

Cinnaminson Township Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting Minutes
February 4, 2026 6:35PM
Cinnaminson Municipal Building, 1621 Riverton Road, Cinnaminson, NJ 08077

Mr. Bednarek called the meeting to order and led the flag salute. He read the Sunshine and Public Statements.

Sunshine Statement: Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act by advertising this meeting in the Burlington County Times and Courier Post newspapers on January 25, 2026.

This meeting is a quasi-judicial proceeding. Any questions or comments should be limited to issues that are relevant to what the Board may legally consider in reaching a decision, and decorum appropriate to such a proceeding must be maintained at all times. Please refer to the Rules Governing Public Comment Periods attached to this agenda.

Roll Call:

Present: Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Mr. Neely, Ms. Sherlock, Mr. Trampe, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek.
Absent: Alternate: Mr. Anninos.

Also Present: Richard Strobel, Board Solicitor; Michael Minton, Zoning Officer; Beverly Russell, Board Secretary

Mr. Bednarek read the Board's policy is not to commence hearing a matter after 10:00P.M., but instead to adjourn the matter to the next regularly scheduled meeting. Any matters still being heard at 10:00P.M. may be completed that evening or may be adjourned to the next regularly scheduled meeting, at the Board's discretion.

Applications

**Case #25-11-1 – Sajmir Shehu; Block 1702, Lot 6 – 1111 Cinnaminson Avenue, Cinnaminson
Minor Subdivision and "c" (bulk) Variances**

Mr. Shehu was sworn by Mr. Strobel.

Hearing

Mr. Shehu explained the application requesting variances to build a 10'4"x23' enclosed porch to the front of his home at 1111 Cinnaminson Avenue. The proposed addition will have a front door, windows and be one story. The property's existing non-conforming conditions, and the addition's encroachment on the setbacks was noted. Mr. Shehu referred to the photo in the application packet, showing his home and that of the attached neighboring home. He explained that similar relief was granted to the adjacent home at 1113 Cinnaminson Avenue to build a similar addition to the front of the home.

The proposed porch will be touching the existing porch of the neighbor's house. Mr. Minton requested that the neighbor's approval be confirmed as a condition of approval should the application be approved.

Mr. Shehu described the materials and finishes: lumber and stucco exterior finish, flat roof, front door and two windows, no steps into the house. He testified the new addition will have heat and will most likely be used as an extra living space and will improve the look of the house. Will most likely be used as home office/living space for he and his family. He testified the space would not be used for commercial purposes. Mr. Shehu stated he purchased the house within the last 7 months and currently lives in Cherry Hill and will be moving into the home after the construction is complete.

The roofing would be TPO roofing material on a flat roof. A Contractor will do the work and must meet all UCC building requirements and codes. Mr. Shehu testified the addition will blend in and match the existing home. Mr. Bednarek explained the new structure must blend in architecturally, color, materials, etc. Mr. Shehu described other renovations to take place including a new kitchen, new doors and flooring to be done before they move in.

Mr. Trampe asked if the addition would be the same dimension as the porch on the neighboring house. Mr. Shehu testified he measured the neighbor's porch and will match everything including the color.

Hearing Open to the Public

Mr. Bednarek opened the hearing to the public, and since there were no comments or questions, closed the hearing to the public.

Determination

Motion by Mr. Trampe, seconded by Mr. Neely to grant approval to construct an addition to the front of the home at 1111 Cinnaminson Avenue with the following variances: lot area of 2,668 sq ft where 5,000 is required; lot width of 21.6' where 50' is required; front yard setback of 10' where 25' is required; side yard setback to the south side of 0' where 8' is required; coverage ratio of 55.8% where limit is 35%; conditional on permission from adjoining neighbor to connect addition to adjoining home; existing and new façade will match; all standard conditions of approval apply.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor:	Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Mr. Neely, Ms. Sherlock, Mr. Trampe, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek.
Those voting against:	None
Those abstaining:	None
Those absent:	Alternate: Mr. Anninos
	Those recusing: None

Case #25-11-2 – Mary Ann and Ralph Fallows; Block 1706, Lot 7 – 22 LeJune Road, Cinnaminson Minor Subdivision and “c” (bulk) Variances

Ralph and Mary Ann Fellows were sworn by Mr. Strobel.

