

Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board Meeting
Rt 12 County Complex Building 1 Assembly Room
October 13, 2022 @ 8:00 pm

Members in Attendance:

Dave Bond- Chair
Christian Bench
Susan Blew
Bill Bowlby
Bob Hoffman
Dave Kyle
Forest Locandro
John Perehinys
Marc Phillips

CADB Staff Present:

Katrina Campbell, Esq. County Counsel
Aaron Culton Esq., County Counsel
Katherine Fullerton, Supervising Planner
Bob Hornby, CADB Administrator

This meeting was held in person with respect to Public Health guidelines.

Open Public Meeting Act:

Chairman Bond opened the meeting at 8:00 p.m. and read the Open Public Meeting Act:

"This meeting is being held in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meeting Act. Adequate notice has been provided by prominently posting and maintaining so posted throughout the year on the first floor of the County Administration Building, Main St., Flemington, New Jersey a public place reserved for such announcements, and by mailing on or before January 15, 2022, to The Hunterdon Democrat, Star Ledger, The Trenton Times, The Courier News and The Express Times newspapers, and TAP Into it newspaper and designated by the Hunterdon County Agriculture Development Board to receive such notices, and by filing with the Hunterdon County Clerk a schedule of the times and dates of such meetings."

Pledge of Allegiance:

Roll Call: Absent – Liz Schmid

Approval of Minutes:

- **Minutes of the September 8th CADB Meeting** – Bill Bowlby made a MOTION to approve, Dave Kyle SECONDED. All in favor by voice vote. Bob Hoffman, Forest Locandro, John Perehinys, and Marc Phillips ABSTAINED

Communications and Administrative Business:

- **CADB Staff Update –**
 - Bob Hornby Bob distributed to the Board a survey from the State Board of Agriculture regarding Right to Farm.
 - New application for a Public Board Member from Alex Hammerstone. There are currently 2 vacant Public CADB Member positions. Alex currently works with Holland Twp. DPW, was a farm assistant at Hammerstone Farms. Alex entertained questions from Board members. The application will be forwarded to the Commissioners for review.
 - Dave Bond, Bill Bowlby, Bob Hoffman, and Bob Hornby had a tour of the ESC School. Bob felt it was impressive and the future of farming in Hunterdon County.

- SADC hosted a meeting of all the CADB Administrators regarding the Soil Standards. Showed them a clear map of what they look for. Soil Standards are still under review before they come up for public comment.
- Growth Management Plan public information session on October 3rd. Sent a survey out to the public. Number one response was support for Farmland Preservation. The public support for Farmland Preservation is overwhelming. Like the Farmland Preservation Plan, Growth Management needs to be updated every 10 years.
- SADC is doing a Regional Outreach for Farmland Preservation. Bob sent the flyers to the Townships to post. Regional meetings will be held on October 21 in Warren County and December 7 in Somerset County.
- NJRC&D is doing Regenerative Farming outreach kickoff at Beneduce Vineyards on December 1st. Open to interested farmers. Contact Christian Bench or Bob in interested.
- Before COVID, CADB had sub-committee meetings prior to regular meetings, the room is available again if any members are interested in resuming the practice.
- **Active Applications** – Currently 22 active applications, of note:
 - **Collins Farm** (East Amwell Twp.) – Have both appraisals, they are pending review at SADC.
 - **Barnes Farm** (Kingwood Twp.) – Offer is with the landowner; she is reviewing it.
 - **Saums Farm** (Readington Twp.) – There is a lien against the Township that is delaying closing.
- **Farm Plan:** The Land Conservancy has printed out summaries from last month's meeting for better understanding. Also provided a comparison of neighboring counties and their minimum standards for preservation. Barbara Davis will be at next month's meeting.
- **Monitoring Update:** Kevin Milz not in attendance, he spoke with Bob before the meeting and reported that he has monitored 29 farms this month with no issues.

State Agriculture Development Committee (SADC) Updates:

- Hunterdon SADC representative Stefanie Miller was attending a meeting in Franklin regarding preservation and could not attend.

Chair Comments:

- Chairman Bond returned to the issue of having sub-committees meet again as Bob had previously mentioned. These meetings would be held before the CADB Board meetings. Bob gave an overview of the sub-committees and how the meetings were held for new Board members. These meetings stopped with the COVID closures. Discussion ensued. Board members agreed that if there is a need they would have them.

