



# ANDOVER TOWNSHIP

SUSSEX COUNTY • NEW JERSEY

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

**CALL TO ORDER:**

Ms. Howell called the meeting to order at 7:30pm.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

Ms. Howell led everyone in a flag salute.

**OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT NOTICE:**

Ms. Howell 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](http://www.andovertwp.org).

**ROLL CALL:**

Michael Lensak (Class I) - Present  
Eric Olsen (Class II) – Present  
Eric Karr (Class III) – Absent  
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) – Excused

**Also Present:**

Richard Brigliadoro, Esq.  
Cory Stoner, PE

Stephanie Pizzulo, Secretary

**ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS:**

**Approval of Minutes:** None.

**RESOLUTIONS:** None.

**COMPLETENESS:** None.

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

**1.) Area in Need of Redevelopment Study for Block 103, Lots: 2 & 3.02**

*The purpose of the study is to make a determination as to whether the study area qualifies as a Non-Condemnation Area in Need of Redevelopment. The study area is comprised of two parcels which occupy 75.57 acres with frontage along Newton Sparta Road. Both lots are irregular in shape with the remains of structures present on Lot 2.*

Mr. Brigliadoro said the procedural requirements have been satisfied.

Mr. Brigliadoro swore in Ms. Jessica Caldwell, PP.

Ms. Caldwell said she submitted a study to the Board dated February 14, 2024, which was the result of the passing of Resolution 2023- 106, which requested the Land Use Board undertake a preliminary investigation of the area identified as Block 103, Lots 2 & 3.02. She said the site occupies about 75 acres along Newton Sparta Road, was the location of a former Girl Scout camp and both lots are relatively undeveloped since the time of the camp. She said there are remains of camp structures, as well as two billboards along the roadway. She looked at the land value ratio and both of the properties are assessed as q-farm with a woodland management plan however, there is no value to the structures on the properties. Ms. Caldwell went over the history of land uses on the property and said there was a Girl Scout camp established in 1968 and operated until the late 1970s. She said there are structures on the property that are in a dilapidated state, the land has been transferred to a private owner and no further development was done to the property. Ms. Caldwell said there is an unpaved access drive and the camp property overflows into Sparta Township with an access drive from the Sparta Township side of the property. She said there was some farming on the site back in the late 1930s, construction of the camp in the 1960s and since then very little has happened on the property. She said there is a Category 1 stream that runs through the study area and underlying rolling hills. The Category 1 stream has 300-foot buffers on each side and runs along the Sparta Ave. side, which restrict access to the property from that side. She said the property is primarily forested with a 1.6-acre lake and two billboards at the front of the property. The front of the property is in the Community Business zone, which allows for a variety of retail and commercial businesses and the rear part of the property is in the R-2 single-family zone.

Ms. Caldwell said she looked at the most recent Master Plan Reexamination Plan as well as the existing Master Plan. She went over some of the goals of the Master Plan and the Municipal Land Use Law. She went over the redevelopment criteria. She said there are structures on the site that are dilapidated and in a state of obsolescence and deterioration. She said the discontinuance of the property occurred around 1978 and since then the property has been allowed to fall into a state of disrepair. She said the property has been vacant for more than 45 years and the Category 1 stream along Newton Sparta Road limits the access and the topography is an issue. She said the designation would be consistent with "Smart Growth." She said developing the area through redevelopment would serve "Smart Growth" principals in locating new development in the area.

Ms. Caldwell said they identified four of the eight criteria, which were criterion A, B, C and H of the Redevelopment Code.

Mr. Lensak asked how close the nearest residential house is located. Ms. Caldwell said they are across the roadway.

Mr. Stoner asked if the redevelopment code had a certain number of dilapidated structures in order to comply. Ms. Caldwell said it just says the generality of buildings are substandard but there is no threshold.

Ms. Gilchrist asked if the property in Sparta Township is also not being used. Ms. Caldwell said that portion is in the same state but is not part of the study because it is in a different municipality.

Mr. Olsen asked if it is common to conduct a redevelopment study on a mostly vacant parcel. Ms. Caldwell said it is not common but she has done them in the past. Mr. Olsen asked about the environmental constraints on the property. Ms. Caldwell was not sure how that would be overcome however, redevelopment allows for more creative ideas and opportunities. She said it could require some significant engineering work. Mr. Stoner said the redevelopment plan does not supersede DEP regulations to which Ms. Caldwell agreed.

