



ANDOVER TOWNSHIP

SUSSEX COUNTY • NEW JERSEY

Land Use Board
Municipal Building
134 Newton Sparta Road
MINUTES
October 1, 2024
7:30 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Messerschmidt called the meeting to order at 7:30pm.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

Mr. Messerschmidt led everyone in a flag salute.

OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT NOTICE:

Mr. Messerschmidt read the following into the record:

This is an open public meeting of the Andover Township Land Use Board to be conducted in-person only at the Municipal Building, located at 134 Newton Sparta Rd., Andover, NJ 07860. Notice of this meeting was given in accordance with the Open Public Meetings Act, Chapter 231, Public Law 85. The rules are generally as stated on the agenda. No new testimony will be taken after 10:30pm. Adequate notice of this meeting has been provided, with an electronic copy posted on the Andover Township website at www.andovertwp.org.

ROLL CALL:

Michael Lensak (Class I) - Excused
Eric Olsen (Class II) – Present
Eric Karr (Class III) – Excused
Suzanne Howell (Class IV) – Present
Richard Skewes (Class IV) – Present
Joseph Ordile (Class IV) – Present
Krista Gilchrist (Class IV) – Present
John Carafello (Class IV) - Present
Sean Degan (Alternate) – Excused
Karen Rozek (Alternate) - Present
Paul Messerschmidt (Class IV) – Present

Also Present:

Richard Briigliodoro, Esq.

Cory Stoner, PE
Stephanie Pizzulo, Secretary

ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:

Approval of Minutes: September 3, 2024.

A motion to approve the minute of the September 3, 2024 meeting was made by Ms. Gilchrist and seconded by Mr. Olsen. Roll Call: Eric Olsen – yes, Suzanne Howell – yes, Richard Skewes – yes, Joseph Ordile – yes, Krista Gilchrist – yes, Karen Rozek – yes, Paul Messerschmidt – yes. Motion carried.

RESOLUTIONS:

1.) Priority Compactor Repair, LLC B: 161 L: 5.02 Application # A23-11

A resolution for minor site plan approval, conditional use approval and exception from site plan design standards.

A motion to adopt the resolution in the matter of Priority Compactor was made by Mr. Skewes and seconded by Ms. Howell. Roll Call: Richard Skewes – yes, Karen Rozek – yes, Joseph Ordile – yes, Eric Olsen – yes, Suzanne Howell – yes, Krista Gilchrist – yes, Paul Messerschmidt – yes. Motion carried.

ORDINANCES: None.

COMPLETENESS: None.

HEARINGS: (All submitted materials can be found under the Land Use section on the Township website www.andovertwp.org.)

1.) Ringo Properties, LLC B: 158 L: 6 Application # 22-5

The applicant is seeking approval to develop the property for a combination of uses entailing retail, office, warehouse/storage and/or light manufacturing. Bulk variances are also required.

Mr. Joseph O’Neil, Esq. with Garofalo, O’Neil & Ruggiero was representing the applicant and said they are continuing the application.

Mr. Messerschmidt said Mr. Ursin, Esq. was present to cross examine the witness.

Mr. John Ursin, Esq. with Schenk, Price said he was representing Slater Kirby who is the owner of the farm adjacent to the subject property. Mr. Ursin questioned Mr. Robine on his professional qualifications. Mr. Robine said he has been licensed for about 12 years, has worked with redevelopment zoned properties, and said he was familiar with the redevelopment process. Mr. Ursin asked what the client’s goal was for the property. Mr. Robine said to develop a marketable mixed-use development. Mr. Robine said he explained the rules of the zone and

