

Cinnaminson Township Zoning Board of Adjustment
Regular Meeting Minutes
April 1, 2026 6:30PM
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, Mr. Bednarek;
Alternate: Mr. Anninos.

Absent: Ms. Woodman

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

Mr. Bednarek read the Board's policy 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 #26-03-01 – Luz Bary Vizi – Continuance requested

Block 1606, Lot 5 - 1110 Parry Avenue, Cinnaminson; R-3 Zone

Variance to build a roof canopy over the front stair landing

- Mr. Strobel announced that, due to deficiencies in the Applicant's notice, the Board does not have jurisdiction to waive re-noticing, therefore a condition of the continuance must be that the Applicant re-notice and re-publish.

Motion by Ms. Galosi, seconded by Mr. Neely, to continue Case #26-03-01 to May 6, 2026 and require the Applicant to re-notice and re-publish.

Roll Call:

Those voting in favor: Mr. Devlin, Ms. Galosi, Mr. Neely, Ms. Sherlock, Mr. Trampe, Mr. Bednarek;
Alternate: Mr. Anninos

Those voting against: None

Those abstaining: None Those recusing: None

Those absent: Ms. Woodman

Request to Reopen Case

Case #SSP-2025-0081 – Shawn W. and Meghan Becker

Block 1201, Lot 6.02 - 5B Par Drive, Cinnaminson; R2 Zone

Request for variance to construct a fence in the front yard at 5B Par Drive

Mr. Shawn Becker, property owner and resident of 5B Par Drive, Cinnaminson, reintroduced himself to the Board. Mr. Strobel asked if the members of the Board present were also present at the December 2025 meeting where the case was initially heard. It was confirmed that the members present tonight were all present in December. Mr. Strobel reminded the Board that this matter was previously entertained, the Board made a motion, which was seconded, and which did not pass. The Applicant requested a rehearing in writing to present a materially revised request along with additional and new evidence to be provided. As the request was submitted before the Board memorialized its decision with a resolution, per NJ Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL), the Board could consider a new hearing on the application and the case would be presented anew. Mr. Strobel gave instructions as to the process whereby the Applicant requests to have the matter reopened for a new hearing and, if the Board agrees by a majority vote of seven members, will conduct an evidentiary hearing.

Mr. Bednarek read a brief statement explaining the process to be undertaken to consider reopening the application. He advised that the Board would not rehear the application unless and until the public hearing of the application is reopened. He explained the Board may first make a motion and second to reopen the public hearing, at which time no vote will be taken. The motion is procedural only and does not reflect the members views of whether the matter should or should not be reopened. The determination will be made only after sworn testimony and evidence has been presented as to reopening the case. Mr. Bednarek asked if there is a motion to reopen the Applicant's request to reopen the public hearing to consider the Applicant's amended variance request.

- Motion by Mr. Trampe, seconded by Ms. Galosi, to open the public hearing to consider the Applicant's amended variance request.

Mr. Bednarek announced that the motion has been made and seconded, and that no vote will be taken at this time. He explained that the board will now take testimony limited solely to the issue of whether the public hearing should be reopened, first from the Applicant and then from the public. He further explained that testimony will be confined to whether reopening the public hearing is appropriate and that testimony will not be heard at this time on the merits of application. He advised that if, and only if, a vote to reopen the hearing passes, will testimony on the application then be taken.

Mr. Strobel confirmed the procedure outlined by the Chairman was consistent with MLUL of New Jersey and applicable due process requirements have been met. The Applicant was advised to republish and re-notice and it is Mr. Strobel's understanding that this has been done. He explained that the Board will render a decision after the conclusion of testimony, as to the merits of the amended application. This procedure, put forward by the Chairman is a clean record and affords all interested parties notice and opportunity to be heard.

Mr. Becker was sworn by Mr. Strobel. Mr. Becker identified himself and thanked the Board for hearing his testimony. He advised that he is seeking to construct a fence to provide safety for his children, and not for privacy. He stated that in the past there was an issue with proposed finishes, and he has now concluded that a simple finish and average, normal, safety divider of a style that is popular in the area, is needed to protect his children when playing in the front yard. Mr. Becker testified that there is a need for something other than landscaping design or water management diversion. He requires something that sits higher and divides the odd property line from the adjacent vacant lot.

