private easements to access properties otherwise inaccessible from a public right-of-way is prohibited in accordance with N.J.A.C. 40:55D-35.

r. Amend Section 503.J.2.f. to read as follows:
Driveways shall be paved with a hard surface, be a minimum of nine (9) feet in width, and setback at least three (3) feet from the side property line. No vehicular circulation area, parking, or loading area shall be permitted in the front portion of a residential lot, other than a residential driveway which shall be provided parallel to the side property line. Only one curb cut and driveway per residential lot shall be permitted.

s. Add Section 503.R. to include the proposed R&V stormwater management review and compliance ordinance.

t. Amend Section 900.C. to read as follows:
Area and Dimensional Regulations
The area, yard, bulk, and other dimensional regulations within the Historic District overlay zone shall be shall be in accordance with those requirements of the underlying zoning district, as set forth in this Ordinance, except whereas modified by Section 304.H., above.

u. Amend Section 900.E.3.a. to add the words: “subdivision of land” after the words “moving or demolition”.

v. Amend Section 900.E.3.c. to add paragraph 5 as follows and to renumber the remainder of the section accordingly:
When the application is for subdivision of land, in addition to the material described in paragraph 3, above, for the proposed development on the newly created lot(s), the application shall be accompanied by a subdivision plan in accordance with this Ordinance.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Borough of Haddonfield conducted a thirty-month-long study of its current residential zoning requirements, including a comparison of existing land development patterns, degrees of lot conformity, and future subdivision potential. The Residential Zoning Study (Study) was conducted by a Planning Board committee (Committee) and a professional planning consultant. The purpose of this study was to identify ways in which the Land Development Ordinance (LDO) could be amended to ensure that the Borough's existing "urban village" development pattern would be maintained in the future, i.e., future subdivisions, new construction, and building additions, will be compatible with the existing and predominant character of the surrounding residential neighborhood.

The Committee analyzed existing land use patterns, non-conforming use patterns, lot widths, lot depths, and lot areas. The Committee also analyzed the key aspects of residential building design, such as height, setbacks, and building coverage, as well as stormwater management and impervious coverage. The Study also included a literature search of planning methods that comparable towns are using to ensure that zoning district regulations actually worked to preserve neighborhood character. During the course of the Study, other miscellaneous problems in the LDO were also identified for future correction (see Study Methodology, in appendix).

The Committee recommended that the best way to present the Study's findings was through the development of a Residential Land Use element, with recommended LDO amendments included in an appendix. Incorporation of the Study into the Borough master plan element is consistent with the Municipal Land Use Law's requirement that zoning ordinance amendments be consistent with the master plans.

The Residential Land Use Element begins with a description and analysis of the Borough's existing land use plan and planning efforts, as they relate to residential development. The plan then explores a series of residential zoning issues, including an analysis of the viability of the LDO in terms of lot size conformity and subdivision availability. Various building scale and lot coverage issues are also discussed along with recommendations to preserve the Borough's current neighborhood design patterns and village scale development. Residential land use and building type issues are examined in another section along with recommendations to protect the stability of single-family detached neighborhoods while encouraging housing diversity in the downtown area. Stormwater management and green space issues are also noted. In addition, the Residential Land Use Element provides analysis and recommendations on a number of housing design-related matters, including lot shapes, outdoor living environments, integration of the automobile with the village's design plan, and the architectural compatibility of new buildings and additions inside and outside the historic district.
A. INTRODUCTION

During the local housing "boom" in the mid-1980s, several housing developers took advantage of a number of unresolved and unclear lot size, frontage, and bulk standard regulations in the Borough's earlier Land Development Ordinance. Under the pre-1990 regulations, a number of subdivision applications were approved that were objected to by several neighbors. The results of a 1990 non-conforming lot study, which was initiated in response to community objections to an increasing number of subdivisions, were clear. Of the over 4,000 residential tax parcels in the Borough, about 33 percent were non-conforming in terms of lot width and area. Many more could still be subdivided under the current zoning regulations. The study found that the highest concentration of non-conforming lots was in the R-3 zone, which represented 66 percent of the Borough's total non-conforming lots. In 1991, the study concluded that there were areas of the Borough that could be rezoned to eliminate non-conforming lots with respect to minimum lot sizes.

In 1996, the Borough initiated a second zoning study to resolve some of the issues identified in the 1990 study (see Study Methodology, in appendix). The purpose of this new Haddonfield Residential Zoning Study (Study) was to conduct an analysis of existing lot and development conditions in the Borough's residential zones and to recommend Land Development Ordinance (LDO) amendments to protect the character of established neighborhoods. As the Study progressed, several conclusions became clear to the Planning Board steering committee (Committee) and the professional planner the Borough engaged to assist them. The first was the recognition that the current zoning plan and LDO do not precisely correlate with existing residential development patterns. This is often the case in older communities, such as Haddonfield, which were actually constructed before local zoning was adopted.

The second was the realization by the Committee that a comprehensive analysis of residential land use issues was necessary, if the Borough were committed to resolve many of the problems identified during the Study. This matter was brought into focus by the 1997 adoption of the Master Plan's Historic Preservation Plan and the Housing and Fair Share Housing Plan elements, both of which incorporated residential land use issues in their findings and recommendations. Finally, it was evident that the Study should recommend a complete re-examination of the existing land use plan and LDO zoning district standards for residential land uses. Because any significant revisions of the LDO also would require a revision to the master plan, it was determined that the Committee should draft a Residential Land Use element for the Master Plan. It is anticipated that a separate Downtown and Business Districts Plan and an Open Space Plan element will be developed in the future.
This Residential Land Use Element includes a description of the Residential Zoning Study and an analysis of existing plans and master plan elements that relate to residential development in the Borough. It then discusses residential zoning and design issues, describes the Study findings, and suggests various amendments to the Land Development Ordinance to address those issues. A comparison of residential development and residential land use planning in other jurisdictions is also provided. A complete list of recommended ordinance amendments and reference maps are found in the appendix.

The purpose of the Haddonfield Residential Land Use Plan element is to analyze existing lot and development patterns in the Borough’s residential districts and to recommend land use plan and LDO amendments with the intent of protecting neighborhood character. This element’s primary intent is to fulfill several enumerated purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law (MLUL) (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2), which are essentially the same as those identified in the Borough’s LDO:

1. To encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands in this State, in a manner which will promote the public health, safety, morals, and general welfare;

2. To secure safety from fire, flood, panic, and other natural and manmade disasters;

3. To provide adequate light, air, and open space;

4. To promote the establishment of appropriate population densities and concentrations that will contribute to the well-being of persons, neighborhoods, communities, and regions and preservation of the environment;

5. To promote a desirable visual environment through creative development techniques and good civic design and arrangements; and

6. To promote the conservation of historic sites and districts, open space, energy resources and valuable natural resources in the State and to prevent urban sprawl and degradation of the environment through improper use of land.

In addition, this element is intended to fulfill other specific residential land use goals and objectives as identified in the 1991 Master Plan Re-examination report:

1. Maintain the visual attractiveness of the community and preserve the historic character of the central area.
• The visual attraction of Haddonfield is due, in part, to its physical sense of order. This sense of order is a product of use compatibility and scale; and these factors should be a primary consideration in Master Plan development and its implementation.

• The standards of the Haddonfield Historic District help maintain the physical sense of order in the central area of the Borough. The District should be expanded where appropriate.

2. Maintain the predominantly single-family residential character of the Borough.

• Maintain and amend zoning as necessary to insure that additional residential development is consistent, in terms of design and density, with existing residences.

• Encourage home improvement and maintenance.

• Preclude the possibility of inappropriate land uses in residential areas.

3. Continue to expand housing opportunities in the Borough to meet established needs for existing and future residents.

• Future housing needs may be satisfied through such means as the preservation of housing in the business district, and the development of senior citizen housing.

4. Establish an appropriate balance of retail, office, residential, public, and other uses in the business area to maintain its role as the center of the community.

• Maintain residential uses on upper floors.

5. Provide for the safe and convenient movement of vehicles and persons within the Borough.

• In all road improvements, the impact on community character and the environment should be a major concern.

6. Maintain and adjust community facilities and services to meet the changing needs of Borough residents.

• Futura open space and recreation improvements should reflect recent trends in population characteristics such as smaller households, a growing number of elderly residents, etc.
• Protect and preserve existing open space areas and acquire additional land for public use.
B. EXISTING LAND USE PLAN

1. Master Plan and Re-examination Report
The existing land use plan that provides the template for residential zoning is the 1984 Haddonfield Borough Master Plan. The goals and objectives noted in the Master Plan are similar to those discussed in the last (1991) Master Plan Re-examination report and the recent Housing and Fair Share Housing element (1996). These include the preservation of the predominantly single family residential character of the Borough. Other complementary goals include providing expanded housing opportunities for current and expected future needs, balancing residential and non-residential uses, and maintaining the visual attractiveness of the community through compatible design. The 1984 Master Plan identified two major housing districts for the Borough: MD (medium density) and LD (low density). The Lane of Acres was indicated as a VLD (very low density) district. An MU (mixed use) district was established for the Haddonfield Commons and adjacent commercial area, and an R-O (residential-office) district was also indicated at either end of Kings Highway in the Central Business District (CBD) and on part of Haddon Avenue.

The Master Plan's Land Use Plan map reflects the Borough's general residential land use goals. The current (1984) Land Use Plan map, however, does not specify lot sizes or other applicable zoning requirements for those areas. Nor does it take into consideration the various ranges of density throughout the residential districts or the diversity of housing types in the core area around the downtown. These shades of difference were clearly identified by of the 1996-98 Residential Zoning Study.

2. Zoning Plan and Land Development Ordinance
The Master Plan's Zoning Plan map generally follows the Borough's 1984 Land Use Plan illustrated in the last Master Plan. Some significant map amendments, however, have been made during the last fourteen years in the residential districts. For example, the Zoning Plan map indicates a separate zone for Haddonfield Mews and Haddonfield Commons. The R-O district is similar to that in the 1984 plan, but does not include all of the same properties. Most of the area identified as MD in the 1984 plan is included in the R-4 district, but it has been expanded to include all of the Estate neighborhood, which in the 1984 Land Use Plan map, had been designated as an LD district. The Zoning Plan map indicates a separate zone for the larger lots in the vicinity of West Kings Highway, Chews Landing Road, and between lower Warwick Road and Washington Avenue. This larger lot zone is now called the R-2 district and the remainder of the LD district is called the R-3 district.

The LDO includes zoning standards for development densities, lot sizes, setbacks, lot coverage, height, etc., which are not detailed in the Master Plan, since master
plans typically provide general guidance for land use, not specific ordinance-type standards. Several of the LDO residential zoning districts have been particularly crafted for the uses within their boundaries. These include the R-1, R-5, and R-6 zones, which cover Lane of Acres, the Haddonfield Mews, and the Haddonfield Commons, respectively. Most of the Borough’s residential development is located within three zones, the R-2, R-3, and R-4. Residential uses are, however, permitted in most of the other zoning districts. Two zones allow first floor non-residential uses and residential uses on the upper floors. The R-0 zone allows R-3 type development and first floor professional office uses, while the CBD zone allows retail and personal services on the ground floor. Residential uses are also permitted at an R-3 intensity in the Commercial zone, and at an R-4 level in the Office zone. The Committee found that there was a wide variety of lot sizes, setbacks, and building coverage ranges in the study units and subzones within the R-3, R-4, and R-5 districts, and that these districts should be re-tooled, or new zones established, that would reflect existing conditions.

