

**MINUTES**

**7:30 PM**

**PRESENT:** S. Harris  
D. Haywood  
M. Syrnick  
G. Vitale  
L. Voronin  
D. Banisch, Planner  
M. Flynn, Attorney

**ABSENT:** J. Mathieu  
S. McNicol  
A. Russano  
F. Murray, Alt #1

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by D. Haywood at 7:32 PM.

**NOTIFICATION**

In order to ensure full public participation at this meeting, all members of this Board, and members of the public are requested to speak only when recognized by the Chair so that there is no simultaneous discussion or over-talk. Your cooperation is appreciated. The Board meeting is a virtual meeting held online. The meeting is hosted on Zoom with the link posted on the Township website.

Notification of the time, date and place of this meeting has been published in the Hunterdon County Democrat and Courier News on January 20, 2023, and has been posted in the Kingwood Township Municipal Building on January 20, 2023 and has been filed with the Municipal Clerk.

**NEW AND PENDING MATTERS**

**Block 12, Lot 1 – Pierce – 1194 State Highway 12 – Request for Extension of Time to File ]**

It was moved by L. Voronin, seconded by M. Syrnick, and carried to adopt Resolution No. 2023-07 - Block 12, Lot 1 – Pierce – 1194 State Highway 12 – A Request for Extension of Time to File – 120 days.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2023-08**

**PLANNING BOARD  
TOWNSHIP OF KINGWOOD**

THE ANT FARM, LLC  
Block 12, Lot 1  
90 Horseshoe Bend Road, Frenchtown, New Jersey 08825  
Resolution No. 2023-09

**RESOLUTION OF EXTENSION OF TIME**

**WHEREAS**, The Ant Farm, LLC ("applicant"), has applied to the Planning Board of the Township of Kingwood ("Board") for an extension of the time permitted to record the deed of subdivision in accordance with the conditions set forth in the Board's resolution dated March 9, 2023, granting the applicant minor subdivision approval, on the lot known as Block 12, Lot 1 in the municipal tax records, more commonly known as 90 Horseshoe Bend Road ("property" or "site"); and

**WHEREAS**, the 190-day period for filing a minor subdivision plat or deed pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47 will expire on September 15, 2023; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant requested an extension of the approval allowing time to perfect the subdivision deed by letter dated August 16, 2023, to the Board; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant indicated that the project has been delayed due to lack of approval of the final map and deed format, and approval from the State Department of Transportation; and

**WHEREAS**, an applicant may, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(f), apply for an extension of time to file a subdivision plat or deed either before, or after, what would otherwise be the expiration date; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds the applicant has demonstrated good cause, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(f), to warrant the Board granting an extension of the 190-day time period to perfect as the applicant has demonstrated: 1) that it was barred or prevented, directly or indirectly, from filing with the County due to a delays in the approval process; and 2) that the applicants promptly sought and diligently pursued all approvals prior to submitting for approval of the minor subdivision deed; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board further recognizes that the applicant will need additional time to file the subdivision deed and feels a four-month extension from the current date would be reasonable and appropriate;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Planning Board of the Township of Kingwood, on this 14th day of September, 2023, that the applicant's request to amend the resolution dated March 9, 2023, to permit additional time (four months from the date of entry of this resolution) to record the minor subdivision deed is hereby granted, nunc pro tunc if necessary, such that recordation must be effectuated on or before January 12, 2024, with such extension to be subject to all of the same conditions as are set forth in the Board's prior resolution to the extent same are not inconsistent therewith.

All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

**Block 12, Lot 33 – Delia – 955 County Road 519 – Request for Extension of Time to File**

It was moved by M. Syrnick, seconded by S. Harris, and carried to adopt Resolution No. 2023-08 - Block 12, Lot 33 – Delia – 955 County Road 519 – Request for Extension of Time to File – 90 days.

