

The Township of Haddon Planning/Zoning Board

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, March 6, 2025

A regular meeting of the planning/zoning board of the Township of Haddon was held on Thursday, March 6, 2025, in the municipal building court room (2nd floor), located at 135 Haddon Ave, Haddon Township, New Jersey was called to order by Chairman Richard Rotz.

Flag Salute

Confirmation of Sunshine Law

Roll Call

Richard Rotz	Present
John Foley	Present
Renee Bergmann	Present
Marguerite Downham	Present
Joe Buono	Present
Frank Ryan	Present
James Stevenson	Excused
Commissioner Mulroy	Present
Gregory Wells	Present
Jose Calves	Excused
Meredith Kirschner	Present
MaryRita D'Alessandro	Present

Also

M. Lou Garty – Solicitor
Greg Fusco – Township Planner & Engineer
Lee Palo – Zoning Officer

Richard Rotz (RR) stated that the first item on the agenda was the swearing in of a board member, he could not make it, so that was postponed until the April meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion by John Foley to approve the minutes from February 6, 2025, seconded by Marguerite Downham. Commissioner Mulroy abstained. Motion Approved.

OLD BUSINESS:

- Application 25-02 – Block 4.16 lot 10 – Zone C-3 - 400 Black Horse Pike – Quick Buds, LLC- This application has been postponed to the April 3, 2025 meeting. No further notice or publication will be given.

A motion to grant the request to post-pone the hearing by Renee Bergman, and seconded by John Foley. Commissioner Mulroy abstained. Motion approved.

- Application 25-03 – Block 5.08 Lot 6 & 14 – Zone I-1 – 601 Crescent Blvd –This application has been postponed to the April 3, 2025 meeting. No further notice or publication will be given.

A motion to grant the request to post-pone the hearing by Renee Bergman, and seconded by John Foley. Commissioner Mulroy abstained. Motion approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

Application 25-07- Block 15.04 Lot 2&3 – Zone R-1- 662 E. Greenman Road

RR: *Is there anyone here for this application?*

No Response

RR: *We will come back to that one if the applicant arrives.*

Application 25-08 – Block 29.07 Lot 32- Zone R-1 – 207 Harding Ave – Eric & Jennifer Hoheisel:

The applicants are seeking to construct a rear yard, one story, sunroom addition, seeking a variance for a lot area relief, 4000 square feet. Also seeking a relief from a lot frontage, 25 feet, lot West 25 feet, total side yard relief from 6.9 feet and accessory one foot, together with any and all other variances.

Solicitor Lou Garty stated that after review of the notices they are in compliance.

Eric & Jennifer Hoheisel, Sworn in.

Richard Rotz assigned and discussed exhibits.

A1: Land Survey (Robins and Associates, dated 11/5/2024)

RR: *Does A1 adequately depict the “as built” condition on your property?*

Homeowner: *Yes.*

A2: Photo Array (5 photos taken by Lee Palo 2/19/25)

RR: *Were these photos altered in any way?*

LP: *No.*

A3: Proposed Sunroom Plans (Jeffrey M. King, architect L.L.C)

- Both, side rear elevation plans and an existing floor plan.

RR: *Does A3 describe and accurately depict the elevation of your proposed modification of your home?*

Homeowner: *Yes.*

Homeowner gave a general summary of plans:

- *Would like to put a sunroom on the rear of the property with walker steps that will allow us to come into the back which will give us easier access to the house when we get older. Looking ahead.*

RR: *How much more feet are you proposing to increase the property?*

Homeowner: *The room is 15 x 15 with 4 ft worth of steps on the back.*

RR: *Is this going to be built on a new foundation, or an existing deck or something like that.*

Homeowner: *New foundation.*

Richard Rotz goes over pre-existing and non-conforming conditions; confirmed that the rear yard setback will not be impacted building this rear addition.

RR: *The application also seeks relief for an accessory building. I see that there's a shed on the survey.*

Homeowner: *Yes, there is a shed.*

RR: *Can you describe the location of the shed and the relief?*

Homeowner: *It sits toward the rear of the property; it was there when we bought the house.*

RR: *Do you know how far the shed is from the rear property line?*

Homeowner: *4 ft.*

RR: *Our ordinance requires 5, so that's the relief being requested.*

Homeowner: *Yes*

RR: *Can the shed be moved a foot closer to your home or is it on a fixed foundation?*

Homeowner: *It might be able to be shifted slightly, I would have to look, but it has a step leading into it.*

RR: *So, you are looking for rear yard one foot relief from the property line with respect to the shed, if it is not able to be moved, is that a fair assessment?*

Homeowner: *Yes.*

RR: *The elevations show what appears to be siding, will this be consistent with the house?*

Homeowner: *Yes, aluminum (white)*

Richard Rotz opened the meeting to the Public

Public Comment: None

A motion by John Foley to close the public portion and seconded by Marguerite Downham. Motion approved.

