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CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Ridgecrest 21 Philips Parkway, application for conditional use of a variance approval, major soil moving permit approval, bulk variance approval, EIS approval and site plan waiver.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Good evening, Mr.
Chairman, Andy Del Vecchio, member of the firm of Beattie, Padovano on behalf of the applicant Ridgecrest Realty.

We are here on continued public hearing. And, as a preliminary matter $I$ would like to address, I guess, what has been voiced as an on-going concern by our neighbors at the Bears Nest. We have been in communication with them since the last hearing and that dialogue has continued. It has, I am pleased to report, resulted in an agreement being reached with the Bears Nest folks that will call for us to in fact proceed with the landscaping that is shown on our side of the plans but also, in addition, we agreed to provide more landscaping, irrigation, tree removal, installation of a berm or the elevation of some trees that was designed by their landscape consultant, Edge Landscaping on their side of the property so it doesn't effect the application before this Board. But, we have made arrangements to make those happen for them.

And based on that, it is my understanding that they will be withdrawing their objection and are supporting the application.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Good evening, gentlemen. Please identify yourselves.

MR. WISS: Good evening. Tim Wiss, Wiss \& Bouregy, P.C., on behalf of Bears Nest Condominium Association.

And that's correct, that's our understanding and we would just ask that any approval to the Board is conditioned on those things.

And with that said, we will withdraw our objection.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And the gentlman with you?

MR. TINTLE: David Tintle, 49 Whitney Hill over at the Bears Nest and I'm on the committee that's been here all along, since this started last summer. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Very good.

And you agree that the Board, by some vote has withdrawn their objections to the proposed?

MR. TINTLE: Absolutely.
MR. REGAN: You are a member of the Board?
MR. WISS: Just to clarify, this came at
basically an, I'll call it, llth hour settlement this evening. This just took place this afternoon.

We still don't have anything formal in writing yet so the attorneys are going to be working that out. We just wanted to get the substantive terms on the record before the Board. Those will be ratified, I assume, by the Board and the individual parties once the attorneys are able to work out something a little more formal but the concept has been placed before the Board.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Does it understand, based upon what Mr. Del Vecchio has stated that the proposed improvements are limited to the area that's under the control of the Bears Nest Association.

Is that correct?
MR. WISS: That's correct.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And that it has no impact other than the esthetics of the rear yard of the proposed development.

Is that also correct?

MR. WISS: That's correct. That's correct.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And, as far as you know, no impact on the drainage or runoff or anything of that nature or has not, that proposed settlement

```
agreement, been reviewed by any engineers?
    MR. WISS: It has not been reviewed by any
engineers but our understanding, given what we're
talking about with landscaping, it's really a
buffering concern. We're trying the best we can, the
closer we get to Bears Nest with the trees obviously
that will block out more of the building.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Are you berming as part of that settlement or are you proposing to have lands bermed.
MR. TINTLE: We're looking into it. The berming is not 100 percent. We moved very quickly over the past few days but there is a plan that, if it happens, could go before the Park Ridge board to remove a berm that's out on Spring Valley Road and utilize that top soil with this.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: My only concern is that if you're proposing to do berming on the Bears Nest property directly behind the proposed development and there is surface water runoff as a result of that berming that that surface water runoff, although it maybe not very significant, should be included in the calculations relative to drainage of the subject property.
```

Because the proposed plan, I presume, analyzed
what runoff, if anything, currently flows from the Bears Nest to the subject.

What effect would a possible berm have on that? I don't know.

MR. WISS: And we haven't and I'll certainly bring that back to the committee. We haven't got that far.

I mean this was, again, the subject, I think at 2:00 or $3: 00$, of continued negotiations trying to get as much landscape coverage.

The point of the berm would just be to elevate the trees but I understand the concern so I'm not sure that that's a necessary component to this. But we'll figure that out.

MR. HIPOLIT: It's on your side of the property.

MR. WISS: It's on our side.
MR. HIPOLIT: It's not in Montvale.
MR. WISS: It's not in Montvale.
MR. HIPOLIT: So the property drains from, I guess it would really be the south side along the sanitary sewer easement heading north. They, they would have to, even if they built it right up to the property line, it would still continue to run back in an area not being disturbed by this applicant so it

```
wouldn't effect the detention or anything on site.
    What's on our side, it's different than what's
here. We'll need to look at it.
    Remember, there's an area that's 25 feet between
the property line and their project they can't touch.
It's an existing sanitary sewer easement.
    MR. DEL VECCHIO: Let's be clear. There
    are no changes proposed on the subject application's
    property that isn't already shown on the plans that
were submitted and reviewed by your office.
    MR. HIPOLIT: From their perspective, on
their property, that's their border. It doesn't
effect this.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Maybe I'm
misunderstanding. You said that you reached an
agreement this afternoon.
    MR. WISS: Yes.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And that was between
        what parties?
            MR. WISS: The Bears Nest Condominium
        Association and the applicant.
            CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. And if there's
                no impact on the applicant's property, why is there an
                agreement?
            MR. WISS: In order to effectuate the best
```

```
coverage for everybody, and we're talking about
buffering concerns, the goal was to bring those back
into the Bears Nest property because the height of the
treat, obviously if those trees are closer to the
Bears Nest, they're able to block out some more. So
as an accommodation understanding, I think the
logistics that there are some trees that have been
updated throughout the course of this project, a new
landscaping plan that was put in by the applicant.
Those weren't enough to satisfy the concerns so
logistically the developer and the Association have
agreed.
                            CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I just don't want it
reflected on the record that the Board is in agreement
with Bears Nest Association. Altering the grading
plan and landscaping on lands in Park Ridge because,
obviously, we have no control over it.
    MR. WISS: Understood.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And if those
improvements are proposed and properly approved by
Park Ridge authorities, our only concern would be what
impact, if any, would it have on the proposed
development.
    MR. WISS: Correct.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And if in fact you
```

```
provide the Board with something that clearly states
that there will be no impact on the Montvale
properties, then, as far as the Montvale Planning
Board is concerned, I'm sure we'll be satisfied with
that. And we will take that in consideration but it
really doesn't have much bearing at this point.
    I'm not looking at a plan of what the
association is proposing to do.
    You know, we, based -- we can't alter a
landscape plan based upon your representation. I
don't want to say, well, because they're doing a berm
and they're going to put evergreens on top of the berm
they don't have to plant this much in Montvale.
    MR. WISS: Right.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: That would not be
right.
    Nor can we say they should plant more. We're
kind of dealing with an unknown.
    When would you expect to have a plan and
something from an engineer stating that any proposed
landscaping will not negatively impact Montvale
properties.
    MR. HIPOLIT: Right. And, you can jump
in. The plans that I have are what you have here.
    You're saying you're not proposing any changes
```

```
in Montvale.
```

