

TOWNSHIP OF HADDON
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING
MINUTES
MARCH 3, 2022

Minutes of the regular meeting of the township of Haddon Planning/Zoning Board, held on Thursday, March 3, 2022, in the municipal building, 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	Present
Suzanne Discher	Present
Marguerite Downham	Absent
Joe Buono	Present
Eve Keller	Present
James Stevenson	Present
Commissioner Linhart	Present
Gregory Wells	Present
Renee Bergman	Present
Jose Calves	Present
Chris Janoldi	Absent
Meredith Kirschner	Present

Also Present,

Lou Garty – Solicitor

Lee Palo – Zoning Officer

Gregory Fusco – Township Engineer

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rotz at 7:30 P.M.

Mr. Rotz asked for a motion to approve the minutes from 1-6-22.

A motion by Joe Buono, and seconded Gregory Wells to approve the minutes from January 6, 2022. 7 members present voted in the affirmative. 2 abstention (Discher, Stevenson) Motion Approved.

New Business:

Application - 21-59 – Block 27.01 Lot 1 – Zone R1 – 240 E. Homestead Avenue – Megan & Daniel Shaw – Applicants are seeking to construct a 2-story addition and porch addition, asking relief of side yard setbacks along with any and all variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

Page 2

Daniel Shaw – 240 E Homestead Avenue – Sworn In

Lisa Soules, Architect for the owner – Sworn In

Mr. Rotz stated that the is survey dated August 4, 2021, an is still acceptable. You are seeking relief from ordinance based on a hardship – side yard, front yard setback relief. Lot is a pie shaped lot; addition is going at the side of the home will encroach on the side yard.

Mrs. Soulas – relied that her clients would like to build a two-story addition, approx. 300 sq ft with an open front porch wraps partially to the back. First floor coming out 16 ft along front and go back 24 ft first floor addition will be a family room, mud room and powder room. Second story will be master suite with bathroom and bedroom.

Mr. Rotz – remarked that the survey will be marked A1, and the proposed renovation plans provided will be marked A2. In order to build the addition as proposed and designed what bulk variance relief do you need?

Mrs. Soulas – we need front and side yard, currently the enclosed porch is 25 ft to property line at street, corner of open porch 19.63.

Mr. Rotz – So you are seeking relief in order to build that because it is an R1 district. The front setback requires 30 feet and you have with open porch and preexisting non-conforming condition already with front porch 19.63 feet. What is distance from side yard?

Mrs. Soulas - Right side back right corner proposed is 22.17 ft. Existing other side yard dimension is 13.44 ft. no change there. The existing house is two story Dutch colonial addition to the sides will continue to form the Dutch colonial. If it was on the back of the house it would take up the whole back yard. The open porch will be an enhancement to the street.

A motion by John Foley 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 John Foley to close the public portion, seconded Suzanne Discher. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

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

Mr. Wells asked if the shed, will need relief for the .25 ft.

Mrs. Garty answered that the notice is adequate so the shed can be part of the application.

A motion by Jose Calves, to approve application as presented, Seconded John. Foley.
8 members voted in the affirmative. 0- no voted, 1 abstention (Linhart)

Page 3.

Application – 22-02 – Block 15.10 Lot 8 – Zone R1 – 204 Breslin Avenue – Jen Scharff – Applicant is seeking relief from ordinance 142:37A (4) bulk variance to allow for the preexisting non-confirming to build a 48 sq. ft. addition on the back of the property. Lot area requires 10,000sq. ft. existing 8760 sq. ft. relief of 1240 sq. ft. lot frontage requires 75 feet actual 71 feet relief of 4 feet, Front yard setback requires 30 feet actual 17 feet relief of 13 feet. Rear yard requires 5 feet only has 1.7' and side yard requires 5 feet and has 1.6 feet along with any and all other variances deemed necessary to approve this application.

Jen Scharff - owner– 204 Breslin Avenue – sworn in

Mr. Rotz starting by marking the exhibits A1 – Survey, A2 Plans, A3 Photo Array and stated that everything you are asking for is pre-existing non-confirming. You want to build a 48 sq. ft. addition on the back of the property.

