

THE HADDON TOWNSHIP PLANNING/ZONING BOARD
MINUTES

April 1, 2021

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Township of Haddon Planning/Zoning Board, held on Thursday, April 1, 2021, via zoom.

Flag salute

Confirmation of Sunshine Law

Chapter 231, Public Law 1975 requires adequate notice of this meeting be provided by specifying time, place and agenda. This has been done by mailing a copy of the Agenda to the Courier-Post and The Retrospect newspapers and by posting on two bulletin boards in the Municipal Building.

Roll Call

Richard Rotz	Present
John Foley	Excused
Suzanne Discher	Excused
Joe Buono	Present
Frank Monzo	Present
Marguerite Downham	Present
Ryan Linhart	Present
James Stevenson	Present
Greg Wells	Present
Jose Calves	Present
Renee Bergman	Present
Chris Jandoli	Present
Meredith Kirschner	Present

Also, present

Francis Ryan – Solicitor

Lee Palo – Zoning Officer

Gregory Fusco – Township Engineer

Meeting called to order by Chair Richard Rotz 7:34 P.M.

Swearing in of new board member, Meredith Kirschner.

Motion by Frank Monzo to approve the minutes from January 7, 2021 seconded by Renee Bergman, 8 members voted in the affirmative, -no votes One abstention (Jim Stevenson)

Page 2

A motion by Joe Buono to approve the minutes from February 4, 2021, seconded by Renee Bergmann, 9 members voted in the affirmative, Motion carried

A motion by Greg Wells to approve the minutes from March 4, 2022, seconded by Joe Buono, 6 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes 3 abstentions (Richard Rotz, Comm. Linhart, James Stevenson) Motion carried.

Old Business – None

New Business – Application 20-42 – Block 19.06 Lot 33 – Zone R1- 388 Westmont Ave-Michael Wood. Applicant is seeking to construct a rear yard deck- required 10,000 sq. feet where 7,000 sq ft exists, need relief of 3,000 sq ft – Lot frontage required 75', 50' exists need relief of 25' – front yard setback.

Michael Wood – Sworn In
338 Westmont Avenue
Haddon Township, NJ 0818

Mr. Rotz - Survey June 2020.

Mr. Wells – deck has started but the survey does not show what has already been built.

Mr. Ryan – do not recall the work session on this application,

Mr. Woods – can in on a work session last September, pictures were provided at that time. I put an add in the paper and it was not approved as proper so at that time it got pushed off until this time.

Mr. Rotz – why did it take this long?

Mr. Ryan – what you are submitting does not show what you are building, impossible for the board to approve what you are building without seeing it. It is not on the survey.

Mr. Woods - Not aware that it needed to be on survey, not informed.

Mr. Rotz – rules and procedure require a survey current of 6 months.

Mr. Woods – provided a plan in detail. It was not certified by a surveyor with dimensions.

Mr. Palo – deck had started, went over and spoke to Mr. Woods, deck ends at the end of the property line, too close to the rear yard set-back needed to come in and get a variance for relief on the right side. Advertising issues, and it just came to surface now.

Mr. Woods – pictures ready to be sent now.

Page 3

Mr. Ryan – we cannot rely on photographs to determine dimensions. Irresponsible for the board to approve plan without a survey.

Mr. Woods – I did supply a plan with all of the details. Had asked why it is now being brought to our attention.

Mr. Ryan – The survey does not show the proposed structure.

Mr. Rotz – we can hear your application now if you would like and the board can vote on it as is. You can submit what you have now if you would like to.

Mr. Wells – he would have to start from scratch again. New work session, new application, new submission.

Mr. Calves – everything is preexisting and the deck is nonconforming then he is in the same position as if he did not come.

Need an updated survey because you need to show your deck

Motion by Renee Bergman, to table application 20-42 until May 6, 2021 – 338 Westmont Avenue, seconded Greg Well. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Ryan- Told the applicant the he does not need to readvertise

Mr. Ryan Updated survey showing the deck is all he will need in May.