MR. DEL VECCHIO: That is correct.
MR. HIPOLIT: What you're saying is you
have a separate agreement with them for work to be done in Park Ridge which is not in Montvale?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Correct.
MR. HIPOLIT: That involves landscaping and berming, whatever is involved and we don't approve that.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Correct. We're not
asking for the Board's approval on Park Ridge property.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I understand. I just want the record to be clear because, in the future, things change.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right,
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And all of a sudden we have a water condition on this property.

I don't want someone pointing at Montvale saying but you agreed to this or you agreed to that.

MR. HIPOLIT: I agree.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Now we agree to rely
upon representations that were made to us by
professionals who are licensed to say that it will not impact Montvale. Once we have that documentation,
correct, me if I'm wrong --
MR. REGAN: I agree, Mr. Chairman.
I question whether the Board could even condition work being done in Park Ridge.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I agree.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: We're not asking for that to be the case.

MR. REGAN: No but Mr. Wiss indicated something about a condition.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I think his, I think his reference was a condition that we do the landscaping that is proposed on the current drawings before the Board in Montvale.

MR. REGAN: That's fine.
MR. HIPOLIT: It has to be.
MR. WISS: I should have been more specific. There was a set of -- there are two stages that happened here during the negotiations, a set of original landscaping plans and then there was a set of second landscaping plans. I don't know if you have the number of those. Those are already of record.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes.
MR. WISS: And those have been proposed by the applicant which, which are in Montvale along the boundary line. Separate and apart from that, today's
resolution did include the Park Ridge component to
this.
MR. REGAN: That's a separate agreement.
MR. HIPOLIT: Those, those plans are dated
2/20/19.
MR. WISS: Correct.
MR. HIPOLIT: That's the set.
Mr. Chairman, I would be uncomfortable reviewing
what's in Park Ridge. It's irrelevant.
MR. REGAN: Yeah. I agree.
MR. WISS: I don't think that was the
intention.
MR. ZITELLI: Should we have a part being
involved in this?
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I just don't want a
future or potential future misconception that the
Board authorized plantings in Park Ridge.
MR. HIPOLIT: Right.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: That negatively effect
this property or any other property in Montvale.
A., we don't have jurisdiction. We have no
basis of anything.
MR. REGAN: Right.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The only thing --
MR. ZITELII: This is just an agreement
between these two parties. We have nothing to do with it.

MR. REGAN: Yeah. They have an agreement. That's fine.

MR. ZITELLI: And the applicant has to go and --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Just let the record be clear and the resolution that ultimately will be acted upon clearly states what we understand.

MR. HIPOLIT: I agree. I think the resolution should specifically say that, I know I have said this more than once, there is a sanitary sewer easement back there. It goes from the property line, I think it's 25 or 20 feet, 20 feet into the property. There can be no disturbance in that area, none, not by the Bears Nest in Park Ridge or by this applicant, by any party.

MR. HIPOLIT: So when the job, if it is approved and we're out there, we're going to go out and make sure this plan, Sheet co-7, revised 2/20/19, they have to comply with that.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Got you.
MR. WISS: Do you need -- with that being said, do you need anything from us at this point?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, I think the
record is going to be clear because you do have a stenographer here and it will be included in any resolution of any action that this Board may take. But, but --

MR. REGAN: It would reference the representation for the settlement but --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It's very typical, just like the last hearing. We have recollections of something that happened 10,12 years ago. And then most of the people that sit here didn't sit on the Board back then. So we have to rely on the memory of a couple of old-timers. And that's not a good thing to do.

I would like to see it memorialized in some way, some how so that future generations could determine how poorly we handled things.

Okay. Anything else?
MR. WISS: Thank you. I appreciate it. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: You're quite welcome. Thank you.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: All right. Mr.
Chairman, since we last appeared we have a couple of additional documents we need to mark.

