

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. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Pannu, Ms. Tulman and Mr. Cupersmith

Absent: Mr. Leoncio

Also, present: Chris Norman, Board Solicitor; Drew Pavlick, Board Engineer, CME; and Jennifer Gaffney, Board Secretary

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL

Mr. Weil motioned to approve the Minutes from the August 26, 2021, meeting; seconded Mr. Pannu; none (0) against.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Pannu, and Mr. Cupersmith

Abstentions: Ms. Tulman

Nays: None

Rakesh Patel
32 Callison Lane
Block 213.19, Lot 7

MDR(R100B)

Case #ZC2020-030

Action Date: 10/31/2021

Applicant has requested a continuance. Mr. Norman read request into record for continuance to October 21, 2021.

Mr. Weil makes a motion to grant a continuance on October 21, 2021. Motion is seconded by Mr. Cohen.

Motion carries with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Pannu, Mr. Cupersmith

Abstentions: None

Nays: None

NEW BUSINESS

Emily Morgan
4 Penn Road
Block 264, Lot 3

RR

Case #ZC2021-021

Action Date: 11/5/2021

Mr. Norman summarized the application for the
The proposed front additions require(s) variance(s) from:

- a. **Section 152.005(D)(1)**, to permit proposed additions at 45' from the Penn Road right-of-way, where the minimum front setback for the RR zone is 50' and the, and

The proposed detached garage requires(s) variance(s) from:

- b. **Section 150.13(A)(2)**, to permit a detached garage to have a peak roof height of 23' 10" where the maximum height permitted for accessory structures is 15'; 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. Norman swore in the applicant, Ms. Emily Morgan, her architect, Mr. Chris Tantillo, and her engineer, Mr. Daniel Patterson.

Mr. Daniel Patterson, the applicant's engineer spoke to his credentials and qualifications to the Board.

Mr. Cupersmith accepted his credentials and qualifications.

Mr. Patterson summarized that the applicant is seeking variances related to proposed additions to the home and a detached garage located near the back of the property with additional paving to access the garage property.

Mr. Patterson indicated that in CME's review letter there was a comment regarding the increased lot coverage and stated that the increase for the garage portion is negligible because the area is already covered by an existing car port.

Mr. Patterson indicated that upon receipt of the Board Engineer's review he submitted the plans to correct scale as requested.

Mr. Patterson stated that Mr. Tantillo can speak to the comments regarding the height requirements as they are architectural.

Mr. Norman asked Mr. Patterson if the applicant is requesting the 45' setback is being requested because of the hardship of the house being built at the 50' setback.

Mr. Patterson and Ms. Morgan confirmed that the house is built on the 50' setback.

Mr. Chris Tantillo, the applicant's architect spoke to his credentials and qualifications to the Board.

Mr. Cupersmith accepted his credentials and qualifications.

Mr. Tantillo indicated that the detached garage is a pre-fabricated structure, therefore the height is a fixed height and is the reason it exceeds the 15' accessory height requirement.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if they could purchase a 15' prefabricated garage.

Ms. Morgan indicated they could, however they are using the attic to store all of their pool equipment, etc. The vehicles will be on the ground floor of the garage. The existing shed that was on the property when purchased is falling apart and will be torn down.

Mr. Cupersmith asked for confirmation that there would be no living space in the area.

Mr. Tantillo confirmed that there are no plumbing or mechanical plans for the area.

Mr. Norman asked if the proposed garage at that height constitutes a better planning alternative as opposed to a conforming structure.

Ms. Morgan stated that the proposed garage would be serving a dual purpose. To store 2 vehicles and the attic storage to store all the pool supplies, in addition to a lawn mower, holiday décor, etc. The house only has a small attic that they can only kneel in, so this would provide for more storage.

Ms. Morgan stated that the attic in the detached garage is very angular, and the tight eaves would never allow for living space.

Mr. Norman asked if the garage is proportionate to the property and asked for Ms. Morgan to confirm that it would conform with the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Norman also asked if any of the neighbors had any issues.

Ms. Morgan confirmed that she not only was able to speak with majority of her neighbors that she could get in touch with, but she also noticed them regarding the hearing and there seemed to be no issue from the neighbors.