had reviewed the amount of development in connection with the rules the Township had set with his client. Mr. Ursin asked if Mr. Robine had explained that the amount of development being requested was going to be in conflict with the rules of Andover to which Mr. Robine said he discussed all of the variances required. Mr. Ursin asked what the primary part of the application was to which Mr. Robine said it was a combination of all of the proposed uses. Mr. Ursin asked what business his client was in to which Mr. Robine said land development. Mr. Ursin asked if the applicant owned other retail strips to which Mr. Robine said he did not know. Mr. Robine said they only discussed the subject project. Mr. Ursin asked what his client's business is in relation to the retail, flex space of outdoor storage. Mr. Robine said this is what his client wanted to accomplish on this site. Mr. Ursin asked about other sites and what his experience is with other sites he owns to which Mr. Robine said they did not get into discussions on other sites. Mr. Ursin asked if he discussed what parts of the project would be conforming and what would not be conforming to which Mr. Robine said yes. Mr. Ursin asked if he explained that the project would be substantially more conforming without 1.95 acres of outdoor storage. Mr. Robine said he believed the project was conforming. Mr. Robine said the outdoor storage is a conforming use. Mr. Ursin asked if the outdoor storage disturbs the steep slopes to which Mr. Robine said yes. Mr. Ursin questioned Mr. Robine on his discussion with his client on how the three buildings without the outdoor storage would have a lesser impact on the steep slopes. Mr. Robine said they discussed it in general. Mr. Ursin asked if there was a decision to just move forward and disturb the steep slopes anyway. Mr. Robine said there was a decision on the balance between the retail space, the flex space and the outdoor space and how to accomplish that. Mr. Ursin asked if Mr. Robine felt 85% disturbance was a balance to which Mr. Robine said yes. Mr. Ursin asked if Mr. Robine had a conversation with his client about building only the retail which would be substantially more conforming to which Mr. Robine said not specifically. Mr. Ursin asked if Mr. Robine advised his client that just doing the retail would be substantially less difficult to get approved to which Mr. Robine said no. Mr. Ursin asked if the retail space is designed to be one tenant or multiple tenants. Mr. Robine said it would be for multiple tenants; up to five. Mr. Ursin asked about the flex buildings. Mr. Robine said each building could have up to five tenants. Mr. Ursin said there was no testimony on the types of tenants. Mr. Robine said the tenants would have to comply with the allowable uses. Mr. Ursin said it could be a septic pumping, asphalt company or an exterminator storing chemicals to which Mr. Robine said yes, if it were permitted by ordinance. Mr. Ursin asked if some of those tenants could create noise for the neighboring property to which Mr. Robine said some could. Mr. Ursin asked if the proposed tenants could create an odor issue to which Mr. Robine said they would have to comply with product requirements. Mr. Ursin asked if Mr. Robine was aware of any ordinances on odor control to which Mr. Robine said he was not. Mr. Ursin asked about the outdoor storage and asked if the space could be rented separately to which Mr. Robine said that was not the intent. Mr. Ursin asked for clarification and asked if the outdoor storage would only be used by the tenants to which Mr. Robine said yes. Mr. Ursin asked if the ordinance says that 0% of the steep slopes should be disturbed to which Mr. Robine said that was in the general ordinance. Mr. Ursin asked for clarification on some of the disturbance testimony to which Mr. Robine explained his testimony. Mr. Ursin asked that instead of coming to the Board with just a retail strip application they wanted to disturb the entire lot with the disturbance percentages they testified to. Mr. Robine said yes. Mr. Ursin