Jen Scharff – Yes I am seeking a small addition on the back, existing bump out in the center of the house. Looking to extend on either side of the bump out to make it flush with the rest of the house. Looking to reconfigure the kitchen and add slider doors.

Mr. Rotz – Again Mr. Rotz stated the plans with a survey of the home. The survey is dated January 22, 2022 is updated stamp. Survey A1. Plans A2, Photo array A3 of front of the property taken by homeowner.

Jen Scharff stated again that all conditions are preexisting non-confirming.

Mr. Rotz remarked that this is an undersized lot, frontage, side yard setback, Addition won't effect any of those with the exception of the square footage of home. 48 sq ft.

Mr. Foley asked you are just building out the bump out on the first floor?

Ms. Scharff – yes.

A motion by John Foley to open the meeting to the public, seconded by Gregory Wells. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion Carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by John Foley to close the public portion, seconded by Gregory Wells, All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Lou Garty asked the applicant– Do you think having the addition in this way is consistent with the homes in the neighborhood?

Jen Scharff – yes it does match the neighborhood.

Mr. Rotz asked the board if they had anything else to add, hearing nothing Mr. Rotz asked for a motion.

A motion by John Foley to approve the application as presented, seconded by Gregory Wells.

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

Application – 22-04 – Zone R2 – Block 27.02 Lot 227 Penn Avenue – Ryan & Madeline Hibbard–

Page 4

Ryan Hibbard – owner of 227 Penn Avenue – Sworn IN

Mr. Rotz – Survey September 28, 2021 Marked A1

Mr. Hibbard – looking for another bedroom, just had twins. We want to stay in town and the addition will allow us to do so. One bedroom and one bathroom in addition.

Mr. Rotz – How large of an addition?

Mr. Hibbard – 12x18 It will not get any closer to property line

Mr. Buono – what is sq footage?

Mr. Hibbard – 216 sq. ft. one-story, conformed by Mr. Palo.

Mr. Rotz – Survey A1, plans A2 plans show the elevation of the property, summary page A3, photo array A4 taken by the homeowner. Have other homes in your neighborhood constructed similar additions?

Mr. Hibbard- yes, that has been noted in the photos. Page 7 shows an addition that was added on the back. Blue dot is 227 Penn yellow dot is the house with the addition similar across the street and down a few houses. Mr. Palo noted that most of this is preexisting non-conforming.

Mrs. Garty – is there already the existing shed, and you're not moving it?

Mr. Hibbard – yes that is a shed and it is not moving. Fence was not put up by me but it is on my property. It has been noted in the variances. Fence is 6 ft high in the back, 3 ft chain-link on the side.

A motion by John Foley to open the meeting to the public, seconded by Joe Buono. All members voted in the affirmative, Motion carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a Motion by Joe Buono to close the public portion, seconded by John Foley. All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mrs. Garty – do you believe that proposed addition is consistent with the other homes in the neighborhood and you are doing it do enhance your enjoyment of the house.

Mr. Hibbard – Yes

Hearing nothing more from the board Mr. Rotz asked for a motion.

A motion by Renee Bergman to approve the application as presented, seconded by John Foley. 9 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes, Motion carried.

Application – 22-05 – Block 11.03 Lot 26 – Zone R1 – 111 Buckner Avenue – Fink Organization, LLC – Applicant is seeking to convert a carport into a family room, it is pre-existing non-conforming structure on an undersized lot, seeking relief from lot area, lot frontage, lot width, front yard setback, total side yard, alteration of a non-conforming structure, Prohibition of front yard parking, along with any ad all variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

Page 5

Erin E Simone, Esquire for the applicant

Robert Fink – Applicant was sworn in

Mr. Rotz stated that you want to convert a carport into a family room.

Mrs. Simone replied yes Mr. Fink purchased this property and wants to convert the carport into a family room, He needs relief of front yard parking space. Minimum lot size, log frontage, lot width, front yard setback, total side yard, parking in front yard.

