

**OXFORD TOWNSHIP  
LAND USE BOARD  
MEETING February 27, 2024  
www.oxfordtwpnj-org**

**FLAG SALUTE**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Mr. Ischinger called the meeting to order at 7:16pm

**ADEQUATE NOTICE** was given as follows: Notice was sent to the Express Times and The Star Ledger. Notice was posted on website and the municipal bulletin board in the Township Administration building in Oxford Township, New Jersey and notice was filled with the Township Clerk.

**ROLL CALL:**

Members Present: Mayor Norton, Mr. Ort, Ms. Koufodontes, Mr. Ott, Mr. Ischinger, Ms. Hoffman, Mr. Mcguire, Mr. Weiss(arrived 7:19pm)

Members Absent: Mr. Niece, Ms. Taranto, Mr. Deneault, Mr. Oneil

Professionals: Richard Schneider Attorney, Michael Finelli Engineer,

**MINUTES:** January 23, 2024 Re0 Org Land Use Board

Eligible to Vote: Mayor Norton, Mr. Ort, Mr. Niece, Mr. Ott, Ms. Taranto, Mr. Ischinger, Ms. Hoffman, Mr. Mcguire, Mr. Mcguire, Mr. Weiss, Mr. Deneault

A motion to approve meeting minutes was made by Mr. Ischinger, seconded by Mr. Ort

Ayes 6, Nays 0, Abstain 1,  
Motion carried.

**RESOLUTION 2024-4**

**APPOINTEMENT OF LAND USE BOARD PROFESSIONALS**

**RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CONTRACTS WITH** Van Cleef Engineering Associates LLC for Land Use Board Planner, for Professional Services for 2024.

**WHEREAS,** there exists a need for the retention of firms of consultants to

render professional advice to the Land Use Board on land use considerations and to review applications for development, and

**WHEREAS,** the contract is based on an hourly rate commencing on January

1, 2024 through December 31, 2024 and funds are available in the appropriation to the Land Use Board, and have been certified by the Local Finance Officer, and

**WHEREAS**, the Local Public Contracts Law (N.J.S. 40A:11-1 et seq.)

Requires that the resolution authorizing the award of contracts for “professional services” without competitive bids on the contract itself must be available for public inspection;

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the Land Use Board of the Township of Oxford as follows:

1. The Chairman and Secretary of the Land Use Board are hereby authorized and directed to execute the attached agreements with Vand Cleer Engineering Associates LLC
2. These contracts are awarded without competitive bidding as a “professional service” in accordance with N.J. S. 40A:11-5 (1) (a) of the Local Public Contracts Law because the above firms have served as the board’s professionals for more than one year and have special knowledge as to land use considerations and conditions in the township, which knowledge as to land use considerations and conditions in the township, which knowledge is particularly valuable to the Land Use Board.
3. A notice of this action shall be printed once in the official newspaper of the Township of Oxford.

**Certification:** I certify that this is a true copy of the Resolution adopted by the Oxford Township Land Use Board at their meeting held on February 27, 2024.

A motion to approve the resolution 2024-04 was made by Mr. Ort, seconded by Mr. Ischinger

Ayes 8, Nays 0, Abstain 0,  
Motion carried.

Richard Schneider stated that this Resolution 2024-05 for Valley Wellness BI 26 L 83 is memorialization from action taken at last month’s meeting. Mr. Schneider thanked Mr. Finelli on the help with this detailed 16 page resolution.

**OXFORD TOWNSHIP LAND USE BOARD**

**RESOLUTION 2024-05**

**DECIDED: January 23, 2024**

**MEMORIALIZED: February 27, 2024**

**MEMORIALIZING RESOLUTION GRANTING TO  
THE APPLICANT, VW RE HOLDINGS, LLC,  
PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN AND VARIANCE  
APPROVAL RELATING TO PROPERTY LOCATED  
AT BLOCK 26, LOT 83 ON THE OFFICIAL TAX  
MAPS OF THE TOWNSHIP OF OXFORD**

**WHEREAS**, VW RE Holdings, LLC, (“Applicant”) has applied to the Oxford Township Land Use Board (“Board”) for site plan and variance approval to operate a Class I Cannabis Cultivation Facility on property commonly designated as 311 Route 31, and designated as Block 26, Lot 83 on the Tax Maps of the Township of Oxford; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board conducted a public hearing on January 23, 2024, in accordance with the jurisdictional requirements of the New Jersey Municipal Land Use Law and the Oxford Township Land Development Ordinance; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board hereby makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1. The Applicant is the contract purchaser from the Township of Oxford of the subject property pursuant to a certain Contract of Sale. The Township consents to the application. It is noted that to avoid any potential conflicts of interest, the Mayor and Township Committee representatives of the Land Use Board have recused themselves from this application.