**RESOLUTION NO. 2023 - 09**

**PLANNING BOARD  
TOWNSHIP OF KINGWOOD**

**ESTATE OF SAMUEL M. DELIA, SR.**

**Block 12, Lot 33**

**963 County Road 519, Frenchtown, New Jersey 08825**

**Resolution No. 2023-10**

**RESOLUTION OF EXTENSION OF TIME**

**WHEREAS**, representatives from the Estate of Samuel M. Delia, Sr. (jointly "the applicant"), have applied to the Planning Board of the Township of Kingwood ("Board") for an extension of the time permitted to record the

deed of subdivision in accordance with the conditions set forth in the Board's resolution dated March 9, 2023, granting the applicant minor subdivision approval, on the lot known as Block 12, Lot 33 in the municipal tax records, more commonly known as 963 County Road 519 ("property" or "site"); and

**WHEREAS**, the 190-day period for filing a minor subdivision plat or deed pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47 will expire on September 15, 2023; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant requested an extension of the approval allowing time to perfect the subdivision deed by letter dated August 16, 2023, to the Board; and

**WHEREAS**, the applicant indicated that the project has been delayed due to lack of approval of the final map and deed format, and approval from the County Planning Board; and

**WHEREAS**, an applicant may, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(f), apply for an extension of time to file a subdivision plat or deed either before, or after, what would otherwise be the expiration date; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board finds the applicant has demonstrated good cause, pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-47(f), to warrant the Board granting an extension of the 190-day time period to perfect as the applicant has demonstrated: 1) that it was barred or prevented, directly or indirectly, from filing with the County due to a delays in the approval process; and 2) that the applicants promptly sought and diligently pursued all approvals prior to submitting for approval of the minor subdivision deed; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board further recognizes that the applicant will need additional time to file the subdivision deed and feels a three-month extension from the current date would be reasonable and appropriate;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, by the Planning Board of the Township of Kingwood, on this 14th day of September, 2023, that the applicant's request to amend the resolution dated March 9, 2023, to permit additional time (three months from the date of entry of this resolution) to record the minor subdivision deed is hereby granted, nunc pro tunc if necessary, such that recordation must be effectuated on or before December 13, 2023, with such extension to be subject to all of the same conditions as are set forth in the Board's prior resolution to the extent same are not inconsistent therewith.

All members present voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

### **Special Occasions Events on Preserved Farmland – Draft Ordinance**

D. Haywood commented that the draft is quite an extensive document and well done. She inquired if it had been forwarded to the Open Space/Agricultural Committee (OS/A).

D. Banisch responded he had no knowledge if it had been forwarded to them.

D. Haywood stated OS/Ag were definitely interested and she feels the Board needs their input on the ordinance. She inquired if there were any comments from the members. She inquired if the Board felt that it meets the needs of the residents surrounding the farms that are holding events.

M. Syrnick stated she lives on a gravel one lane road and certain items like parking and traffic control if there are more than 50 cars would be an issue with ongoing noise. The ordinance addresses the traffic and parking issues that could arise with the events. She did have a question about the changing of the definition of a farm stand. She thought the Board was going in a different direction by requiring a farm stand to have 75% of sales from products from the property. She feels that a farm stand is at the end of someone's driveway with 75% coming from the property versus a farm market where they may sell additional items and have 51% coming from the property and 49% of other items. A farm market would have a building and be more elaborate and not at the end of someone's driveway.

D. Banisch stated he was not aware that was how the Township wanted to deal with the issue. He stated the Planning Board would like definitions that distinguish between the two specifically. The definitions should relay the fact that a farm stand is at the end of a driveway and may or may not have someone at the stand. The purchaser would buy the produce and leave the money in a can or something similar. A farm market is a more formal arrangement.

M. Syrnick stated the draft indicates that a farm stand shall conform to the definition of a farm market. For her, a farm stand is someone who has eggs and produce and are selling it to their neighbors. A farm market is something more like a Black Shed type of business.

G. Vitale stated he agrees that a farm stand should be a table in the driveway and not meant to be a full time business. He would not equate the two to be the same thing.

D. Haywood stated the Township needs to make sure they have a consistent definition that all the Board members can agree upon for a farm stand. She inquired if the Board members can agree on a definition of a farm stand that it is located at the end of a driveway manned or unmanned.

M. Syrnick added that 75% of the product must come from the farm or residence.

L. Voronin agreed that a farm stand and farm market are different and should be separate. She stated a farm stand is pretty small.

D. Banisch stated the Township needs a definition of a farm stand in their ordinance. He stated it will have to be consistent with the Right To Farm Act (RTF). The ordinance currently contains a definition of a farm market but not a definition of a farm stand. He will work on an amendment and resend it to the secretary for circulation to other committees.