Mrs. Simone went on to say that Mr. Fink is a licensed real-estate agent and would be to present as an expert.

Mr. Fink – courses to become real-estate agent, degree finance, license, 3 years realtor, association of realtors. Want to enclose existing carport and turn it into living space. Limited amount of living space in the house right now, it would be better suited with additional living space.

Mr. Rotz at this point marked the Plans A1

Mr. Fink explained the plans stating that the wall will go straight across on existing, back down the side yard and enclose the entire area under that roof. Move the utility closet, that will be relocated, that area will be a family room.

Mr. Rotz stated the Mr. Fink has a phot array and it will be marked A2

Mr. Fink – photos are form google maps or taken by Mr. Fink. There is landscaping adjacent to the carport. Not getting rid of anything, just bringing walls down where existing carport is. Addition will not change the number of bedrooms, just additional living space. Size of current carport about 12-13x25 but it is not large enough for a truck to park in. We are going to Rehab the entire property, new roof, windows, etc. Carport enclosure will be consistent with that.

Mr. Foley – do you plan to live in the house?

Mr. Fink – I will either rent it or sell it

Mrs. Bergman – owner listed as Brian Penn.

Mr. Fink – he is no longer the owner.

Mrs. Kirshner – what percentage of the business do you do that is with properties that you own like this one?

Mr. Fink – about half.

Mrs. Simone – confirmation that sale has been concomitated since paperwork.

Mr. Rotz – The applicant submitted legal description Deed and it is marked A3.

Mr. Fink – property built 1953.

Mr. Rotz – I am marking composite zoning Camden County new jersey – new jersey county zoning A4

Page 6

Mrs. Simone – on page 2 on A4 with the map – 4th paragraph, the zoning ordinance were enacted after the date the house was constructed.

Mr. Foley – if you have a house with more rooms in it, it is more attractive and gives them more space.

Mr. Fink – the slight increase in living space in the house is necessary because more people work from home now and spend more times in their home.

Mr. Rotz – We are marking the Survey A5, and the concept plan A6

Mrs. Simone – with regard to the concept plan, is that what you are proposing?

Mr. Fink – yes, it is consistent with the survey. Not changing the building footprint.

Mrs. Simone – setbacks will remain the same, not changing the lot width, frontage or size?

Mr. Fink – not changing and it is all pre-existing. It would restrict the way that the property would be used and can't do any additions because of existing conditions. In the neighborhood there are a lot o houses that have done the exact same thing.

Mr. Rotz – Pictures of the houses that have been converted with garages or carports converted submitted as part of application A7.

Mr. Fink – first photo of house is directly adjacent; second house is directly across the street.

Mrs. Simone – with regard to front yard parking, are there others in the neighborhood with parking?

Mr. Fink – most of them.

Mr. Rotz – marking photo showing houses with front yard parking. A8

Mr. Rotz – A9 Concept plan #2

Mr. Fink – concept plan that would be consistent with ordinance that I would prefer not to do. One issue with plan is that we would have to remove a tree and some other landscaping on the side of the property. It will allow parking spaces behind the building line. That vehicle would be closer to the next-door neighbor.

Mrs. Simon- A2 photo array of the house – 3rd photo in page 2

Mr. Fink – shows a car from the 1980 parked on property, shows landscaping that would have to come down. Previous page, shows the tree that would have to be removed. The next-door neighbor had to enlarge her garage and encroach on the side yard in order to build a garage that fits a normal car.

Mr. Fink – pine tree.

Mrs. Simone – with regard to zoning ordinance for the front yard parking.

Mr. Rotz – We will mark A10 parking ordinance HT

Mr. Linhart – first picture of exhibit 'B' shows shade tree along Buckner, if you were to move driveway it would not interfere with any shade trees?

Page 7

Mr. Fink – it would not interfere with any shade trees.

Mr. Fink – 3rd and 5th as is.

Mrs. Simone- looks like it was to address commercial properties and not single-family residents.

Mr. Calves – second one talks about R1 and R2 zones not commercial zones.

Mr. Rotz – you are talking about the amendment.