Application 21-02 – Block 21.13 Lot 2 – Zone R2- 16 Chestnut Ave- O’Conner Builders - Ever Marino
Applicant is seeking to construct an addition seeking relief from front yard set-back. Along with any and all variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

Mr. Marino- Sworn In

Owner of property, yes. Addition to the house- backyard addition

Mr. Ryan – lot is required to be 6,000 sq. ft. existing is 5356 sq. ft. seeking relief of 644 sq ft short – side yard requirement compliant – front yard set-back is required to be 25 feet existing is 19.88 feet needs 5.12 feet of relief Frontage is required 50 ft. exists is 48.8 ft. seeking 1.2 ft. of relief – survey shows proposed addition – that will all be in building lines of existing structure – not changing any of the existing non conformities – in compliance with rear yard setback requirement.

Mr. Palo – the shed is being removed.

Mr. Marino- Yes, shed is being removed.

Page 4

Mr. Rotz - Any witnesses to speak on your behalf? No.

Mrs. Downham- How high is addition?

Mr. Wells – It is a one-story addition.

Mr. Rotz – other photographs, Mr. Linhart can you please pull them up. Testimony that your fence is 5’?

Mr. Ever - Yes.

Mr. Downham – where will stormwater from back of addition go?

Mr. Ever – around the house, going to the other side of the house. Needs to go to the street or the storm sewer.

Mrs. Downham - The existing house has a basement, yes.

Mr. Rotz - asked for a motion to open up to public comment

A motion by Joe Buono to open the meeting to the public, seconded by Renee Bergmann, all members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Fred Stein - 217 Fern Ave – Sworn In

Is the addition being proposed is it in exact same footprint of the current back porch? Is there a patio now.

Mr. Merino – cement building on the back, using that as the addition, yes there is a concrete patio on back, increasing that on the back for the foundation.

Mr. Stein - Increasing size of footprint of house?

Mr. Merino – Yes

Mr. Rotz – what is the size of the patio? What is the size of the addition?

12x28 patio 12x28 is size of addition

Mr. Rotz – ask for a Motion to close motion to close the public portion for this application

A motion by Frank Monzo and seconded by Greg Wells to close the Public portion of this application. All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Page 5

Mr. Rotz stated that the application seeking bulk variances relief from pre-existing non-conforming conditions with respect to the variances requests.

A motion by Greg Wells to approve application 21-02 – 16 Chestnut Avenue – rear addition seconded by James Stevenson

9 members present voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes. Motion carried.

Application 21-03 – Block 10.09 Lot 7 – Zone R2- 1012 Merrick Ave- Catherine & Thomas Van Curren- Applicants are seeking to construct a rear yard addition and deck seeking right side yard relief along with any and all other variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve the application.

Thomas Van Curren – Sworn In – owner of property

Mr. Van Curren explains he is asking for a variance for the existing house, to put an addition on rear of home that conforms to current regulations – deck along with rear of the house.

Mr. Rotz states that there is a current Survey, application filed January, survey is from September 2020. The current condition on the property is pre-existing non-conforming, is that correct?

Mr. Van Curren – yes, we want 308 ft addition for kitchen and bathroom, small deck next to it. Falls within current requirements. Existing house is out of compliance, reason for application. Requesting .98' of relief for the side set back where 6' is required existing is 5.02' on one side and the other side again where 6' is required only has 5.14' seeking relief of .86' on the other side

Mr. Rotz – any other testimony or photographs?

Mr. Van Curren – when I came to the work session, I was asked to make sure downspouts didn't impact on direct neighbors, builders and architects will make sure it will drain into street. We will also Replace windows, roof, new door, general renovations.

Mr. Rotz – Do you have a screened in deck or porch?

Mr. Van Curren – We are Demoing the small deck to left, leaving half of space for a deck and the other portion incorporated in addition.

Mrs. Downham asked if the majority of addition will be on the footprint of existing porch?

Mr. Fusco remarked that there will be 145 sq feet of new impervious coverage

Mr. Rotz – hearing nothing else Mr. Rotz asked for a motion to open to public portion.

A motion by Frank Monzo to open the public portion of this application, seconded by Marguerite Downham, All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Page 6

Fred Stein – Sworn In

I have Concern about the stormwater drainage, drains down into newton lake. Footprint of house impervious coverage of the house. What is the percentage of impervious coverage the new project will have on this?

Mr. Fusco replied it does not exceed requirements.

Mr. Stein – Will the downspouts direct towards road, down the hill into newton creek, Is there any part of town code that requires capturing rain water on property.