She stated that currently there is a large car port there and very large and tall trees that provide coverage so the detached garage would not be seen very easily.

Mr. Pavlick stated that they received the applicant's revised plan, however they are coming up with 25.5% use coverage where the variance states that accessory use/structures may not exceed 25% of the rear yard area.

Mr. Cupersmith asked for Mr. Patterson to confirm that any issues with the drainage/soil erosion have been addressed with the Board Engineer.

Mr. Patterson confirmed there would be no issues and that the applicant would be able to comply with what is in the letter, with the exception of the additional 0.5% rear yard coverage.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if there were any plans for lighting.

Ms. Morgan stated that there are no plans for lighting as of yet.

Mr. Cupersmith asked the applicant if she was planning on removing any trees.

Ms. Morgan confirmed that no trees would be removed.

Mr. Cupersmith closed the testimony portion and opened for public comments and questions.

With no questions from the public, Mr. Cupersmith closed the public portion.

Mr. Pannu asked for Mr. Norman to summarize the motion.

Mr. Norman summarized the original request for variances, stating that it would be a motion to request the variances for the height of the addition, the lot coverage, and setback of the Penn Road right-of-way.

Mr. Pannu makes a motion.

Motion is seconded by Mr. Willard.

Motion carries with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Ms. Tulman, Mr. Pannu, Mr. Cupersmith

Abstentions: None

Nays: None

Mr. Norman explained that there 45-day period of appeal.

Richard Dougherty
405 E. Evesham Road
Block 109, Lot 4

MDR(R100)

Case #ZC2021-022

Action Date: 12/18/2021

Mr. Norman summarized that the applicant is seeking variance(s) related to a proposed patio installation, with variance from:

Section 150.13(A)(1) to permit the installation of a proposed patio within the secondary front yard, where accessory uses and structures are only permitted within rear yards, 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. Norman swore in the applicant, Mr. Dougherty.

Mr. Dougherty stated that he wanted to increase his driveway in a small section so that he could park both of his cars in the driveway for security reasons.

Mr. Norman asked if he needed the variance because he is located on a corner property that has 2 front yards.

Mr. Dougherty stated that is why he requested the variance, and the section that is located inside of his fence is not located 50' off of the right-of-way.

Mr. Norman asked how many cars will be parked in the driveway.

Mr. Dougherty stated that there would be 2 cars parked in the back yard.

Mr. Cupersmith stated that the application talks about a patio.

Mr. Dougherty confirmed that the driveway goes up to the patio.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if he was building a garage.

Mr. Dougherty stated that no garage would be built, that he is extending his driveway and redoing his patio.

Mr. Cupersmith asked for Mr. Dougherty to confirm that he is not building another structure.

Mr. Dougherty confirmed that no structure is being built.

With no questions from the Board, Mr. Cupersmith opened the public portion of the application. With no comments from the public, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Pannu makes a motion. Motion is seconded by Mr. Willard.

Motion carries with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Ms. Tulman, Mr. Pannu, Mr. Cupersmith

Abstentions: None

Nays: None

Mr. Norman explained that there 45-day period of appeal.

Christine Swift

MDR(R100)

Case #ZC2021-023

1127 Kirkwood-Gibbsboro Road

Block 181, Lot 3

Action Date: 12/01/2021

Mr. Norman summarized that the applicant is seeking variance(s) related to an existing unpermitted non-conforming addition on the front of their home, with variances from:

- a. **Section 152.15(D)(1)(a)** to permit the existing front porch addition to remain as constructed at approximately 44' from the Kirkwood-Gibbsboro Road right-of-way, where the minimum front setback from a county road is 50', 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. Norman swore in Mrs. Christine Swift & Mr. Bryan Swift.

Mrs. Swift stated that the work that they bought the house in May 2021, the work that they have submitted the application for was pre-existing prior to the purchase. The previous owners completed the work without permits and the applicants want to make sure that all records are updated and requested the variances so that the porch may remain where it is.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if the applicant was aware of the discrepancy at settlement.

Mr. Swift stated that they were aware and did escrow money.

With no questions from the Board, Mr. Cupersmith opened the application for public comment or questions. Seeing no public comment or questions, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Pannu makes a motion. Motion is seconded by Mr. Willard.