G. Vitale inquired why are farm stands being referenced in an ordinance for Special Events on Preserved Farmland.

D. Banisch stated it will address some clean up work as part of the same ordinance amendment. He said he could see a farm market having a Special Event. He stated the two are unrelated to one another.

D. Haywood requested it be taken out and D. Banisch come up with a proposal based on the Board's discussion.

M. Syrnick stated the Board spoke about a farm stand and that 75% of the product has to come from the farm. The stand is non-enclosed and non-permanent. She stated when you get to a structure with a roof and four walls it converts it into a farm market.

G. Vitale stated his farm stand is like a cabinet and you are unable to walk inside of it.

M. Flynn stated if you distinguish between the two in the ordinance, the Board can also be much freer in a way that a farm stand is an accessory and is included in zoning versus a farm market which may require a certain amount of parking or something if the Board is concerned about pedestrian traffic into an enclosed structure as opposed to a stand on the side of the road.

D. Banisch stated the ordinance does include some standards addressing farm markets. He stated a farm stand does not have to have any parking. Someone pulls off the side of the road or parks on the road, purchases their items and leaves.

D. Haywood agreed with D. Banisch's comments.

G. Vitale also agreed and stated the customer can pull into the driveway.

M. Syrnick was also in agreement.

M. Flynn stated the Township would get more control by distinguishing a farm stand and farm market.

S. Harris inquired about the place on Route 519, Sisters Farm. He inquired how would that be categorized. They have parking and indoor structures. He is not sure if 51% of the products sold there are generated on the property.

D. Banisch stated based on S. Harris' description, he would say it is a farm market.

M. Syrnick stated it is a farm market. It contains two enclosed structures, they hold events, there is parking and they bring in different products to sell. She thinks they recently had a big mum sale. There is a difference between the farm stand down the road that you would purchase some tomatoes.

M. Flynn stated if the farm stand/market does not meet the 51%, which is the commercial farm standard, then it just becomes a regular grocer and it is zoned and regulated separately.

G. Vitale stated he saw a sample ordinance that talked about the percentages to the amount of sales and not the amount of product. He stated the 51% has to come from the farm in sales for the year.

M. Flynn responded the ordinance was from E. Amwell. They have a sales criteria and also have a square footage of the structure criteria. The criteria is how much of the product is utilizing the square footage and is it made on site or imported.

G. Vitale stated if the Township does not utilize a square footage criteria and it does the 51% from the farm it can be seasonal. If someone has pumpkins, they could sell 51% in the fall and the rest of the year sell other stuff from China.

D. Haywood stated it would appear if you are selling 51% over the period of time, then you are meeting the requirements. She inquired if anyone else has a different interpretation.

M. Flynn stated for a commercial farm designation the farmer has to demonstrate where their income is from so it would be relevant for the sales and not just the storage or display of products.

M. Syrnick stated it might make sense in the definition of a farm stand versus a farm market to indicate the permitted square footage. She stated if the farm stand structure goes above the non-permitted shed it starts moving towards a farm market.

G. Vitale stated he thinks a permit is not required for a 200 sq ft shed, which is 12 x 16, and is a good size for a small market.

D. Banisch stated he can imagine a farm stand having a configuration of a table with a roof above it that the customer is underneath and technically inside of it. He stated the Board will need to distinguish between that structure and something larger. He stated initially during the discussion a roof with an enclosure was a criteria.

G. Vitale stated a farm stand is open air. He stated it can have a roof with all the sides open and still be considered a farm stand.

D. Banisch suggested a structure with a roof of about 12 x 16. There is a table underneath from one end to the other and it is manned and you can walk inside but it is not enclosed. He inquired if the fact that it is manned make it more of a market rather than it being unmanned and a stand.

G. Vitale inquired if it is a permanent structure.

D. Banisch responded in this example, it is not.

M. Syrnick stated she purchases produce from someone outside of Stockton who has a wagon with a roof on it. The wagon has wheels and is pretty substantial, possibly 10' wide by 12-15' long, where they pile up their produce and sell it. They are there for some period of time when they have produce to sell and then they are gone.

D. Banisch inquired if it being a non-permanent structure should be a criteria in the definition.

S. Harris responded that he read somewhere that it is a permanent structure.

D. Banisch stated he will draft language up for the Board to review. He inquired if the Board would like to settle on a square footage.