Mrs. Simone – page 11 of master reexamination report from 2019 – housing objectives page 11 D.

Mr. Linhart – is there a reason you didn't consider building up?

Mr. Fink - didn't think that would fit with the neighborhood.

A motion by John Foley to open the meeting to the public, seconded by Renee Bergmann. All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried

Hearing nothing from the public a motion from John Foley to close the public portion, seconded by Renee Bergmann. All members present voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mrs. Garty stated that 6 are preexisting non-conforming, final variance is not a change in structure or setbacks it is to permit the parking of the vehicles in the front yard.

Mrs. Simone – there is currently one front yard parking space that would be adding one.

Mrs. Simone – A1 – page that is labeled A4 shows proposed elevations, Page marked A5 in A1

Hearing nothing more from the board Mr. Rotz asked for a motion.

A motion by Jose Calves to approve the application as presented, Seconded John Foley.
9 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes Motion Carried.

Mrs. Garty stated that the resolution would be presented at the April 7, 2022 meeting.

Application – 22-10 – Block 14.04 Lot 1 – Zone R1 – 601 Hopkins Road – Andrew Williams – Applicant is seeking front yard parking relief and all pre-existing, nonconforming conditions.

Mr. Brandon R Croker, Esquire for the applicant

Andrew Williams – owner – sworn in

Mr. Williams – took photographs of elevations, passed out. Idea is to show where the parking is.

Mr. Croker – stated that the photographs are on the easel next to him.

Mr. Williams explained the photos– the first one is the neighbor's house fronts Mt Vernon Ave.

Mr. Crocker explained that the photos are from google on the top, shows direct view from Hopkins, seconded shows view of parking area from Hopkins, third shows angle from Mt Vernon and Hopkins. Aerial photo shows rectangular nature of the lot. The parking is for 601 Hopkins on photos. Neighbor who is present tonight has a driveway from Mt. Vernon.

Mr. Rotz stated that the exhibits are as follows – A1 survey, photos A2 and A3. Easel photo array A4.

Mrs. Garty stated that the notice was provided and published in timely fashion.

Mr. Crocker stated that this is an undersized .2-acre corner lot, 8700 sq ft, 60x145 dimensions, single family detached residents built in 1946. Applicant was previously a plumbing supply store on the first floor and single-family residence on second floor. He had applied for building and zoning permits, was not aware that there were any zoning issues. Seeking variance from 14239-a5 to permit front yard parking in the R1 zone, and preexisting non-conforming conditions not impacted by application, allow lot size of 8700 sq ft where 10000 is required front yard setback, side yard setback of 4 ft where 10 required, lot frontage of 60 where 70 is required.

Mr. Williams stated that this is a cinder block house with aluminum siding, unfinished on first floor old plumbing supplies hadn't been used, bathroom first floor, set of exterior steps coming down towards Hopkins in front yard that is how you got to the second-floor house. Moved steps to the inside replaced garage door with sliding glass door. First floor is kitchen living room, dining room. Second floor is bedrooms. When purchased, it was a garage but was used as a workshop. It had a garage door so it was considered a garage. It did not appear that cars had been parked in the garage. Applied for permits to renovate house and was issued the permits, 6 months later the zoning issue came up.

Mr. Crocker asked Mr. Williams where are you proposing parking?

Mr. Williams – room to pull out onto Hopkins, k-turn onto the street. Technical garage became the kitchen. Single family home one kitchen. Not aware of any prior approval for mixed use in the R1 zone.

Mrs. Garty – you would be abandoning any commercial use, and it will not be a duplex?

Mr. Williams – correct, and it will not be a duplex. Believes the renovation will improve the neighborhood. Renovations have brought it more within the R1 zone, increased visual of property, planted, mulched, new windows and painted house. Neighbors have not voiced concerns about parking in front yard, front yard parking is consistent in the area. House sits off center from the property, did not change the building footprint. Driveway expanded, that is it.

Mr. Rotz – you demolished the exterior stairs, correct?

Mr. Williams - Yes.