Old Business:

- None at this time

New Business:

- None at this time

Right To Farm Matters:

Hearing: West View Vineyards, Raritan Twp. Block 25 Lot 4

- County Counsel Katrina Campbell stated that the owners are Allen & Susan Funk, the property is located at 7 West View Dr., Flemington, NJ, Raritan Township. Property owners are seeking a Site-Specific Agricultural Management Plan (SSAMP) to allow the construction of a 15' x 30' concrete pad to be used for a wine making operation. The property was certified as a Commercial Farm by this Board at the June CADB meeting. The property owner noticed the Right to Farm Hearing for the July CADB meeting, she has reviewed the notices and they were done properly. The Board carried the July hearing to confirm with the State Agricultural Development Committee (SADC) that they don't want jurisdiction over this matter. Brian Smith of SADC Counsel clarified that although they want to hear matters where the activities seeking protection is not one of the previously approved Agricultural Management Practices (AMP) from the SADC, they only want to hear matters that are generated through the complaint process. Matters that are generated as an SSAMP being requested by the landowner, even if they involve subsequent complaints, should be heard by the CADB. This matter was further carried from the September CADB meeting to tonight at the request of the landowner because they were not available. The hearing was opened and closed at the J meetings to allow the matter to be carried without further notice.
- For members of the public not familiar with the Right to Farm hearing process, Ms. Campbell gave an overview. First the applicant will give testimony in support of their application. Then the Board, staff, and professionals can ask questions. Once they are done, members of the public will have the opportunity to ask questions of the applicant. Once that is completed members of the public will have the opportunity to give their own testimony on the application. Anyone giving testimony will be asked to give their name and address and be sworn in. The Board will discuss the application and give its decision. Should the Board approve the application, it will be done in the form of a MOTION, any conditions will be spelled out for the record. Once a vote is taken, a formal resolution will be written up and approved at the next meeting. That resolution will be the formal Right to Farm approval. This is not an open-ended approval; it is very specific. The landowner will only be able to operate in accordance with the terms and conditions set forth in the resolution. If the landowner later decides they want to change their farm plan or change something about its use, they must come back before the Board for a new Right to Farm hearing. That means a new hearing, new notices to all the neighbors and a new opportunity for support or opposition. There were some concerns that the landowners would want to change things down the road; that is not a possibility, they must come back here if they want to change what they are going to do.
- Ms. Campbell swore in Mr. Allen Funk, 7 West View Dr., Flemington, NJ. Ms. Campbell asked Mr. Funk to tell the Board about his application.
- Mr. Funk proceeded to show a slide show. It is an existing vineyard, spread out over a ~6.5 acres lot. Mr. Funk applied to Raritan Township for a 15' x 30' concrete pad to crush grapes for winemaking.
- Existing zoning (R-1) allows "any form of agricultural...including farm product sales." R-1 zone also specifically allows commercial activities such as a kennel, riding academy, camps, churches, fraternal lodges, etc.
- Permit was denied on April 1st – "wine-making is not designated as a principal permitted use within the R-1 zoning district." The Raritan Township denial letter outlined 3 options; to seek an appeal, to seek a use variance from the Board of Adjustment, or to apply to the HCADB "if you claim wine-making as protected under the Right to Farm Act."