Mr. Fusco - Ordinance revision will be on the agenda for the planning board members next month that will address minor increases in surface runoff. 10% or more. Most of the time that increase is deposited on the rear yard and conveyed to the street.

Mr. Rotz – hearing nothing else Mr. Rotz ask for a motion to close the public portion.

A motion by Frank Monzo to close public portion, seconded by James Stevenson. All members present voted in the affirmative. Public portion closed.

Mr. Rotz asked the applicant if he had anything else to add to his application.

Mr. Van Curren - I think the addition will improve the neighborhood and the house, we have no plans on moving out.

Mr. Rotz ask the board members if anyone else had anything to add and if not. Could we have a motion.

A Motion by James Stevenson to approve application 21-03 – 1012 Merrick Avenue as proposed, Seconded by Greg Wells. No discussion. 9 members voted in the affirmative, 0-no votes. Motion carries.

Application 21-08 – Block 14.04 Lot 13 – Zone R1- 104 Breslin Ave- Chris Hubler & Katie Welsh – applicants are seeking to construct a single-family home, demo existing house, seeking side yard variances along with any and all other variances needed to necessary to approve this application.

Chris Hubler – Owner – Sworn In

Katie Welsh – Sworn In

Mr. Hubler explained the they are proposing to demo existing structure build new home on vacant lot – it is in a R1 zone, existing lot is 50x120 ft and would require frontage variance, lot size variances, side yard variances of 8 ft relief from 25 ft total required.

Mr. Ryan stated that at the discussion at work session the applicant was advised that once they tore down the existing house, they would lose all rights with regard to pre-existing non-conforming conditions, and they were also advised that part of their burden with regard to building on an undersized lot was to establish that they were unable to buy property from adjoining property owners to make this lot conforming. with obligations with regards to under sized lot.

Mr. Hubler stated because we are undersized, we sent certified letters to neighbors on both sides. Asking if we could buy a portion of their land we sent it to 102 & 106 Breslin.

Mr. Linhart- Shared letter that was sent to neighbors on screen for review by board.

Mr. Rotz marked - A1-tender letters that Mr. Hubler sent to his neighbors.

Mr. Rotz – where they willing to sell some portion of property?

Mr. Hubler replied that if they sold it could put them out of compliance if they do so. The max that could get is about 1 ft along the 120 ft side.

Mr. Rotz asked the applicant to describe actual variances? And size of house requesting? Also, could you make reference to the actual style of the house and why you want to build it at this size and not comply with the smaller home.

Mr. Hubler – build a 33 ' x 47' deep house, given size of house we would like to build we would need a 6ft setback on left side, improvement of 1 ft of setback on that side right side 11ft setback, improvement 6 ft. with new structure – includes attached one-car garage and a location that provides us with more off street parking – does not put over impervious coverage for lot designed – meaningful access to rear yard – side yard improvements this size house on the property of an efficient use of the size lot.

Mr. Rotz- asked the applicants if there had any photographs of streetscape, neighboring homes, character of street and neighborhood?

Mr. Hubler – We did not provide any in our application, but we can share google street view on google maps. Applicant put on screen google map, on the Left side there is a two-story structure maybe about 25 ft' tall estimate – right-side two-story home estimate 25 ft.

Mr. Rotz – You are proposing a 34 ft. house. Correct?

Mr. Hubler - Yes

Page 8

Mr. Hubler continued to state that behind tree there is a 1.5 story home, The house on corner across street is 2.5 story homes. Home on corner of Avondale and Breslin similar slightly shorter.

Mr. Rotz stated that the large home has a very large lot, one of the larger lots in the neighborhood. IS that correct?

Mr. Hubler - Yes

Mr. Rotz – asked are there any homes the size you are proposing on lots as small as your son your street?

Mr. Hubler - Not on our street, next block down to the left across Mt. Vernon down to cul-de-sac 2.5 story home Dutch colonial house and a second home that is 2.5 stories, smaller lots both less than 10,000 sq ft.

Mr. Ryan – what is average height of the buildings?

Mr. Hubler – Not sure around 31' not seeking height relief.

