VOORHEES TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD MINUTES NOVEMBER 13, 2025

Zoning Board Chairperson, Mr. Cupersmith 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. Phillips, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Jhaveri, Mr. Willard, and Mr. Cupersmith
Absent: Mr. Weil, Mr. Leoncio, Mr. Hundal
Also, present: Mr. Christopher Norman, Esq., Board Solicitor, Mr. Bennett Matlack, Board Engineer, Mr. Miles Elgart, Board Planner, and Mrs. Jennifer Gaffney, Board Secretary

Mr. Norman, Esq. swore in the Board's professionals.

NEW BUSINESS

GALINDO PROPERTIES, LLC **O1 - OFFICE** **ZC2025-012**
606 S. BURNT MILL ROAD | Block: 59, Lot: 2

Mr. Norman, Esq. summarized the application as follows. The applicant requests Use variance relief to permit a hair salon in the O-1 zone, where hair salons are not permitted. The relief requested is as follows:

A. Section 152.052 to permit a hair or beauty salon in the O-1 zone, where hair salons are not permitted, and
B. Section 152.055(H)(3) to permit proposed parking 5.1' from the side property line, where the required minimum setback from the side property line is 15'; and,

The following design waivers may also be required:

C. Section 154.006(A)(4) where the property appears to have existing vegetation in the rear of the property adjacent to the MDR district that is less than 25' in width, and a 25-foot-wide buffer inclusive of three rows of trees or shrubs is required where a property abuts a residential district.

Seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

Ms. Jennifer McPeak, Esq. of Siciliano & Associates, LLC, attorney for the applicant, summarized the application.

Mr. Norman, Esq. swore in the following people:

Tara Sutherland

Mr. Brian Peterman of Peterman Marcy Associates, LLC of 189 S. Lakeview Drive, Suite 101, Gibbsboro, NJ 08026, applicant's engineer.

Mr. Stephen Hawk, 509 Chanticleer Drive, Cherry Hill, NJ, applicant's planner.

Ms. Sutherland gave testimony about being a local hair stylist for the past 26 years. She decided to break away from the salon and has become the sole proprietor of her business. She is looking for a quiet space to promote wellness and relaxation, away from the hustle and bustle of a traditional salon.

She indicated that while she has the space to accommodate more stylists, but is not looking to branch out, only 1 other part time person. She stated that she will do 1-2 people at a time. Since she does not have a front desk, clients know that they cannot come early and hang around. They come at their appointment time.

Ms. Sutherland said she would do 4 days a week, Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday. Those days are flexible based on holiday schedules. Hours of operation are 11am – 8pm. There are no walk ins, it is appointment only.

Ms. Sutherland indicated that she would anticipate 3-5 people at a maximum at a time. There was a discussion about Ms. Sutherland's future plans and understanding whether there is growth that can be discussed now so that there may not be a need to come back in the future.

Mr. Matlack explained that the town has a specific required number of spaces. Such as the 8 current spaces, which work out for the current business model. He indicated that currently the parking lot needs a variance because it's 5' from the property line.

Mr. Phillips asked if the current parking meets Ms. Sutherland's needs. Ms. Sutherland stated it did, and should her business grow, she will go back to the Board.

Ms. McPeak, Esq., called on Mr. Brian Peterman. Mr. Peterman gave his credentials, which were accepted by the Board. He reviewed the layout and suitability of the site for the proposed use. He indicated that it would be less intensive of use than a bank, which is permitted in the zone.

Mr. Stephen Hawk, the applicant's planner, gave his credentials which were accepted by the Board. He reviewed the site suitability and explained the status of the interior being set up for commercial use. He discussed all of the positive and negative criteria. He recommends that the variance be granted as the use would be in line with the master plan.

Mr. Cupersmith opened the meeting to the public for comment. With no public comment, Mr. Cupersmith closed the open portion and brought it back to the Board for a motion.