I would propose as $A-22$ the updated site plan set prepared by $L 2 A$ consisting of 16 sheets bearing a
last revision date of February 20, 2019.
A-23 is the written embodiment or report of Mr . Preiss's prior testimony. That document being dated February 20, 2019 as well.

And then, finally, as $A-24$, is the updated storm water report prepared by $L 2 A$ bearing the date of February 20, 2019.

Now just by way of overview, we have made and we have resubmitted the site plan set. We have submitted the entire set to address some open comments so I'm going to recall Mr. Dipple just to overview what the summary of those changes are.

I have asked Mr. Englebaugh to come back. There were two items he needed to address. One was providing the exhibit of the roof hatch that we did not pre-submit and also to identify the location of the affordable beds within the project which is something this Board requested that we do as opposed to allowing them to float.

And then, finally, I have asked Mr. Preiss to return, as $I$ indicated while we're marking the exhibit he did complete his testimony last time. I asked him to return in case there were any further questions either of his testimony or the embodiment of his opinion in the report that was now submitted.

So in that order, I'm going to start with Mr. Dipple. MR. REGAN: He remains under oath. Thank you. MR. DEL VECCHIO: I recall Mr. Dipple, remind him he was previously qualified and is still under oath.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:
Q Mr. Dipple, the drawings and reports that were attributed to L2A which I marked this evening were either prepared by you or under your supervision?

A They were. Yes.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: We just need it turned on.

Q So those were prepared by you or under your supervision?

A Yes.
Q And can you provide the Board with a general summary or overview of what the changes were to the drawings since the last addition was submitted?

A Yes. Referring to Sheet $C O-4$ and, I think it's going to come up on the TV monitor soon, the layout is really nearly identical to what we presented last time.

I think one of the most notable changes occurs
in the detention basin in the front of the property where, as Mr. Hipolit requested and we concur, that we really, it would be better served, the emergency spillway should this basin fail, be redirected toward the driveway where then it has an opportunity to flow through a number of inlets before it really causes any problem or it goes across the sidewalk.

So that is, that is noted on $\mathrm{CO}-4$ and it carries throughout the project set.

We revised the plans to address the comments of the various professionals so the comments are not always, you know, obvious to the, by just reviewing the plans but they are incorporated.

We did send them back with a response letter which generated some new comment letters.

I do feel very satisfied with the responses that we received recently from engineering, planning and what not.

A couple other minor changes.
MR. HIPOLIT: Stop there. Shouldn't we mark your response letter?

THE WITNESS: Yes. I don't have a copy in front of me.

MR. REGAN: Dated February 20 th, $A-25$.
THE WITNESS: And that response letter was
prepared by me and my staff.
A So looking at Sheet $C 0-5$, you will notice the changes to the storm water management system. The basin kind of crept in a little bit, got a little bit smaller. We ended up expanding the little underground portion of the basin which lies beneath the, the parking area in the front of the site. That was always there. It got expanded slightly because we had to accommodate the emergency spillway off to the driveway which changed the grading a little bit and the basin is in the same location. It didn't encroach any further on the neighboring property or Philips Parkway, just through the calculations it just had to tighten up a little bit which resulted in some underground detention in that area.

One of the other notable changes was a variance that was requested or noted by your planner for the size of the retaining wall which surrounds the four parking spaces in the southeast corner of the property -- some grading, I think we were just unaware of that until the letter was produced and some grading was revised in order to eliminate that variance.

So looking at the retaining wall I believe they all, the wall is within that 6 foot limit, within that area and that eliminated that, the request for that

```
variance in that area.
```

And that, that was the site plan.
Looking at the landscape plan I think you would see probably the most notable difference on the landscape plan, I think that's been discussed a little bit before I came up here in that we've added quite a bit of landscaping. We improved the area --

MR. DIPPLE: Bless you. MR. HIPOLIT: Thank you.

A In the back of the site we beefed it up so-to-speak, around the back of the property, still maintaining a good distance away from the curb line for the snow removal and $I$ think we just kind of did a better job throughout. We made sure, to the best of our ability that our, our planting schedule matches our plans. I think we did a decent job. Maybe we missed one or two.

But, that that was also improved upon and I think, other than some other incidental changes, $I$ think that's really the most notable unless, of course, throughout the testimony or my response to your professionals anything else wants to be heard.

Q Just a couple questions.
I think one of the review letters indicated that on one of the drawings there appeared to be an
encroachment of the fence around the detention area and to Philips Parkway and there is a question as to whether that was graphically correct or there was an issue there, the basin beyond the fence edge along Philips Parkway and the driveway on Sheet co-4.

A Yeah. I think that was graphically incorrect. And I think that, that just needs to be adjusted. I have one of my engineers here who worked on the plan. He noted that he thinks that was just a mistake in our plan in our haste to get it back in.

But that will be corrected to the satisfaction of the planner and the engineer.

Q I think there was another question raised about the proper height calculation for the building, your drawing showing it at 45.29 feet and 1 believe that Mr. Preiss's planning report initially noted it as 45.67.

I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, the building height calculation was corrected based on grading. Mr. Preiss's report was a summary of his prior testimony with the old numbers, yours has the updated number.