Mr. Rotz – so building is less of an encroachment on neighboring property.

A motion by John Foley to open the meeting to the public, seconded by Renee Bergmann. All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by John Foley to close public, seconded by Mrs. Bergman.

Page 9

All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Mr. Palo stated- I think he did a great job with the house. Has been an eyesore for years. Looks great compared to before.

Mr. Stevenson- making it a single-family home is more consistent with the community.

Hearing nothing more from the board Mr. Rotz asked for a motion.

A motion by Suzanne Discher to approve the application as presented. Seconded by Renee Bergman.

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

Resolutions:

A motion by James Stevenson to approve resolution 21-53 – 428 Addison Ave, seconded by John Foley. 8 members voted in the affirmative. 0- no votes, 1 abstention (Suzanne Discher)

A motion by Joe Buono to approve resolution 21-56 – 25 Reeve Ave – The Haven Church, Seconded by Jose Calves. 8 members voted yes 0- no votes 1 abstention (Suzanne Discher)

A motion by Gregory Wells to approve resolution 22-06 – 201 Norwood Ave, Seconded by Joe Buono. 7 members voted in the affirmative, 0 no votes 2 abstention (Suzanne Discher, John Foley)

Zoning Office Report – Lee Palo

Last meeting there was an applicant that was supposed to come in, he had received survey late. He will be coming to next work session. One commercial and one residential, 5 applications on next regular meeting. All preexisting and one commercial.

Mr. Rotz – saddler town neighborhood, blue house next to Mr. Fink's property, gigantic blue house with porch is not in compliance. Is he coming in?

Mr. Palo – do have pictures and a file. I need to work on that.

Mr. Rotz – the porch was not approved; he did not get relief to add additional relief and come 3-4 more feet out.

Mr. Rotz – What is going on with the new application forms.

Mrs. Garty – created new application forms, presented to the board.

Mrs. Garty – proposed application. Provides a check list for applicants. Schedule for them to fill in.

Page 10

Mr. Linhart – How will an applicant know what they need to be approved on? Is it clear that the applicant is to complete that or someone internal?

Mrs. Garty – it is marked clearly for the applicant to fill in.

Mr. Wells – still need to talk to Lee to find out which form to fill out, a little confusing. Notarizing is a little excessive.

Mr. Foley – New application is for the benefit of the professionals but for the rest of us..

Mrs. Garty – applications will be set forth on a scheduled, it is clearer for everyone.

Mr. Rotz – Application lists things that we go through at working sessions, and questions that we are always asking. That will all be done by the applicant already before, and they can be walked through and attorney if complicated. If a simpler application, Lee will direct them as he is now full time. They use Mr. Palo's recommendations.

Mr. Foley – the burden is more on the applicant as opposed to Lee.

Mr. Linhart – say I am a resident and I want a 6 ft fence, I go online and look at the, where do I start? When they show up will they receive entire packet?

Mrs. Garty – No. Will be available online; we could develop a cheat sheet for setback and bulk requirements for key areas to give them some of the information that you need. We can have rewritable PDF applications on line and make changes like you would. Less handwritten scroll. I think it will be user friendly once the learning curve is over.

Mr. Rotz- When the resident wants an 8 ft fence, there is an application anyhow, right?

Mr. Palo – yes, it is a two-page application. The applicant will come in, fill it out, pick through survey and guide them. That will not change.

Mr. Rotz – they will just have a more complete application. I didn't realize it was notarized.

Mrs. Garty – we don't have to have it notarized, some members mentioned it is excessive to have it notarized. We can note – basics, example, please make sure to have a survey no more than a year old.

Mr. Wells – so they have to submit all of those things at once.

Mr. Fusco – if they don't provide the information then don't accept it.

Mr. Rotz – what happens if they don't produce the stuff?

Mr. Fusco – they don't get on the agenda.

Mrs. Garty – an application just came in that had a survey that was outdated, this would help avoid that.

Mr. Rotz – Bonnie or Lee do you see any issues with using this, issues with the next applicant coming in

Mr. Palo – makes job easier.

