STRATFORD JOINT LAND USE BOARD MINUTES
August 27, 2026

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Paul McGovern at 6:30 pm. The Chairman led the board in the pledge of allegiance and a prayer. The public statement was read that the meeting was advertised in the Courier Post, the Collingswood Retrospect, and a notice was posted on the bulletin board at the Borough Hall stating the time and place.

ROLL CALL:

Present		Absent	
P. McGovern, Chairman	Class IV	T. Kozeniewski	(Class IV)
K. Walton	Class IV	R. St. Maur	(Class IV)
R. Bove	Class III		
T. Hall	Class IV		
S. McBride	Class I		
R. Morello	Class II		
M. Chicalo	Alternate I		
M. DiGiacomo	Alternate II		

T. Coleman, Solicitor
C. Reilly, Bach Associates
C. Bach, Bach Associates
C. Kanaplue, Bach Associates
K. Rauer, Secretary

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Motioned by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. Chicalo to approve minutes from August 27, 2026 meeting. All ayes.

NEW BUSINESS –

Walt Haas, 10 Buttonwood Road, Block 100 lot 5. Construction of 30' x 24' detached garage.

Mr. Coleman swore in Mr. Haas before asking questions regarding his application. Mr. Haas then stated his full name and address for the record. Mr. Coleman stated the Board has had an opportunity to review said application & asked Mr. Haas to present said application to the Board as if no one knew of the property by walking them through the property, where it is located, and why he is here in front of the Board. Mr. Coleman also requested Mr. Haas to state the reason(s) this variance that he is seeking should be granted. Mr. Haas went on to state he would like to build a garage in the backyard, 24 foot wide by 30 foot deep, so that when you drive a car down the driveway I can store my vehicle on the left side of the garage & store all my tools & everything else on the other side. Mr. Haas stated there is currently no garage at the residence. Mr. Coleman asked Mr. Haas if he had received & had the opportunity to review the August 24th letter from Bach Associates. (said letter is attached to the filed minutes & also the Board received a copy of) Mr. Haas stated he did. Mr. Coleman mentioned in said letter there were 3 variances that were identified. Mr. Haas agreed. Mr. Coleman mentioned there is minimum side yard setbacks & a rear yard setback. Mr. Haas was asked to give some reasons as to why he believes those regulations & zoning ordinance provisions should be relaxed for this project. Mr. Haas stated he would not have room to do anything else. He stated his yard is so

small & that is the reasoning for needing to go so close to the fence. Mr. Haas stated if he was to do the regulated 10' off the side & 5' off the back he would have to come down his driveway & make a sharp right & only be able to do a 1-car garage. Mr. Haas stated the bigger size would let him be able to do what he wanted & he would be able to drive straight down the driveway without needing to turn and have somewhere to put his tools 'in the other bay'. Mr. Coleman stated to Mr. Haas he did not know the property but if he were to go to said property were there other similarly sized houses with garages like the one he is proposing? Mr. Haas stated there are a few in the area. Mr. Coleman asked if they were detached garages in the rear yard. Mr. Haas stated detached 2 car yea. Mr. Haas stated they are not as common as the attached 1 car, stating that was an option for the houses back in the day, but yes there are a handful of them. Mr. Haas stated you were able to tell said detached 2 car garages were built after. Mr. Coleman then asked Mr. Haas that if the Board were to grant the requested variances did he feel there would be any negative impact on his neighbors or the surrounding neighborhood. Mr. Haas stated no not at all. Mr. Haas said if you could even see it from the street or maybe just part of it. Mr. Haas stated it will look very nice, it is going to match the house. Mr. Coleman asked if he was adding electric into the garage & Mr. Haas stated yes there will be electric. Mr. Coleman asked if he was adding plumbing or a bathroom. Mr. Haas stated there would be no water. Mr. Coleman asked if the garage was going to be strictly for residential no commercial business. Mr. Haas said it was not for any business it was for his own personal self. Mr. Coleman asked if there were going to be any sleeping quarters & Mr. Haas stated no.

Mr. Coleman that turned things over to Mr. Reilly to speak in reference to the Bach Associates Bulk Variance Review letter sent to the homeowner (again said letter is attached). Mr. Reilly reviewed the a couple points of note for the variances that are being requested with the Board. The max occupied area proposed is 32.9% where the allowable is 30%, and as a note the existing is 24.7. Mr. Reilly stated the number is a little skewed, and he questioned Mr. Haas for this, that he is using the existing concrete slab & a shed is being removed. Mr. Haas stated the concrete slab is going to be removed because it is not level & nothing can be added to it. Mr. Reilly stated the reason he mentioned said concrete slab is because it is not going to have that big of an impact on pervious coverage because of what he is replacing. Mr. Reilly questioned if Mr. Haas is aware of any issues with storm water run-off between his property & any of the neighbors. Mr. Haas stated no there are no issues & the drainage is really good. Mr. Reilly stated the next variance is for the accessory structure / side yard setbacks that 2' is being proposed where 10' is required, the existing concrete slab is 2' so it is an existing nonconformance that is being approved upon. The third variance is rear yard setback for the accessory structure where 4' is being proposed & 5' is the allowed. There were two additional things Mr. Reilly wanted to point out from the letter. First, the application itself showed the property as being 10,240 square feet but per the survey provided the lot is 8,790. Mr. Reilly wanted to make the Board aware the survey is what was used as far as their calculations. Second, Mr. Reilly wanted to confirm that the height of the structure will be 12' or less. Mr. Haas questioned as for the 12' is that total? Mr. Reilly stated it is to the peak. Mr. Haas questioned that it is not to the peak of the ceiling? Mr. Reilly stated no it is only to the peak. Mr. Coleman questioned Mr. Haas if he was able to comply with that. Mr. Haas stated yes he could but stated he has not even had a chance to look into getting prices of pole barns or metal buildings. He stated he did not know what rules as far as height. Mr. Reilly stated he wanted to clarify that if he went over 12' that another variance would be needed. Mr. Coleman stated he would have to come back in height was over 12'. Mr. Haas stated he hopes he doesn't go over in the allotted height but was not sure. Mr. Reilly stated he cannot go over 12' as his application stands. Mr. Reilly stated if Mr. Haas was comfortable & was going to need the additional height he can request an additional variance in front of the Board at this meeting but an exact height was needed. Mr. Haas again stated he hasn't even began the process of looking. Mr. Haas