3. Housing and Fair Share Housing Plan
The demographic data from the 1980 and 1990 U. S. Census indicates that Haddonfield is a maturing community with a decreasing, aging, and relatively affluent population base. The Borough’s recent land use data confirms that there is very little room left in Haddonfield for the construction of new housing, which is not unique in the older suburbs surrounding Camden City. After consideration of the existing demographic and housing profiles, projected trends, and the findings of the 1984 Master Plan and the 1991 Master Plan Re-examination report, the Planning Board adopted the recommendations of the Haddonfield Housing and Fair Share Housing Plan in 1996.

The Housing and Fair Share Housing Plan recommends maintaining the Borough’s current housing policies, which focus on the maintenance of the predominant single family residential character of Haddonfield. Continued use of proper zoning, land development regulation, and code enforcement are identified as critical to the preservation of the community’s existing character. Preservation of the village character within the local historic district is encouraged through the existing historic preservation program. Exploration of alternative and additional housing opportunities are recommended, particularly those for senior citizens on fixed incomes. The Housing and Fair Share Housing Plan also recommends that the findings of the Historic Preservation Plan and the Residential Zoning Study be folded the Master Plan.

The Haddonfield Housing and Fair Share Housing Plan element identified that there was little land remaining in Haddonfield available for new development, and that most future residential development would involve either redevelopment, infill construction, or conversion of existing buildings from one use to another. The element recommended that the Borough provide its local affordable housing obligation by continuing its existing rehabilitation program with the County and
encouraging the development of a new affordable independent living community for senior citizens.

4. Historic Preservation Plan
The 1997 Historic Preservation Plan element outlines the Borough's major historic preservation goals, which have been an integral part of Haddonfield's planning agenda for more than twenty-five years. The Borough's primary goal for historic preservation is to enhance the quality of life and economic well-being of current and future generations, both within and around Haddonfield. The plan provides a history of historic preservation in the Borough and the benefits accrued to date through local efforts. Various levels of district expansion are discussed for certain parts of the northwest and southeast quadrants of the Borough, including a recommendation to double the size of the current historic district, if administratively feasible.

Alternative design control methods are also noted, such as stand-alone districts, streetscapes, buffer zones, and view corridors. These other measures are used in other municipalities and in other states to address local community design issues outside local historic districts. Further study is recommended to evaluate the potential for historic district listing in several early twentieth century neighborhoods, including the Estate and Birdwood sections.

It is clear that the Borough of Haddonfield is committed to historic preservation in the older, central portion of the village. The Borough's Historic Preservation plan also states that the quality of life throughout the community, even beyond the historic district, is affected by the visual character of its individual homes, streetscapes, and neighborhoods. The areas and neighborhoods noted as potential areas for historic district expansion are also those with a currently high application rate for additions and alterations to meet modern lifestyle needs. The Residential Zoning Study also identified that existing LDO zoning controls would permit such alterations to occur in a manner that could be completely out-of-character with traditional neighborhood patterns.
C. ZONING ISSUES

1. Reasons for Changing the Current Ordinance
The Borough’s LDO and Zoning Plan dates back to 1939 when the first Zoning Ordinance was adopted. The first Master Plan was adopted 20 years later. The Borough’s zoning district regulations have been reviewed and amended several times in the past sixty years. The residential zoning district regulations were significantly amended in 1985 after the completion of the 1984 Master Plan. This 1984 plan recommended a set of varying zoning district densities, with the highest densities around the downtown area. Since that time, the LDO has been amended several times. The LDO’s current residential development provisions differ from the 1984 Land Use Plan map, particularly in the Estate section of the Borough and in the area now zoned R-2. During the course of the 1996-1998 Study, the Committee identified a variety of other inconsistencies with actual residential development patterns and current zoning regulations. Because the MLUL requires general consistency among the LDO, land use element, and housing element, it is appropriate to review the LDO and the Land Use Plan to determine how this situation can be resolved.

There are other indications that the LDO should be re-examined or amended. These include: age of the ordinance; increased number of applications for variances; occurrences of undesirable development; and an increase in zoning-related lawsuits. Through the course of the Study, the Committee found that most of the problems were not procedural flaws in the current LDO. Many of the problems related to the LDO not addressing recent development trends or problems in definitions, or special cases, such as corner lots, flag lots, and other atypical development situations. Other problems related more to the incongruity between the existing LDO and the actual character of development in Haddonfield, most of which was built before the LDO was written.

A trend of inappropriate and undesirable development was also noted. By undesirable development, the Committee mentioned such items as inappropriately-scaled subdivisions and residential construction. Over the past few years, several homes have either been built, demolished and then re-built, or added to in an incompatitable scale with neighboring properties. This change is also manifested in the diminishment of open or green space in a neighborhood and increase in paving. The Committee members from the Zoning Board of Adjustment also noted that many variance requests are for residential bulk variances, e.g. to exceed the side yard setback, building coverage, or impervious coverage requirements. These were related to building additions for larger living spaces and extra rooms in existing homes.
Additional problems are related to the automobile in a town that was primarily developed as a railroad suburb in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These problems include garage door orientation, additional paving and stormwater runoff, parking locations, curb cuts, etc. The Committee noted an increase in zoning-related lawsuits or lawsuit threats, either by applicants or applicants’ neighbors. The reasons for this increase, however, were not determined.

The Committee decided that the LDO’s current residential development standards needed to be revised. They proposed twelve new residential zones (R-1 through R-11, and R-O) based upon existing land use, lot size, building scale and coverage, development character, and other features. Zoning regulations were then drafted for each district to ensure that future development and alterations to homes could be done in a manner that would preserve the existing neighborhood character while allowing some change for current and future household lifestyle needs. These new zones are included in the map attached as an appendix to this element.

2. Implications of Existing LDO Lot Size Revisions

a. Non-Conforming Lot Sizes

The current LDO provides for five residential districts, R-1 through R-4 and R-O (Office). The R-O mixed use (office and residential) district has the same zoning requirements as the R-4 zone. Using the Borough’s tax assessment data files, the Study was able to determine the amount of lots that were currently non-conforming to LDO’s district requirements in terms of lot area, depth, and width. Altogether the Study evaluated 3,996 tax parcels, excluding anomalous tax parcels, such as churches, cemeteries, schools, public property, etc., in the Borough’s residential zones. The highest concentration of properties, 49%, were in the R-3 zone, which has 1,960 properties. The next highest were the R-4 and R-O zones, which have 1,554 properties or 39% of the total. The R-2 zone with 453 properties represented 11% of the total number of tax parcels in the study, and the R-1 zone with only 29 lots represented 1%.

The LDO’s lot size requirements were designed in the late 1980s in response to the aforementioned New Jersey Superior Court case on lot averaging. With the aid of modern computer technology and after a detailed lot by lot analysis, the Study was able to determine the degree to which the LDO’s current lot size requirements reflected existing development patterns (see Study Methodology, in appendix). The following chart identifies the percentage of lots that conformed to their minimum zoning district lot dimensions:
Existing Zoning Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4 &amp; R-0</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum frontage requirement</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>75’</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum depth requirement</td>
<td>500’</td>
<td>150’</td>
<td>125’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot area requirement</td>
<td>100,000 sf</td>
<td>15,000 sf</td>
<td>10,000 sf</td>
<td>5,000 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Lots</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Conforming (lot area, width, depth)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>1,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Conforming</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Zoning districts for Haddonfield Commons and Mews not included.

A conforming lot would be one that met the LDO’s minimum requirements for lot frontage, depth, and area for the district in which it was located. A non-conforming lot is one that did not meet at least one of the district’s lot size requirements. The results indicated that a total of 59% of the residential lots could not meet the LDO’s minimum lot size requirements, or a clear majority of lots were non-conforming. The highest number of non-conformity lots is in the R-3 zone, which has a 73% level.

The LDO does not require a property owner with an undersized, non-conforming ot to get a zoning variance for its pre-existing, non-conforming lot size condition. Problems with the LDO’s setback and impervious cover requirements arise, however, when those lot owners seek ordinary building additions or house alterations. Such additions, when built on a lot with conforming dimensions, usually do not need a variance, but those on undersized or non-conforming lots often do. The cumulative effect is a larger number of hardship variance requests to the Zoning Board of Adjustment due to the LDO’s incompatibility with existing conditions.

The Study recommended the adoption of nine new single-family detached housing zones and two other residential zones, one each for the Haddonfield Mews and Commons. The lot size requirements for the R-1 (Lane of Acres), Mews, and Commons districts would remain the same, but all of the others were to be changed. The R-0 (Residential/Office Mixed Use District) was recommended to be changed to an overlay zone with minimum lot size and bulk requirements tied to underlying zones, such as the new R-2, R-3, R-5, R-8, and R-9 zones. If these recommended changes were implemented, the LDO’s lot size conformity rate would be increased from 41% to 64%. The following chart illustrates the results of this recommendation:
Proposed Zoning Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum frontage requirement</td>
<td>200'</td>
<td>125'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum depth requirement</td>
<td>400'</td>
<td>150'</td>
<td>125'</td>
<td>120'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot area</td>
<td>80,000 sf</td>
<td>20,000 sf</td>
<td>12,500 sf</td>
<td>9,600 sf</td>
<td>7,500 sf</td>
<td>6,000 sf</td>
<td>5,000 sf</td>
<td>4,000 sf</td>
<td>4,000 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # lots</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Conforming (lot area, width, depth)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>2,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Conforming</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Zoning districts for Haddonfield Commons and Mews not included.

Districts with a lower degree of conforming lot sizes than the 64% average were generally those with a high degree of internal house type and lot size diversity, such as in the older part of the Borough. For example, the R8/R8-O and R9/R9-O zones had a high number of twin lots, row houses, and older smaller houses. Other non-conforming lots are related to lot depth or lot frontage anomalies among comparable districts in different sections of the town. Some of the new zoning districts were developed to preserve historic homes and landscape design themes in the historic district and along the Borough’s high streets, as recommended in the Carter Van Dyke study. The Committee’s task of combining the lot size characteristics of 385 study units into 11 distinct zones was a difficult one. A higher degree of district conformity could probably be achieved if many more districts were added to the mix. The Committee resolved that a dozen residential districts would be the upper limit for a two square mile Borough.

b. Subdivision Potential
One traditional method used to ensure compatibly of streets and neighborhoods is controlling future subdivision. The Committee identified that one of the more significant problems in new applications was the creation of new lots that were incompatible with existing streetscape patterns. Many of those new lots have been determined to be conforming under the current LDO. Adjacent property owners and neighbors, however, often viewed them as too small, in terms of frontage, lot width, or lot area, and awkwardly spaced along an otherwise homogeneous blockface. Smaller than average lots, and the houses built upon them, also decrease the amount of open space along the blockface and in the surrounding neighborhood. This is another important issue in urban village communities, such as Haddonfield, that place a high value on the maintenance of green space.

The Study confirmed that the size of an individual lot had a general correlation to house type and massing and neighborhood scale and character. For example, bigger houses with wide lawns on Kings Highway and Chews Landing Road were
generally on larger lots than those situated behind them on Westminster Avenue or Evans Avenue. Compact historic houses and twin houses were found on much smaller lots around the Borough’s older downtown district. Entire neighborhoods, such as the Estate section and the Fargo section, were all platted using common lot size patterns. The Committee found that, in many neighborhoods, the existing LDO allowed residential subdivision uncharacteristic in those neighborhoods. In some cases, such as the older mid-nineteenth century neighborhoods, entire blocks of existing houses were non-conforming under the current LDO.

