

The Township of Haddon Planning/Zoning Board

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, August 6th, 2026

A regular meeting of the planning/zoning board of the Township of Haddon was held on Thursday, August 6th, 2026, 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	Excused
Marguerite Downham	Present
Joe Buono	Present
Frank Ryan	Present
James Stevenson	Excused
Commissioner Mulroy	Present
Gregory Wells	Present
Meredith Kirschner	Excused
Maryrita D'Alessandro	Present
Chris Jandoli	Present

Also

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

The Board appointed Lee Palo as Temporary Acting Board Secretary for the meeting. A motion was made by Frank Ryan and seconded by John Foley. All members present voted in favor and the motion carried.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes from the July 2, 2026 meeting were presented for approval. There being no additions or corrections, a motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Ms. Downham to approve the minutes. The motion carried, with Mr. Buono and Mr. Rotz Abstaining.

OLD BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

Application 26-17 – Block 27.14 Lot 3 – Zone R-2 – 128 Stratford Avenue – Matt Sanders

Solicitor Lou Garty stated that she reviewed the notice provided by the applicant and confirmed that it was timely and sufficient and that the Board had jurisdiction to hear the application. The applicant, Matt Sanders, was sworn in and testified regarding his proposal to construct a two-story addition to the existing home, including a front porch, an expanded family room, and additional second-floor bedroom space.

Chairman Rotz marked the following exhibits:

- **A1:** Survey, Walter H. Macnamara & Associates, dated March 5, 2026
- **A2:** Architectural Plans, James A. Dubal, Architect
- **A3:** Photo Array (5 photos), taken by Lee Palo on July 14th, 2026.

The applicant is seeking relief for pre-existing non-conforming conditions, including lot area, side yard setback, total side yard setback, and accessory building setback. The required lot area is 6,000 square feet, where 5,894 square feet exists. An existing side yard setback of 4.93 feet requires 1.07 feet of relief, and the total side yard setback of 12.73 feet requires 2.27 feet of relief. The existing accessory building requires approximately 0.22 feet of setback relief.

The applicant testified that these conditions existed prior to the proposed construction and that the lot and existing structures had not been altered to create the non-conformities. He further testified that the irregular shape of the lot affects the setback of the existing accessory structure.

Mr. Sanders stated that other homes on the street have similar front additions, porches, or enclosed rooms and that the proposed addition would be consistent with the character of the neighborhood. The Board discussed a previously constructed two-story addition on the side of the home, which the applicant testified had received the required permits and did not require variance relief.

The Board also discussed building and impervious coverage. Mr. Palo advised that the property would remain within the applicable coverage requirements. The proposed front addition will also comply with the required front yard setback.

The applicant agreed to construct the addition consistent with the submitted architectural plans, obtain all required permits, pass all required inspections, and ensure that the exterior of the addition matches or complements the existing home. The applicant acknowledged that the improvements may result in a reassessment of the property.

Public Comment: None.

The application was opened to the public. No members of the public appeared or offered comment. A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Ms. Downham to close the public portion.

Solicitor Garty summarized the application and stated that the requested relief involved pre-existing non-conforming conditions that were not being exacerbated by the proposed addition. She stated that the application satisfied the standards for C (1) hardship variance relief and could also be considered under the C (2) standard.

A motion was made Mr. Foley and seconded by Mr. Wells to approve the application based upon the findings and conditions stated by the Solicitor. The motion was approved by the Board.

Application 26-18 – Block 17.07 Lot 35 – Zone R-1 – 505 Graisbury Avenue – Gregory Frye

Solicitor Lou Garty stated that she reviewed the notice provided by the applicant and confirmed that it was timely and sufficient and that the Board had jurisdiction to hear the application. The applicant, Gregory Frye was sworn in and testified regarding his proposal to demolish an existing one-story rear addition and construct a new two-story rear addition, a five-foot covered front porch, and a detached one-car garage.

Chairman Rotz marked the following exhibits:

- **A1:** Survey, Walter H. Macnamara, dated May 15, 2026
- **A2:** Architectural Plans, David J. B
- **A3:** Photo Array, photographs taken by Lee Palo on July 14, 2026

The applicant testified that the proposed addition would add approximately 960 net square feet to the home after demolition of approximately 300 square feet of existing space.