2. In conjunction with the consideration of this application, a brief background as to the recent history of the subject property is relevant and appropriate. The subject property is part of what was commonly referred to as the Cambridge West Property. In 2019, the Township Committee, pursuant to Resolution 2019-54, declared the subject property as a non-condemnation area in need of redevelopment. In furtherance of the designation of the subject property as an area in need of redevelopment, the Township adopted a Redevelopment Plan dated March 3, 2020 (“the Redevelopment Plan”). In furtherance of the aforesaid actions, the Township thereafter adopted a Resolution 2023-43 designating the Applicant here as a redeveloper for the redevelopment area, and entered into a Redevelopment Agreement by and between the Township and the Applicant as redeveloper.
3. The Board is in receipt of the following review reports:
  - A. Second Completeness and Initial Technical Review of Finelli Consulting Engineers (“FCE”) dated January 22, 2024.
  - B. Review report of HGA, Township Planner, dated January 22, 2024.

Both of the respective reports detail the documentary submissions made on behalf of the Applicant in support of the application. Specifically, reference is made to those plans referenced therein comprising a site plan of 21 sheets prepared by Wayne J. Ingram, P.E., P.L.S., P.P., of French & Parrello Associates dated November 30, 2023 (“Plans”). To address the initial recommendation of the Land Use Board Engineer to recommend the application incomplete, the Applicant, through its project engineer, submitted a correspondence dated January 5, 2024,

and at the Board's public hearing on January 23, 2024, the application was deemed complete.

4. The Applicant was represented by Brian Tipton, Esq., and presented the testimony of the following witnesses:

- A. Seth Tipton, Esq. – Mr. Seth Tipton is an attorney with the same law firm as Mr. Brian Tipton, and presented testimony as herein after detailed relative to the cannabis regulatory matters relating to this application.

- B. Wayne J. Ingram, P.E., P.L.S., P.P. – whose qualifications were accepted as an expert witness in the field of civil engineering and professional planning.

- C. Virginia Seminara, A.I.A. – whose qualifications were accepted as an expert witness in the field of architecture.

- D. Sarah Trent - principal of the Applicant and intended operator of the proposed cannabis cultivation operation.

5. The subject property comprises approximately 35.13 acres, with frontage both along New Jersey State Highway Route 31 and Upper Denmark Road. Of the 35.13 acres, approximately .7 acres of the property along Route 31 is cleared and vacant, while the remainder of the property is wooded. A waterline easement is located originating from Route 31 to an existing water tower located on an adjacent property, Block 26, Lot 83.01. With respect to surrounding land uses, the property is bordered to the east by residential properties, to the north and south by a wooded area, and to the west by farmland.

6. With respect to the zoning classification of the subject property, it is located in the Highlands Planning Area and within the TC-2 Zone of the Township within a Cannabis Business Overlay Zone (“CBO”). It is important to note that the CBO Zone is intended to permit certain limited classes of licensed cannabis businesses, as defined in the New Jersey Cannabis Regulatory Enforcement Assistance and Marketplace Modernization Act (“Act”), including, as a principal permitted use, any business requiring a Class I, II, III or IV Cannabis License, as defined in the Act. The Applicant proposes to operate a Class I cultivation facility, and at this time, that is the only use for which approval is being sought. The Applicant referenced a potential future use of the property for manufacturing purposes which, if pursued, would require a separate new application to the Board.
7. As originally filed, the Applicant sought preliminary and final site plan approval, together with certain variance relief, as hereinafter detailed and amended during the course of the public hearing. While it is noted that the Applicant sought both preliminary and final site plan approval, during the application process, it was determined that the Applicant would proceed only with a preliminary site plan application, together with required variance relief, and would not seek final site plan approval at this time.
8. The application, as originally filed, sought approval for the construction of a cannabis growth facility or cultivation facility involving the initial proposed construction of a 15,194 square foot single-story frame building intended as a cultivation and processing facility, as part of a contemplated Phase I approval with the intention to thereafter seek, as part of a subsequent phase, an additional future