The Board agreed that there should be a square footage maximum in the ordinance for farm stands.

D. Banisch suggested possibly 200 sq ft.

The Board members agreed with the above comments.

### **Farmland Preservation Plan**

D. Banisch stated he is still working on the revisions. He has not finished the target farms and cost estimate.

### **Trailer Storage Ordinance Review**

L. Voronin stated she had a few comments about the memo dated August 16, 2023.

M. Flynn stated it was marked as "Attorney-Client Privileged" and if it is shared on the screen the Board would be waiving the attorney client privileged.

D. Banisch stated the memo raised a few questions.

M. Flynn stated the ordinance does not limit the number of what it considers utility trailers which are used in an agricultural operation. In the AR-2 Zone, which may be the largest in the Township, utility trailers are unlimited in number if they are stored in side or rear yards. He stated in theory what a farmer could do is bring in hundreds of these utility trailers and provided that they do not meet all alternative definitions and the ordinance, which include, cargo containers or storage containers, they are a utility trailer. If they are a utility trailer and are used to transport product, they can be unlimited in nature. Based on last month's discussion, the Board may have been interested in amending the ordinance to control the number of trailers on a property. The Board could limit the number by limiting the total amount of square footage or a number per acre. There are different ways to create limitations. As of right now, a lot could have unlimited storage of trailers in the rear and side yards in the AR-2 Zone.

M. Syrnick stated the particular incident that the Board was referencing the trailers are used for transporting hay. They need these trailers to store the hay and then transport it or pick it up from their other locations. She stated the trailers are a significant part of his business. She stated for agricultural production, she would not want to ever restrict that activity. If you restricted it, you would be cutting off a farmer's income. She stated if it is just a junkyard storing those trailers, that is a different story.

M. Flynn stated he is not suggesting anything. He stated the memo presented the options available to the Board. The property in question would be grandfathered in if a new ordinance was passed.

D. Haywood inquired what raised the whole issue. She inquired if there was a situation where it is out of hand.

S. Harris stated he looked at Google today and it does not look like too much of an issue. He stated the Precision Drilling and a couple other places may have some vehicles stored on them.

L. Voronin stated looking at the Precision Drilling property, it has about 500 tractor trailer containers on it. It looked like the whole side of the property is covered with them. The other issue is the Board was talking about farm stands and saying that they would have to have 51% of the product that they are selling on their property has to be from that property. The Board is then talking about this farm on Route 519 and he is bringing in a lot of hay that he is getting from outside the Township and it is not off of his farm. She stated it does not look like he is not even getting 10% from his farm as he has only 13 acres. She stated it looks like maybe 3 acres are being used for the storing of the trailers and the buildings, so he is maybe farming 10 acres. She stated the Board is regulating farm stands by requiring them to sell 51% of the produce from their farm but we have this other person who has all the trailers, is getting hay from all over the place and storing it in all these tractor trailers. She stated there seems to be two sets of rules and she doesn't think it is fair.

S. Harris stated one supplements an income and the other one it is their main business. He feels that would be the biggest differential. For a farm stand you would be selling your eggs or mums at the end of the driveway and not going to make a living selling the eggs or mums. The farm stand will supplement your income versus it being your main source of income.

M. Syrnick stated the property on Route 519 is the farmer's business. He is doing the business of agriculture. It is different than if somebody were to build a building and want to start selling products from their farm in a retail setting, which would be considered a farm market.

L. Voronin stated the Board was discussing farmers and there is a set of rules for these farmers who are selling their produce at either a farm stand or farm market as opposed to this person who is bringing in a lot of hay, storing it



there and then taking it out, selling it and bringing it to someplace to deliver it. She does not see why there is a difference between a farm stand and a commercial farmer who is using his land to store a lot of farm product. She stated if he owned and only sold 10-20% from his farm, why is it okay for him to do that and the farm market has to have 51% of the stuff they are selling from their farm.

D. Haywood stated it doesn't seem as if the Board is discussing the same thing. There is a difference between a farm stand and a farmer that has a number of farms that he works and aggregates the product on his property for distribution. She doesn't see any similarity.