Mr. Fusco – When you go back to the original sketch on survey you are knocking existing home down including the foundation. The red outline is the new outline of the home so half of garage is not going to be constructed and driveway will be shifted over to line up with new side of house
Rough math- roughly the same amount of impervious surface. You are going to be required to submit a grading plan, verify season high ground water tables, most homes stick up above surface elevation of 3-4 ft. Going to exceed 35 ft in height when you take that into consideration. With this style home those Dutch colonials are about 30-31 ft high they did not have to comply years ago that the finish flooring in basement was above the seasonal high. Consider that with approval and moving forward.

Marguerite Downham asked- what is the basement plan?

Mr. Fusco Useable space in a basement should be 7 ft.

Mr. Hubler – planning on using hand drawn plans. Bring in engineer for grading plan and evaluation of concerns.

Mr. Ryan - What is sq footage of existing?

Mr. Hubler - 794 sq feet - Proposing, excluding basement, not finish attic of basement- total square footage would be around 2700-2800 sq feet

Mr. Ryan - Difficulty with proposed on narrow lot it accentuates the height and even though 35 ft is permitted that is on a 10,000 sq ft lot with much bigger side yard. On narrow lot it is going to look much

Page 9

larger than actual height. Not going to have a basement or a 3rd floor. Not sure how to justify why you should be able to build a nonconforming house.

Mr. Hubler – improving side yards, improve off street parking situation, 11 ft setback we can likely add a larger driveway without going over impervious coverage.

Mr. Ryan – You have not provided a proposal showing that this design is better than the zoning code and is better for the neighborhood. You need to show the benefits of building a house this size among the moderately sided home. You do not need to provide any information as to the volume of the other houses and how it will fit in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Hubler - With existing zoning if we were to add onto house, we would be limited by the 25 ft setback and we could build only 19 ft wide addition on the house about 34 feet deep max, on back of existing structure. Difficult to design a well flowing, well designed house with the current structure.

Mr. Hubler- We are looking to build a 4-bedroom 2.5 bath home on 25,000 sq ft lot, estimated 25 ft tall.

Marguerite Downham asked what is on third floor? Dormer showing on side window on front.

Mr. Hubler it is an optional on plans, if we were able to meet height requirements having the option to finish that space in the future.

Mr. Rotz – Do you have any alternative designs for smaller home?

Mr. Hubler – No we do not. We do not think that a smaller home would provide a valuable use of the property.

Joe Buono – Basement projected about 7 ft. attic going to be 9 ft. Is that correct?

Mr. Hubler- We can have the general contractor join in and make comment on the design.

Mr. Linhart – would help to have architectural plans, soil grading where basement will interact with soil grading requirements.

Mr. Calves – if we approve without height variance the soil grading makes that lift and they would be above, make attic small, make basement smaller, or come back and ask for relief. Just asking for the two side yards.

Mr. Ryan- just because they meet that does not mean they are intitled to it in light of the other variances they are seeking. The height is an issue because they are saying that this plan is a better plan then what the zone allows.

Mr. Rotz – When they come with the variance, and a grading variance, you can put conditions on it.

Mrs. Downham – This area in Haddon Twp. Is for small homes, I understand that you love the neighborhood but the dream house does not fit on the tiny space on the street, it is out of character for the neighborhood.

Mr. Fusco – We need to verify, the first fl. Is 9 ft. on sketch have a 12-inch floor joist make 10 ft second story 8 ft, 4 ft out of the ground, would make it 9 ft 8-inch roofline. Around 31 ft similar to Dutch colonials on street. Suggest talking to an architect.

Mr. Thomas Welsh – Sworn in Builder
405 Loucroft Ave., Haddonfield 08033– GC on project.

Mr. Rotz –Mr. Welsh can you give testimony regarding impervious coverage?

Mr. Hubler - the existing house is 794 sq ft., 16.5 % home proposed 24.5 % coverage.

Mr. Fusco – based on sketch provided I don't understand how there is an increase in impervious coverage. Increase of impervious coverage, if you look at survey, they are removing half of length of driveway and half of garage will disappear in sq footage plus patio in the back.

Mr. Hubler – straight driveway and we were considering additional off-street parking, having a solid driveway blocks or tire tracks.

Mr. Ryan – You are not allowed to park in front yard. It cannot be between the front building line and front property line, grass or no grass even if there is a driveway.

Mr. Hubler – We have the option to extend driveway along the side of the home, within the 50 % limit.

Mr. Ryan – You are changing plan again, not conforming with parking under this design.

Mr. Welsh – Could they park along side of the house, they would have 11 ft.?