Motion carries with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Ms. Tulman, Mr. Pannu, Mr. Cupersmith

Abstentions: None

Nays: None

OLD BUSINESS

Maasi Shamilov

MDR(R100B)

Case #ZC2020-012

5 Stead Court

Block 213.04, Lot 50

Action Date: 9/9/2021

Mr. Norman indicated that both Dr. Maasi Shamilov, the applicant and Mr. Patrick McAndrew, the applicant's attorney are still under oath from the previous hearing.

Mr. Norman swore in Kenneth Levers, the applicant's engineer.

Mr. Levers spoke to his qualifications and experience. Mr. Cupersmith accepted his credentials.

Mr. McAndrew indicated that the application had been before the Board at least 2 times. He further explained that the last time it was heard in March, the Board was looking for the applicant to complete two things, a drainage report needed to be completed to make sure that the drainage would be sufficient with no adverse effects, and to cut back on the scope and the number of variances requested.

A revised plan was submitted to the Board which will be presented during this meeting. The plan was created on 4/21/2021. The revised plan pulled in the proposed patio quite a bit which reduced the number of variances requested. The drainage report was also submitted.

Mr. McAndrew stated that the legal reasoning behind the variance requests is that it is an unusually shaped property, it is not rectangular, it is trapezoidal. There are also severe contours and a large drop off towards the rear of the property line. That is the primary reason for the request, and to give more utility for the family for a nice patio and barbeque area.

Mr. Levers presented the revised plan by sharing them on the screen with the Board. There is an existing condition plan that represents what is currently in place. There is a circular bulb for the patio that is extended very close to the rear property line, which has been eliminated in the revised plans. The plans show a dark line perimeter that indicates where a variance was granted in 2009.

Mr. Levers indicated that by bifurcating and removing majority of the circular bulb there will be a better setback to the rear, reducing the amount of impervious coverage, also reducing the overall lot coverage.

Mr. Levers stated that the prior engineer, Mr. Avila in this plan showed the removal of the marble patio in that circular area. There are 2 retaining walls in their place due to the sloping lot in order to level the area. The retaining wall that is outside of the perimeter line is being proposed to remain. The retaining wall that is a part of the circle that is being removed it has been proposed to be backfilled to get the top at grade so that there is no above grade portion of the retaining wall. There is no proposal to rip out the lower retaining wall so that there is no disturbance to the soil, erosion, etc.

Mr. Levers stated that the plan shows that the patio will be removed, and the area will be converted to grass, however in lieu of grass he proposed them using a 3/8" stone to create a decorative area which would be pervious.

Mr. McAndrew asked for Mr. Levers to confirm the 2 variances that would remain after these adjustments are addressed.

Mr. Levers stated that the overall lot coverage variance where it states that 45% is the maximum permitted, the latest plan shows the coverage to be 48.95%, just under 4% differential. It equates to 605 square feet. The additional variance would be the rear yard coverage which states a 25% maximum, the

latest plans show the coverage to be 37.6%, however the current state is at 50.7%. With the changes proposed it will be dropped substantially.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Levers if the variances can be granted without substantial negative impact to zoning or the neighborhood.

Mr. Levers confirmed that the variances could be granted without substantial negative impact because when you look at impervious coverage, whether it is rear yard or total lot, the first thing you would want to look at is the clearing or increase in drainage.

Mr. Levers stated that the smallest of the overage in regard to storm water management is right off the rear corner from the retaining wall of the existing patio to the far rear corner is in vegetative condition. There is substantial growth, trees, etc. It is the natural low point for the neighborhood. The lots that back to that or adjoin it all have rear yards that slope to the corner. The positive is that the soil is very permeable, the permeability is over 20 inches per hour, which is very rapid.

Mr. Levers stated that he went to the property earlier in the day in the rain, despite the fact of uphill run off, there was no standing water. The vegetation shows no evidence of a ponding water situation, even on a temporary basis. In summary that low area for the neighborhood and more specifically the applicant's lot is draining well and being infiltrated into the soil.

Mr. Levers stated when looking at coverage, it's doing very well now and they will be reducing the existing condition by removing some of the marble tile patio, the 600 square feet over will run off to the existing lower area, there should be no stormwater issues from the patio that will not be absorbed by the lower area.

