

The Township of Haddon Planning/Zoning Board

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, November, 6th 2025

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

Flag Salute

Confirmation of Sunshine Law

Roll Call

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

Also

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

A motion to approve the minutes of the October 2nd, 2025 meeting was made by Foley and seconded by Downham. The motion carried on voice vote. Rotz, Buono, Calves, and Kirschner abstained.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

Application 25-31 – Block 15.02 Lot 44 – Zone R-1 – 506 Homestead Ave – Graham Asbury – Applicant is seeking to construct a one-story front porch and garage extension. Seeking 2,320 sq ft relief for lot area, 11ft relief from lot frontage, 11ft relief from lot width, 3.06ft relief from side yard setback and 7.54 ft relief from total side yard setback. With any and all variances deemed necessary to approve this application. Solicitor, Lou Garty, stated that after review of the notices they are in compliance.

Homeowner Graham Asbury sworn in.

Richard Rotz marked exhibits:

A1: Survey, Ewing Associates, 4/3/25

A2: Photo Array of existing conditions taken by Lee Palo,

A3: Architectural elevation and proposed porch/garage extension plans

Testimony described that the applicant proposes a compliant front porch addition across the front elevation of the home and a garage extension of approximately ten feet to restore full usable garage depth. Mr. Asbury explained that the existing nonconformities, including reduced lot size, lot width, and side yard setback are all pre-existing conditions. The left side yard measures 6.94 ft where 10 ft is required, resulting in a request for 3.06 ft of relief. The combined side yard total is 17.46 ft where 25 ft is required, resulting in a request for 7.54 ft of aggregate relief. Lot width of 64 ft requires 11 ft of relief as a pre-existing condition. The proposed porch addition remains fully compliant with the required front yard setback.

The applicant testified that the garage extension is intended to restore adequate depth for regular vehicle use due to prior interior modifications reducing usable space. The extension will match the existing architectural style of the home and maintain approximately 13 ft of driveway depth.

Lou Garty summarized the application and explained about style, conditions, permits, taxes, inspections, assessments, next steps, etc. Mr. Asbury agreed to obtain all required construction permits, pass all required inspections, and construct the improvements in accordance with the submitted plans. He acknowledged that any improvements may result in a reassessment of the property. Richard Rotz opened the meeting to the public.

Public Comment: None.

Foley made a motion to close the application to the public and Downham seconded, motion carried.

No members of the public appeared to speak for or against the application. Foley made a motion to approve the application as presented, and seconded by Downham. Motion approved.

The application was approved. The resolution memorializing the approval will be presented at the December 4th, 2025 meeting; the homeowner will be responsible for publishing the decision in the local paper; the applicant may apply for permits at their own risk prior to that time.

Application 25-18 – Block 8.10 Lots 26 & 27 – Zone C-1 – 931 White Horse Pike – UK Brothers 11, Inc. (Nifty Fifty's) - Applicant is seeking final site plan approval in furtherance of prior preliminary approvals for a Nifty Fifty's restaurant, together with signage variances, and with any and all variances deemed necessary to approve this application. Solicitor Lou Garty noted that this matter was continued from a prior meeting for which proper notice had already been provided; therefore, no new notice was required. She clarified that the prior hearing addressed preliminary site plan and some variance relief, and that the current hearing is for final site plan approval and the accompanying sign package. It was further discussed that some Board members were not present at the earlier hearing and had not listened to the recording. Ms. Garty advised that, because the applicant would be repeating key testimony and the plans now simply demonstrate compliance with the previously granted preliminary

approval and engineer's review, those members could participate in the final site plan vote, as the changes are essentially administrative in nature and remain subject to outside agency approvals.

Andrew Simpkins and Leo McGlynn, sworn in.