expansion of that building comprising approximately 5,743 square feet. It was subsequently clarified during the course of the public hearing that the Applicant would not “phase” the development and would seek approval in one phase for the entirety of the building comprising the 15,194 square feet and 5,743 square foot area originally designated as proposed future expansion. The Applicant noted it may elect not to undertake the interior “fit-up” of the expanded area, but that would not impact its request to seek approval for the entirety of the building at this time as part of its application for preliminary site plan approval. In addition to the building as just described, the Applicant proposes five (5) 2,000 square foot greenhouse areas proposed atop a gravel lot. Additional site plan improvements include certain modular block retaining walls, a concrete equipment pad, a trash pad, lighting, gravel driveways and a paved driveway that will connect the facility to Upper Denmark Road to be physically located within the waterline easement. All of the details relevant to same are set forth on the aforesaid plans.

9. The Applicant presented the testimony of Seth Tipton, Esq., an Attorney at Law of the State of New Jersey and member of the same law firm of Mr. Brian Tipton. Mr. Tipton is a recognized expert in the field of law on cannabis regulations and specifically possesses expertise in the field of the relevant regulatory background relating to the operation of cannabis facilities under the previously referenced Cannabis Regulatory Act. As referenced above, this facility would constitute a Class I facility under the Cannabis Regulatory Act, and Mr. Tipton, as well as all other experts, made clear that this application seeks approval for a Class I cultivation only operation. It was expressly acknowledged that no approval for

retail sales is being sought and, in fact, such retail use would not be permitted as it relates to this property. The Applicant essentially has been granted a provisional license, which becomes in essence effective upon completion of final inspections after receipt of governmental approvals and construction. The Applicant noted that it may, at some future date, seek the right to conduct “manufacturing operations” at the facility, but no such approval is being sought at this time. Any such application would require a separate and new application to the Board.

10. The Applicant further presented the testimony of Wayne J. Ingram, P.E., whose qualifications were accepted as an expert in the field of civil engineering. The substance of Mr. Ingram’s testimony was intended to address all civil engineering items, as relating to the site plan and to otherwise address the substantive review comments contained in the FCE review report. The focus of Mr. Ingram’s testimony was on the following substantive aspect of the site plan:

- A. Mr. Ingram acknowledged the slopes associated with the property, which is the primary factor necessitating the significant length and design of the proposed driveway to be located off of Upper Denmark Road. The driveway is essentially comprised of a 20-foot wide paved asphalt access drive to be located within an existing waterline easement. The driveway is approximately 1,500 feet in length, once again, in large measure, necessitated by the slope and topography of the property. Ultimately, at the conclusion of Mr. Ingram’s testimony, it was determined, with specific reference to the access drive commencing at Upper Denmark Road, that certain improvements would be required, as hereinafter detailed, necessitating the granting of an additional right-of-way by the Applicant.



The specific location and width, inclusive of required improvements to Upper Denmark Road, in conjunction with its widening, shall be subject to the approval of the Township Engineer.

B. Mr. Ingram also testified as to the required parking. Based on the original application filing seeking approval for only the 15,194 square foot building, 21 parking spaces were proposed. However, as recalculated when the additional building expansion comprising 5,743 square feet was included, the same necessitated the construction of five (5) additional parking spaces to be compliant with the parking calculation for the proposed use, inclusive of EVSE stalls. (See parking calculation as originally set forth on Sheet 5 of the plans.) In order to address the requirement for additional parking, the Applicant agreed to construct five (5) additional parking spaces in the westerly portion of the driveway, which specific location shall be subject to the review and approval by the Township Engineer. No parking variance was accordingly required, and based on the testimony of Ms. Trent, the Board is able to conclude that the parking calculations proposed by the Applicant for this type of use is appropriate, recognizing the limited number of employees and no visitors to the site, and is otherwise satisfied that the number of 26 parking spaces, as ultimately proposed, should address the required parking for the operation in question.

C. In response to the comments of both the Township Engineer and Planner, the issue of whether supplemental landscaping was required was addressed. The Applicant noted, and the Board concurs, that the site is generally substantially wooded, and the building itself maintains significant setback of approximately 256

feet to the front yard property line, making the facility operation generally remote and not visible to the general public. As such, the Board concludes that in recognition of those conditions other than as set forth on the aforesaid plans, no supplemental additional landscaping will be required.