Mr. Levers clarified that when the term low is being used, he is not referring to it as a standing water area, it is wooded, it is vegetative, it may have been cleared at one time, but that is not how it exists today. Most of the surrounding neighboring properties drain into that area properly.

Mr. McAndrew asked Mr. Levers what drives the request for the variance and what are the practical difficulties.

Mr. Levers stated that it is slightly over a 15,000 square foot lot. The slope from the front right corner of the drop off to the rear corner of the lot that was previously described is almost a 20' drop. The angle coming across is about 90'. A 20' decline within a 90' distance is a substantial slope. The front yard slopes down into the house, the usable area like several of the other lots in the area handle it with patios or decks. In order to create outdoor living areas, a level space is required.

Mr. Levers stated that in order to create a level space, it can be done with retaining walls, which is what is already existing on the property. Reducing that amount of space is going to be a benefit and will be more in line with the ordinances.

Mr. McAndrew asked if the Board had any questions. There were no questions from the Board.

Mr. McAndrew asked if Dr. Shamilov had anything to add to the testimony. Dr. Shamilov had nothing to add.

Mr. McAndrew asked Dr. Shamilov the purpose of the patio if it was for outdoor living space for his family.

Dr. Shamilov confirmed and stated that children that were friends with his children would gather there to play at a safe distance due to COVID.

Dr. Shamilov stated that there is a drainage pipe that they are planning to cap located on the right side of the drawing.

Mr. McAndrew asked if the Board had any other questions.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if all of CME's questions have been addressed. Mr. Pavlick stated that he had further questions.

Mr. Pavlick stated that in CME's letter dated 5/14/2021 a couple additional variances were listed with regards to the retaining walls in the back and on the side a setback of 10.5' where 15' is required. Mr. Pavlick asked if they would remain and are the setbacks accurate.

Mr. Levers stated that they are correct, the one is an existing non-conforming and the other is a portion retaining wall in the back, but a portion would remain that is 5.2'. It currently has a setback of 1.93', which with the revised plans will go to 5.2' where the 15' is required.

Mr. Pavlick stated that waivers were listed in the request regarding the grading plan checklist and asked for Mr. Levers to confirm.

Mr. Levers confirmed those waivers to still be necessary.

Mr. Pavlick asked for Mr. Levers to speak more about the drainage system, CME had proposed a couple of sumps open bottom inlets.

Mr. Levers clarified that there are 2 scenarios going on. The stormwater management report referred to the overage of the patio and how that will drain.

Additionally, there are 2 downspouts which are on the left side (eastern side) of the house. Those downspouts pick up the left portion of the roof, of approximately 612 square feet. Those downspouts are then directed into a bubbler system at the end where it does bubble up and run off the project site to the east. Mr. Avila initially proposed rerouting those and developing an infiltration trench system along the easterly side of the property line. CME's letter raised an issue with the depth of the seasonal high-water table, Mr. Avila was going to spec a bottomless inlet, but when you look at the seasonal high-water table there was a conflict. Currently they have proposed to re-pipe that area, as shown in the plans, but instead of having infiltration pipe and an open bottom inlet, they will be daylighting down to the corner where the low area is and let it flow naturally down there to be absorbed.

On the easterly side of the house, the way that it's directed is a short distance on that sideline, currently it captures it and directs it to the adjoining property. By altering it so that it's captured and redirected to the low-lying area of the property line. They plan to build up a small natural retention basin there, without clearing, it will serve as an infiltration area in that corner.

Mr. Levers continued stating that when you look throughout the neighborhood, upslope properties are draining across the adjoining property, this is the ongoing pattern throughout the subdivision. Given the size of the topography, small lot sizes, it is understandable. In order to rectify the direct discharge of the 2 downspouts, redirecting it to the corner of the lot should be beneficial.

Mr. Pavlick asked for Mr. Levers to speak about the proposed retaining wall.

Mr. Levers asked if Mr. Pavlick meant proposed of what is to remain.

Mr. Pavlick stated proposed as to what is to remain, what is to be eliminated, etc.

Mr. Levers stated upon viewing the site layout, the existing retaining wall that will remain is shown as a dashed line. The semi-circle of what is left will be grass or stone area. For the dashed retaining wall, the marble tile above it will be removed, the retaining wall in that area will be covered. The solid line in the site diagram will remain and hold in the grading as it exists.