- The current situation as a young vineyard – planted in 2018, they have completed 3 harvests. In 2020 sold our grapes to Unionville Winery. In 2021 we sold our grapes to Grape Finale which has since closed. In 2022 we sold our grapes to Grape Escape.
- We are a small production capable of 40-50 cases (~1 ton of grapes) annually.
- Use organic farming methods and no irrigation. If you give the grapes too much water, it dilutes the flavor. ~3.4 acres of vines are being filled in one year at a time. Added recently to our farm is just under 2 acres of Timothy Hay
- Received Commercial Farm Certification in June.
- Showed a slide of the Revised Farm Plan showing vines (3.4 acres) and Hay (1.75 acres)
- The reason why we are growing hay is because it is a lot of work to harvest the grapes by hand. We have no employees. Was encouraged by Raritan Twp. to plant hay to fulfill farmland assessment requirements. Have no plans to expand the vineyard beyond 3.4 acres.
- Our goal is to process grapes on-site using the proposed outdoor concrete pad & the existing detached garage. Right now, we put them in bins and take them elsewhere to be processed. With the concrete pad we could process the grapes and let it sit in the detached garage.
- Goal is to permit winemaking not for consumption on-site. The “not for consumption on site” wording refers to existing law wherein families can make (at home) up to 200 gallons of wine (1,000 bottles/80 cases) per 2+ adults. Grape processing and winemaking would take place in front of and inside the existing detached garage, approximately 500’ and not very visible from the cul-de-sac. Currently, there are two or three grape harvests each growing season
- The concrete pad for crushing/processing grapes would be incorporated into the driveway in the turnaround area removed during house re-build. Would be used to collect and process yellow bins filled with 25lbs of grapes. Rinse water would be collected in adjacent retention area.
- Next Mr. Funk showed a slide of the revised location of proposed concrete pad, reducing impervious surface area.
- Mr. Funk then showed a slide of the Current view from the Cul-de-sac (West View Dr.) Described the structure on the left as the detached garage.
- Mr. Funk gave an overview of Grape processing: Grapes are run through a crusher de-stemmer to create a slurry of juice and skins. Stems can be composted. White grapes are immediately pressed off (reds- 2 weeks later) into stainless steel fermenters. Press material is returned to the vineyard as mulch. Wine (white or red) is stored quietly for 3 – 6 months. Finished wine is then pumped into a bottle filling machine and then corked, capsulated, labeled, boxed.
- Mr. Funk stated existing NJ Law – Winery must be located on or adjacent to a Vineyard of 3+ acres. As a result, in New Jersey, it is not legal to be a winery that: makes wines apart from the vineyard (for example in a business park), makes wine using another winery’s facilities, or makes wine at a wine instructional facility
- The plan for the finished wine is to sell cases to friends & family. Currently more demand than supply. Desired result is low production volume & high-quality wine. No plan to create a tasting room, carry out retail sales on site, hold public events, or have any public-facing signage.
- Took a survey some of our neighbors. Three of the four neighbors bordering our property told us they have no concerns. Other neighbors we met with are also supportive
- The Northeast Organic Farming Association of NJ (NOFA) supports our organic farming efforts in the vineyard and is working with us on re-establishing viable hay production in the non-vineyard areas.
- Potential concerns that we think need to be addressed.

- Traffic: Little or no impact on neighborhood traffic, as there will be no public events and no public tasting room
- No signage
- No on-site sales
- Noise: Winemaking is a relatively quiet process with no use of loud, cooling fans
- Water use: Water will be used primarily to rinse off winemaking/wine processing equipment specifically:
 - At harvest: rinsing of crusher/de-stemmer and press (2-3 times/year)
 - At bottling: cleaning tanks and bottle filling machine (1-2 times/year)
 - Minimal or zero run-off, as concrete pad will flow into retention area
 - Our wines use stainless steel fermentation and storage, not barrels, and therefore are much less water intensive
- Unwanted commercial activity in residential neighborhood: Commercial wine-making activity will not be visible from street. Commercial activity will not involve visitors; similar to many home-based business
- Mr. Funk entertained questions from the Board regarding hay production, grape yields, and runoff. Discussion ensued between applicants and Board members. Mrs. Funk began to give testimony, County Counsel swore her in.
- Mr. Funk entertained questions from the public.
- Ron Tongue (3 West View Dr.) has questions regarding the retention pond, at first it was just a concrete pad, now there is a retention pond that was not part of the original plan. He is concerned about the runoff because he lives downhill from the vineyard, whenever there is rain the water runs through several back yards. He is concerned because he says they don't need any more run off water and they don't know what he is using to clean the barrels. Mr. Funk responded as to where the retention pond will be located, it is meant so the water stays in one place and does not interfere with anyone else's property. They plan on rinsing equipment with water, if they do use cleaning supplies it will be a low-grade organic cleaner. There is no need to use anything else. If the retention pond becomes a negative, he will do away with it.
- Pete Smith (16 Greenhills Dr.) Wants to know how many bottles of wine will he produce? Mr. Funk responded currently ~40-50 cases. Also, has concerns about the Aquifer and wells going dry.
- Ron Tongue asked how he can sell his wine without having a Tasting Room? Mrs. Funk replied that they are selling it to friends and family and by recommendations from others. People are buying a share of a barrel by reputation.
- Peter Lisi (2 West View Dr.) When approached by you a few months ago you said you were only making 20 cases now it is 50. Concerns are what about the future where much more wine could be made. County Counsel. Ms. Campbell replied that it will be in the resolution, that he will have to come back before the Board if he wants to make any changes. He is limited to what is stated now. No public tasting etc. That is your protection.
- Ron Quintana (6 West View Dr.) He has concerns about traffic and agricultural equipment. Are you selling on the internet? Mr. Funk responded no. It's just friends and family. Under NJ law, they can't send wine to anyone.
- Steve Rubin (4 West View Dr.) How many acres are in grapes? Mr. Funk responded when they get more vines in by April, 3.4 acres. Ms. Campbell asked if 3.4 is the limit. Yes, anymore would be too much work for 2 people. All in, 3.4 acres in vines and 1.75 acres in hay.