Mr. Ordile asked Ms. Caldwell if she was aware of any redevelopment plan for the property in Sparta to which Ms. Caldwell said she was not aware. Mr. Ordile asked how long the two billboards were on the property to which Ms. Caldwell said she did not know. Mr. Ordile asked if she was aware of any permits for the billboards to which Ms. Caldwell said she was not sure how they got there.

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

A motion to recommend the Governing Body declare the area as a non-commendation area in need of redevelopment was made by Mr. Ordile and seconded by Mr. Skewes. Roll Call: Michael Lensak – yes, Eric Olsen – no, Richard Skewes – yes, Joseph Ordile – yes, Krista Gilchrist – yes, John Carafello – yes, Karen Rozek – no, Suzanne Howell – yes. Motion carried.

*Minor site plan application submitted in response to zoning notices of violation from the Township. No change in use.*

Mr. Lensak questioned if he could sit on this application. Mr. Briadoro said there was no “d” variance so he was permitted to sit on the Board for this matter.

Mr. Bruce Nimensky, Esq., with Gray Law Group, was representing the applicant. He said they were seeking minor site plan approval. He said the matter was raised by the Township and there are some variances and design waivers they were seeking.

Mr. Briadoro swore in Mr. David A. Clark, PE with CP Engineers. Mr. Clark gave his qualifications, which were accepted by the Board.

Mr. Clark said the applicant is 698 Route 206, LLC and the site is located at 698 Route 206, on the southbound side of Route 206. He said they are proposing a minor site plan to address several items brought up by the Township. He said the site is 4,000 square feet, located in the Route 206 Redevelopment Zone. He said the zone has no minimum for commercial use as far as lot size so the lot size is permitted under the zone. He said the site currently has three buildings; each building has a separate use, and under the redevelopment zone criteria; multiple buildings with multiple uses are acceptable.

Mr. Stoner asked Mr. Clark to give the Board a little history as to why they were before the Board. Mr. Clark said there have been a number of zoning violations that have been issued against the property and various letters from August 2022 through August 2023. He said there is no current proposed modifications to the site. He said they are addressing all of the issues that have been brought up through the letters and asking for either variances or deviations from the zoning plan to address the concerns. He said the site received a site plan waiver approval in 1993. Mr. Clark said some of the items listed in Mr. Stoner’s report are the result of the 1993 approval not being constructed as approved. He said they were seeking approval for all of those differences.

Mr. Clark went over the Board Engineer’s report dated May 3, 2024. He said there are three buildings on the site, Building A, B and C and located them on the plan for the Board. He said Building A is office space and is occupied by a contractor, Building B is occupied by a dog groomer which is a permitted retail service and Building C, which is occupied by the applicant, is a loading dock installation and repair business. He said Building C is a flex building which is allowed under the Redevelopment Plan.

Mr. Clark addressed the violation letters and said a trash enclosure was placed on the property without a zoning permit. He said behind the flex building is a pad for a dumpster. He said the

concrete dumpster is currently there and at the time of the letter, there was an enclosure around it. Mr. Clark said the client, in trying to comply with the zoning letter, removed the enclosure. He said they are requesting a variance for the pad and dumpster to remain and for the applicant to re-enclose that with a board-on-board style fencing. He said it would be 5.2 feet from the rear property line where 10 feet are required. He said on the south side of Building C there had been a shed style addition for storage, which has also been removed. He said the addition on Building B has also been removed. The area south of Building C was to be restored to lawn however; it was still gravel and being utilized for storage of materials. He said in 1993, prior to the site plan waiver, that area was gravel. He said the site plan waiver allowed for a larger structure and to remove the gravel and plant lawn along the side. He said at the time of the approval the area was wooded so that was one of the approvals the applicant varied slightly. He said the applicant removed parking and gravel areas elsewhere on the site and as a result has reduced the impervious on the site. He said the chain-link fence was never installed.