D. Mr. Ingram further provided detailed testimony as to the proposed stormwater management improvements. The same was reviewed by the Township Engineer, who in summary took no issue with the nature of the proposed site plan improvements, subject to compliance with the Township Engineer's review report. Water to the facility would be provided from the existing water tower facility already located on Block 26, Lot 83.01, and as to all utility service, the Applicant will provide "will-serve letter" as conditions of approval.

E. Substantial discussion ensued relative to the proposed fencing. As developed during the course of the public hearing, the Applicant will be required to install a 6 foot high fence with barbed wire on top necessitating variance relief from the relevant provisions of the Oxford Township Land Development Ordinance. The 6 foot high fence with barbed wire shall be required surrounding the entirety of the facility, except that interior to the facility, only a 6 foot high fence around the loading area shall be required. Any and all necessary variance relief associated with the requirement to install a 6 foot high fence with barbed wire is herein granted.

F. Mr. Ingram addressed the proposed lighting as reflected on the plans. Specific reference is made to Sheet 15 of the aforesaid plans, which detail the height and design of the proposed lighting, including lights of 20 feet in height on the building and 25 foot light poles at such location as referenced on the aforesaid

sheet of the site plan. All lighting details are referenced within said plan, and the Applicant otherwise agreed to comply with the specific recommendations of the Township Engineer as set forth on Page 6 of his review report relative to lighting. While Ms. Trent addressed the processes for refuse disposal, Mr. Ingram reviewed the same from a site plan prospective. The trash pad is intended to be located within the fenced area of the parking lot (to be surrounded by a 6 foot high fence), and the Applicant agreed to comply with the Township Engineer's review report requiring a detail of the proposed trash pad area. Mr. Ingram otherwise confirmed that he can comply with all outstanding recommendations and requirements contained within the Township Engineer's review report.

11. Wayne Ingram also testified in his capacity as a licensed professional planner and testified as to the specific variance relief required in conjunction with this application summarized as follows:

- A. A variance from Section 90-340-26A(4), which permits only a 4 foot high fence, whereas, as amended, the Applicant is proposing, at its maximum height, a 6 foot high fence with additional barbed wire on the top surround the perimeter of the facility, and which Section also requires that such fence have a 50% minimum transparency. The fence height is necessitated by the need to provide adequate security for the facility, which is advanced by the authorized exceedance of the 4 foot high fence limitation and the fence shall be designed to exceed 50% minimum transparency requirements, also based on the need to provide adequate

security, and to effectively preclude high visibility of the facility from the exterior of same.

B. Variance from Section 90-340-27A, which limits the aggregate area covered by any accessory buildings to 800 square feet. In this case, the five (5) 2,000 individual greenhouses comprising a total of 10,000 square feet exceeds the 800 foot limitation by ordinance. Variance relief is required and appropriate in order to permit use of the greenhouse as a critical aspect of the cultivation process.

C. Variance from Section 90-340-28E(2). This section of the ordinance requires a width of driveway serving aisles in parking lots to be 25 feet, whereas 20 feet is proposed by the Applicant. Based on the testimony presented on behalf of the Applicant, the site generates generally low traffic volume, and the nature of the vehicles accessing the property do not necessitate the ordinance required 25 foot width. Accordingly, variance is appropriately granted.

D. Variance from Section 90-340-30B, which requires a loading berth to be 55 feet long, 12 feet wide and 14 feet high. The variance relief is appropriately granted recognizing the specific unique nature of the use for which the general ordinance provision was not intended, and as presently designed, the site provides adequate access to the loading area.

E. Section 90-340-34A requires a 20 foot setback from the property line, whereas the proposed sign is only set back 10 feet from the property line. The Board recognizes in this unique case the signage is not being installed

for the purposes of any “advertising”. Its nonconforming location is justified in order to provide appropriate means of identification of the site only to those vehicles accessing the site in a manner which will allow for vehicles entering the site to quickly and safely identify the site without further accessing the site. While the Applicant agreed to make the sign conforming to the 20 foot setback, if required, it noted that that would increase the size of the site of the sign. The Board feels that a sign of the size proposed is appropriate in the proposed location, notwithstanding its nonconforming condition, as an appropriate and safe location for identification of the nature of the facility.

All of the above variance relief may be appropriately granted pursuant to the statutory criteria of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-70c(2) in which the Board hereby finds that the benefits of the deviation in all cases substantially outweigh the detriments and otherwise advances the purposes of zoning pursuant to N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2.

