

Mr. Senges asked the applicant if there are executed agreements for the 2 existing lots to acquire the additional land. The applicant confirmed that he has written executed agreements with both of them. Mr. Cupersmith asked if he had them to provide, Mr. Karwoski stated not at this time.

Mr. Norman summarized that currently the 2 existing dwellings on the existing properties will not be expanded or changed in any way, the 3rd lot would receive a single-family dwelling. Should the existing dwellings wish to expand or change the footprint, they will require a D2 variance.

Mr. Dochney, Board Planner, asked if Mr. Karwoski owns 4 & 6 Abbett or just 2 Abbett. Mr. Karwoski indicated that he only owns 2 Abbett which is the "L" shape. Mr. Peterman confirmed that Mr. Karwoski does not own the adjoining lots, it is a subject to approval for those lots to absorb his lot into theirs.

Mr. Norman stated that it is a lot line adjustment where Mr. Karwoski is conveying the lands to the 2 neighbors. He stated he would be comfortable adding the deeds and legal descriptions from Mr. Karwoski to the 2 owners as part of the conditions.

Mr. Peterman stated that this approval is needed in order to deed the land to those neighbors. Mr. Norman confirmed to the Board that Mr. Peterman is correct, that the subdivision is a precondition to conveying the back portion of the lots.

Mr. Peterman stated that he understood that a condition of any use and/or minor subdivision approvals will require a plot plan and grading plan be submitted for review prior to the issuance of any building permit.

Mr. Peterman continued with his testimony that the dwellings are on the same side of the road, and consistent with the use that is appropriate. The development of a single-family home on the lot would be the last on the block. Mr. Peterman stated that it is his professional opinion that it is not advantageous as a B – Business Use. He indicated that it does not have frontage on 561 and is blocked by the existing businesses that are in front of them that face 561.

The proposed front yard setback is consistent with the adjacent properties' setback on the adjoining lots. With the addition of the land to the adjacent properties, it will eliminate any existing non-conforming setbacks. Mr. Peterman reiterated it is just expanding the lot area, not the dwellings.

Mr. Peterman continued his testimony with regards to the positive criteria, he believes that the additional bulk variances for the existing non-conforming front yard setbacks and the existing non-conforming side yard setbacks of lots 1 & 1.01. Allowing the development of lot 1 as a residential use would be consistent with the intent of the master plan under section B1, which encourages development on a vacant, underutilized property along with section C1, to be sensitive to the adjacent and existing uses. The proposed residential use meets the positive criteria in order for the Zoning Board to grant the variances.

Mr. Peterman addressed the negative criteria next, stating that it would not cause any adverse impacts of the surrounding community or the intent of the master plan. The residential use is less of an impact of the current B type use, has less of a traffic flow, and fits in with the surrounding uses. Camden County Planning Board has provided a letter of no impact since the properties do not front on county roads.

Currently there is no curb or sidewalk on either side, given that the road will never be extended to service any other uses, the applicant respectfully requests no right-of-way improvements.

Mr. Peterman concluded his testimony and welcomed any questions from the Board and Professionals.

Mr. Cupersmith asked if Mr. Matlack had any questions. Mr. Matlack stated that their willingness to comply with their review letter was acceptable. Mr. Matlack stated that the township has a complete streets policy, and while there are no improvements for the surrounding streets at this time, the addition of sidewalks, curbs, or road widening may need to be addressed when the plot plan is submitted for the development of lot 1.02.

Mr. Senges commented that the township does have a complete streets policy and the Board has never waived that. The Board and professionals reviewed the building envelope and standard setbacks. They also discussed that future sidewalks and curbs will be needed and can be addressed at the time of development of lot 1.02.

Ms. Tulman asked for Mr. Peterman to share Google Earth of the property so that the Board could have a better look at the property and surrounding areas. Mr. Peterman continued his presentation sharing the images of the property via aerial views and street views.

Mr. Cupersmith opened the application to the public. There was no public present, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Cupersmith opened the meeting back up to the Board and asked if there were any motions to be entertained. Mr. Senges asked for Mr. Norman to summarize a motion for the Board.

Mr. Norman summarized the motion.

Ms. Tulman made a motion to approve the requests as summarized by Mr. Norman. Mr. Willard second the motion, a roll call vote followed.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Willard, Mr. Pannu, Ms. Tulman, Mr. Hundal, Mr. Senges
and Mr. Cupersmith
Abstentions: None
Nays: None

Mr. Cupersmith opened the meeting to the public for general comment. With no public present, the public portion was closed.

Mr. Cohen made a motion to adjourn the meeting, Mr. Pannu second the motion. All were in favor, meeting adjourned.

Jennifer L. 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.