Mr. Clark said all vehicles on site are either tenants, customers or employees. He said there are materials stored outside, which are mostly materials that were purchased for a job and then removed from the site to be delivered to the applicant's clients. He said they are requesting the concrete pad and gravel be allowed to remain. He discussed the site plan layout and parking per the Redevelopment Plan and said 12 spaces are required where 18 spaces are provided. He discussed the size of the spaces and said if they complied with the required size, they would still have 15 spaces. Mr. Clark said they were not proposing to stripe the spaces because it has been functioning well and they are not proposing to change it. He said they were not proposing any screening for the loading area as the buildings provide screening for the loading area and it is not interfering with site movement. The two buildings have been in existence back to the 1950s and the surfaces that are currently there function and have been operating for over 30 years and there are no problems with it. The gravel has not been coming out into Route 206 and there have been no complaints recorded. They requested an exemption from the 10 X 20 parking space. Mr. Clark said the site has functioned with out the curbing and the addition of curbing could impede water runoff. They are not proposing to change the current drainage, parking loading area and vehicle movement on the site. Mr. Clark discussed the alterations to the parking from 1993 to current and said that since 1993 there has been a net gain in permeable surface. He said they are not proposing to change any landscaping because it functions and is aesthetically pleasing. There is a wooded area in the back right, a maintained lawn area, a significant tree at the front left of the property and the property is well maintained and groomed. There is no area in the parking lot that they could add additional plantings without reducing parking. Mr. Clark said the parking works for the applicant. Mr. Clark discussed street trees and said a significant amount of the frontage is driveway and parking area and there is not much area they could plant street trees without blocking signage and the driveway so they are not looking to add trees. They did not provide lighting intensity because there is no proposed change as the current lighting, which consist of a number of floodlights and wall-mounted sconces is sufficient. He explained where the lightings is located and said all

lights are on switches or motion detectors. The lighting is not excessive and is on mostly during the winter months until about 5:30pm. The lights are off when nobody is there and only the lights in rear are on motion detectors.

Mr. Clark said there are currently two free standing signs on site. The two signs advertise the two tenants and the size and height comply with the ordinance however, they do not meet the front yard setbacks. They are not proposing to modify the signs just maintain them. The sign to the north was part of the 1993 site plan waiver application. The one to the south has been added and the applicant said they had submitted a zoning application for that sign however it was not on file with the Township and they are requesting the signs be allowed to stay in their current locations. There is a building façade sign on building C that advertises the applicant's business, which complies, and they are looking to maintain that sign. They requested variances to maintain the signs in their current position. Mr. Clark felt the two free standing signs had predated the current zoning and requested a variance for the second sign and their current locations. Building A has window signs that exceed the allowable amount, which the applicant will address with the tenant. Mr. Clark addressed the outdoor storage and said they felt it was not storage but items that had been sold and awaiting placement. The items cannot be seen from any residential zone with the exception of the farm property and little bit from the street. Mr. Clark said they are proposing a board-on-board fence on the front left of building C to screen the view from the street. Mr. Clark said there are two existing septic systems one for Building A and one for Building B. He said the County has no records of the septic systems however, the septic systems are functioning and they are not looking to change them. He said there is one well on the property behind Building B.

Mr. Stoner said Mr. Clark had addressed the issues in his report. He said the Redevelopment Plan does permit three uses however, before the Redevelopment Plan was put in place there was only one permitted use allowed. He discussed the waivers and said the site had been in existence for many years. He said the proposal to "not" add landscaping might require a variance. Mr. Stoner suggested a light test. He said Building A is an office use, Building B is a retail service use and building C is a flex space for industrial or commercial type business. There was a discussion on the various uses in the buildings. There was a discussion on the outdoor storage. Mr. Clark said even though it is outside it would not be seen from any residential property.

Ms. Rozek asked for a survey of the septic and well to make sure the pipes could sustain the trucks driving over them. Mr. Clark said because the septic systems are separate and on either side of the drive, there are no pipes going across. He said the water pipe has no information on it however, it is probably at the required depth and felt there was no concern with the trucks driving over it. There was a discussion on the well and septic locations. Mr. Clark said they were approved at the time they were installed and there is no requirement to go back and check the distances. He said they are currently functioning.

Ms. Gilchrist asked if the contractor in Building A utilizes the outdoor storage area to which Mr. Clark said no. Ms. Gilchrist asked about the open wire fencing. Mr. Clark said that was the neighbors, which was removed. The only proposed fencing would be the six-foot high fence that goes from Building C to the property line and around the trash enclosure. Ms. Gilchrist asked if the applicant would agree to adding plantings along the property line to buffer the storage from the adjoining farm property. Mr. Clark said there is not a lot of room there but the applicant did agree to put something there.