Mr. Rotz- move driveway towards lot line.

Mr. Fusco – now there is an issue with the impervious.

Mr. Welsh – Drive strips with grass in between.

Mr. Hubler – Can we add parking variance, have one spot need two, asking for one to park in driveway.

Mr. Welsh – If we put roof going side to side instead of front to back so it did not have overbearing appearance. Making the house lower would only make it look squatty. Could do a 5 pitch but does not do justice to the house. The height of the house would be about 31-32 ft. Head on it is the peak of the roof that would be that height, the house does not have an over powering look. Maybe over improving for the lot.

Mr. Rotz – Do you and anymore testimony regarding the design being proposed?

Mr. Welsh – I did research on basement in regards to water issue, put all underground drains and sump pumps in. We want it to fit and improve the neighborhood.

Mr. Rotz – Would you propose a smaller design?

Mr. Welsh – That would not make any sense financially. It would not be an efficient house. It would not be functional smaller.

Mr. Wells – survey shows the front of the house is 33 ft across, assuming front porch will be recessed in line with garage or in front?

Mr. Welsh – Does it line up with garage, it sticks out about a bit.

Mr. Hubler - One side elevation provided shows left side elevation that you can see the porch sticking out of the left. Sticks out about 6 inches.

Mr. Rotz asked for a motion to open the meeting to the public.

A motion by Frank Monzo to open the meeting to the public on this application only, seconded by Joe Buono, All members present votes in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing nothing Mr. Rotz asked for a motion to close the public portion.

A motion by Frank Monzo to close the public portion, seconded by Greg Wells, All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Rotz asked the applicant if he had anything else to say.

Mr. Hubler – No that is all

Mr. Rotz asked the board members if they had anything else to say.

Mr. Wells – I think it is really tall for a 1.5 story house to look up at a 34 ft tall house may be too much. Good faith attempt to correct problem of property line, having one side expand to 11 ft good effort to make a nonconforming situation more conforming. Height should really be closer to 30 ft, something

more in line with the house on the left, estimate about 28 ft tall, something more like that for the height would be more consistent to neighbors across the street. Condition put on variances.

Mr. Calves – overall it is not as overbuilt as suggested, some of testimony of Dutch styles houses made sense. But may have to lose a few feet in attic or basement to make it more palatable.

Mr. Buono – agrees with proposed conditions.

Mr. Wells – suggesting height

Mr. Fusco – I can up with 31 ft.

Mr. Wells – Condition of 31 feet.

Mr. Linhart – clarify, the variances being discusses

Mr. Rotz - Total square footage of lot, 6000 ft sq where 10,000 is required, frontage is variance, side yards are variances. Impervious appears to be close to the 50% depending on type of driveway to be constructed.

Mr. Ryan – what about Parking?

Mr. Rotz - If they put the driveway to back of the home then it gives them room for the parking.

Mr. Ryan - The plan doesn't show conforming project. It shows a garage that gives them one space.

Mr. Fusco - Won't know coverage until I review valid grading plan.

No variance for impervious coverage. They have to comply for both building and impervious coverage.

Mr. Linhart – what makes this difficult is that if we consider variance for parking in front yard it is a slippery slope. Reluctant to include variance for parking in front.

Mr. Calves – either they don't park in the front, add more driveway on the side, adds more concrete. Rather have them have less impervious coverage. Less concerned about car in front then about cement.

Mr. Jandoli – unappealing to have parking on the front yard. The curb view of excess parking on the front lawn is unappealing.

Mr. Wells – they are all parking like that.

Mr. Stevenson – residential site improvement standards.

Page 13

Mr. Linhart – Looking at survey as drafts 18 ft per parking spot, 10 ft distance from vehicle to sidewalk. The other houses have their garages set back.

A motion by Greg Wells, to approve this application with conditions, 31 ft. max height, bulk variances, front yard parking, no variances for building or impervious coverage, seconded by Joe Buono.

Mr. Rotz asked if there were any further discussion as to any amendments or can we vote as Mr. Wells proposed.

Mrs. Downham – I think this is too much house for this lot.

Mrs. Bergman – too much house

Mr. Rotz – I am sympathetic to applications but the applicant has not met necessary requirements.

Mr. Rotz asked for a roll call vote.