stated if he agreed to the 12' height at this meeting he would be good. Mr. Coleman stated you would "be stuck" at the 12' height. Mr. Coleman stated if the company he goes with told him that nothing can be delivered less than a 15' height then you would have to file a whole new application & come back. Mr. Haas questioned if that would have to include reaching out to the neighbors again & Mr. Coleman stated yes that whole process again would have to be completed. Mr. Coleman stated he was sure the Board would like to complete the application at the meeting as would Mr. Haas, but for his benefit, asked him if he would like to currently pause & carry this over to next meeting so he is not 'stuck' at the 12' regulation. Mr. Haas stated that he feels since he has not even started to get prices on buildings as of yet nor does he know the height of what would be built that asked how would he be able to then proceed. Mr. Coleman stated his application would be carried over to the September meeting, he would not have to re-notice the neighbors, he would come back with all relevant information. Mr. Coleman stated it would be helpful to the Board to see exactly what is being proposed. Mr. Morello commented he feels that there is a lot of testimony that has been missed to get him for the C variance or the bulk variance. Mr. Morello feels that nothing the applicant has said would carry him for the variance. Mr. Coleman stated he is trying to elicit the right questions here to get some testimony. Mr. Walton brought up a question stating that the proposal is for a garage not a pole barn. Mr. Walton stated a garage is very different than a pole barn. Mr. Haas feels externally they are not different that they do look the same it is all just how the inside is built. Mr. Bove questioned Mr. Haas about how much height is needed to be working on cars inside the garage stating about an 8' ceiling? Mr. Haas stated he would prefer a 10' ceiling indoor but did not know what that would give as far as peak wise. Mr. Bove stated if you are talking about a 30' deep garage you would only have 2' for the total pitch stating he would make sure he has enough for runoff. Mr. Morello stated that there are certain boxes that need to be checked as far as the Board approving applications & that it is up to the applicant to provide testimony to the Board & what is legitimate under the law. Things can't just be approved because someone is a nice person or they like cars. Mr. Haas stated he received the Bach letter on Monday (August 24) via email & physically in the mail today (August 27). Mr. Haas stated he had no idea what to expect at this meeting, was unsure of what he had to say. Mr. Morello questioned any other options for the garage such as other houses in the neighborhood have attached garages, some go deeper. Mr. Morello stated that would fit better in the neighborhood. Mr. Haas made a mention of a residence about a block away from his just put up a 2-car garage, in a court over by the Sterling Arm Condos. Mr. Morello stated he was familiar with that & stated it is bumped out to the left in the driveway. Mr. Morello stated it was not in the backyard that's the difference. Mr. Morello stated his did not require anything because of the size of his lot. Mr. Haas mentioned another garage, which is exactly what he is trying to do, off of Longwood Drive. It was commented that was on Meadow Lark Road. Mr. Morello stated he knew that exact one also but again it was not in the backyard. Mr. Morello stated it was on the left side of the house & that is an older & taller garage but commented that again it is not in the backyard. Mr. Haas questioned the position of that garage being so close to his fence. Mr. Morello stated it was more straight back & not situated in the backyard. Mr. Haas stated he knows for a fact that he build said garage very close to the fence. Mr. Morello stated he does not know the exact side / rear measurements but that is older & it shouldn't be. He stated that if there is 1 that shouldn't be we don't want another that shouldn't be, and another, etc. Mr. Coleman questioned if Mr. Haas was looking to be 2' from the side yard & with running electric out to the garage is he going to be putting lights out there? Would the lights be going down? Would they be shining into the neighbor's backyard? Mr. Haas stated he does not want to disrupt any neighbors in anyway & stated he would not be out there late at night working on things. Mr. Haas stated he wanted to hear what the Board has to say because he did not know what to expect at this meeting, as far as what he can & can't do. Mr. Coleman stated he feels the Board would like to see exactly what Mr. Haas is proposing to build. Mr. Coleman feels for Mr. Haas' own benefit it

