

THE HADDON TOWNSHIP PLANNING/ZONING BOARD
MINUTES
Thursday September 2,2021

A regular meeting of the Planning/Zoning Board of the Township of Haddon was held on Thursday September 2, 2021 in the Haddon Township Municipal Building located at 135 Haddon Avenue, Haddon Township, New Jersey.

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 newspaper and by posting on two bulletin boards in the Municipal Building.

Roll Call

Richard Rotz	Present
John Foley	Excused
Suzanne Discher	Present
Joe Buono	Present
Frank Monzo	Excused
James Stevenson	Excused
Marguerite Downham	Present
Commissioner Ryan Linhart	Excused
Gregory Wells	Present
Rene Bergman	Present
Jose Calves	Present
Chris Janoldi	Excused
Meredith Kerschner	Present

Also present

Francis Ryan – Solicitor

Lee Palo – Zoning Officer

Gregory Fusco – Township Engineer

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rotz at 7:34 P.M.

A motion by Joe Buono to approve the August 5, 2021 minutes, Seconded by Suzanne Discher. All members present voted in the affirmation. Motion carried

Old Business

Settlement of 511 Rhoads Ave Block 17.06 Lot 15 – Robert Fink

Mr. Ryan – Subject of two different applications. Matter appealed by applicant after application was denied and appealed to superior court. Matter remanded to the board. Settlement of the matter – Board has filed appeal to - The board did consider the matter at two executive sessions during which no formal vote was taken in regard to the settlement. Decided to bring the matter to a public vote on the settlement. 2019 application. While lawsuit was pending parties agreed to allow the applicant to file a

new application to the board with a different house design. Prior record established at the first hearing would be admitted into evidence for the second hearing. Hearing on second application 8/6/2020 applicant resubmitted proofs. The parcel sits between a developed house on one lot and vacant township lot on lot 13. Township was given notice of application and opportunity to purchase the property, township declined to settle property to applicant. Emphases of second meeting was in design of the change in the house. Second hearing board voted to deny application. Title to 509 Rhoads has been transferred. The board could not provide subdivision of that lot, undersized. The court determined the plaintiffs right to build a house on this lot was established at the time of the initial application, change in ownership was not legally significant. Judge ruled against the board with regard to both applications, found the boards denial of the application were arbitrary capriciously and unreasonably found that the plaintiff. Other non-conforming houses built on non-conforming lots I in the area. The applicant contends that the board must approve either or both applications, the board understands that they could approve earth house or a new house design. IF the decision was reversed, they could affirm the decision or remand the matter back to the board. The board would agree to grant the variances necessary to build second house, 1762 sq ft 29 ft tall home. IF the board does vote to settle the case the board would at the next meeting adopt a resolution memorializing the decision. The board would then have a special meeting on September 20, 2021 where the resolution would be adopted and the remand hearing for the variance application would be conducted. After adopted notice would be advertised any party objecting to settlement would have 45 days to appeal that decision. Part of the relief would be to authorize the chairmen to enter into formal settlement agreement under terms approved by the board. The basic thrust of the settlement would be the board would approve application for second house. The determination with regard to the approval of the second house would be based on exhibits at hearing and testimony. Any member of board not present at meeting of initial hearing would need to review transcript of meetings and vote on the matter.

Erin Simone – Malley Gibbins – agrees that what Mr. Ryan has outlined is general concept of the settlement.

Mr. Ryan – opened up to public comment.

Hugh Williams – 79 Hampton Gate Drive – Sicklerville, - Representing on behalf mother Bessie Williams at 525 Rhoads Ave. Mr. Williams was sworn In

Has zoning board been nullified by the court.

Mr. Ryan – Under the law people who own property have certain rights. If they meet the requirements of the variance then they are entitled to the variance. The courts get involved when the opinion differs, courts are natural party to stand between two parties to see if statutes of variances were met or not.

Mr. Williams – How many variances do you get? Do community standards not mean anything? Was great-great grandfathers' property, moved away because they could not build. Seems like things are changing and generations have moved away because they could not build on lots.

PAGE 3

Mr. Ryan – One of the elements that I made very clear to the court was the history of saddler town. Indicated that one of the reasons the board denied was because of the unique character and nature.

Mr. Williams – Historical significance of the properties need to be upheld. Opening up a can of worms for any other lots that have area where people could come in and build.