- Gregg Chaplin (5 West View Dr.) Has concerns about runoff. Mr. Funk stated when they built their new house, they made sure the runoff went into a drainage system so it would not just run down the hill.
- Michael Silbert (Attorney for Raritan Township) asked how many cases of wine he could make with an unlimited volume of grapes. Mr. Funk answered he didn't really know. It's only what we grow. Has no plans to bring in grapes from the outside. In the future would you expand beyond what you have now? No, he thinks it's large enough now. Ms. Campbell reiterated that if he had any plans to expand, he would have to come back before this board. Mr. Silbert asked how he is transporting this wine now. Right now, he has a pickup truck, he loads the grapes in the back and transports them to a wine making facility. If he needs supplies for the vineyard, they come in on UPS or FedEx. There would be minimal truck traffic at best. Mr. Silbert asked if he would still be transporting grapes to be processed elsewhere? No, one ton of grapes makes about 60 cases of wine. That is more than enough. Mr. Silbert asked why they are going before this Board instead of appealing to the Zoning Board? Mr. Funk replied they didn't feel the Zoning Board was going to be "friendly" to them. Mr. Silbert asked if you are building a concrete pad are you are increasing the impervious surface? Compared to what it is now, 15' x 30', it's a lot less than with the old driveway. Discussion ensued.
- Chairman Bond asked if the Board had any questions. More discussion ensued.
- County Counsel swore in Ron Tongue (3 West View Dr.); testified that he is a neighbor of Mr. Funks, lived in the neighborhood for 32 years, there are no sidewalks; people walk and talk in the street. Kids get the school bus at the entrance to the neighborhood. He states that in all the time he has lived there Mr. Funks property was never a working farm. The prior owners didn't farm the property. The property was a farm of convenience, for a tax break. A farmer would come through once a year to cut and remove hay and be in and out within a day or two. When the vineyard was planted, it was and is no problem. It was just another crop on the property and some neighbors had been assured that it would go no further. That apparently has changed, and we have concerns about what seems to be proposed. We have concerns, water usage effects on our private wells, run-off, noise, traffic, and safety are among those concerns, but most of all we are concerned about how a pre-emption of local zoning will negatively impact the character of our residential neighborhood. For two years, as a neighborhood, we have put up with a daily influx of heavy-duty commercial demolition and new construction, including loud rock crushing from what looked like mining equipment, run-away trailers destroying mailboxes and yards, as well as putting up with blocked driveways, all due to activities on the applicant's property. We assumed all of this was temporary but some things, including blocked driveways, continue to this day. This is a residential neighborhood. The farmers on this Board likely have private entrances to access your operations. The applicants are effectively proposing to use our residential street as their driveway for their proposed commercial wine making operation. We strongly object to changing the character of our neighborhood and we have questions:
 - What is being requested by the applicant and for what purposes? Is it for the operation of a winery, as stated in various application documents?
 - If so, does the applicant have the necessary state and federal licenses to produce alcohol on this site?
 - If not, then what specifically is the applicant intending to do with any approvals that may come from this Board?
 - To that end, there have been inconsistencies with the history of this application.