would be best if he knew how high he was looking to go because he would hate to have to see Mr. Haas come back, after he received approval, to do a whole new application for a height of another 2', 3', 4' on the garage. Mr. Coleman stated he can only help Mr. Haas to a certain degree, he is not his attorney, but it would also be inappropriate for him to guide Mr. Haas down a trail just to get testimony that Mr. Haas should already be providing. Mr. Chicalo spoke stating this room (the room the meeting takes place in) is probably 30' deep, mentioning how that is really not a garage. Mr. Chicalo feels 30' deep is a big building to be in said location. Mr. Chicalo just wanted to point out the fact that a garage for a couple of cars is one thing, but the size of 30' deep is just a large building. Mr. Chicalo feels that if it is 30' deep than 12' wide is not going to work there has to be enough for drainage. He even feels a 15'x15' with a 2' rise would even be sufficient that there is not enough slope. Mr. Chicalo stated to Mr. Haas if he was able to provide more clarity as to what that size would look like & how it is going to lay out would be a tremendous help. Mr. Walton suggested to Mr. Haas about doing an actual scale drawing to the property as well. Mr. Haas stated he did not realize he had to come in to argue or persuade a case, he figured it was black & white as to what is allowed & not allowed. He feels it is not that way & felt if he spoke differently maybe that it wouldn't be so hard. The Board all disagreed with that statement. Mr. Chicalo spoke to Mr. Haas stating if you come in & are within the variances then you are good to go. Mr. McGovern stated if you were building something that was already with in specs & the law you would be good. Mr. Morello stated than you would not need a variance. Mr. Haas stated that if he was to do with in those limits he would only be able to maybe get a tiny 1-car garage, he would have to 'swing around' to pull into it. Mr. Morello questioned if it was attached to the house? Mr. Haas stated if it was attached then he would lose part of his backyard because it is a single driveway that goes up. Mr. Bove commented about how he is very close to the neighbor's fence there. Mr. Morello stated then he would only need the 1 variance then. Mr. Coleman stated given the size & location of the structure that is all you may be able to do right? Mr. Haas stated he was going as big as he possibly could thinking if he had to go smaller he would, that he doesn't have to do the 30'x24'. Mr. Coleman stated the Board was politely telling Mr. Haas that you can't do the 30' x 24' unless you give the appropriate reasons as to why you should be granted those 3 variances. Mr. Reilly stated to Mr. Haas what he is allowed to do is stay within the setbacks, on your property, in your zone. He then stated once you go out of that zone that is when you have to ask for relief, via variance. Mr. Morello stated with the justification. Mr. Reilly agreed stating you have to justify to the Board as to why that is appropriate for your property & why is it unique for your property that it should be approved over someone else's property in the same neighborhood with the same size. Mr. Haas questioned if he does it with in those rules would he have to notify the Board? He stated if he did this within the 10' & 5' rule does he have to notify the town? Mr. Coleman stated he would then have to pull a construction permit & then at that point the construction code official would say ok well looks like you don't need any variances, show the plans & then you'd be good to go. Mr. McGovern commented that the plans would then include the height & so forth to make sure they are all good. Mr. McGovern had an additional question, based on what was marked on the survey, stating there is an arrow, which is pointing to an existing shed. Mr. McGovern questioned if the shed is going away or is it just being moved? Mr. Haas stated originally he wanted to just move the shed but if it was going to be an issue he would just get rid of it. Mr. Bove questioned if it would just be moved to the other corner & Mr. Haas stated yes. Mr. McGovern just wanted to state out another point that if the shed is going to be removed that the calculations that were made to the impervious coverage were based on that shed going away, correct? Mr. Reilly stated not necessarily, however the Board could take that into account. Mr. Reilly stated so the definition is the maximum occupied area so the shed would not be defined as a maximum occupied area. However looking from the outside in you can say it won't have an impact on the storm water, but if the shed is still there it would not show up in that table. Mr. McGovern stated that he understood, he just didn't know what that arrow

meant. Mr. Morello asked Mr. Haas if he wanted to talk things over with his mom, the property owner. Mr. Haas asked her if she had any thoughts on things & she stated that she feels he needs to downsize & get a drawing completed & see about coming to next month's meeting. Mr. Haas questioned if he was to downsize did he need to do the process again & contact the neighbors again? Mr. Coleman stated no he does not but if he wanted he was still free to proceed at the meeting. Mr. Coleman stated he was sensing that the Board has some real serious questions state he can't really say what the Board will do or not do but feels it would be in Mr. Haas's best interest to carry this to the September application. Mr. Coleman feels that the Board needs a lot more detail to be given to them. He stated that Mr. Haas needs a thought process as to how big of a structure he is wanting to build & how it is going to impact things because he is looking put a really big building 2' from his neighbors. Mr. Coleman feels the Board is concerned about the runoff & where it will be on his property & his neighbor's property. Mr. Coleman stated again that Mr. Haas needs to come back with some more justification for size of the structure, a better / firmer drawing on how high it will be & how the lights are going to be facing downward. Mr. Bove commented about the height issue too & there has to be a more clear idea of how high it is actually going to be to get the proper drainage off the roof. Mr. Haas feels he is going to downsize it & also reach out to speak to a builder & obtain more detail. Mr. Haas stated he was going as big as he comfortably wanted the structure to be on his property. He stated it was not a necessity to have such a big building but thought if he was able to get approval or not & stated he was unsure of the rules & all that go along with putting this structure up. Mr. Coleman asked the Board if they would like to grant Mr. Haas a continuance to the September meeting a motion to continue this application would be needed. Motion was made by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. Chicalo. All ayes from the Board. Mr. Reilly wanted to mention if the footprint of the building changes & set backs are altered that Mr. Haas would need to submit said information so it could be reviewed. Mr. Coleman reminded Mr. Haas he does not have a lot of time & stated that if the size of the building did change that it has to be submitted immediately due to calculations changing. Mr. Coleman stated Mr. Haas needs to focus on what it is going to look like, how high it is going to be, where it is going to be situated, how big it is going to be & stated Mr. Haas needs to have testimony prepared. Mr. Coleman stated once Mr. Haas has something in hand, if it's going to be pre-fabbed or a builder is going to be doing it get it submitted to Sharon as soon as possible.