asked for clarification on the shared parking calculation to which Mr. Robine explained how he calculated the parking and felt there was adequate parking around the retail center and adequate parking for the flex buildings. He said 149 spaces is what the ordinance requires. Mr. Ursin said 149 is required however; the applicant was before the board with only 125 because they could not fit the parking spaces in. Mr. Robine said that was not correct and said his testimony was that there is adequate space in the outdoor storage area to provide additional parking however; it did not seem necessary with the uses. Mr. Ursin asked how many spaces would be needed if only the retail center was built to which Mr. Robine said 29 spaces. Mr. Ursin asked if any one part of the project was eliminated would they be in compliance with the Township's parking ordinance to which Mr. Robine said yes. Mr. Ursin asked if the water tank would be visible offsite to which Mr. Robine said yes. Mr. Ursin asked if the water tower would be needed if only the retail were built to which Mr. Robine said he did not have that calculation. Mr. Ursin asked how long the quarrying operation would take place to which Mr. Robine said two years. Mr. Ursin asked about the amount of material that needed to be removed and what would be used onsite. Mr. Robine said about 45,000 cubic yards would remain onsite. Mr. Ursin asked how many days a week the soil moving operation would take place to which Mr. Robine said 5 days a week. Mr. Ursin asked how many trucks would be needed to remove 113,000 cubic yards to which Mr. Robine said he did not have that calculation. Mr. Ursin asked what equipment would be used in the soil moving. Mr. Robine said excavators, front end loaders and crushers and a conveyor belt. Mr. Ursin asked if blasting would be done to which Mr. Robine said it was not anticipated. He said they would use a rock hammer. Mr. Ursin asked about the phases and if after Phase I and II were complete what would require the applicant to build the site. Mr. Robine said there is an incentive to build the site but there is no requirement. Mr. Ursin asked what the soil and stone sells for to which Mr. Robine said he could not testify to that. Mr. Ursin asked about the Township's soil moving permit process and if Mr. Robine was aware of the regulations. Mr. Ursin asked if the quarrying would cause harm to the area. Mr. Robine said it was not an engineering item and was not able to answer the question. Mr. Ursin asked about the water level of the property. Mr. Robine said it was at 582.6. Mr. Ursin asked if Mr. Robine had reviewed the plans from the previous applicant for the site to which Mr. Robine said he did not. Mr. Ursin asked for the lowest elevation of the site. Mr. Robine said the lowest elevation on the site is the front corner at 592.35 and the bottom of the basin is 588. Mr. Ursin said the ordinance does not allow for rock and soil to be removed within 8 feet of the water table. Mr. Robine said he was aware of the ordinance however; it does not address the bottom of stormwater basins. Mr. Ursin asked about the landscaping tree spacing to which Mr. Robine said they are proposing 14 street trees at 85 foot spacing. Mr. Ursin asked what the 85-foot spacing provides to which Mr. Robine said a street scape. Mr. Ursin asked about the green space in the parking lot. Mr. Robine said the ordinance does not specify how to calculate the green space however; for every row of parking, one landscape island is provided. He said they are proposing one landscape island for every 9 spaces. Mr. Ursin asked about the screening of the loading area. Mr. Robine said the loading areas by the flex building are screened by the buildings and the surrounding fence and landscaping and for the loading area behind the retail area, they are requesting relief from that requirement. He said the landscaping would limit the view of it. Mr. Ursin asked about drainage. Mr. Robine indicated where the 6" pipe is located and explained the piping and how the water gets to the pipe. Mr. Ursin asked if the water

would go to Lot 7 to which he said yes. Mr. Ursin asked if they had a construction easement or discharge easement from Lot 7. Mr. Robine said it would be in the DOT jurisdiction because it is their drainage facility. Mr. Ursin asked what level of storm fills the basin. Mr. Robine said the basin is designed with an under drain so there would be no infiltration from the basin into the water table. He said the basin is designed to handle the 100-year storm. Mr. Ursin asked about modeling. Mr. Robine said there was some modeling in the test holes. Mr. Ursin asked if Mr. Robine had reviewed the soil testing from the previous application for the site to which Mr. Robine said no. Mr. Ursin questioned Mr. Robine on the types of soils. Mr. Ursin asked if they had sought County approvals for the driveways to which Mr. Robine said not yet. Mr. Ursin questioned the spacing on the access points to which Mr. Robine said they are spaced about 220 feet apart and it is compliant with County regulations.

Mr. Ursin concluded his questioning.

Mr. Messerschmidt opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Brigliadoro swore in Mr. James Casler. Mr. Casler asked if there would be gates at the rear access point and who would operate them. Mr. Robine said there would be gates and site management would operate them. Mr. Casler asked if the management would be onsite. Mr. Robine said it was not an engineering question. Mr. Casler said the EIS noted there would be propane tanks for heating and asked about the location. Mr. Robine said they would be providing the location of the tanks. Mr. Casler asked about a tenant that would prefer oil heat to which Mr. Robine said it was not an engineering question. Mr. Casler felt some of the stormwater flows would change after regrading and said the water would flow onto the subject property. Mr. Robine said that was not correct and the site has been designed in a way that the lowest grade on the property is above the highest grade on Lot 10. Mr. Casler felt the subject property would be the low spot and water would flow onto it. Mr. Robine said the water is controlled in the stormwater management basins.