Hearing

Mr. Fellows introduced the following exhibits and distributed copies to the Board:

- A-1 – tax map of the surrounding area
- A-2 – color Google map
- A-3 – copy of the title description
- A-4 – conceptual photo of proposed home to be built on subdivided property in the future
- A-5 – survey
- A-6 – 4 page survey of historic Palmyra extension

Mr. Fellows explained that he and his wife have owned the property at 22 LeJune Road for 13 to 14 years and have rented the entire time to the same family. They are requesting a minor subdivision of the 40' x 240' fronting on LeJune Road in the front and Fairfax in the rear. They would like to split the lot into two 40' x 120' lots. Mr. Fellows explained the property was two lots in the past and was combined at some point into one lot. He stated there are no utilities on the back half of the existing lot.

Mr. Fellows explained exhibit A-2 shows the proposed lot fronting on Fairfax outlined in red. Green dot-outlined properties on exhibit A-1 show properties in the neighborhood of the same 40'x120' size they are proposing. He reported there are nineteen single family homes on the same size lot. He described the pink dot-outlined properties on the map are smaller lots. Mr. Fellows believes the request is keeping with the lots in the neighborhood.

Mrs. Fellows outlined the requested variances for lot area of 4,800 sq ft where 8,000 is required; lot width of 40' where 80' is required, and side yard setback of 6' on one side where 12' is required. The home on the property presents a preexisting non-conforming condition as are the neighbors currently. The history of the lot sizes in the development were discussed. Mr. Bednarek asked for clarification on exhibit A-2, looking at the property from Fairfax, if the property to the right is the back yard of the next door neighbor which includes a pool, etc. Mr. and Mrs. Fellows confirmed it is. Mr. Fellows stated there is a thick growth of Bamboo in the backyard of his property. He explained if a house is eventually built on the subdivided property, from Fairfax looking at the lot, the driveway side would be on the left and 6' variance would be on the right side facing the fence. This would give the neighbor the most space with the driveway to the left, and tighter side on the right which is the back yard of the existing neighbor on LeJune.

Mrs. Fellows described exhibit A-6 showing the original layout of the neighborhood and property sizes. The area was known as the Palmyra Extension.

Mr. Neely asked if the conceptual house has a 6' side yard setback. Mrs. Fellows explained this house is 26' wide house and is only an example of what type of house might look nice there on the 40' wide property.

Mr. Devlin asked if there was any indication why it went from two lots to one. Mrs. Fellows did not know any specifics, but understood it may have been a custom to combine them. It was confirmed that it is one single lot at this time.

Mr. Neely asked if it is appropriate to grant a 6' side yard setback at this time without plans in place for a house. Mr. Bednarek explained that would be the limit to what they could build to and if a wider house is considered, they would need to come back before the Board for additional variance relief. Mr. Minton explained the layout of the proposed home in relation to homes in the neighborhood. The Fellows determined to ask for variance relief on the side with adjoining the neighbor's back yard. The limitations to the future driveway were discussed and possible future need for variance relief for parking.

Hearing Open to the Public

Mr. Bednarek opened the hearing to the public for comments and questions.

- Dan Mahoney, 25 Fairfax, Cinnaminson – reported he lives in the home to the right of the property on Fairfax, on the Bamboo side. He is in attendance to learn more about what the Fellows are planning to do with the property. Mr. Fellows stated he plans to remove the Bamboo. The difficult process of removing Bamboo was discussed.

Hearing Closed to the Public

Since there were no further comments or questions, Mr. Bednarek closed the hearing to the public.