Exhibits:

- A11: Revised Site Plan, Consulting Engineers, revised 9/25/25
- A13-15 Elevations (view from WHP, View from Holly, View from Park)
- A17-22 Examples showing consistency with neighborhood
- Sign Summary (part of packet) – dated 10/2/25
- Sign Package, dated 9/26/25, Urban Sign Group
- Survey, Consulting Engineers, dated 12/20/24

Attorney Robert Mintz appeared on behalf of the applicant along with engineer/planner Andrew Simpkins and franchise president Leo McGlynn. Mr. Mintz described the property as a three-frontage site located in the C-1 Zone, fronting White Horse Pike, Park Avenue, and Holly Avenue, across from an existing restaurant/bar and near the Wawa and the Westmont Theatre area. He reviewed the history of the lot, noting prior site plan approvals for other concepts that were never built. The current approved use is a restaurant, which is a permitted use in the zone. The site is constrained by two utility lines: a water main along the rear with an existing recorded easement, and a sanitary sewer line crossing the site behind the building location for which no easement was previously of record. After discussions with the Township engineer, the applicant obtained the owner's cooperation and prepared a draft sewer easement in favor of the Township, to run from Holly to Park and preserve access to the line. Mr. Mintz testified that the building has been positioned to maintain a 10-foot offset from the sewer line, except at one corner where the offset is approximately 7.5 feet; the Township engineer indicated this reduced distance was still workable for maintenance purposes.

Mr. Simpkins testified that an access permit application has been submitted to NJDOT in connection with the project, including a request to allow the existing freestanding sign pole in the state right-of-way to remain. A response has not yet been received, though the application was submitted over a month prior and remains under review. With respect to parking, the plan provides 38 spaces where approximately 25 spaces are required, with standard 9' x 18' stalls. In response to prior comments, parking spaces that had backed directly into the White Horse Pike driveway have been removed and replaced with a landscaped/pervious area while still meeting the minimum parking requirement. Mr. Simpkins stated that overall impervious coverage has been reduced compared to existing conditions and that new landscaping and streetscape elements have been added, including rear yard planting behind an existing fence line and streetscape treatments coordinated with Township standards. Trash storage will be located to the rear of the site on a concrete pad within a fenced enclosure, with loading and delivery access from Park Avenue through a designated loading zone and circulation exiting toward Holly Avenue. He testified that circulation for delivery trucks and trash vehicles is adequate and consistent with the prior approval. The Township engineer, Greg Fusco, confirmed in his October 28 review letter that the revised plans fully address the comments in his original September review and comply with the conditions of the preliminary approval and resolution, with no new changes added beyond those required. Mr. Fusco also noted that the dumpster location and access conform to the previously

approved arrangement, and that the plan remains subject to outside approvals including NJDOT, Camden County Planning Board, and Soil Conservation.

Mr. Mintz then introduced the signage variance component. He explained that the Nifty Fifty's brand is 1950s-themed and relies heavily on neon signage as part of its nostalgic identity. The site contains an existing three-panel freestanding pole sign in the NJDOT right-of-way, which the applicant proposes to retain and reface. The top panel would carry the main tenant's name, the middle panel would be a secondary "sandwich board" style panel, and the lower panel is currently a manually changeable copy board. Mr. Simpkins testified that, based on the ordinance provision permitting a 10' x 12' surface-mounted sign (120 sq. ft.) for multi-tenant centers, the proposed freestanding sign with all three panels would remain under 120 sq. ft. Board members and the Township engineer noted that the building is not a multi-tenant center and expressed concern that a changeable copy/reader board is not permitted under the Township's ordinance and has been discouraged or removed in other recent applications. The Chair emphasized that the ordinance does not allow LED or "reader board" style signs and that the referenced "sandwich/menu sign" language in the code pertains to a different, ground-mounted style of sign, not a changeable copy panel on a pylon.

Regarding wall and window signs, Mr. Simpkins reviewed Section 142-43 (C-1 Zone sign standards) and the ordinance's definition of sign area as the smallest quadrilateral enclosing the letters, numbers, or images. The proposal includes neon window signs depicting products (such as milkshakes and burgers) in each of six front windows facing White Horse Pike and additional neon signs in windows facing Park Avenue and Holly Avenue. Using the quadrilateral measurement, each window sign would be approximately 15–16 sq. ft., with the total sign area on the White Horse Pike façade (three wall signs plus three window signs) at about 81 sq. ft., or roughly 9.6% of the façade area. Mr. Simpkins compared this to a 15% coverage standard used in the C-4 Zone, noting that if that percentage were applied, the permitted sign area would be approximately 123 sq. ft., and the proposed 81 sq. ft. would fall below that threshold. He acknowledged that the ordinance for the C-1 Zone instead limits sign area based on 0.75 sq. ft. per linear foot of frontage, with a maximum of 25 sq. ft. per sign, and that the proposal exceeds the maximum square footage and letter height limitations (letters up to approximately 19" high where 12" is allowed). He also testified that a "faux window" panel is proposed on the front elevation to maintain a continuous sign band appearance, even where there is no actual window behind it.