The applicant is seeking relief for pre-existing non-conforming conditions, including lot area, lot frontage, lot width, and side yard setback. The applicant testified that the property is approximately 51 square feet below the required 10,000-square-foot lot area and that the existing lot is 60 feet wide where 75 feet is required. The applicant stated that these conditions existed prior to his ownership and were not created or intensified by the proposed construction.

The applicant testified that the proposed rear addition would be consistent with similar additions located on neighboring properties along Graisbury Avenue. The proposed detached garage will measure approximately 16 feet by 30 feet and will be used as a garage and storage area only, with no kitchen, living area, or other residential use. Mr. Palo confirmed that the garage complies with the applicable setback and height requirements and does not require variance relief.

The Board discussed the proposed five-foot front porch. The applicant testified that the existing front yard setback is approximately 35.1 feet and that the addition of the five-foot porch will maintain compliance with the required 30-foot front yard setback. The porch will have a brick face with bluestone pavers.

Public Comment:

Karen Barry of 512 Graisbury Avenue appeared and was sworn in. Ms. Barry requested clarification regarding the requested 15-foot lot frontage relief and expressed concern regarding visibility and pedestrian safety in the area. The Board and applicant explained that the 15 feet of relief relates to the existing 60-foot lot width where 75 feet is required and does not involve construction extending 15 feet into the front yard. The applicant explained that the proposed porch will extend approximately five feet from the existing front of the home and will remain conforming. Ms. Barry stated that, following the explanation, her concerns regarding visibility were addressed.

No other members of the public appeared. A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Mr. Wells to close the public portion.

The applicant agreed to construct the improvements consistent with the submitted plans and survey, ensure that the improvements complement the existing home, obtain all required permits, pass all required inspections, and pay all applicable property taxes. The applicant acknowledged that the improvements may result in a reassessment of the property.

Solicitor Garty summarized the application, noting that the requested relief involves pre-existing non-conforming conditions that cannot reasonably be corrected by the applicant. The proposed front porch will remain compliant with the front yard setback, and no variance relief is required for the proposed detached garage.

A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Mr. Wells to approve the application as presented and subject to the conditions stated by the Solicitor. The motion was approved.

Application 26-21 Block 29.07 Lot 26 – 219 Harding Avenue – Patrick Decker / Dylan Decker

Prior to the hearing of the application, Board Members Gregory Wells and Chris Jandoli recused themselves due to their proximity to the subject property and took seats in the audience. They did not participate in the hearing, discussion, or vote on the application.

Solicitor Lou Garty stated that she reviewed the notice provided by the applicant and confirmed that it was timely and sufficient and that the Board had jurisdiction to hear the application.

The applicant Patrick Decker and his son Dylan Decker were sworn in. The applicants testified regarding a proposal to construct a two-story rear addition to the existing home. The addition will include an expanded kitchen area on the first floor and a new primary suite on the second floor, totaling approximately 880 square feet.

The following exhibits were marked:

- **A1:** Survey, Clancy & Associates, dated February 17, 2026
- **A2:** Photo Array, photographs taken by Lee Paylo on July 14, 2026
- **A3:** Architectural Plans and Elevations, Vicco Arc.
-

The applicants are seeking relief for several pre-existing non-conforming conditions. The existing lot contains approximately 5,989 square feet where 10,000 square feet is required. The lot frontage and lot width are 50 feet where 75 feet is required. The existing front yard setback is 27.2 feet where 30 feet is required. Relief is also required for the total side yard setback and the setback of the existing one-story detached garage.

The applicants testified that a rear porch will be demolished to accommodate the proposed two-story addition. The remainder of the existing home will be renovated, and the existing garage will remain in its present location and be refurbished.

The applicants testified that similar rear additions exist on other homes in the neighborhood, including a neighboring property, and that the new construction will occur entirely toward the rear of the property. The front of the home will generally remain as existing with cosmetic improvements.

The Board discussed the number of bedrooms in the home. The existing home contains three bedrooms, and the proposed improvements will result in four bedrooms. The applicants testified that the property was purchased in approximately February 2026 and that no improvements had been made since the purchase.