A detailed analysis of the Borough’s land tenure program found that a total of 66 lots may be available for subdivision under the current LDO provisions. This analysis does not include large private institutional properties, such as those owned by Bancroft School, Christ the King, etc., which are also potentially available for subdivision. These 66 lots could potentially produce 82 new residential lots, some mother lots producing more than two daughter lots. It should be noted that almost every one of these subdividable lots is already developed with a single-family home. Borough records show that there are only 17 vacant residential lots available for development under the LDO provisions without a variance or are not constrained due to wetlands or limited access.

The recommended changes would slightly decrease the number of subdividable lots from 66 to 62, while the recommended lot size and other ordinance amendments would reduce the number of new lots created from as many as 82 to 70. About 13 vacant lots would be available for development under the recommended changes compared to 17 under the current LDO provisions. It should also be noted that with 9 new recommended single-family detached housing zones, new lots and future homes will be more compatible with their neighboring properties than under the current LDO regulations. The proposed R-7 zone, the Borough’s largest, has the highest number of subdividable lots, due to existing land tenure patterns. The following charts indicate the estimated subdivision potential under the existing LDO provisions and the proposed recommended zoning district and regulation amendments:

### Existing Zoning Plan*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>R-1</th>
<th>R-2</th>
<th>R-3</th>
<th>R-4 &amp; R-O</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum frontage requirement</td>
<td>'200'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum depth requirement</td>
<td>600'</td>
<td>150'</td>
<td>125'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot area requirement</td>
<td>100,000 sf</td>
<td>15,000 sf</td>
<td>10,000 sf</td>
<td>5,000 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # lots</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>3,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdividable lots without variances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># new housing units</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Zoning districts for Haddonfield Commons and Mews not included.
**Proposed Zoning Plan***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>200’</td>
<td>125’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>75’</td>
<td>60’</td>
<td>50’</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>40’</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frontage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>400’</td>
<td>160’</td>
<td>125’</td>
<td>120’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum lot</td>
<td>80,000 sf</td>
<td>20,000 sf</td>
<td>12,500 sf</td>
<td>9,600 sf</td>
<td>7,500 sf</td>
<td>6,000 sf</td>
<td>5,000 sf</td>
<td>4,000 sf</td>
<td>4,000 sf</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # lots</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>6/0</td>
<td>1,38/</td>
<td>30/</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdividable</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lots without</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># new housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Zoning districts for Haddonfield Commons and Mews not included.

c. **Lot Size Recommendations**

After intensive study, the Committee drew eleven new residential districts and a revised R-O (residential-office) overlay district that would allow for a high degree of conformance to proposed bulk requirements for existing developed lots, while minimizing future incompatible subdivisions that would be disruptive to adjacent and neighboring properties. The following chart identifies the recommended lot area, lot width, lot frontage, and lot depth dimensions for the proposed zoning districts as discussed in sections 1 and 2, above. Additional LDO amendments to lot size provisions were also recommended to ensure compatible future development. Most of these related to definition changes and the resolution of issues for special case lots, such as corner and odd-shaped lots.

**PROPOSED MINIMUM LOT SIZES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Zone</th>
<th>Lot Area</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>80,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>200'</td>
<td>200'</td>
<td>400'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>20,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>125'</td>
<td>125'</td>
<td>150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>12,500 sq. ft.</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>125'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>9,600 sq. ft.</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>120'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>7,500 sq. ft.</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td>75'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>6,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7</td>
<td>5,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>50'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-8</td>
<td>4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-9</td>
<td>4,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>100'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>160,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>200'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>200'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-11</td>
<td>40,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-O*</td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Same as underlying zone.
3. **Building Scale and Coverage**

The Planning Board does not review many applications for single-family homes, which are typically exempt from review under the Municipal Land Use Law. Many of the development applications heard by the Zoning Board, however, are for bulk variances related to the expansion of existing homes on existing lots, and the Planning Board does hear applications for Certificates of Appropriateness for single-family homes with zoning variance requests in the historic district. In both cases, most of these variances involve similar building setbacks and coverage issues. The primary problem in new house construction and building additions is that property owners seek to push the established building envelopes with regard to height, setbacks, and building coverage.

a. **C Variances**

Another key factor in controlling compatibility in residential design is the role of the Zoning Board of Adjustment, which hears most residential bulk variance issues. The Municipal Land Use Law (N.J.S.A. 40:65D-70.c.(1) and c(2)) provide the tests for granting such residential bulk variances:

   c.(1) Where: (a) by reason of 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 reasons of an extraordinary and exceptional situation uniquely affecting a specific piece of property or the structures lawfully erected thereon, the strict application of any zoning regulation would result in peculiar and exceptional practical difficulties to, or exceptional and undue hardship upon, the developer of such property, a variance from such strict application of such regulation so as to relieve such difficulties or hardship [and the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment, or]

   c.(2) Where in an application or appeal regulating to a specific piece of property the purposes of the Act (M.L.U.L.) would be advanced by a deviation from the zoning LDO requirements and the benefits of the deviation would substantially outweigh any detriment.

This first test is designed for special cases, such as properties on narrow lots, corner lots, or with unique topographical features. Personal "hardship" issues cannot be considered: only those uniquely related to a specific piece of property, regardless of the owner. These conditions do exist in Haddonfield for many odd-shaped properties under the current LDO. By redefining zoning district boundaries, it is anticipated that many of the existing problems can be resolved. The LDO should also be amended to address these special case lots. (see Chapter D)
The second alternative test requires an applicant to prove that deviation from the LDO, i.e. breaking setback and coverage limit regulations, would actually advance the purposes of zoning (N.J.A.C. 40:55D-2). Again, this criterion should be evaluated by how it advances the greater public good, as opposed to the private "hardship" issues.

b. **Height**

Most of the existing homes in the Borough currently meet the 35 foot and 2.5 story height limit, and few homes are built that exceed it. Some of the older homes have three occupied floors, and sometimes this becomes problematic when a property owner wants to expand a third floor area for additional living space. The continued design of gable roofed houses, being the predominant house form in Haddonfield, is encouraged. To ensure an appropriate scale of development, the Committee recommended maintaining the 2.5 story limitation and resolved that further study is necessary prior to proposing a height above grade limitation less than the currently permitted 35 feet. The Committee also recommended that the LDO be amended to add a definition for the term "story" to coordinate it with the B.O.C.A. definition and to clarify that it would not include basements.

c. **Setbacks**

Building envelope restrictions were identified as a very useful method of controlling compatibility in residential building design. The building envelope is the perimeter of the area on the lot in which a structure may be erected. It is primarily defined by a lot's front, rear, and side yard setbacks. Setbacks have been used for more than a century to ensure public safety and private enjoyment in urbanized areas and villages, such as Haddonfield. Setbacks also ensure a minimum degree of fire separation and emergency accessibility between adjacent owners, as well as adequate room for sunlight, air, green space, and privacy. Side yard setbacks control the width of houses on a street, and are often used to locate driveways for off-street parking.

Setbacks provide additional public and private benefits. Rear yard setbacks, for example, are an important measure of privacy in urban villages. Front yard setbacks, in particular, have a significant impact on a neighborhood's streetscape and residential character because they are so highly visible. Because randomized front yard setbacks on an individual street tend to be visually disharmonious and aesthetically disturbing, continuity of traditional front yard setbacks is an important issue. Setbacks also transform private open space and green space into a greater public open space by providing a "common" landscape that provides neighborhood cohesiveness.

Most home-owners build at the minimum front yard setback line in order to maximize house size or rear yard area. Few people request front yard variances, compared to those for other setbacks. Keeping a common street setback is an important issue, particularly in the historic district. For example, a house on Kings
Highway recently was built further back than the minimum front yard setback ostensibly to reduce street noise impacts. The Planning Board recommended additional landscaping treatments for this application, because the owner would not build the house closer to the street.

Some neo-traditional planning measures advocate establishing both minimum and maximum front yard setbacks to control streetscape cohesiveness. Building a house further back from the minimal setback line is currently possible anywhere in the Borough. This is a significant issue in the historic district, where it is sometimes resolved using the LDO’s current historic preservation controls. Houses set too far back from the street can also be visually disharmonious along Haddonfield major streets outside the historic district. The Committee was concerned that the current LDO did not provide adequate controls for this issue, even in the historic district.

The Committee recommended further study of minimum and maximum front yard setbacks along Haddonfield’s main streets in the “visual corridors” identified in the Carter Van Dyke report, which is in an appendix to the Borough’s Historic Preservation Plan. The Committee also agreed that the side yard setback is an important tool for ensuring residential compatibility. The Committee analyzed existing front, side, and rear yard setbacks from Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and then field-verified the data. They learned that there is a great variety of actual setbacks in the current zoning districts, and recommended a series of new setback requirements based on their data and the newly proposed lot size dimensions. The following chart indicates the proposed new yard setbacks, which would help ensure compatibility of future residential design.

**PROPOSED MINIMUM SETBACK (Suggested)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Zone</th>
<th>Principal Bldg.</th>
<th>Accessory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>One Side</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>100'</td>
<td>30'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>40'</td>
<td>18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>18'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>35'</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>30'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-8</td>
<td>20'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-9</td>
<td>5'</td>
<td>10'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>25'</td>
<td>25'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-11</td>
<td>15'</td>
<td>15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-O*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Same as underlying zone.
One type of recurring request at the Zoning Board is for house additions that exceed the zoning districts minimum side or rear yard setback, but do not extend any further than other parts of the house that already exceed the setback. The Committee recommended that the LDO’s current requirements for setback conformity be maintained, i.e. maintaining the LDO requirement for all additions or new construction. It also was recommended that the LDO’s historic district provisions should be strengthened to ensure that common street setbacks are maintained (see recommended amendment to LDO Section 304.H, in appendix). Deviations of front yard setback regulations to encourage the (re)building of front porches, a traditional Haddonfield residential form, were also evaluated. (see Chapter D) The Committee could not come to any conclusion regarding the LDO’s current ten foot setback for accessory structures in Section 304.F; it was agreed that this issue should be revisited in the future.

d. Building Cover and Floor Area Ratio
Regulating built height and setbacks will provide some degree of compatibility in residential building. However, without additional coverage controls, houses could be constructed to the maximum limit of the building envelope. In order to protect neighborhood green space and maintain traditional building scales, the Haddonfield LDO also includes building coverage ratio maximum thresholds. A building coverage ratio is the sum of the area of all structures on a lot divided by the lot area. Building coverage includes the square footage of finished first floors, enclosed porches, open porches, decks, canopies, attached garages, guest houses, and other minor structures.

The Committee evaluated the compatibility of the LDO’s building coverage ratios to actual existing ratios from computerized tax assessment records. The LDO’s current building coverage ratios range from 20% to 35%. The data revealed significant differences between actual conditions and the LDO. These differences would allow for much greater building coverage than those already found in most of the Borough’s neighborhoods. Larger coverage areas also translate into bigger building volumes (often referred to as mansionizing). Revised building coverage ratios were re-calibrated for the newly proposed zones using typical and minimum lot areas and the proposed setback requirements. These were then compared to existing conditions and information on recent building trends for home additions. The following chart indicates the proposed building coverage ratios for the newly proposed zones based upon the Committee’s findings:
PROPOSED MAXIMUM BUILDING COVERAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Zone</th>
<th>% Bldg Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-8</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-11</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-O*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Same as underlying zone.