Mr. Levers stated that they did not want to disturb the exterior retaining walls or the one that is closest to the north westerly property line. They will remain as is.

Mr. Pavlick referred to the plans where there is a retaining wall featured on the east side with a comment that states, "proposed retaining wall for future construction, if needed" and asked if this was something that was being considered moving forward.

Mr. Levers stated that he did not believe that it is Mr. Avila's intention to include it. He believed that it was in part related to the drainage that was proposed in the area.

Mr. Pavlick asked if there are any trees that would be removed during the project.

Mr. Levers stated that when rerouting the 2 downspouts, no trees will be removed. He also stated that a positive benefit of keeping the existing retaining walls there will be the least amount of disturbance to the vegetation.

Mr. Pavlick inquired about the location of rerouting the downspouts as it looks to be located within a sanitary sewer easement.

Mr. Levers stated that it is 10', the plan is to put it in between easement and the existing walkway and hug the existing patio. The pipe should be about 6 feet, they will hand dig, and by doing so they will be able to keep that pipe pretty close to the base of the wall. They prefer to get it past the angle point on the wall before discharging so that nothing will undermine the existing footing for the patio that remains.

Mr. Levers reiterated that they would run the drain that picks up the 2 downspouts right along the wall, crossing the easement, but there would be limited encroachment through there. Mr. Levers stated that they were unable to find the manhole in the easement, but he would assume that the line runs through the center.

Mr. Pavlick asked if Mr. Levers was able to find the manhole in the street. Mr. Levers stated that it is offset a little bit from the property, which is why they were wondering if there was another manhole in the cul-de-sac. Mr. Levers stated that he was not sure if the easement was created when the subdivision was done, and they ended up not putting a sewer line in that direction. There is a manhole that exists, but it does not line up directly with the easement. There could be another angle point and the manhole are buried.

Mr. Pavlick asked for Mr. Levers to confirm that it is his belief that there are currently no utilities in the easement.

Mr. Levers stated he could not speak to that, they did not pull a manhole cover to look and see what is existing, but they can and put it on any plan revisions that the Board may require.

Mr. Pavlick stated that CME would like to see that to be sure that no conflicts will be created by the installation of the pipe. Mr. Levers stated they would do that.

Mr. Pavlick stated that with regards to the stormwater report, CME agrees that the soil is very permeable.

Mr. Cupersmith asked for Mr. Pavlick to confirm that the only thing the applicant needs to come back with is the request regarding the manhole.

Mr. Pavlick confirmed that CME would like to see that on a plan to be sure there is no impacts to the Township or any private utilities.

Mr. Cupersmith asked Mr. McAndrew if the applicant would agree to the revised plan request.

Mr. McAndrew stated that the applicant agrees to that.

Mr. Cupersmith asked Mr. McAndrew if there was anything else that the applicant would like to present before the testimony is turned over to the Board for questions.

Mr. Cupersmith opened up the application to the Board for questions. With no questions from the Board, the testimony portion was closed, and the application is opened to the public for questions.

Ms. Asha Verma of 4 Lynch Road raised her hand to speak.

Mr. Norman asked Ms. Verma if she previously testified on the application.

Ms. Verma stated that she had not.

Mr. Norman swore in Ms. Verma.

Ms. Verma stated she lives behind the applicant, their rear yards meet in the shape of a V. She stated that during the testimony the vegetation was discussed and how the drainage is controlled. Their concern is that the applicant's patio is like a shelf and under it is a very steep drop. They would like some

reassurance that the water is not collecting, pooling, or conditions that could possibly deteriorate in the future. She stated that she would like for the engineer to provide reassurance and confirm that any potential issues would not happen.

Mr. Levers stated that when you look at the patio as it exists today it does have a slope from the rear line of the house to the edge of the retaining wall. The slope is very shallow. The runoff is not concentrated now, there is no French drain that you would experience with pool decking, there is no collection point. This will sheet flow across, however it does so in a very wide path. It will be less since the rear bowl will be removed. It will not be concentrated and when you want to promote infiltration of stormwater runoff the best thing is to have it spread across the surface that it's coming from.

