the City to have the City’s Planning Board include Block 619, Lot 45 in such investigation, which parcel is currently in private ownership, as described and delineated on the official Tax Map of the City of Camden; and

WHEREAS, such preliminary investigation will be designed to evaluate such area to determine whether designation of the properties as an “area in need of redevelopment” is in conformance with the statutory criteria and the City’s efforts toward redevelopment, pursuant to the Master Plan; now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Camden, County of Camden, that:

1. The Planning Board of the City of Camden is hereby directed to include Block 619, Lot 45 in the preliminary investigation authorized by Resolution MC-16:5114, adopted June 14, 2016, to determine whether Block 619, Lot 45, in addition to those parcels set forth in Resolution MC-16:5114, are an area in need of redevelopment according to the criterion set forth in N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5.

2. The Planning Board of the City of Camden is hereby directed to study Block 619, Lot 45 in addition to those parcels set forth in Resolution MC-16:5114, adopted June 14, 2016, to develop a map showing the boundaries of the proposed redevelopment area, to provide public notice and conduct public hearings pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 and to draft a report/Resolution containing its findings.

3. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 the redevelopment area shall authorize the municipality to use all those powers provided by the Legislature for use in a redevelopment area other than the power of eminent domain (“Non-Condemnation Redevelopment Area”) with respect to Block 619, Lot 45 in addition to those properties set forth in Resolution MC-16:5114, adopted June 14, 2016 as part of the “Non-Condemnation Redevelopment Area.”

4. The results of such preliminary investigation shall be submitted to the City Council for review and approval in accordance with the provisions of the New Jersey Redevelopment and Hosing Law, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-1, et seq.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to N.J.S.A. 53:27E1B-23, a true copy of this Resolution shall be forwarded to the State Commissioner of Community Affairs, who shall
have ten (10) days from the receipt thereof to veto this Resolution. All notices of veto shall be filed in the Office of the Municipal Clerk.

Date of Introduction: September 13, 2016

The above has been reviewed and approved as to form.

/ / /  
MARC A. RIONDINO  
City Attorney

FRANCISCO MORAN  
President, City Council

ATTEST:  
LUIS PASTORIAZA  
Municipal Clerk
A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY OF CAMDEN, COUNTY OF CAMDEN,
AMENDING RESOLUTION MC-16:5114 AND RESOLUTION MC-16:5264 TO
INCLUDE BLOCK 619, LOT 45, BLOCK 621, LOTS 48, 49, 76, 89, 90, 97, 100, 104, AND
106, AND BLOCK 623, LOTS 73, 85, 137, 138, AND 139 AS PART OF THE
"CONDEMNATION REDEVELOPMENT AREA"

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Camden seeks to undertake a redevelopment
effort within the City; and

WHEREAS, N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6 authorizes the governing body of any municipality, by
Resolution, to have its Planning Board conduct a preliminary investigation to determine whether
any area of the municipality is a redevelopment area pursuant to the criteria contained in
N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution MC-16:5114, adopted June 14, 2016, the City Council of the
City of Camden directed the Planning Board to conduct such an investigation regarding Block
619, Lots 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 73, 75, 78, and 79, Block 621, all lots, Block 623, all lots, Block
625, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, and 131, Block 642, Lot 1,
and Block 643, all lots, which parcels are currently in private ownership, as described and
delineated on the official Tax Map of the City of Camden; and

WHEREAS, by Resolution MC-16:5264, adopted September 13, 2016, the City Council of
the City of Camden directed the Planning Board to include Block 619, Lot 45 in the
investigation authorized by Resolution MC-16:5114, which parcel is currently in private
ownership, as described and delineated on the official Tax Map of the City of Camden; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Camden considers it to be in the best
interest of the City to amend the aforementioned Resolutions to include Block 619, Lot 45,
Block 621, Lots 48, 49, 76, 89, 90, 97, 100, 104 and 106, and Block 623, Lots 73, 85, 137, 138
and 139 as part of the "Condemnation Redevelopment Area;" now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Camden, County of Camden,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to N.J.S.A. 53:27BBB-23, a true copy of
this Resolution shall be forwarded to the State Commissioner of Community Affairs, who shall
have ten (10) days from the receipt thereof to veto this Resolution. All notices of veto shall be
filed in the Office of the Municipal Clerk.

Date of Introduction: February 14, 2017

The above has been reviewed
and approved as to form.

MARC A. RIONDINO
City Attorney

FRANCISCO MORAN
President, City Council

LUIS PASTORIZA
Municipal Clerk
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Introduction

The purpose of this Redevelopment Study and Preliminary Investigation Report (hereinafter referred to as “the redevelopment study”) is to determine whether certain properties in the City of Camden qualify as an area in need of redevelopment, as defined in the Local Redevelopment and Housing Law, P.L. 1992, Chapter 79 (commonly and hereinafter referred to as the “LRHL”).

The Study Area is shown on the accompanying Study Area mapping (see Figure 1) and includes the following tax parcels:

- **Block 619**, Lots 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 73, 75, 78, 79
- **Block 621**, Lots 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112
- **Block 625**, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131
- **Block 642**, Lot 1
- **Block 643**, Lots 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 45
This report is written pursuant to Section 6 of the LRHL (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6a), which states the following:

No area of a municipality shall be determined to be a redevelopment area unless the governing body of the municipality shall, by resolution, authorize the planning board to undertake a preliminary investigation to determine whether the proposed area is a redevelopment area according to the criteria set forth in Section 5 of P.L. 1992. C.79 (C.40A:12A-5). ... The governing body of a municipality shall assign the conduct of the investigation and hearing to the planning board of a municipality.

On June 14, 2016, the Camden City Council adopted Resolution MC-16:5114, which requested that the Planning Board undertake a preliminary investigation of the Study Area to determine whether it qualifies as an area in need of redevelopment pursuant to the LRHL. This resolution was subsequently amended by Resolution MC-16:5264 on September 13, 2016 and again by Resolution MC-17:5491 on February 14, 2017. These resolutions are included in this report (n.b., they are located before the Table of Contents).

This report serves as the “statement setting forth the basis for the investigation,” which is required by the LRHL [N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6b(1)]. In accordance with N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-6b(5):

After completing its hearing on this matter, the planning board shall recommend that the delineated area, or any part thereof, be determined, or not be determined, by the municipal governing body to be a redevelopment area. After receiving the recommendation of the planning board, the municipal governing body may adopt a resolution determining that the delineated area, or any part thereof, is in need of redevelopment.

It is noted that in directing the Planning Board to undertake the preliminary investigation and redevelopment study, the City Council identified which properties within the Study Area may be subject to a condemnation redevelopment area designation. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40A, the redevelopment area designation shall authorize the municipality to use all those powers provided by the Legislature for use in a redevelopment area, including the power of eminent domain.

Of the Study Area properties listed above, the properties listed below and mapped in Figure 2 may be designated as a condemnation redevelopment area, subject to the recommendations of this report, potential subsequent recommendation by the Planning Board to the City Council, and potential subsequent formal designation of the redevelopment area by the City Council:

- Block 619, Lots 45, 47, 48, 49, 73, 75, 78, 79
- Block 621, Lots 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 76, 79, 80, 81, 83, 87, 89, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 110, 111, 112
The properties listed below and mapped in Figure 2 may be designated as a non-condemnation redevelopment area, and shall **not** be subject to eminent domain, subject to the recommendations of this report, potential subsequent recommendation by the Planning Board to the City Council, and potential subsequent formal designation of the redevelopment area by the City Council:

- **Block 623**, Lots 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 103, 107, 109, 111, 113, 114, 119, 121, 122, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140
- **Block 642**, Lot 1
- **Block 643**, Lots 2, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 45

**Note:** Blocks 623, 642, and 643 are the only ones listed, but they are the ones in the image.
Approach

In preparing this report, the project team analyzed and considered the applicability of all of the aforementioned statutory criteria for redevelopment on each of the individual properties in the Study Area. Despite the large quantity of individual properties that encompass the Study Area, it was necessary to consider the application of the statutory criteria on a property-by-property basis. A description of the site conditions existing in the Study Area properties, as well as discussion as to how each property does or does not meet the statutory criteria of the LRHL, is provided in Appendix A.

The project team utilized the following resources and documentation in preparing this redevelopment study:

- Tax records (City of Camden tax maps, MOD IV data, and historical assessment data);
- Planning and Zoning Board approvals;
- Fire code violations (City of Camden Building/Code Enforcement);
- Building permits (City of Camden Building/Code Enforcement);
- Police records (Camden County Police Department);
- GIS records (NJDEP, NJDOT, NJGIN, FEMA, Camden County);
- Historic aerials (www.historicaerials.com); and,
- Site visit (conducted on January 25, 2017)

This redevelopment study is a result of the approach described above.
Study Area Description

The Study Area is located in the Morgan Village neighborhood in southern Camden City, which is located on Morgan Street, just to the east of Exit 3 off Interstate 676. The Study Area is shown in Figure 3.

The Study Area is a six-block area that consists of 134 tax parcels and comprises approximately 9.5 acres of land area. It is bound to the north by Tulip Street, to the east by South Ninth Street, to the South by Hunter Street, and to the west by Master Street and the interchange with Interstate 676. The Study Area is bisected from east to west by Morgan Street, which provides direct access to Interstate 676 to the west. The tax lots in the Study Area (see Figures 4 and 5) are listed on the official tax map of the City of Camden (sheets 10.09, 10.10, 10.11, 10.14, and 10.15) as:

- **Block 619**, Lots 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 73, 75, 78, 79
- **Block 621**, Lots 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112
- **Block 625**, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131
- **Block 642**, Lot 1
- **Block 643**, Lots 2, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 45
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Land Use

Existing land uses at the Study Area were evaluated during a site visit and field analysis conducted on January 25, 2017, as well as through investigation of MOD-IV land use classifications and land use/land cover data as mapped by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) in 2012.

NJDEP Land Use Land Cover (2012)
According to NJDEP’s land use/land cover (LULC) data, all land in the Study Area is classified as either, residential, commercial/services, or “other urban,” as shown in Figure 6. These land uses are distributed throughout the Redevelopment Area as follows:

**Residential (High Density or Multiple Dwellings):** The LULC Classification System defines residential (high density or multiple dwellings) as either high-density single units or multiple dwelling units on one-eighth (⅛) - to one-fifth (⅕) - acre lots. These areas are generally found in the densely populated urban zones, and generally are characterized by impervious surface coverage of approximately 65 percent. Areas classified as residential (incl., high density or multiple dwellings) include the entirety of Blocks 619, 623, and 643. This area also includes Block 621, Lots 56, 58-66, 78-83, 87, 88, and 106-112.

**Commercial/Services:** Commercial/services uses in the Study Area are located on Block 625 (incl., the Creative Arts Morgan Village Academy portion of the Study Area) and Block 642, Lot 1 (incl., the small commercial strip mall to the south of Morgan Street).

**Other Urban or Built-Up Land:** The LULC Classification System defines “other urban or built-up land” as: “undeveloped, open lands within, adjacent to, or associated with urban areas. Some structures may be visible, as in the case of abandoned residential or commercial sites that have not yet been redeveloped. The land cover in these areas may be brush-covered or grassy. Large, managed, maintained lawns common to some residential areas are also included.” The “other or urban built-up land” in the Study Area is confined to Block 621, Lots 48-53, 55, 76, 89, 90, 91, 92-100, 104, and 105, which are all vacant properties.
New Jersey MOD-IV (2017)
The New Jersey Property Tax System, known as MOD-IV, provides for the uniform preparation, maintenance, presentation, and storage of statewide property tax information. MOD-IV is the mechanism to maintain and update all assessment records and produce all statutorily-required tax lists. For the classification of taxable real property by land use, the following codes are applicable: Class 1 – Vacant Land; Class 2 – Residential (i.e., four families or less); Class 3A – Farm Regular; Class 3B – Farm (Qualified); Class 4A – Commercial; Class 4B – Industrial; Class 4C – Apartment; Class 5A – Class I Railroad Property; Class 5B – Class II Railroad Property; Class 6A – Personal Property Telephone; Class 6B – Machinery, Apparatus, or Equipment of Petroleum Refineries; Class 15A – Public School Property; Class 15B – Other School Property; Class 15C – Public Property; Class 15D – Church and Charitable Property; Class 15E – Cemeteries and Graveyards; and, Class 15F – Other Exempt.

MOD-IV land use classifications for the year 2017 are shown in Figure 7. MOD-IV classifications within the Study Area are varied, and include Class 1 – Vacant, Class 2 – Residential, Class 4A – Commercial, Class 15A – Public School, Class 15C – Public, and Class 15F – Other Exempt, as outlined below:

- **Class 1 – Vacant:** Vacant properties in the Study Area are confined to Blocks 619, 621, and 623, and primarily include properties where residential structures one stood but have been demolished.
- **Class 2 – Residential:** Residential uses are dispersed throughout the Study Area, on Blocks 619, 621, 623, and 643.
- **Class 4A – Commercial:** There are only two properties in the Study Area assessed as commercial uses. The first is Block 621, Lot 66. The second is Block 642, Lot 1. Block 642, Lot 1 is the largest individual tax parcel in the Study Area and is currently used as a commercial strip mall, which is owned by Rosados Morgan Market.
- **Class 15A – Public School:** Land assessed as public school in the Study Area is confined to Block 625 (incl., the Creative Arts Morgan Village Academy, as stated above).
- **Class 15C – Public:** There are a number of public properties in the Study Area, which are dispersed throughout Blocks 619 and 621. These properties are all owned by the City of Camden and are all vacant properties.
- **Class 15F-Other Exempt:** There is only one property in the Study Area assessed as “other exempt:” Block 643, Lot 45. This property is in the southeastern portion of the Study Area along Hunter Street and is a part of the Crestbury Apartments complex, located to the south.
Land uses in the vicinity of the Study Area include the following: to the north of Block 619 across Tulip Street is the Volunteers of America development known as Hope Hall, which is a 175-bed residential correctional treatment program for adult male offenders. To the north of Blocks 621 and 623, across Tulip Street, is a mix of residential and vacant properties, with a similar development pattern to that of Blocks 619, 621, and 623. To the north and east of the portions of Block 625 in the Study Area is the remainder of the Creative Arts Morgan Village Academy. The remainder of Block 625 further to the east is vacant land. Located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Morgan Street with Morgan Boulevard is a fire house, to the east of which are recreational facilities owned by the Camden Board of Education, and to the south of which are residential uses. The Study Area is bound to the south by Crestbury Apartments, a large apartment complex that extends to the south to Newton Creek. The Study Area is bound by the west by Interstate 676, to the west of which lie a mix of industrial and vacant properties.

During the site visit, the project team affirmed the land uses of all of the properties in the Study Area, with one exception: Block 621, Lot 66 is assessed as Class 4A – Commercial, but is actually a residential property.
Zoning and Relationship to Zoning Ordinance

The Study Area spans two zoning districts, as seen on the City of Camden Official Zoning Map (a portion of which is displayed in Figure 8), including the R-2 (Residential) and C-1 (Commercial) zones. The majority of the Study Area, as well as the majority of the surrounding properties, are in the R-2 Zone. The only property that is in the C-1 Zone is Block 642, Lot 1.