The Committee also evaluated whether Floor Area Ratios (FARs) could be used to manage building scale in the residential districts. A property’s FAR equals the total floor area of all structures on a lot divided by the total lot area. For example, a two-story home with a total floor area of 2,500 square feet on a 10,000 square foot lot has a FAR of 0.25. Floor area ratio is a legal method of controlling floor area and volume for residential and non-residential uses. It is frequently used in controlling the volumes of office building and other non-residential structures in cities and modern suburban developments.

FARs were computed for each property using tax assessment data on the square footage of finished first floors, finished upper floors, finished half floors, finished attics, unfinished areas excluding any basements, enclosed porches, and attached garages. The Committee found that FARs were generally higher in the village core and decreased the further the lot was located from downtown. If Haddonfield were to apply FAR thresholds, FAR measurements would need to be consistently determined and include closets, stairwells, foyers, halls, and other miscellaneous areas. The use of FAR thresholds, therefore, might require each applicant to use an architect to measure, calculate, and attest to each home’s floor area ratio for each development application.

The Committee thought that FARs would be a good way to limit non-residential development or new suburban development, where property owners had better access to necessary architectural data. The adoption of FAR regulations for existing single-family houses and new additions in Haddonfield, however, would be too cumbersome, at this time. Therefore, no FAR standards were developed for any of the newly proposed single-family detached residential zones. Should the proposed bulk regulation amendments to the Land Development Ordinance prove inadequate, the Committee agreed that further exploration of FAR regulation should
be considered in the future. The existing FAR requirements for the Haddonfield Mews and the Haddonfield Commons multi-family housing complexes were recommended to be left intact.

4. Non-Conforming and Conditional Uses and Structures
   a. Existing Land Use Patterns
   Four current zoning districts (R1, R2, R3, and R4) represent the bulk of the Borough’s residential zoning districts and permit only single family detached homes. The R-5 zone includes all of the townhouse units and open space in the Haddonfield Mews, while the R-6 zone contains both mid-rise and townhouse units associated with the Haddonfield Commons. The Existing Land Use analysis, done as part of the Study, did find a variety of non-conforming uses in several residential zoning districts. The most common non-conforming use is single family semi-detached housing (or twin houses). These units were found throughout the older parts of the Borough, especially The Hills section, the side streets off Washington Avenue, north of West Surmit Avenue, along Euclid Avenue, Lee Avenue, and in the upper Estaugh Avenue area. There are approximately 260 twin structures that account for 7% of the Borough’s total residential structures. Some of these twin structures have also been converted to multi-family dwellings.

Duplexes and triplexes were the second most common non-conforming use. A comparison of 1986 and 1995 listings of apartments indicated that the number of these low density multi-family structures had decreased (from 60 to 27). These units continue to be prevalent in the older parts of the Borough with larger scale homes in locations similar to those with twin units. Additional concentrations are also found in the older parts of West Haddonfield and some of these uses are scattered. The Borough’s tax assessment records, however, record approximately 167 former two and three unit apartment structures and approximately 18 deconverted more than 3 unit apartment structures in Haddonfield, typically in larger homes that at one time converted for multiple occupancy. These former multi-family properties represented approximately 5% of the Borough’s total residential unit total and is a testament to Haddonfield’s success in rebuilding its older single-family home neighborhoods. Two major structures, at Kings Highway and Potter Street and at Kings Highway and Linden Avenues, were built as apartment buildings at the beginning of the century.

Far less common are rowhouses. There are only a handful of rowhouse groups in Haddonfield: Clement and Centre Streets and Fowler Avenue. There are also 41 townhouses at the Haddonfield Mews and several others in the smaller building at the Haddonfield Commons. There are also “dormitory” uses at Bancroft School and the Haddonfield Presbyterian Home. Two former convents, Christ the King and Saint Mary’s of the Angels, are no longer used as residential structures. In 1998, a 48 unit senior citizen apartment structure was also approved as a conditional use for Lincoln Avenue opposite Park Avenue. Most multi-family uses are in the center
of the Borough, either in the Lincoln Avenue area, Kings Highway at Potter Street, or in the vicinity of the PATCO High Speed Line Station.

Most of the commercial buildings with a residential design are located in the R-O District. However, there are four properties on lower Grove Street, three on East King’s Highway, and one on upper Potter Street that are not included in this mixed use zone. Another Haddonfield residential anomaly is the occupied carriage houses and “in-law suites” found primarily along Warwick Road, lower West End Avenue, and Linden Avenue. In 1996, there were 19 such uses in the Borough. There is also a 9 room bed and breakfast inn on West End Avenue, at the site of a former boarding house.

The largest non-conforming uses, in terms of land area, are the public and private schools, churches, and cemeteries situated throughout the Borough’s older neighborhoods. Both public schools and cemeteries are not permitted uses in most zones in Haddonfield, while private schools and houses of worship are conditionally permitted in some of the traditionally non-residential districts. None of the existing single-family residential zoning districts contain any conditional uses, except for one zone, which allows for senior citizen housing on 1.5 acre lots. No changes were recommended to permit additional conditional uses in the newly proposed single family residential zones.

Home occupation and home office uses are permitted accessory uses and are distributed throughout the Borough. There does not appear to be any significant problems with these types of uses in general, although site specific disturbances do arise every so often. The Committee recommended, however, that the LDO be amended to classify these uses as ancillary uses, not accessory uses. Residential uses are permitted above ground floor commercial and office uses in the CBD and Office zones, and single family detached dwellings are also permitted in the Commercial and Office zones. This situation also appears to work harmoniously. The LDO should, however, be amended to specify that only one permitted principal use or conditionally permitted use may be permitted per tax parcel, unless otherwise specified. This will resolve some ambiguity in the current LDO.

b. Non Single-Family Detached Housing

As discussed above, the Existing Land Use Map prepared for the study indicated that there are a significant number of single-family semi-detached (twin) houses, duplexes, and other multi-family homes in the Borough. Most of the twin homes were built in the central historic neighborhoods before World War II, and tended to blend in with the surrounding, predominantly single-family neighborhoods. Duplexes and other multi-family (three- or more) homes had a larger range within Haddonfield and tended to be located in former single-family detached homes. The Committee concluded that these three- or more unit multi-family properties tend to have greater amounts of impervious coverage, automobiles and other incompatible features and may detract from neighboring single-family properties.
The Committee evaluated whether these types of non-traditional housing units should be permitted or conditionally permitted in the newly proposed residential zones. It was determined that Haddonfield has a sufficient mix of apartments in the downtown area in established apartment buildings and more than enough opportunities for downtown housing above stores, shops, and offices in the CBD, Office, and Residential-Office districts and that additional multi-family housing opportunities should not be encouraged. Due to the large number of townhouses and single-family semi-detached homes on portions of streets in the oldest part of the Borough, single-family semi-detached homes were recommended as a conditional use in one of the newly proposed zoning districts where these uses are common (see recommended amendment to LDO Section 307.C.10, in appendix). The Committee also recognized that further study would be required relating to the expansion of areas where the construction of single-family semi-detached homes may be permitted.

Currently, the LDC limits housing in Haddonfield to “families,” however, families are not defined. In order to recognize current court decisions regarding family and non-family households, the LDO should be amended to include and define families to comport with state law. The issue of creating accessory dwelling units for alternative living for older family members and non-family members was also discussed. Accessory and alternative-style dwelling units were not recommended in established single-family detached neighborhoods. Fewer than 20 carriagehouse or in-law suite homes were identified, many of which were on larger lots that can fit two families per tax parcel. It was recommended that future accessory living areas for older family members should be constructed as part of a standard house addition within the confines of the zoning ordinance. This would allow for the addition of extra bedrooms, bathrooms, and living areas, but not kitchens, which would create a separate dwelling unit.

c. Land Use Considerations
There appear to be several areas where non-conforming uses are so prevalent and characteristic that the Borough should consider amending the LDO’s land use provisions to reflect those uses and local conditions.

- Portions of the oldest residential streets outside the downtown, such as Walnut, Centre, Potter, Ellis, Colonial, Lake, etc., have a high number of historic single-family semi-detached and attached dwellings. The LDO should be amended to allow for their continuation and the construction of new single-family semi-detached dwellings as a conditional use. Because townhouse (single-family attached) uses are uncommon outside the Mews and Commons developments, amending the ordinance to encourage the development of new townhouses and rowhouses is not recommended.
• Bancroft School is included in a single-family detached residential district, although it is unlikely that it will be converted to such uses in the future. Currently, this pre-existing non-conforming use must apply to the Zoning Board of Adjustment whenever any changes to the site are proposed. This century old use has experienced significant growth and change over the past few decades and has adversely impacted nearby residential areas. The Borough should begin a process wherein the Borough moves to document existing uses and conditions at the Bancroft site, and to establish standards acceptable to the Borough for the Bancroft site (Block 13, Lot 25 & Block 14, Lot 2). Bancroft should be invited to participate in this process. Any campus plan by Bancroft must address the school’s current and potential adverse impacts on nearby single-family and other residential uses as well as the Borough as a whole, and demonstrate how the school will ameliorate any such adverse impacts.

• Three parcels north of the Haddonfield Commons in the R-6 zone are occupied by two commercial properties and the parking lot of a tavern in adjacent Haddon Township. They should be included in the Borough’s Commercial zone.

• Currently, the mixed use properties on Haddon Avenue between Mount Vernon and Redman Avenues are in the CBD zone. The Borough should consider R-O zoning for these properties, which would maintain the existing residential character of this portion of Haddon Avenue and stabilize property values on the rest of the block, which is also now zoned R-O.

• The existing zoning regulations for the R-5 (Haddonfield Mews) and the F-6 (Haddonfield Commons) zones allow for the development of single-family detached homes. Such new homes would be completely out of character with the existing development patterns in these established areas: both properties are completely developed, and the Commons area is surrounded by a commercial district. The new zoning district amendments should be drawn to contain the current limits of these two properties and re-written to prohibit new single-family housing.

d. **Restoration, Discontinuation, and Abandonment of Non-Conforming Uses**
The LDO should contain a clause indicating that any non-conforming building, structure, or use which has been condemned or damaged by fire, explosion, flood, windstorm, or other act of nature shall be permitted to be reconstructed, without a variance, provided the damage does not exceed fifty percent (50%) of the value of replacing the entire structure, provided the reconstruction does not exceed the height, area, and volume of the original structure, and further provided the reconstruction is completed within a specified timeframe.

With respect to discontinuation and abandonment, the LDO should indicate that a non-conforming use involving land, buildings, or structures shall be presumed abandoned if said use is terminated by the owner, or if there is a discontinuance of the use for a period of time as may be acceptable in law.
e. **Recommended Residential Land Use Provisions**

The following chart contains recommended permitted and conditional residential land uses for proposed eleven new residential zones and three other existing business zones where residential uses are permitted:

**PROPOSED PERMITTED AND CONDITIONAL USES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Zone</th>
<th>Single Family Detached</th>
<th>Single Family Semi-Detached</th>
<th>Townhouses</th>
<th>Multi-family</th>
<th>Non-Residential w/Second Floor Housing</th>
<th>Senior Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Conditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-8</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-9</td>
<td>Permitted Conditional</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-O*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial**</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office**</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Permitted</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Same as underlying district.