> But if I'm incorrect, could you please correct me?
A No, I agree. As this thing is a moving

```
document. Things change with the grading which then
impacts the height calculation and perhaps then
    resulted in the discrepancy but the maximum height is
    50 feet. Our plan shows 45.29. His may show
    something slightly different but it would comply with
    the }50\mathrm{ foot height requirement.
    MR. DEL VECCHIO: I don't have any
additional direct comments of Mr. Dipple.
    Obviously, there is a report from your engineer.
I had not asked him to go through that in detail but
subject to the Board's wishes, we can.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. And we will in a
moment.
    However, why don't we mark into evidence some
Board exhibits and have Mr. Dipple address them before
we enter into evidence Mr. Hipolit's technical review.
    So let's start with the Montvale Police
Department dated March 4, addressed to Lorraine
Hutter.
    MR. REGAN: That will be B-8.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: This is B-8.
    And, Mr. Del Vecchio, do you have a copy of that
review letter?
    MR. DEI VECCHIO: I received it late
today, yes.
```

```
        Michael Dipple - Redirect - Mr. Del Vecchio
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It states after
reviewing this application the Montvale Police
Department has a few concerns.
No. 1, the building needs more parking stalls for vehicles.
No. 2, the Police Department would like to have the ability to enforce 39, Title 39.
And, No. 3, the Police Department would like to see a camera system recording vehicles entering and exiting the parking lot onto Philips Parkway.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I have had an opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to review that with my client. He is amenable to Items 2 and 3 requested by the Police Department. And we believe the parking issue was the subject of the testimony, extensively in these hearings, that the, obviously the Police Department were not privy to. And we believe the project is properly parked.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Let's move on to Montvale Fire Department, dated March 5th.
MR. REGAN: B-9.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And we'll mark this B-9.
And it reads, the latest plans submitted by the applicant still failed to address the Fire
```

Michael Dipple - Redirect - Mr. Del Vecchio

```
Department's recommendations regarding water supply.
    In our first review dated July 3, }2018\mathrm{ we
requested a hydrant on the inner curb in the vicinity
of the proposed water main as well as one adjacent to
the Fire Department connection which we assume would
have to be at the rear of the building since the water
utility, fire sprinkler and fire pump rooms would be
in the basement at the far end of the building.
As this layout would require the service line run the length of the building to reach the basement level connection point. We expect subsequent plans be changed to correct the fact that running a water main underneath the floor of the length of the building would be foolish.
In the interim, since our initial review, the water utility has started requiring all large domestic water lines as well as fire service and hydrant service lines be run through a hot box near the curb to contain the meters and back flow preventers for all service lines. Since the current plans do not show this arrangement, we consider this plan to be incomplete.
When reviewing plans for facilities such as this, the Fire Department has to take into consideration the fact that if there is an emergency
```

    at the site, access the numerous ambulances is a
    primary consideration.
    With the current site plan not providing any on-site hydrants, in fact the plans do not show the hydrants on Philips Parkway. The first responding fire apparatus would have to drop a 5 inch supply line at the first hydrant on Philips and into the site thereby denying access to and exit from the site to all but fire apparatus. This is not an acceptable situation.

In addition, we maintain our position that the number of parking spaces is inadequate and in fact vehicles will end up being parked in the fire lanes on a regular basis will occur. This will only hamper maneuverability on the site.

Okay. Well, dealing first with the water supply question, and Mr. Hipolit, can you elaborate on what the Fire Department's concerns are relative to water supply?

MR. HIPOLIT: So SUEZ is requiring a hot box. It's an above-ground structure. It's small where your backflow and the meter go through before you come on to the site because they don't want any responsibility for what passes that point.

They kind of detached themselves from there.

```
    Plus the building will have fire protection, a
separate line for fire.
                            CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Had the Fire Department
previously requested the installation of hot boxes?
    MR. HIPOLIT: It's not the Fire
    Department, it's Suez. The Fire Department would
    rather not have it but they can't get around it. Suez
        requires it.
                            CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And, Mr. Dipple, do you
        have difficulty in supplying that?
    THE WITNESS: No. I can add to that
        because I'm very familiar with Suez's request.
    The distance that they like to see is }125\mathrm{ feet.
        If you can't provide 125 feet in the near curb line to
        where your meter is then you do need a hot box. They
        don't want that water line extending too far into the
        property because then there could be connections or
        unmetered water and it could create difficulties in
        getting the data from the meter. So they're 125 feet,
        pretty cut and dry with that. I have maybe seen 130,
        you know.
    We have 96 feet to the building. So, speaking
        to the architect, we have a stairway in that area and
        we think that that's where the initial meter could go
        and the back flow preventer. We haven't gotten that
```

far with the architectural drawings but there's a possibility there.

So, as it stands right now, we're 96 feet, we wouldn't need a hot box. I think the Fire Department's comment was that we usually see or he said typically $I$ don't, I don't know if it says typically but I'm very familiar with the process. I don't think we need a hot box. If we did, it would be a box, as Mr. Hipolit correctly said. It would sit above-ground. It would be heated. And that's where the meter and the back flow preventer would be and you can hide it with some landscaping.

MR. HIPOLIT: It's hard for them to be fair to the applicant. It's hard for them to do that now because until they actually design the building, do the hydrant flow testing, they don't know that. They have a water report going to Mr. Fette's office. Depending on the complexity of it, your plumbing subcode official, they may ask us to review it. We don't know yet.

I wouldn't get too far into that. I think the hydrants is more important.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: We'll put hydrants anywhere the Fire Department wants. We don't have an issue with them.