Figure 8: Existing Zoning

Land use regulations as outlined in Sections 577-45 and 577-50 of the City of Camden Zoning Ordinance are detailed in the following subsections.

C-1 (Commercial) Zone
Permitted principal uses in the C-1 Zone include the following:

1. Retail and business uses:
   a. Groceries, food stores, and bakeries.
   b. Drugstores and pharmacies.
   c. Newspaper, periodical, stationery, and tobacco stores.
   d. Banks.
   e. Funeral homes.
   f. Restaurants with seating capacity for not more than 50 people.
   g. Gas stations with the primary purpose of pumping gas.
   h. Clothing and shoe stores.
   i. Barber and beauty shops.
   j. Tailor shops, dressmakers, and shoe repair shops.
   k. Dry cleaners and laundries.
   l. Radio and television service.
2. Business, professional, and governmental offices.
3. Clubs and lodges organized for fraternal or social purposes.
4. Any use permitted in an R-2 Zone.

R-2 (Residential) Zone
Permitted principal uses in the R-2 Zone include the following:
2. Municipal buildings or uses.
3. Noncommercial parks, playgrounds, or recreation areas.
4. Churches or houses of worship.
5. Public, private, or parochial educational institutions.
6. Planned unit residential development.
7. Planned unit development.
8. Home occupations and home professional offices.

Area, Yard, and Building Requirements
Table 1 outlines the area, yard, height, and building coverage requirements of the C-1 and R-2 zones:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>C-1 Zone</th>
<th>R-2 Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size (square feet)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard Setback (feet)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard Setback (feet)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side Yard Setback (feet)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Width (feet)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building Width (feet)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height Limitation (feet)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffer Zone Required</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Distance Between 2 Buildings on Same Lot</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space Ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Commercial uses: no side yard requirement
Residential uses: see side yard requirements for R-2 zone
Commercial uses with side yards or proposed commercial uses providing for side yards, no side yard shall be less than four square feet.

2 See requirements in Article XVIII

3 Not less than half the height of the larger of the two buildings facing each other

In comparing the bulk requirements from the City's zoning ordinance to the properties in the Study Area, it is noted that there are no properties that exhibit non-conforming lot size. The one property in the C-1 Zone (i.e., Block 642, Lot 1) has one principal structure that meets all of the bulk requirements. The remainder of the Study Area is in the R-2 zone. The minimum lot size in the R-2 zone is 750 square feet. All properties in the R-2 Zone within the Study Area have a lot size of more than 750 square feet.
Planning Context

City of Camden Comprehensive Master Plan

The City of Camden Planning Board adopted the “Future Camden” Comprehensive Master Plan on March 12, 2002. The Master Plan contains language that supports redevelopment and revitalization, as indicated in the Master Plan sub-sections identified below.

Improving Housing and Neighborhoods—Housing Plan Recommendations

1. Goal One: Create a coordinated City-wide housing and community development program.
   a. Establish a neighborhood reinvestment policy.
   b. Prioritize revitalization activities by neighborhoods.
2. Goal Two: Restructure management of vacant and underutilized properties.
   a. Streamline acquisition and disposition of vacant properties.
   b. Develop a targeted demolition program.
   c. Establish a vacant lot and neighborhood clean-up program.

Capitalizing on the City’s Physical and Historical Assets

1. Goal Two: Create urban design guidelines to enhance the distinctive physical and natural features of Camden’s diverse neighborhoods.
   a. Develop urban design guidelines to improve neighborhood appearance.

Additionally, in each section of the Master Plan, project activities are recommended for each neighborhood planning district. Among the recommendations for the Morgan Village neighborhood, the following are particularly supportive of redevelopment and revitalization of the Study Area:

1. Improving Housing and Neighborhoods: “Medium density residential land use throughout redevelopment, new housing development, and rehabilitation is recommended.”
2. Improving Housing and Neighborhoods: “Morgan Village area is suggested for rehabilitation treatment north of Morgan Boulevard.”
3. Achieving a Dynamic Economy: “Upgrade compact retail areas at Morgan and Eighth Streets.”
4. Capitalizing on the City’s Physical and Historical Assets: “Upgrade landscaping and signage at the commercial center at the intersection of Morgan Street and Eighth Street.”
5. Maintaining and Improving the Environment: “Rebuild or repair local water and sewer lines as part of redevelopment projects (Morgan Village).”

Based on the above, it is noted that if determined to be in need of redevelopment, any redevelopment plan for the Study Area should be developed with consideration of these objectives.
Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan

The Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan was created in 2007 as part of a collaboration between the City of Camden, residents, property owners, and businesses to identify issues, formulate goals, and choose investments to realize a better future for the Morgan Village Neighborhood. As part of the public involvement and outreach process, a Citizen Task Force was formed and included the stakeholders listed above. The City of Camden Department of Planning organized various meetings within the neighborhood in which the Citizen Task Force participated. The Citizen Task Force was responsible for overseeing and guiding the development of this plan, which involved such tasks as identifying neighborhood development problems, identifying planning issues, and designing effective solutions.

The plan provides a substantial background on the history of development patterns in Morgan Village, outlines existing conditions from a land use planning perspective, and identifies neighborhood issues and concerns.

The Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan also provides an extensive inventory of recommendations for the revitalization of the neighborhood, with references to the specific properties in this Redevelopment Study. Key issues that are relevant to the redevelopment of the Study Area are as follows:

1. Conceptual Land Use Plan:
   a. Create a new Urban Mixed Use Village Zone District located along both sides of Morgan Street between the Interstate 676 interchange and the Morgan Street/Ninth Street intersection that will permit: retail uses, personal services, professional offices, and restaurants with residential flats located above non-residential uses; semi-detached units; townhouses; and, multi-family dwellings.
   b. Promote commercial redevelopment within the existing C-1 Zone.

2. Conceptual Neighborhood Site Plan:
   a. The Mixed-Use Village Zone District should become the focal point of the neighborhood to include a mix of housing types for a variety of income levels, retail, office, and personal services.
   b. Promote the development of public spaces such as small scale parks, plaza, and squares in order to promote the gathering of residents.

3. Urban Design Features: The plan also encourages implementation of various urban design features to enhance the neighborhood. Features specifically recommended for the properties within this Study Area include gateway signage, new and enhanced street lighting, on-street dedicated bike lanes, new and enhanced sidewalks, street trees, traffic calming techniques, and bus stops and shelters.

Based on the above, it is noted that if determined to be in need of redevelopment, any redevelopment plan for the area should be developed with consideration of these concepts.
Statutory Requirements

Pursuant to Section 5 of the LRHL (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5), an area may be determined to be in need of redevelopment if it meets one or more of the following statutory criteria:

A. The generality of buildings are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, or obsolescent, or possess any of such characteristics, or are so lacking in light, air, or space, as to be conducive to unwholesome living or working conditions.

B. The discontinuance of the use of buildings previously used for commercial, manufacturing, or industrial purposes; the abandonment of such buildings; or the same being allowed to fall into so great a state of disrepair as to be untenantable.

C. Land that is owned by the municipality, the county, a local housing authority, redevelopment agency or redevelopment entity, or unimproved vacant land that has remained so for a period of ten years prior to adoption of the resolution, and that by reason of its location, remoteness, lack of means of access to developed sections or portions of the municipality, or topography, or nature of the soil, is not likely to be developed through the instrumentality of private capital.

D. Areas with buildings or improvements which, by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light and sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, deleterious land use or obsolete layout, or any combination of these or other factors, are detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the community.

E. A growing lack or total lack of proper utilization of areas caused by the condition of the title, diverse ownership of the real properties therein or other similar conditions which impede land assemblage or discourage the undertaking of improvements, resulting in a stagnant and unproductive condition of land potentially useful and valuable for contributing to and serving the public health, safety, and welfare, which condition is presumed to be having a negative social or economic impact or otherwise being detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the surrounding area or the community in general.

F. Areas, in excess of five contiguous acres, whereon buildings or improvements have been destroyed, consumed by fire, demolished or altered by the action of storm, fire, cyclone, tornado, earthquake or other casualty in such a way that the aggregate assessed value of the area has been materially depreciated.

G. In any municipality in which an enterprise zone has been designated pursuant to the “New Jersey Urban Enterprise Zones Act,” P.L. 1983, c. 303 (C.52:27H-60 et seq.) the execution of the actions prescribed in that act for the adoption by the municipality and approval by the New Jersey Urban Enterprise Zone Authority of the zone development plan for the area of the enterprise zone shall be considered sufficient for the determination that the area is in need of
Redevelopment pursuant to sections 5 and 6 of P.L. 1992, c.79 (C.40A:12A-5 and 40A:12A-6) for the purpose of granting tax exemptions within the enterprise zone district pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 1991, c. 431 (C.40A:20-1 et seq.) or the adoption of a tax abatement and exemption ordinance pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 1991, c. 441 (C.40A:21-1 et seq.). The municipality shall not utilize any other redevelopment powers within the urban enterprise zone unless the municipal governing body and planning board have also taken the actions and fulfilled the requirements prescribed in P.L. 1992, c.79 (C.40A:12A-1 et al.) for determining that the area is in need of redevelopment or an area in need of rehabilitation and the municipal governing body has adopted a redevelopment plan ordinance including the area of the enterprise zone.

H. The designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation.

Furthermore, the LRHL permits the inclusion of parcels that do not meet the statutory criteria if they are necessary for effective redevelopment of the proposed redevelopment area:

A redevelopment area may include land, buildings or improvements which of themselves are not detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, but the inclusion of which is found necessary with or without change in their condition, for the effective redevelopment of the area of which they are a part (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-3.).
“A” Criterion – Deterioration of Buildings

A property meets the “A” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“The generality of buildings are substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, or obsolescent, or possess any of such characteristics, or are so lacking in light, air, or space, as to be conducive to unwholesome living or working conditions.”

The first facet of assessing the applicability of the “A” criterion involves identifying properties with buildings. Of the 134 properties in the Study Area, 90 have buildings, as is consistent with 2017 tax assessment records and verified during the site visit. These 90 properties are depicted as the hatched areas in the mapping in Figure 9 and include the following:

- Block 619, Lots 46, 47, 49
- Block 621, Lots 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 87, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112
- Block 625, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131
- Block 642, Lot 1
- Block 643, Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19
During the site visit conducted on January 25, 2017, the project team assessed the building conditions of the 90 aforementioned properties in order to review the applicability of the “A” criterion to each. Staff members from the City of Camden’s Building Department and Department of Public Works assisted in assessing building conditions from a structural perspective, as well as in accessing and entering the six boarded and vacant structures in the Study Area.

The site visit revealed that many residential properties in the Study Area exhibited a certain degree of superficial dilapidation or disrepair, or conditions that may be considered substandard or below code and potentially subject to a code violation, but may not warrant application of the “A” criterion. Some examples found on some of the residential structures throughout the Study Area include: missing or exposed bricks on façades; missing or damaged gutters; missing siding; minor leaking of porch roof; minor rotting of foundation; unstable ramp/porch railing; cracked porch foundation; and, graffiti on detached garage structures. It is noted that some, not all, of the residential properties in the Study Area exhibit some of these conditions. Additionally, it is also noted that these conditions on their own may not warrant the application of the “A” criterion if they do not result in unwholesome living or working conditions.

Apart from the conditions noted above, the following Study Area properties are considered to be either substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, dilapidated, or obsolescent, or are so lacking in light, air, or space, as to be conducive to unwholesome living or working conditions, for the following reasons:
### Table 2: Application of Criterion "A" to Study Area Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>This structure is vacant and boarded. The inside of the structure exhibits mold and moisture issues as well as a collapsing ceiling on the first floor. There are debris strewn throughout the first and second floors. There also are unsanitary plumbing and water conditions, with human fecal remains in the second-floor bathroom. For the reasons above, this building is substandard, unsanitary, and dilapidated, and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>This structure is vacant and boarded. The City posted an unsafe structure notice dated January 24, 2017 declaring the structure unsafe for human occupancy. The structure is in an advanced state of disrepair, which is evidenced by extensive fire and smoke damage as seen internally, and a collapsing ceiling in the rear of the first floor. For the reasons stated above, this building is substandard, unsafe, and dilapidated, and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>The structure is not boarded and does not appear to be vacant. The roof of the front porch, which abuts the right of way, is deteriorating, sagging, and is in need of repair, as evidenced by the temporary support beams keeping the roof in place. The building structure exhibits cracked windows, deteriorated windowsills, a damaged front door, and peeling paint on the surface of the front porch and front door. For the reasons stated above, this building is substandard, unsafe, and dilapidated, and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>This structure is vacant. The external structure (mainly the upper façade, parapet, and roof decking) is dilapidated, and the roof decking is rotting. The first floor of the structure is boarded, but the windows on the second floor are not. It is clear that this site has not been adequately secured from the public and from the elements (i.e., weather and wildlife). The site visit revealed the interior of the building smelled of urine and mold. The interior exhibited extreme water and mold damage and displayed large amounts of debris strewn throughout the entirety of the interior. For the reasons stated above, this building is substandard, unsafe, unsanitary, and dilapidated, and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>These properties are commonly owned and adjacent to one another. They are marked by two attached vacant residential structures. These structures were boarded (not by the City). The buildings exhibit structural decay to the front façades. The joint stoop and cinderblock wall (where a porch once stood) is also dilapidated, cracking, and has no handrails. There is graffiti along the side wall of the structure on Lot 84. The windows that are not boarded are cracked/broken and not properly secured from the public. The rear of the structures exhibits more graffiti and remains of what appears to be former rear entryways but are now piles of dilapidated steps and construction materials. The rear façade exhibits water damage as well. For the reasons stated above, these buildings are substandard, dilapidated, and unsafe, and as such are conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>This structure has multiple boarded windows, though they have not been boarded by the City. The rear of the structure facing Hunter Drive to the south exhibits dilapidation in various locations that could have a negative impact on the inhabitability of the structure. The foundation to the steps leading to the rear porch are structurally unsound, and there is no step handrail. The foundation of the rear porch appears to be damaged as well. The rear porch roof exhibits dilapidation. In addition, the framing to the rear windows and doors does not seem to be secure. There is also caution tape across the rear door. The inside of the building revealed holes in the floors, ceilings, and a large amount of water intrusion. On February 9, 2017, this property was added to the City's list of properties to be demolished. For the reasons stated above, this building is unsafe, substandard, and dilapidated and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>This structure is not boarded. The City Building Department indicated that the building is inhabited. The building façade on the second floor is damaged, as evidenced by missing and cracked bricks and frieze. The front porch exhibits severe dilapidation, as evidenced by multiple damaged window sills as well as missing and broken windows, some of which are covered by makeshift boards but do not appear to be adequately secured from the public. The front door does not appear to be secure. There is also peeling paint on the entirety of the front porch. The front porch also appears to have exposed, warped, and damaged structural beams. The view of the rear of the property from Hunter Drive reveals a cinder block accessory structure that is boarded by plywood. For the reasons stated above, this building is substandard and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>This structure is vacant and boarded. The City posted an unsafe structure notice dated January 24, 2017 declaring the structure unsafe for human occupancy. The foundation and structural beams of the front porch are warped and rotting. The porch roof and façade are also warped and damaged. The rear yard has a dilapidated wood accessory structure that has no roofing and is not adequately secured from the public. The interior of the structure exhibited extensive water damage and mold. During the site visit, there was water actively dripping from the second floor, suggesting that rainfall from the days prior to the site visit entered the structure through the roof. The first-floor ceiling is damaged and collapsing. For the reasons stated above, this building is substandard, unsafe, and dilapidated and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>This structure is vacant and boarded. The porch stoop is substandard, as it is damaged, unstable, has no handrails. There are various broken windows on the second story, which do not appear to be properly boarded, as living plants are entering the window slots and growing into the rooms on the second story. The fencing from the rear of the building is damaged and dilapidated. The internal of the building exhibits water damage. For the reasons stated above, this building is substandard, unsafe, and dilapidated, and as such is conducive to unwholesome living conditions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown above, this Redevelopment Study finds that the ten aforementioned properties meet the “A” criterion for redevelopment. These properties are identified in the mapping below in Figure 10.
“B” Criterion – Abandoned Commercial and Industrial Buildings

A property meets the “B” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“The discontinuance of the use of buildings previously used for commercial, manufacturing, or industrial purposes; the abandonment of such buildings; or the same being allowed to fall into so great a state of disrepair as to be untenantable.”