Mr. Levers summarized that it would continue as it does today, it is not concentrated. It will be less than what occurs today and instead of approximately a foot off of the rear property line it will be kicked back to 16' allowing for more absorption. That is also coupled with good soil that provides percolation.

Mr. Levers pointed out that the soil is key. There was an in-depth analysis where they ran 2 permeameters which measures the soil, showing infiltration. There were several borings that show the soil profile, etc.

Ms. Verma was satisfied with Mr. Levers confirmation.

Mr. Pavlick asked Mr. Levers if they had spoken to any outside agency approvals that might be needed.

Mr. Levers stated that he was unaware if anything was submitted to outside agencies for approval. He did not do any analysis; however, he knows that if they are disturbing more than 500 square feet, a soil erosion approval will be necessary.

Mr. Pavlick asked that be a condition of approval.

Mr. Cupersmith asked Mr. Norman if he could summarize the motion adding the two items for conditions would be for County approval and revised plans regarding the manhole cover.

Mr. Norman confirmed the conditions to include:

- Capping the drainage pipe.
- No tree removal
- Revised plans showing the utilities and sewer line within the easement.
- Any outside agency approvals, if necessary.

Mr. Pavlick asked for them to clarify what "capping the current drainage pipe" to mean.

Mr. Levers stated it would be tying into the proposed line.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if there were any other questions or comments from the public since the public portion was not closed yet.

Ms. Melissa Squire from 7 Johnson Lane joined the meeting.

Mr. Norman swore in Ms. Squire.

Ms. Squire indicated that she owns a neighboring property and that her property is located at the southeast corner of the map. She also wanted to receive reassurance that the existing structure would not interfere with their property. They have heard in the last couple of hearings that the low point seems to be in the bottom corner of the property. Ms. Squire stated that is on her property and that it seems to drain through a swell in their backyard. It then goes out to what is believed to be wetlands.

Ms. Squire stated that her property has a dip that then leads to the woods. That dip is typically "marshy", and they are frequently having problems maintaining grass there. Ms. Squire would not like to see that get any worse, she was hoping that there would be improvement.

Ms. Squire stated that there is a drainage pipe that comes directly onto her property and would like clarification on what capping it means, she would like for it to be removed and taken off her property as it should not have been there in the first place.

Mr. Levers stated that it will be removed from where it is and redirected/rerouted. It will no longer exist on her property.

Ms. Squire asked if problems should persist with drainage, what recourse do neighbors have, if any.

Mr. Norman stated that the Board is going off expertise planning and testimony. A lot of it is expert opinion, and sometimes there is differences of opinion. There could be potential concern. In defense of the applicant, it is hard to know what was before the patio was ever built, so if they are making improvements for it to be better, then there should be no issue. If there is a natural issue with drainage, the applicant would not be causing it.

Ms. Squire stated that if it were to permeate where the engineer states it would not, then there would be a problem.

Mr. Norman asked if Mr. McAndrew could speak to that concern.

Mr. McAndrew said the first part of the question is a practical matter, they are taking what was otherwise subtracting impervious and rerouting drains, which should improve things. If it does not improve there are civil remedies, however the Township has an improvement staff, so if there is a problem there is a process in place.

Mr. McAndrew doesn't believe there will be a problem because they are subtracting and not adding. If anything should happen, there should be improvement based on Mr. Levers testimony.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if there was anything on Ms. Squire's property that could be removed.

Mr. Norman stated that an additional condition would be removing the pop-up drain from Ms. Squire's property.

Mr. McAndrew confirmed that a pop-up drain is being removed.

Seeing no more public questions or comments, the public portion of the application was closed.

Ms. Tulman makes a motion. Motion is seconded by Mr. Willard.

Motion carries with the following roll call vote:

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Weil, Mr. Willard, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Pannu, Mr. Cupersmith

Abstentions: None

Nays: None

With no further business to discuss, Mr. Weil motioned to adjourn the meeting seconded by Mr. Cohen.

Jennifer Gaffney
Zoning Board Secretary
Voorhees Township

Minutes prepared by Jennifer Gaffney. The minutes are intended to reflect the basic comments and action. Verbatim transcripts of all electronic recordings can be available upon proper request and payment.