Next up on the agenda is Cajun Realty LLC d/b/a Church's Texas Chicken. 2 S. White Horse Pike, Block 62.01, Lot 1 – Site Plan Review – For Completeness Only. Mr. Reilly went over the Site Plan Review letter (see attached). Under the Completeness portion of the letter Mr. Reilly stated everything was provided. He mentioned there was one item – item #8 – that was not applicable. Mr. Reilly stated after review that the Board deem this application complete. Mr. Reilly asked if the Board had any questions from the review letter. Mr. Morello stated he would like to see the 2 left turns stay as they are. Mr. Reilly stated that would be the DOT & if it was trying to be changed they would have to apply for a permit. It was unsure if they would be a next month's meeting. Mr. Morello mentioned that the 'no left turn' onto Laurel Rd. came after the original approval. He stated as for the White Horse Pike entrance they realized there was a problem with their jug-handle. Mr. Morello stated it may not have been on their original application when it was constructed. Mr. Morello stated that 1 of the turns came before the other, the left onto Laurel Rd came after the left onto the Pike. Mr. Reilly asked if the worry was the left onto the Pike. Mr. Morello stated the original approval / stipulation was done somewhere along the line. Mr. Reilly stated that can be looked further into to keep the turns as is. It was noted that originally you were allowed to make a left out of the parking lot onto Laurel Rd. but then there were so many accidents at that jug-handle that the DOT issued a "no left turn". Mr. Chicalo quested if the plans currently dictate a 'no left turn' on them or not. Mr.

Morello feels the original site plan allowed for a left turn to be there but it was modified by the DOT after. Mr. Reilly stated he has not review that plan but it will be looked into. Mr. McGovern asked for a motion to deem application approved for completeness only. Motioned by Mr. Hall & seconded by Mr. McBride. A roll call was taken and all ayes.

OLD BUSINESS – Master Plan Re-examination Workshop Review. A Memorandum packet was given to all Board members (see attached). Candace Kanaplue & Chloe Bach, both from Bach Associates, were in attendance & went over the memo. Ms. Kanaplue stated this workshop was meant for discussions while reviewing the Masterplan & if anyone had questions or wanted to make any points or to add anything to bring it up. She stated the memo that is reviewed will go through some specific recommendations that were in the 2016 Master Plan Re-Examination & touch on what is no longer valid, what has been satisfied, what may not make sense anymore for the Borough. We will also talk about some of the things that have happened in the last 10 years such as ordinances that have been adopted. Ms. Kanaplue stated it's really just a list as you can see the items, the redevelopment plans & different plans that have been adopted & enacted in the past 10 years. Ms. Kanaplue stated she will review a couple recommendations & then open things up to the Board to discuss & provide any feedback or any additional recommendations. Ms. Kanaplue was going to start with reviewing the 6 parts of the required Masterplan re-examination items & also the recommendations from the last Masterplan & then discuss some new potential new recommendations for the next 10 years with the report. She stated the next step would then to provide the Board, at the next hearing, with a draft Masterplan re-examination report combining everything that is being discussed tonight & would be for review & discussion next month. Then the month after that, which would be the October meeting, there would then be a public hearing if everyone was satisfied with the report.

Ms. Kanaplue read right off the memo for the 6 parts that are required for the Masterplan re-examination:

- the major problems & objectives relating to land development in the municipality at the time of the adoption of the last re-examination report
- the extent to which such problems & objectives have been reduced or have increased subsequent to such date
- the extent to which there have been significant changes in the assumptions, policies, & objectives forming the basis for the Masterplan or development regulations as last revised, with particular regard to the density & distribution of population & land uses, housing conditions, circulation, conservation of natural resources, energy conservation, collection, disposition & recycling of designated recyclable materials, & changes in State, county, & municipal policies & objectives
- the specific changes recommended for the Masterplan or development regulations, if any, including underlying objectives, policies & standards, or whether a new plan or regulations should be prepared
- the recommendations of the planning board concerning the incorporation of redevelopment pans adopted pursuant to the "Local Redevelopment & Housing Law" P.L. 1992, c. 79(C.40.A:12A-1 et al) into the land use plan element of the municipal Masterplan, & recommend changes, if any, in the local development regulations necessary to effectuate the redevelopment plans of the municipality
- the recommendations of the planning board concerning locations appropriate for the development of public electric vehicle infrastructure, including but not limited to, commercial districts, areas proximate to public transportation & transit facilities & transportation corridors, & public rest stop; & recommended changes, if any, in the local

development regulations necessary or appropriate for the development of public electric vehicle infrastructure

Ms. Kanaplue stated in review of the Boroughs 2016 Masterplan Re-Examination report she stated there were several specific recommendations, stating there were problems & also objectives wrapped in. Specific recommendations are as follows:

- The COAH obligations – it is recommended that the municipality work through this process towards meeting that obligation. The suggested response is this is no longer valid as the Borough is currently compliant with the State's round 4 affordable housing requirements. The Housing Element & Fair Share Plan has been adopted & the Borough is currently working towards compliance. Ms. Kanaplue stated the Borough has done a good job with-in the last 10 years of getting that done.
- Consider updating the zoning map to accurately reflect current zoning, overlay zones & new zoning. The suggested response is that this remains a valid objective. The zoning map was updated in 2016 when the re-examination report was last completed, but there have been some changes in the last 10 years so the zoning map should be updated to reflect the redevelopment areas & the zones that have been added since 2016
- The municipality should remain cognizant of NJAC 7:8-4.3 – A municipality shall adopt a municipal storm water management plan as an integral part of its Masterplan & official map in ordinance with the schedule in (a)1 or 2 below, whichever is sooner. The suggested response is this is no longer valid that the items have been addressed & the Borough ordinance has been updated to be consistent with the NJDEP best management practices for storm water
- Review current signage requirements of the municipal code & in each zoning district to determine whether electronic scrolling signs (usually red) should be prohibited, especially in the Commercial & Office Districts. The suggested response is that it remains partially valid stating since 2016 LED sign technology has advanced & it is somewhat of a dated recommendation but it is recommended that the Borough review the sign ordinance & provide recommendations to regulate LED signs
- Investigate the development of a Sidewalk Prioritization Program. Suggested response is this is no longer valid. The Delaware Valley Regional Planning Commission published their Sidewalk Prioritization Score data in 2025 & the data identified areas of missing sidewalks & calculated priority scores using different factors proximity to transit, roadway classification, regional bicycling & pedestrian injury data. Said study identified 60 segments of sidewalk within the Borough of Stratford with priority scores ranging from 4.40 to 6.95 out of 10, 10 being the worst. The highest priority segments were located on the WHP, Berlin Rd, & WHR. It was stated that the DVRPC took care of that.

** NOTE - the next 11 items were listed on the memo as further discussion needed before actions are presented):

- <u>The Complete Streets Policy</u> was recommended. The suggested response is this is no longer valid. A complete streets resolution was adopted by Borough Council in 2017

- <u>Expansion & restriction of permitted uses in the Commercial District & the Central Business District</u>. The suggested response is that this remains valid. The Borough should review all uses & a statement should be added to the re-examination report

    - Mr. Morello had a comment about this section, Mr. McGovern agreed, & it was asked for the option to get rid of the kennels. Ms. Kanaplue stated yes that is the kind of thing that we are trying to gather from you, recommendations & we can

put specifically in the re-examination report & then the planning board adopts the re-examination report & the attention would be that Borough Council would take the recommendations & adopt them. Mr. Morello questioned how do we make it noted for the record tonight & Ms. Kanaplue stated it would be noted. Mr. McGovern what zone is it currently in? Mr. Morello stated it is in the Commercial Zone right now, & it is allowing with-in 50-75 feet of a residential home, having dog kennels with up to 75-90 dogs. Mr. Morello stated this was passed by an amended ordinance, to circumvent the zoning laws where it was prior in an Industrial Zone. Mr. McGovern questioned if there is even an Industrial Zone in town & it was commented yes, that the Bradlees area is an Industrial Zone. Mr. McGovern stated they wanted the kennel removed stating kennels of any kind except in the industrial area. Mr. Morello stated this probably was not codified & believes it was passed about 2 years ago. Ms. Kanaplue stated there were a lot of miscellaneous ordinances that were adopted in the last 10 years & have not been codified. She stated they try to catch as many as they could on the list. Mr. McGovern commented so can we prohibit dog kennels & Ms. Kanaplue stated that it can be recommended, that it is not actually taken out when it is in the re-examination report & that is the Planning Boards job to recommend things. Mr. McGovern stated that the Board strongly suggest to prohibit dog kennels, except in industrial areas / industrial zones. Mr. Morello stated if it would revert back to the code that was in place for the last '90' years that would be great because that is what they had changed. Ms. Kanaplue stated she has a list of permitted uses in each zone. Mr. Morello stated he did not think it would be found it there (talking about a list of codes that Ms. Kanaplue had). Ms. Kanaplue stated that it was not in that list because it had not been codified, which is a big problem too, because things should be codified & updated so that you can go online onto Municode & see all the current regulations as they stand now. Mr. Morello stated that we currently have an ordinance book & there are random pages stuck within the book for ordinances that have been added. Ms. Kanaplue stated that most people would go the online version & then you have the situation where you are not looking at the most up-to-date regulations.

- Sustainability, Green Infrastructure & Energy Conservation. Suggested response is this is no longer valid. The NJDEP provides storm water management & infrastructure rules. Additional oversight by the Borough is not necessary. Additionally Borough requirements on individual property owners would be onerous & are not recommended. Those would be for the individual land owner.

- Signage. Suggested response remains valid. The signage requirements should be re-evaluated in light of new LED signage technology, as well as any other issues that have come up. Review the signage requirements within each individual zoning district.

    - Mr. Morello stated that our home lighting ordinance does not allow for the new things that people have on their houses. He stated they cannot twinkle it has to be a solid color, they can't be chasing. Mr. Morello stated there have not been any complaints as of yet about it but they technically are not allowed. Mr. McGovern stated there are complaints about a house on Saratoga Rd. Mr. Morello stated that when said lights are set a certain way or are shining into someone's yard, it is against code. Mr. McGovern questioned how that can be addressed. Ms. Kanaplue stated it could be a recommendation to review it & potentially amend the ordinance to allow for certain reasonable things. Mr.