To assess the applicability of the “B” criterion, the properties in the Study Area were categorized based on land use (MOD-IV).

**Class 1 – Vacant, Class 2 – Residential, and Class 15C – Public Property:** The majority of the properties in the Study Area (primarily in Blocks 619, 621, 623, and 643) are either: developed with residential structures; vacant (formerly residential); or, vacant (City owned). Additionally, the Study Area is an established residential neighborhood, going back to the early twentieth century. In fact, tax records show that of the existing residential structures in the Study Area, all were built either in 1925 (Blocks 621 and 623), 1930 (Block 619), or 1935 (Block 643). Historic aerials are not available for years earlier than 1931, and City tax records show no history of development prior to the developments from 1925, 1930, and 1935 mentioned above. For these reasons, properties in the Study Area assessed as either Class 1, Class 2, or Class 15C are determined to be either historically residential or historically vacant, and have no history of being used for commercial, manufacturing, or industrial purposes, as is required in the “B” Criterion. As such, the “B” criterion for redevelopment does not apply to any of the residential or vacant properties in the Study Area.

**Class 15A – Public School:** As indicated earlier, the properties in Block 625 are currently developed as the Creative Arts Morgan Village Academy, which was constructed in 2010. Prior to the development of the school, the properties in Block 625 were developed with residential structures dating back to at least 1931, which is evidenced by historic aerials. For this reason, these properties are determined to be historically residential, and the “B” criterion does not apply.

**Class 15F – Other Exempt:** Block 643, Lot 45 is assessed as Class 15F. As stated above, this property is part of the Crestbury Apartments complex, which was constructed by 1951. Historic aerials show that this property was vacant in 1931 and 1940. Historic aerials dating back earlier than 1931 were not available. As available records do not indicate that this property was formerly used for commercial, manufacturing, or industrial purposes, the “B” criterion does not apply.

**Class 4A – Commercial:** While there are no properties within the Study Area used for manufacturing or industrial purposes, the following two properties were assessed as Class 4A in 2017.

1. The only property assessed as 4A-Commercial on Block 621 (Lot 66) was built in 1919. City tax records show that the property was formerly used as both a residence and a shoe repair business. However, the site visit conducted on January 25, 2017 revealed that this property is a residential use with two
separate units. While the prior commercial use was technically “abandoned” some years ago, it was replaced with a residential use. As such, the “B” criterion does not apply to this property.

2. Block 642, Lot 1 is a commercial strip mall. Historic aerials show that the building on site was constructed by 1951. However, the site visit conducted on January 25, 2017 concluded that the building on Block 621, Lot 66 is an occupied and active commercial use, is not abandoned, and was not found to be in a state of disrepair as to be untenantable. In fact, all of the store fronts at the strip mall were open and active, with frequent visitors throughout the duration of the site visit conducted on January 25, 2017. As such, the “B” criterion does not apply to this property.

For the reasons stated above, this Redevelopment Study finds that none of the properties in the Study Area meet the “B” criterion for redevelopment.
“C” Criterion – Public and Vacant Land

A property meets the “C” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“Land that is owned by the municipality, the county, a local housing authority, redevelopment agency or redevelopment entity, or unimproved vacant land that has remained so for a period of ten years prior to adoption of the resolution, and that by reason of its location, remoteness, lack of means of access to developed sections or portions of the municipality, or topography, or nature of the soil, is not likely to be developed through the instrumentality of private capital.”

Application of the “C” criterion first requires identifying vacant land. Vacant properties are identified in Figure 11 below. The following properties are vacant and owned by the City of Camden:

- Block 619: Lot 51
- Block 621: Lots 50, 88, 92, 94, 109

Apart from vacant properties owned by the City of Camden, there are also privately-owned properties that have been vacant for a period of at least ten years prior to the adoption of the City Council resolution directing the Planning Board to conduct this Redevelopment Study, as evidenced by both tax records and historic aerials. These include the following properties:

- Block 619: Lots 45, 48, 78, 79
- Block 621: Lots 48, 49, 51, 52, 53, 55, 76, 89, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106
- Block 623: Lots 136, 137, 138, 139

There are also some privately-owned properties within the Study Area that had structures that were demolished within the past ten years. These include the following properties:

- Block 619: Lots 73, 75
- Block 621: Lots 62, 63
- Block 623: Lots 72, 73, 74, 75, 76

The second part of the application of the “C” criterion involves identifying, of the vacant properties (incl., either publicly-owned or privately-owned and vacant for ten or more years), those which are not likely to be developed through private capital due to their location, remoteness, lack of means of access to developed portions of the municipality, topology, or nature of the soil. It is determined that none of the properties in the Study Area are particularly remote or located away from other developed portions of the City. All properties in the Study Area front on a public right of way, are located in sewered areas, are within close proximity of Morgan Street (a well-traveled road with direct access to Interstate 676), and have no evidence of brownfield conditions. For the reasons stated above, this Redevelopment Study finds that none of the properties in the Study Area meet the “C” criterion for redevelopment.
“D” Criterion – Obsolete Layout and Design

A property meets the “D” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“Areas with buildings or improvements which, by reason of dilapidation, obsolescence, overcrowding, faulty arrangement or design, lack of ventilation, light and sanitary facilities, excessive land coverage, deleterious land use or obsolete layout, or any combination of these or other factors, are detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the community.”

As is the case with assessing the applicability of the “A” criterion, assessing the “D” criterion first involves identifying properties with improvements (e.g., accessory structures and other site improvements, including driveways, sidewalks, parking areas, etc.). As previously stated, of the 134 properties in the Study Area, 90 have improvements, in accordance with 2017 tax assessment records and verified during the site visit. These 90 properties are depicted as the hatched areas in the mapping in Figure 12 and include the following:

- Block 619, Lots 46, 47, 49
- Block 621, Lots 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 87, 107, 108, 110, 111, 112
- Block 625, Lots 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131
- Block 642, Lot 1
- Block 643, Lots 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19

Criterion “D” Conclusions

This Redevelopment Study further identified the properties with buildings or improvements that exhibit one of the following conditions: dilapidation; obsolescence; overcrowding; faulty arrangement or design; lack of ventilation, light, or sanitary facilities; excessive land coverage; deleterious land use; or obsolete layout. These properties are discussed in Table 3 below.
Table 3: Application of Criterion "D" to Study Area Parcels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 621   | 87  | 1. The overhang and roof of the front porch is dilapidated and sagging, and is abutting the right of way, which is a safety hazard to pedestrians.  
2. The side yard is used as a driveway, as storage for commercial appliances and equipment, and is strewn with debris throughout. There are two commercial freezers in the side yard that do not appear to be adequately sealed or separated from the public, and could serve as an attractive nuisance and a danger to children in the neighborhood or others who access the site.  
3. For the reasons stated above, the property exhibits dilapidation, faulty arrangement, and deleterious land use, all of which are detrimental to the safety of the community. |
| 621   | 108 | 1. This structure is vacant. The external structure (mainly the upper façade, parapet, and roof decking) is dilapidated, and the roof decking is rotting.  
2. The first floor of the structure is boarded, but the windows on the second floor are not. It is clear that this site has not been adequately secured from the public and from the elements (i.e., weather and wildlife).  
3. The site visit revealed the interior of the building smelled of urine and mold. The interior exhibited extreme water and mold damage and displayed large amounts of debris strewn throughout the entirety of the interior. All of this could serve to have a potentially detrimental impact on the health and welfare of the community. As the property is not adequately secured from the public, it could serve as an attractive nuisance, encouraging individuals to enter the structure and squat in these unsanitary and structurally unsound areas.  
4. For the reasons stated above, the property exhibits significant dilapidation which is detrimental to the safety, health, and welfare of the community. |
| 623   | 84  | 1. These properties are commonly owned and adjacent to one another. They are marked by to attached vacant residential structures. These structures were boarded (not by the City).  
2. The buildings exhibit structural decay to the front façades.  
3. The joint stoop and cinderblock wall (where a porch once stood) is also dilapidated, cracking, and has no handrails.  
4. There is graffiti along the side wall of the structure on Lot 84, which suggests unauthorized access by the public.  
5. The windows that are not boarded are cracked/broken and not properly secured from the public.  
6. The rear of the structures exhibits more graffiti and remains of what appears to be former rear entryways but are now piles of dilapidated steps and construction materials. The rear façade exhibits water damage as well.  
7. For the reasons stated above, these properties exhibit dilapidation, and as such are detrimental to the safety of the community. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 623   | 110 | 1. The City Building Department has identified this property as vacant and not occupied, but not deteriorated to the point that demolition is required, as noted during a site visit by the Building Department as a follow up to the January 2017 site visit.  
2. The overhang and roof of the front porch is dilapidated.  
3. There is debris strewn throughout the front yard, including large pieces of siding. The rear yard also exhibits large quantities of overcrowding and debris that is not adequately screened from the public via the rear alleyway. Some of the debris in the rear yard includes large pieces of glass, furniture, and food containers.  
4. Vegetation in the rear yard is also overgrown and contributes to the presence of faulty site layout/arrangement.  
5. The presence of large quantities of debris and materials (including exposed broken glass), along with the accessibility to passersby, serves as an attractive nuisance and could serve as a threat to the safety and health of the community.  
6. It is noted that there is also record of larceny at this property from 2013. While there is no proved nexus to the crime record to the condition of the property, the fact that the property is accessible to the public could invite future crime activity that could potentially have a negative impact on the adjoining inhabited properties.  
7. For the reasons stated above, this property exhibits such dilapidation so as to make the property detrimental to the safety and health of the community. |
| 642   | 1   | 1. The property exhibits faulty and obsolete site layout/arrangement and design. The striping for parking spaces is aged and no longer properly delineated, and the property is not striped in a way that facilitates adequate site circulation. There is also no clear delineation of loading areas at the rear of the building.  
2. The site has no buffers or screening to adjoining residential areas to the south. The site visit revealed that the southern end of the property (the paved area) is used for parking for various refuse trucks, which should be screened from residential areas.  
3. There is not proper storage or screening of on-site refuse, as the existing on-site dumpsters are strewn throughout the rear of the lot. They are also accessible from the public right of way and could serve as an attractive nuisance to the adjacent residential properties or pedestrians passing by.  
4. For the reasons stated above, the property exhibits faulty arrangement and design, obsolete layout, and a well-established history of both violent and non-violent crimes, and as such serves as a detriment to the safety, health, and welfare of the community. |
1. The cinder block wall, which serves as a barrier from the sidewalk and right of way, is dilapidated, as is evidenced by cracks in multiple locations to its foundation. If this wall were to fall due to its structural integrity, it could serve as a threat to the safety of pedestrians. The rear yard has a similar cinder block wall along the side boundaries of the property.

2. For the reason stated above, this property exhibits dilapidation, which can serve as a detriment to the safety and health of the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 643   | 14  | 1. The building façade and front porch are dilapidated and damaged.  
2. There are multiple missing and broken windows, some of which are covered by makeshift boards but do not appear to be adequately secured from the public. 
3. The site visit revealed a collapsed sidewalk in front of the property, and the vicinity smelled of sewage. This suggests a potentially cracked sewer line, which could result in a back-up of sewage service into the property or expose pedestrians to effluent. 
4. The rear of the property is overcrowded, as evidenced by a cinder block accessory structure that is boarded by plywood right up against the rear alleyway and comprising the majority of the rear yard area. 
5. For the reasons stated above, this property exhibits dilapidation and overcrowdedness, which can serve as a detriment to the safety and health of the community. |
| 643   | 19  | 1. The property exhibits faulty and obsolete site layout/arrangement. The striping for parking spaces is aged and no longer properly delineated, and the property is not striped in a way that facilitates adequate site access and circulation.  
2. There is not proper storage or screening of on-site refuse, as the existing waste removal is accessible from and abuts the public right of way and vehicular pathway, serving as an attractive nuisance to the adjacent residential properties. 
3. The activities on site are poorly maintained, as evidenced by debris and refuse strewn throughout the site. This both limits the functioning of the property as a safe site, and has an impact on the adjoining residential properties. 
4. For the reasons stated above, this property faulty site layout/arrangement, and as such is detrimental to the safety and health of the community. |

643 | 45 | 1. The property exhibits faulty and obsolete site layout/arrangement. The striping for parking spaces is aged and no longer properly delineated, and the property is not striped in a way that facilitates adequate site access and circulation.  
2. There is not proper storage or screening of on-site refuse, as the existing waste removal is accessible from and abuts the public right of way and vehicular pathway, serving as an attractive nuisance to the adjacent residential properties. 
3. The activities on site are poorly maintained, as evidenced by debris and refuse strewn throughout the site. This both limits the functioning of the property as a safe site, and has an impact on the adjoining residential properties. 
4. For the reasons stated above, this property faulty site layout/arrangement, and as such is detrimental to the safety and health of the community. |

As shown above, this Redevelopment Study finds that the nine (9) aforementioned properties meet the “D” criterion for redevelopment. These properties are identified in the mapping below in Figure 13.
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Crime Data Analysis

As part of its investigation of the Study Area, the project team coordinated with the Camden County Police Department to identify crime events throughout the entire Study Area. The Camden County Police Department provided crime data for dates ranging from January 1, 2012 through August 24, 2016, which was the date of data preparation by the Police Department. This section summarizes the results of the crime data, which is tabulated and mapped in further detail in Appendix A.