MR. HIPOLIT: They want at least one or two hydrants on the site. That can be problematic, again with suez because suez doesn't want to own the hydrants on a private site. So there's going to have to be coordination between the applicant, the Borough and Suez.

It may just require the hydrants go in the Borough right-of-way on either side of the site or at least one side near the road because suez won't allow a hydrant in the rear of the site. You could have a fire hydrant. They don't take responsibility. Again, it's another SUEZ issue.

If the applicant would agree to put a hydrant in front of the site and one off their system in the back of the site.

THE WITNESS: I concur with Mr. Hipolit that, like we've seen on other properties, projects that $I$ have designed, we have had difficulties with the public hydrant versus the private hydrant. And, I think that is a viable solution that we can look at as to pulling a private hydrant off the back and making sure.

And, I apologize if I missed a comment or I upset the fire official in any way. It was not the intent. But we're making sure that this is protected,
it is not only in our best interests but our
applicant, of course, also.

MR. HIPOLIT: I guess the last comment on the parking, the applicant is consenting to Title 39 on the property so if people were parking in the fire lanes the police would ticket them and tow them.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Since we're across the street from the Police Department I'm sure it's not a problem to enforce.

MR. HIPOLIT: That's that part.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: The fourth paragraph of the Fire Department letter where they speak to emergency vehicles on the site and the need for access for numerous ambulances is a primary consideration.

Well, what's your opinion on that, Mr. Dipple?
THE WITNESS: Well, I think, as we said, we would have private ambulance service. We have already established that.

I don't -- we've been through, in parking testimony, we are providing 43 spaces. Your ordinance requires 38 . But we also looked at other facilities in the area and we think that we're kind of right there in the middle of the number of spaces that are provided for like facilities in the area. And our client, the applicant, has provided testimony of that

```
operation.
    I don't know if a situation where multiple
ambulances would be here and be any way restricted
from circulating throughout the site. We have no
parking fire lane and that can be enforced, of course,
especially with Title 39. Now you have another level
of enforcement on the property if I'm not correct or
if I'm incorrect.
    But, I don't, I don't know if I really, because
I received that today, if I really formulated a, a
solid response to that other than I just don't see
multiple ambulances being crowded on the site in any
way. I just don't see that, that possibility.
                            CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Mr. Hipolit,
your most recent review letter, I guess, is dated
February 28th?
                            MR. HIPOLIT: Yes. We should mark it.
        Right?
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
    MR. REGAN: B-10.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: B-10.
    MR. DEL VECCHIO: I'm sorry. What was
B-9?
    MR. HIPOLIT: The Fire Department.
    MR. DEL VECCHIO: And what was B-8 then?
```

MR. HIPOLIT: Police.
MR. REGAN: Police.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I'm sorry. I'm going
back but $B-7$, because I, I started at B-7 and not B-8 this evening. That's my only concern.

MR. REGAN: Maybe it wasn't marked. Look at the transcript. Oh, $B-7$ has something to do with comment from Mr . Dipple regarding shift change parking. I think it was in connection with Mr. Wiss's cross-examination.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Okay.
MR. REGAN: That's what my notes reflect.
MS. GREEN: I have B-7 something from the Fire Department dated 7/31/18.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I hate to say it but I have it as B-6.

Let's leave the marking as is. I'll confirm it with the transcript back to Mr. Regan.

MR. REGAN: Okay.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: We'll just use the

```
transcript.
```

MR. REGAN: If we don't have a $B-7$ we'll
say intentionally omitted.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Perfect.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Hipolit, with

```
respect to your technical review of February 28 marked
into evidence as Board Exhibit 10, could you please
summarize this?
    MR. HIPOLIT: I don't need to bore you
with the whole review because a lot of it continues
from the first review.
    If you advance to Page 17. So when you go to
Page }17\mathrm{ you're going to get, start to get what we call
new comments where, I believe, the applicant really
addresses those comments. We talk about Title 39 and
we talk about some documents that they have to
provide. Damage to the roadway. We talk about the
Fire Department issues.
    So I think, at this point, if you were to
approve it, this would be the letter for approval so
if you were to approve the application you would
attach the February 28th letter to it.
    I think Mr. Dipple's response or as we mark
A-25, is somewhat of a supplement to it because it
answers a lot of it but it doesn't have to be part of
it, the resolution, if you were to approve it.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Say that again. I'm
sorry.
    MR. HIPOLIT: So I think Mr. Dipple's
response, A-25, is somewhat a response to our letter
```

of February 28 th which is B-10. They have pretty much, as far as we're concerned, answered all and everything we wanted so I don't think it's necessary to go through it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Is that correct, Mr. Del Vecchio, your client has agreed to all of our requirements as forth in Mr. Hipolit's review marked into evidence as B-10?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I believe that's correct, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HIPOLIT: With the supplement of the things we just discussed, the Fire Department, Police Department issues.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Let's, let's get from Board Members questions starting with Mr. Culhane. Any questions of Mr. Dipple or Mr. Hipolit?

MR. CULHANE: The one concern $I$ have in the way is there is no independent living units on this application so it's basically assisted living.

The concern I have is what if these occupants decide to have a car, park it on the site. I don't know of any penalty arrangement. We can't make a penalty arrangement.

