

**STRATFORD JOINT LAND USE BOARD MINUTES**  
**June 25, 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

|                          |             |
|--------------------------|-------------|
| P. McGovern, Chairman    | Class IV    |
| K. Walton, Vice-Chairman | Class IV    |
| B. Bove                  | Class III   |
| T. Hall                  | Class IV    |
| T. Kozeniewski           | Class IV    |
| R. St. Maur              | Class IV    |
| M. DiGiacomo             | Alternate I |

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

Absent

|            |             |
|------------|-------------|
| R. Morello | Class II    |
| M. Chicalo | Alternate I |

First action of the meeting was to swear in the new member – Stephen McBride – Class I Officer. Mr. Coleman swore in Mr. McBride. The signed sworn Oath of Office is attached.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Motioned by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. St. Maur to approve minutes from May 28, 2026 meeting. All ayes.

**NEW BUSINESS –**

Mr. & Mrs. Subramanya, 44 Saratoga, Block 87.01, Lot 30 – side yard variance for a florida room on back of house. Mr. Subramanya was sworn in by Mr. Coleman before starting his presentation. Mr. Coleman stated we have jurisdiction to hear this from a notice of standpoint where the secretary, Ms. Rauer, gave a “Yes” response. Mr. Subramanya talked to the board about the variance that is being requested. Mr. Subramanya also spoke about the comments that were in the engineers letter for said project. Said request was to improve an existing covered rear patio & turn it into a florida room. Said project is to make a functional indoor/outdoor living space. The property is an existing single family resident located in the R1 residential zone. The lot contains approximately 8,625 sq. ft. & complies with the zone’s minimum area of lot with requirements. The property will continue to be a single family residence. The proposed

improvement is located in an area that already occupied by an existing patio area & existing concrete slab foundation. The application arises as the proposed improvement will consist of a permanent roof structure, rather than the existing awning type structure, with screened openings & the ability to seasonally install & remove glass panels to make the space more functional throughout the year. The homeowner requested to turn over photos, which Mr. Coleman labeled "Exhibit A1". (Said photos are attached). Mr. Coleman asked Mr. Subramanya to describe said photos which he stated were of the existing area & were just taken on June 24, 2026. MS. Subramanya also made remarks about the Bach & Associates Variance Review documents. (Said documents are attached). The review stated that the dwelling currently has a side yard set back of 6.8 feet, where 10 feet is required. Mr. Subramanya stated that was how the property existed when they purchased the residence; it was not created by them. He stated that the proposed improvement does not move any closer to the adjacent side property line than the existing covered patio area & that the existing side yard condition remains the same. He also stated the proposed project is approximately 88 sq. feet. The footprint will extend slightly beyond the existing awning area (towards the woods) the proposed structure will remain within access of the required rear yard setback & does not move any closer to the adjacent side property line than the current existing covered patio. This improvement does not increase residential density, does not create additional traffic, does not effect parking, does not create commercial activity, does not alter the residential character of the property or neighborhood, & does not create any meaningful impact on neighboring properties. Mr. Subramanya stated he had personal contact with all but 1 of the neighboring property owners within 200 feet of the property, stating the feedback received was overwhelmingly positive & there were no objections or concerns expressed. The neighbor at 42 Saratoga Rd, whose property is adjacent to the site where the existing covered patio is located, expressed support for the project. He stated some of those he spoke to were surprised that a variance was even required. He also stated that no neighbor indicated that the project would negatively impact their property. Said structure is located entirely within the rear yard & will have minimal visibility from the street. Mr. Subramanya mentioned the engineer's review mentioned an existing shed & a block wall located in the rear of the property. Mr. Subramanya stated that was all existing when the property was purchased in 2008 & were constructed by prior owner. He stated approximately 8 years ago a storm damaged much of the above ground block wall along the rear of the property. They replaced the damaged portion with a wooden fence. In the same location, all portions of the original wall remain around the shed & below grade as a retaining wall. Said area was not expanded, those conditions remained the same. He is not seeking any additional approval for the shed, wall, or fence & are they are not proposing to expand or modify them as part of this application. The proposed Florida room is entirely separate from those existing conditions & does not extend into or effect the wooded area behind the rear property line in any way. Mr. Subramanya stated granting this requested variance will allow a reasonable improvement to an existing home while maintaining the residential character of the neighborhood. The project advances the purpose of the municipal land use law by allowing appropriate improvement of an existing residence. The proposal will not substantially impair the intended purpose of the zoning ordinance because the property remains a single family residence, the lot conforms with zoning

requirements, the project is modern in scale, the project does not move closer to the neighboring side property line, the project remains compliant with rear yard setback requirements and no adverse impacts to neighboring properties are anticipated.

Mr. Reilly spoke stating that the applicant had pointed out some of the things in the review letter (which is attached). He stated the office did review the application & issued a letter dated June 18, 2026. Mr. Reilly stated the only thing he would add is that there are 2 variances that are actually required. 1<sup>st</sup> variance for side yard set-back, as the applicant indicated, and the 2<sup>nd</sup> variance being the side aggregate, which the requirement is 25 feet but what is proposed is 20.96 feet. Mr. Reilly stated as the applicant indicated these are already existing additions & the applicant is not encroaching any further into the side yard set backs/existing footprint. Mr. Reilly stated that since they are touching the area the variances are required. Mr. Reilly stated the last thing to be addressed, which was by the applicant, was the shed & the block wall which appears to be encroaching on the adjacent property, was just being brought to the boards attention, but was addressed by the applicant.