Mr. Becker provided testimony regarding reported suspicious activity on the property since the prior meeting. He reported having to contact police on occasions where strangers and trespassers were present on the property and his wife was afraid for the family's safety. He reported that trespassers walk across the front, shared lot and these situations cause he and his wife great concern. Mr. Becker explained that his job causes him to travel and

to be away from the area, and he wants his children to have the protection of a safety divider from strangers and workers coming to the vacant property that will be developed in the future.

Mr. Strobel asked Mr. Becker if the future anticipated construction is on his own property of the adjacent property. Mr. Becker confirmed it is the neighboring property. Mr. Strobel asked Mr. Becker if the Cinnaminson Police Department has been called to report incidents of trespassing. Mr. Becker advised he has a list of the reports made to the Police. Mr. Becker provided testimony regarding one occasion where two trespassers were present at an odd time of the day, which is still unresolved. He testified that police reviewed his surveillance cameras on numerous occasions. Mr. Becker explained this is why he wants to divide the land properly to protect his children. Mr. Strobel asked if there were two incidents. Mr. Becker testified there were two concerning incidents as well as multiple incidents where strangers were present in the neighboring vacant lot. Mr. Becker confirmed that the police were called and their response was logged.

- Ms. Galosi asked if the trespassers walked on Mr. Becker's property. Mr. Becker confirmed two men pounded on his door in the middle of an ice storm asking for permission to fish in the pond on the vacant lot. He had to yell through his door for them to get off the porch before he would come out to respond. The men told him they had spoken with the country club adjacent to his and the neighbor's property. Mr. Becker asked them to leave the property and, as they remained, the police were called.
- Mr. Bednarek asked Mr. Becker how old the men appeared. Mr. Becker reported one man appeared to be about 40 the other appeared to be 18 to 20 years of age.
- Mr. Neely asked how Mr. Becker thought a fence could stop that from happening. Mr. Becker explained that people assume the pond is on his land because the area is open. He believes the men could have thought all of the area was his property and he feels a fence will show the boundary of his land from the vacant lot.
- Mr. Trampe asked if the men had fishing poles with them. Mr. Becker stated their truck was parked at the top of the apron and he does not know what was on the truck, but it was during an ice storm, so an odd time to ask about fishing.

Mr. Strobel asked Mr. Becker if he has video surveillance of his property. Mr. Becker confirmed that he does and that the police have that footage.

- Mr. Neely asked if he thought this would continue once the new house is built on the neighboring lot. Mr. Becker stated that he had no way to know that and the house will not be built for a period of time. Mr. Becker stated he is not willing to wait two years for the house to be built. He reiterated his concern for his children's safety and does not want another incident to occur.

Mr. Strobel explained that the Board cannot vote on the same motion that was previously considered but the process allows the Board to consider an amended proposal. He noted that Mr. Becker testified earlier that he is now proposing a simpler fence solution as a safety divider. He asked Mr. Becker if his request of the Board will be different than what the Board voted on in December. Mr. Becker explained he is not asking for pillars or pointed finishes, but rather a basic black aluminum, safety divider fence.

- Ms. Galosi asked how high the fence would be. Mr. Becker testified the fence would be 4' high panels with a max of 5' high depending on the grade of the land.
- Mr. Trampe, referring to the plan provided, asked at what distance from the curb line is the pin and how far back will the fence begin. Mr. Becker testified the fence will begin at 11' from inside of the curb line on his side of the boundary line.
- Mr. Bednarek asked how long the fence will be. Mr. Becker testified that the fence will be 109' long. He explained his error in calculating the length when he was last before the board in December on my side. Mr. Bednarek asked if it would run 109' straight or make a turn. Mr. Becker testified that the fence would be a straight run of 109' and would stop at the 45 degrees pivot in the property line. Mr. Bednarek asked about the

proposed fence material and asked if there would be gates. Mr. Becker confirmed the material is black aluminum and there will not be a gate. Mr. Bednarek asked if the fence would go over or through the berm and Mr. Becker testified that it would not. He explained there will be a 6" trench dug and the fence will be fully on his side behind the landscape design, not on top of the berm.