Mr. Brigliadoro swore in Mr. Wayne Grenewicz. Mr. Grenewicz asked about the flow of water onto Lot 10 and said it currently is natural and flowing onto a chemical free farming facility. He expressed a concern that the vehicles would be parked on a porous pavement which would then drain onto his chemical free property with oil leaking cars, asphalt trucks, or a dripping sewer truck. He asked how the pollutants would be kept from flowing onto his property. Mr. Robine said the porous pavement provides the water quality treatment. He said it is an approved method of treating water quality based in the State regulations for stormwater management. He said there is a choker course that obstructs any material before being discharged to a stone bed which would meet the States water quality requirements of any runoff. Mr. Grenewicz asked if it captures oil and antifreeze. Mr. Robine said any type of spill such as antifreeze should be cleaned up in accordance with requirements for a spill. Mr. Grenewicz asked if any parking lot would be covered in oil. Mr. Robine said the NJDEP has certain criteria to be able to treat that for water quality before discharge. He said they are providing that with the porous pavement areas and the bioretention basins. Mr. Grenewicz felt the origin and the quality of the water would be changed.

With nobody else coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Briigliodoro swore in Mr. Eric Keller, PE with Bowman Consulting Group. Mr. Keller gave his qualifications, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Keller said he prepared a report entitled Traffic Engineering Evaluation, Ringo Properties, LLC dated June 4, 2024. He said the proposal is to construct three buildings; one retail and two flex space buildings with outdoor storage. He said the access to the site would be from Brighton Road with two driveways and that Brighton Road is under County jurisdiction. He said there are 125 parking spaces which is actually 121 physical spaces plus 4 EV spaces with six ADA spaces. He said loading is provided to the rear of each building. The site is located at the intersection of Route 206 and Brighton Road with frontage on both roadways. Access is not permitted to Route 206 because it is an access level 2-roadway site, which prohibits access if there is access to a non-State highway. He said they conducted a traffic count and followed standard procedures for the preparation of the traffic study collecting existing data, analyzing that, calculating no build traffic volumes, and comparing that with the proposed development. They conducted a traffic count on May 30, 2024 during peak hours of 7-9am and 4-6pm. He explained the peak hour traffic counts. He said they looked at pre-pandemic DOT data and data from the County. He said traffic volumes are lower than they were before the pandemic. Mr. Keller explained how they calculated the traffic count and said the intersection is un-signalized. He explained the level of service and said the intersection currently operates at a level "C" which is more than an acceptable level of service along a major State highway. He said they looked at no-build conditions and explained that to the Board. He said there were no other approved developments at this intersection. He explained the proposed trip generation. He said their analysis found that during the am peak hours the level of service remains at level "C" and during the PM peak hour there is a slight change to a level of service "D" on Brighton Rd. which is still an acceptable level of service. He said they analyzed the driveways as one location to be more conservative. He said the driveways would operate at a service level of "A". From a traffic perspective, this site would not have any impact on traffic flow along the State highway or along the County road or have an impact on the operation of the roadways. He said the Township has a parking requirement of 178 in the Redevelopment Plan with a provision for shared parking credit up to 20%, which reduces the parking requirement to 149. He said they are providing 125 spaces so they are requesting a variance for the difference. He said if there was a demand for those required spaces, a portion of the outdoor storage area could be set aside for those additional spaces. He said the ITA has a trip and parking generation manual, which are based on real world data. He explained the ITA to the Board. He said the real world data is that they need 62 spaces. He said from a site distance perspective the site would operate safely. There is more than adequate site distance and explained the requirements to the Board and said the site would operate safely.