Morello questioned if it is the twinkle that is being complained about? Mr. McBride stated the lights are flashing practically all night long & its all over the house & Mr. McGovern agreed it is the flashing that is the issue. Ms. Kanaplue stated may time constraints on when said lights should be turned off. She stated the re-examination won't go into to super detail but specific recommendations can be made for the Borough Council. Mr. Bove questioned the lights being talked about, he was unsure about these lights, but asked if it is a constant issue? Mr. McGovern commented it is a constant issue. Mr. McBride stated they are on 24/7 & has been this way for months. Mr. Bove stated can the Board come in later & say well its been like this for so long. Mr. Morello asked if they are Christmas lights. Mr. McBride stated they are are just lights that are placed on the house & they can be changed to whatever color you want. He stated they are never off. Mr. Bove asked if they have been there for years. Mr. McBride stated not years but for quite a few months but they are never shut off. Mr. McGovern stated they have been there for a period of time & there is no right to have them the way they are run right now. Ms. Kanaplue asked if they were just seasonal. Mr. McGovern stated they are not seasonal. Ms. Kanaplue stated this would not be something that would be grandfathered in either. Mr. McBride stated you can change them for all different holidays, you can change them to be in different modes & different colors. It was commented they would look nice to support your favorite teams or for the holidays but when it is just a constant blinking it is horrible. Mr. Morello stated there is a law that exists, maybe it just needs to be looked at again. It was commented maybe to be putting in hours of the day or brightness or motion of said lights. Mr. Chicalo questioned if we have received complaints what has happened with that outcome? Mr. McBride mentioned that it had been said that this person does this purposely because he hates his neighbors.

- Parking. The suggested response remains valid. Chapter 17.68 – off-street parking & loading sets forth the requirements for off-street parking & loading. Section 17.68.010 – general requirements sets forth stall with & stall depth based on angle of parking & driveways. The NJ RSIS provides for parking spaces to measure 9' x 18' & it was discussed in 2016 to change that in the Borough's code. Ms. Kanaplue stated that has not changed so that remains valid & still recommends review.
    - Mr. Morello stated that Stratford is more restrictive. Ms. Kanaplue stated she believes our stalls are larger. Mr. Morello stated than ours would be less restrictive. Ms. Kanaplue stated 9'x18' is the smallest & is what is recommended in RSIS & what they use when reviewing & anything having to do with arching in the municipality.

- Solar / Photovoltaic Panels & Wind Power. Suggested response is no longer valid. The NJ DCA building codes now prescribe all standards for these types of systems. Ms. Kanaplue stated it was discussed that the panel installations might overhang roof structures or be improperly installed, may pose a fire safety. It seemed they were concerns from the public at that time. She stated the rules & regulations oversight have come a long way in the last 10 years. The NJ DCA has building codes for these things so it is not necessary that it be in the Borough code because they would have to go with the building codes through DCA.

- Fee & Escrow Provisions. No longer valid. Last year the Borough developed updated fee & escrow provisions & are in the process of adopting them. It was recommended

that the fee & escrow provisions that are in the zoning ordinance, the subdivision ordinance, & the site plan ordinance be reviewed to determine whether they are appropriate.

- Code Book – The suggested response – remains partially valid. As a first step, all uncodified ordinances should be codified & all repealed ordinances should be removed. The Borough should update its code on Municode. The current code book used by the Borough is dated from the 1970's & multiple stakeholders pointed out to the fact that a new code book would be beneficial & should be re-written for the Borough. It is recommended the Borough take steps to eventually re-write the municipal code book.

    - Mr. Morello stated the code book was updated he believes in 1998 or 1999. He stated that book was a bit better because you could add & remove items. Ms. Kanaplue stated that on this memo whatever is in written in black was taken from the 2016 Master Plan Re-Examination report. She stated the red items in italics are our commentary on those recommendations from 10 years ago.

- Shade Tree Commission – the suggested response is no longer valid. Borough code chapter 2.48 Shade Tree Commission was repealed per ordinance 2017:03.

    - Mr. Chicalo questioned what that means as far as what the Borough is or is no longer responsible for? Ms. Kanaplue stated they removed the Shade Tree Commission, which is an optional group / charter. Mr. Morello stated it was a commission that regulated trees. Ms. Kanaplue stated it was extra rules but not necessarily in the code book rules & it is up to the individual towns. Mr. Morello stated it was dissolved about 10 years ago. Mr. Chicalo asked what happens now if a resident wants to plant a tree. Mr. Reilly stated there is an updated tree ordinance that was passed down & recommended by the DEP so the new ordinance that is in the book does the job of what the Shade Tree Commission did. Mr. Morello stated there is nothing stopping the cutting down of trees now. Mr. McGovern asked about the trees between the sidewalk & the street asking if it is property owner's responsibility. Mr. Bove stated yes it is & if the tree falls down you have to take care of it. Mr. Chicalo commented that walking along some of the sidewalks in town can be harder to do in some areas due to some of the trees hanging down so low. Mr. Morello stated there is an ordinance that does cover that area though which is separate from what the tree commission. Mr. Chicalo stated most people probably don't even know of that ordinance too. Mr. Morello stated there should be clear & smooth sidewalks. Mr. Reilly stated that the way the ordinance is written anything from the curb up to the house is up to the property owner's responsibility to maintain such as sidewalk, curb, trees, all of that. Ms. Kanaplue stated that could be something that bring up but usually requires these issues coming from a complaint. Mr. Chicalo stated the sidewalks around are huge issues & stated some residents who reside on corner properties may not even see these horrible issues. He questioned how these issues can be addressed with these specific residents. Mr. Chicalo stated it is all how this town looks, the aesthetics of the town, & that residents should not be given free passes. Mr. McBride commented to contact the Borough Hall & they can pass the information on to the code enforcement officer. Mr. Morello feels, in his opinion, over the years homeowners were not allowed to cut trees down which caused sidewalks to have these issues & it was just years of allowing that to happen & stopping people from wanting to remove the trees for said reason & fix

the problems. Mr. Chicalo stated there are ways people can fix their sidewalks when the tree causes the issue, they just go around said issue. He also stated that when walking down the sidewalks when there are eroded & dilapidated timbers that have started to bleed into the sidewalks & are just left there so you have to walk around them. It was commented that sidewalks are raised all over town, not just a specific side of town.