Page11

Mr. Rotz – Discussion on working session, the necessity of work sessions.

Mrs. Garty – represented a couple of planning boards that don't hear bulk variances, joint boards that do both, and another zoning board that hears bulk and use variances. One town I represent has a screening committee for a concept review. They don't make every single applicant come to the screening committee, only if it is an odd use or an odd property. If something is more complicated you can ask for a concept review. Can do video conferences. Developers usually asked for those meetings. I tend to think that for a lot of the bulk variances if people understand what the requirements are the work session is someone duplicative and may not be necessary. Only request is to change the Monday to the second Monday, scheduling issue.

Mrs. Discher – what was happening to us was we were getting so jammed up because people were coming in, didn't know what they were doing. If you could come in and get them going for the general meeting, would go smoother. That is how the working session got started.

Mr. Foley – observation if you were facilitation of this new application that will address a lot of these things, in my opinion I am willing to move forward with that if the application process will eliminate the need for a working session.

Mr. Calves – for most of these applications we don't need to have work sessions for. I do think that for some of the more complicated, i.e., the bars, a mechanism where we have a working session every other month depending on applications.

Mr. Linhart – ordinance does say that

Mr. Calves- work out system to see whose application are warranted.

Mr. Fusco – don't really know it is complicated until we have a full room of public.

Mr. Linhart – Hopkins ave had two work sessions for his application. Detached garage proposing to build, then the garage is gone and not part of the plan.

Mr. Wells – example of PJs wanting to put a bright light up sign, they came in and had to adjust the application to approve because of the works session.

Mrs. Bergmann – experience presented in front of planning boards that don't do working session. How do we allow them to have the work session if they want it?

Mr. Fusco – they can ask for it.

Mr. Linhart – better off with the default that there is a work session, but they can waive the work session.

Mr. Rotz – transition away from work session. Start doing work session every other month.

Mr. Calves – may do work session for 3 more months and give applicants time to get used to the new application process.

Page 12

Mr. Wells – it sounds like we have to have the availability of a meeting. If we have an agenda we have a meeting, if not then we don't have a work session.

Mrs. Richards – we need to advertise what we are going to do.

Mr. Linhart – why do we have a planning board?

Mr. Stevenson – it's required.

Mr. Fusco – if something gets by Lee then they are not heard.

Mr. Rotz – Lee, if we give you two months to get comfortable and then we remove the working session.

Mr. Palo – full time April 1st.

Mr. Fusco – as the applicants come in if Lee can streamline them and waive the work session for applicants.

Mr. Rotz – beginning with the May work session we can waive it.

Mrs. Richards – so we can waive Sprouts and just have them come into a regular meeting.

Mr. Rotz – Yes. We will continue to have work sessions through June. Moving work sessions March, April, May and June to the second Monday. Lou will make final decision on completeness.

Mrs. Garty – usually the board professionals that make that determination.

Mr. Rotz – for people who want to waive the work session, who is making the completeness determination, who is signing this application is complete and goes on the agenda.

Mr. Fusco – if its residential it is up to Lee, commercial up to Lou and I.

Mr. Rotz – who will certify that Sprouts is complete?

Mr. Fusco – Lee and I will. In any community I work for I review it for completeness, at end of completeness review I make a recommendation as to if they are going to be on the agenda or not.

Mr. Rotz – Continue how we have been through June. Lee will have to certify applicants for completeness after June. We still have to certify them as being complete.

Mr. Fusco – will do a completeness letter this weekend that Sprouts is complete and will come to the regular meeting and not the working session.

A motion by Jose Calves to have work session in March, April, May and June, changing them to the 2nd Monday of each month. After June 13th no work sessions unless an applicant requests it. We will readdress it at the end of the year when we do the 2023 meeting schedule. Residential applications will be signed off for completeness by Mr. Palo. Commercial applications need to be signed off by the

Engineer and Solicitor Seconded, Renee Bergmann. All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Page 13

A motion by Suzanne Discher to adjourn, Seconded by Gregory Wells. All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

10:31 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

Bonnie Richards
Secretary