So to cover that, I would think the Mayor and Council would have to pass an ordinance covering that
kind of a situation.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, I think the first question would be in the agreement, be it a lease agreement or service agreement between a tenant or patient, I don't know how you would refer to them, with ownership or management, whether or not they would be permitted to keep their vehicle on-site. And, Mr. Del Vecchio, what is your client's position on that?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I think the testimony was very early on in the process we had the intended operator speak to their experience about the likelihood of somebody having a car on-site. And I think the testimony was that they very rarely do. It's usually, at most, one or two per project but even that is more of an anomaly than a normal situation.

We don't envision that to be a problem or a concern but if the Board thinks otherwise, we can address it.

MR. CULHANE: My concern is, unfortunately there are people who always break the rules.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So, Bob, would you recommend a stipulation that no one be permitted to park on-site, a tenant or patient or whatever?

MR. REGAN: I think any, any resident
would not be able to have a car, to park the vehicle on the premises.

Would you consent to that as a condition? MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Culhane, does that satisfy you?

MR. CULHANE: Well, we get people who like to break rules.

What happens if somebody does park, who is going to correct the action?

Is it going to be the applicant or the operator or would it have to be deferred to the police?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, I guess it would be a zoning violation.

MR. REGAN: Yeah. It would be a violation of the condition of approval. Chances are the Borough would not even know about it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Right.
MR. CULHANE: I know but...
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Mr. Fette's, fifth and sixth --

MR. HIPOLIT: Well, we would know. It
would kind of be like somebody parking a truck on their site and they're not supposed to. We would know if the car was there at the time. It's pretty obvious

```
because we pass by there everyday.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Mr. Culhane.
            MR. CULHANE: No other comments.
            MR. HIPOLIT: That's how you fix that.
            CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
        Mr. Fette.
            MR. FETTE: Nothing at this time.
            CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
        Ms. O'Neill.
            MS. O'NEILL: I have no questions.
            CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
        Mr. Zitelli.
            MR. ZITELLI: Let me follow-up on that
    question about the parking.
    So the parking spaces, I think we said there was
38 required and you're providing 43.
                            THE WITNESS: That's correct.
                            MR. ZITELLI: So the 38 required, does
that include potentially tenants, residents?
    How is that calculation done?
    THE WITNESS: Well, there was, there was
testimony early in the process about the staff and the
change and shift and how that would work. And, and
not only does your ordinance require us to have the
space but also Residential Site Improvements require
```

half a space per, per dwelling unit. We also did that little study of it and found that that's pretty much how the industry goes. So, I think it would be really parking.

I think what the testimony is and I don't want to speak for, because I didn't give the testimony but I think the way it's going is that the staff would have the spaces primarily in the rear and visitation would occupy some of the other spaces. And then you have the, the physician that might come in or another representative who might come in. We have a loading space for deliveries so that really wouldn't take up a space. But if someone wants to deliver flowers, they would occupy the other spaces.

So that's the makeup of the spaces.
MR. ZITELLI: Just going back to the 38
that's required, I mean is that, does that assume that we need a half a space per resident?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: That includes all parking demand generated from the use whether it be from a resident, delivery person, a doctor, a guest, a visitor.

MR. ZITELLI: I got that. So Mr.
Culhane's -- so if a couple residents did park cars there are we going to run out of spaces?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: We don't believe so. Our ideal situation, if we had our druthers, would be to limit it to no more than two residents having on-site vehicles. We think that still leaves us a surplus and still counts for the one off who might want a car temporarily.

Our goal is to provide enough service where they find the car to be a burden and not a convenience and they want to get rid of it anyway.

So we would like the flexibility to have up to two but if the Board sees otherwise, we'll consent.

MR. ZITELLI: Okay. I don't think I have any other questions at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Teagno.
MR. TEAGNO: Yes, I have a couple.
Referring to Ms. Green's February 28 th letter.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Has that been marked?
We didn't mark that.
MR. REGAN: We didn't mark that.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Why don't we mark it?
MR. REGAN: That will be B-11.
MR. TEAGNO: Page 4 has variances, D
Variances that go over to Page 5. And on Page 5 there are the C Variances. I'm counting six, maybe five D

Variances and three C Variances.
The two D Variances are, I would like to focus in on are the impervious coverage, 50 , the limit is 50 percent and you've got 52.77 which is not a great variance but it's still a variance.

The second one is for the floor area ratio which should be .35 and it's .52 along your proposal.

And there have been comments from both the police and the Fire Department about parking spaces and not enough of them even though your study shows that it's in keeping with other facilities, I guess.

It seems to me that one way to address the $D$ Variances and the parking issue would be to reduce the number of units that you have on the site. A simple way to do that might be on the northern wing to take off, take out units -- it's three floors so you've got three floors of units. I don't know how many units face the north. But if you took off some of the real estate on the north end and on the east end it would reduce the number of units, reduce the number of the square footage of the building and thereby positively effect the floor area ratio and the impervious coverage.

I wondered if those thoughts had crossed your mind in how to address those areas.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Those are really
questions for Mr. Preiss. I'm happy to recall him and
ask him to answer them. If the Board wants me to do
it now or do it later, it's your discretion.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Why don't we carry that
until we hear testimony from Mr. Preiss.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Okay.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Any other engineering
questions?
MR. TEAGNO: No.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Wiss, do you have any questions of the witness at this point.

MR. WISS: I do not. Thank you.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Ms. Green.
MS. GREEN: I have one engineering
question.
Mr. Dipple you noted at the beginning of your presentation that you eliminated the retaining wall?