Determination

Motion by Mr. Trampe, seconded by Ms. Galosi to conditionally approve subdivision of the property at 22 LeJune Road and granting the following variance relief to the new property: lot area of 4,800 sq ft where 8,000' is required; lot width of 40' where 80' is required; side yard setback of 9.8' feet where 12' is required, side yard setback of 5.9' where 12' is required; all standard conditions of approval apply.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor: Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Mr. Neely, Ms. Sherlock, Mr. Trampe, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek.
 Those voting against: None
 Those abstaining: None Those recusing: None
 Those absent: Alternate: Mr. Anninos

Resolutions

Resolution 2026-06

Block 2602, Lot 70 - 15 Saxony Drive

Motion by Mr. Neely, seconded by Ms. Woodman to adopt Resolution 2026-06.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor: Mr. Devlin, Mr. Neely, Mr. Trampe, Ms. Woodman, Mr. Bednarek.
 Those voting against: None
 Those abstaining: None Those recusing: None
 Those not voting: Ms. Galosi, Ms. Sherlock
 Those absent: Alternate: Mr. Anninos

- The Resolutions for applications considered for Block 1201, Lot 6.02, 5B Par Drive, and Block 1113, Lot 10, 905 Thomas Avenue will be considered at the next meeting.

Approval of Minutes

Approval of the January 7, 2026 Reorganization Meeting Minutes

Motion by Mr. Neely, seconded by Ms. Galosi to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2026 Reorganization Meeting. The minutes were approved by those members eligible to vote.

Approval of the January 7, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion by Mr. Neely, seconded by Ms. Galosi to approve the minutes of the January 7, 2026 Regular Meeting. The minutes were approved by those members eligible to vote.

Meeting Opened to the Public

Mr. Bednarek opened the meeting to the public, and since there were no comments or questions, closed the meeting to the public.

Discussion Items:

Appeal Procedures

- Mr. Strobel explained anticipating an appeal to the denial of variance relief for 5B Par Drive, Block 1201, Lot 6.02. He cautioned that the Board may discuss the procedure and case management, but not any part of the hearing or decision. The matter has been requested to be reopened by the Applicant. Under MLUL this can be done prior to the resolution memorializing the decision is adopted – applicant submitted an email requesting the board reopen the matter to consider different relief than was denied and because they believe there is relevant testimony to be provided in response to recent events – applicant will need to provide notice same as initial application – 200’ as well as published notice – the board would convene a hearing to decide whether to reopen, if the board voted to reopen, would now hear the case from the beginning – board would hear as if starting anew what the applicant is proposing and would consider and vote –

Mr. Strobel will share details of the process and suggested language with the Board Chair, Mr. Bednarek, to ensure that all rules are adhered to. He noted the notice language must be carefully written and has provided guidance for what is required.

- Mr. Trampe asked for a brief recess at 7:30PM. The Meeting returned to order at 7:33PM.

Mr. Strobel continued to review the process and made a strong recommendation that the Board consider hearing comments from the Applicant and the public prior to voting whether or not to reopen the application. If the application is to be heard again, it will be from the beginning as if anew application. The make up of the Board and who can participate in both questions, whether or not to reopen the application and whether or not to grant the relief sought was considered. Mr. Strobel announced both parts should be heard by all Board members in attendance at the meeting.

- Ms. Woodman announced she will be out of town and not attending the March 4th meeting.
- Mr. Trampe asked about the risk to the Board or Mr. Strobel for making recommendations on the notice. Mr. Strobel explained that, while it is not routine practice to do so, he felt it best to make recommendations as to the specific language needed. It will be up to the Applicant if they choose to use the recommended language. He was unsure if the Applicant would be represented by counsel. The historical practice of reviewing and making recommendations of notices was discussed.
- Mr. Trampe asked about the appeal process in the event the case is reopened, and relief is again denied. Mr. Strobel explained that any case can be appealed to the Superior Court of New Jersey. He explained the process of appeals and cautioned that the Board's comments should always be made in a judicious manner and are not outside of acceptable boundaries should the case be reviewed by a judge.
- Mr. Neely asked if the Board hears the application and the vote is no to hear it, would there be a memorializing resolution at that meeting. Mr. Strobel explained the Board would memorialize the decisions made in December and with the appeal at the next meeting, most likely in April. He stated the Applicant has 45 days after the memorializing resolution in which to appeal.
- Mr. Neely asked what could be presented to make the case to reopen. Mr. Strobel explained they may change the relief being sought or present new information or evidence relevant to their case.

Comments of the Board

There were no additional comments from the Board.

Adjournment

Motion by Ms. Galosi, seconded by Mr. Devlin to adjourn the meeting at 8:16PM. The voice vote by the Board was unanimous in favor.

Prepared by:



Beverly G. Russell, RMC
Board Secretary

Approved: March 4, 2026