Mr. Norman, Esq. summarized the motion for the Board, subject to recommendations

Mr. Cohen made a motion to approve the application; Mr. Willard seconded the motion. A roll call vote followed:

Aye:	Mr. Cohen, Mr. Phillips, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Jhaveri, Mr. Willard, and Mr. Cupersmith
Nay:	None
Abstain:	None

BRUCE AND KATHLEEN LACARTE **RR** **ZC2025-018**
24 BROOKSTONE DRIVE | Block: 218.37, Lot: 11

Mr. Norman, Esq. summarized the application as follows. The applicant requests bulk variance relief for various as-built non-conforming improvements including a concrete patio, paver patio areas, 6' x 6' raised deck landing, concrete pool surround, 8'x 12' shed in side yard, irregular shaped paver driveway and paver walkway. The relief requested is as follows:

A. Section §152.005(G), where the maximum lot coverage permitted for properties in the RR zone is 45%, and the lot consists of 52.88% of impervious coverage.
B. Section §150.13(A)(1), to permit more than 50% of the rear yard to be occupied by accessory buildings and uses.
C. Section §156.037(B)(5), where improvements exceeding 500 SF in surface dirt disturbance require a grading plan approval, and a number of improvements were installed which exceed 500 SF in total area, but a grading plan (and the required grading plan application items) has not previously been submitted.
D. Section §150.13(A)(6), where the minimum rear setback for all accessory uses and structures is 10', and both paver areas and the planter were installed at less than 10' from the rear property line.
E. Section §150.13(A)(7)(a), where sheds are only permitted within the rear yards of interior lots, and the shed is primarily located within a side yard.
F. Section §150.13(A)(7)(b), where sheds not exceeding 100 SF in area shall not be installed within 5' of any property line, and the subject shed was installed approximately 1' from a side property line.
G. Section §150.12(B)(1), where no improvements shall be installed within 5' of a side or rear property line and
    a. concrete area is 4.5' from a side property line;
    b. paver area is 0.2' and 4.5' from a side property line and 0.4' from the rear property line;
    c. the shed was installed at approximately 1' from a side property line; and
    d. the paver patio was installed less than 2' from a side property line.
H. Section §152.015(D)(3), where the minimum side setbacks for the RR zone are 30' and
    a. concrete area is 6.2' from a side property line;
    b. the deck was constructed at 8' from a side property line;
    c. the existing paver patio area is less than 2' from a side property line; and
    d. the existing paver areas were installed at 0.2' and 4.5' from a side property line.

Seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals

Mr. Baranowski, Esq., of Hyland, Levin, and Shapiro, attorney for the applicant, also summarized the application and gave the history of the applicants and the property.

Mr. LaCarte, applicant and Mr. Mancini of Tristate Engineering and Surveying, engineer for the applicant, were both sworn in for testimony by Mr. Norman, Esq.

Mr. LaCarte gave testimony to how they moved to Voorhees 43 years ago, he became a volunteer firefighter for Kresson Fire Company, while being an officer in Evesham. They moved to their current home 4 streets away from their first home. His elderly parents came to live with the family and adjustments needed to be made to the driveway, staircase, etc. He apologized and stated that he never tried to circumvent the zoning department. He claimed they put the pavers throughout the backyard to help make the property low maintenance.

Mr. LaCarte indicated that in efforts to comply with and correct the issues, he removed 800 square feet of pavers and put sod down. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. asked if there was ever an issue or complaint about the pavers from the neighbors. Mr. LaCarte commented that he put in the pavers in 1996.

Mr. Baranowski, Esq. had Mr. LaCarte testify to the various improvements, including the shed, driveway, walkway, stairs, and planters.

Mr. Willard thanked Mr. LaCarte for his service to the community. He asked Mr. LaCarte if any of the improvements that he did get a permit for, if anything was expanded upon past what was approved. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. stated that the pool and the concrete was installed as per the approved plan.

Mr. LaCarte explained how he saw several people in the neighborhood using Four Seasons for pavers, he saw them and got a quote, paid in cash, and they did the work. He didn't know that they needed to get permits. The work was done in 1999. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. explained that they are unsure of the timeline for when the impervious coverage surpassed what was approved for the pool. Mr. LaCarte said he didn't understand what impervious meant. But once he was aware, he immediately tried to remedy it by removing and putting sod down.

Mr. Norman, Esq., asked what the shed is used for. Mr. LaCarte said strictly storage.

Mr. LaCarte stated that he called the landscape company that put in the pavers, they came out and removed everything, dug the pavers out, and put the sod down.

Mr. Phillips asked what made him remove the grass and when it was removed. Mr. LaCarte stated that he removed it 3 years ago to lower maintenance.

Mr. Cupersmith asked Mr. LaCarte what he could possibly do to help remove some more of the existing violations. Mr. Willard stated or if they could explain the hardship why they are not able to remove anymore. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. stated that the Board will hear more testimony from Mr. Mancini with regard to the property's unique condition.

Mr. Cupersmith stated that the impervious coverage needs to be reduced. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. stated that it is a big ask after they've already done significant work to remove 800 square feet of pavers.