Camden County Police Department records revealed 232 individually reported crime events from January 1, 2012 until August 24, 2016. Of the 232 individual crime events, 116 events are associated with the Crestbury Apartments complex, located immediately to the south of the Study Area. 1 A total of 25 crime events are associated with properties that have an address outside, but in the immediate vicinity of, the Study Area. A total of 91 crime events are associated specifically to either individually assessed properties within the Study Area (47 crime events), or to roadway intersections along roads that transect the Study Area (44 crime events). The 232 total crime events, along with the 91 crime events associated with the Study Area, are categorized below in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Crime Events</th>
<th>Crime Events on Study Area Properties</th>
<th>Crime Events on Street Intersections within Study Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murder/Manslaughter</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Violent Crime</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>232</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the crime events that are documented, 50 violent crimes, consisting of either murder/manslaughter, rape, robbery, or aggravated assault, as identified in the records provided by the Camden County Police Department, have occurred within the Study Area since 2012.

The 91 crime events associated with the Study Area are also mapped below in Figure 14.

---

1 It is noted that Block 643, Lot 45 is a part of the Crestbury Apartment complex, though the addresses provided by the Police Department for the individual crime events are not tied to Block 643, Lot 45.
As shown in Figure 14, crime events are generally associated with a roadway intersection than with an individual property. Figure 14, shows the number of crime events associated with a property or roadway intersection (i.e., a property identified as “11” has a record of exactly 11 crime events from 2012-2016; a property identified as “5” has a record of exactly five crime events from 2012-2016; etc.).

This Redevelopment Study finds that there is no direct correlation between crime events and properties meeting the “D” criterion for redevelopment. However, of the nine properties meeting the “D” criterion, three have crime events on record, which are noted in Table 3. Nonetheless, the extensive history of crime events in the Study Area is evidence of the socio-economic stressors on this neighborhood. Crime records, associated with relevant individual properties, are discussed further in Appendix B: Property Analysis Sheets.
“E” Criterion – Condition of Title and Diverse Ownership

A property meets the “E” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“A growing lack or total lack of proper utilization of areas caused by the condition of the title, diverse ownership of the real properties therein or other similar conditions which impede land assemblage or discourage the undertaking of improvements, resulting in a stagnant and unproductive condition of land potentially useful and valuable for contributing to and serving the public health, safety, and welfare, which condition is presumed to be having a negative social or economic impact or otherwise being detrimental to the safety, health, morals, or welfare of the surrounding area or the community in general.”

The determination of whether or not all or a portion of the Study Area satisfies the “E” criterion is based on a three-part analysis made up of the following components:

1. “A finding of title problems, diverse ownership, unique lot configuration, or other similar characteristics affecting the Study Area;
2. A showing of how these factors result in the properties being stagnant and unproductive and impede their ability to be developed or redeveloped in a manner that would benefit the community; and,
3. A determination that the stagnant and unproductive characteristics of the property are having a deleterious effect on the surrounding area or community as a whole” (The Redevelopment Handbook: A Guide to Rebuilding New Jersey’s Communities, 2012. Pg. 63).

This analysis will include a review of tax assessment data, including conditions of title (such as tax lien information and other factors), stagnant and unproductive condition (vacant properties and properties with low improvement-to-land ratio), and conditions impeding land assemblage (such as diverse ownership), to support the application of the “E” criterion. This Redevelopment Study and Preliminary Investigation Report outlines these components of the tax records for the Study Area properties.

Part One of Three-Part Analysis (Conditions of Title, Diverse Ownership, and Other Similar Factors)

Diverse Ownership

Excluding the Board of Education properties on Block 625, there are 120 properties in the Study Area and 94 individual property owners. This means that 78 percent of the Study Area properties (excluding Block 625) exhibit diverse and unique ownership. These statistics serve to exhibit the general extent of the diversity of ownership within a five-block neighborhood, a condition which can serve to impede land assemblage or discourage the undertaking of improvements, as discussed later.

Specifically focusing on vacant properties in the Study Area, there are 44 properties in the Study Area that are currently vacant with no improvements on site. 43 of these properties are part of tracts of land with more than one vacant property that exhibit diverse ownership, or are small vacant properties (former row homes) adjacent to
other developed lots under different ownership. These properties are mapped below in Figure 15 and are listed as follows:

- Block 619, Lots 45, 48, 51, 73, 75, 78, 79
- Block 621, Lots 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 62, 63, 76, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 109
- Block 623, Lots 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 85, 136, 137, 138, 139

\[1\]

It is noted that Block 619, Lot 45 is a vacant property that is held in common ownership with adjacent Lot 46, which has improvements on it. Lot 45 is used as a side yard associated with Lot 46. Nonetheless, Lot 45 is identified in the mapping in Figure 15 in order to display the extent and ownership of vacant properties in the Study Area.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>CUMMINGS ROOSEVELT</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>NIWEN HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>JONES BOBBY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>POMPEANO NICOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>POMPEANO NICOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>ROBERTS, ALLEN P &amp; PARKER, ROD</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>ABRINGTON JOHN</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>POMPEANO NICOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>FERRELL MAYNARD</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>DUKE MICHAEL G</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>STANLEY ALBERT ET UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>CARTER EDWARD E</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>LINDSEY SABRINA &amp; IRENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>WILLIAMS CLARENCE H ET UX</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>LINDSEY MARY LET AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>TURRES MARIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NIWEN HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>WALKER KENNY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>FAULK SHIRLEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>ROGERS, RONALD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>MICKENS JOHN ET UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>FOUNTAIN, W ETUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>FAHAT HAREF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>MICKENS JOHN ET UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>MICKENS JOHN ET UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>VOAID PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>RICHARDSON VERNON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of the vacant properties listed above, some stand as tracts of multiple contiguous small vacant properties, as is the case with all properties on Block 619 fronting on South Seventh Street, the majority of the properties in the western half of Block 621, and two patches of vacant properties on Block 623 fronting on Tulip Street. Other scattered, small, and individual vacant properties have no common ownership with the developed properties adjacent to them, as is the case with Block 621, Lots 62, 63, 88, 106, and 109, as well as Block 623, Lot 85. In either of these cases, the diversity of ownership of these small vacant lots serves to impede land assemblage through private capital, making it either difficult or impossible, due to a multiplicity of land ownership in a relatively small area, to assemble these properties in a consolidated tract of land. This is evident based on the length of time many of these parcels have remained vacant and fallow.

**Part Two of Three-Part Analysis (Stagnant and Unproductive Condition of Land)**

The second part of the three-part analysis of the “E” criterion is to determine how the aforementioned conditions of ownership have resulted in a stagnant and unproductive condition in the Study Area. As applied to the vacant parcels in the Study Area, vacant properties that have been fallow for an extended period of time can be determined to be in a stagnant and unproductive condition. If these properties were consolidated, they could be redeveloped in a manner consistent with the objectives of the City’s Master Plan and Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan. We also will analyze tax liens and improvement to land (I:L) ratios in the Study Area as further evidence of a stagnant and unproductive condition.

**Vacant Land**

Vacant land laying fallow in an otherwise developed neighborhood can be considered stagnant and unproductive, as evidenced by the ratio of the assessed value of the improvements on the property to the value of the land. The improvement-to-land (I:L) ratio is a recognized standard for evaluating the economic productivity of a property. If the value of the improvements on a property is less than the value of the land, this suggests that the “land is not currently supporting a reasonable value of improvements” and as such can be considered stagnant and unproductive (The Redevelopment Handbook: A Guide to Rebuilding New Jersey’s Communities, 2012. Pg. 64). This can serve as a burden to the City of Camden for land and properties that could otherwise be potentially useful, valuable, and contribute to the tax base of the City. They also become an attractive nuisance and a dumping ground for a variety of trash and debris that further degrades the character of the neighborhood.

Where a property has remained vacant for an extended period, there is evidence of a lack of investment of the land, allowing it to remain fallow and to potentially impact and undermine the fabric of the neighborhood at large. Properties where buildings were recently demolished (fewer than ten years ago), were in fact demolished because the prior buildings and improvements were in a state of disrepair or abandoned and were considered a threat to public, health, safety and welfare, providing further evidence of stagnation and decline.
The 44 vacant properties in the Study Area are outlined above as part of the discussion of the first part of the three-part analysis. These properties are outlined again below in Table 5 and Figure 16, with further distinction as to the year of vacancy. In Table 5, if a property is identified as being vacant since a specific year, it is a result of City tax records or City Department of Code Enforcement records. If a property is identified as being vacant since before a year (i.e., “Before 1999”), it means that City records do not identify a specific year, and that historic aerials interpretation identified an approximate year, as identified in Table 5.

Table 5: Vacant Properties in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Vacant Since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Before 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Before 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Before 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Vacant Since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Before 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Before 1999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Vacant Since</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Before 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>Before 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Before 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Before 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Before 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Before 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown above, of the 44 vacant properties in the Study Area, 34 have been vacant for ten years or longer. The remaining ten properties that have been vacant for fewer than ten years have had a building that was deemed in such deteriorated condition that it needed to be demolished. As can be seen from the this graphic, a substantial portion of Blocks 619 and 621 have been impacted by vacant and fallow properties. This blighting condition has begun to extend eastward into Block 623 as buildings have become deteriorated and have been demolished by the City.

These properties also exhibit either a long history of tax liens, or diversity of ownership with an ongoing and long-term vacant condition, and as such are found to have a stagnant and unproductive condition of land.

**Tax Liens**

A review of tax assessment records indicates that a substantial number of properties in the Study Area have tax liens associated with them. The City of Camden holds an annual tax sale as an enforcement tool to encourage residents to pay their property tax obligation. A property can be listed for tax sale if the property owner owes a municipal charge, such as property taxes, water, sewer, or county sewer charges. When a purchaser bids at the tax sale, they are bidding for the interest rate they will earn on their certificate. If a property has no bidders, then the lien reverts to the City and becomes a “municipal lien.” When a property has a municipal lien, all charges due become automatically attached to the lien and continue to earn interest until the lien is paid off.

As of November 2016, there were 53 properties in the Study Area (approximately 40 percent of all properties in the Study Area) that had a total of 55 active liens (incl., tax liens, outside liens, or both). This is demonstrated in Table 6 (below).
### Table 6: Study Area Properties with Active Tax Liens

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Vacant?</th>
<th>Year Municipal Lien Began</th>
<th>Year Municipal Lien Ended</th>
<th>Age of Municipal Lien (Years)</th>
<th>Year Outside Lien Began</th>
<th>Year Outside Lien Ended</th>
<th>Age of Outside Lien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Redevelopment Study & Preliminary Investigation Report
#### City of Camden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Vacant?</th>
<th>Year Municipal Lien Began</th>
<th>Year Municipal Lien Ended</th>
<th>Age of Municipal Lien (Years)</th>
<th>Year Outside Lien Began</th>
<th>Year Outside Lien Ended</th>
<th>Age of Outside Lien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>643</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there are 53 properties with active tax liens, some properties have records of both municipal and outside liens, which results in a total of 57 individual tax liens for the properties in the Study Area as a whole. It is important to note the following regarding the 57 individual tax liens:

1. Eight properties have a record of outside liens, of which four are still active.
2. Six properties have a record of both municipal and outside liens.
3. Of the 53 properties with active liens, the age of the liens as of 2016 (or the age of the lien at the time it was paid off as indicated above) can be broken down as follows:
   a. Six properties have liens that have been active for fewer than five years;
   b. Six properties have liens that have been active for between five and ten years;
   c. 18 properties have liens that have been active for 11-20 years; and,
   d. 23 properties have liens that have been active for more than 20 years.
4. Of the 53 properties with active liens, the following is noted regarding the status of development on the properties:
   a. 31 properties with active liens are vacant properties, of which 15 have liens that have been active for more than 20 years
   b. 22 properties with active liens are developed properties, of which 12 are owner-occupied and ten are not owner-occupied.
5. 47 liens have been active for a time period of five or more years, or were at least five years old at the time of their maturity.

6. Of the 55 active tax liens, the average age of liens is 17.6 years.

7. Of the 76 properties in the Study Area with improvements (excluding the Board of Education properties on Block 625) 21 properties with improvements have active tax liens. This represents a percentage of 27.6 percent of improved Study Area properties.

The 53 properties with active tax liens are mapped and broken down by age of lien, as displayed in Figure 17, and broken down by status of development (vacant or developed), as displayed in Figure 18 below.
When a property has a tax lien for an extended period of time, that property serves as a burden to the City of Camden due to a lack of revenue from property taxes (i.e., a negative economic impact on the City). As such, it follows that where there exists an established record or history of an active tax lien on a property, that status results in a stagnant and unproductive condition of the land that otherwise may be potentially developed in a way to contribute to the health, safety, and welfare of the community.

**Part Three of Three-Part Analysis (Negative Social or Economic Impact)**

The aforementioned properties (vacant properties as well as properties with an extensive history of tax liens) exhibit a diversity of ownership and a stagnant and unproductive condition that has a clear blighting trend on the neighborhood and the community as a whole. In general, the large tracts of fallow and vacant land are concentrated in Blocks 619, 621, and 623. However, it is clear that the disinvestment, abandonment, and decline are negatively impacting other areas of the neighborhood, as evidenced by: the ongoing pattern of abandonment and decline throughout the Study Area; the fact that the extent of vacant and abandoned properties in the Study Area has increased in recent years; and, the extensive impact of tax liens on the economic vitality of the Study Area.

**Criterion “E” Conclusions**

Further, the properties in the Study Area that meet the “E” criterion for redevelopment may potentially useful and valuable for contributing to and serving the public health, safety, and welfare if consolidated into a single parcel and developed in a coordinated manner, as is consistent with the City’s Master Plan and Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan. By designating these properties in need of redevelopment, the City of Camden will be able to reduce the impediments affecting their development described in this section. It follows that, through the implementation of a comprehensive plan of redevelopment, the City will be able to ensure that the properties will more effectively contribute to the general welfare of the community, by providing jobs, a diversity of housing, and services needed by the community, as well as increasing the City’s tax base, and achieving other important economic and planning goals and objectives. Additionally, the redevelopment of these properties can help to reverse the blighting trend that these properties are having on the overall neighborhood.

