The Chairman called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the “Open Public Meeting Act” and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Schwenke

Absent: Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Senges

Also, present, Chris Norman, Board Solicitor and Corrine Tarcelli, Zoning Board Secretary

**RESOLUTIONS FOR APPROVAL**

 Mr. Willard motioned to approve the Resolution for Case #ZC2019-002, Thomas Jefferson University Hospital, 443 Laurel Oak Drive, Block 161, Lot 22 – Use variance to utilize a portion of the facility as a physician’s assistant’s educational facility; seconded by Mr. Daddario; none (0) against, Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cohen and Mr. Weil abstained.

 Mr. Willard motioned to approve the Resolution for Case #ZC2018-005 James and Rosemary Kearney, 6 Oak Ridge Court, Block 202.10, Lot 1 – Bulk variance to permit an existing driveway and shed; seconded by Mr. Daddario; none (0) against, Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cohen abstained.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Safety In Groups**

2515 Evesham Avenue

Block 207, Lot 4.18

Seeking relief from the requirement that the approved service provider be affiliated with COA. Accreditation by COA is not predominant in New Jersey and being required to affiliate with a service provider accredited by COA will severely limit Safety In Group’s ability to secure a high quality service provider to provide the required services for screening and care giving at this site.

Mr. Richard Goldstein, Attorney for the Applicant, Safety In Groups, Inc., summarized the application and stated the Applicant, has a business address of 6 Artisan Way, Cherry Hill, NJ 08003 has filed an application seeking relief from Condition #5 of its Use Variance Approval, previously granted by the Voorhees Township Zoning Board, by Resolution No. 11-17 (Application ZC-2011-007), and memorialized on June 23, 2011. He further stated the use variance permitted construction of three (3) group homes for developmentally disabled adults and an ancillary stand-alone recreation building for use solely by the residents of the group homes and their guests within the Main Street Complex located at 2515 Evesham Avenue, Voorhees, NJ.

Mr. Goldstein explained condition #5 as stated in Resolution No. 11-17 states “The applicant must contract with a COA, Council on Accreditation, approved service provider for screening and care giving services at the site.” The applicant is requesting condition #5 read as follows: “The applicant must contract with a qualified service provider for screening and care giving services at the site.”

Mr. Goldstein further explained when the applicant originally planned for its future operations in 2011, it intended to retain the services of Samost Jewish Family and Children’s Services (“JFCS”) as a qualified service provider for screening and caregiving services. See Paragraph 7 of Resolution No. 11-17. At that time, JFCS (referred to in Resolution No. 11‑17 as “SCFS”) was a licensed and accredited COA service provider. Applicant indicated that such COA accreditation was not deemed a material requirement for the operation of a qualified home for the developmentally disabled adults, but rather was merely a statement of JFCS’s professional credentials. In 2019, Applicant no longer intends to contract with JFCS, but rather seeks to contract with another qualified service provider.

Ms. Elizabeth M. Shea, Applicant’s Regulatory Consultant was sworn in to testify. She stated that she has nearly twenty years of professional experience in the field of regulatory affairs for healthcare services for the developmentally disabled. Ms. Shea testified that COA Accreditation is not a critical designation for providing safe and adequate quality of care for the developmentally disabled in New Jersey. She further stated the State of New Jersey already assumes a comprehensive and critical role in administrative oversight in this field, thus rendering COA Accreditation in New Jersey non-essential. Ms. Shea further testified that because COA accreditation is not necessary in New Jersey, few providers of care for the developmentally disabled seek COA accreditation. As a result, the enforcement of Condition #5 would severely limit Applicant’s options for procuring a qualified service provider for screening and caregiving services.

Ms. Shea further stated, the Applicant indicated they may wish to contract with a qualified service provider for screening and caregiving services, which is not COA accredited. Ms. Shea reiterated that granting such relief would pose no impediment to providing quality of care for those who reside in the three (3) approved group homes.

 The meeting was opened to the public. Seeing no one from the public, the public portion was closed.

The Zoning Board agreed that changed circumstances exist to warrant granting relief from condition #5 of Resolution No. 11-17, and that the proposed modification to condition #5 is acceptable, based upon the testimony by Ms. Shea.

Mr. Cohen motioned to approve relief from condition #5 of Resolution No. 11-17 which stated “The applicant must contract with a COA (Council on Accreditation) approved service provider for screening and care giving services at the site.” Condition #5 shall now read as follows: “The applicant must contract with a qualified service provider for screening and car giving services at the site.”; seconded by Mr. Willard.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Brocco, Mr. Schwenke,

Mr. Weil

Nays: None

Abstentions: None

Seeing no further business Mr. Weil made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Willard.

Meeting was adjourned.
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