** Single-family uses based on R-9 standards.

n.b. Public parks, playgrounds, recreation areas, and municipal uses are permitted in all zones. Home occupations/offices are permitted accessory uses in all zones.

5. **Stormwater Management and Open Space**

Effective stormwater management is a serious concern in Haddonfield. Much of the Borough, however, was developed before the 1970s when this issue became a popular environmental concern. Prior to that time, most developments in Haddonfield and elsewhere simply discharged stormwater water runoff to the street or a nearby stream. Today, most development is constructed to provide for sufficient storage of stormwater during a storm event and to allow for water quality discharge to a stream or infiltration to replenish the aquifer.
In Haddonfield, stormwater management is important because some neighborhood areas were built on filled wetlands, such as portions of West Haddonfield, while others were built on hills and in valleys. Streets and basements in low-lying areas tend to flood during major storms. Discharged water also carries silt and non-point source pollution into the Cooper River and Newton Creek. This threatens their environmental quality and, in-turn, the quality of life for all living things in the Borough and throughout those watersheds.

The greater the amount of impervious coverage for buildings, roads, driveways, patios, sheds, etc., the greater the amount of stormwater runoff and the lesser chance for groundwater recharge. In a natural wooded condition of approximately 0% impervious coverage, about 10% of stormwater can be expected to be run-off. The remaining 90% of stormwater is divided between 40% recycled as evaporation and transpiration and 50% ground infiltration. The three largest residential zones in Haddonfield have an average impervious rate of about 35 to 40%. This degree of building and paving coverage increases run-off to about 30%. Evaporation-transpiration rates are reduced to 35% and the ground infiltration to only 35%. Deep infiltration for aquifer recharge is similarly reduced from roughly 25% of total stormwater in natural conditions to only 15% under the current Borough impervious cover thresholds. The loss of deep infiltration through increase paving and impervious coverage also threatens local groundwater supply for future generations.

Because Haddonfield is an almost fully developed community, additional impervious coverage for new streets is unlikely. Major stormwater management concerns, however, remain for private drainage and runoff from existing structures, driveway and patio/deck paving and other improvements. The Borough should address stormwater management issues by requiring that any new development applications that increase impervious coverage have a 0% increase in stormwater runoff for a 100 year storm event. This should typically result in a homeowner connecting his roof downspouts to French drains providing direct (nearly 100%) infiltration from the buildings.

The Borough should consider amending the LDO to require all construction permits to be reviewed by the Borough Construction Official and/or Municipal Engineer to determine whether a topography and grading plan with drainage calculations should also be submitted for review and approval. Such reviews should be required when:

- the proposed construction will result in alteration of existing topographic conditions or obstruct existing stormwater flow patterns,
- the proposed building improvements are permanent and placed directly on the ground or on a continuous foundation wall, and/or
- the improvement is a new in-ground pool, patio, driveway, or other impervious surface.
The construction official or municipal engineer should evaluate the proposed improvements to determine whether:

- the improvement will have the potential to obstruct stormwater flow patterns on site or on adjacent properties,
- the improvement will have potential to direct overland stormwater flow, roof drain system or sump discharge onto adjacent properties,
- Apparent storm drainage problems exist in the surrounding area, or
- The site is a low area, which is to be filled or partially filled.

If any of these issues are answered in the affirmative, the applicant should be required to submit a revise topographic and grading plan with calculations which result in zero increased runoff for the 100 year storm design event. In the case where an existing structure is demolished and a new one to be built, credit should be given for the impervious coverage of the former structure. Engineers can design a variety of ways to control storm water, including French drains, swales, ponds, and underground retention. Whatever system is used should be integrated into the property’s landscaping plan.

The issue of public and private open space is also important to urban villages where people live close together. In Haddonfield, many of the recent residential design controversies included the appreciable loss of green space. Some communities, such as Evesham Township, have minimum green space ratios along with their standard impervious coverage ratios. The Committee determined that amending the LDO to include a minimum green or open space ratio, along with a maximum impervious coverage ratio, would be redundant. They also decided that the definition of impervious coverage should also be amended to include any inorganic paving material, regardless of void ratios, which may be blocked up or re-paved in the future.

The Committee developed typical driveway, walkway, patio, and other paved surface coverages for average house lots in the newly proposed zoning districts, and found that the existing LDO impervious coverage ratios would exceed estimated paving projections. After new impervious coverage ratios were developed and then compared with existing development patterns, the new ratios provided for more green space than that previously required under the LDO. The following chart includes recommended maximum impervious coverage for the proposed zoning plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed ImperVIOUS Coverages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-O*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Same as underlying zone.
D. DESIGN ISSUES

1. Corner, Flag, Curved, Odd-Shaped and Double-Fronted Lots
There are numerous residentially developed lots in Haddonfield that are atypical due to their location. These include corner lots and odd-shaped (non-rectilinear) lots, which have been created to follow the existing street patterns in the Borough. Other atypical lots also include curvilinear lots, those on cul-de-sacs, and double-fronted lots. The LDO contains several provisions to encourage standard, rectilinear development. These include:

- Lot lines should be at right angles to street lines or radial thereto, wherever practical. (503.C.4.) This design standard minimizes irregular or jogged side lot lines.

- In order to maintain privacy and the character of existing neighborhoods, lots must be oriented so that side yards adjoin other side yards, and rear yards adjoin other rear yards. In the case of corner lots, the one rear yard is allowed to adjoin the side yard of an adjacent lot (Section 503.C.8.) This design standard is meant to discourage flag lots, but does not specifically prohibit them.

- The definitions of lot frontage and width (Section 204) specify that the minimum lot width is to be maintained. The minimum lot frontage of curved lots shall not be less than 75% of the lot width. This standard adequately addresses curved frontage and cul-de-sac lots. An alternative definition could define frontage as measured along an arc drawn parallel to the front setback line. This definition would be easier to delineate and manage.

- The definitions (Section 204) prescribe that at least one street frontage of a corner lot is to meet the required minimum lot frontage requirement. The LDO should be amended to specify that this street frontage should correlate with the property address, as currently implied by the LDO. It also states that corner lots shall have two front yards and two side yards, with at least one of the side yards meeting the rear yard requirement. This requirement places a serious burden on property owners, whose lots already experienced limited privacy opportunities with two front yards and front yard setback obligations. Approval for setback variances for corner lots can be readily argued, due to their unique location (see page 17). The ordinance should be amended to provide greater flexibility and reduce the burden of the Zoning Board, i.e. by requiring only two side yard setbacks.

The Borough should amend the LDO to specifically define and prohibit flag lots and double-fronted lots, which tend to blur the quiet enjoyment and privacy of abutting neighbors who lose common side and rear yards in a traditional neighborhood.
setting. Similarly, the LDO should be amended to prohibit the use of private easements and lanes to access properties otherwise inaccessible from a public street, but where they are established, they should be built to New Jersey Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) and other Borough standards, in order to provide safe and sufficient access for emergency vehicles, waste disposal vehicles, and other typical traffic demands.

2. Outdoor Living: Porches, Decks and Patios
More and more people are making the most of their front, back, and side yards for outdoor living. This is evidenced by the recent popularity of rear decks and patios in Haddonfield. Many homes, particularly those built before 1945, have or had open front porches. Some neighborhoods in Haddonfield have also seen a moderate rise in front porch rebuilding and a reduction of an earlier trend of enclosing front porches. The Study used Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps to analyze front yard setbacks and the predominance of front porches. The Study and the available literature note that open front porches are important community design elements that contributed to architectural compatibility, as well as neighborhood interaction. By spending time outdoors on a front porch, neighbors get to see and know each other, reinforcing community stability and security. Open front porches also increase a home’s living space in three seasons of the year.

The Committee concluded that the Borough should amend the LDO to encourage the development of open front porches. One Study recommendation is to permit open front porches to exceed the front yard setback, as long as a minimum setback threshold is maintained. This issue, however, requires further study before a final specific LDO amendment recommendation can be made. This exception, however, would not be allowed for enclosed porches, or the building of enclosed living spaces above or around a front porch. Open porch areas would be included in the total impervious coverage ratio formula, but not the building coverage formula. No recommendations were made regarding the erection of open side porches. The LDO should also be amended to clarify whether front porch steps and house steps are included in the front yard setback requirements.

The Committee also determined that the LDO should be amended to change the words “hard surface coverage” to “impervious coverage” and to include all decks, pools, and other paved areas in the calculation of impervious surfaces. The LDO should be amended to clarify that above-ground patios, decks, and pools are structures requiring minimum setback controls. Decks and above-ground patios attached to a dwelling should be required to meet the principal structure setback standards. Grade level and flush to the ground patios and walkways, however, should not be considered structures and not be required to meet setback requirements.
3. **Automobile Living: Garages and Driveways**

Much of the Borough of Haddonfield was designed either before the invention of the automobile or before it became as popular as it is today. Automobile culture and its impact on residential development are now ubiquitous, manifested in paved roads, concrete curbing, paved driveways, on- and off-street parking, attached garages and carports, and detached garages, some of which were formerly used for horses and carriages. Planning for residential neighborhoods, therefore, must also involve planning for automobiles.

The New Jersey Residential Site Improvement Standards (RSIS) now supersede the Borough’s residential parking allocation and design standards, as well as street and sidewalk design. For the most part, the Borough’s standards are consistent with the new state standards. Residential parking allocations under the RSIS are now a function of the number of bedrooms in a proposed residential unit. For example, two bedroom units require 1.5 stalls, while five bedroom units require 3.0 stalls. Off-street parking stalls must measure at least 9 by 18 feet.

The RSIS does not specify the width or construction methods for driveways, so the Borough’s 9 foot wide paved driveway standard remains in effect. The Study recommends that the LDO be amended to require a 3 foot wide green space separation between paved driveways and the side lot line. This separation would enable a passenger to leave a vehicle without walking on a neighbor’s property. It would also mitigate potential stormwater runoff issues between residential properties. Driveways, regardless of construction materials, should also be counted as impervious areas because it can be assumed that they eventually will be paved.

The LDO specifies that no off-street parking shall occur between a building’s actual setback line and a street (Section 503.J.2.g.). However, a few property owners have constructed vehicular circulation loops and a second curb cut in their front yards, in addition to having side parking areas. This practice breaks up Haddonfield’s traditional pattern of grass lawns and side driveways. The LDO should be amended to prohibit front circular drives and permit only one curb cut for a driveway along the side lot line. If property owners align their driveways adjacent to each other, the result can also provide wider lawn expanses, which benefits the individual owners and the community in general. Limiting curb cuts to one per lot and requiring side driveways will also enhance traffic safety and, in many cases, decrease total impervious coverage.

The predominant garage pattern in the Borough is a freestanding garage structure built behind and to the rear of the house. Recent new garage construction in Haddonfield, and neighboring communities, tends to place garage doors on the same setback line as the house front door. The LDO classifies freestanding garages located least 10 feet from the house, as accessory structures with shorter setback requirements. Otherwise, the building must meet the same setback requirements as the house. In zones where the lot width may allow, the preferred attached
garage location may be on the side of the house, set back at least 10 feet from the house’s front setback. The Committee determined that the preferred garage door location for attached garages would be to the side yard so as to maintain the Borough’s traditional streetscape pattern.

4. **Architecturally Compatible Design**

The Committee also discussed local concerns about the appearance of the materials and designs of new construction. Recent building alterations have used texturized stucco finishes with contemporary features on houses in neighborhoods of two-story colonial revival style horizontal sided homes. While this architectural design issue is of great concern and can be regulated in the historic district, there are currently no such architectural design regulations outside the historic district.