For the reasons stated above, and as mapped in Figure 19 below, the following properties meet the “E” criterion for redevelopment:

- Block 619, Lots 48, 51, 73, 75, 78, 79
- Block 621, Lots 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 62, 63, 76, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 104, 105, 106, 109
- Block 623, Lots 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 85, 136, 137, 138, 139
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#### Properties Meeting Criterion E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>JONES BOBBY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>NGUYEN HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>ROBERTS, ALLEN P &amp; PARKER, ROY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>POMPEANO NICOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>AARRINGTON JOHN</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>POMPEANO NICOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>FERRELL MAYNARD</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>DUKE MICHAEL G</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>POMPEANO NICOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>CARTER EDWARD E</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>WILLIAMS CLARENCE H ET UX</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>POMPEANO NICOLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>VOADV PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>STANLEY ALBERT ET UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>VOADV PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>LINDSEY SABRINA &amp; IRENE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>VOADV PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>LINDSEY MARY L ET AL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>SECY OF HUD</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>TORRES MARIANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>LEVA, MANUEL ET AL</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>VOADV PROPERTY INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>HARDEN, G ET UX</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>NGUYEN HOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>WALKER KENNY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>VOADV PROPERTY INC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>FAULK SHIRLEY</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>CAMDEN CITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>VOADV PROPERTY INC</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>BLAND, VINCENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>ROGERS, RONALD</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>MAY, THOMAS E &amp; RODGERS, ROSE MARIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>NASOVI, ABBAS M</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>FOUNTAIN, W ETUX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>FAHAT HAREF</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>MICKENS JOHN ET UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>MICKENS JOHN ET UX</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>MICKENS JOHN ET UX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>RICHARDSON VERNON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“F” Criterion – Fire and Natural Disasters

A property meets the “F” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“Areas, in excess of five contiguous acres, whereon buildings or improvements have been destroyed, consumed by fire, demolished or altered by the action of storm, fire, cyclone, tornado, earthquake or other casualty in such a way that the aggregate assessed value of the area has been materially depreciated.”

Tax records show that, in 1995, a fire destroyed a row of five vacant residential structures on Block 621, Lots 76, 97, 98, 99, and 100. Despite the impact the fire event had on the structures on these properties, the total land area of the five contiguous lots is approximately 0.20 acres, and, as such, does not meet the minimum of five contiguous acres required for the “F” criterion to apply.

In addition, the site visit conducted on January 25, 2017 revealed that the vacant/boarded residential structure on Block 621, Lot 82 exhibits widespread damage to the internal features, resulting from a fire event. However, this property is only 1,800 square feet in area, and does not meet the five acre area requirement in the “F” criterion.

There are no other records of impacts on properties in the Study Area from other fire events, storms, cyclone, tornado, earthquake, or other casualty that would warrant application of the “F” criterion.

For the reasons stated above, **none of the properties in the Study Area meet the “F” criterion for redevelopment.**
“G” Criterion – Urban Enterprise Zone

The “G” criterion for redevelopment under the LRHL relates to municipalities designated as an Urban Enterprise Zone under the Urban Enterprise Zone Act of 1983. Portions of the City of Camden were designated as an Urban Enterprise Zone in October 1984. The designation was prompted by the New Jersey Urban Enterprise Zone Act of 1983, which authorized the provision of tax incentives and other benefits to businesses in targeted, distressed urban areas throughout the state. The intended impact of the Urban Enterprise Zone legislation was the revitalization of New Jersey’s distressed urban communities through the creation of private sector jobs and investment in targeted urban areas.

Figure 20 depicts Study Area properties within the Urban Enterprise Zone. As seen in Figure 20, all properties in the Study Area to the west of South Eighth Street are within the Urban Enterprise Zone. For this reason, all Study Area properties located within Blocks 619, 621, and 642 meet the “G” criterion for Redevelopment.

It is noted within the statutory requirements that the “G” criterion for Redevelopment may only be exercised for the purpose of granting tax exemptions within the enterprise zone district pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 1991, c. 431 (C.40A:20-1 et seq.) or the adoption of a tax abatement and exemption ordinance pursuant to the provisions of P.L. 1991, c. 441 (C.40A:21-1 et seq.). The municipality shall not utilize any other redevelopment powers within the urban enterprise zone unless any of the properties in the Urban Enterprise Zone are designated in need of redevelopment based on at least one other statutory criterion.
“H” Criterion – Smart Growth Consistency

A property meets the “H” criterion for redevelopment if the following applies:

“The designation of the delineated area is consistent with smart growth planning principles adopted pursuant to law or regulation.”

Smart growth is an approach to planning that directs new growth to locations where infrastructure and services are available, limits sprawl development, protects the environment, and enhances and rebuilds existing communities. The New Jersey Office for Planning Advocacy has developed the definition of a “Smart Growth Area” to include an area classified as one of the following:

1. Metropolitan Planning Area (PA1) in the State Plan;
2. Suburban Planning Area (PA2) in the State Plan;
3. A designated center in the State Plan;
4. An area identified for growth as a result of either an initial or advanced petition for plan endorsement that has been approved by the State Planning Commission;
5. A smart growth area designated by the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission; or,
6. A Pinelands Regional Growth Area, Pinelands Village, or Pinelands Town as designated by the New Jersey Pinelands Commission.

It is noted that items 1 and 3 above apply to the Study Area in its entirety, as described below.

To promote smart growth in New Jersey, the State Planning Commission adopted the State Plan in June 1992, which was subsequently revised on March 1, 2001. While the State Plan contains various goals and objectives regarding the future development and redevelopment of New Jersey, its primary objective is to guide development to areas where infrastructure is available, or can be readily extended, such as along existing transportation corridors in developed or developing suburbs and urban areas. It seeks to promote development and redevelopment that will consume less land, deplete fewer natural resources, and use the state’s infrastructure more efficiently.

To achieve these goals, the State Plan divides the state into various planning areas, each of which has its own policy objectives. The Study Area is located within the Metropolitan Planning Area. The following policy objectives are intended as guidelines for planning activities within the Metropolitan Planning Area:

1. Provide for much of the state’s future redevelopment;
2. Revitalize cities and towns;
3. Promote growth in compact forms;
4. Stabilize older suburbs;
5. Redesign areas of sprawl; and,
6. Protect the character of existing stable communities.
The City of Camden also received designated center status as an urban center on June 12, 1992. The State Plan states that center-based growth is the preferred vehicle for accommodating growth in the state, for the following reasons:

1. Reduce number of vehicular trips;
2. Reduce energy consumption;
3. Reduce water and gas consumption;
4. Support transit; and,
5. Reduce infrastructure costs.

Based on the above, the designation of the properties within the Study Area as an area in need of redevelopment would be consistent with the policy objectives of the Metropolitan Planning Area, the intent of center-based development, and the City’s designation as a center in the State Plan.

Designation of the properties within the Study Area as an area in need of redevelopment would also be consistent with the intent of the Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan, which supports the promotion of an urban mixed use village, a mix of housing types, public spaces that promote the gathering of residents, and enhanced multi-modal transportation. Conversely, the current conditions of the neighborhood, with the ongoing pattern of abandonment and decline, are antithetical to the principals of smart growth that are intended to promote vibrant and economically viable neighborhoods. Redevelopment would, accordingly, promote revitalization and stabilization of the area as well as the objectives of smart growth incorporated in these planning initiatives.

It is noted that a designation based on the “H” criterion would not only enable the City of Camden to capture an opportunity to provide for a portion of the state’s future redevelopment within both the Metropolitan Planning Area and designated urban center area, but also to help to revitalize the Morgan Village neighborhood consistent with the goals and objectives of the City’s Master Plan and the Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan. These goals are also consistent with the City’s Urban Enterprise Zone status. Specifically, an adopted redevelopment plan would effectively control the form of development within the Study Area to ensure that the smart growth principles established in the Morgan Village Neighborhood Strategic Plan would be implemented in accordance with the City’s vision for the area.

Additionally, the smart growth consistency of such a designation is supported by the Study Area’s location within the heavily traveled corridor of Morgan Street, which would enable any redevelopment of the Study Area to meet the State Plan’s primary objective of guiding development to areas with existing local and regional infrastructure.

Accordingly, the designation of properties as an area in need of redevelopment would effectuate the implementation of the smart growth planning principles adopted by the State Planning Commission in a manner recommended in the State Plan. Based on the foregoing, all properties in Blocks 619, 621, 623, 642, and 643 in the Study Area meet the “H” criterion for redevelopment. This includes all Study Area properties except for the Board of Education properties on Block 625. The Board of
Education properties are developed with the Creative Arts Morgan Village Academy school, which is consistent with smart growth principles.

There are 43 properties in Blocks 623 and 643 of the Study Area that only meet the “H” criterion for redevelopment, identified as the following:

- Block 643, Lots 2, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23

While the properties listed above technically meet the “H” criterion of the statute, the Planning Board should understand the implications of designating any of these properties in need of redevelopment solely on the “H” criterion. As noted in the most recent edition of The Redevelopment Handbook:

“Since its inclusion in the LRHL, the “H” criterion has been used sparingly and often with caveats offered by planning professionals as to its use in designating an area in need of redevelopment. Unlike the other statutory criteria in the LRHL, the “H” criterion’s focus tends to be on the future redevelopment of the area rather than on existing conditions. It also essentially equates the elimination of “blight” with the advancement of “smart growth” principles. While these principles are defined in law, a determination that the area is or is not consistent with smart growth may be subjective and less reliant on an objective analysis of existing conditions and empirical evidence. Accordingly, municipalities are cautioned not to rely exclusively on the “H” criterion in designating an area in need of redevelopment, particularly if it is anticipated that property may be acquired by eminent domain.”  

As described in the analysis above, the Study Area properties identified above meet the “H” criterion. However, these properties do not meet any of the other criteria of the statute. Therefore, the Planning Board should be cognizant of the issues involved in designating such properties in need of redevelopment and make its decision accordingly.

Furthermore, there are 22 Study Area properties that only meet the “H” criterion for redevelopment and are located within the proposed condemnation redevelopment area designation pursuant to the governing body resolution. These properties are identified below and in Figure 21:

- Block 623, Lots 71, 77, 78, 79, 86, 87, 89, 103, 107, 109, 111, 113, 114, 119, 121, 122
- Block 643, Lots 2, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16

The other 21 properties that only meet the “H” criterion are located within the proposed non-condemnation redevelopment area.

---

While the Courts have not ruled specifically on the constitutionality of the “H” criterion of the statute, recent court decisions suggest that any redevelopment designation, particularly where such a designation empowers a municipality to acquire property by eminent domain, must be grounded in the constitutional provisions defining the concept of blight. However, the “H” criterion remains in the statute and is clearly intended to advance the defined public purpose of using redevelopment to promote smart growth consistent with statewide planning objectives.

At the same time, its use should be undertaken judicially and tempered by an understanding of the constitutional framework underpinning the concept of blight and the ability to acquire a property by condemnation for a public purpose.

Therefore, the Planning Board should carefully consider the proposed redevelopment area designation for those properties that are located in the proposed condemnation redevelopment area and solely meet the "H" criterion. Ultimately, it will be up to the governing body to designate these properties in need of redevelopment based on the Planning Board’s recommendation. However, the Planning Board could recommend that the governing body designate these properties as a non-condemnation redevelopment area.
Needed for Effective Redevelopment

The LRHL permits the inclusion of parcels that do not meet the statutory criteria in a redevelopment area if they are necessary for the effective redevelopment of the area:

“A redevelopment area may include land, buildings or improvements which of themselves are not detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare, but the inclusion of which is found necessary with or without change in their condition, for the effective redevelopment of the area of which they are a part (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-3.).”

There are several properties in Blocks 619 and 621 that, when evaluated individually, only meet the “G” and “H” criteria for redevelopment. These properties are scattered throughout both Blocks 619 and 621. This study recommends the inclusion of these properties in the redevelopment area, as they are needed for the effective redevelopment of the Study Area.

Specifically, inclusion of all the lots in Blocks 619 and 621 into the redevelopment area would allow for a contiguous tract of land that can be developed comprehensively and in a coordinated manner improving site design, access, and circulation in the redevelopment area. As such, apart from meeting the “G” and “H” criteria for redevelopment, the properties listed below and depicted in Figure 22 also are needed for the effective redevelopment of the Study Area:

- Block 619, Lots 45, 46, 47, 49
- Block 621, Lots 56, 58, 59, 60, 61, 64, 65, 66, 78, 79, 81, 83, 107, 110, 111, 112
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Redevelopment Analysis and Conclusions

A careful analysis of the Study Area and the individual properties within the Study Area was undertaken to determine if the area and individual properties meet any of the statutory criteria under Section 5 of the LRHL (N.J.S.A. 40A:12A-5). The results of this analysis are described in this report. The findings for each property are listed below in Table 7 and depicted in the Study Findings maps (Figures 23–29). Note that when a property meets more than one of the statutory criteria, it is shown with cross-hatching in multiple directions. Additionally, the Redevelopment Study’s findings are also described in more detail in the property analysis sheets located in Appendix B.
Table 7: Redevelopment Analysis and Conclusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Lot</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>Needed for Effective Redevelopment?</th>
<th>Subject to Condemnation Redevelopment Study?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>619</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>Needed for Effective Redevelopment?</td>
<td>Subject to Condemnation Redevelopment Study?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Block | Lot | A | D | E | G | H | Needed for Effective Redevelopment? | Subject to Condemnation Redevelopment Study? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>625</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Study Area lots on B 625: not recommended for redevelopment.

642  | 1   | X | X |   |   | X | N                               | N                                          |
| 642  | 2   | X |   |   |   |   | Y**                             | N                                          |
| 643  | 6   | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 7   | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 8   | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 9   | X |   |   |   |   | Y**                             | N                                          |
| 643  | 10  | X |   |   |   |   | Y**                             | N                                          |
| 643  | 11  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 12  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 13  | X |   |   |   |   | Y**                             | N                                          |
| 643  | 14  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 15  | X |   |   |   |   | Y**                             | N                                          |
| 643  | 16  | X |   |   |   |   | Y**                             | N                                          |
| 643  | 17  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 18  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 19  | X | X |   |   | X | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 20  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 21  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 22  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 23  | X |   |   |   |   | N                               | N                                          |
| 643  | 45  | X |   |   |   | X | Y                               | N                                          |