The Board Engineer, Greg Fusco, also discussed roof drainage from the proposed addition. The applicants agreed to direct roof drainage toward Harding Avenue as a condition of approval.

Public Comment: None.

The application was opened to the public. No members of the public appeared or offered comment. A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Ms. Downham to close the public portion.

The applicants agreed to obtain all required permits, pass all required inspections, construct the addition consistent with the submitted plans and survey, and ensure that the improvements are architecturally compatible with the existing home and surrounding neighborhood. The applicants acknowledged that the addition may increase the assessed value of the property.

Solicitor Garty summarized the requested relief as involving pre-existing non-conforming conditions and stated that moving the existing garage to eliminate the setback condition would create a hardship. The applicants further agreed that the roof drainage from the rear addition would be directed toward the street.

A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Ms. D'Alessandro to approve the application subject to the conditions stated by the Solicitor, including the roof drainage condition. The motion was approved.

Following the conclusion of the application, Mr. Jandoli and Mr. Wells returned and resumed participation in the meeting.

Application 26-22 Block 7.10 Lot 36 – 100 E Ormond Avenue – Andria Ayer

Solicitor Lou Garty stated that she reviewed the notice provided by the applicant and confirmed that it was timely and sufficient and that the Board had jurisdiction to hear the application.

The applicant, Andrea Ayer, was sworn in and testified regarding her request to replace an existing four-foot wooden fence with a new four-foot vinyl fence. The ordinance permits a three-foot fence in the applicable location; therefore, variance relief is required to maintain the existing four-foot height. The applicant also requires relief associated with pre-existing non-conforming conditions on the property.

The following exhibits were marked:

- **A1:** Survey, Walter H. Macnamara, dated June 12, 2026
- **A2:** Photo Array, photographs taken by Lee Palo on July 14, 2026
- **A3:** Proposed Fence Design: White Vinyl, Imperial Style

The applicant testified that the existing four-foot wooden fence was present when she purchased the property approximately 21 years ago and is now deteriorated and in need of replacement. The property is a corner lot located at Johnson Avenue and Ormond Avenue in the Bettleground section of the Township.

The applicant proposed replacing the wooden fence with a white vinyl Imperial-style fence with approximately one-inch spacing between the pickets. She testified that vinyl was selected because it is more durable, easier to maintain, and more cost-effective than replacing the existing fence with wood.

The applicant also testified that the four-foot height provides privacy due to the amount of pedestrian and vehicular traffic along Johnson Avenue and assists in containing the family's dog. The proposed fence will be slightly less opaque than the existing wooden fence.

The Board discussed visibility from the applicant's driveway. The applicant testified that the new fence will be pulled farther into the property and angled near the driveway to improve sight distance when vehicles exit. Three existing arborvitae trees in the area will also be removed.

The applicant agreed to obtain all required permits and install the fence in the location depicted on the survey and consistent with the Imperial-style fence presented to the Board.

Public Comment: None.

The application was opened to the public. No members of the public appeared or offered comment. A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Mr. Wells to close the public portion.

Solicitor Garty summarized that the property has maintained a four-foot fence for at least 21 years, the proposed replacement will provide continued privacy on the corner lot, and the fence will not exacerbate any of the property's other pre-existing non-conforming conditions. The applicant agreed to all permitting, location, and design conditions discussed by the Board.

A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Mr. Buono to approve the application as presented. The motion was approved by the Board.

App 26-20 - Block 5.14 Lots 2, 3 & 4 – 408 Crescent Boulevard - Brotherly Bud Haddon Township, LLC – Micro Class 5 Retail Cannabis Dispensary

Commissioner Mulroy and Mr. Ryan recused themselves from hearing the application due to the conditional use variance relief sought.

Louis Cappelli, Jr., Esq., of Florio Perrucci Steinhardt Cappelli & Tipton LLC appeared on behalf of the applicant, Brotherly Bud Haddon Township, LLC. Counsel explained that the property is currently utilized as an automobile repair facility and that the applicant proposes to adaptively reuse the property as a Micro Class 5 retail cannabis dispensary.