THE WITNESS: No. No. We eliminated the one wall.

MS. GREEN: It's still on the one wall
around the seven parking spaces.
THE WITNESS: And, and, you know, as long

```
as that's a C Variance and if I can give this
justification that is where some of the parking is,
the wall does kind of screen that a little bit more.
The grade is steep and we're trying to save some trees
there.
    From an engineering perspective, that's how I
justified the request.
    MS. GREEN: I understand now. I
misunderstood in the beginning that you eliminated it
    entirely.
    THE WITNESS: No, I didn't mean to.
    MS. GREEN: No. No. Thank you. That
    answers it.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Let's open the meeting
    to the public for questions.
    The Chair will entertain a motion.
            MS. O'NEILL: So move.
            MR. CULHANE: Second.
            CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Ms. O'Neill, seconded
        Mr. Culhane.
    All in favor?
                            (Aye)
    Does anyone from the public have any questions
of either Mr. Dipple or Mr. Hipolit? No.
    The Chair will entertain motion to close the
```

```
meeting to the public.
    MR. CULHANE: So move.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Culhane.
    MS. O'NEILL: Second.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Ms. O'Neill.
    All in favor?
    (Aye)
    Okay. Mr. Del Vecchio, I guess -- who is your
    next witness, Mr. Preiss, and we'll go into planning
    or do you want --
    MR. DEL VECCHIO: I was going to call Mr.
    Englebaugh back real quick. I don't think his
    testimony will take us more than two or three minutes.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Why don't we do
that.
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:
    Q Bruce, as you come forward, you were
previously sworn, qualified and remain under oath this
evening.
    A Yes.
    Q Okay. You were asked to come back
essentially by me for three items and I'm going to
address them in this order.
    One is to provide the hatch exhibit and
actually, I actually turned that in this evening.
```

We'll incorporate it formally in our submission.
Two is to identify where the affordable beds are to be located within the building.

And, three was to offer testimony on the porte cochere.

Correct?
A Correct.
Q So in that order, if we can, you have brought with you this evening at least a handout that we can turn in with the roof hatch as depicted when you last appeared here and testified on the larger exhibit?

A Yes.
Q If you would be kind enough to, I'm going to ask -- I'll take them. How's that?

MR. REGAN: That would be A-26.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: That sounds about right. I'll check when I get back to my pad.

Q Mr. Englebaugh, as I hand this out, A-26 is meant to represent what?

A Well, if it's Sheet A6 they're looking at, that would be the roof hatch.

Q And that roof hatch has remained in the same location that you testified to when you appeared here last?
A Correct.
Q And that roof hatch provides access to the
roof as it indicates so that the units and mechanicals
can be tended to?
A Correct.
So we're looking at Sheet A6 right now.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Hold on one second.
Let's see if we can project that on to the monitor.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: He doesn't have it on
his electronic pad.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: The camera.
MS. HUTTER: It's not working.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It's not working?
MS. HUTTER: No.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: We're going to take a
picture of it with the IPad and try to project it that
way.
A Okay. The sheet we're looking at now
shown up on the screen, it's probably not the first
sheet in your set. Turn to sheet No. A6. The date on
that is January 2nd, 2019.
And if we look at the roof plan over on the
right-hand side, you'll see at the end of each wing is
shown a roof hatch.
The circles that you see, one on each end, those

```
```