Mr. Ryan – Right now the issue is in one sense choosing between the two evils, the bigger house or smaller house being approved.

Mr. Williams – Judiciary is nullifying their autonomy and their rules. Any other person coming in with the same things can refer back to a judge about this.

Mr. Rotz – We are quasi-judicial here we use our judgement, listen to the testimony of the people and make decision. In every type of judicial dispute there are higher courts. The trial court is the initial appellate level. The 1700 sq ft house meets the R2 requirements for smaller lots, the lots are not R1 sizes. Larger house on the lot would be outside of the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. William – he has the precedence to say that you guys need to give me this two because it needs 6-7 variances. He could come back with another lot and continue to do this around time in other lots that he owns. I believe that other townships would join with you and appeal this decision because it would ne nullifying them also.

Mr. Ryan – many cases on record where the courts have nullified the board decision. You have to appeal this because it is going to set a precedence. Trying to keep it historic.

Christopher Rossi 515 Rhoads Avenue – Sworn In

Mr. Rossi – The property that I live at is surrounded by the vacant lots that are in subject here. I understand that it is easier and more cost efficient to go ahead and settle and make it go away. I live there and I know what is going to happen I have told board a couple of times my circumstances with Autistic son. Have been trying to create a house for him that would accommodate his needs. The idea that one house going up what phases me it knowing what comes next. Agree with Mr. Williams that you're opening a can of worms. That size lot goes up, township lot becomes of value, lots around value goes up. Please continue with you appear because things may surface along the way and the precedence being set is bad. It is a very defeating circumstance to have to contemplate. I understand what you have said about it being a gamble between the bigger or smaller house.

Mark Williams – 504 Rhoads Ave – 525 Rhoads and 401 Second Ave – Sworn In

Mr. Mark Williams - Never thought we would be here again for the second time on this issue. Could have been resolved way before it came to court. At our church we represent 6 families. Saddler family owns most of the properties in that area. Own and maintained these properties, welcoming community to good neighbors that have made up community for 170 years. Combined lots would be 8000 sq feet. Here to offered this option to the settlement to give to Mr. Fink for \$1 for the lot on roads avenue to use a part of open space community forever. The deed is free and clear, would have 8000 sq feet. The community is on board with this. We want to help the community frow, township would welcome a 3600 sq foot house on that lot. Taxes are paid up to December 2021. We will make a garden on that

Page 4

property for the community, next door is the township lot with post behind champion school. History is there, a way of dealing with your neighbors is there and building a community is there.

Mr. Ryan – Must point out that we do not control your deed. We cannot enforce or do that. The board cannot impose that as a settlement.

Mr. Mark William – Asking Mr. Fink to be a good neighbor and consider the offer.

Michael Zeigler 519 Rhoads Ave – Sworn In

Mr. Zeigler – Saddle town – my wife and I purchase 2009 demolished home and built home on two lots. We thought about dividing lots and building two homes. We did not divide we built one single family home, there is precedent in the historical township. We utilized two lots to do and in order to build that home we had to use the two lots in accordance to ordinances in the township.

A motion by Greg Wells to close public portion, seconded by Suzanne Discher all member present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Rotz – Does client want to accept offer given by Mr. Mark Williams to purchase Second Ave lot.

Council for Mr. Fink – Mr. Fink is not in a position to decide that right now. We would like to have this move forward and have an opportunity to think about.

Council for Mr. Fink – The historic character of the neighborhood and other towns have requirements not applied in this place – Haddon Township does not have a historic ordinance that stops this like other towns do have. He selected the character of the house, design of the house to try and fit in with the neighborhood.

Mr. Rotz – The board will discuss if litigation will be settled. We have heard concerns and questions of the neighbors. The board shares many of those concerns. Question we are faced with is whether or not the settlement is appropriate.

Mr. Wells – If we approve the settlement, we are just approving that we are going to revote on the second application without condition but the vote tonight depends of the validity of settlement

Mr. Ryan – if the board votes to approve the settlement, then the actual hearing, if the board votes to approve the settlement the board has to approve a resolution at the next meeting. IF settlement is approved tonight the resolution memorializing the settlement will be adopted at the 20th. Then there is the 45 days from that date for anyone to appeal this decision. Whoever appeal the decision (the public) is voting to appeal the decision made by the judge. Anyone who wants to challenge the boards settlement will have 45 days of notice of the resolution approving the settlement. Once the board adopts the variance another resolution has to be adopted and notice has to be given and there will be 45 days to appeal that.