4 Board members voted in the affirmative, (Wells, Buono, Stevenson, Calves- 5 no votes (Rotz, Downham, Linhart, Monzo, Bergman) Motion denied.

Application 21-09 – Block 21.11 Lot 25 – Zone R2- 6 East Albertson- John Sheehan – applicant is seeking to construct a front shed roof over brick patio, looking for side yard relief, lot size relief and frontage relief, also for shed side yard relief and height of fence relief, along with any and all other variances needed necessary to approve this application.

Mr. Sheehan – Sworn In – Owner of property

Mr. Rotz – You are seeking a series of variances many of which are persisting non-conforming bulk variances, looking to change property and put front shed roof over brick patio, need relief from preexisting nonconforming circumstances that exist. Is that correct?

Mr. Sheehan – Yes that is correct I am looking to put a shed roof over existing brick patio approx. 7 ft. the front house will run about 16 ft in front of house ½-2/3 across, the roof is to cover the brick patio and front entry way.

Mr. Rotz – You have a current survey dated February 4, 2021 – The survey will be marked A1

Mr. Ryan – You have submitted a number of photographs, any of them photos of your house? I am trying to find the patio.

Mr. Sheehan – Yes there is a photo of the patio it will be coming out approx. 7 ft and across from left to right about 16 ft.

Page 14

Mr. Ryan – Are you enclosing the patio?

Mr. Sheehan - No.

Mr. Ryan - Persisting conditions- lot is undersize supposed to be 6000 sq. ft. have 4272 sq. ft. which would need 1728 sq. ft. Frontage is supposed to be 50 ft. has 40 ft, seeking 10 feet of relief. Single side yard setback should be 6 feet and have 2.32 feet seeking relief or 3.68 feet. On the other side has 6 feet. You also need relief for the existing shed which is supposed to be 5 feet from all property lines Rear is 1.2 feet from property line seeking relief of 3.8 feet and side where 5 feet is requires you have 3.3 feet seeking relief of 1.67 feet. And you are also seeking to have a 6 ft fence with only 5 ft is permitted.

Mr. Sheehan – The fence was there when house was purchased in 2014, have only replaced a few slats.

Mr. Ryan - Where you're putting porch roof will conform to front yard setback? Required to have 30 will be about 40 ft away. Not increasing coverage any because you are just cover patio.

Mr. Sheehan – Yes I submitted pictures of my home that show a few different vantage points. One right side shows adjacent to commercial property, maybe why the taller fence is there. Submitted pictures of other homes on the street that have similar patio roofs.

Mr. Stevenson – What about a variance for front yard parking?

Mr. Ryan – It is a Preexisting non-conforming conditions, so yes it can be added in when vote is considered.

A motion by Greg Wells to open application to public comment, seconded by Joe Buono. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by Frank Monzo to close public portion, seconded by Commissioner Linhart. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

No further testimony taken

A Motion by Greg Wells motion to approve application 21-09 as submitted includes the parking variance, seconded by Marguerite Downham. 9 members voted in the affirmative.)-no votes Motion carried.

Application 21-10 – Block 15.10 Lot 51 – Zone R1- 516 Homestead Ave- David and Eleanor Cuneo – applicant are applying for a minor subdivision and site plan review with any and all other variances deemed necessary to approve this application.

Mr. Del Duca Attorney for the applicants– stated that he has two witness Cliff Clay-Stantec Consulting & David Cuneo. Cliff Clay will needs to share screen. Exhibits have been pre-marked. A1 google images. A2 survey. A3 subdivision plan A4 Stantec plans, final subdivision plans A5 building elevations.

Mr. Del Duca – Explained that this is a proposal to subdivide lot into two lots so daughter can move into existing house and they can build a house next door on the lot to be subdivided. Fronts on Homestead Ave which is a dead end. Page two of A1 is arial photo bird eyes view of open grass area is lot to be subdivided. Subdivision line is on page 3 of A4. Overall lot extends north west on the end of homestead and goes around has over 100 ft of frontage on the south side of homestead where driveway is today, frontage on north west end roughly 24 ft. Lot 50 will be 25,172 sq ft lot 51 lot to rear proposed new home would be 22,723 proposed sq ft. Does comply with all of ordinance requirement, except R1 min lot size in zone is 10,000 sq ft, each lot is more than double lot size. Lot frontage and width are requirements not met for proposed lot 51. 24.4 ft across that does front on Homestead Ave only that wide because existing configuration of the unique lot. Proposed driveway is within frontage no easements require; it is just that the front of the lot is too narrow to meet the ordinance. Lot frontage and lot width required. There are two existing conditions on lot 50, 1 front yard setback existing distance on house to corner is 20.92 ft required to be 30 ft rear yard is required to be 30 ft but is existing at 13.14 ft at rear corner of house. House is put on lot as angle. Existing non conformity does not require any variances.

