

Christopher J. Noll, PE, CME, FP
President & CEO

William H. Kirchner, PE, CME, N-2
Vice President

Rakesh R. Darji, FE, PP, CME, CFM
Vice President/Treasurer

Benjamin R. Weller, PE, CME, CPWM, S-3, C-3
Secretary



Harry R. Fox, NICET III
G. Jeffrey Hanson, PE, CME
Jennifer A. Harris, PE, CME
Joseph R. Hirsh, PE, CME, CPWM
Ethan F. Hyder, CST II
Ryan G. McCarthy, PE, CME
C. Jeremy Noll, PE, CME, CPWM
Marc H. Selover, LSRP, PG
Neil J. Werket, RLA, LLA, CPSI

April 14, 2026
22200 86

Re: **Bulk Variance**
24 Charlotte Court
Block 11.55, Lot 15
Application # Z26-06

Ms. Jennifer Newton, Board Secretary
Township of Evesham
984 Tuckerton Road
Marlton, NJ 08053

Dear Ms. Newton:

Our office has reviewed the Bulk Variance application for proposed improvements to the existing dwelling. The applicant proposed to construct a covered patio, deck with trellis, deck with spa feature, paver patio with fire pit and extend the existing driveway.

The property is a single-family dwelling within the Fox Hollow development. The zoning district is Low Density (LD) residential. The single-family detached dwelling is permitted use within the zoning district. The dwelling is located within a subdivision on a street of similar type dwellings. The neighborhood's stormwater detention pond is located to the west of the parcel.

The site is encumbered by 10 FT wide shade tree/utility easement along its frontage. In addition, there is a drainage easement located along the southern property line. The proposed improvements do not impact these areas.

Submitted Application Materials

We have received the following documents which were submitted in support of the application:

1. Township of Evesham Land Development Application.
2. Architectural plans, prepared by Three Dimensions Architectural Group, dated August 8, 2025, consisting of 6 sheets.
3. Building and Lot Coverage Worksheet, prepared by applicant, received February 19, 2026.
4. An exhibit, file name "SURVEY" showing dimensions.

General Information

Owner: Henry Pizoli
Applicant: 22 Charlotte Court
Marlton, NJ 08053

Zoning Review

1. The property is located in the Low Density (LD) zoning district.
2. Per §160-63B(4), a single-family dwelling is a permitted used in this zoning district.
3. The following area and bulk requirements apply to this application:

Area and Bulk Requirements – LD Zoning District:
§160-63 and Attachment 10

Requirements	Required	Existing	Proposed	Status
Principle Structure				
Min. Lot Area	12,000 SF	16,587 SF	N/C	C
Min. Lot Width at Setback	100 FT	100.7 FT	N/C	C
Min. Front Yard Setback	30 FT	31 FT	N/C	C
Min. Side Yard Setback	10 FT*	18.8 FT		C
Min. Rear Yard Setback	20 FT	25 FT		C
Max. Impervious Cover (Percent)	50 %	~28.99%	41.8%	V
Max. Building Height	35 FT	<35 FT	N/C	C

C = Conforming; N/C = No Change; V = Variance required

*The minimum side yard in the LD zoning district is 20 FT. At the time of application for the subdivision, a variance was granted for a side yard setback of 10 FT (Resolution #18-37SUBD).

Variances

1. Per Attachment 10, the required rear yard setback is 20 FT. By definition, a patio is a structure which would be required to meet the setback for the principal building. Sufficient data has not been provided to determine the exact variance necessary, however, it appears that the patio scales to approximately 10.21 FT from the property line. **A variance is required.**
2. Per Attachment 10, the required side yard setback is 10 FT. By definition, a patio is a structure which would be required to meet the setback for the principal building. Sufficient data has not been provided to determine the exact variance necessary. **A variance is required.**
3. **The Zoning Board would be unable to make an informed decision based upon the information provided. It is recommended that a plan be provided that shows the dimensions to the property line for the proposed improvements. It is recommended that this application be continued until the requested information has been provided.**

The Applicant has the burden of proof to justify the variance, by testimony or other means, by using either the c(1) or c(2) proofs.

For c(1) variances the Applicant must demonstrate that strict application of the zoning requirement would have “peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon the Applicant arising out of:

- a. The exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape of a specific piece of property, or
- b. By reason of exceptional topographic conditions or physical features uniquely affecting a specific piece of property, or
- c. By reason of an extraordinary and exceptional situation uniquely affecting a specific piece of property or the structures lawfully existing thereon.”

For c(2) variances the Applicant must demonstrate that:

- a. The purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) would be advanced by a deviation from strict application of the zoning requirement;

- b. The variance can be granted without substantial detriment to the public good;
- c. The benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh the detriment; and
- d. The variance will not substantially impair the intent and purpose of the zone plan and zoning ordinance.

General Comments

4. A plan should be provided to clearly identify the location of the improvements.
 - a. The architectural plan shows the location and dimensions of the approvals relative to the dwelling however, dimensions to the property line are needed to determine what, if any, rear or side yard setback relief is required.
 - b. The contractor provided a plan from the original subdivision with hand drawn areas for the proposed improvements and dimensions. The dimensions on this plan do not correspond to the architectural plan. For example, the architectural plan shows the proposed patio is 14 FT from the dwelling and the contractor plan shows this as 15.5 FT.
 - c. Our office cannot provide a recommendation to the Board without the requested information.
5. Testimony should be provided on the purpose of the extended paver patio area. Discussion should include whether this area is intended to extend the existing driveway (the edge of the existing driveway should be labeled). It is recommended, should the Board act favorably upon this application, should this area be intended for vehicle parking that this parking area is limited to the side of the garage and should not extend beyond the rear of the garage.
6. The “squares with a circle/bullseye” should be identified. If these are pillars, a decorative fence of some sort can be provided to limit vehicles past the garage.
7. The limit of disturbance should be identified and quantified. Should the disturbance exceed 5,000 SF, certification from the Burlington County Soil Conservation District will be required.
8. A grading plan will be required. Grading activities should not impact the adjoining parcel.
9. Our office recommends that as a condition of approval, should the proposed improvements adversely impact drainage conditions on adjoining properties, the applicant will remedy the condition at their expense to the satisfaction of the Township/Board Engineer.
10. It does not appear that the drainage easement will be impacted by construction activities. It should be staked on-site to keep construction vehicles from driving over this area.
11. The plan provided is a hand sketch on a plot/grading plan for the existing dwelling. This is not a survey. The applicant should be passed on a survey of the property not a plot plan.

Administrative

12. We reserve the right to make further comments in our review of plans should additional information become available to address this initial review.
13. All future resubmissions of the plans shall clearly indicate a revision date and be accompanied by a point-by-point response letter to the comments of the above grading memo

Based upon the above, our office recommends that this application not be heard by the Zoning Board until further information is provided.

Should you or the applicant have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Sincerely,



Rakesh R. Darji, PE, PP, CME, CFM
Zoning Board Engineer

RRD/mbs/jlc

cc: Matthew Wieliczko, Esq., Board Solicitor, via email mwieliczko@zwattorneys.com
Mark Springer, Applicant's Contractor, via email markspringer7@yahoo.com
Giovanni Pizoli, Applicant, via email [REDACTED]
Nicholas Piro, III, RA, Applicant's Architect, via email nick.piro@3daginc.com