Lou Garty explained about style, conditions, taxes, permits, inspections, assessments, etc.

A motion by John Foley to approve this application based upon the conditions in the summary and the findings as stated, seconded by Greg Wells. Motion approved (10 affirmatives, 0 negatives).

Resolution will be signed at the April 3rd, 2025 meeting.

Homeowners are given the obligation to publish notice; they may pull their permits in the meantime, at their own risk.

Application 25-09 - Block 20.12 Lot 7 - Zone R-2 - 102 Ardmore Ave - Paul & Bridget Toroni - Applicants are seeking to construct a second-story addition within the footprint of the existing structure. Seeking variance for minimum lot area relief of 2,200 square ft, minimum lot width relief of 10 ft, minimum lot depth relief of 5 ft and minimum front yard setback relief of 12.12 ft. With any and all variances deemed necessary to approve this application.

Lou Garty stated that after review of the notices, they are in compliance.

Luke Grabiak, Esquire (Representing Homeowners):

- The property is currently improved with a one and a half story single family dwelling and other associated improvements.
- The applicants propose to construct a second story addition within the existing footprint of the home that is there now.
- The reason that the applicants are proposing this second story addition is because they need additional space for their two young children who are growing up and for their work-from-home setup

Grabiak presented exhibits:

A1: Street View photograph of the home that is there now. (prepared by Sloan Springer-Architect, 10/17/24)

A2: Copy of the Survey submitted with application (prepared by Walter H. McNamara Assoc., Inc., 09/03/24),

A3: Proposed Site Plan & Elevations (prepared by Sloan Springer-Architect, 10/17/24)

A4: Proposed floor plan (prepared by Sloan Springer-Architect, 10/17/24)

Grabiak explained:

- Applicants are requesting a variance for the front yard setback of 12.78 feet due to the vertical extension of the front facade within the existing setback.
- The home otherwise complies with all other bulk requirements in the zone, including height, which is not at issue in this application.

Grabiak outlined the existing non-conforming conditions:

- Property is undersized (3800 sq. ft. instead of 6000 sq. ft.), narrow (40 ft. instead of 50 ft.), and shallow (95 ft. instead of 100 ft.)
- Existing home is pushed towards the front of property (visible on survey)
- The relief requested is a variance for the front yard setback, which is not changing, and the proposed improvements will not have a substantial detriment on neighboring properties.
- The proposed second story addition will be consistent with the architecture of the existing home and neighboring homes.

RR: *How many square feet are they adding to this?*

Esq: *The second story addition will be constructed within the existing footprint of the home.*

Sloan Springer, architect, sworn in.

Esq: *Mr. Springer, would you please provide the board with your professional credentials?*

SS: *I'm a sole practitioner architect based in New Jersey and licensed in New Jersey and several other states. I have 15 years of practice and this is my fifth year in my own practice.*

Esq: *Okay, and would you just please provide the board with a brief overview of the elevations and four points that you prepared in connection with this application?*

Sloan Springer gave brief overview:

- The intent with this project is to add the second floor so they can get some more living space, reconfigure the house and make it more functional for them long term.
- We took great care with this front elevation to obviously, we're adding the story, but to do so in a way that does not double the height of the house. That tries to keep it, (understanding that we are much closer to the street), as Cottage style as possible, to still fit in with the rest of the homes on the block.
- A lot of the two-story homes are on lots that have much greater depth, so there the second floor is pushed back.
- We did investigate some options for how we might do this in a way that would not require variance, but doing that ended up causing more problems than just going straight up with the front setback.