Mr. Rotz - Voting to approve the settlement then our appeal would be dismissed. Any member of the public can appeal the board's decision tonight.

Page 5

Mr. Calves – appeal form public not from board what does that do to the settlement?

Mr. Ryan – Holds up the settlement. If there is no appeal then the matter is disposed of in 90 days.

Mr. Bergmann – Do we opportunity to delay this to further flush the settlement option.

Mr. Ryan – No.

Mrs. Discher– had abstained from the last vote. I would be more comfortable abstaining tonight. (She read the transcripts).

Mr. Rotz – If you read the transcripts then yes you would vote.

Mr. Calves – everyone wishes that this had been settled some other way, that he could work something out with the neighbors. Still inclined to vote for the settlement what the public is missing is the percentage change on appeal, that are very low based on the length of the opinion.

Mr. Buono – How do you know that until you appeal?

Mr. Calves – In personal opinion based on experience if we appeal this we will end up with the larger house. Changes of succeeding on appeal are very low.

Mr. Rotz – Agree with Mr. Calves. Cost is not a consideration. Want to prevail on what is the best option under the law.

Mr. Buono – When I joined the board I was told to listen to the residents, the neighborhood and that is what I am going to do tonight.

A Motion by Mr. Jose Calves to approve settlement under the term's outlines, seconded by Mr. Gregory Wells. 6 members voted in the affirmative, 2 no votes (Buono, Bergmann) Motion carried.

New Business: Application 21-17 – Block 22.13 Lot 2 – Zone C4 – 318 Haddon Avenue – Haddon Building Group LLC.

Mr. Rotz and Mrs. Bergmann have recused themselves on this application.

Trevor Williams – Represents Haddon Building Group – Applicant is seeking a Use variance for mixed use. This property is located in C4 commercial district. Designed similar to other properties in the area commercial downstairs and residential upstairs. Two witnesses present. Mr. Ward n Owner of property and Mr. Cliff Quay Professional planner

Mr. Williams – Addressing Mr. Ward about property and plans.

MR. Ward stated the he is the owner of Haddon Building group and owner the property 318 Haddon Avenue.

Mr. Ward explained that his building is a two-story commercial building with a residential unit upstairs one bedroom one bath downstairs commercial.

Page 6

I purchased this property 2.5 years ago to occupy for office space and tenant use to offset cost for office space.

Mr. Williams asked - Was it your own self for commercial use? Yes

Mr. Williams - Was it mixed use when you bought the property? Answer from Mr. Ward - One commercial user at the time.

Mr. Williams – Was it represented to you that you could use as mixed use? Yes, was told that by previous owner of property and was in listing.

Mr. Williams - Was the downstairs as use for commercial office? Yes

Mr. Williams - What did you do with upstairs? Mr. Ward- Renovated second story, applied for permits and submitted drawings. Kitchen, bedroom, bathroom for renovation. Understand to use for residential use upstairs.

Mr. Ward after the renovation – after tenant came in to rent space for residential usage for about a year and a half. We did not obtain a certificate of occupancy – when we went to sell property, we found that we needed that.

Mr Williams- you had one to one- and one-half tenants and then tenant vacated. Did your vacant downstairs? Yes.

Mr. Williams -What happened when you wanted to lease property? Mr., Ward – We marketed property for commercial use downstairs and residential use upstairs.

Mr. Williams -Did you find a tenant? Mr. Ward- Upstairs for residential usage, commercial of Kona ice out. Another tenant wanted to use it as a mixed-use hair salon.

Mr. Williams - What did you do after you received inquiry to use it for residential use? Mr. Ward- Contacted the township for purposes to obtain a cert of occupancy. That is when he was told that he couldn't use it for residential. Was told to come to this meeting for a use variance for a mixed use.

Mr. Williams - Can it be used completely for commercial purposed?

Mr. Ward - Everyone who came to look at the property would want the second floor as use of residential and first floor as commercial use. More draw actually wanted to use the entire space for residential but we told them that was not possible.

When looking to buy property I went into a few on the avenue that had been for sale at the time, they were all second floor residential and first floor commercial. 5 units.

Mr. Wells – do you know if they have variances?

Mr. Buono – Did neighbors have CO for unit upstairs.