Several architectural design issues were evaluated for each study unit to determine whether they were of such substantial significance as to warrant special zoning controls, like those used in the historic district. These design issues included: façade profile and type; porch location and type; roof gable orientation and type; and garage location and type. The Committee reviewed whether property subgroups had a definitive rhythm of structures, and if a neighborhood consisted of a common house form or style. Many of the neighborhood study units did have a perceptible rhythm of houses, side yards, and driveways, but none as static or obviously calculated as to require new zoning regulations beyond typical setback requirements. Roof overhangs, such as eaves, cornices, gutters, etc., that extend less than two feet beyond a building’s outermost vertical plane surface should be considered necessary architectural design elements and not required to meet setback requirements.

Similarly, there were a variety of architectural styles, gable orientations, and façade profiles throughout the neighborhoods. While some streets did have definite similarities, these similarities did not extend to any larger area to the extent that new architectural design zones other than those proposed in the Borough’s recent Historic Preservation Plan would be required. The Committee discussed current residential designs outside the historic district that have used stucco and other non-traditional building materials and forms, but they realized, however, that architectural design styles had changed remarkable over the past 300 years and that such patterns of change are an integral part of that which makes Haddonfield a unique community.

It was agreed that most of the neighborhood study units where architectural design issues are important are already included in the historic district or in those areas recommended for inclusion in the expanded historic district. It was also agreed that the design of homes along the Borough’s main, or high, streets is a significant issue. These streets include Kings Highway, Chews Landing Road, Warwick Road, and Washington Avenue. These areas were also identified in the Carter Van Dyke Historic Preservation Report as special areas. Upon closer examination, it was
determined that the greatest unifying factor in these areas was front yard setbacks and landscaping in the right of way, particularly shade trees and tree canopies. The Study recommended maintaining the minimum setback requirements, ensuring consistency in lot frontages, and increased attention to shade tree preservation and enhancement on the Borough's main streets and major collectors. Additional study of design controls at the Borough gateways was also recommended by the Study.
E. COMPARISON TO OTHER JURISDICTIONS:

As part of this plan, residential land use development and zoning patterns in adjacent municipalities were reviewed for their compatibility with those in Haddonfield. None were found to have incompatible land use patterns or zoning plans that would adversely impact existing residential development in Haddonfield. Other issues, such as traffic congestion, urban decay, and suburban sprawl, were identified as regional problems that must be addressed if the vitality and high level of quality of life are to be maintained in Haddonfield. They were also found to be compatible with the Master Plan’s housing and residential land use goals and objectives proposed in this element. All of the following municipalities are, like Haddonfield, also fully developed communities that have only experienced minor changes in the past five years:

1. **Cherry Hill Township**: The majority of the Borough’s northern and eastern border is along the Cooper River, which is primarily publicly owned park land. Low density residential neighborhoods flank the river, with only minor exceptions for the garden apartments at Kings Highway and a mixed use district in Batesville. The county park and the adjacent Croft Farm open space form a natural greenway corridor along the Cooper River. It is a major benefit to Borough residents significantly increasing the local quality of life. Park land, medium density residential, and mixed use development in Haddonfield is quite similar to that along the border in Cherry Hill. No major changes have occurred in the past five years other than the development of a handicapped accessible County park at Evans Pond, the conversion of the old Croft Farm into a cultural arts center, and the conversion of the key tenant at the Brace Road shopping center from a K-Mart retail store to a Giant supermarket. Existing land use and zoning plans are not in conflict with those in Haddonfield.

2. **Tavistock Borough**: Tavistock is a small community of a handful of homes built around a golf country club on the southern end of Haddonfield. No major land changes have occurred or are anticipated in Tavistock. Existing land use and zoning plans are complimentary to Haddonfield’s adjacent very low density residential area on Lane of Acres.

3. **Barrington Borough**: The existing low density land uses and zoning plan in Barrington are compatible with those adjacent in Haddonfield. No major land changes have occurred or are anticipated. Proposed zoning changes are compatible with adjacent residential uses in Haddonfield.

4. **Haddon Heights Borough**: The existing low density land uses and zoning plan in Haddon Heights are compatible with those adjacent in Haddonfield.
No major land changes have occurred or are anticipated. Proposed zoning changes are compatible with adjacent residential uses in Haddonfield.

5. **Haddon Township**: Low density residential development and zoning districts in the Haddonleigh, Crystal Lake, and Westmont neighborhoods are compatible with those in adjacent Haddonfield, as are the business uses along Haddon Avenue. The former Township pumping station on Coles Mills has been developed as a low-rise senior citizen apartment building. The open space on this tract has the potential to be tied into the County Park system. No significant impact to adjacent low density residential uses in Haddonfield is anticipated other than traffic impacts on this steep and narrow County Road. Proposed zoning changes in the Township’s new Master Plan are compatible with adjacent residential uses in Haddonfield.

Haddonfield is located within the Camden Metropolitan Planning Area on the State Plan for Development and Redevelopment because of its proximity to that central city and its fully-developed and older suburban community character. It is similarly identified in the Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission’s 2020 Plan. The proposed goals and objectives in this master plan element are compatible with these regional plans and those for future development and redevelopment in the above adjacent Camden County municipalities.

The Borough is one of a series of suburban towns located on major roadways into Camden City. Local residents and businesses frequently travel among these separate municipalities to work, shop, and play. The economic vitality and quality of life in the Haddonfield area is therefore linked to that of the Borough’s environs. Other links have been formed through the County Park system and mass transit. Recently, the Borough has developed cooperative relationships with a number of neighboring towns to share municipal services.
F. CONCLUSION

The Study undertaken as part of the development of this plan identified that there were several problems with the existing LDO that warranted attention. Most of these problems were minor in nature and simply required amendments to address issues that had arisen since the Ordinance was last revised in the early 1990s. Other findings recommended substantial revisions to the area, bulk, and coverage requirements of the zoning districts and district boundaries.

The Study found that under the current Land Development Ordinance provisions, approximately only 41% of the Borough’s roughly 4,000 residentially zoned properties were conforming to their respective lot size zoning requirements. Even more non-conformity was found when figures were also computed for lot coverage and other zoning requirements. Clearly, an Ordinance should provide for a higher degree of conformity for existing development, while allowing for a moderate amount of irregularities and future subdivision. It is estimated that the existing Ordinance may allow about 82 new lots on 66 subdivisions. Most of the uses in the Borough’s residential areas were conforming to those permitted by the LDO. Irregularities were primarily concentrated in the downtown area. No significant land use changes were recommended other than allowing semi-detached homes are a conditional use in one downtown residential zone.

The proposed new 11 residential zoning districts were designed by the Committee to provide for a wide range of residential development patterns that would permit a higher degree of lot size and bulk conformity and allow compatible future subdivision. It is estimated that the proposed LDO amendments would provide for 64% conformity in terms of lot frontage, depth, and area. As many as 70 new homes on about 62 potentially subdividerable lots could be generated by the proposed changes. Most of these subdivisions would require demolition of the existing house on the lot. About 18 of the total number of 62 possible subdivisions are in the historic district.

The following chart provides a description of the recommended lot size, bulk, and other basic zoning district requirements for the Borough’s residential zoning districts. The Proposed Zoning Map dated ________ illustrating the basic residential zoning district boundaries and the downtown office overlay districts is found in the appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Frontage (ft)</th>
<th>Rear (ft)</th>
<th>One-Side Combined</th>
<th>Height (ft)</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table represents a portion of the data for residential zones with varying frontage, rear, and density requirements. The table continues with similar entries for additional zones and requirements.
APPENDIX

1. Study Methodology

The Study focused on several questions regarding the Borough's residential zoning regulations and whether they encourage development, building additions, and redevelopment that was compatible with existing residential neighborhoods. Some of those questions included:

Lot Area Issues:
• Are there neighborhoods where existing lot areas differ significantly from current lot area requirements?

• If so, what types of residential zones should be created?

Bulk and Setback Issues:
• To what extent do principal structures and lots in these neighborhoods comply with current yard, width, and frontage requirements?

Coverage Issues:
• To what extent do developed lots in these various neighborhoods comply with current building and impervious coverage requirements?

• If significant differences exist, what changes should be made?

Non-Conforming Use Issues:
• Are there neighborhoods where non-conforming uses are so prevalent and characteristic that the zoning regulations should be amended to reflect those uses?

• Should separate zones be created in such cases or might it be more appropriate to permit non-traditional housing, e.g., non-single family/detached housing, as conditional uses in certain existing or newly established zones?

The Study addressed these issues in a quantitative and qualitative manner and recommended changes to the zoning regulations based upon its findings, consistent with current elements of the Borough Master Plan.

To undertake the Study, the Planning Board established a Committee comprising members of the Planning and Zoning Boards, Environmental and Historic Preservation Commissions, the Borough Administrator, and Zoning Officer. The Committee's role was to steer the process through the expected morass of statistical analysis and provide a local feel on an otherwise potentially technical
document. Originally, the project was to be undertaken by the Committee itself with guidance provided by a professional planning consultant. The Study was to include only the four primary residential zoning districts: R-1, R-2, R-3, and R-4. However, after reviewing the amount of research, statistical analysis, and fieldwork required to do a thorough study, the Committee decided to expand the role of the consultant. In addition, the Study's scope was widened to include all of the seven residential zones in the Borough including the townhouse zone (R-5), apartment house zone (R-6), and the mixed use residential residential-office zone (R-O).

The Committee and the consultant developed a set of tasks and responsibilities for completing the project. These tasks were then entered into a computerized task tracking schedule composed of a series of milepost products or research tasks, including the following:

1. Preparation of a composite tax parcel zoning map.

2. Preparation of an existing land use map for properties in the residential zones.

3. Identification of areas where non-conforming twins, duplexes, apartment buildings, vacant lot, etc. predominate.

4. Identification of "property groups" of similarly sized lots sharing common development characteristics.

5. Preparation of data tables for each property group including information on lot area, lot frontage, finished floor area, approximate floor area ratio, and approximate impervious coverage ratio based upon computerized tax parcel data prepared by the Borough tax assessor.

6. Collection and organization of statistically complete data by property group and determination of areas of commonality to build larger groupings of like subgroups and to map these data characteristics.

7. Research of innovative zoning development standards used in other communities to protect the character of residential neighborhoods and an overall village atmosphere.

8. Completion of windshield surveys to characterize similar and dissimilar features in property groups, including massing setbacks, age of stock, porches, driveway locations, etc. and to verify existing land use map.

9. Analysis of areas of predominantly non-single family detached housing to identify features to help identify zoning regulation amendments.
10. Preparation of a new zoning map based on property group and neighborhood analyses.

11. Preparation of zoning district regulations (use, bulk standards, lot area, frontage, width, and depth) suitable for all residential zoning districts and major use types.

12. Preparation of additional standards for single-family detached residential zones including separation of principal buildings, impervious surface ratios, floor area ratios, yard requirements, permitted conditional uses, and other appropriate innovative regulations.