Mr. Strobel advised that the questions asked by the Board have been relevant to what is to be decided at this stage, whether or not to reopen the case. He noted the reasons that a board would be well served to reopen a case include a material change to the application proposed and new evidence to be presented that would be different or in addition to what a board may have already heard. He advised that a determination may be made after hearing public comment. If they decide to move forward, more detailed questions about the application and further testimony will be provided.

Discussion continued as to what would constitute a material change. Mr. Strobel explained that if the Board had memorialized their decision, there could be no consideration to reopen the case, however the Applicant could reapply and present new evidence. This process is one way to continue the application but the Board could not grant post hearing relief without the public's full involvement.

Mr. Becker advised that he had copies of the report of police involved incidents, his survey and subdivision plot plan and a photo example of the proposed fence material.

- Mr. Minton advised that the Township assisted Mr. Becker in obtaining the record of police calls. These were not presented in the members' agenda packets but may be submitted by the Applicant as evidence. Mr. Minton stated the list was prepared by Cinnaminson Police Chief William Obuchowski at his request as to the calls that occurred at the residence. Mr. Strobel added the list is in the form of an email and lists dates, incidents and location, as well as the type of call with factual data, all of which has been authenticated by Mr. Minton.

The Board had no objection to the list being entered as an exhibit A-1 and copies were presented to the Board. Mr. Strobel advised that Mr. Becker had given testimony under oath as to the calls and he invited members of the public to come forward to view the exhibit.

- Mr. Bednarek asked if Mr. Becker had any additional documents or testimony he wished to add. Mr. Becker stated he did not and thanked the Board for their consideration.

Comments from the Board

There were no additional comments or questions from the Board.

Hearing Opened to the Public

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

Roll Call: (to consider the motion previously made by Mr. Trampe and seconded by Ms. Galosi to open the public hearing to consider the Applicant's amended variance request)

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

Mr. Strobel reported the motion carried and the case is reopened. He explained the Board will now hear the Applicant present their case with more details as to what they are proposing, will provide testimony and documentary evidence, and at the conclusion, the Board can entertain a motion whether or not to grant the

amended application. He added that members of the public will have the ability, along with board members, to question and cross examine the Applicant and any witnesses. Mr. Becker advised he had no additional witnesses. Mr. Strobel announced that the Applicant should now have a full hearing, presenting in more detail all of the evidence and testimony of this case.

Case #2025-0081-A - Shawn W. and Meghan Becker

Block 1201, Lot 6.02 - 5B Par Drive, Cinnaminson; R2 Zone

Request for variance to construct a fence in the front yard at 5B Par Drive

Hearing

Mr. Becker explained he is seeking a variance to construct an plain, ordinary aluminum 4' fence, with a maximum height of 4.5' to 5' dependent on grade, in the front yard of his property in order to protect his children who play in the front yard. He stated the proposed fence does not include pillars or pointed tops. He reported there have been unfortunate circumstances and shared his concern of the potential threat to the safety of his children. He stated the normal landscape designed water management diversion does not do this. Mr. Becker submitted a survey and original subdivision agreement that indicates setbacks from the curblines. He testified as to the overall length of the requested fence and provided a photo of the type of fence he is seeking.

- Mr. Bednarek asked how far from the apron would the fence be. Mr. Becker testified it will begin 11' in from the inside line of the curb and will be exactly 109'. Mr. Bednarek asked if the fence would be in a straight line with no gates. Mr. Becker confirmed that it would. He added the fence will not make the curve where the property line bends and will be black aluminum.

Mr. Becker reintroduced the following exhibits:

A-1 – emailed list of police department activity log

A-2 – photo of the fence sought

A-3 – survey obtained from PS&S showing stake out, property line and monuments – red notations added by Mr. Becker to show the location of proposed fence. Mr. Minton noted PS&S was formerly Stout and Caldwell, having changed within the year.