Mr. McGovern asked if any of the board members had any questions. Mr. Walton questioned the side yard & the rear awning. He was asking the applicant if he was replacing that said area with the Florida room. Mr. Subramanya stated that the awning will now be a shingled roof with a screened in porch. Mr. Walton questioned if walls were being put down. Mr. Subramanya stated "yes there will be walls". Mr. Subramanya then submitted a photo of proposed construction. Mr. Coleman had said photo marked as "Exhibit A2". Mr. Coleman questioned Mr. Subramanya that the picture he submitted was a depiction of what is to be constructed. Mr. Subramanya stated "Correct". Mr. McGovern asked if there were any other questions from the board, which there were not. Mr. Walton had a question for Mr. Reilly. He asked if the variances are already existing conditions, are we, as a Joint Land Board giving the applicant a variance or are we just approving his plan? Mr. Reilly stated we are giving him a variance for improving an existing non-conformance.

There were no other questions from the board.

Mr. McGovern asked for a motion to open to the public for this matter. Motion by Mr. Walton & seconded by Mr. St. Maur. All in favor. There was no one from the public to speak on this matter. Motion to close the public portion by Mr. Hall & seconded by Mr. Bove. All in favor.

Mr. McGovern requested a motion to approve 44 Saratoga Road – block 87.01, lot 30 – applicant is Neil and Jessica Subramanya for a side yard setback where 10 feet is required and the existing condition is 6.8 feet, the proposed is 6.8 feet, and a motion to approve a variance for an aggregate side yard setback of 25 where 25 feet is required & the existing condition is 20.96 feet and the proposed will be 20.96 feet. This will be subject to any and all conditions of the Back Associates letter dated June 18, 2026.

Motioned by Mr. St. Maur & seconded by Mr. Bove. Roll call was taken – Mr. McGovern – yes, Mr. Walton – yes, Mr. Bove – yes, Mr. Hall – yes, Mr. Kozeniewski – yes, Mr. St. Maur – yes, Mr. DiGiacomo – yes. Mr. McBride had to abstain from the vote as he is a direct neighbor of said applicant.

As for the other applicants that were on the agenda, neither had appeared. They had asked for a continuance. Mr. Reilly stated that in each of their review letters were things that needed to be completed.

Richard Piendak - 19 Hunt Ave., Block 61, Lot 7.01, Preliminary & Final Site Plan Review (For Completeness Only)

There was a motion to deem application incomplete. Motioned by Mr. Walton and seconded by Mr. Bove. A roll call was taken – all ayes.

Burger King – 21 S. White Horse Pike, Block 52, Lot 5, Minor Site Plan Review (For Completeness Only)

Mr. Reilly stated that in their review letters, dated June 18, 2026, there were things that needed to be addressed by each applicant. Mr. Reilly reviewed each letter with the board. Said review letters are attached. Mr. Coleman stated that the applicant from Burger King called his office requesting a continuance which he could not grant because the application is deemed incomplete. Mr. Reilly stated yes they are incomplete but if they are asking for a continuance & they have no objection to the timeline the board has set / is held to & they provide the additional documents than they can be review / re-evaluated & be brought in again next month but stated that is up to Burger King. Mr. Coleman feels if the application is incomplete due to a review by Bach Associates he would rather deem said application incomplete. Mr. Coleman stated if Burger King has to put out notices again that is the risk that they take.

There was a motion to deem application incomplete. Motioned by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. St. Maur. A roll call was taken – all ayes.

**OLD BUSINESS** – none

**MEMORIALIZATION OF RESOLUTIONS** – Resolution 2026:14 - 1 Colby Avenue.

Motion by Mr. St. Maur and seconded by Mr. Hall. Roll call was taken – all ayes.

**CORRESPONDENCE** - none

**PUBLIC PORTION** – Motion to open to the public. Motioned by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. St. Maur. All in favor. There was no one at the meeting to speak during the public portion. Motion to close the public. Motioned by Mr. Walton and seconded by Mr. Bove. All in favor.

Before closing the meeting Mr. McGovern stated that Mr. Walton had a question regarding the Incollingo's. Mr. Walton asked if the applicant for Incollingo's has provided the documents / 3 items that were missing. He asked Mr. Reilly if they were ever provided to their office. Mr. Reilly questioned what said items were. Mr. Walton stated the board approved things back in March. It was a 6-month extension for something, like documents for something. Mr. Reilly stated the deed description & yes they have been submitted & most of them are approved but there were some comments & sent them back. Mr. Reilly stated the escrows are not in place as of yet but that is not required until they put a shovel in the ground. Performance bonds have been going back & forth with the Jeff, the town solicitor, so that is in the process as well. Mr. Reilly stated they are making progress, more progress than they have in the past. Mr. Reilly stated he will make sure he has a better report for that at the next meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT** – Motioned by Mr. Bove and seconded by Mr. St. Maur. All ayes.

Meeting closed at 653 PM.