Mr. Quay – Sworn In
Board excepts him as an expert wittness

Mr. Quay explained that this is a uniquely shaped lot. It is a perfect lot for this proposal, and the zone allows. Proposed subdivision will recharge system for roof drainage, directed runoff from driveway back to south side of driveway to the east end of the driveway that would overflow directly to Homestead Ave. Overall improvement on conditions to stormwater management. Justified under C1 criteria.

Mr. Rotz – when describing lot 50 and 51 I was under the impression that lot 50 is the existing property and lot 51 is new proposed lot that the subdivision will create. You will need to resubmit plans and correct on front sheet. You will have to conform with tax assessor as how they will be numbered.

Mr. Del Duca - The tax map that is shaded in gray has the lots switched.

Mr. Cuneo – Sworn in – Owner of the property
We are proposing subdivision to stay in neighborhood and stay close to the family. Not planning on building house and flipping it. We are proposing to construct a 2813 sq ft structure according to designs, many of the homes in this immediate neighborhood resemble the proposed house.

Mr. Ryan stated it does not appear to be a classic flag lot – generally what is a criticism of flag lots and how does this lot not be subject to this?

Mr. Quay – Generally a flag lot revolves around trying to create too much density on a particular road or location, the concerns about access for fire services, etc. In this case it is a short dead-end street only two lots that have driveways on it. Do not think density issue is a problem. This will have a 10 ft wide driveway with turnaround in it.

Mr. Rotz - What is on lot 52? The other flag lot

Mr. Quay - A Single family home, with a large garage, driveway comes right to end of Austermule and runs up- side of the property.

Mrs. Downham - How many Bedrooms? What size Garage?

Mrs. Cuneo - Sworn In – Owner of Property
It will have 3 bedrooms, and a 2- car garage.

A motion by Greg Wells to open the meeting t the public, seconded by Joe Buono All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Fred Stein- 217 Fern Ave – Sworn In

Could we have more detailed explanation of stormwater mgmt. system and design that will be there.

Mr. Quay – Explained that we are going to be putting a dry well system/chamber type system underground anticipate citing that along common property line. The Overflow will flow down to the swale that will provide emergency overflow to street not adjoining property. Grading driveway north to south alone a vegetative swale, end of swale retention swale for driveway runoff. Conform for high water table with technical test.

Mr. Stein – Do you or are you doing a mounding analysis? What happened to all of that water going to the ground in the concentrated area.

Mr. Quay -I Didn't contemplate doing it because it is such a large lot, typically. I do not think that we will have any issue with that. I would defer to Mr. Fusco, we will do what we need to do that?

Mr. Stein what is requirement for separation between seasonally high-water table and bottom of storm water feature?

Mr. Quay - Typically look for 2 ft. System will not be anywhere near as deep as the basement.

Mrs. Jacobs 250 Macarthur Blvd. – Sworn In

I am the executive director for Saddler's Woods Conservation, and I have concerns about potential that subdivision would have on Saddlers woods by increasing impervious coverage and storm water flow.

Will there be any net loss of tree coverage? IS the asphalt for driveway pervious? Is there a planting plan for vegetative swale?

Mr. Quay - One or two trees will be removed to construct plans designed. I would have to go back and compare existing conditions plan to design plans to specifically answer that. We did not design contemplating pervious paving system

Mr. Del Duca - The proposed impervious coverage as shown on subdivision plan is less than what is permitted in the zone. With the coverage as proposed we are reducing storm water runoff, no plan yet to use pervious pavement.

Mr. Quay - Typically, on a single-family home we do not do a planting plan. Most is just vegetative lawn swale.

Mr. Jeff Mclivaine 514 Homestead Ave – Sworn In

I am in full support of subdivision. Have lived next door since 2007. We agree that this will not be a flip house. Increases monetary value of the neighborhood and increases the lifestyle value of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Tracy Reuter – 410 Austermuhl Ave – Sworn in

I am in support of subdividing and building on second lot. Did an excellent job preparing and explaining details.