12. The Applicant further presented the testimony of Virginia Seminara, A.I.A., whose qualifications were accepted as an expert witness in the field of architecture. Ms. Seminara generally testified in furtherance of her architectural plans consisting of two sheets dated November 27, 2023, and marked into evidence as Exhibit A-2. Ms. Seminara provided an overview of the cultivation facility, the location of all relevant aspects as part of the cultivation process, the location of the offices, and relevant details pertaining to the proposed signage. Ms. Seminara noted that the building was a pre-engineered building of a noncombustible material. Ms. Seminara also provided a detailed floor plan review marked into evidence as

Exhibit A-3. No issues were identified by any Board professionals or the Board relative to the testimony presented by Ms. Seminara.

13. The Applicant presented the testimony of Sarah Trent, a principal of the Applicant. Ms. Trent reviewed all operational aspects of the proposed facility in great detail. Initially, it is noted that the cultivation facility, as proposed here, is intended to provide “product” to the Applicant’s retail dispensary operation in Raritan Borough. The Applicant contemplates a portion of the facility might be leased to third-party entities who would engage in the cultivation process in accordance with that which is approved by this application. This would include potentially wholesale distribution to other third parties, other than the Applicant’s retail dispensary in Raritan Borough. The Applicant contemplates employing approximately 15 individuals in conjunction with its operation who would be at the property in staggered shifts. All employees are required to wear scrubs for purposes associated with the cultivation process and would wear badges for security purposes. Ms. Trent provided a detailed review of the cultivation process, including taking the Board through a step-by-step, room-by-room process as to how the cannabis product is cultivated. Interestingly, the product will be produced in “pots” and not directly in the ground. The plants within the pots then essentially get moved from room to room throughout the cultivation process. Three shipping containers, which will be used for storage, are proposed for near the proposed greenhouse. Ms. Trent further reviewed for the Board the transition of the product from cultivation through packaging and then delivery. She noted that the greenhouses were only intended to be seasonal, as they are not heated nor

intended for use in the winter. Deliveries to and from the site are minimal, and create no traffic concerns. Deliveries are generally made in a box truck with incoming deliveries necessary for the operation of the facility approximately three times a week, with one to two outgoing deliveries. The contemplated number of 15 employees may increase dependent on the nature of the employees by potential third party lessees, but should not generally exceed 20 in number. Significant discussion took place relative to security associated with the proposed facility. Without revealing anything specifically proprietary, the facility is monitored via surveillance 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, providing specific surveillance as to both where the product is and on the exterior of the facility. There is "a live feed" providing for real time surveillance. Access to the facility by employees is via an authorized access card to prevent unauthorized use, and employees must wear proper identification at all times. The site, as amended during the public hearing process, will propose barbed wire on top of the fence. The Fire Department will be provided with a Knox box for appropriate Fire Department access. In addition to the issue of security, testimony was presented to address the Board's potential concern about any "odor" concerns being generated from the proposed facility. The Applicant proposes an activated carbon filter system installed at the outset of the facility, together with appropriate other odor protection mitigation issues. Necessary watering is on a sensor, and essentially all runoff takes place in the proposed pots. In addition, the Board imposes that the sign being approved contain lettering reading "Authorized Personnel Only" on the basis that no general members of the public shall be granted access to the proposed facility.

14. Based on all of the foregoing, the Board is able to conclude that the Applicant is entitled to the grant of all variance relief, as herein after set forth, together with preliminary site plan approval only. No approval herein is granted as to final site plan approval, which must be obtained prior to the granting of any required certificates of occupancy. The approval herein granted is subject to the conditions herein imposed.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Land Use Board of the Township of Oxford that the variance and preliminary site plan application of VW RE Holdings, LLC, is hereby approved, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Applicant agrees to be bound by all representations and stipulations made during the course of the public hearing.
2. The approval herein granted is for variance approval, as set forth in this Resolution, together with preliminary site plan approval only. Final site plan approval is not being granted and shall be required as a condition of the issuance of any certificate of occupancy.
3. The approval herein granted is subject to the Applicant complying with all requirements and recommendations set forth in the Township Engineer's review report dated January 22, 2024.
4. Fencing around the perimeter of the entire facility shall be 6 feet with barbed wire on top. The barbed wire requirement does not apply to the fencing around the loading area.