- On March 31 of this year, in their original application to Raritan Township (which was denied), the Applicant said that “they are seeking a zoning permit for wine making utilizing grapes grown in the existing vineyard.” The application also stated they had 6.5 acres in total land area and “are actively expanding the vineyard from 1.5 acres to the full farm appraisal required size of 5.0 acres.
- Two months later, in their May 27th application to this Board, they then specified new numbers. 5 acres “farmed” and 6.7 acres that are “owned”.
- Two weeks later, according to the minutes from the June 9th meeting of this Board, the applicant testified that there were “5 acres of grapes growing. Wants to start making wine on site”. At the same meeting, he also apparently testified “yes” to this question posed by the Board: “to the best of your knowledge, is your operation in compliance with all Federal and State statutes? We assume that such compliance would include holding the necessary licenses to make wine. To our knowledge, the applicant does not have the required Federal and State licenses needed to produce alcohol.
- In a recent conversation with the Board Administrator, I was told that the applicants have most recently represented to Farmland Assessment that they have 3.4 acres of grapes.
- Raritan Township official tax records indicated a total of 6.53 acres for the property.
- In a Summer of 2022 satellite view, using GIS mapping tools, I mapped the applicant property at 6.5 acres, a difference of less than 1% from the official Township records, with only 2.66 acres of grapes currently under production, which includes all recent plantings.
- So based on the applicants’ own submissions and testimony, we don’t know if they have 1.5 acres of grapes, 5 acres, 3.4 acres, or based on GIS mapping about 2.66 acres of grapes being grown. With all these inconsistencies and lack of clarity about the purposed of the application, why are we here? Based on the changing information, do we even know if the property satisfies the Right to Farm criteria? And if the original intent of the application was to facilitate the operation of a winery, but the necessary licenses aren’t in hand, why are we here? And irrespective of any of that why is consideration being given for allowing the start of a commercial wine making operation, no matter how small it might be, in the middle of a well-established residential neighborhood, one that has never contained anything resembling a traditional commercial farming operation? We therefore respectfully ask that you consider relevant local standards, and the impact on affected property owners and deny this application.
- Ms. Campbell swore in Steve Rubin (4 West View Dr.) – Have been residents for 48 years. Thinks Mr. Tongue covered just about everything. Says the application for put in a concrete pad is not as simple as that. He had to ask for what purpose, Mr. Funk stated previously it was to produce wine. In order to produce wine, you have to have at least 3 acres of grapes, he does not believe they have 3 acres of grapes, according to what Mr. Tongue says he only has 2.66-acres; therefore, he asks if this Board has jurisdiction to even entertain this application. That’s the primary questions, if they don’t have jurisdiction, Mr. Funk should go back to the Township. He does not believe this Board has jurisdiction. Unless he has 3 acres, which he doesn’t, when he says he has 3.5 acres that’s what he intends. Can’t go by what he intends. Ms. Campbell discussed some of his concerns. Ms. Campbell said he does have 3 acres plus filling in with hay. Ms. Campbell said to base their decision on Mr. Funks testimony. Ms. Campbell stated they do have jurisdiction over this matter.
- Board member Christian Bench asked if the Board certified the Vineyard as a Commercial farm back in June? Ms. Campbell stated yes, the commercial farm includes the hay operation. Christian asked if they certified it by acres or by income. Ms. Campbell stated she believes it’s both, Bob Hornby confirmed there are criteria for both sales and farmland assessment. He provided receipts

for income, he is farmland assessed through Raritan Township. He is going to have to obtain a wine making license through ABC.