Mr. Del Duca – asked Mrs. Reuter - Do you live in large lot behind Cuneo residence?

Mrs. Reuter – yes.

Mrs. Prince- Newton Creek Water Shed Association – Sworn In

I can't hear about stormwater arrangements for subdivision. Can you actually say that there will be no extra water running into streets at all? How will it function during extreme event?

Mr. Quay - There is water that runs off the property currently, can't represent that there will be no water running off of the property when we are done. That is not intent of stormwater management. The work will be reviewed by Mr. Fusco, if he is not satisfied with what we have done then we will adjust. When we put these systems in place, we should have an equal or less amount of runoff to Homestead than what we do currently.

Mrs. Prince – I am worried about water going down Yale Road.

Mr. Quay - The other direction is on property, currently the property drains in a north west direction towards Redman & Yale, mostly towards Redman, taking all of the area of the house and driveway and none of it will be running that direction any longer.

Mrs. Prince – when these things overflow which direction would they overflow in?

Mr. Quay - Emergency Overflow towards Homestead.

Mr. Prince - How big is the underground system?

In order to complete sizing of system. Will geotechnical testing be done and submitted to Mr. Fusco's office for their review.

Hearing nothing more a motion by James Stevenson to close the public portion, Second by Jose Calves. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Rota asked Mr. Fusco if he wanted to report on his review letter.

Mr. Fusco replied that Mr. Del Duca has addressed all of my comments. Everything is in order.

Mr. Ryan stated in anticipation of motion, when the subdivision deed get reported there will be a deed notice.

Mr. Rotz asked if the board had any more questions for discussion from the board.

Commissioner Linhart stated I imagine there was a reason why this lot was not developed in the first place. My concerns are with circulation of traffic being as though there is on street parking. There is another driveway that has a shed that could create line of sight issues. Possible issues with snow removal.

Mr. Rotz asked– Are you suggesting the application does not meet the standards?

Commissioner Linhart replied the application has some consequences at a municipal level. How would a garbage truck get down?

Mr. Stevenson stated the there is no problem there at all. It is the same condition that already exists. Has always been that way,

Mr. Rotz asked why would there be an issue with snow removal having driveway at end of Homestead.

Mr. Stevenson remarked that every dead end has driveways on it. We have a number of locations around town that are similar.

Mr. Fusco stated that the new home is basically going to be serviced in the same way the existing home is serviced in terms of trash. The trash truck has the same difficulty. Not going to change much, will not be that much more difficult to back up further down homestead to pick up trash. That is what those guys do for a living and I don't think there is a situation here that we have to worry about. Parking

shouldn't be an issue because there are two homes with rather long driveways that can accommodate a lot of company. Snow will be an issue.

Commissioner Linhart stated that this will be creating a situation where the town would have to deal with more difficult snow removal.

Mr. Fusco remarked that it is our job to provide those services regardless of this subdivision. (i.e., snow and trash removal.

Hearing nothing more from the board a motion by James Stevenson to approved application 21-10 516 Homestead Ave with the requirement of the deed notice and complying with Greg Fusco's letter as presented. Seconded by Jose Calves
8 members voted in the affirmative, (Rotz, Wells, Downham, Buono, Stevenson, Monzo, Bergman, Calves) 1- abstained (Commissioner Linhart) Motion carried.

As the time was getting late Mr. Calves made a motion to wave 11pm requirement. Seconded by Marguerite Downham. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion Carried.

Mrs. Richards reported she received no resolutions so there are no resolutions to approve. Mr. Ryan will resend.

Mr. Fusco stated that he sent out parking notice, grading plan ordinance notice, that we will discuss at a further meeting.

Defer zoning officer report.

Mr. Ryan – Application 21-01 215 Lawnside- will be heard at the next meeting and no further notice is needed for neighbors.

Discuss location of future meetings in the work session on April 19th

With no further Business for the Haddon Township Planning/Zoning Board A motion by Frank Monzo to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Renee Bergman. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned 11:20 P.M.

This meeting was recorded by the Zoom Host Rivell (Jack Dooley)

Respectfully submitted

Bonnie Richards, Secretary