Several residentially zoned parcels, however, were excluded from the analysis due to their anomalous nature. These included all public and private schools, the old Lincoln Avenue School, the Presbyterian Home on Warwick Road, and the Old Convent site on Kings Highway, public parks, churches, and cemeteries. The remaining more than 4,000 residentially zoned tax parcels were then identified on an Existing Land Use map. Land use information was taken from tax assessment data, field verified by the planner and the steering Committee, and color-coded to represent a variety of uses including:

- single-family detached dwelling
- single-family detached dwellings with occupied outbuildings
- single-family attached dwellings (twins and rowhouses)
- low-density multi-family dwellings (duplexes and triplexes)
- high-density multi-family dwellings (4 or more units per structure)
- commercial properties
- commercial and mixed use properties in an original residential structure
- public and quasi-public properties (parks, cemeteries, playgrounds, schools, churches, clubs, public buildings, etc.) and vacant land.

The Committee then decided that the first analysis of “property group” data should be taken at the most basic form of commonality, which was determined to be a “blockface”, or the group of homes that face each other on a street, generally between cross streets. The Committee identified 385 blockface study units. Statistical data from tax parcel assessment data was then generated into table and map form for each property group, including lot area, lot frontage, building coverage ratio, and approximate floor area ratio. Impervious coverage ratio could not be generated from the assessment data because there was no accurate measurement for paved surfaces. Finished floor area data was included in the floor area ratio information.

Another map was prepared to indicate concentrations of non-conforming uses. Because most of the Borough’s residential zones permit only single-family detached housing, this map identified the areas where multi-family and single-family attached units are located. Multi-family units, or properties where more than one household
lives on a single tax parcel, include duplexes, triplexes, apartment structures, and single family homes with accessory units, such as occupied carriage houses. Single-family attached units include twin units, rowhouses, and condominiums, with only one household per lot.

After studying this tabular and mapped data, the Committee consolidated the 385 blockface study units into approximately 105 larger groupings of blockfaces with similar characteristics. These groupings were based on statistical data prepared by the professional consultant, as well as intensive neighborhood analysis by Committee field teams. The Committee divided the Borough into quadrants, and each team walked, bicycled, or drove every street in their respective quadrant. Additional characteristics, such as setbacks, building design and massing, street orientation, etc., were also used by the teams to arrive at the 105 larger groupings, or subzones.

The Committee spent more time on the subzone groupings than originally anticipated. This was due to the complexity of the residential design in several Borough neighborhoods, particularly those in the northwest and southeast quadrants. In these quadrants, homes were typically built one at a time or in small groupings long before local zoning controls were in effect. Although much of the northwest quadrant had been platted at the turn of the century, subsequent resubdivision altered these neighborhoods' original streetscape design. The short blockface patterns in these neighborhoods also allowed more housing diversity than typical modern (post World War II) residential subdivision on longer streets. Post World War II neighborhoods, which are concentrated in the northeast and southwest quadrants, are relatively easier to place in subzone groupings.

The Committee believed that this extra attention to detail and confirmation of subzone groupings is critical to the success of any future rezoning efforts. By the time this task was completed, the original project completion schedule had elapsed. Through this task the Committee found that many of the identified subzones bore little resemblance to the existing zoning regulations, and that new zoning requirements would need to be drafted to reflect and thus preserve each of the Borough’s neighborhoods’ character.

While these tasks were being done, the professional consultant conducted a literature search for zoning, urban design, housing, and other planning issues that could provide guidance for the Borough. Of primary interest to the Committee was the neo-traditional planning movement, which encourages the development of mixed-use villages based on old colonial and street-car suburb towns like Haddonfield, and planned communities, such as Yorkship Village (Fairview) in Camden. The search found that very few North American communities had ever attempted to identify and preserve their unique urban design characteristics on the scale that Haddonfield had initiated. Several small towns and villages had identified core areas or major streets where community design issues were important. Most
communities used historic preservation regulations to control the scale of future development.

Although Haddonfield has preserved much of its core village design through historic preservation, the Committee's goal was to encourage or require compatibility of building and streetscape fabric outside the historic district through zoning. Most of the neo-traditional planning movement material, which had set formulae for tax parcel sizes, building envelopes, and house volumes, was developed for building new planned communities from scratch. In Haddonfield, the genie was already out of the bottle. The literature search did, however, identify that many communities were facing problems similar to Haddonfield's, such as the "teardown" phenomenon and the "mansionization" of smaller homes with commensurate impacts on impervious coverage.

The Committee was somewhat frustrated when the planning consultant informed them that the state-of-the-art method used by planners to encourage compatible design is lot averaging, or using blockface averages for building setbacks, lot widths, etc. In 1983, the New Jersey Superior Court determined, in Diller v. Borough of Haddonfield, that Haddonfield's "blockface averaging" provisions for minimum frontage zoning standards were invalid. Although Haddonfield had used this method to determine neighborhood compatibility, the court held that this practice created different bulk requirements throughout the same zoning district. Zoning district standards generally must be uniform throughout the district. The recent Study was undertaken to better identify individual neighborhood design characteristics so that blockface averaging would not be necessary. The Committee found that the use of blockface averaging was, however, critical to the implementation of the Borough's long-standing historic preservation objectives and should be used in the historic district overlay zone where streetscape cohesiveness is paramount.

The next step of the Study process involved the drafting of a recommended zoning map and zoning requirements based upon the subzone groupings. The major goal of crafting the new zoning requirements was to ensure that for a high percentage of existing structures in each new zone would be in conformance with the new requirements while allowing for a moderate degree of flexibility for changing lifestyle conditions. The Committee realized that to preserve the vitality in the village community and its appeal to a variety of demographic groups, the zoning regulations must be written to permit compatible alterations and changes of older homes to meet modern needs. One locally successful model for regulating compatible building alterations is the LDO's historic preservation guidelines. The Committee, however, understood that it would be unrealistic to require these same standards throughout the Borough, beyond the historic district. The Committee also reviewed the language of the existing LDO and prior histories of controversial development applications to determine where the LDO was unclear or could be amended to correct problems.
After five preliminary zoning district map iterations, the Committee identified a zoning plan and lot dimension requirements (minimum lot width, frontage, depth, and area) that met the Study goals. It then examined the Borough's Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps and conducted additional field research to identify bulk standard issues. These included front, rear, and side yard setbacks, impervious coverage, driveway and garage orientation, and other zoning and residential design-related issues, not included on the computerized database prepared by the Borough tax assessor. The Committee developed a series of prototypical building lots based on the proposed lot size and bulk standards to test the draft zoning amendments. After making minor adjustments, the Committee finalized the draft LDO amendments for residential development and completed its Study.

At the completion of the Study in the summer of 1998, the Committee asked its planning consultant to prepare a report, which would discuss the Study findings and make recommendations for LDO amendments and public policy initiatives. Due to the complexity of the findings and the report's recommendation to undertake a complete rezoning of the Borough's zoning plan, it was decided by the Committee that the final report should be fashioned into a Residential Land Use Plan element for the master plan.

This new element combines the traditional issues explored in master plan land use, housing, historic preservation, and urban design elements into one comprehensive element which would address residential lot sizes, bulk standards, stormwater management, compatible design, automobile circulation, and other technical issues not typically discussed in land use plans. The plan was envisioned as including the essential characteristics of residential patterns that form the "village of Haddonfield" and recommendations to ensure that the village's design and atmosphere will be preserved and enhanced through zoning.
2. **Recommended Land Development Ordinance Amendments**

a. Amend Section 204 Definitions to add or amend the following definitions to read as follows:

**Accessory Use:** A use of land of a structure or portion thereof that is incidental and subordinate and customarily supportive of the principal use to the principal use of the land or structure and located on the same lot with such principal use.

**Basement:** That portion of a building below the ground floor, unless the finished surface of the floor above the basement is (1) more than six feet above the average finished ground level around the building’s perimeter, (2) more than six feet above the finished ground level for more than fifty percent of the total building perimeter, or (3) more than twelve feet above the finished ground level at any point along the building’s perimeter.

**Blockface:** Those properties having frontage and property addresses on the same side and section of the street between a pair of cross streets.

**Coverage, impervious:** The square footage or other area measurement by which all buildings, parking lots, masonry patios, driveways, sidewalks, pools, decks, and other inorganic impervious surfaces, regardless of void ratios, upon a lot as measured in a horizontal plane.

**Family:** One or more persons occupying a dwelling unit as a single housekeeping unit, who are living together as a permanent living unit.

**Lot, corner:** A lot on the junction of land abutting two or more intersecting streets where the interior angle of the intersection does not exceed 135 degrees. Each corner lot shall have two front yards and two side yards.

**Lot, Double-fronted:** A lot which fronts on two streets, and is not a corner lot.

**Lot, Flag:** A lot whose access is from a lane narrower than the minimum lot width and whose main portion is situated behind a lot or lots that abut the right-of-way.

**Lot frontage:** The distance between the side lot lines measured along the street line. The minimum lot frontage shall be the same as the minimum lot width, except that where the frontage is curved, i.e. with a radius, the minimum lot frontage shall be measured along the arc parallel to the right of way line at the required front yard setback line. Frontage shall be determined by the property address indicated in the property identification portion of the
tax records of the Borough of Haddonfield at the time of the passage of this Ordinance.

Semi-detached single family dwelling or unit: A single family dwelling or unit on a lot which is attached to one other like dwelling or unit, also known as a twin unit or dwelling.

Setback line: A line drawn parallel with the street line or the front lot line and drawn through the point of a building or structure nearest to the street line or front lot line. Building steps, roof overhangs less than twenty-four (24) inches beyond the outermost vertical plane of a structure or wall, and patios and walkways at grade level or flush to the ground should not be counted toward any setback requirement.

Story: That portion of a building included between the upper surface of a floor and the upper surface of the floor or roof next above it. A cellar or basement shall not be considered a “story.” A half-story is that top floor of a building which is under a sloped or pitched roof where the roof creates a usable floor area beneath the roof that is smaller than the area of the story below it.

Twin unit or dwelling: see Semi-detached single family dwelling or unit.

b. Delete “Coverage, Hard Surface” in Section 204 Definitions and replace term with “Coverage, Impervious” or “Impervious coverage”, as appropriate, throughout the Ordinance.

c. Amend Section 302 to change the existing language from “dated June 1990 with a revised date of October 1993” to read “dated ______, 2000, and as amended by Ordinance”.

d. Amend Section 304.E Non-Conforming Lots to add the following sentence after the current text:

Where two (2) or more contiguous lots exist, under common ownership, with one (1) lot not conforming to ordinance requirements, the lots shall be considered as merged. Said lot(s) shall not then be conveyed absent the granting of a subdivision by the board having jurisdiction. This provision shall not apply to contiguous developed parcels held in common ownership.

e. Add Section 304.H. Front Yard Setback Exceptions, Historic District to read as follows:

Due to the importance of maintaining the unique features of the Borough’s historic district, such a “continuity of walls” and the “rhythm of spacing”
along a street,” a Certificate of Appropriateness may require a minimum or maximum front yard setback for new construction or a building alteration that is different than the underlying zone. If required, this front yard setback requirement shall be the numerical average or the most frequently occurring distance, whichever is greater, of the existing front yard setbacks of similar uses on the same blockface. In the case where there are no similar uses within the same blockface, the front yard setback shall be the numerical average, or the most frequently occurring distance, whichever is greater, of the existing front yard setbacks of all uses on the same blockface. Vacant lots shall not be included in blockface averaging computations. For the purposes of this section only, the front yard setback distance shall be measured from the right of way to the nearest portion of the structure’s facade, and shall not include porches, porticos, patios, eaves, or other open, non-livable areas on the outside portion of the structure.

f. Add Section 304.I. Abandonment of a Non-Conforming Structure, Property, or Use to read as follows:

A non-conforming structure, property, or use shall be considered abandoned: (1) if it is terminated by the owner; or (2) if a non-conforming use is discontinued or ceases for a period of at least one (1) year, for any reason. The subsequent use of the abandoned structure or property shall be in conformity with this Ordinance.

g. Add Section 304.J. Number of Structures and Uses to read as follows:

Except where specifically permitted in this Ordinance, no lot shall have erected upon it more than one (1) principal building or use.

h. Add Section 304.K. Double-frontage and Flag Lots to read as follows:

Double-fronted and flag lots shall not be permitted. Minimum lot area and yard requirements for existing double-fronted lots shall be measured from both street frontages. Minimum lot area and yard requirements for existing flag lots shall be measured from the rear lot line of the adjacent lot it is situated behind.

i. Delete Sections 305.A. to 305.G. and insert the following new paragraphs A. through L., and renumber accordingly.