Mr. Messerschmidt asked about the volume of Level "C" to which Mr. Keller said it is not based on volume but the ability of the traffic on the side streets to enter the flow of traffic on Route 206. He explained Level of service "C" to the Board. Mr. Messerschmidt asked about the trips

in and out of the site. Mr. Keller explained the calculations in his report to the Board. Mr. Messerschmidt asked why the report calculates to 2027. Mr. Keller said that is when the project is expected to be completed. Mr. Keller explained the calculation to the Board. Mr. Messerschmidt felt the amount of traffic going in and out of the site would be more during the construction period with the truck traffic. Mr. Keller explained the traffic during the construction period compared to the typical retail use. Mr. Messerschmidt felt the truck traffic during the construction process would have more of an impact on the area than after construction. Mr. Keller said they do not analyze construction traffic because it is temporary. He felt the number of truck trips would be less than the ultimate development would be.

Mr. Olsen asked for the number of trucks coming in and out of the site during construction. Mr. O'Neil said they would calculate that and get that number to the Board. Mr. Olsen asked how traffic is calculated with no known uses. Mr. Keller said it is based on the type of use. He explained table 2 of his report and said it is based on presumed types of tenants. He used a general light industrial uses for the flex building. Mr. Olsen asked for clarification on the traffic data numbers to which Mr. Keller explained how the data is calculated and what the traffic would be for a proposed use. Mr. Olsen asked if a turning lane would be necessary to which Mr. Keller said no because of the amount of traffic. Mr. Keller explained the levels of turning traffic onto Brighton Road and said it does not warrant a turning lane. Mr. Olsen asked for total traffic trips during the day to which Mr. Keller said they generally do not calculate that. Mr. Olsen asked for those numbers to be provided to the Board. Mr. Keller explained they look at peak hours and explained that the typical uses and their peak hours. He said they could provide the daily traffic volumes.

Ms. Gilchrist asked what would happen to the data if they had added the passerby traffic into the count to which Mr. Keller said it would decrease the numbers and explained the turning movements would not change. He said the pass-by traffic goes away at the driveway. Ms. Gilchrist asked if they witnessed any turning movements from the retail across the street during their traffic study. Mr. Keller said he was there during the morning and Simon Peter was not open and he was not there during the pm count. Ms. Gilchrist asked if the 28-second delay was an average to which Mr. Keller said yes and explained the signals at Goodale Rd and Limecrest Rd, which would create a gap in traffic along Route 206. He said they calculate the delay based on an average. Ms. Gilchrist asked if cars would backup on Brighton Road. Mr. Keller said there were never more than three vehicles waiting in line to make the left turn out onto Route 206 and that only happened a few times. Mr. Keller explained his calculation on the turning wait time. Ms. Gilchrist expressed a concern about future development. Mr. Keller said they do not have to factor in future development. He said they did factor in growth and the impact. He said the intersection operates safely and operates within the confines of what the DOT requires, and in his opinion, this is an appropriate development from a traffic perspective and would operate safely and there would not be undue congestion at the intersection.

Ms. Rozek asked if a turning lane would be needed in the future since the tenant is unknown. Mr. Keller said they do know what traffic is expected with a shopping center of this size. He explained how they collect and analyze the data.

Mr. Ordile asked about the sources of the data. Mr. Keller said the traffic counts are based on a person counting traffic, which is then compared to County and DOT data. The trip generation come from the ITE Trip Generation Manual. Mr. Ordile asked if Level "D" is acceptable to which Mr. Keller said the DOT determines it is acceptable. Mr. Ordile asked which proposed operation would have the most traffic to which Mr. Keller said most likely the flex space. Mr. Ordile asked questions about the onsite traffic for the flex buildings to which Mr. Keller gave examples of how the onsite traffic would operate. Mr. Ordile asked how many spaces were in front and on the side of the retail to which Mr. Keller said 47.

Mr. Olsen asked if one driveway was for ingress and one for egress to which Mr. Keller said they are both for ingress and egress and explained the site circulation. He said good circulation has multiple access points to the site. Mr. Olsen asked if there would be signage for where the customers should park, to which Mr. Keller said that was an operations question.