A-4 – original subdivision plot plan indicating the curb setback with the notated straight fence line

- Mr. Neely asked for clarification as to the curblines and setback of fence. Mr. Becker testified the inside curblines is indicated and outside curblines is asphalt street. Mr. Neely asked how many feet in on Mr. Becker's property, will the fence be erected as the area appears tight at the end of the Cul de sac. Mr. Becker testified that his apron is wide enough and the adjacent apron is under reconstruction to be widened. Mr. Neely expressed concern with the safety of cars moving in and out the driveway. Mr. Becker explained that the fence will begin 11' back from the inside curb, which he feels is much longer than the average of fence or pillars beginning on other properties.

- Mr. Trampe asked how it was decided that 11' would be wide enough. Mr. Becker testified that on the inside there is a monument, about 1' inside the monument along the stone bed and will create a little division between the apron and fence.

Mr. Strobel asked if the fence would be constructed over asphalt. Mr. Becker testified that the end of the fence will go over asphalt by 2.5'.

- Mr. Trampe asked if Mr. Becker was open to bringing it back further. Mr. Becker stated he would be open to shortening the fence to 108'. He added he needs that little bit of division as he pull in and out of the driveway. Mr. Trampe asked about tapering the fence up to the monument. Mr. Becker explained that tapering the fence was discussed when pillars were being considered for aesthetics. Without the pillars, he does not feel there is a

need for the fence to taper. He added that other houses in the neighborhood have full height fence panels that go out and to make it make sense as a divider, he would be open to shortening to 108' but prefers it be 109'

- Mr. Bednarek asked if at 109', would there be 10' of asphalt before the primary curb. Mr. Becker testified there is 11' curb then 11' back from inside of curb.
- Mr. Trampe asked if there is enough room for a pickup truck to turn in and out. Mr. Becker reported his entrance is wide enough and the fence would allow for plenty of room for a truck or car to turn in and out. Mr. Trampe asked about the fence posts and Mr. Becker reported they are 2"x2" prefab posts between panels. He added that installation would be normal dry set fence installation using "Quickrete" concrete mix that is compacted.

Hearing Open to the Public

Mr. Bednarek opened the hearing to the public.

- Mike Goins, 100 Purnell Drive, Cinnaminson – Mr. Goins was sworn by Mr. Strobel – Mr. Goins shared that he has a fence around his yard and has had to call the police out for trespassers although he has "No Trespassing" signs posted. He does not believe a partial fence with no gate will keep people out.

Hearing Closed to the Public

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

Comments of the Board

- Mr. Neely expressed concern for the integrity of the neighborhood noting it is a small tight Cul de sac and not typical for a big fence coming out. He stated that zoning laws are in place for a reason and feels it would be awkward for this neighborhood. Mr. Becker stated the proposed fence is popular throughout the neighborhood and is the same that he has around his pool in his backyard. He added that this is an odd situation, and he works to improve his property. He complained of the condition of the unkempt lot next door.
- Blake Fitzgerald, Board Engineer, recommended the Board consider requiring the last fence panel to be stepped down to 2' high, as was previously stated at the December hearing, out of concern for visibility at the shared driveway, to provide greater visibility should two vehicles come out at same time. Mr. Bednarek believes a 4' fence panel would be more visible than a 2' fence, which he feels could be a pedestrian trip hazard. Mr. Fitzgerald further recommended not allowing fencing in the paved area. He cited concerns with no dimension for comparison with black fence on asphalt and concern with emergency vehicle circulation and visibility at night.
- Mr. Minton clarified that it is not a shared driveway, but two singular driveways. He added the Township understands what the Applicant wants to do and added that Mr. Neely's comments of optics are valid.
- Mr. Bednarek asked if Mr. Becker would open to posting reflective material on the end posts so cars will see the end of the fence at the driveway. Mr. Becker testified he would be open to doing that.
- Mr. Trampe asked if the fence could be moved into the grass another 3' past the monument. Mr. Becker was adamant that he needed the fence to be at 109' feet to feel comfortable. He added with the 11' setback, width of curb, and reflective posts, there would be plenty of notice to the fence. He explained that the width of the driveway appears to be one, and is categorized as one, but his driveway and apron are plenty wide enough. Mr. Becker stated he drives a large pickup truck and does not come close to the turning radius coming in and out to the monument.