5. No “manufacturing” of cannabis is authorized in conjunction with this approval.
6. The Applicant shall amend its plans to provide for the construction of five (5) additional parking spaces contemplated to be in the western portion of the driveway in such a location and design as is subject to the approval of the Township Engineer.
7. The proposed sign shall be authorized in its proposed location in conjunction with the variance herein granted, but shall contain a detail reading “Authorized Personnel Only”.
8. The Applicant shall obtain the consent and any required modification of the existing easement held by New Jersey American Water in order to authorize the installation of the proposed driveway in such location as is reflected on the approved plans.
9. The Applicant agrees to dedicate an additional right-of-way along Upper Denmark Road, the dedication inclusive of required improvements to the additional dedicated area to be subject to the review and approval of the Township Engineer.
10. The Applicant agrees that there shall be a left turn only at the connection point with Upper Denmark Road and appropriate signage, subject to the review and approval of the Township Engineer shall so designate this restriction.
11. The Applicant shall resurface Upper Denmark Road from the driveway to Route 31, subject to the approval of the Township Engineer.
12. This approval is subject to the Applicant obtaining approvals from any other governmental agency with jurisdiction over the application and relief sought by the

Applicant, including and not limited to Warren County Planning Board approval and Upper Delaware Soil Conservation District.

13. All fees, taxes, assessments, escrows and other monies due to the Township of Oxford shall be paid in full.

IN FAVOR OF THE BOARD ACTION TAKEN ON JANUARY 23, 2024 APPROVING THIS APPLICATION.

OPPOSED:

ABSTAINED:

The undersigned hereby certifies that the within is a true copy of the Resolution memorializing the action taken by the Land Use Board at its meeting held on January 23, 2024, which was adopted by the Board at its meeting on February 27, 2024

A motion to approve the resolution 2024-04 was made by Mr. Ort, seconded by Mr. Ischinger

Ayes 6, Nays 0, Abstain 2,  
Motion carried.

#### **Hearing for Valley Wellness Fence:**

Mayor Norton and Linda Koufodontes recused themselves from this hearing.

Mr. Tipton came in front of the Board to discuss the hearing for the fence fro Valley Wellness Bl 26 L 83. Mr. Tipton explained that after our preliminary approval last month that we need to amend the fence. The fence variance change is 6ft to 8ft the change is because of the NJ Administration code for cultivation is required by law.

Rich Schneider – The fence variance from last meeting approved 6ft with barbed wire will increase to 8 ft with 50% transparency amending the preliminary Site Plan.

Mr. Tipton stated around the perimeter it will go from 6ft to 8ft because of the Cannabis Law regulation by the State of New Jersey. It will now be 8ft with barbed wire and privacy mesh.

At this time it was opened up to the public for comment for only the hearing about the fence:

Amy Steele – Oxford, NJ

- Asked for the copy or review of this application
- Asked what are the nexted steps
- Stated that the town is not happy with this- why wasn't the town notified

Keith Gibbons – Oxford, NJ

- The residents have a right to be upset and asked why this did not go out to a referendum

Erica Griffth – Oxford, NJ

- Community doesn't want this in our town.

Rich Schneider – Board Attorney stated that the application that has come across is a permitted use in the town had been approved by the towns committee and that I understand your frustration we are here to approve or deny any current zoning approved by the town not whether or not is should be permitted or not permitted.

Mr. Basko – Oxford, NJ

- Did anyone go look at Upper Demark road.
- Water in the catch basin
- Sign on Rt31 says Private road

Tim Steele – Oxford, NJ

- Will the fence increase security
- Cameras on fence
- Opposed to hirer fence

Kathy Young – Oxford, NJ

- Asked about fence type
- Will you see this from Rt. 31
- Lights be on 24 hours

Amy Steele – Oxford, NJ

- Asked about the Bog turtles which is an endangered species

Public Comment closed.

A motion to approve the Valley Wellness Change in Fence variance was made by Mr. Ort, seconded by Mr. Ott

Ayes 6, Nays 0, Abstain 2,  
Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Keith Gibbons, Oxford, NJ

- Question: what was the process of this application does it go to the Town Committee then come to you?
- Asked about the driveway to the tank on Cambridge West

**VOUCHERS:**

A motion was made by Mr. Ischinger and seconded by Ms. Koufodontes to pay the Vouchers for the Land Use Board.

Ayes 8, Nays 0, Abstain 0,  
Motion carried.

**ADJOURNMENT:** A motion was made by Mr. Ort and seconded by Mr. Ischinger with no further business before the board and no public comment offered the meeting was adjourned at 8:04pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee L. Geller, Secretary