Mr. Phillips asked for more information, and historical timeline regarding the shed. Mr. LaCarte stated that he originally had one shed in 2018 which was for storage. Evergreen Sheds from Southampton installed it. He stated that there are 4x4 runners that the shed is sitting on top of. The shed was built into the walkway and cannot be moved. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. passed photos showing that the neighboring property has a shed that abuts the shed that is on the LaCartes's property.

Mr. Cohen asked if the driveway could be reduced. Mr. LaCarte stated that he widened it for his parents. Mr. Jhaveri stated that it is a 1-car garage, could they reduce the driveway to be just for 1 car. Mr. Jhaveri stated that the Board is trying to help the applicant, but the applicant also has to help be compliant.

Mr. Baranowski, Esq. called Mr. Mancini. Mr. Mancini gave his credentials that were accepted by the Board. Mr. Mancini reviewed the property and improvements made. He stated that there are some aspects of the lot being undersized that would warrant relief.

Mr. Mancini explained that many properties on Brookstone Drive are undersized and nonconforming to the RR Zone standards. Strict adherence to RR standards is impossible. For example, putting the shed 5' from the property line would cut into the pavers and cause drainage concerns. Referring to the Variance Plan, Mr. Mancini indicates the remaining pavers that are around the edge of the planters and the turf area. The runoff from the pool goes to the sod and the turf, it is directed there purposely. Removing the remaining pavers could be detrimental to mitigating the runoff.

Mr. Mancini stated that most of the improvements have been in place for 30 years, they have stood the test of time and there has been zero issues that the applicant is aware of.

Mr. Matlack asked Mr. Mancini to confirm that the turf is pervious. Mr. Matlack stated that the turf has an "option" impermeable liner, if that was installed it is impervious. Mr. Mancini stated that he was not there when it was installed, so he cannot confirm whether or not it was installed. Mr. Mancini also stated that Mr. LaCarte would know if the impervious liner was put underneath the turf because there would be pooling of water. Mr. LaCarte confirmed that there is no impermeable liner under the turf.

Mr. Matlack stated that the applicant has agreed to a grading plan as a term of conditions should the Board grant relief.

Mr. Cohen asked how they would know for sure if there was impermeable liner installed, or there was anything under the sod. Mr. Matlack stated that there's no way to know for sure unless it was dug up. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. stated that Mr. LaCarte testified that the impermeable liner.

Mr. Cupersmith opened the hearing up to the public for comment.

Mr. Michael Massimilla of 28 Brookstone Drive testified that they moved into their property as a brand-new home 41 years ago. For over 30 of those years LaCartes have been their neighbors. They are sad to see them go as they were great neighbors, everyone has been envious of their beautiful aesthetic upgrades to their property. There have been no issues or concerns about his property. Mr. Matlack asked if Mr. Massimilla has had any negative impact. Mr. Massimilla said there was no negative impact. He stated that they do have a single car garage with a driveway and a half that was original to when the house was built.

Mr. Tan Pham of 22 Brookstone Drive moved into the property in 1998. He indicated that the LaCartes have been great neighbors. He has the shed that abuts the property line where the LaCartes shed abuts, as referenced earlier in the photo that Mr. Baranowski, Esq. shared with the Board. He said that there has been no negative impact or drainage concerns to his property.

With no further comments from the public. Mr. Cupersmith opened the meeting back to the Board for a motion. Mr. Norman, Esq. summarized the application and stated that he would have it be subject to a grading plan and the compliance requirements mentioned in the CME review letter.

Mr. Jhaveri asked Mr. Baranowski, Esq. if there were any other suggestions for additional compliance from the applicant. Mr. Baranowski, Esq. stated that the applicants have already made a concerted effort to remedy and would urge the Board to go to a vote.

Mr. Phillips made a motion to approve the application as summarized

Aye:	Mr. Cohen, Mr. Phillips, Ms. Stewart, Mr. Willard, and Mr. Cupersmith
Nay:	Mr. Jhaveri
Abstain:	None

COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC
Mr. Cupersmith opened the meeting up to the public for general comment. No one from the public remained. Mr. Cupersmith closed the public portion of the meeting.

COMMENTS FROM THE BOARD
Mr. Cupersmith asked the Board if they had any further comments, no comments were made.

NEXT MEETING DATE(s): December 11, 2025

Mr. Cohen made a motion to adjourn, Mr. Phillips seconded the motion. 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 actions. Verbatim transcripts of all electronic recordings can be available upon proper request and payment.