The Board took a 10-minute break.

Ms. Howell said during the construction period the tunnel in Andover will be shut down and a lot more traffic would be coming out onto Brighton Rd and asked if that would cause problems. Mr. Keller said he was not aware of what the State is doing and that would not be a typical decision in the calculations. He said the Township Committee could go to the State and ask for a temporary traffic signal.

Mr. Stoner said he had no objection to the level of service calculation. He expressed a concern with the unknown tenants. Mr. Keller said that typically flex space buildings of the proposed size have single unit trucks or box trucks. He said onsite traffic would be mostly passenger vehicles. Mr. Stoner asked about the DOT access permit to which Mr. Keller said Route 206 in this area only allows access from the side street. Mr. Stoner asked how many vehicles could stack on Brighton Rd before the first driveway to which Mr. Keller said nine vehicles.

Mr. Ordile asked if Mr. Keller had asked the DOT for an access point to which Mr. Keller said the answer would be no.

Mr. Carafello asked if they had applied to the County for an access permit to which Mr. Keller said no.

Mr. Messerschmidt opened the meeting to the public.

Mr. Ursin questioned Mr. Keller's testimony on the required number of parking spaces. Mr. Keller explained the ITE parking requirements for these types of uses and said they calculate the parking on the square footage of the buildings. Mr. Ursin asked about the uses that were proposed for the buildings. Mr. Keller explained the uses and said the flex spaces are not small offices but rather storage and assembly areas. Mr. Ursin questioned Mr. Keller on the various

codes that could be used for the calculation. Mr. Ursin asked if a three-lane entrance would be warranted. Mr. Keller said this site would not warrant a three-lane access.

Mr. Wayne Grenewicz asked about the distance from the stop line and the double yellow line that Mr. Ursin referred to which Mr. Keller said that was not his testimony.

With nobody coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public.

Mr. Briigliodoro swore in Mr. Joseph R. Gates, Professional Architect with Gates Architectural Design. Mr. Gates gave his qualifications, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Gates presented a color version of sheet A-1, entitled Architectural Plans, with a date of 8.29.22 which was marked and entered as exhibit A-2.

Mr. Gates presented a color version of sheet A-2, entitled Architectural Plans with a date of 8.29.22 which was marked and entered as exhibit A-3.

Mr. Gates said there are three proposed buildings. The retail is 57' X 175' which is 10,000 square feet and is divided into four separate units. Each unit is 2,500 square feet and all units have separate entrances. Mr. Gates explained the entrances and the accent features. He said the façade could be changed for a little variation in color. He explained the stone veneer at the bottom, cement panels in the middle with metal panels at the top with accent features.

Mr. Gates said the flex buildings are 100' X 250' and divided into five spaces each. Each space has a small office in the front with warehouse space in the back with overhead doors. The colors are from the Benjamin Moore Historic selection. He said the design is compatible with the Redevelopment Plan with split face block at the bottom, cement panels in the middle and metal panels at the top. He said the buildings were designed at the same time the Redevelopment Plan was being adopted.

Mr. Stoner asked how the buildings are compatible with other features of the Redevelopment Plan. Mr. Gates said the retail is more compatible with the Redevelopment Plan and it would be easy enough to add a cap along the top to help breakup the vertical façade of the two flex buildings. He said he could make them a little more similar to the retail. Mr. Stoner said the warehouse flex spaces were not in line with the Redevelopment Plan. He felt it looked very industrial and plain. Mr. O'Neil said they could make those changes and return to the Board.

Mr. Ordile asked about signage. Mr. Gates said the units would have small nameplate signs and would add that to the plan. Mr. Ordile asked about lighting on the flex building to which Mr. Gates said it was on the site plan and explained the locations. Mr. Gates said any door would have to have a light. Mr. Stoner said the plan showed a flood light which is not usually permitted.

