The Chairman called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the “Open Public Meeting Act” and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Willard, Mr. Schwenke, Mr. Senges

Absent: Mr. Leoncio

Also, present, Chris Norman, Board Solicitor and Corrine Tarcelli, Zoning Board Secretary

**MINUTES FOR APPROVAL**

 Mr. Cohen motioned to approve the Minutes from April 11, 2019; seconded by Mr. Willard; none (0) against, Mr. Cupersmith abstained.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Kevin and Amber Monroe**

70 Woodstone Drive

Block 230.17, L30

Seeking Bulk Variance relief from Section 150.12(B)(1) to allow an 85 SF shed to remain with a 2.64’ side yard setback, where in no event shall any improvement be permitted within 5’ of a side or rear property line; from Section 150.13(A)(7)(d) to allow the same 85 SF shed to remain with a side yard setback of 2.64’ where sheds not exceeding 100 SF in floor area shall be a minimum of 5’ from a side property line; from Section 150.13(A)(1) to allow accessory buildings and uses to occupy 36.91% of the rear yard area where such buildings and uses may occupy no more than 25%; from Section 150.13(A)(6) to allow the existing pool apron to have a rear yard setback of 8.82’ where a minimum of 15’ is required; from Section 152.015(D)(3) to allow the exiting brick paver patio to remain with an approximately 14’ side yard setback where a minimum of 15’ is required; from Section 152.015(D)(3) to allow the existing pool apron to remain with a 12.68’ side yard setback where a minimum of 15’ is required; and from Section 152.015(D)(3) to allow the existing concrete pad to remain with a 5.31’ side yard setback where a minimum of 15’ is required; and seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

Mrs. Amber Monroe was sworn in to testify. Mrs. Monroe explained they had listed and sold their home in Collingswood and were scheduled to close on the home located at Woodstone Drive. However, thirty hours before closing they were made aware the shed, paver patio, and pool apron were not permitted and were not in conformance. Her and her husband had an eleven month old child at the time and had nowhere to go. They had no choice but to move forward with the settlement. They placed funds in escrow and submitted the variance application. She further stated the previous owners informed her the brick patio as well as the concrete slab was in existence when they purchased the property in May, 2016. The previous owners also had a playground set removed and that exposed the concrete patio. The only improvements that were made without permits was the addition of the pool apron. Mrs. Monroe further stated if they were to move or remove the shed, they would have to remove the trees. They are environmentally friendly and would prefer not to. Additionally, the shed is utilized to store the pool equipment. Regarding the additional apron, that is used for patio furniture so they are able to sit closer to the pool to watch their child. The deck is too far away from the pool. There has never been an issue with grading. There is no water run-off from the property. The shed, apron, and patio have been there for a very long time and there have been no complaints whatsoever from the neighbors.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Mrs. Julie Morgan, 5 Eastwood Court, Voorhees was sworn in to testify. She stated she has lived in her home for over 40 years and she has no issues whatsoever with the application and there has never been any disturbance to her property.

Seeing no one further from the public, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Weil motioned to approve relief from Section 150.12(B)(1) to allow an 85 SF shed to remain with a 2.64’ side yard setback, where in no event shall any improvement be permitted within 5’ of a side or rear property line; from Section 150.13(A)(7)(d) to allow the same 85 SF shed to remain with a side yard setback of 2.64’ where sheds not exceeding 100 SF in floor area shall be a minimum of 5’ from a side property line; from Section 150.13(A)(1) to allow accessory buildings and uses to occupy 36.91% of the rear yard area where such buildings and uses may occupy no more than 25%; from Section 150.13(A)(6) to allow the existing pool apron to have a rear yard setback of 8.82’ where a minimum of 15’ is required; from Section 152.015(D)(3) to allow the exiting brick paver patio to remain with an approximately 14’ side yard setback where a minimum of 15’ is required; from Section 152.015(D)(3) to allow the existing pool apron to remain with a 12.68’ side yard setback where a minimum of 15’ is required; and from Section 152.015(D)(3) to allow the existing concrete pad to remain with a 5.31’ side yard setback where a minimum of 15’ is required; seconded by Mr. Cupersmith.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cupersmith,

Mr. Senges

Nays: None

**Brian and Rebecca Dib**

37 Brookstone Drive

Block 218.03, Lot 47

Seeking Bulk Variance relief from Section 150.13(A)(1) to permit an existing deck and proposed pool with apron to occupy 32.77% of the rear yard area where accessory buildings and structures may occupy no more than 25% of the rear yard area; and seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

 Mr. and Mrs. Dib were sworn in to testify. They moved into the property in July of 2018. They wanted a home with a large back yard and finally found a home that met their needs. They contracted with Niagara Pools. They designed the pool of their dreams. Niagara informed them they would have to apply for a variance because the pool did not meet the necessary setback requirements. They did not want to have to submit a variance and therefore decided to scale back the size of the pool to meet the setback requirements. They were then informed because of the size of the deck and the addition of the pool, they would require a variance due to the fact that they would be over the lot coverage of 25%. The deck already exists. There will not be any issues with run-off water impacting the neighbors and there will not be any standing water.

 The meeting was opened to the public. Seeing no one from the public, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Cupersmith motioned to approve relief from Section 150.13(A)(1) to permit an existing deck and proposed pool with apron to occupy 32.77% of the rear yard area where accessory buildings and structures may occupy no more than 25% of the rear yard area; seconded by Mr. Weil.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Senges

Nays: None

The meeting was opened to the public. Seeing no one from the public, the public portion was closed.

**James Heinz**

115 Bergen Avenue

Block 122, Lot 1

Seeking Bulk Variance relief from Section 150.13(A)(6) to permit the installation of a concrete patio 6’ from the rear property line where a minimum of 15’ is required; and seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

Mr. Heinz was sworn in to testify. He stated he purchased the property in August of 2012 and there was a discrepancy with the address due to the fact that the home is located on the corner of Somerdale Road and Bergen Avenue. It was determined at the time of settlement the property address, block and lot would reflect an address of 115 Bergen Avenue. The front door of the property as well as the driveway face Bergen Avenue. Because the lot is a corner lot and is considered to have two front yards, the lack of a back yard, Mr. Heinz would like to place a concrete patio to the right side of the home furthest away from Somerdale Road for safety and privacy reasons. Due to the size of the lot and how narrow the lot is, this presents a hardship with no other location available for the patio. The frame shed was removed exposing the rocks and weeds are now growing through the rocks. Mr. Heinz would like to place the concrete patio over the area where the rocks were located under the shed.

The meeting was opened to the public.

Mrs. Anita Walker, 119 Bergen Avenue, Voorhees was sworn in to testify. She stated her and her husband live next door to Mr. Heinz and has absolutely no issues whatsoever with the concrete patio and feels it will be a nice comfortable setting for him and his family to enjoy.

Seeing no one further from the public, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Weil made a motion to approve relief from Section 150.13(A)(6) to permit the installation of a concrete patio 6’ from the rear property line where a minimum of 15’ is required; seconded by Mr. Cohen.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Brocco, Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Senges

Nays: None

Seeing no further business Mr. Senges made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Willard.

Meeting was adjourned.

 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

 Corrine Tarcelli

 Zoning Board Secretary