Mr. Briigliodoro swore in Mr. David Mosner. Mr. Mosner said he would be agreeable to some planting along the property line from the adjoining farm property. Mr. Lensak requested a condition of any approval that the planting be maintained.

Mr. Olsen asked what the original use of the property was. Mr. Clark said going back to the 1993 approval, there was a retail use in Building A and the applicant utilized Building B as his office and what was in the location of existing Building C was a smaller garage which was an accessory structure. What is there now was approved as an accessory structure to Mr. Mosner's existing use. Mr. Olsen asked if the uses were ever approved by the Township. Mr. Mosner said the front building was used for sales office, Building B was originally a house, and the structure in the back he constructed. He said in 1992 the town knew the house would be used as an office. There was a discussion on the uses of the buildings over the years. Mr. Mosner said the Zoning Officer at the time knew the use because he needed to apply for FFL licenses. Mr. Olsen asked what is being stored outside. Mr. Mosner said he has loading docks and seals outside. He said the customer orders the dock, which are delivered, and then they are sent to the jobsite. Mr. Olsen asked how long the materials are typically onsite. Mr. Mosner said he could not afford to stock the material so as he sells it he tries to get it off the premises quickly. He said he tries to keep nothing on site because he cannot afford to stock the materials. Mr. Olsen asked about sidewalks. Mr. Stoner said he did not raise the requirement of a sidewalk because it would be about 50 feet however; it could be a design waiver. Mr. Olsen asked if there was an alternate location for the trash enclosure to be compliant with the rear yard setbacks. Mr. Clark said it could be moved further north and into the gravel area, however it would not be as hidden. They would enclose it but it would be more visible. Mr. Clark said its current location is less visible.

Mr. Stoner went over some of the Redevelopment Plan requirements. He felt some of the items could be waived because it is an existing property.

Mr. Ordile asked if Mr. Mosner maintains all records of zoning or construction changes that he has made. Mr. Mosner said he had not done anything different since he purchased the property in 1989. Mr. Ordile asked if he had construction or zoning permits to which he said no. Mr. Ordile asked if there were architectural renderings of Building C. Mr. Mosner said it is a pole

barn. Mr. Clark said the document he viewed which was a portion of a site plan showed the footprint of the building. Mr. Mosner said that is all he presented to the Board at that time. Mr. Ordile asked Mr. Mosner why his plans changed in 1998. Mr. Mosner said that originally it was to be a dome type building but felt it was ugly so they asked the Board for a pole barn. Mr. Ordile asked how many of the variances go back to the 1993 approval. Mr. Clark went over those variances. Mr. Ordile asked when the temporary addition was built on the south side of Building C. Mr. Mosner said it was not an addition. It was a 10 X 10 freestanding building built about 8 years ago. He said they removed it when Mr. Stoner told him to remove it. Mr. Ordile asked why the gravel area was not replaced with grass. Mr. Clark said he utilizes it for where the loading docks are kept. Mr. Ordile about the location of the fence that was supposed to be built. Mr. Clark explained the proposed fence that was never built. Mr. Mosner said he never built it because he did not need it. Mr. Ordile asked about a small concrete slab to which Mr. Mosner said it was an old pad for the Eastern Propane business. Mr. Ordile asked if there are concrete stoppers in the parking area to which Mr. Clark said no. Mr. Ordile asked if Mr. Mosner would add them to Building A and B to which Mr. Mosner said yes. Mr. Stoner said the wheel stop could be made of any material. Mr. Ordile suggested small shrubs to the base of the signs to which Mr. Mosner said yes. Mr. Ordile asked about the two trailers parked behind building C. Mr. Mosner said he uses them to transport material to the jobsite.

The Board took a 10-minute break.

Ms. Howell opened the meeting to the public and read the following into the record:

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. Brigliadoro swore in James Grenewicz who identified himself as the tenant farmer at 690 Route 206.

Mr. Grenewicz asked where the dumpster was supposed to be located per the 1993 approval. Mr. Clark said they proposed disposal containers at the right rear of building A. Mr. Grenewicz asked if there was a change of use obtained from the Township for the house that is now being used as a dog groomer. Mr. Clark said it was on the site plan waiver application as an office use for Mr. Mosner's business as part of a site plan that was approved. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the unit is taxed as a residence or was it officially changed to be a commercial building. Mr.