Mr. Ryan – You have indicated that he had a tenant in the building for approximately a year and a half without the CO and when it was up for sale and a change in tenancy that triggered the discovery that there was no CO.

Page 7

Mr. Williams - He did not retrofit the property arbitrarily, he thought he had done everything that he needed to do to move a tenant in.

Mr. Ryan – Those were subcode inspections.

Mr. Buono – When you purchased it was there a tenant?

Mr. Ward – Yes.

Mr. Buono - How long was tenant there before we bought it? Tenant was using both areas.

Mr. Richards -Rents or sells have to get a COC to rent or move anyone in.

Mr. Quay – Roles as planner to make argument for use variance. Properties are old single-family homes that have been converted to offices over a period of time. We went out into the neighborhood, shows copy of tax map between PATCO lot and Stoy Ave. A lot of commonalities to properties old residential homes converted to office use or mixed use. 4 lots on Haddon Ave, 2 on Carlton that are single family homes. All in C4. What we are seeking is not uncommon. All substandard in size for the zone 5000-7500 sq ft in size. This particular property is about 7000 sq ft on property. Number of other bulk deficiencies on property. Not modifying the exterior looking to use it as it is. Left or right 22.13/1 2nd floor over insurance office, lot 2 second floor over office, lot 4 second floor over personal services business, 5 completely residential on first and second floor. 22.14/2 & 3 are single family homes, lot 8 is office with apartment above. 2019 reexamination of master plan, housing element, encourage residential development along Haddon Ave (Page 6 C4 under housing) Planning standpoint, these properties are immediately adjacent to public transit system, having small residential components in that area would be a perfect place for that to occur. Separate entrances to each portion. When you go into a very small foyer in the back a door goes into lower unit and has access to stairs to upstairs unit. I could not identify any detriment to the public or public good. If the second floor was commercial you would have a higher demand for parking in that residence it would require 4 parking spaces where residence requires 2. If you go another 800-900 ft up the street into the C1 zone this would be permitted.

Mr. Ryan – you indicated that 800 ft away it is a C1 zone, as I read the ordinances purpose is two story building at the sidewalk line. C4 description development of downtown office and business center.

Mr. Wells – Hallway has exterior door?

Mr. Quay – Yes. Challenge with properties of this nature is getting good use out of the second floor as an office. Having mixed use and building makes it more valuable.

Mrs. Downham – do units have separate meters?

Mr. Ward – No.

Mr. Ryan – Bulk variances preexisting?

Mr. Fusco- confirmed that they do need bulk variances.

Page 8

Mr. Quay – lot required is 11000 sq. ft. existing property is not intending to change. Structure itself is deficient on front and side yard setback requirements. Existing non conformities not looking to modify. The attached garage does not meet accessory setbacks. Do not meet requirements of accessory building which are 20 ft on the side and 15 ft on the rear. Parking based on sq footage of the office itself and the apartment above would require

Mr. Fusco – Residential 2 spots, office space will generate 4 but is limited to office.

Mr. Quay – at 1000 sq ft we have sufficient parking.

Mr. Ryan – Do they need for one accessible parking space on site?

Mr. Fusco – yes it does require.

Mr. Ryan – If the board were to approve this the condition of approval would to be provide accessible parking space. We cannot waive accessibility issue. The relief would be relief on total number of spaces required.

Mr. Quay – Mr. Fusco said to create an accessible entrance into the building. Not sure where we stand with requirement because I don't think we are reaching the threshold of modification that would us to put that in.

Mr. Ryan- we do not determine the accessibility requirements. Resolution we would say we are not waiving any requirements.

Mr. Fusco – Building requirement that allows applicant to deviate from the law.

Any condition that Mr. Fusco would require as per pot hold and lightings we are happy to work with him on that.

Mr. Fusco – Mr. Quay will provide small revised site plan. Survey April 29, 2021.

A motion by Gregory Wells to Open the meeting to the public. Second by Joe Buono all members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing no public comment. A motion by Gregory Wells to close the public portion, seconded by Joe Buono All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Wells – Clearly lists it as property type office, property office, reading from description from listing. Testimony that it had been an occupied space. It was commercial when you acquired it?

Mr. Ward – appeared that it was residential but no confirmation.

Mrs. Downham – Does an apartment have to have separate meters?

Mrs. Richards – No.