** Property in a condemnation study area that only meets the h criterion
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Appendix A: Crime Data and Mapping
The following statistics are for the designated area in Morgan Village between Tulip and Hunter, from Master to the outer boundary of the Creative Arts Morgan Village Academy school for the years of 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015 and the YTD 2016 (1/1-8/24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MURDER/MANSLAUGHTER</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROBBERY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGGRAVATED ASSAULT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL VIOLENT CRIME</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NON-VIOLENT CRIME</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BURGLARY</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARCENY</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny from Auto*</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARSON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROPERTY CRIME</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CRIME</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note, Larceny from Auto is a subtotal of the Larceny category
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLOCK</th>
<th>LOT</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>Type of Crime</th>
<th>UCR Code</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>48 684 Tulip Street</td>
<td>ASSAULT W/KNIFE OR CUTTING INST</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>5/19/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>107 2448 S 7TH ST</td>
<td>LARCENY OVER 200 OTHER</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>7/26/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>112 2458 S 7TH ST (S 7TH ST)</td>
<td>BURGLARY, RESID. FORCIBLE ENT, NIGHT</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>7/20/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>56 724 TULIP ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 OTHER</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>8/23/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>59 728 TULIP ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1/31/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>61 732 TULIP ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 AUTO PARTS AND ACCESSORIES</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>61 732 TULIP ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 FROM AUTOS</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>5/2/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>65 740 TULIP ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 TO 200 OTHER</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>7/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>66 742 TULIP ST</td>
<td>BURGLARY, RESID. FORCIBLE ENT, UNKNOWN</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>6/1/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>110 815 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 AUTO PARTS AND ACCESSORIES</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>10/15/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>111 817 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ARSON, SINGLE RESD. INHABITED</td>
<td>901</td>
<td>5/31/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>115 825 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>BURGLARY, RESID. FORCIBLE ENT, NIGHT</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>8/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>115 825 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>BURGLARY, RESID. FORCIBLE ENT, NIGHT</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>11/30/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>115 825 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, FIREARM, RESIDENTIAL</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>12/16/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>121 835 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 AUTO PARTS AND ACCESSORIES</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>3/17/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>121 835 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>BURGLARY, RESID. FORCIBLE ENT, DAY</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>1/7/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>121 835 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT/AGG/HANDS, FISTS &amp; FEET</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>6/1/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>123 839 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH A FIREARM</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1/13/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>71 800 TULIP ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT W/KNIFE OR CUTTING INST</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1/29/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>71 800 TULIP ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 OTHER</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>8/8/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>71 800 TULIP ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, FIREARMS, STREET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8/16/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>87 844 TULIP ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 FROM BUILDING</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>2/7/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>87 844 TULIP ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 OTHER</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>5/16/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>87 848 TULIP ST</td>
<td>RAPE-SEXUAL ASSAULT</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7/4/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 732 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, KNIFE, STREET</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>9/19/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 732 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY 50 TO 200 FROM BUILDING</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>3/11/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 734 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>4/7/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 736 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY/STRONG ARM</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>9/5/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 736 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 SHOPLIFTING</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>7/29/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 736 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 SHOPLIFTING</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>1/2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 738 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>8/15/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 740 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY/OTHER WEAPON, STREET</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>8/31/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 740 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>BURGLARY, NON-RES FORCIBLE ENT, UNKNOWN</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>10/30/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 740 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 SHOPLIFTING</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>8/11/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>1 740 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, KNIFE, CONV STORE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/17/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>13 814 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT/AGG/HANDS, FISTS &amp; FEET</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>12/6/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>14 816 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 OTHER</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>2/2/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>14 816 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH A FIREARM</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>6/14/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>14 816 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>3/9/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>14 816 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>BURGLARY, RESID. FORCIBLE ENT, NIGHT</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>4/18/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>14 816 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY OVER 200 OTHER</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>9/15/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>17 824 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>BURGLARY, RESID. FORCIBLE ENT, DAY</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>2/2/2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>6 800 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT LOCALLY</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1/23/2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>7 802 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT LOCALLY</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>1/16/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>7 802 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT LOCALLY</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>12/22/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>8 804 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7/27/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>8 804 MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7/29/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadway Intersection</td>
<td>Type of Crime</td>
<td>UCR Code</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNTER DR &amp; MORGAN BLVD</td>
<td>RAPE- SEXUAL ASSAULT</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>7/17/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTER ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>8/16/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASTER ST &amp; TULIP ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>4/13/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN BLVD &amp; RAMP</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>4/17/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN BLVD &amp; RAMP</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>8/29/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN BLVD &amp; RAMP</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2/21/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN BLVD &amp; RAMP</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>7/23/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN BLVD &amp; S 9TH ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH A FIREARM</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1/9/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORGAN ST &amp; MORGAN BLVD</td>
<td>Assault with other weapon</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>11/26/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 7TH ST &amp; S 7TH ST</td>
<td>LARCENY 50 TO 200 OTHER</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>9/11/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 7TH ST &amp; TULIP ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, KNIFE, STREET</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>8/24/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 7TH ST &amp; TULIP ST</td>
<td>ARSON, OTHER RESIDENCE UNINHABITED</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>7/18/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; HUNTER DR</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT LOCALY</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7/17/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; HUNTER DR</td>
<td>LARCENY OVER 200 FROM AUTOS</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>12/3/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; HUNTER DR</td>
<td>ASSAULT/AGG/HANDS, FISTS &amp; FEET</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>8/24/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; HUNTER ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH A FIREARM</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>3/12/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT LOCALY</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>7/28/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>HOMICIDE-MURDER</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10/6/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>HOMICIDE-MURDER</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10/6/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, FIREARMS, STREET</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>11/5/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY OVER 200 FROM AUTOS</td>
<td>614</td>
<td>12/22/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT W/KNIFE OR CUTTING INST</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT W/KNIFE OR CUTTING INST</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT W/KNIFE OR CUTTING INST</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6/19/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, FIREARMS, STREET</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>8/16/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>MV THEFT LOCALLY / Rec Locally (Attempts)</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>4/25/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>5/18/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>6/1/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY UNDER 50 OTHER</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>9/18/2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>LARCENY 50 TO 200 PURSE SNATCHING</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>8/15/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>12/7/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/11/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4/11/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; TULIP ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT W/KNIFE OR CUTTING INST</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>7/15/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; TULIP ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT/AGG/HANDS, FISTS &amp; FEET</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>9/18/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; TULIP ST</td>
<td>MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT LOCALY</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>11/14/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 8TH ST &amp; TULIP ST</td>
<td>ROBBERY, STRONG ARM, STREET</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>6/29/2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 9TH ST &amp; MORGAN BLVD</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/24/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 9TH ST &amp; MORGAN BLVD</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH A FIREARM</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>1/21/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 9TH ST &amp; MORGAN BLVD</td>
<td>ROBBERY/OTHER WEAPON, STREET</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>4/28/2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 9TH ST &amp; MORGAN BLVD</td>
<td>ARSON, ALL OTHER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/8/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S 9TH ST &amp; MORGAN ST</td>
<td>ASSAULT WITH OTHER WEAPON</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>2/8/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULIP ST &amp; S 9TH ST</td>
<td>LARCENY OVER 200 AUTO PARTS AND ACCESSORIES</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>9/24/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B: Property Analysis Sheets
Property Analysis Sheets
The property analysis sheets that comprise this Appendix identify the following information associated with each Study Area property:

- Block Number
- Lot Number
- Land Use (MOD-IV)
- Lot Area
- Property Location
- Owner’s Name
- Owner’s Address
- Property Description
- Analysis (Redevelopment Study Findings / Statutory Criteria Met)
- Aerial imagery with tax parcel boundaries

In addition to the information provided in the property analysis sheets, Appendix C provides photographs of each Study Area property, as documented during the site visit conducted on January 25, 2017. The photographs in Appendix C should be reviewed concurrently with the property analysis sheets for extra reference.
**Property Description**
This property is a vacant lot that serves as a side yard and driveway to the adjacent Lot 46. The property is bordered by a fence, which is falling over in some places. The property exhibits some debris and two shopping carts stored along the façade of the building on Lot 46.

**Analysis**
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is also needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>This property is an occupied single family residential structure, held in common ownership with adjacent Lot 45.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is also needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Block: 619
Lot: 47
Use: Residential
Area: 2,000 sq ft
Property Location: 682 Tulip Street
Owner's Name: Brown, Marshay C
Owner's Address: 824 So 6th Street
Camden, NJ 08104

Property Description: This property is an occupied single family residential structure.

Analysis: This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is also needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block: 619  
Lot: 48  
Use: Vacant  
Area: 2,000 sq ft  
Property Location: SS Tulip 85 W 7th St  
Owner’s Name: Jones, Bobby  
Owner’s Address: 3 Cobalt Court  
Swedesboro, NJ 08085

Property Description: This property is a vacant fenced-in lot located inbetween two residential properties. The site visit revealed it is used as storage for vehicles. The property is held in common ownership with adjacent Lot 49, a residential structure.

Analysis: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>619</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>686 Tulip St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Jones, Bobby</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>3 Cobalt Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**  
This property is an occupied single family residential structure, held in common ownership with adjacent Lot 48.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment, and is also needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block 619
Lot 51
Use Public (Vacant)
Area 4,000 sq ft
Property Location 694 Tulip St
Owner’s Name Camden City
Owner’s Address PO Box 95120
Camden, NJ 08101

Property Description This property is vacant and owned by the City of Camden. The site visit revealed that the western portion of the property is used as part of the fenced-in side yard to adjacent Lot 49. The eastern portion of the property along the corner of Tulip and S 7th Streets is vacant. On this portion of the property, the remains of a former building foundation can be seen. Debris is also strewn throughout this portion of the property.

Analysis This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This property is a vacant lot as of 2016. Prior to 2016, there was a building on site and the property was assessed as commercial. There are remains of a building foundation. There is also debris strewn throughout the property.

**Analysis**

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Property Description: This property is a vacant lot as of 2015. Prior to 2016, there was a building on site and the property was assessed as commercial. There are remains of a building foundation. There is also debris strewn throughout the property.

Analysis: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 619  
Lot: 78  
Use: Vacant  
Area: 1,400 sq ft  
Property Location: 2459 S 7th St  
Owner's Name: Ferrell, Maynard  
Owner's Address: 207 Robin Lane, Mt Holly, NJ 08060

**Property Description**: This is a vacant property with no improvements on site. There is some minor debris strewn throughout the site.

**Analysis**: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 619
Lot: 79
Use: Vacant
Area: 1,080 sq ft
Property Location: 2457 S 7th St
Owner’s Name: Duke, Michael G
Owner’s Address: 3692 Route 47
Millville, NJ 08332

Property Description
This is a vacant property with no improvements on site. There is some minor debris strewn throughout the site.

Analysis
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**  This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Block** 621  
**Lot** 50  
**Use** Public (Vacant)  
**Area** 1,261 sq ft  
**Property Location** 706 Tulip St  
**Owner's Name** Camden City  
**Owner's Address** PO Box 95120  
Camden, NJ 08101

**Property Description**  
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Property Description

This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

Analysis

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block 621
Lot 56
Use Residential
Area 3,000 sq ft
Property Location 724 Tulip St
Owner’s Name Farhat, Farag H
Owner’s Address 15 No 35th Street
Camden, NJ 08105

Property Description
This property is an occupied single family residential structure. The side and rear yards
of the property are fenced in. The site visit revealed debris in the front yard.

Analysis
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the
effective redevelopment of the study area.
**Property Description**

This property is an occupied single family residential structure with an enclosed front porch. The site visit revealed some minor damage to the gutters on the front of the structure.

**Analysis**

This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
**Property Description**
This property is an occupied single family residential structure with a fenced front porch and yard. The site visit revealed some minor debris in the front yard. There is some superficial damage to the stucco façade on the front of the building.

**Analysis**
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block | 621  
Lot   | 60   
Use   | Residential 
Area  | 2,100 sq ft 
Property Location | 730 Tulip St 
Owner's Name | Arroyo, Gabriel 
Owner's Address | 2802 Finlaw Avenue Pennsauken, NJ 08109 

Property Description | This property is an occupied single family residential structure with a fenced front porch and yard. 
Analysis | This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
**Property Description**
This property is an occupied single family residential structure with a fenced front porch and yard. The site visit revealed storage of some furniture, microwaves, and a door in the front yard.

**Analysis**
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
**Property Description**  
This property is vacant. Tax records show the former residential structure on site was demolished in 2016. The site visit revealed minor debris strewn throughout the empty lot.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 621  
Lot: 63  
Use: Vacant  
Area: 2,000 st ft  
Property Location: 736 Tulip St  
Owner's Name: Harden, Georgia & Thelma  
Owner's Address: 220 Hampshire Road  
Sicklerville, NJ 08081

Property Description: This property is vacant. Tax records show the former residential structure on site was demolished in 2016. The site is currently used as storage of two personal boats. The site visit also revealed minor debris strewn throughout the lot.

Analysis: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This property is an occupied single family residential structure with a fenced front porch and yard.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
**Block**  621  
**Lot**  65  
**Use**  Residential  
**Area**  2,000 st ft  
**Property Location**  740 Tulip St  
**Owner's Name**  Brown, Marshay C  
**Owner's Address**  824 S 6th Street  
Camden, NJ 08103

**Property Description**  This property is an occupied single family residential structure with a fenced front porch and yard.

**Analysis**  This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
**Property Description**  
This property is assessed as commercial, but the site visit revealed that it is actually an occupied residential structure with two separate units. This property is a corner lot with a fenced in rear yard. There is a detached two car garage at the southern end of the property and fronting on South 8th Street. The garage is covered with multiple graffiti tags.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block: 621
Lot: 76
Use: Vacant
Area: 2,000 sq ft
Property Location: NS Morgan 185 E 8th St
Owner’s Name: Nguyen, Hoa
Owner’s Address: 719 Morgan Street
Camden, NJ 08104

**Property Description**
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. The tract of land has remained vacant for over 20 years and is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Block** 621  
**Lot** 78  
**Use** Residential  
**Area** 1,800 sq ft  
**Property Location** 723 Morgan St  
**Owner’s Name** Lang, Isadore Et Ux  
**Owner’s Address** 723 Morgan St  
Camden, NJ 08104

**Property Description**
This property is a single family residential lot. The front yard is fenced in and the front porch is enclosed. The driveway to the west of the residential structure appears to be a part of the right of way, which leads to the north into the 20 foot wide common alleyway running to the east towards S 8th Street. The rear yard is also fenced in, with an enclosed back porch.

**Analysis**
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block 621
Lot 79
Use Residential
Area 1,800 sq ft
Property Location 725 Morgan St
Owner's Name Cortes, Rafael & Evelyn
Owner's Address 534 Vine St
Camden, NJ 08102

Property Description
This property is a single family residential lot with a fenced in front yard and an enclosed front porch.

Analysis
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block: 621
Lot: 80
Use: Residential
Area: 1,800 sq ft
Property Location: 727 Morgan St
Owner's Name: Brown, Barbara A
Owner's Address: 1082 So Common Rd
Camden, NJ 08104

Property Description: This property is a residential structure that is vacant and boarded. The site visit revealed that the inside of the structure exhibits mold and moisture issues as well as a collapsing ceiling on the first floor. There is debris strewn throughout the first and second floors. There also are unsanitary plumbing and water conditions, with human fecal remains in the second floor bathroom.

Analysis: This property meets the A, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block 621
Lot 81
Use Residential
Area 1,800 sq ft
Property Location 729 Morgan St
Owner's Name Remenice Enterprise, LLC
Owner's Address 112 Baker Ave
Atco, NJ 08004

**Property Description**

This property is a residential structure that is vacant and boarded. The front yard is fenced, and the front porch is open. The site visit revealed some damage to the awnings on the front of the structure as well as some broken glass on the front porch. The inside of the structure appears to be in sound structural condition, as was found to be the case during the site visit with the City Building Department.

**Analysis**

This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block: 621
Lot: 82
Use: Residential
Area: 1,800 sq ft

Property Location: 731 Morgan St
Owner's Name: Utley, L V Et Ux
Owner's Address: 731 Morgan St
Camden, NJ 08104

Property Description: This property is a residential structure that is vacant and boarded. The front yard is fenced, and the front porch is open. The City posted an unsafe structure notice dated January 24, 2017 declaring the structure unsafe for human occupancy. The structure is in a state of disrepair, as evidenced by extensive fire and smoke damage as seen internally, and a collapsing ceiling in the rear of the first floor.