- Mr. Funk stated it is his understanding that if you are a successful applicant for a farm or a plenary license both have the same requirement, you need to demonstrate you have 3 acres of a vineyard, ABC would have to come out and verify it at that time. We have not applied for that yet, as the Judge (Mr. Rubin) pointed out, there are 600 vines arriving in April 2023 which will complete the vineyard site. It's hard to plant vines, you need to space it out a little bit, it's a lot of work. Ms. Campbell stated that if this Board rejected the application, why would you go to the ABC to get a winemaking license? Some advised to go get the wine license and then figure it out with the Ag Board. He figured they'd start with the Ag Board and then get the winery license. Plus, we don't have 3 acres all buttoned up. We get that buttoned up in April then we have 3 acres completed then we will go for Federal & State approval. Ms. Campbell would recommend to this Board that if they were inclined to approve this application, one of the conditions be that he must obtain the license.
- Board member Bill Bowlby remarked that they deemed him a commercial farm because he was growing grapes and he was selling the grapes. Now he comes before the board because he needs the concrete pad, does he really need to be a winery to have this pad? Ms. Campbell stated that in his application he did put for a wine making operation he could have been dishonest about what he wanted to use the concrete pad for, but he was truthful with what he wanted to pad for. Discussion ensued concerning verbiage on this SSAMP application. Board member quoted "West View Vines is seeking approval of a concrete pad to assist with grape harvesting and processing. The 15' x 30' pad will be located adjacent to an existing detached garage where all the vineyard equipment and supplies are currently stored." It says processing grapes it doesn't say winemaking. He could use the pad to clean the grapes before he sold them to another winery.
- Kimberly Fromme (10 Greenhills Dr.) was sworn in. She states she lives at a cross street to West View Dr. has concerns about the application and previous testimony on June 9th that the current owners want to start making wine on site. She stated that their neighborhood is older and has concerns about safety on the roads. Chairman Bond stopped her statement as it does not relate to the matter at hand. She restated that she is concerned about the potential of more commercial traffic.
- Devin Cornia (266 Lambertville Headquarters Rd) was sworn in. Is a farmer and has worked at other vineyards. He stated that those vineyards are high volume vineyard +30 acres, and you would never know that there is a winemaking facility there when passing the driveway. It's routine traffic, one truck a year bringing bulk supplies. He has no vested interest in West View Vineyards, the Funk's reached out as a member of NOFA New Jersey which is a non-profit advocacy group, his interest in them is of being a member of the group. The hay production will mitigate any runoff from the concrete pad. They are organic, so no danger from chemicals. They use a power washer to clean, there is nothing to smell, or hear from it and no erosion from run off. Gives his full support for this operation.
- Mark Carvlin (14 Green Hills Dr.) was sworn in. 32-year resident, has noted all other vineyards in Hunterdon County are in Agricultural Zones with their own access roads. None of the operations are in a Residential Zone, also all those vineyards operate retail sales and hold public events.
- John Wappel (7 Green Hills Dr.) – He stated that the Board has told everyone that they are here strictly for the concrete pad. Chairman Bond answered that is correct. Mr. Wappel then stated that there will be a document stating what can be done and what can't be done. Ms. Campbell replied that it will be up to the Board to decide but yes. Until we see what the Board is doing, and they

explain that he must come before the Board if he wants to make any changes then we know what is happening. As far as traffic UPS, FedEx and Amazon trucks are on those roads all day. He believes that they are going to do what they say they are.

- Board member Mark Phillips asked if Agriculture was a permitted use in that area? Yes. They can sell their product, but it doesn't specify variety so that's any form of Agriculture/Horticulture, including farm product sales. They can sell the wine there if they want to, but they are not proposing to, they can grow the grapes, that's a public street, not a private road. They have as much right to use that as anyone else.
- Chairman Bond closed the hearing to public comment.
- Board member Forest Locandro stated that Raritan Township asked if winemaking is protected under the Right to Farm? That is what they hinged their denial on, if you claim winemaking as protected you may apply the Board. Discussion ensued.
- Bill Bowlby made a MOTION to approve the Concrete Pad, Susan Blew SECONDED. Ms. Campbell asked the Board to clarify the MOTION to approve with conditions set forth in his Power Point presentation. Chairman Bond asked for a Roll Call vote. County Counsel will draft a Resolution to be voted on at the next meeting on November 10th.

ROLL CALL MOVED SECONDED AYES NAYS ABSTAIN ABSENT

David Bond, Chair			<i>X</i>			
Robert Hoffman, Jr., Vice Chair			<i>X</i>			
Susan Blew		<i>X</i>	<i>X</i>			
Marc Phillips			<i>X</i>			
John Perehinys			<i>X</i>			
Bill Bowlby	<i>X</i>		<i>X</i>			
Christian Bench			<i>X</i>			
Dave Kyle			<i>X</i>			
Liz Schmid						<i>X</i>
Forest Locandro			<i>X</i>			

9 IN FAVOR, 1 ABSENT, MOTION CARRIED

Public Comment:

- None at this time.

Adjournment:

- MOTION to Adjourn made by John Perehinys, Bob Hoffman SECONDED. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted: Bob Hornby, CADB Administrator

Prepared with the assistance of Colleen Runge, Planning Department Clerk