Mr. Ordile asked if the building could be anywhere between one and five units or would be built as five distinct units. Mr. Gates said it could be either way and that would be left to the owner to decide. He said the structure is set so that the separation walls could be added as needed. Mr. Ordile expressed a concern if the building was only for one tenant. Mr. Ordile asked about the sprinkler room. Mr. Gates explained the sprinkler room. Mr. Ordile asked for the location of the HVAC system. Mr. Gates said it could be roof or ground mounted and could be screened and not seen. Mr. Ordile asked about the colors. Mr. Gates said his exhibits are the general colors but they vary. Mr. Ordile asked if the retail building could also be one or more units. Mr. Gates said the walls could be installed or removed as needed. Mr. O’Neil felt they should stop the hearing, get more information for the Board, and revise the plan.

Mr. Carafello asked if the buildings were pre-engineered to which Mr. Gates said yes. Mr. Carafello asked for the height to the ceiling of the flex building to which Mr. Gates said 20 feet.

Mr. Messerschmidt said the hearing would be carried to November 19, 2024 at 7:30pm without further notice.

OLD BUSINESS:

Mr. Ordile asked about the cannabis ordinance amendment. Mr. Messerschmidt said the Board Secretary was looking for sample ordinances.

NEW BUSINESS:

Ms. Howell asked about a stormwater tree ordinance. Mr. Stoner said the Township drafted a tree preservation ordinance. Ms. Howell asked if it was adopted. The Board Secretary will get the ordinance from the Clerk and send it to the Board.

Mr. Messerschmidt said the Land Use Board Procedures were removed from the website. He said they are making changes and will repost them when those changes are completed.

The Board Secretary said larger applications would now be sent to the Township Fire Official for his review and a report.

LIAISON REPORTS:

Township Committee – Mike Lensak

Environmental Commission –Eric Olsen

Sustainable Andover – Eric Olsen

Economic Development Committee – John Carafello

Master Plan – Joseph Ordile

The Board agreed to carry the liaison reports to the next meeting.

VOUCHERS:

Company	Purpose	Amount	Paid By
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Master Plan	\$870.00	Budget

Harold Pellow Assoc.	Priority Compactor Repair, LLC	\$858.00	Applicant's Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	National Land Developers	\$403.00	Applicant's Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Perona Realty Corp.	\$1,293.00	Applicant's Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Ringo Properties	\$537.13	Applicant's Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Feels of Green	\$725.00	Applicant's Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Suez Water	\$87.00	Applicant's Escrow

A motion to pay the bills was made by Ms. Howell and seconded by Mr. Ordile. Roll Call: Eric Olsen – yes, Suzanne Howell – yes, Richard Skewes – yes, Joseph Ordile – yes, Krista Gilchrist – yes, John Carafello – yes, Karen Rozek – yes, Paul Messerschmidt – yes. Motion carried.

PUBLIC PORTION:

If a member of the public has a question or comment, please raise your hand and wait to be recognized by the Chairperson to speak. Please come forward when recognized and state your name and address, unless you are a registered covered person under Daniel's Law by the Office of Information Privacy. Please refrain from asking questions or making comments about any pending application before the Board, as the applicant may not be present for cross-examination. The Chairperson has the right to limit the amount of time a person from the public has to ask questions and make comments so all members of the public may have a chance to speak.

Mr. Messerschmidt opened the meeting to the public. With no public coming forward, the meeting was closed to the public.

CORRESPONDENCE:

1.) From: Patricia L. Bussow, RMC

Re: Resolution 2024-126 – Waiving a Cannabis Licensing Condition in the Matter of Feels of Green

2.) From: Mr. Virgil Rome, Jr., Sussex County Fire Marshall

Re: Ringo Properties, LLC – Review of the application.

PENDING APPLICATIONS:

1.) Canniff, William & Michelle – 10.15.24 Completeness and Hearing

2.) National Land Developers, LLC – Hearing 10.29.24

3.) Woodmont Treatment Center, LLC – Hearing 10.15.24

UPCOMING MEETINGS: October 15, 2024, October 29, 2024

ADJOURNMENT:

With no further business to come before the Board, a motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Howell. It was seconded by Mr. Olsen and passed with everyone saying aye.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Stephanie Pizzulo

Stephanie Pizzulo

Land Use Administrator