Analysis: This property meets the A, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,850 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>733 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Flax, Jesse M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>12 Westerly Dr Sicklerville, NJ 08081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**
This property is a single family residential lot with a fenced in front yard and an enclosed front porch. The lot also has a side driveway located to the east of the building, which leads into the rear yard and to a detached garage.

**Analysis**
This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
This property is the largest residential property in the Study Area. It is also the only residential property in the Study Area that was originally developed with a single family detached structure, instead of the row homes that characterize the rest of the neighborhood. The roof of the front porch, which abuts the right of way, is deteriorating, sagging, and is in need of repair, as evidenced by the temporary support beams keeping the roof in place, and as such could serve as a threat to the safety of passersby. A window on the front of the structure does not appear to be adequately insulated or sealed. The side yard is used as a driveway, as storage for commercial appliances and equipment, and is strewn with debris throughout. There are two commercial freezers in the side yard that do not appear to be adequately sealed or separated from the public, and could serve as an attractive nuisance and a danger to children in the neighborhood or others who access the site. A "For Sale" sign is posted on the front of the residential structure.

This property meets the A, D, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Public (Vacant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,500 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>751 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Name</td>
<td>Camden City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Address</td>
<td>PO Box 95120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camden, NJ 08101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

This property is located along the corner of Morgan Street and S 8th Street. It is a vacant property. There is an unpaved walking path that has been formed due to pedestrians taking a shortcut through the property. The property is strewn with small debris.

**Analysis**

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Block</strong></th>
<th>621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot</strong></td>
<td>89, 90, 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>1,275 sq ft (each)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Location</strong></td>
<td>2460, 2462, &amp; 2464 So 7th St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner's Name</strong></td>
<td>Pompeano, Nicola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner's Address</strong></td>
<td>1002 Prospect Ridge Blvd Haddon Heights, NJ 08035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

These properties are part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**

These properties meet the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 621
Lot: 92
Use: Vacant (Public)
Area: 1,275 sq ft
Property Location: 2466 So 7th St
Owner's Name: Camden City
Owner's Address: PO Box 95120
Camden, NJ 08101

Property Description: This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

Analysis: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 621  
Lot: 94  
Use: Vacant (Public)  
Area: 1,275 sq ft  
Property Location: 2470 So 7th St  
Owner’s Name: Camden City  
Owner’s Address: PO Box 95120, Camden, NJ 08101

Property Description: This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

Analysis: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 621
Lot: 96
Use: Vacant
Area: 1,600 sq ft
Property Location: 711 Morgan St
Owner's Name: Lindsey, Sabrina & Irene
Owner's Address: 1411 Broadway
Camden, NJ 08103

Property Description: This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

Analysis: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,600 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>713 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Lindsey, Mary L Et Al</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>713 Morgan St Camden, NJ 08104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 621  
Lot: 99  
Use: Vacant  
Area: 1,600 sq ft  
Property Location: 717 Morgan St  
Owner's Name: VOADV Property Inc.  
Owner's Address: 235 White Horse Pk 2nd Fl, Collingswood, NJ 08107  

**Property Description**  
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 621  
Lot: 104  
Use: Vacant  
Area: 1,261 sq ft  
Property Location: 702 Tulip St  
Owner's Name: Walker, Kenny  
Owner's Address: 702 Tulip St  
Camden, NJ 08104

Property Description: This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central-eastern portion of the tract.

Analysis: This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>621</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,261 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>708 Tulip St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Name</td>
<td>VOADV Property Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Address</td>
<td>235 White Horse Pk 2nd Fl Collingswood, NJ 08107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 22 individual properties totaling approximately 0.85 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have remained vacant for over 20 years. The tract is marked by an informal walking path cutting through the southern half of the tract. There is debris strewn throughout the majority of the tract, with some larger debris piles located in the central- eastern portion of the tract.

**Analysis**

This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block 621
Lot 106
Use Vacant
Area 960 sq ft
Property Location 2446 So 7th St
Owner's Name Faulk, Shirley
Owner's Address 2448 So 7th St
Camden, NJ 08104

Property Description
This property is located at the northwestern corner of Block 621 along Tulip and S 7th Streets. The property is used as the side yard to adjacent Lot 107, though the property is not held in common ownership. The yard is well maintained and is fenced in.

Analysis
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
This property is a single family residential structure. The rear yard is fenced in along with the adjacent Lot 106, though the property is not held in common ownership. In fact, the entrance to the structure is not facing South 7th Street but rather is located on Lot 106. The structure appears to be well maintained.

This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block 621
Lot 108
Use Residential
Area 960 sq ft
Property Location 2450 So 7th St
Owner's Name Franco, Wilfredo Et Ux
Owner's Address 2450 So 7th St
Camden, NJ 08104

**Property Description**
This structure is vacant. The external structure (mainly the upper façade, parapet, and roof decking) is dilapidated, and the roof decking is rotting. The first floor of the structure is boarded, but the windows on the second floor are not. It is clear that this site has not been adequately secured from the public and from the elements (i.e., weather and wildlife). The site visit revealed the interior of the building smelled of urine and mold. The interior exhibited extreme water and mold damage and displayed large amounts of debris strewn throughout the entirety of the interior.

**Analysis**
This property meets the A, D, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Block** 621  
**Lot** 109  
**Use** Vacant (Public)  
**Area** 960 sq ft  
**Property Location** 2452 So 7th St  
**Owner's Name** Camden City  
**Owner's Address** PO Box 95120  
Camden, NJ 08101

**Property Description**  
This property is vacant, owned by the City of Camden, and is located between two residential properties (row homes). It is strewn with debris along the length of the structure on Lot 108.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Block**: 621  
**Lot**: 110  
**Use**: Residential  
**Area**: 960 sq ft  
**Property Location**: 2454 So 7th St  
**Owner’s Name**: Farhat, Dawy  
**Owner’s Address**: 15 No 35th St  
Camden, NJ 08105

**Property Description**: This is an occupied residential property. The property exhibits superficial deterioration to the front of the structure, including the porch roof, missing gutters, porch floor, and parapet. The rear yard has debris and car parts strewn throughout, but is fenced in.

**Analysis**: This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is an occupied residential property. The front porch is enclosed and the rear yard is fenced in.</td>
<td>This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a residential property. The front porch is open, and the front façade appears to have been recently stuccoed. The rear of the structure shows some superficial dilapidation to the brick surface and parapet. The rear yard has some debris strewn throughout.

This property meets the G and H criteria for redevelopment, and is needed for the effective redevelopment of the study area.
Block 623
Lot 71
Use Residential
Area 3,500 sq ft
Property Location 800 Tulip St
Owner's Name Farhat, Mamoun
Owner's Address PO Box 2191
Cinnaminson, NJ 08077

Property Description
This is a recently renovated residential property. The structure is in good shape, with minor brick pointing and cracks on the side of the structure fronting on Tulip Street. The front porch, which is enclosed, has an older type of shingles. The yard is completely fenced in.

Analysis
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Block  |  623  
Lot |  72  
Use |  Vacant  
Area |  2,000 sq ft  
Property Location |  802 Tulip St  
Owner's Name |  VOADV Property Inc  
Owner's Address |  235 White Horse Pike, Collingswood, NJ 08107

**Property Description**
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 5 individual properties (not held in common ownership) totaling approximately 0.24 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have been vacant since 2015. There is some debris strewn throughout the tract, but the tract of land is otherwise cleared and has no improvements or live vegetation.

**Analysis**
This property meets the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
Property Description
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 5 individual properties (not held in common ownership) totaling approximately 0.24 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have been vacant since 2015. There is some debris strewn throughout the tract, but the tract of land is otherwise cleared and has no improvements or live vegetation.

Analysis
This property meets the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
Property Location
Property Description
Analysis
**Block**  623  
**Lot**  75  
**Use**  Vacant  
**Area**  2,000 sq ft  
**Property Location**  808 Tulip St  
**Owner's Name**  May, Thomas E & Rodgers, Rose Marie  
**Owner's Address**  744 Bentley Lane  
Somerdale, NJ 08083  

---

**Property Description**  This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 5 individual properties (not held in common ownership) totaling approximately 0.24 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have been vacant since 2015. There is some debris strewn throughout the tract, but the tract of land is otherwise cleared and has no improvements or live vegetation.

**Analysis**  This property meets the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Block** 623  
**Lot** 76  
**Use** Vacant  
**Area** 2,000 sq ft  
**Property Location** 810 Tulip St  
**Owner’s Name** Nasqvi, Abbas M  
**Owner’s Address** 4727 Choctaw St  
San Diego, CA 92115

---

**Property Description**  
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of 5 individual properties (not held in common ownership) totaling approximately 0.24 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have been vacant since 2015. There is some debris strewn throughout the tract, but the tract of land is otherwise cleared and has no improvements or live vegetation.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block 623
Lot 77
Use Residential
Area 2,000 sq ft
Property Location 812 Tulip St
Owner’s Name Fattore, Jacqueline & Santo
Owner’s Address 23 Brookwood Drive
Voorhees, NJ 08043

Property Description
This is a residential property. The front of the residential structure exhibits brick pointing, front porch roofing missing fascia and gutters, and hanging shingles. The stoop and walkway in the front yard is undermined. The front yard has bicycles stored hanging over the fence. The rear yard also has multiple bicycles, shopping carts, and debris strewn along the perimeter of the yard.

Analysis
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Block** 623  
**Lot** 78  
**Use** Residential  
**Area** 2,000 sq ft  
**Property Location** 814 Tulip St  
**Owner’s Name** Cruz, Emiliano  
**Owner’s Address** 426 48th St  
Pennsauken, NJ 08110

**Property Description**  
This is a residential property. The front porch is open and exhibits a cracked foundation. The stoop and walkway is sagging and undermined. The front yard is fenced.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
This is a residential property. The front porch is open and its foundation is sagging. The stoop and walkway is sagging and undermined. The front and rear yards are fenced. The rear yard exhibits debris strewn in various locations. The rear of the residential structure has a window that has been closed with cinder blocks. The roof of the rear

Analysis
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Block: 623  
Lot: 84  
Use: Residential  
Area: 1,300 sq ft  
Property Location: 836 Tulip St  
Owner's Name: Farhat, Hossein  
Owner's Address: 15 No 35th St  
Camden, NJ 08105

**Property Description**  
These properties are commonly owned and adjacent to one another. They are marked by to attached vacant residential structures. These structures were boarded (not by the City). The buildings exhibit structural decay to the front façades. The joint stoop and cinderblock wall (where a porch once stood) is also dilapidated, cracking, and has no handrails. There is graffiti along the side wall of the structure on Lot 84. The windows that are not boarded are cracked/broken and not properly secured from the public. The rear of the structures exhibits more graffiti and remains of what appears to be former rear entryways but are now piles of dilapidated steps and construction materials. The rear façade exhibits water damage as well.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the A, D, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**
This is a vacant, former residential property. Tax records indicate the residential structure was demolished in 2015. The property is not held in common ownership with other adjacent properties.

**Analysis**
This property meets the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 623  
Lot: 86  
Use: Residential  
Area: 3,000 sq ft  
Property Location: 842 Tulip St  
Owner's Name: Abed, Fihmi  
Owner's Address: 3412 Farragut Ave  
Camden, NJ 08105

Property Description: This is a residential property with an enclosed carport attached and to the west of the residential structure. The front porch is open and the front yard is enclosed with a fence. The carport structure and roofing exhibits some dilapidation. The rear yard is also enclosed with a fence and appears to be well maintained.

Analysis: This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description
This is a residential property with an open front porch. The porch foundation is cracked and the porch roof is dilapidated. The brick fascia above the parapet needs repair. The stoop and walkway in the front yard is also undermined. The rear yard is also enclosed with a fence and appears to be well maintained. The stoop to the rear entrance is undermined.

Analysis
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Block 623
Lot 89
Use Residential
Area 2,000 sq ft
Property Location 848 Tulip St
Owner’s Name Abed, S Abed
Owner’s Address PO Box 1226
Camden, NJ 08105

Property Description 
This is a residential property with an open front porch. The property is in overall good shape, but the front porch roof is slightly sagging. The rear yard is also enclosed with a fence and appears to be well maintained.

Analysis 
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Block 623
Lot 90
Use Residential
Area 2,000 sq ft
Property Location 850 Tulip St
Owner's Name Coleman, L Et Ux
Owner's Address 850 Tulip St
Camden, NJ 08104

**Property Description**  This is a residential property with a screened front porch. The front façade is painted brick, and needs some pointing at the parapet. The front stoop is cracked and undermined. The rear yard appears to be well maintained.

**Analysis**  This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This is a residential property on a corner lot, at the corner of Tulip and South 9th Streets. The residential structure has some cracked and missing stucco at the parapet. There is a boarded basement window. The property also has a detached two car garage, which shows some dilapidation to the garage doors. The property is fenced in on the front, side, and rear yards.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>623</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>3,150 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>801 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Jones, Alexander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>5846 Delancey Street Philadelphia, PA 19143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

This is a residential property on a corner lot, at the corner of Morgan and South 8th Streets. The property appears to be divided into two units, as evidenced by two separate mailboxes on the property labeled "A" and "B." The residential structure needs some brick repointing, but otherwise is in good condition. At the time of the site visit, there were some home repairs being made on the structure. The property is fenced, but the fencing is damaged in some areas.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**
This is a residential property with an open porch and a partition on the shared porch with the adjacent Lot 105. The stoop and walkway are undermined. The front facade needs some brick repointing. The front porch roof is warped. This property is held in common ownership with adjacent Lots 105 and 106.

**Analysis**
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This is a residential property with an open porch and a partition on the shared porch with the adjacent Lot 104. The front porch foundation is slightly undermined. This property is held in common ownership with adjacent Lots 104 and 106.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Block: 623
Lot: 106
Use: Residential
Area: 1,800 sq ft
Property Location: 807 Morgan St
Owner’s Name: Henriquez, Jose
Owner’s Address: 807 Morgan St, Camden, NJ 08104

Property Description: This is a residential property with a cinderblock/open porch. This property is held in common ownership with adjacent Lots 104 and 105.

Analysis: This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**
This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. There is some minor damaged brick pointing at the parapet on the front façade. The property is otherwise well maintained and in good condition.

**Analysis**
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>623</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>811 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Taylor, Jannie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Owner's Address | 811 Morgan St  
Camden, NJ 08104 |

**Property Description**
This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. The property is generally well maintained and in good condition.

**Analysis**
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description: This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. There is some deteriorated brick pointing and the porch roof is slightly collapsed.

Analysis: This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This is a residential property with an open front porch and missing siding. The overhang and roof of the front porch is dilapidated. There is debris strewn throughout the front yard, including large pieces of siding. The rear yard also exhibits large quantities of overcrowding and debris that is not adequately screened from the public via the rear alleyway. Some of the debris in the rear yard includes large pieces of glass, furniture, and food containers. Vegetation in the rear yard is also overgrown and contributes to the presence of faulty site layout/arrangement.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the D and H criteria for redevelopment.
Property Description
This is a residential property with an open front porch and missing siding. The overhang and roof of the front porch is sagging, and the gutter on the front porch is poorly attached. Both the front and rear yards are fenced, but the fencing in the rear yard is damaged in some places.