Counsel stated that the applicant had previously appeared before the Board seeking approval for a Class 5 retail cannabis dispensary and was now applying for a Micro Class 5 retail cannabis dispensary. Counsel explained the applicable microbusiness requirements, including limitations on building size, cannabis product volume, employees, and residency/ownership requirements.

William Sirois, an owner of Brotherly Bud Haddon Township, LLC, and Jason T. Sciallo, P.E., P.P., of Eciullo Engineering Services, LLC, were sworn in. Mr. Sciallo was accepted by the Board as an expert in civil engineering, site design, and professional planning.

Mr. Sirois testified that he owns a five-percent interest in the applicant entity and resides in Haddonfield, an adjoining municipality. He described the property as a commercial property located along the Route 130 corridor and testified regarding his experience operating an existing Brotherly Bud cannabis dispensary in Mount Ephraim.

Mr. Sirois testified that all cannabis products are delivered to the facility pre-packaged and sealed and are immediately secured within a vault. There will be no cultivation, processing, on-site consumption, drive-through service, or curbside pickup. Customers will be required to present identification for electronic verification prior to entering the sales area.

The proposed hours of operation are 10:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday and 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on Sunday, consistent with the Township ordinance. The applicant testified that the facility will generally operate with approximately three to five employees, with additional staffing during higher-volume periods, subject to the limitations applicable to a microbusiness license.

The applicant will utilize a third-party unarmed security company. The facility will contain interior and exterior security cameras, controlled-access areas, and a secured vault. The applicant testified that no cannabis consumption will be permitted inside the facility, within vehicles on the property, or within the parking area.

The following exhibits were marked during the hearing:

- **A1:** Floor Plan
- **A2:** Site/Parking Exhibit
- **A3:** Off-Site Parking Agreement

- **A4:** Site Rendering/Plan (front view)
- **A5:** Township Resolution/Approval

Mr. Sirois testified that customer parking will be provided on site, with additional off-site parking available pursuant to a written parking agreement. The applicant agreed to notify the Township within 30 days of any reduction, modification, or termination of the off-site parking agreement and acknowledged that a change affecting parking compliance may require the applicant to return to the Board.

Mr. Sciullo testified regarding the existing and proposed site conditions. The existing garage doors facing the highway frontage will be converted to storefront windows, and the site will be restriped to provide customer parking, accessible parking, employee parking, pedestrian access, a loading area, landscaping, and a trash enclosure. Deliveries of cannabis products will be made by smaller delivery vehicles such as Sprinter vans rather than large trucks.

Mr. Sciullo testified that the site will provide 13 on-site parking spaces together with additional off-site parking, exceeding the 16 spaces required by ordinance when the off-site spaces are included. Employee parking will be located in designated stacked spaces, preserving the remaining parking for customers.

Mr. Sciullo further testified that the property is located within the I-1 Light Industrial Zone, where a micro cannabis retail facility is permitted as a conditional use. He reviewed the conditional use requirements and testified that the application complies with those requirements except for relief required due to existing bulk non-conformities.

The applicant is seeking D (3) variance relief from the conditional use standard requiring compliance with the bulk requirements of the I-1 Zone. Mr. Sciullo testified that the relevant non-conformities are existing conditions and are not being created or exacerbated by the proposed use. These include existing lot dimensional/setback conditions and existing driveway locations and distances from property lines and the intersection.

Mr. Sciullo provided professional planning testimony under the standard established in *Coventry Square, Inc. v. Westwood Zoning Board of Adjustment*. He testified that the proposed use can operate appropriately on the site despite the existing bulk non-conformities and that the application satisfies both the positive and negative criteria required for the requested D (3) relief.

Mr. Sciullo further testified that the adaptive reuse of the existing building advances several purposes of zoning, including promoting the general welfare, providing adequate light and open space, providing appropriate locations for a variety of uses, encouraging efficient use of existing developed land, improving existing development, creating employment opportunities, and supporting businesses along the Route 130 corridor.

The Board discussed signage. The applicant initially proposed retaining and refacing an existing freestanding pole sign. The Board advised that reuse of the non-conforming freestanding sign would require separate variance relief. The applicant agreed that any signage will comply with the Township ordinance and receive the necessary permits or, if variance relief is required for the freestanding sign, the applicant will return to the Board.