Mr. Mintz and Mr. Simpkins offered testimony on neighborhood context, pointing to nearby Wawa, Froggy's Liquor Store, a tattoo parlor, and other businesses along White Horse Pike and Haddon Avenue that utilize multiple window signs, neon, and larger wall signage. They argued that the proposed neon would be set back approximately 60–65 feet from the curb line, with parking in front, which they believe mitigates the intensity of the lighting. Board members questioned the reliance on C-4 standards in a C-1 district and reiterated concerns about the changeable copy panel and total amount and height of signage, including the placement of the Nifty Fifty's name above the nine-foot façade measurement line and effectively above the roofline. The applicant agreed that variances are being requested for sign area, number of signs, letter height, placement above the permitted façade height, and the use of neon and changeable copy, and indicated that additional testimony on the sign package would continue, along with public comment and eventual separate votes on the final site plan and sign variances.

Further testimony on the signage focused on the number, scale, and impact of the proposed neon and cabinet signs. Engineer Andrew Simpkins testified that the building is set back approximately 65 feet

from the White Horse Pike, about 73 feet from Park Avenue, and a similar distance from Holly Avenue, and that illumination from the neon dissipates significantly over that distance. He stated that, in total, the applicant is seeking 13 neon window signs, one wall sign over the main entrance door, and the existing freestanding pylon sign. In his opinion, the aggregate signage across all façades covers less than 10% of the wall area and is not excessive or out of character with the surrounding commercial corridor. He also opined that the current condition of the site—vacant and mostly impervious for roughly 15 years—constitutes an underutilized property that has a negative aesthetic and fiscal impact on the neighborhood and that redevelopment with an active use will advance the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law. He referenced the Township’s Master Plan goals for architecturally consistent signage and suggested that the proposed package, with coordinated neon and building design, would create a unified appearance and contribute positively to the streetscape.

Board members questioned how that testimony specifically supported the sign variances, noting that the Board had already accepted the general benefits of redeveloping the vacant site during the preliminary approval. The Chair and Solicitor asked why the applicant could not design a sign package that complies with the Township’s sign ordinance, and whether any alternative, more compliant design had been prepared for comparison. Mr. Simpkins acknowledged that there is no physical constraint preventing compliance but stated that the Nifty Fifty’s brand relies heavily on its neon window treatment and consistent 1950s motif. No alternate “Plan B” sign scheme was prepared; the package presented reflects the corporate standard for the franchise.

Franchise president Leo McGlynn then testified that Nifty Fifty’s currently operates ten other locations, most of which are in or near residential areas, and all use the same wrap-around neon window concept. He stated that the window signs are intended more as atmospheric décor than readable copy and that the company has not received neighborhood complaints about signage at other sites. Mr. McGlynn explained that he explored the possibility of dimmable neon in response to Township concerns but found the technology unreliable, causing uneven brightness and flickering and requiring multiple additional devices on each transformer. He testified that neon is not designed to project light outward like a floodlight; at one foot from the tubing, illumination may be around 50 foot-candles, but at roughly 50 feet away it drops to less than one foot-candle, comparable to low ambient light. In response to comments from Board members about impacts on nearby homes along Holly and Park, Mr. McGlynn indicated that, although the company prefers full “wrap-around” neon, they would be willing to reduce the number of neon window signs on the side street façades, potentially retaining only a limited number of side windows (such as the first window on each side) to address neighborhood concerns while keeping the brand identity. Board members noted that franchise standards have been modified at other locations (such as the larger Turnersville site with golf and arcade uses) and reiterated that local zoning and compatibility with adjacent residences must be considered.