Esq: *So, you investigated other ways to accomplish what the applicants want to accomplish, and you found this is most practical way to accomplish that?*

SS: *Correct.*

Esq: *The applicants are proposing to construct the second story edition fully within the existing footprint of them?*

SS: *Correct, yes.*

Esq: *Would you agree that the lot is significantly undersized as well as narrow for this zone?*

SS: *Yes indeed.*

Esq: *Would you agree that the property otherwise complies with all the bulk requirements in this zone other than of course the lot areas width and depth, correct?*

SS: *Yes. Setback issues.*

Esq: *The nature of the relief that the applicants are requesting is to extend the front facade vertically, and by virtue of that, the front yard setbacks not actually changing. The relief being requested is just because we're extending that front façade, that is within the front setback.*

SS: *Yes, that's correct.*

Esq: *Based on the location for the home, and the undersized and narrow nature of the home, there is no other practical way to accomplish what the applicants want to accomplish other than what we are proposing tonight?*

SS: *Correct.*

Esq: *You investigated potentially expanding the existing home to the rear, correct?*

SS: *Yes, we looked at some initial options for pushing out the back. We covered several scenarios and ultimately everything ended up just coming back around to this being the best from a cost perspective and from an esthetic perspective.*

Esq: *Would you agree that what the applicants are proposing this evening is the most architecturally appealing way to accomplish additional living space at this house?*

SS: *Yes, I do.*

Esq: *The height is not an issue in this application?*

SS: *Correct, the building, even with the new addition is still underneath the required height. The total change in height from what we'll be adding is only 3 feet, 5 inches based on the roof lines.*

Esq: *Can you just briefly discuss, the proposed architecture of the proposed second story addition?*

SS: *The goal was to make this look, not like we just stuck a second floor on top, that it was always there.*

Esq: *The existing and proposed front yard setback is consistent with the other homes on this block, correct?*

SS: *Yes, the majority that I know, most of them, are all much closer than the front setback.*

Esq: *That's all the questions I had for Mr. Stringer, and I'd like to open up for the board if they have any additional questions.*

FR: *Could you clarify, what was your testimony concerning the rear yard? 17 ft?*

SS: *There's about 17 feet from the back of the house to the rear set back line so adding off the back would end up pushing this over. Either we deal with setback issue there or we deal with coverage issues.*

FR: *Because I'm looking at the survey, which appears to be more than that.*

Esq: *Well, the point is, there's only 17 ft before you reach that, that graveyard set back line. There's about 42 feet back there.*

MD: *Is there a back alley back there or a road that runs between the houses?*

Esq: *it's a shared drive way.*

Homeowners, Paul and Bridgit Toroni, sworn in.

LG: *So, you can confirm that it's not really an alley?*

Homeowners: *It connects Ardmore ave, when you turn from Chestnut, and it does an "L" and it connects to Glenwood.*

MD: *So, you don't park back there?*

Homeowners: *No, we don't. But some of the neighbors do.*

RR: *Back to my original question, how many square feet are you adding to the property?*

Esq: *The current footprint is 851 sq ft. and we are adding 851 sq ft.*

RR: *Right, doubling the actual square footage because this is a pairing.*

Esq: *Yes, which makes it impractical to, you know, accomplish adding space to the property without triggering some sort of relief.*

Richard Rotz opened the meeting to the Public

Public Comment: None

A motion by John Foley to close the public portion and seconded by Marguerite Downham. Motion approved.

Lou Garty explained about style, conditions, taxes, permits, inspections, assessments, etc.

A motion by John Foley to approve this application based upon the conditions in the summary and the findings as stated, seconded by Joe Buono. Motion approved (10 affirmatives, 0 negatives).

Resolution will be signed at the April 3rd, 2025 meeting.

Application 25-07- Block 15.04 Lot 2&3 – Zone R-1- 662 E. Greenman Road

- The Applicants did show up to this meeting; however, a resident was present to hear the application, prompting the board to review the protocol for handling such situation.
- After some discussion, this application has been moved to the April 3, 2025 meeting. No further notice or publication will be given.

A motion to grant the request to toll the time to adjourn the hearing by Greg Wells, and seconded by John Foley. Motion approved (8 affirmatives, 2 negatives).

RESOLUTIONS: – Lou Garty reviewed and explained the resolutions

- 25-01 – 120 STRATFORD AVE
- 25-05 – 87 UTICA AVE
- 25-06 – 37 EMERAL AVE

A motion by John Foley to accept the above resolutions and seconded by Joe Buono. Motion carried (10 Affirmative, 0 negative and 1 abstained).

PUBLIC COMMENT: NONE

A motion by John Foley to close public comment and seconded by Gregory Wells. Motion carried.

ZONING OFFICE REPORT: (Lee Palo): Gave brief summary of next month's meeting: 3 residentials, 2 cannabis, and possibly application 25-07 that was not heard at tonight's meeting.

With no further business tonight for the Haddon Township Planning/Zoning Board a Motion by John Foley to close the meeting and seconded by Gregory Wells. Motion carried.

Next meeting – Thursday, April 3, 2025.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:22 P.M.