Mr. Ryan – use variance, bulk variances preexisting non-conforming, lot size, accessory building, parking based on number of spaces limited uses to what the first-floor office could be 2 for residential, one of which would be accessible as required and 2 in the garage.

Page 9

Mr. Wells asked if anyone had anything else to add, hearing Mr. Wells asked for a motion.

A motion by Joe Buono to approve application with the conditions that Mr. Ryan went over, seconded by Jose Calves. 5 members voted in

Mrs. Richards – someone is living up there and the Construction permits have never been finalized.

Mr. Ryan – All permits must be closed and CA must be obtained.

Application 21-27 – Block 7.04 Lot 7 – Zone R2 – 16 East Collingswood Avenue – Stephen Rizzo, INC. Rescheduled to October meeting. They will be no other notice of this application.

Application 21-32 – Block 15.02 Lot 48 Zone R1 -514 Homestead Ave – Jeff & Kelly McIlvaine - Applicants are requesting 6.2 ft of aggregate side relief to construct 2 story additions as well as any existing variances including garage done by previous owner. Power point in packages to guide you through what we are trying to do. Survey and plans are in packet because it was small on the power point. 12.8 ft on one side 12.2 complied with 25 ft of aggregate looking to go out to 14 ft that will give 6' on one side and 12'.8" to the other. Page 3 pictures showing side yards as they are today on east side 12.8 ft west 12.2 ft, Addition on westside, page 4 outline of box where addition would be. Neighbors are setback far so their property line is 12.2 ft away, they have a driveway and large front yard in front of house. Elevations have been drawn up, future internal plans are not final, survey that includes the addition. There was a small error on power point, internal plans on back addition that won't require variances, in power point there are steps on the side they will be in the back, they have been updated on the survey. The rear addition will be a bedroom that goes above an existing attached shed.

Mr. Ryan – Power point materials marked A2

Mr. Rotz – I see pavers, slate, where is shed?

Mr. McIlvaine – unfinished space, connected to the home but no access from home. 6 properties with our model of house that have done very similar additions. As far as the character of the neighborhood it would be consistent with what is already there.

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

David Cuneo 516 Homestead Ave – Sworn In – I own the property to the west. We sit way back so an addition towards us would come close to our driveway and would not create much of an impact at all. Anyone who occupies that property this addition will not create a major impact. Won't impact use of the front yard. This would be a welcome addition to the neighborhood, it terms of making it so that larger families can live there. It is very consistent with other properties in the neighborhood and other additions in the neighborhood. I am in favor of this project.

Emily DeSmith- 516 Homestead Ave – Sworn in – We are under contract to purchase 516 Homestead from my parents who are building a new house at 518 Homestead– We intend to live in this house for a

very long time and have no plans of expanding towards their addition. We agreed to purchase this house knowing that they were going to build the addition. Nothing that they do with their house will be done without the utmost consideration of the neighbors. It will maintain the quality of the neighborhood at the end of the street.

Hearing nothing more from the public a motion by Greg Wells to close the public portion, seconded by Joe Buono, all members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Rotz asked if anyone from the board has anything else to add. Hearing none Mr. Rotz asked for a motion.

A motion by Jose Calves to approve application 20-32 as presented, seconded by Gregory Wells. 7 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes Motion carried.

Application 21-34 – Block 6.02 Lots 12-20 – Zone C3 – 700 Black Horse Pike – Lembesis Real Estate LLC (Rexy's Bar and Restaurant) - No one is here for this application.

Application 21-35 - Block 28.08 Lot 1 – Zone R1 – 426 Bradford Avenue – Sylvia Smith & William Sheridan. Applicants are seeking to convert garage into living space, needing relief from front yard parking.

Sylvia Smith – Sworn in, William Sheridan – Sworn in

Jeff Brummer – 212 Morgan Ave, Architect– sworn in

Mr. Brummer is licensed in PA, NJ, DE since 2007 went to Drexel University

Mr. Ryan stated that the board recognize Mr. Brummer.

Mr. Rotz stated that the applicant is seeking relief from parking ordinance that requires there to be room to park two cars on property. Garage counts as parking and the applicants want to convert to residential living space.

Mr. Brummer started by saying his client applied for front porch side yard approval. We were approved for both front and side yard variance to create an open front porch on property. Noted which what has previously been provided has not substantially changed. Now we are going to brick up garage and have a window on the front and on the side. The front porch remains unchanged, we have not started construction intend to do that if granted this variance they would like to do both projects at one time. Matching brick, raising the floor so that it is level, creating a new entrance, side window and front window at same height as adjacent, match brick color and grout.