Township Engineer Greg Fusco reviewed his comments regarding the application. The applicant agreed to install protective parking stops or barriers for spaces located adjacent to the building. The Board and professionals also discussed the existing Route 130 driveway openings and the New Jersey Department of Transportation letter of no interest. The applicant will not alter the existing driveway openings without any required NJDOT review or approval.

The applicant agreed to provide supplemental landscaping and green space as shown on the plans. The Board discussed the ordinance requirement for curbing around landscaped areas, and a waiver from the curbing requirement was requested based upon the existing site configuration.

The applicant further agreed to provide appropriate wall-mounted lighting without creating glare onto the highway or surrounding properties, maintain adequate lighting at the off-site employee parking area, repair broken or damaged concrete and pavement as required, comply with ADA requirements, obtain Camden County Planning Board approval, comply with any applicable Police and Fire Department requirements, and maintain all required approvals and licensing from the New Jersey Cannabis Regulatory Commission. The applicant also agreed to submit the signed Lease Agreement for the building.

The applicant acknowledged the applicable affordable housing contribution of 2.5% of the equalized assessed value of the improvements. The applicant also agreed to provide the Township with the applicable cannabis reports submitted to the State for purposes of administering the Township cannabis tax.

Public Comment: None.

The application was opened to the public. No members of the public appeared or offered comment. A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Mr. Buono to close the public portion.

Solicitor Garty summarized the requested D (3) conditional use variance relief, the pre-existing bulk non-conformities, the professional planning and engineering testimony, and the numerous conditions agreed to by the applicant. She stated that the Board was required to determine whether the site remained suitable for the conditionally permitted use despite the existing non-conformities.

A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Ms. D'Alessandro to approve the application subject to the conditions stated by the Solicitor and the waiver from the curbing requirement. The application received the required affirmative votes and was approved.

RESOLUTIONS

The Board considered and acted upon resolutions concerning the following previously heard applications:

Application 26-13 - 251 W. Crystal Lake Avenue – Resolution concerning previously approved porch and fence variance relief. A motion was made and the resolution was adopted, with Mr. Buono and Mr. Rotz Abstaining.

Application 26-09 - 412 Avondale – Resolution concerning previously approved variance relief for a vertical addition and existing side yard conditions. A motion was made by Mr. Wells, seconded by Mr. Foley and the resolution was adopted, with Mr. Buono and Mr. Rotz Abstaining.

Application 26-16 - 201 Hazel Avenue – Resolution concerning previously approved construction of a one-story rear addition and front porch. A motion was made by Ms. Downham, seconded by Ms. D'Alessandro and the resolution was adopted, with Mr. Buono and Mr. Rotz Abstaining.

Application 26-19 - 619 Graisbury Avenue – Resolution concerning previously approved construction of a one-story rear addition and relief associated with pre-existing non-conforming conditions. A motion was made by Mr. Wells, seconded by Ms. Downham and the resolution was adopted, with Mr. Buono and Mr. Rotz Abstaining.

The Board also considered a written resolution confirming the Chairman's authority to execute a mutual release relating to prior litigation involving the Nifty Fifty's property. The Board had previously authorized execution of the release during an executive session.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The meeting was opened to the public for general comment. No members of the public appeared or offered comment. A motion was made by Ms. Downham and seconded by Mr. Foley to close the public portion. All members present voted in favor.

ZONING OFFICER REPORT

Mr. Palo advised the Board that five residential applications were scheduled for the September meeting and that the September agenda was closed. Applications were thereafter being scheduled for October.

The next meeting of the Board is scheduled for September 3, 2026.

Prior to adjournment, the Board briefly discussed a previously approved development involving four first-floor retail spaces and four second-floor residential units. The Board was advised that a prospective tenant was interested in combining two of the first-floor retail spaces for use as a coffee shop. The matter was identified as requiring further legal and engineering review regarding whether the modification could be approved administratively.

ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Mr. Foley and seconded by Mr. Buono to adjourn the meeting. All members present voted in favor, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:41 pm.