Determination

Motion by Mr. Trampe, seconded by Mr. Anninos, to grant a variance to construct a fence along the side yard of property, beyond front of building line of main dwelling; 4' aluminum panels, with land elevation changes up to

5' dependent on land grade; black in color, with no pillars, no gate, and no points atop; reflective panels on the front facing posts; 11' from front curb line to run 109'; all standard conditions apply.

• Mr. Minton asked if the Board might consider requiring Mr. Becker to post construction stakes along the boundary where the new fence will be installed for a period to be determined by the zoning office, so that all parties will be able to see where the fence is going and determine if there are any conflicts with landscaping inside the lot. He added it is an odd lot and to do so would provide clarity for all and would be helpful for us. He suggested it be posted for 7 days and if there are any public comments, his office can respond and will sign off. Mr. Becker agreed to this condition.

Roll Call:

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

Mr. Strobel explained the motion carried and the variance has been granted subject to conditions listed in the motion. The Board will entertain a resolution of memorialization capturing the details of the approval at a future meeting and once the Board adopts the resolution of memorialization, there is a 45-day period that anyone can appeal. He advised it would be wise to wait to begin any work until the appeal time period expires.

Request for Extension of Minor Subdivision Approval Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(f) and/or (g); McDonald's Real Estate Company, Block 2102, Lot 46.01

Mr. Strobel announced a request for extension by McDonalds Real Estate Company to extend the time for subdivision approval by two months. He explained they have been proceeding to implement the terms of the approval granted last fall. He reviewed and shared comments on the documents regarding the easement that would implement the subdivision, and McDonalds came back with a revised plan. He will be sending comments back. Mr. Strobel believes that a two-month extension is appropriate to perfect the subdivision and to implement what the Board has requested. Discussion continued as to the length of time being appropriate to complete the documentation needed. Mr. Minton confirmed his conversation with the Applicant's attorney and they do believe two months is sufficient.

Motion by Mr. Trampe, seconded by Mr. Neely, to grant a two-month extension.

Roll Call:

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

Resolutions

**Resolution 2026-09
Block 1706, Lot 7 – 22 LeJune Road**

Motion by Mr. Trampe, second by Ms. Galosi, to adopt Resolution 2026-09.

Roll Call:

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

Resolution 2026-10 – requested extension of Resolution 2023-11

Block 806, Lot 1.02 – 1705 Industrial Highway

- Vote on adoption deferred to May 6, 2026.

Resolution 2026-11

Block 2003, Lot 19.06 – 217 Forklanding Road

- Vote on adoption deferred to May 6, 2026.

Approval of Minutes – March 4, 2026 Regular Meeting Minutes

Motion by Ms. Galosi, second by Mr. Neely, to adopt the minutes of the March 4, 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.

- Larry May, 624 Sienna Drive, Cinnaminson – Mr. May distributed information requesting action be taken by the Zoning Board of Adjustment and/or Township Committee regarding the use of warehouses as detention centers. He also distributed a list of properties that may be used for these purposes. He reported he represents Action Together Burlington County (ATBC) , a division of Action Together New Jersey (ATNJ). He shared the organizations concern with the Dept. of Homeland Security dedicating money to purchase and convert warehouses into large detention centers for immigrants and US Citizens, referencing recent action taken in Roxbury, New Jersey in protest. He shared concern that Cinnaminson has at least one warehouse for sale and ATBC strives to ensure that no structures are purchased by DHS to be converted in detention centers within industrial zones as warehouses lack the infrastructure for housing large groups of people, i.e. water, sewer, safety. ATBC request the support of the Township and urge preemptive zoning precedents be created that oppose this purpose.

Mr. Minton confirmed the address of the warehouse in questions as 511 N. Read Street, and reported it is under contract for sale to a manufacturing business. Mr. May asked about proposed construction at 995 Taylors Lane and Mr. Minton reported that Maersk has built phase 1 of the warehouse development and if phase two were built, it would be part of a redevelopment agreement and must be connected to Maersk’s operations.