Mr. Rotz – not changing anything about application that was already approved. Only parking variance that needs to be granted. Survey A1 plans A2 and on the plans is front elevation that shows a drawing with bricked up garage with size of the window. (A1.0)

Mr. Ryan – are you parking in the garage?

Mrs. Smith – no never, you cannot. Fairly common on the block that people park in front of their garages.

A motion by Greg Wells to open the meeting to the public, seconded by Suzanne Discher, all members presented voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by Jose Calves to close the public portion, seconded by Joe Buono. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

A motion by Suzanne Discher to approve the application 21-38 as presented, Seconded by Renee Bergmann. 7 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes, Motion carried.

Application 21-37 – Block 29.07 Lot 27 – Zone R1 -217 Harding Avenue – John Mascaro – Applicant is seeking to construct a 2nd story addition over existing house, seeking front yard setback relief and side yard setback relief along with any and all variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

Mr. Gregory Wells recused

John Mascaro – 217 Harding Ave – Sworn In

Mr. Rotz replied you are seeking to construct a 2-story addition, front and side yard setback relief.

Mr. Mascaro -Yes, I also believe I may need Lot area, lot frontage, front yard setback, site yard, total side yard, and two accessory building to side and rear. I am proposing to build a second story addition otop of existing first story of home. Nothing will expand off of existing structure as it sits today.

Mr. Rotz – A1 Survey August 24, 2020. No material changes or conditions that are reflected on survey. 4 photographs are A2. How many square feet is addition?

Mr. Mascaro – DO not have that information. 33 ft 11 inches elevations.

Mr. Rotz – there is a document prepared by Always by Design. Zoning data chart on page Z2. Do these reflect the bulk zoning requirements, existing and proposed?

Mr. Mascaro – Yes, they do. Based on grading plan according to the code with the 5 ft setback.

Mr. Rotz – You have an undersized lot 75 ft. is required you have 50 ft preexisting non confirming, same with lot area and lot width and the rear setback is compliant, side yard setback needs variance 10 ft min on one side only have 9 aggregate is short, need approximately 4 ft 32 inches of relief. Accessory building?

Mr. Mascaro – Yes. The garage is standing and will remain.

Mr. Rotz – Will this stay in the character of neighborhood?

Mr. Mascaro – Yes, it is surrounded by all 2 story homes with attic.

Mr. Rotz – the pictures are of two-story homes to your Immediate right and left?

Mr. Mascaro -Yes. It will match the character of the neighborhood.

Page 12

Mr. Buono – Would like to know the square footage of the addition.

Mr. Mascaro – addition of about 600-700 square feet.

Mrs. Bergmann – Is this a garage or is it a shed we are talking about?

Mr. Mascaro – Boundary survey identifies it as a garage.

Mr. Ryan – Identified on the plan as a shed.

Mr. Mascaro – I am removing the driveway up to the garage to gain more grass space while still allowing us to meet the code and have the driveway and park a car up on the side of the home.

Mr. Rotz – so you are decreasing impervious coverage?

Mr. Mascaro – yes.

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

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by Joe Buono to close the public portion, seconded by Suzanne Discher. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

A motion by Meredith Kirshner to approve, Application 21-37 as presented Seconded by Jose Calves. 6 members voted in the affirmative. 0- no votes

Resolution:

21-22 – 427 East Melrose Avenue

21-28 – 18 MacArthur Boulevard

21-29 – 53 Stratford Avenue

A motion by Meredith Kerschner to approve the three resolutions 21-21, 21-28, 21-29, Seconded by Renee Bergmann. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Zoning Office Report – Lee Palo

515 Rhoads Ave – front yard setback violations with front porch. He needs to stop work until he comes in.

Haddon Ave – another applicant that I will be sending a letter to EMSL owner.

Burger King – did not address yet.

Next Meeting – Work Session Monday, September 20, 2021

Regular Meeting – Thursday, October 7, 2021

Page 13

With no further business tonight for the Haddon Township Planning/Zoning Board a motion by Joe Buono to adjourn the meeting seconded by Gregory Wells. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried. Meeting adjourn 10:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

Bonnie Richards
Secretary