Township staff further testified that the proposed cabinet signs on the building and freestanding pylon—specifically the main “Nifty Fifty’s” façade sign over the entrance and the two cabinet panels on the existing pole—are internally illuminated with LED. The Township engineer and planner recommended that these cabinet signs be placed on dimmable circuits so their brightness can be reduced to a neighborhood-friendly level at night. It was also reiterated that the ordinance does not permit changeable copy or reader-board style signs, and that the existing changeable copy panel on the pylon will need to be addressed within any approval. At the conclusion of the applicant’s testimony, the Chair

noted the applicant's willingness to remove or reduce some side-street window neon and to dim cabinet signs, and then opened the application to the public for comment.

Public Comment:

Denise DeFilippo of 10 East Park Avenue, sworn in.

Ms. DeFilippo, who resides within 200 feet of the site and can see the parking lot area from her living room window, stated that she remains strongly opposed to the application. Her primary concern is the impact of neon window signs and anticipated parking lot lighting, which she believes will shine directly into her home and neighboring residences. She also raised an environmental concern that was not previously addressed: storage and handling of used cooking oil. She noted that at other Nifty Fifty's locations, used oil is kept in exterior tanks or sheds, and questioned where such a shed or container would be located, how often oil would be picked up, and what would happen if a container leaked or was tampered with. She expressed worry that spilled oil could seep into neighboring yards or run-down East Park Avenue, which has limited stormwater infrastructure, and did not want oil entering storm drains.

Ms. DeFilippo also questioned the traffic assessment relied upon by NJDOT. She stated that when the prior Newton Diner operated, there was no Super Wawa, no art center, and fewer surrounding businesses. She described current conditions in the area—including the Super Wawa, art center, tattoo parlor, restaurants, cat café, and other establishments—as already creating heavy congestion and making it difficult and dangerous for residents to exit East Park Avenue. She anticipates additional traffic from box trucks making deliveries, trash trucks several times per week, and customer vehicles, which she believes will worsen an already problematic situation on both East Park Avenue and the White Horse Pike.

She noted there has been longstanding frustration with maintenance of the vacant lot (overgrown grass), and that while many disliked the lack of upkeep, some residents supported a different vision for the property. Ms. DeFilippo stated that she would prefer to see the parcel used as a municipal green space or public parking lot—similar to the existing town square/beer garden area, possibly with metered parking that could generate revenue while relieving parking pressure and event congestion. She believes the proposed restaurant will introduce noise, trash operations, truck traffic, and lighting that will negatively impact quality of life and property values for adjacent residents. She questioned whether, if her home value is reduced by the project, the Township would be willing to reduce her property taxes.

She reiterated her long-standing requests for a formal traffic study and for “no tractor-trailer” restrictions on East Park Avenue, especially given the nearby elementary school (Jennings) and student pedestrian traffic. She stated these requests have not been addressed and urged the Board to prioritize the safety and concerns of residents over additional commercial revenue, emphasizing that the project will have a “major impact” on her home and neighborhood.

Christine Locastro of 20 E Holly Avenue, sworn in.

Ms. Locastro, a resident on Holly Avenue approximately five houses from the site, stated that her primary concern is the integrity and safety of the approximately 100-year-old sewer line running behind

the property. She said that in 44 years at his home, she has never seen work performed on that sewer and is skeptical of claims that it has been rehabilitated. She asked when any “slip lining” or repair actually occurred, noting that previous development proposals were reportedly constrained by the same old sewer line. Township staff responded that the line was slip-lined in 2014 as part of a larger sewer rehabilitation project, and that a liner was inserted through the existing pipe.

Ms. Locastro added that truck and tractor-trailer traffic is already “insane” in the area, given her 25 years working at Jennings and observing school-area conditions. After hearing more about the neon package, she also joined in opposing neon signs along the side façades, stating that windows facing Holly and Park will be “horrible” for nearby homes and will light up the neighborhood. She emphasized that long-time residents are not opposed to development in general, but want the Board to respect the character of the neighborhood and take residents’ concerns seriously.

Robert Dempsey of 5 East Holly Ave, Sworn in.

