

TOWNSHIP OF HADDON  
PLANNING/ZONING BOARD MEETING MINUTES  
DECEMBER 1, 2022

Minutes of the regular meeting of the Township of Haddon Planning/Zoning Board, held on Thursday December 1, 2022 in the Municipal Building, 135 Haddon Avenue, HDDON TOWNSHIP, New Jersey 08108

FLAG SALUTE

CONFIRMATION OF SUNSHINE LAW

Chapter 231, Public Law 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	Present
Suzanne Discher	Present
Joe Buono	Excused
Greg Wells	Present
Marguerite Downham	Present
Eve Keller	Present
Commissioner Ryan Linhart	Present
James Stevenson	Excused
Renee Bergman	Present
Jose Calves	Present
Chris Jandoli	Excused
Meredith Kirschner	Present

Also Present

Lou Garty – Solicitor

Lee Palo – Zoning Officer

Gregory Fusco – Board’s Engineer and Professional Planning Consultant – Arrived 7:35 P.M.

The meeting was called to order by Chair Rotz at 7:31 p.m.

A motion by John Foley to approved the minutes of November 3, 2022, seconded by Gregory Wells 5 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes – 3 abstention – Eve Keller, Commissioner Linhart, Renee Bergman. Motion carried, Minutes of 11-3-22 approved.

**Old Business: none**

New Business: 202 Black Horse Pike – Application for variance approval for business sign – anyone here on that matter it will be adjourned until the January meeting.

Application 22-34 – Block 6.01 Lot 6 – Zone R2 – 13 Wilson Avenue – Laura & Michael Gage – Applicants are seeking to install a 5/6-foot fence in side yard where 3’ is allowed along with any and all variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

**Application will not be heard because they did not notice. It will be put on the January agenda**

Page 2

Application 22-43- Block 21.10 Lot 10 – Zone R2 – 24 Cambridge Avenue – Michael Pozielli – Applicant is seeking to install a 6’ fence in rear yard where only 5’ high fence is allowed, seeking any and all variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

Mr. Rotz – Commented that the Survey is dated 10/10/2022 and will be marked A1 – Asked you are seeking a variance to install a 6’ fence in the rear where only 5’ fence is allowed. Can you describe where you are proposing to put the fence?

Mr. Pozielli – Based on the survey slightly inside of the property lines, completely on our property. Currently a chain-link fence that we would take down and the new fence would go inside the property line. The fence is in the all in the rear, not requesting anything for the sides. Just want to replace current fence, we just had a baby and we want a little extra safety and privacy, and the other reason is that behind us on the rear the neighbor has a 6’ fence so for aesthetic reasons.

Mr. Rotz – What materials would you use?

Mr. Pozielli - The materials would be vinyl.

Mr. Rotz – do you have a sample or pictures of the fence?

Mr. Pozielli – I do not but we will do it tastefully.

Mr. Rotz – is it solid?

Mr. Pozielli – yes.

Mr. Foley – I would like to call attention to the picture at the top with the tree under the tree it looks like your neighbor has a white vinyl fence. Is that what you are looking to do?

Mr. Pozielli – yes.

Mrs. Downham – does your neighbor have a pool?

Mr. Pozielli – no.

Mr. Rotz – do you have any other testimony?

Mr. Pozielli – no I do not. Thank you everyone for your time.

Mr. Rotz – Stated that the photo array you provided will be marked A2

A motion by John Foley to open the meeting to the public on this application only. Seconded by Greg Wells. All members present voted in the affirmative. Meeting now opens to the public

Page 3

Mr. Foley remarked I lived at 35 Cambridge Ave., for about eight years and I had no idea that any kind of a fence was behind there. I said that in support of the applicant because you wouldn't even be able to see this thing at all.

Mrs. Downham – why do we even have a fence ordinance if we keep giving variances. The whole idea of a suburban area is to have neighbors. I think it looks horrible. This is not a commercial area, not a busy street, they don't have a giant dog. There is nothing wrong with a 5'. I have dogs and kids and I have a 4' fence in my yard and it is fine.

Mr. Rotz – often when we have granted variances to go around ordinances it is typically a fence that is not solid. Ordinance was amended a few years ago to permit a 5' fence. Now that 5' is permitted a lot of people come asking for 6' fence and then when 6' is granted is it something with transparency, rod iron fences. Would you be opposed to a picket fence or more transparent fence.

Mr. Pozielli – I would be open to having the last foot of the fence that is open maybe black spindles or latus.

Mr. Rotz asked Would you be opposed to a transparent fence?

Ms. Bergman – Can we tell them what type of material they have to use?

Ms. Middaugh – 26 Cambridge Ave – Sworn In – We are close neighbors we look out for each other, not only is the fence behind their yard a 6' white vinyl fence but the one behind my house is a 6' vinyl fence. I have no problem from a neighborhood perspective if it. We are all out there on Halloween together, out shoveling each other's snow together. I have lived there 18 years and I am not going anywhere. I do like them next door, most of us have dogs and I understand wanting to protect small children.

Mr. Wells – do you have a fence?