A. R-1 Residential District
   1. Permitted principal uses:
      b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
      c. Municipal building or use.
2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-1 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 80,000.
      2) Minimum width: 200'.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 200'.
      4) Minimum depth: 400'.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 100'.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 30'.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 75'.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 100'.
   c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 100'.
      2) Minimum side yard: 5'.
      3) Minimum rear yard: 5'.
   d. Lot coverage:
      1) Maximum building coverage: 6%.
      2) Maximum impervious coverage: 10%.
   e. Height requirements (principal building):
      1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
      2) Maximum height: 35'.
   f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
      1) Maximum height: 18'.

B. R-2 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
   b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
   c. Municipal building or use.
2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-2 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 20,000.
      2) Minimum width: 125’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 125’.
      4) Minimum depth: 150’.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 40’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 18’.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 40’.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 60’.
   c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 40’.
      2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
      3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.
   d. Lot coverage:
      1) Maximum building coverage: 15%.
      2) Maximum impervious coverage: 21%.
   e. Height requirements (principal building):
      1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
      2) Maximum height: 35’.
   f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
      1) Maximum height: 18’.

C. R-3 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
   b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
   c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.
4. Area and yard requirements for the R-3 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 12,500.
      2) Minimum width: 100’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 100’.
      4) Minimum depth: 125’.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 35’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 10’.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 40’.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 45’.
   c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 35’.
      2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
      3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.
   d. Lot coverage:
      1) Maximum building coverage: 18%.
      2) Maximum impervious coverage: 25%.
   e. Height requirements (principal building):
      1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
      2) Maximum height: 35’.
   f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
      1) Maximum height: 18’.

D. R-4 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
   b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
   c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-4 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 9,600.
      2) Minimum width: 80’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 80’.
      4) Minimum depth: 120’.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 35’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 15’.
3) Minimum combined side yards: 35’.
4) Minimum rear yard: 45’.

c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
1) Minimum front yard: 35’.
2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.

d. Lot coverage:
1) Maximum building coverage: 20%.
2) Maximum impervious coverage: 28%.

e. Height requirements (principal building):
1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
2) Maximum height: 35’.

f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
1) Maximum height: 18’.

E. R-5 Residential District

1. Permitted principal uses:
   b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
   c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-5 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 7,500.
      2) Minimum width: 75’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 75’.
      4) Minimum depth: 100’.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 30’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 12’.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 30’.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 40’.
   c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 30’.
      2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
      3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.
   d. Lot coverage:
      1) Maximum building coverage: 20%.
      2) Maximum impervious coverage: 30%.
e. Height requirements (principal building):
   1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
   2) Maximum height: 35’.

f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
   1) Maximum height: 18’.

F. R-6 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
   a. Single family detached dwelling.
   b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
   c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-6 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 6,000.
      2) Minimum width: 60’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 60’.
      4) Minimum depth: 100’.

   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 30’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 10’.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 25’.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 40’.

   c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 30’.
      2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
      3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.

   d. Lot coverage:
      1) Maximum building coverage: 22%.
      2) Maximum impervious coverage: 35%.

   e. Height requirements (principal building):
      1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
      2) Maximum height: 35’.

   f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
      1) Maximum height: 18’.

G. R-7 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
a. Senior citizen housing.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-7 zone:
a. Lot Size:
   1) Minimum area in square feet: 5,000.
   2) Minimum width: 50’.
   3) Minimum lot frontage: 50’.
   4) Minimum depth: 100’.

b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
   1) Minimum front yard: 25’.
   2) Minimum one side yard: 10’.
   3) Minimum combined side yards: 25’.
   4) Minimum rear yard: 35’.

c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
   1) Minimum front yard: 20’.
   2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
   3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.

d. Lot coverage:
   1) Maximum building coverage: 25%.
   2) Maximum impervious coverage: 40%.
   3) Minimum green space ratio: 60%.

e. Height requirements (principal building):
   1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
   2) Maximum height: 35’.

f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
   1) Maximum height: 18’.

H. R-8 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.
3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-8 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 4,000.
      2) Minimum width: 40’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 40’.
      4) Minimum depth: 100’.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 20’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 10’.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 20’.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 25’.
   c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 20’.
      2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
      3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.
   d. Lot coverage:
      1) Maximum building coverage: 30%.
      2) Maximum impervious coverage: 50%.
   e. Height requirements (principal building):
      1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
      2) Maximum height: 35’.
   f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
      1) Maximum height: 18’.

I. R-9 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
   b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
   c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. Single family semi-detached dwelling.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-9 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 4,000.
      2) Minimum width: 40’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 40’.
      4) Minimum depth: 100’.
b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
   1) Minimum front yard: 5’.
   2) Minimum one side yard: 10’.
   3) Minimum combined side yards: 12’.
   4) Minimum rear yard: 25’.

c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
   1) Minimum front yard: 5’.
   2) Minimum side yard: 5’.
   3) Minimum rear yard: 5’.

d. Lot coverage:
   1) Maximum building coverage: 30%.
   2) Maximum impervious coverage: 50%.

e. Height requirements (principal building):
   1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
   2) Maximum height: 35’.

f. Height requirements (accessory structure):
   1) Maximum height: 18’.

J. R-10 Residential District

1. Permitted principal uses:
   a. Townhouses.
   b. Publicly owned park, playground, or recreational area.
   c. Municipal building or use.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-10 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 160,000.
      2) Minimum width: 200’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 200’.
      4) Minimum depth: 200’.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 25’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 25’.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 50’.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 25’.
   c. Yard requirements for accessory structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 25’.
      2) Minimum side yard: 25’.
      3) Minimum rear yard: 25’.
d. Lot coverage:
   1) Maximum building coverage: 30%.
   2) Maximum impervious coverage: 50%.
   3) Floor area ratio: 50%.

e. Density:
   1) 40/40,000 square feet.

f. Height requirements (principal building):
   1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5.
   2) Maximum height: 36’.

g. Height requirements (accessory structure):
   1) Maximum height: 18’.

K. R-11 Residential District
1. Permitted principal uses:
   a. Townhouses.

2. Permitted accessory uses:
   a. Accessory uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

3. Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):
   a. None.

4. Area and yard requirements for the R-11 zone:
   a. Lot Size:
      1) Minimum area in square feet: 40,000.
      2) Minimum width: 100’.
      3) Minimum lot frontage: 100’.
      4) Minimum depth: 150’.
   b. Yard requirements for principal structures:
      1) Minimum front yard: 15’.
      2) Minimum one side yard: 15’.
      3) Minimum combined side yards: 35’.
      4) Minimum rear yard: 10’.
   c. Lot coverage:
      1) Maximum building coverage: 50%.
      2) Maximum impervious coverage: 80%.
   d. Density
      1) 20/40,000 square feet.
   e. Height requirements (townhouses/apartments):
      1) Maximum number of stories: 2.5/6.
      2) Maximum height: 35’/58’.
L. **R-O Residential Office Overlay District**

1. **Statement of intent:**
   a. The intent of the Residential Office Overlay District is to maintain the residential character of certain areas adjacent to the central commercial area of the Borough of Haddonfield. Because of the proximity to the commercial area, it is appropriate to allow professional offices as a conditional use. However, such offices should be allowed only if they meet strict criteria intended to allow professional office use on sites which can bear that use without damaging the residential and historic character of the sites or the district, and to preclude such office use where the intensity would be too great or the site too small for the professional office use.

2. **Permitted principal uses:**
   a. Permitted principal uses in the R-O Residential Office Overlay District shall be in accordance with the use, area, and yard requirements of the underlying zoning district in which it is designated above.

3. **Permitted accessory uses:**
   a. Accessory structures and uses, including home occupation and home office use, which are customarily incidental to a permitted use, but not including professional offices or business offices.

4. **Conditional uses (meeting the requirements of Section 307):**
   a. Professional office and dwelling unit.
   b. House of worship.

j. **Amend Section 306.B.1.a.** to read as follows:
   Permitted principal uses in the R-4 zone district, in accordance with the area and yard regulations of that zone district.

k. **Amend Section 306.C.1.a.** to read as follows:
   Permitted principal uses in the R-7 zone district, in accordance with the area and yard regulations of that zone district.

l. **Amend Section 307.C.9.a.** to change the word “R-4” to “R-7”.

m. **Add new Section 307.C.10.** to read as follows:
   Semi-detached single family dwellings:
   Semi-detached single family dwellings, also known as “twin units”, may be erected within the R-9 zone under the following conditions:

   1. Each twin unit is to be erected on a lot with a conforming lot area and lot frontage;
2. Each twin unit property shall have equal lot frontage, depth, and lot area;
3. The new structure is to be a mirror image to its twin along the center lot line on a party wall and is to appear as if designed as one single family detached house;
4. The front entry of each unit must be symmetrically placed either in the center of the structure or along the side elevation of each unit;
5. The driveway must be placed along the side lot line;
6. Any garages or other outbuildings shall also be similarly designed and placed symmetrically on the lot;
7. Each property shall record a facade easement ensuring that the exterior front and side elevations of each twin unit and all improvement upon the properties shall be maintained to appear symmetrical to the other in size, shape, materials, texture, and color with such easement enforceable by the Zoning Officer;
8. Each twin unit property shall provide a minimum one side yard setback equal to the combined minimum side yard setback required in the zone; and
9. Twins or semi-detached single family dwellings existing at the time of the adoption of this Ordinance shall be exempt from the above conditional use requirements, other than subparagraph g., above.

n. Delete existing and replace with: Amend Section 503.C.3, to read as follows:
   When a property is listed in Section 900D of this Ordinance, the Board shall review any proposed subdivision of land and subsequent development on the newly created lot(s) for the proposed development’s impact on the physical integrity of the historic resource and of the historic district, in accordance with Section 900.

o. Add Section 503.D.5, to read as follows:
   Residential developments with three or more units per structure shall provide a centralized and screened solid waste and recycling management facility.

p. Amend Section 503.H.4.a to read as follows:
   Shade trees shall be provided on both sides of all streets by applicants at a minimum of one tree per each twenty-five feet of frontage. Tree location, landscape design, and spacing shall be included as part of the landscape plan approved by the Planning or Zoning Board.

q. Amend Section 503.I.14, to read as follows:
   All streets shall be built to Borough standards, or in accordance with the New Jersey Residential Site Improvement Standards (N.J.A.C. 5:21-1.1 et. seq., as required). Such standards shall be as published in the Borough Technical Standards and Specifications Addendum or Manual. The use of