- Zoning – the suggested response – no longer valid. This area consists of a portion of Block 52 and the entirety of Blocks 53, 60, & 61. A Redevelopment plan for the entirety of Block 53 was adopted in 2019. In addition, the Berlin Road Redevelopment Plan for Block 52, Lot 15 was adopted in 2023. The 2016 Master Plan Re-Examination said to recommend a consider use of overlay zoning for mixed used commercial & residential development in the area bounded by White Horse Pike, New Rd., Berlin Rd., Bishop Terrance, & the municipal boundary with Lindenwold Borough.

- Zoning – the suggested response – remains valid. The Board may wish to consider this recommendation. Consider expansion of commercial zoning to provide deeper commercial properties along White Horse Pike where commercial zoning already exists with provision of protective elements to protect residential properties.

    - Mr. McGovern questioned the meaning 'deeper commercial properties' if the property is zoned commercial on the White Horse Pike, does that mean we can say the next property in can have an overlay? Ms. Kanaplue stated yes that even if it is a residential property, that property would be grandfathered in & legal, & it would be put in the ordinance but you can extend it for commercial so should a business come in & want to open up there would be larger lots which may attract more businesses in those areas. Ms. Kanaplue stated the re-examination report is just a recommendation that you can put it in or not, it does not mean that it will be completed in the next 10 years but it is on the record as having it as a suggestion. Mr. Morello asked if that is problematic for homeowners & their right for taking. Ms. Kanaplue stated potentially homeowners may not be thrilled but may also work for them because if they are having problems selling their house because they are right next to a business or commercial zone & that adds buyers to that lot. She feels it could go either way. Mr. McGovern stated it could be like a domino effect. Ms. Kanaplue stated it does require some consideration & looking at the maps & seeing if things make sense or not. Ms. Kanaplue stated there may be some parts where it is 1 block so maybe there is no house next to or adjacent to house behind that commercial lot. Mr. Morello stated that was done in redevelopment zones & residents weren't happy, and for no reason were they unhappy. Ms. Bach stated that this may not be as applicable as it was back in 2016 because with commercial corridors we don't have the same demand but we have more demand for residential.

Next on the memo were things the office has identified as significant changes since the last Mater Plan Re-examination:

Ms. Kanaplue stated those were all of the recommendations that were all in the 2016 Master Plan Re-Examination Report. This is a list of 20 strong, and probably all are not listed, several ordinances that have been adopted in the last 10 years & they have not been codified. Ms. Kanaplue stated there have been a lot of redevelopment preliminary investigations, as well as redevelopment plans in the past 10 years. In addition we have been through the housing

element of Fair Share Plan process so that has added a couple new zones & redevelopment plans.

Next on the memo are recommendations the Board consider the following specific recommended changes:

Ms. Kanaplue stated as far as her office recommending specific changes, there were 2 that came to mind, which are open for discussion, one being updating online zoning ordinance (Municode) so that it is more accessible to everyone. Next being although the Borough's Code does not specifically permit data centers, the Board may wish to consider adding data centers as a prohibited use in all districts. Or don't add this if you are open to attract them or as a permitted use. Ms. Kanaplue stated that a lot of municipalities have chosen to prohibit them. She stated typically if something is not permitted in your zoning code then it is prohibited but actually stating that it is a prohibited use specifically is helpful.

- Mr. Bove asked by putting it out that we want to eliminate this possibility that this opens things up to possible litigation? Mr. Coleman questioned as far as the data center? He stated that Ms. Kanaplue is right. A lot of municipalities, all of our towns, have all said they were not interested & as opposed to an applicant coming in & trying to get a use variance for it, & then did you satisfy the burden or not for just taking it off the table. Mr. Coleman agrees with Ms. Kanaplue's recommendation. If you don't want it then prohibit it. Mr. Chicalo stated he thinks the question is if we prohibit it are we then subject to litigation by some group who represents data centers nationally who just want to argue against 'that there are no plans, that's ok, but we will argue against that for the future'. Mr. Coleman stated there would then be 2 readings. It would go to the 1st reading then it would come here to the Board for Master Plan consistency. Then this board would say thumbs up or thumbs down on Master Plan consistency. Mr. Coleman said if you say yes it is consistent with the Master Plan that data centers shouldn't be in the 'XYZ' zone, now it goes back to Council, it is open to the public. Mr. Coleman stated he cannot stop anyone from coming in & suing but stated if you follow the appropriate steps, you listen to your professionals, then you are on firmer ground. Mr. Morello questioned if they would have to sue the ordinance first, stating that would be the first thing the Board could see. Mr. Coleman stated if they sued after the fact the first thing he would say was where have you been? Mr. Morello commented yeah after the window closed on them & their time expired. Ms. Bach state that all over the state they are seeing more & more municipalities are adopting these. She went on to stated that she thinks if the data centers were trying to go for somebody saying 'let us in' it would be going for a more rural area with space & that this area would not be first on their list. Mr. Bove commented that there is a data center in Voorhees, in the industrial park, across the street from AAA. Mr. Chicalo if it is in an industrial zone like that than that's fine & commented 'to me it is like the kennel'. Ms. Kanaplue stated that technology will & is rapidly improving so they use so much less water now & who knows where things will be maybe a year from now. Mr. Chicalo commented about on Princeton Ave., the old school that would be a perfectly reasonably sized building right? If they decided to sell that someone could say we can put a data center in there. Mr. Chicalo stated it is essentially a house now. Mr. Bove stated he was looking at the old 2016 plan & he thinks it is considered historical. Mr. Chicalo stated but a building of that size don't you think? Mr. Bove stated they could go to Laurel Rd. the old Christian Academy.