Mrs. Middaugh – no I do not

Mrs. Discher – are you okay with the solid wall look or the height?

Mrs. Middaugh – I am okay with the solid wall look and height. I don't feel a 6' fence is going to make the difference between me being able to speak to them.

Mrs. Discher – what the board is trying to say to you is that they discourage those fences it looks like walls.

Mrs. Middaugh – so many people have flowering bushes, I didn't even know the difference between the 5' and 6' fences.

Mrs. Discher – I wasn't sure if you were fixed up on the height or the style.

Mrs. Middaugh – I am fine with a 6' fence in general.

Page 4

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

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

A motion by Marguerite Downham to approve a 6' fence with the last upper foot being an open spindle or latus area, seconded by John Foley.

8 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes 1- abstention (commissioner Linhart)

Motion carried. Application approved.

Application 22-44 – Block 29.05 Lot 18 – Zone R2 – 226 Burrwood Avenue – Nik Kuzowsky – Applicant is seeking to install a 4' high fence in side yard there only 3' high is allowed, seeking any and all variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

Mr. Rotz – Remarked that the survey dated 8/29/2022 will be marked A1 you are seeking a variance to construct a 4' high fence where 3' is allowed.

Mr. Kuzowsky the owner was sworn in – what is currently there is a 4' fence, cedar fence, came around the rear of the property and met up with the front of the property. The fence was already installed per Audubon Fence, we were unaware that it was not allowed because we just replaced the existing fence.

Mr. Rotz -what is the yellow on the survey?

Mr. Kuzowsky – the area of the fence that is installed at – seeking a variance for the yellow area.

Mr. Wells – Did Audubon Fence as for a permit?

Mr. Kuzowsky – not that I am aware of. They didn't have a conversation with us about a permit. They actually showed up with the wrong fence and had to come back a month later.

Mr. Rotz – did you get a permit?

Mr. Kuzowsky – no.

Mr. Wells – did they call PSE&G?

Mr. Kuzowsky – I did have flags in front of my property.

Mr. Palo – it sits back 47' from the front of the property.

Mr. Foley – is the pictures of the fence one that exists right now?

Mr. Kuzowsky – yes. It is not solid, only 4' tall and you can see through it.

Mr. Rotz – you have kind of a high, foundation. How high does the house sit up from grade the front door?

Page 5

Mr. Kuzowsky – about 3' high.

Mr. Rotz – The photo array you provided will be marked A2

Mr. Kuzowsky – it is not a safety hazard or anything of that sort. I am hoping that since it was there for 20 years before and I just replaced it in kind.

Mr. Rotz – how close is the neighbor's home to yours?

Mr. Kuzowsky – 12-15 ft

Mr. Palo – they had a variance next door for all of that.

A motion by John Foley to open to meeting to the public portion. Seconded by Greg Wells All members voted in the affirmative. Motion carried.

Hearing nothing from the public a motion by John Foley to close public portion, seconded Greg Wells. Motion carried.

Ms. Garty – Do you think the fencing is consistent with your home and the character of the other homes in the neighborhood?

Mr. Kuzowsky – Yes.

A motion by Jose Calves to approve the application as presented, seconded by John Foley. 7 members voted in the affirmative, 1- no vote (Renee Bergman) 1 abstention (Commissioner Linhart)

Motion carried - Application is approved.

Application 22-45 – Block 28.03 Lot 1 – Zone R1 – 500 South Park Drive – Kaitlyn & Sean O'Hara – Applicants are seeking to construct a 2<sup>nd</sup> story addition over existing one-story and add a porch over concrete front porch. This is a corner lot two front yards 30' required exists 8.5' need relief of 21.5' side yard setback required 10' 8.3' exists relief of 2.7' along with any and all other variances, waivers deemed necessary to approve this application.

Jay Reinhart – architect –Sworn In

Mr. Rotz – Mr. Reinhart has appeared in front of this board on numerous occasions and is an expert.

Mr. Reinhart – the O'Hara's contacted me to take the home they had purchased and create their forever home. The home has great bones so I recommend that we not tear it down.

Mr. Rotz- Marked the survey dated 10/19/2022 A1

Mr. Reinhart – the survey you will see that the building is located on the property in an existing non-conforming way. The next page is the zoning study that is on top of the existing survey. That indicated the budling setback line. Corner property front and second front both required at 30'. Glendale front is existing at 8.5' from property line, the left side from the front also encroaches into the required side yard

Page 7

setback. Our requests are for a corner lot second front yard where 30' required asking for 21.5' of relief, allows room for overhang to gutter that side of the building and put a fascia there. Side yard on Glendale 8.3' asking for 7.3' to allow room for the same purpose to control the water coming off the roof. That would require 2.7' relief on that side of the property. In the design process we looked at a lot of difference approaches to deal with this. A wrap around the front porch is appropriate for this property but we held it back from the right side 8.5' where the existing house is so that we would not encroach on the building. The front porch is pretty much the only addition areas that are increasing coverage. This property is way under covered so that doesn't seem to be a problem. Picture 1 is the front of the house; the existing front doorway is to the right. The existing condition enclosed space on the left side, that space is above the garage and that system is concrete with flagstone and very unusual to see that off the ground like that. Picture 2 shows the right-side elevation from the corner. Picture 3 is the rear elevations, that is again you can see on the right side we are proposing to increase that space. We are going to put some space under the roof so it will be a 1.5 story. Picture 4 is looking further around showing how the property really drops off into the stream.