Brigliadoro said how the structure is taxed is irrelevant to the land use end of the application. Mr. Grenewicz asked if it is officially zoned as a commercial building. Mr. Clark said the current zoning for the property is the Route 206 Redevelopment Plan, which permits the uses currently occupying the site. Mr. Grenewicz said as it stands now in its current use, because they have not been approved yet, it is still a residence and asked if that was what Mr. Clark was saying. Mr. Clark said no and explained it was approved in 1993 as an office. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the Township zoning for that building is commercial. Mr. Clark said his position is that it is commercial. Mr. Grenewicz asked if there was a separate septic for the dog grooming business. Mr. Clark said that was his understanding. Mr. Grenewicz asked if both septs are functioning and there are no issues. Mr. Clark said it is his understanding that both are functioning and no current issues. Mr. Grenewicz asked if there have been any issues that would require any professional service for the septic. Mr. Clark said not to his knowledge. Mr. Grenewicz asked when the last time a professional looked at the septs and rendered an opinion on their current status. Mr. Clark said he did not know. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the well was functioning properly. Mr. Clark said to his knowledge yes. Mr. Grenewicz asked if there have been any issues that require professional services recently. Mr. Clark said not to his knowledge. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the former garage where Building C is now had been demolished to which Mr. Clark said correct. Mr. Grenewicz asked if Mr. Clark was familiar with the piles of debris in the rear of the property along the property line with the farm. Mr. Clark said he was familiar with some piles back there however, he could not comment on the contents. Mr. Grenewicz asked if Mr. Clark had knowledge of where the materials came from to which Mr. Clark said he had no knowledge of where it came from. Mr. Grenewicz asked if Mr. Mosner would like to address the Board and identify where those materials came from. Mr. Grenewicz said Mr. Clark confirmed that there is currently piles of concrete to which Mr. Clark said he did not confirm that. Mr. Clark said he confirmed there were piles back there and said he did not know what the contents are. Mr. Grenewicz said there are piles of some material in the back and asked if Mr. Clark would go that far to say that. Mr. Clark said there is a grade change and said he would call it a berm but did not know what was in it. There was a discussion on the pile of debris.

Mr. Grenewicz asked Mr. Clark to elaborate where the delivery area is. Mr. Clark said it was in the general vicinity of the loading area. He said the trucks pull into the optimum space for drop off, are unloaded and the material is brought to the inside of the building or to the rear of the building. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the material coming in was palletize, to which Mr. Clark said he could not comment on that. Mr. Grenewicz asked how material is delivered to the site. Mr. Clark said by either flatbed, tractor trail, box truck, or Amazon trucks. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the trucks pull into the building or back in to which Mr. Clark said he did not know. Mr. Grenewicz asked if there was a tractor-trailer turn around on the plan to which Mr. Clark said no. Mr. Clark said there is no room on the site for that and it has been functioning like that for 30 years with no issues. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the tractor-trailer pattern would disrupt the traffic pattern on the highway. Mr. Clark said he could not comment on that. Mr. Grenewicz asked about the screening of the storage area and asked if the material gets taken away to

other jobsites. Mr. Clark said that is what has been testified to. Mr. Grenewicz asked if any old used material from those job sites come back to this facility. Mr. Clark said there may be materials brought back and maybe used on other job sites. Mr. Grenewicz asked if there is a residence that can see the back of the building. Mr. Clark said potentially but the zoning ordinance requirement is from a residential zone.

Mr. Briigliodoro swore in Mr. Wayne Grenewicz, a resident of Andover. Mr. Grenewicz said in September of 1990 Mr. Mosner went in front of the Board for a site plan waiver. Mr. Grenewicz read from minutes from a 1990 Land Use Board meeting. Mr. Grenewicz said he was trying to establish a pattern. Mr. Briigliodoro said the Board understood there were zoning violations and that the applicant is now before the Board to address that. Mr. Grenewicz asked if the Board, in 1990, allowed the applicant to convert a commercial business without an American Disabilities Act. Mr. Clark said he was not there and did not testify to that.

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

Mr. Nimensky said he had no further remarks.