M. Flynn stated his office reviewed the issue extensively. A farm stand is usually protected by the RTF provided that the farm is making a certain amount of income. The property in question is a commercial farm but trailer storage is not a protected use under the RTF, so they are separate considerations. The homeowner could go to the County Ag Board and get a Site Specific Agricultural Management Practice (SSAMP) site plan approval, which they did not do since their use is permitted under the ordinance. The use is distinguishable because the farm stand is regulated by the RTF and the trailer storage for the hay and other agricultural material is regulated by the Township's local ordinance because the storage of agricultural products is not a protected activity of the RTF.

D. Haywood inquired if the Township does have an issue and if there is an issue how can it be corrected.

D. Banisch stated agricultural has to be put in context. He stated the mere fact that the Township hasn't seen any very intensive agricultural use in the Township doesn't mean it can't happen. The big dairy farms have moved away. Chickens were big in the area as evidenced by the chicken farms all over the Township. He requested the Board to take a step back. He stated the site that has been identified in this discussion is a commercial farm. Agricultural is an industry and has all kinds of variables that would be protected under the law. He inquired how significant is the situation. If it is visually unappealing, something could be done about it. The Board has to keep in mind that agriculture can be a lot uglier than a few trailers and create a lot of impact on the community and still be protected under the RTF.

D. Haywood inquired if the trailers are causing an issue in the area with a lot of traffic. She inquired if the Board needs to take any type of action.

D. Banisch inquired about the location of the property.

M. Syrnick stated it is located on Route 519 south of Baptistown. It is set back from the road and not highly visible from the road. The owner has been an active farmer for years and years. The situation came to light because of looking at Google Earth. She stated after reading M. Flynn's memo, it is a legitimate business that has gone to the County to be determined a commercial farmer and uses the trailers as part of the farming business. She hasn't received any complaints from the neighbors or anyone else. She thinks the Planning Board is sensitive because they have had other issues with other properties in the Township.

D. Haywood inquired if the Board needs to take any action or hold it in abeyance at this point. She asked L. Voronin her opinion.

L. Voronin stated she is not convinced that this is really a farming operation. She had some comments about the August 16, 2023 memo from the attorney. She stated underneath Factual Background it says by their own admission they are using the trailers to store and transport hay bales that are reaped from the property's fields. In



the previous memo from July 10, 2023 on Exhibit F it states that he picks the bales of hay at other farms so all of his hay is not from this property. She inquired if the Township has proof.

D. Haywood inquired if he is obtaining the hay from properties that he rents.

L. Voronin responded they are not reaped from his property but from someone else's property.

G. Vitale stated if he is registered as the farmer of the property, he is the owner of the crop.

D. Banisch stated the definition of a farm unit in the RTF is all those properties that the farmer is farming and he may be leasing. He may own all of the land or it can be a combination of leasing and owning.

L. Voronin stated she is referencing the statement under Factual Background in the memo where it states that the hay bales are reaped from the property's fields indicating that all of the hay in the trailers are from that property. She feels it isn't really factual.

D. Banisch stated it could be the farm unit. He stated another side to this where he is buying the hay off of farms that are under farmland assessment and that's how those property owners make their farmland assessment income, which yields a fairly significant benefit in terms of maintaining their farmland assessment. It also yields a fairly significant benefit in terms of maintaining the open space in the agricultural character of the Township. The other point that L. Voronin may have been raising is if the property is running some other type of business. He stated at a certain point the Township has to accept that farmers are doing what they can to survive and they'll cobble together as many locations as they can to farm to maximize whatever production they can put together.

L. Voronin stated there was another statement in the memo that states that it is uncertain as to exactly how many of the such trailers are regularly stored on the property through first hand accounts. She stated she does not know who the first-hand accounts were and suggests there maybe six to fifteen. She doesn't know where those numbers came from and who is the first-hand account.

D. Haywood inquired of L. Voronin is it that she doesn't like that many trailers on the property.

L. Voronin stated that her problem with the memo is that it states Factual Background and that it is not factually correct and she doesn't understand why any of this is in the memo because it was just background information. She inquired how is it relevant to the discussion of changing the current ordinance to limit the number of trailers that can be stored on a farm. Those are her problems with the memo. She doesn't feel it is correct. She stated no one went out to check to see if these trailers are legal. They have to be registered with the DMV and they have to have a license plate and insured.

D. Haywood asked inquired of L. Voronin what she would like the Board to do in regard to the trailers. She has heard a lot of different things from the Board's experts and she is not sure where L. Voronin would like the Board to go.