Mrs. Downham – are you going to keep the side entrance? Those little steps where you come into the basement. That used to flood all of the time.

Mr. Reinhart – on P2 picture 1 is front south park drive showing context with neighbor on left side. Picture 2 looking up Glendale that shows the relationship of the neighboring house on Glendale and our house on Glendale and the setbacks are appropriate in the neighborhood. Picture 3 looking down Glendale showing that the houses are in the same proximity. 4 views across h street. 5 neighboring houses across the street and same with 6. First floor basement shows where we are talking about adding an addition. A masonry wraparound front porch. Proposing the enclose the covered porch area. To make the house more usable, right now the existing bedrooms are very low. This is a 1.5 story house where the roof is down on the top of the floor. We are proposing to lift an area of the house in order to give a walking area. (A4) shows existing elevation and proposed elevation. (A5) shows right side existing conditions, roof there is being maintained to keep the scale from the corner and then the house gets larger as it goes further in.

Mr. Linhart – on A4 is there a reason the roof is not consistent throughout, it drops?

Mr. Reinhart – the roof on there is existing and then the other portion is the new roof. This does work better with the corner as the house builds up. We were trying to maintain some of the house as well. The porch stops at a certain location to maintain the second yard setback of 8.5'. Overhang of 12" on roof so that is why we are asking for the additional foot. Rear we have taken the covered entry and incorporated it into the addition. The garage will stay in the same location, windows staying in the same location.

Mr. Wells – on the drawing you have it as a one car garage with storage, you are going to make that another garage door?

Mr. Reinhart – yes, we are putting another garage door in.

Mrs. Downham – can you get two cars in there?

Mr. Reinhart – yes. Last is the stream side, from the family room we are proposing a terrace that comes out across the front working out in the lawn to make that a family area. Makes the front yard a usable space and creating a way around the house because it is kind of treacherous now so we are proposing the stairs to go down the side.

Mr. Rotz – the materials around the front of the house?

Page 8

Mr. Wells – for the stream, I used to go to this house as a kid, the water was pretty high.

Mr. Reinhart - We want to work with our builder to make sure there is no water in the basement.

Mr. Reinhart – the basement as they bought it there was no water damage. Not adding additions, the porch that we are putting on will be on a slab and that will prevent us from creating more issues for ourselves.

Mr. Rotz – can you review the variances that you are requesting?

Mr. Reinhart – the variance we are requesting for the second front for the corner lot, 30' required 8.5' exists asking for 7.5 which would be 21.5 relief. Side yard 10' required 8.3' existing and that is preexisting asking for 1' there as well in order to provide a roof on that area and be able to control water on that side of the house.

Ms. Garty – So there is an 8.5' setback now and you actually need 22.5' of relief and 22.5' setback relief on the Glendale side.

Mr. Linhart – but the majority of that is preexisting?

Ms. Garty – yes.

A motion by John Foley to open the meeting to the public for this application, seconded by Greg wells. All members present voted in the affirmative.

Johanna Flicko - O'Hara – 502 Glendale Ave – Sworn In– We have lived here for 18 years we have occasionally had water in their basement and the Smiths who lived there before had their business in their basement as much as they had water in the past, they did not have water in there. They never seemed to have a problem. The plans will make it much more livable and a great setting outside. If you look at a lot of the houses along park Ave there have been some houses that have made improvements over the years and this will match that.

A motion by John Foley to the close public portion, seconded Marguerite Downham. All members present vote in the affirmative. Motion carried.

A motion by John Foley to approve the application as presented, seconded by Commissioner Linhart. 9 members voted in the affirmative, Motion carried. Application approved.

Resolutions:

2022 -14 Lindis Farne Avenue

2022-32-301 Evergreen Avenue

2022-38- 910 Mt. Vernon Avenue

2022-40 – 408 Graisbury Avenue

2022-41 – 219 Virginia Avenue

A motion by John Foley to approve the resolutions, 2022-14 – Lindis Farne Ave, 2022-32 – 30 Evergreen Ave, 2022-38 – 910 Mt. Vernon Ave, 2022-40 – 408 Graisbury Ave, 2022-41 -219 Virginia Ave, seconded Marguerite Downham. Mrs. Richards made a correction 2022-14 – 26 Lindis Farne Ave. 6 members voted in the affirmative, 0- no votes, 3 abstentions. (Commissioner Linhart, Jose Calves, Renee Bergman)

Zoning Office – Lee Palo – gave a written report

Page 8

With no further business tonight for the Haddon Township Planning/Zoning Board a motion by Greg Wells to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Marguerite Downham. All members present voted in the affirmative.

Meeting adjourned 8:41 P.M.

Respectfully submitted

Bonnie Richards, Secretary