Mr. Morello commented or the Bowling Alley. They all agreed it is worth considering.

Next on the memo is Redevelopment Plan Recommendations:

Ms. Kanaplue stated they are not recommending any redevelopment investigations or plans at this time. The redevelopment areas & plans that have been adopted since the 2016 Master Plan Re-examination are included above & those would be added to the Master Plan & also onto the proposed zoning map.

Mr. McGovern questioned what is involved in the Municode & adding the 20 odd things that were listed in the memo that aren't codified currently, stating kind of odd that they are not, but asked what is involved in adding them to that. Ms. Kanaplue stated it is someone has to send it to Municode. Mr. McGovern stated it would have to be sent to a firm & that is who does it. Mr. Coleman stated it can be super expensive & Ms. Kanaplue stated which is probably why it has not been done. Mr. Coleman said it is very expensive & you are constantly doing it so Clerks will say we can do it in a couple years because it is not in the budget this year so it will get done next year & so on. Mr. Chicalo questioned what you are actually paying for. Mr. Coleman stated they have attorneys on staff that will say 'we recommend this…' and you revise it because the current law in NJ is X,Y,Z. So it is a more in-depth analysis, but it is not cheap & that is why a lot of towns are like this & they'll just keep pushing it. Mr. McGovern questioned if it is easier to do it in bulk. Mr. Morello commented he thinks that where we are now that the balance of what is not in there now would be a bulk. Ms. Kanaplue stated she too believes that is why a lot of towns are this way because you don't want to send just 1. Ms. Kanaplue stated it has been a really long time & it should be updated because there are certain small things, especially in the R-1 district, some of the bulk standards have changed & Municode reflects 1 thing that is not the case anymore. She feels it leaves potential issues.

Ms. Kanaplue stated that is the end of the review of the memorandum. The next step would be the Land Use Board meeting on September 24 stating that they will come with a draft report.

Mr. Morello stated there was 1 other issue he would like to bring up, that was talked about at the last meeting, having to do with the swim club, which is in the residential R-1, and not knowing what the future of that is unknown. He asked how lot sizes, that would be eligible, in that area, can be consistent with the neighborhood. Ms. Kanaplue stated it would have to abide by the R-1 bulk standards. She stated all that is permitted is single family detached dwellings & a swim club that is grandfathered in. Mr. Chicalo commented off a survey from the previous applicant stating it was mentioned the minimum lot size & minimum lot width, that is the standard right? Mr. Morello stated correct. Ms. Kanaplue stated that is what they would be allowed & if that is what you want. Mr. Morello asked if there would be any reason to have to add anything & Ms. Kanaplue stated no. Mr. Bove questioned with the Laurel Mills farm area are those lot sized different. Mr. Morello stated no they aren't. Mr. Bove stated ok than that is the standard. Mr. Morello commented that with Old Stratford, the laws came after the houses. Mr. Bove commented about a document that was sent to Council, by Michelle & stated that a bulk of the houses in town were built between 1960-1969, stating a lot of them were Laurel Mills, but if you go back to all the dwellings it was between 1950-1979 that's 20 or almost 30 years when the bulk of all the dwellings were constructed. Ms. Kanaplue stated that nothing would be recommended for that if you want it to stay that way – R-1. Ms. Kanaplue stated she was finished with going over things but if anyone had questions they could email her. She stated there will be another draft to come for the next meeting.

Mr. Walton questioned Mr. Reilly in regards to the Laurel Mills shopping center, stating that nothing has even started, there were no shovels in the ground as of date. Mr. Reilly stated that he has seen emails regarding the bonds & the escrows but has not seen any compliance plans for review finalized & that would be the last step before pre-construction is held. It was stated he is doing some things. Mr. McGovern asked if he is spending the money to set up the bonds & Mr. Reilly stated yes from what he has seen so far. Mr. Reilly stated he doesn't get the project documents until he is ready for construction. Mr. Reilly stated he does not know if things are finalized but he has provided the terminology to the town solicitor to make sure that things are all correct. Mr. Walton questioned any time frame that was imposed. Mr. Bove stated the courts did. Mr. Walton stated he knew the courts did but we approved an extension with a time frame for him to do something. Mr. McGovern stated until September. Mr. Walton said his understanding was he was to start in the summer on this project. Mr. McGovern stated his understanding of the extension was to make sure they were covering all bases. Mr. Morello stated they attorney could say that his client had the intentions to do all that. Mr. McGovern asked if had an overall time frame where hes the developer? Mr. Reilly stated yes it was 36 months. Mr. Bove stated he thought that time frame was for completion & Mr. Reilly stated he believed so. Mr. Walton stated his concern has been the pitch form all the demolition & all the rain. Mr. Morello stated the Board had never heard back for extension of what damage actually happened.

MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS – none

CORRESPONDENCE - none

PUBLIC PORTION – Motioned by Mr. Chicalo and seconded by Mr. Bove to open to the public. All ayes. No one was in the public attendance. Motion to close public portion – motioned by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. McBride. All ayes.

ADJOURNMENT – Motioned by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. McBride. All ayes.

Meeting closed at 753 PM.