Mr. Lensak asked if only one dumpster was permitted per the 1993 plan. Mr. Clark said the 1993 plan shows a refuse area adjacent to building A. Mr. Lensak asked if the dumpster at building C was approved. Mr. Clark said no it was not at that time. Mr. Clark said Mr. Stoner's report noted the one dumpster was placed without a zoning permit and that is why they are before the Board. Mr. Lensak asked if the residence that turned into a business was being taxed as a residence or as an office. Mr. Clark said he did not know. Mr. Lensak asked whose property the piles of debris are on. Mr. Clark said he would have to look at that because there were concerns about material across the property line as well. There was a discussion on the pile of debris and its location. He said the surveyor shows the fence post on the survey and so if someone went to the site, it would be able to determine which property the pile is on. Mr. Lensak expressed a concern about how the tractor-trailers get onto and off the property. Mr. Mosner said they pull into the first or second entrance and then back into the door. He said there has never been an issue. He said they do not stop traffic on the highway. Mr. Lensak asked how often the tractor-trailers come onto the property. Mr. Mosner said once or twice a month. Mr. Lensak asked about the garbage coming back to the site and how long it stays onsite. Mr. Mosner said it goes into a dumpster and he could not answer how long it is onsite.

Mr. Briigliodoro said the application is for a minor site plan as well as for some variances and design exceptions. He went over the variances and waivers requested and noted conditions. There was a discussion on the pile of debris. There was a discussion on truck deliveries. Mr. Lensak asked if it was possible to not have tractor trailers come to the site to which Mr. Mosner said no.

A motion to approve the application with the noted conditions was made by Mr. Skewes and seconded by Ms. Gilchrist. Roll Call: Michael Lensak – no, Eric Olsen – yes, Richard Skewes – yes, Joseph Ordile – no, Krista Gilchrist – yes, John Carafello – yes, Karen Rozek – no, Suzanne Howell – yes. Motion carried.

**ORDINANCES:** None.

**OLD BUSINESS:** None.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Mr. Ordile said the noise ordinance was never registered with the State, and therefore invalid. He said the Township Committee is moving the noise ordinance into the nuisance ordinance.

**LIAISON REPORTS:**

***Township Committee*** – Mike Lensak

Mr. Lensak said the ambulance squad approached the Township Committee to ask for their building to be rezoned. He said they did not pass anything but gave them the approval to move forward with looking for a buyer for the building.

Mr. Lensak said the Township is making signs for the businesses saying “Welcome to Andover.”

***Environmental Commission*** –Eric Olsen

Mr. Olsen had nothing new to report.

***Sustainable Andover*** – Eric Olsen

Mr. Olsen had nothing new to report.

***Economic Development Committee*** – John Carafello

Mr. Carafello had nothing new to report.

***Master Plan*** – Joseph Ordile

Mr. Ordile had nothing new to report.

**VOUCHERS:**

Company	Purpose	Amount	Paid By
Weiner Law Group	Andre Andrutchuk	\$448.00	Applicant’s Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Engineering	\$355.00	Budget
Harold Pellow Assoc.	698 Route 206S – David Mosner	\$142.00	Applicant’s Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Ringo Properties	\$ 71.00	Applicant’s Escrow
Harold Pellow Assoc.	Andre Andrutchuk	\$284.00	Applicant’s Escrow

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

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

1.) From: David C. Krueger, Environmental Technology, Inc.

Re: 285 Newton Sparta Rd., Block 106, Lot 17.07 – Application for Wetlands LOI

**PUBLIC PORTION:**

Ms. Howell opened the meeting to the public and read the following into the record:

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. James Grenewicz who identified himself as a tenant farmer in Andover, questioned if Mr. Lensak felt he should have recused himself to which Mr. Lensak said he did not feel he needed to recuse.

Mr. Grenewicz said the lawsuit referenced earlier had been dismissed.

Mr. Wayne Grenewicz, a resident of Andover, asked Mr. Stoner if he had a conflict with the applicant. Mr. Stoner said he had no conflict.

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

**PENDING APPLICATIONS:**

Ballantine Woods – Deemed Complete 4.2.24 / Hearing 5.21.24

Daniel Scully – Deemed Complete 2.20.24 / Hearing 5.21.24

Ringo Properties – Deemed 4.19.24/ Hearing 6.18.24

Priority Compacting Repair, LLC – Deemed Incomplete 1.16.24

**UPCOMING MEETINGS:** May 21, 2024, June 18, 2024

**ADJOURNMENT:**

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

Respectfully submitted,

Stephanie Pizzulo  
Land Use Administrator