

Meeting Minutes February 4, 2026
Joint Land Use Board
Town of Hammonton

The regular meeting of the Hammonton Joint Land Use Board was called to order this day by Chairman Olivo in the Council Chambers at approximately 7 P.M. with the announcements of the Sunshine Laws and fire exit procedure. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

PRESENT:

Ralph Capaccio
Michael Hozik
Micky Pullia
Ed Wuillermin
Philip Barbagallo
Jessie Childs
Chairman Olivo

ABSENT:

Jonathan Baske
Michael Messina
Ray Scipione
Chris Kalani

ALSO PRESENT:

Joseph McGroarty, Esq
Shelly DiChurch, Secretary
Stuart Wiser, Planner
James Sia, Eng

Chairman Olivo called for a motion to approve the January 21, 2026 meeting minutes, James Matro made the motion that was seconded by Ralph Capaccio, motion carried with all "Yes" votes from attending members except Jessie Childs who did not vote.

Zoning Board Issues

Triple Net Investments 171 N White Horse Pike and 1,30,50 Basin Rd Hammonton NJ Block 4601 lots 1,2,4,4.01,4.02

Chairman Olivo announced that per the applicant this will be postponing until March 4, 2026 to seek approval to subdivide and create 3 new tax lots from the existing lots, construct a proposed 168,560 sq ft warehouse on lot A, construct a 15,000 sq ft retail space on lot B and modify site access for lot C resulting from the subdivision.

Chairman Olivo stated a motion was needed to postpone until March 4, 2026, Ralph Capaccio made the motion that was seconded by James Matro, motion carried with all :Yes votes to postpone from attending members except Jessie Childs who did not vote.

Planning Board Issues:

Robert & Linda Tassone

212 & 214 Line St Hammonton NJ 08037 Block 2604 Lot 2&3

Applicant seeks a lot line adjustment for 2 existing non-conforming lots. Lots 2 and 3 contain existing single-family homes and are both located in the Town's Residential (R-2) Zoning District.

Chris Mullen introduced himself as the attorney representing Linda Tassone for the property 212 and 214 Line Street. Mr. Mullen stated that Mrs. Tassone seeks to move the line 10 ft at the narrow end of the lot from lot 3 to lot 2 with both lots have single family residences and the applicant resides in one. Mr. Mullen stated the other residence is currently vacant. Mr. Mullen stated there is a driveway between these 2 residences and the owner/applicant is seeking this relief to allow to pull into garage and allow turning without encroaching onto lot 2. Mr. Mullen stated that the applicant seeks this relief as she takes care of her elderly husband and allowing this access would help in the event of emergencies. Mr. Mullen stated that multiple C variances are needed some of which are pre-existing non conforming providing relief for lot size and bulk requirements. Joe McGroarty swore in Linda Tassone. Mrs. Tassone stated that she owns both Lot 2 and 3 and built her new home that she resides in 2 and a half years ago to accommodate her elderly husband with dementia to have everything on the first floor of the home and allow easier for him since the other home is much older. Joe McGroarty questioned the applicant why not doing an easement instead. Mr. Mullen stated that the applicant wanted a permanent action for her lot line adjustment request and did not want to do the easement. Stuart Wisner commented that the variance relief that was pre-existing non conforming that changes are being requested would be now making them straight up variance relief. Mr. Wisner then stressed his concerns that the applicant did not have a planner for what was being proposed not having that specific merit of planning testimony. Mr. Mullen stated that the residential use was a permitted use and the use is not changing and that this property is unique and there is not change requested to the property. Joe McGroarty stated that seeking exemptions under the rules and regulations he would agree the necessity for a planner to testify to the positive and negative criteria that is required. Mr. Mullen stated that he was willing to provide testimony for the positive and negative criteria. The board professionals again stressed the need for a Planner to the applicant and her attorney and Mr. Wisner stated that if testimony was provided now it may contradict future testimony from a Planner. Mr. Mullen consulted with his client Linda Tassone and decided that Mr. Mullen would state the positive and negative criteria for the record. Mr. Mullen stated that under the Municipal Land Use Law this application promotes the general welfare to allow the applicant to care for her husband. Mr. Mullen stated that the proposed will have no significant impact and the applicant owns both lots. Mr. Mullen stated that the positive outweighs any negative. Michael Hozik questioned if the property line was moves to the side of the driveway if will eliminate the need for variance relief. Mr. Mullen stated that they can agree as a condition of approval. It was discussed that a new plan would be necessary to view before agreed upon. Mr. Mullen agreed to postpone until March 18, 2026 to allow to have an updated plan. Joe McGroarty stated a motion to postpone until March 18, 2026 was needed, Michael Hozik made the motion that was seconded by James Matro, motion carried with all :Yes votes to postpone from attending members .

There were no Resolutions this meeting.

Chairman Olivo opened the meeting up to the public no one came forward, public portion closed.

Stuart Wisner made a Planning/Zoning presentation to the Board members. Mr. Wisner stated this presentation was previously done for the board some years ago. Mr. Wisner stated that most towns have a separate Planning and Zoning board as where Hammonton has one for both and zoning issues only allow the Zoning board members to vote and we refer to this board as Land Use Board. Mr. Wisner stated the powers of the Board include: make and approve the Master Plan, site plans, C and D variance relief and review development plans. Mr. Wisner stated that the first step is the creation of the Master Plan with the overall goal of the Master Plan being to promote public health and safety and general well being. Mr. Wisner stated the Master Plan was adopted in 2024 and the master plan has a 10 year life cycle. Stuart Wisner then went through the application process that gets submitted to the board secretary then given to ARH for a 45 day review allowance and then to the board once deemed complete. Mr. Wisner went through all the different D variances and the importance of the burden on the applicant to provide adequate proof when seeking relief from these variances as these are set with reason. Mr. Wisner stated when this variance relief is requested the board he suggested they not feel compelled to grant them and not always a hardship. Mr. Wisner stated that he has his Wisner 6 rules of Variances: 1. Developers and attorneys will stress there interpretations of the ordinance and it says what it says, if the ordinance is silent then it is not permitted. 2. Uses not specific or not included are not permitted. 3. Developers/Attorneys hate variances as they cost money and time and the board can make suggestions. 4. Witnesses will try anything to justify relief. 5. Hardship stated is not always a true hardship unless it is a property hardship relative to the area in question not the person wanting the relief. 6. Variances are not evil and the need in necessary when deviating from the allowed. Stuart Wisner closed his presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

Respectfully submitted this day of Thursday February 5, 2026 by Shelly DiChurch