Mr. Dempsey stated that he is generally in favor of the application. He has lived on Holly Avenue for approximately 47 years and noted that the property has been vacant for 15–16 years, providing no real tax benefit to the Township. While acknowledging that a public parking lot or open space might be attractive in concept, he observed that the Township does not receive meaningful tax revenue from a simple parking facility. By contrast, a functioning business on the site would contribute to the tax base and support surrounding enterprises.

He compared the situation to the area near Planet Fitness on Haddon Avenue, noting that events there can create congestion and that people sometimes park improperly, but that the redevelopment and increased activity have ultimately helped the business district. He believes the Nifty Fifty’s project will bring customers to the pike and to the Ritz Theatre and provide local employment. He stated that, in his view, neon lighting on the building will have far less impact than the existing strong lighting from the Super Wawa, which he described as significantly brighter. He characterized the “neon sign controversy” as less important than getting a quality business built on the long-vacant lot.

Maria Glinos of 7 East Park Avenue, sworn in.

Ms. Glinos, who lives at 7 East Park Avenue on the residential/commercial property line, reiterated that her chief concern is the location of the trash and dumpster enclosure. She explained that when the former diner operated, the dumpster was attached to the rear of the building in an enclosure that respected the required 20-foot buffer from the residential line. Under the current plan, the dumpster and enclosure are located along the shared residential/commercial property line behind her home, and she believes this placement is unreasonable and inconsistent with the zoning buffer intent.

She noted that at the prior hearing she indicated she would view a relocation of the dumpster away from the residential line as a meaningful “olive branch,” but felt the discussion was cut short. She again asked the Board to show consideration and respect for the adjoining residents by moving the enclosure away from the property line. After being shown a concept sketch during this meeting that would relocate the

enclosure behind the building instead of along the rear line, she indicated she would be supportive of that alternate location, provided it is implemented as represented.

Foley made a motion to close public comment, and Buono seconded. Motion Carried.

Board Follow-Up and Conditions – Application 25-18

Following public comment, the Board's solicitor asked the applicant to address Ms. DeFilippo's concern regarding used cooking oil. The Township engineer confirmed that an existing grease trap from the former diner remains in place and has been inspected for continued use. Nifty Fifty's president testified that used fryer oil will be stored in a sealed 250-gallon tank located inside the masonry trash enclosure. The tank is filled through a grate to prevent solids, is exchanged or cleaned approximately every six months, and is emptied by suction hose rather than being tipped or dumped. He further stated that a professional power-washing company will clean the enclosure area every other week.

With respect to the dumpster location, the applicant presented a concept plan (identified as Exhibit A-12/B-12) showing the trash enclosure relocated from the rear property line to a position behind the restaurant building, closer to the structure and away from the residential line. The applicant explained that this alternate placement would sit within or near the proposed sewer easement area and therefore requires the consent of the property owner, the Township (as easement holder), and other reviewing agencies such as the construction office and fire officials. The applicant agreed on the record that, if all necessary approvals are obtained, they will move the dumpster and oil tank enclosure to the new location behind the building as shown on the concept plan. The Board agreed to structure any approval so that the currently approved location remains valid, but with the clear preference and authorization to relocate the enclosure behind the building subject to outside agency approval.

The Township planner/engineer also recommended that all new landscaping and streetscape plantings be guaranteed for two years, and that the project remain subject to the Township's non-residential affordable housing contribution requirements.

Board Discussion and Action – Sign Variances (Application 25-18)

Several Board members and the solicitor clarified for the audience that the Board does not control the ultimate use of the privately owned property; rather, its authority is limited to determining whether the proposed use and site plan comply with zoning and whether requested variances are justified. Members reiterated that a restaurant is a permitted use in the C-1 Zone and that the main questions before them concerned the scope of signage and related variances.

After further discussion, the Board focused on reducing the intensity and quantity of signage while allowing the applicant to maintain its basic brand identity. The Board expressed particular concern about neon window signs along the side façades facing nearby residential streets and about the bottom "reader board" or changeable copy panel on the freestanding pylon sign, which is not permitted under the Township's current sign ordinance and has been disfavored in other recent applications. The applicant indicated a willingness to eliminate some side-street window signs and to accept conditions on illumination.