L. Voronin stated her concern is that there are a lot of trailers on the property and what are they really being used for on the property. She thinks the Board needs to establish if they are really using these trailers to store hay. She doesn't have a problem with that but you can see from the road that they don't look like they are in operation. Some of them are leaning over and one of them doesn't even look like it has a top on it. It looks like it went through an overpass and the trailer was too big and it ripped off the top of it. She inquired if the Township should

be going out and checking to ensure those trailers are being used for the farm operation. She stated that is her concern.

D. Haywood inquired if there is a method available in the community to do what L. Voronin is requesting.

M. Syrnick stated she sent the issues of the Planning Board to the Zoning Officer. The Township cannot just walk onto somebody's property. The Zoning Officer can send a letter and ask the owner if he can come and inspect the property. If the property owner refuses, there is only so much he can do. It is private property and someone can't just barge on to the property because of hearsay. If the Zoning Officer visits the property and they are full of hay, there are no violations. She stated the properties that the Township had him look at were found to have no violations. She stated people may not like what they see but they are not in violation. She stated if she read M. Flynn's memo the property owner is permitted to do what he is doing on the property. She knows that the ordinance provides for two unlicensed vehicles on a property.

M. Flynn stated the distinction between storage containers and utility trailers is that the definition for storage container specifically exempts trailers that are tagged, registered, and used in an agricultural operation. If they are not tagged you have a potential discrepancy in the ordinance where it depends on the way you look at it. It could be considered either a portable storage container or a utility trailer provided it meets the definition of utility trailer it is permitted by ordinance in the rear yard as its currently situated.

D. Haywood stated it sounds to her that the Township doesn't have any legal right to try to go in and enforce something. She agrees with L. Voronin about having things licensed and insured. If the trailers are used to transport the hay from other farms or other locations to this particular location, she would then assume that the owner is not in violation of not having them insured or licensed for the road and if they are being used for storage, then there is no requirement to have them registered or licensed. She is still having a problem trying to understand if there really is an issue. She stated it doesn't seem that the Township does. She stated she is looking for input from the Board of either confirmation or argument that the Township does have an issue.

M. Syrnick stated people might not agree with her but they have talked with people that have done business with him and they have not issue on that property. She stated the drilling company keeps expanding and its not a farm. It is a business in the agricultural zone. She isn't sure of the background on the business since it has been there for approximately 25 to 30 years.

S. Harris stated the drilling property has pipes for drilling and no trailers.

M. Syrnick stated he has a storage yard for pipes. The farmer on Route 519 is a farmer and other people in the farming industry state that he is 100% a farmer and uses that property for agriculture or agricultural activities. He may have a lot of trailers but it is what it is.

G. Vitale stated he agrees with M. Syrnick statement. Farming is not always glamorous so there may be parts of it that someone may not like such as when it was hinted about back when there were chicken coops everyone. It can get overwhelming but this guy is a farmer and salt of the earth kind of person. He has found a way to make his operations work without going into such severe debt so that he has to sell to some developer who is going to build homes. There may be some other properties where it is becoming an issue where they are not putting vehicles out of the way and people can see them.

D. Haywood requested the item be removed from the agenda. She thinks the Board has reached an impasse at this point. She stated as M. Flynn has pointed out any changes in the ordinance would not affect the property as it is grandfathered.

### **Farm Stand Memo**

D. Haywood stated it was discussed under the Special Events on Preserved farms and D. Banisch will have provide a draft for review by the Board.

### **Minutes**

It was moved by S. Harris, seconded by M. Syrnick, and carried to approve the minutes of August 10, 2023 and place on file.

An unidentified member of the public inquired if she needed zoning approval for a 12 x 16 shed.

M. Flynn responded the Board cannot give out advice at meetings but what he would recommend is that she reach out to the Zoning Officer and Construction Official at the Township building. He informed her the contact info is on the website.

All members presented voted **AYE** on **ROLL CALL VOTE**.

### **CORRESPONDENCE**

### **PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

### **ADJOURNMENT**

It was moved by M. Syrnick, seconded by S. Harris and carried to adjourn the meeting at 8:32 pm. All members present voted **AYE**.

**Respectfully submitted,**

**Diane Laudенbach, Secretary**