Mr. Strobel explained the purview of this board and the others with concern to land use. He explained the form of governing body is a Township Committee and there are two boards that handle applications, Zoning Board of Adjustment and Planning Board. The boards play related but different rules with the Planning Board more involved with policy, as they adopt the Master Plan that helps guide development in the town. The Township Committee crafts zoning ordinances and adjusts them overtime as necessary. The Zoning Board of Adjustment hears requests for exceptions when an applicant is asking for a variance from what is permitted within the zoning ordinance. He added that the Planning Board does that too but has a different focus in MLUL and are more involved in site plans and major subdivisions. He explained that the main focus of a zoning board is one that considers requests for exceptions from the zoning ordinance, and the Planning Board and Township Committee are more the policy makers in the process. Mr. Strobel suggested Mr. May pay close attention to applications that are coming before the Zoning or Planning Boards, stressing the importance of published and mailed notices that inform the public before a board can act on the request. This board does not make policy but

entertains requests for deviation. He explained where notification can be found of applications coming before either board

- Jarmilla Shepherd, 215 Front Street, Palmyra – representing the Civic Club of Riverton, East Riverton and Palmyra – Ms. Shepherd asked if applications come to Township Committee first and asked if a warehouse is for sale, who determines what the building can be used for. Mr. Minton explained the process, if a business sells their property, the new buyer must submit a business registration and zoning permit. Mr. Minton is responsible for reviewing the applications and makes the determination if that business is a permitted use. If it is not a permitted use, the permit will be denied and they will be required to come before the appropriate board. Ms. Shepherd asked if DHS can overrule the Township. Mr. Strobel reported that, generally speaking, they cannot as there is no federal oversight over municipal land use. Any action doing so can be appealed to the Superior Court of New Jersey as can any decision of this Board.
- Jim Frances, 804 Bellview Street, Cinnaminson – asked what would happen if the Federal Government were to just do it without asking for permission. Mr. Strobel reported that over the years, the Township has had people try to do things that were not allowed, and it does not work. He explained that this board, the Planning Board and Township Committee do not allow that to happen. He added if handled properly and appealed to Superior Court, any matter would be referred back to the Township. Mr. Minton added that the Amazon site on Taylor's Lane is also subject to a redevelopment agreement.
- Laura Clemmons, 2007 Hunter Street, Cinnaminson – asked about the status of the empty house at the corner of Union Landing and Land Street that had been in a fire. She expressed her concern that it is not boarded up and there are children living in the neighboring house. She stated that nothing has been done and the property has been empty at least six years. Mr. Minton explained the Township is aware of situation and it has been declared an unsafe structure. They are working with a third party to relocate the tenant next door, so the property can be bought and the house demolished. Ms. Clemmons asked what the gaping hole is in front of Public Works Garage. Mr. Minton believes it to be a stormwater basin. She asked what is going in where the Dare Farm used to be. Mr. Minton explained that is Chick's Towing's new location. Ms. Clemmons asked about the building being erected behind U-Haul and Mr. Minton explained that U-Haul's new building that was approved by the Zoning Board.
- Renee Oler-Davis, 2108 Hunter Street, Cinnaminson – asked if the 200' notification requirement is a state law and could the Township amend that to include a larger area. Mr. Strobel explained it is a State law and is for any application for development, where property owners within 200' of the property must be notified by certified mail or hand delivery and it must be published in the newspaper of the Township, in our case Burlington County Times. Ms. Oler-Davis asked if these notices could be published on the town's website. Mr. Strobel believes the land use law probably preempts local governments from amending the notice area but reported he would research it. He added the Township website could include any notices of public interest and explained the amendments to the Open Public Meeting Act enacted by the State Legislature to include notices on the website. Ms. Oler-Davis suggested that the Township include these types of notices on the website.

Meeting Closed to the Public

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

Correspondence

Mrs. Russell advised there was no correspondence to discuss

Discussion Items

There were no items to discuss.

Comments of the Board

The Board offered no comments.

Adjournment

Motion by Ms. Galosi, seconded by Mr. Neely, to adjourn the meeting at 8:36PM. The voice vote by the Board was unanimous in favor.

Prepared by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Beverly G. Russell". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "B".

Beverly G. Russell, RMC

Board Secretary

Approved: May 6, 2026