A motion was made by Calvez and seconded by Kirschner to approve modified sign variances for Application 25-18 as follows:

- Approve the existing freestanding pylon sign structure with two cabinet panels only (main tenant panel and secondary panel), eliminating the third/changeable copy panel, subject to NJDOT approval for its continued location in the state right-of-way. If NJDOT denies the requested waiver, the applicant must comply with state direction, which may require removal or redesign of the sign.
- Allow neon window signage on the front (White Horse Pike) façade and a limited number of side-window signs consistent with the Board’s discussion, by removing the designated side-street signs identified on the applicant’s exhibit (removal of signs labeled B-11, B-12, B-1, and B-2, while retaining the front windows and the first window on each side).
- Require that all internally illuminated cabinet signs—including the pylon cabinets and the façade sign above the entrance—be installed on dimmable circuits so their brightness can be reduced to a neighborhood-appropriate level at night.

The Board found that, as modified, the sign package would further the purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law and the Township’s commercial design objectives by redeveloping a long-vacant site, supporting nearby businesses, and providing coordinated building signage, while reducing potential negative impacts on adjacent residential properties and eliminating non-permitted changeable copy. The motion to approve the sign variances as modified carried on a roll-call vote (all members present voting “yes”).

Final Site Plan Approval – Application 25-18

A separate motion was then made by Foley and seconded Kirschner to grant final site plan approval to Application 25-18, subject to all prior conditions and the additional conditions discussed at this meeting, including:

- Compliance with the Board engineer’s review letter and the previously adopted preliminary approval resolution.
- Receipt of all required outside agency approvals, including NJDOT access permit, Camden County Planning Board approval, and Soil Conservation District certification.
- Execution and recording of the proposed sewer easement in favor of the Township, as described in the testimony.
- Construction and use of the grease trap and used-oil storage system within the masonry trash enclosure, and maintenance procedures as described on the record.
- Installation and two-year guarantee of all landscaping and streetscape improvements.
- Payment of any required affordable housing contribution for new non-residential development.
- Submission of revised plans reflecting the approved sign package and, if implemented, the relocation of the trash and oil enclosure as shown on Exhibit A-12/B-12, subject to approval by the Township, property owner, and other agencies having jurisdiction.

The motion for final site plan approval, with conditions, carried unanimously on roll call.

Resolutions:

The Board then considered memorialization of resolutions from the prior meeting:

- Resolution 25-28 – 601 Route 130 – Conditional use variance and revised site plan approval for a cannabis operation.
- Resolution 25-29 – 123 Vesper Avenue – Bulk variance approval for a rear yard addition.

A motion was made Downham and seconded by Foley to adopt both resolutions as presented. The motion carried on voice vote, with all members voting in favor. Rotz, Buono, Calves, and Kirschner abstained.

2026 Meeting Dates:

The Board reviewed the proposed 2026 Planning/Zoning Board meeting schedule. Staff noted that the first Thursday of January falls on January 1 and is not available, and that the second Thursday (January 8) presents a scheduling conflict for the Board solicitor, who has another municipal commitment that evening. The Board briefly discussed whether there were any active applications requiring a January hearing and directed staff to adjust the January meeting date accordingly and circulate a revised schedule. The remaining 2026 dates were accepted as set forth on the handout.

The Board briefly discussed upcoming applications and scheduling. The Chair and staff noted that questions regarding six-foot fence matters would be addressed at a future meeting. The **Zoning Officer Report:** advised that the December 4, 2025 meeting is expected to include at least one commercial application, likely involving a restaurant previously approved by the Board, while another potential commercial application is not yet ready and will not be heard in December. The Chair indicated that final determination of the January 2026 meeting date will be confirmed at the Board's December meeting and announced on the record at that time.

Public Comment: None.

At the conclusion of regular business, the Chair opened the floor for public comment on any non-agenda items. No members of the public came forward or wished to be heard. A motion was made by Foley and seconded by Buono to close the general public comment portion. The Board then prepared to enter executive session. The Board subsequently recessed to executive session; minutes of the closed portion are kept separately in accordance with law.

Next Meeting - Thursday, December 4th, 2025

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

Meeting adjourned at 10:13 pm.