Analysis
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>This is a residential property at the eastern end of a row of ten row homes. To the east of the residential structure is a driveway. The structure has an enclosed front porch. Some areas of the front facade have some damaged brick pointing. The property is overall in good condition.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Property Description**

This is a residential property at the western end of a row of ten row homes. The property has a driveway located to the west of the residential structure. The structure has an enclosed front porch. The ramp and porch railings leading to the front entrance are not sound. The porch foundation is cracked, with damaged bricks.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Block</strong></th>
<th>623</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use</strong></td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area</strong></td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Property Location</strong></td>
<td>823 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner's Name</strong></td>
<td>Troche, Jose S Sr</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Owner's Address** | 2823 Westfield Ave  
Camden, NJ 08105 |

**Property Description**  
This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch and siding. The front and rear yards are fenced.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Block** 623  
**Lot** 115  
**Use** Residential  
**Area** 1,800 sq ft

**Property Location** 825 Morgan St  
**Owner's Name** Rodriguez, Ramona  
**Owner's Address** 825 Morgan St  
Camden, NJ 08104

**Property Description**  
This is a residential property with a gated front porch and fenced yard. The windows have metal grating. The front of the structure has siding on top of the original brick façade. The rear of the structure has an enclosed back porch and an extended roof over the second floor porch. The rear yard is paved and used for parking, which is accessed via the rear alley way to the north.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description

This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch and fenced yard. The brick facade is painted yellow, except for the enclosed front porch, which has siding on the facade. The front porch roof is also sagging, and there is a large ladder stored on top of the porch roof, which is just above some electrical wires leading to the house. There is some missing siding on the the front porch. The rear yard is used for parking, which is accessed via the rear alley way to the north.

Analysis

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. The front porch has siding on the facade. The front porch roof is in poor condition. There is also some damaged brick pointing at the parapet. The front yard has debris strewn throughout. The rear yard is used for parking, which is accessed via the rear alley way to the north.</td>
<td>This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>831 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Name</td>
<td>Ellison, Sharlyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Address</td>
<td>831 Morgan St Camden, NJ 08104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**  
This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. The entire front facade and front porch are covered with siding over the original brick. There is some deterioration of the pointing on the bricks on the front stoop. The front steps are also cracked. The rear yard is fenced.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**
This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. The front porch has siding on the facade. The front porch roof is sagging. The facade of the building exhibits some damage to brick pointing. The hand rail to the front porch is damaged. The rear yard is used for parking, which is accessed via the rear alley way to the north.

**Analysis**
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>This is a residential property with a gated front porch. The front porch has siding on the facade. The front porch roof is sagging. The front and rear yards are fenced.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Block: 623
Lot: 122
Use: Residential
Area: 1,800 sq ft
Property Location: 837 Morgan St
Owner’s Name: Williams, John A
Owner’s Address: 100 Drexel Avenue
Blackwood, NJ 08012

Property Description: This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. There is some damage to the brick pointing on the front façade.

Analysis: This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description
This is a residential property at the eastern end of a row of ten row homes and located at the southeastern corner of Block 623 at the intersection of Morgan Street and South 9th Street. The building facade is stuccoed and has water damage on all sides. Most windows are grated. The entrance facing South 9th Street exhibits some damage to the steps. In the rear of the property (to the north at the entrance of the alleyway) is a detached garage structure, which has some damage to the garage door and the roofing.

Analysis
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description:
This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of four (4) individual properties (not all held in common ownership) totaling approximately 0.15 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have been vacant since 2005 or 2006 (building department and tax records do not specify an exact date of demolition). There is some debris strewn throughout the tract. At the southern end of the tract along the rear alleyway that cuts through Block 623, the site visit revealed a large deposit of debris, including a sofa, various mattresses, car tires, a large television, along with other various debris items. The tract of land is otherwise cleared and has no improvements or live vegetation.

Analysis:
This property meets the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 623  
Lot: 137, 138  
Use: Vacant  
Area: 1,400 sq ft, each  
Property Location: 830, 832 Tulip St  
Owner's Name: Mickens, John Et Ux  
Owner's Address: 830 Tulip St, Camden, NJ 08102

Property Description: These two properties are part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of four (4) individual properties (not all held in common ownership) totaling approximately 0.15 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have been vacant since 2005 or 2006 (building department and tax records do not specify an exact date of demolition). There is some debris strewn throughout the tract. At the southern end of the tract along the rear alleyway that cuts through Block 623, the site visit revealed a large deposit of debris, including a sofa, various mattresses, car tires, a large television, along with other various debris items. The tract of land is otherwise cleared and has no improvements or live vegetation.

Analysis: These properties meet the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
Block: 623
Lot: 139
Use: Vacant
Area: 1,400 sq ft
Property Location: 834 Tulip St
Owner's Name: Richardson, Vernon
Owner's Address: 834 Tulip St Camden, NJ 08104

Property Description: This property is part of a greater tract of vacant land comprised of four (4) individual properties (not all held in common ownership) totaling approximately 0.15 acres in area. All of the individual properties comprising this tract of land have been vacant since 2005 or 2006 (building department and tax records do not specify an exact date of demolition). There is some debris strewn throughout the tract. At the southern end of the tract along the rear alleyway that cuts through Block 623, the site visit revealed a large deposit of debris, including a sofa, various mattresses, car tires, a large television, along with other various debris items. The tract of land is otherwise cleared and has no improvements or live vegetation.

Analysis: This property meets the E and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Block** 623  
**Lot** 140  
**Use** Residential  
**Area** 1,300 sq ft  
**Property Location** 838 Tulip St  
**Owner's Name** Farhat, Hossein  
**Owner's Address** 15 No 35th St  
Camden, NJ 08105

**Property Description**  
These properties are commonly owned and adjacent to one another. They are marked by attached vacant residential structures. These structures were boarded (not by the City). The buildings exhibit structural decay to the front façades. The joint stoop and cinderblock wall (where a porch once stood) is also dilapidated, cracking, and has no handrails. There is graffiti along the side wall of the structure on Lot 84. The windows that are not boarded are cracked/broken and not properly secured from the public. The rear of the structures exhibits more graffiti and remains of what appears to be former rear entryways but are now piles of dilapidated steps and construction materials. The rear façade exhibits water damage as well.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the A, D, and H criteria for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>623</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>2,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>846 Tulip St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Collins, Julia TR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>846 Tulip St, Camden, NJ 08104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

This is a residential property with an open front porch. The rear yard is enclosed with a fence and appears to be well maintained. The soop to the rear entrance is undermined. The property is otherwise in generally good condition.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Block** 625  
**Lot** 93, 94, 95, 97, 99, 100, 101, 102, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131  
**Use** Public School  
**Area** 0.85 acres (total)  
**Property Location** 900 Tulip St  
**Owner’s Name** Camden Board of Education  
**Owner’s Address** 201 No Front St, 8th Flr  
Camden, NJ 08102

**Property Description** These properties are developed with the newly constructed Creative Arts Morgan Village Academy school.

**Analysis** These properties don’t meet any of the redevelopment criteria.
Property Description
This property is developed as a strip mall, occupied with seven (7) different businesses: a clothing store, a restaurant, a deli, a beauty supplies store, two salons, and a liquor store. The property exhibits excessive land coverage, as evidenced by the fact that it is nearly entirely covered with impervious surfaces (an estimate generated based on aerial imagery in GIS software finds approximately 80% of the property is impervious coverage.) The property also exhibits faulty and obsolete site layout/arrangement and design. The striping for parking spaces is aged and no longer properly delineated, and the property is not striped in a way that facilitates adequate site circulation. There is not proper storage or screening of on-site refuse, as the existing waste removal is accessible from the public right of way and could serve as an attractive nuisance to the adjacent residential properties.

Analysis
This property meets the D, G, and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This is a residential property with an open front porch. The walkway leading to the front porch is cracked and the stoop has minor brick damage. There is debris stored in the front yard, which is fenced. The rear yard is enclosed with a fence and has a detached garage.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description

This structure has multiple boarded windows, though not boarded by the City. The rear of the structure facing Hunter Drive to the south exhibits dilapidation in various locations that could have a negative impact on the inhabitability of the structure. The foundation to the steps leading to the rear porch are structurally unsound, and there is no step handrail. The foundation of the rear porch appears to be damaged as well. The rear porch roof exhibits dilapidation. In addition, the framing to the rear windows and doors does not seem to be secure. There is also caution tape across the rear door. The inside of the building revealed holes in the floors, ceilings, and a large amount of water intrusion. On February 8, 2017, this property was added to the City’s list of properties to be demolished.

Analysis

This property meets the A and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>643</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>802 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Santos, Dauselina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>802 Morgan St Camden, NJ 08104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch and fenced front yard. The porch roof is collapsing and the structure is in need of minor fascia repairs.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>643</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>804 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Rozier, Annie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>804 Morgan St Camden, NJ 08104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

This is a residential property with an open front porch and fenced front yard. The façade of the front of the structure is in need of minor brick repairs, but is otherwise in good condition.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>643</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>806 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Trimill, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>PO Box 125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Franklinville, NJ 08322

**Property Description**
This is a residential property with an open front porch and fenced front yard. The front porch roof is dated, and the walkway and stoop are undermined, but the structure is otherwise in good condition.

**Analysis**
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>643</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>808 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Name</td>
<td>PCIREO-1, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Address</td>
<td>1000 Had-Berlin Rd Voorhes, NJ 08043</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**

This is a residential property with an open front porch and open front yard. The brick fascia of the front façade needs repointing, but otherwise the structure is in good condition.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch. The front of the structure is covered in siding, and some of the siding and gutters on the front porch are warped and sagging.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Block**
643

**Lot**
12

**Use**
Residential

**Area**
2,700 sq ft

**Property Location**
812 Morgan St

**Owner's Name**
Cuevas, Roni

**Owner's Address**
812 Morgan St
Camden, NJ 08104

---

**Property Description**
This is a residential property with an open front porch and a painted brick facade. The structure is overall in good condition. The yard is fenced in.

**Analysis**
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Block: 643
Lot: 13
Use: Residential
Area: 2,700 sq ft
Property Location: 814 Morgan St
Owner's Name: Caputi, Leonor
Owner's Address: 113 Canvas Court
Manahawkin, NJ 08050

Property Description: This is a residential property with an open screened front porch and fenced yard. The porch roof is collapsing and the stoop is undermined.

Analysis: This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>643</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>1,800 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Location</td>
<td>816 Morgan St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Name</td>
<td>Palma, Guillermo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner's Address</td>
<td>816 Morgan St Camden, NJ 08104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Property Description**
This is a residential property with an enclosed front porch and walled yard. The cinder block wall, which serves as a barrier from the sidewalk and right of way, dilapidated, as evidenced by cracks in multiple locations to its foundation. If this wall were to fall, it could serve as a threat to the safety of passersby. The rear yard has a similar cinder block wall along the side boundaries of the property. The property exhibits excessive land coverage, as it is almost entirely covered by impervious coverage (the rear yard is entirely paved).

**Analysis**
This property meets the D and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**  
This is a residential property with an open front porch and fenced yard. The porch foundation and floor is cracked, and the porch ceiling is rotted.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description
This is a residential property with an open damaged screen porch. The porch floor is sagging and there are cracks in the stoop.

Analysis
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Property Description: This is a residential property at the eastern edge of a building of six homes. The structure has an enclosed porch with a collapsing roof, rotted framing, and broken windows. The structure has damaged brick pointing. The rear yard is fenced.

Analysis: This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This is a residential property with an enclosed porch and awning. The structure has some minor damaged brick pointing, but otherwise is overall in good condition. The rear yard is fenced.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
This is a residential structure with an enclosed front porch. This structure is not boarded. The City Building Department indicated that the building is inhabited. The building façade on the second floor is damaged, as evidenced by missing and cracked bricks and frieze. The front porch is dilapidated and has multiple missing and broken windows, some of which are covered by makeshift boards but do not appear to be adequately secured from the public. The front porch also appears to have warped and damaged structural beams. The view of the rear of the property from Hunter Drive reveals a cinder block accessory structure that is boarded by plywood.

This property meets the A, D, and H criteria for redevelopment.
Property Description
This is a residential structure with an enclosed front porch. This structure is vacant and boarded. The City posted an unsafe structure notice dated January 24, 2017 declaring the structure unsafe for human occupancy. The foundation and structural beams of the front porch are warped and rotting. The porch roof and façade are also warped and damaged. The rear yard has a dilapidated wood accessory structure that has no roofing and is not adequately secured from the public. The interior of the structure exhibited extensive water damage and mold. During the site visit, there was water actively dripping from the second floor, suggesting that rainfall from the days prior to the site visit entered the structure through the roof. The first floor ceiling is damaged and collapsing.

Analysis
This property meets the A and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Block** 643  
**Lot** 21  
**Use** Residential  
**Area** 2,700 sq ft +/-  
**Property Location** 2511 Morgan Boulevard  
**Owner's Name** Jones, Edward P Et Ux  
**Owner's Address** 2511 Morgan Boulevard  
Camden, NJ 08104

**Property Description**  
This is a residential structure with an enclosed front porch. This structure is vacant and boarded. The porch stoop is substandard, as it is damaged, unstable, has no handrails. There are various broken windows on the second story, which do not appear to be properly boarded, as living plants are entering the window slots and growing into the rooms on the second story. The fencing from the rear of the building is damaged and dilapidated. The internal of the building exhibits water damage.

**Analysis**  
This property meets the A and H criteria for redevelopment.
**Property Description**

This is a residential structure with an enclosed front porch and siding on the front and rear facades. This structure is in overall good condition.

**Analysis**

This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
**Property Description**
This is a residential structure with an enclosed front porch, siding on the front and rear facades, and a fenced yard that is well maintained. This structure is in overall good condition. The property also has a detached garage with a rotting frame and sagging roof.

**Analysis**
This property meets the H criterion for redevelopment.
Block 643
Lot 45
Use "Other Exempt"
Area 0.67 acres +/-
Property Location NE Hunter & 8th Sts
Owner's Name Crestbury Estates Urban Renewal LLC
Owner's Address 575 Route 70, 2nd Flr
Brick, NJ 08723

Property Description
This property is in the southeastern portion of the Study Area along Hunter Street and is a part of the Crestbury Apartments complex, located to the south. The property is primarily used as a rear alleyway to service the residential properties to the north and east and for parking to service the Crestbury Apartments. There is a cinder block structure in the western half of the property. The site visit proved inconclusive in terms of the purpose of this structure, but it is clear it is a use ancillary to the Crestbury Apartment complex. The property is mostly covered in impervious surface. There are various dumpsters located along the southern edge of the property that are not screened from Hunter Street and are accessible to passersby. There is also a large quantity of debris strewn throughout the majority of the property.

Analysis
This property meets the D and H criteria for redevelopment.
Appendix C: Site Visit Photos
BLOCK 621
BLOCK 623