are what I drew during the last presentation. And
where those are located are in each stairwell so those
are the fire exit stairs. Where you get to the very
top, there will be a ladder that goes up the wall and
a roof hatch, that will take you out to the roof deck.
Q Okay. The second item that I asked you to address is where the affordable beds would be deed restricted to it as requested by the Borough.
A Correct. So the sheet that we're looking at now is labeled Sheet A2. It's dated today, March 5th, 2019.
And if you look at the third floor over on the -- it's the plan on the left hand side, you'll see a red cloud around those units. There are one, two, three, four, five, six, seven two-bedroom units and one-bedroom unit. So if you total those up you get 15 beds.

```

So those would be the affordable units. They're on the third floor.

Q And last but not least, the porte cochere, you have revisited that topic with the applicant?

A Yes. We worked with the civil engineer on that. They actually have contacted the Fire Department to get the height of the highest truck which is the ladder truck. That's 11 feet 9 inches.

So what we're proposing here, the clearance
height on porte cochere to be 13 feet. So that should be adequate for the ladder truck to get through.

Q And the applicant would agree to post a
height bar indicating that height dimension to avoid anything larger coming under that porte cochere.

Correct?
A Correct. Yes.
MR. HIPOLIT: Either a height bar or sign it.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: We could use either one. THE WITNESS: Typically we put a sign. MR. HIPOLIT: I wouldn't put a height bar, a sign on both sides and at the lowest point on the porte cochere.

THE WITNESS: Typically that's what we do.
Many times I have seen it lower than that so I don't expect any problem with a 13 foot height limit.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I don't have any further questions of Mr. Englebaugh and make him available to the Board and its professionals.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you. Questions starting with Mr. Fette.

MR. FETTE: No questions.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you.

Bruce Englebaugh - Redirect - Mr. Del Vecchio

Ms. O'Neill. MS. O'NEILL: I have no questions. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.

Mr. Zitelli. MR. ZITELLI: No, no questions, Mr.

Chairman.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Teagno. MR. TEAGNO: No questions. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.

Mr. Culhane. MR. CULHANE: No questions, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Please continue. MR. REGAN: Mr. Del Vecchio, we did get to the bottom of that exhibit. \(P-7\) was the report of the Fire Department.

Ms. Green was correct, it's dated July 3rd. MR. DEL VECCHIO: Okay. Mr. Englebaugh wants to offer one other item in response to the Fire Department memo.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:
Q Mr. Englebaugh.
A Okay. When we originally designed the building, you may remember the basement was in the back. Okay. That would be to the south where those angled parking spaces are. At one point we flipped that with these diagonal access so what would happen is all of the mechanical equipment, service equipment as well as the basement over on this side so now the basement is actually up front here. So it's going to be much easier for the water lines to get into the building with all that metering and things like that.

So I just want to make it clear that that letter was written when the basement was in the back. The building has been flipped and now the basement is in the front so it would be easier to handle all of that. MR. DEL VECCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Englebaugh.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
Okay. We'll hold off opening to the public again.

Why don't you introduce your next witness, Mr. Del Vecchio.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes. I recall Mr. Preiss. Mr. Preiss was previously sworn, qualified and remains under oath.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: If the Board recalls, Mr. Preiss offered extensive planning testimony when he last appeared. The Board requested that he
memorialize that testimony in a written report which was submitted and marked this evening. REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:

Q Mr. Preiss, that report was prepared by you and under your supervision?

A It was.
Q And while you've already testified and I don't wish you to go through that testimony again, if you could respond to the Board Member's question that you were present and heard earlier this evening.

Correct?
A Yes.

So, Mr. Teagno, I recall you were at the previous hearing where \(I\) testified extensively in relationship to this issue. I think the first point is the reason why we have an extensive number of \(D\) Variances is because the Board adopted assisted living facilities as a conditional use and had a whole series of not only use restrictions but restrictions relating to bulk and design standards which were not met. So all of the \(D\) Variances are as a result of that.

Moreover, the density variances are really a result of rounding to the fourth decimal point. We're very, very, very close to 25 units to the acre.

The only -- after going through my extensive testimony, the only D Variance that \(I\) thought was substantive was the FAR variance. And, essentially what that relates to is the fact that if you do a standalone assisted living facility most of them are started in the 70 to 75 unit range and we go up from there.

In this particular project, we have 75 units which is really the lower end. And given the quality of the facility and, moreover, the need to provide extensive common facilities and services those have to be shared by the number of units that you have in the facility. So we're at the very, in my opinion, based on numerous assisted living facilities that I've been involved in, we're at the very lowest threshold which makes it economically feasible.

So at 75 units or 98 beds you can look on Page 19, I have a table there which looks at this in the context of six other assisted living facilities and use that as the basis to compare the density. But if you look at the number of beds, we're at 98 beds. The next smallest one is 115 which is the Sunrise facility which goes up to 160. So I think that's proof positive of what \(I\) just indicated.

Moreover, if you look at the variance in the context of the fact that this is an inherently
beneficial use and the fact that the, none of the variances -- it's not a use variance. It's not a D-1 variance. So it's not a question of whether this site is particularly suitable. It's a question of whether the site can accommodate the problems by not meeting, for example, the FAR coverage and so forth.

And if you look at the assisted living facility, the way that it's been designed and laid out, it really doesn't create any problems in terms of the impacts on the surrounding uses from a traffic point of view or parking point of view, in terms of the amount of open space, the storm water that's generated.

The most sensitive land use is Bears Nest and, as you heard this evening, they're satisfied that with the additional landscaping, they're protected.

So when you look at the, the variances in context, first you have to weigh the fact that as an inherently beneficial use that we're entirely on the scale of entirely beneficial uses. This Board would have to find that there are substantial negative impacts which can't be ameliorated in order to deny them. And, I think that's clearly not the case here.

And because you simply can't, you know, take a floor off or reduce the number the units because it
will be below that economic threshold on the one hand, on the other hand doing that doesn't really reduce the impacts because there are no substantial impacts that are created by virtue of those variances.

So I would say to the Board that the 75 units, the 98 beds, the FAR that's proposed, the site plan that's proposed does not create any kinds of problems which can't be accommodated by the design itself and, therefore, I see no basis and no reason why the applicant should reduce the FAR, the number of units for the size of the structure.

Q Mr. Preiss, just a question if I may. Let's say a portion of each wing of the building is sliced off and whatever number of units are produced, would that provide for any meaningful improvement of the site, the site layout or lessen the impact to the neighbors other than complying with the numbers in the bulk table?

A I think it would only satisfy one in terms of numeric counting of the variances. So, in my opinion, substantively it doesn't really make a difference.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I have no further questions of Mr. Preiss. He remains available to the Board.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Teagno.
MR. TEAGNO: Thank you, Mr. Preiss.
I understand what you're saying but from my perspective I would like to try and get every application down to zero variances. It would make all of our jobs very easy.

THE WITNESS: As would I.
MR. TEAGNO: We do have a zoning ordinance with specifications that we expect to be met and the fewer exceptions we can make to those ordinance requirements \(I\) think the closer we are to what the town of Montvale would like to have.

Now I see the fact that you're doing this on a three acre site where 10 acres is minimum required is the root of the problem.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. Let me just address that.

The, the genesis of this particular regulation was based on the availability of another site where TSI Pike assisted living facility wasn't a standalone but assisted living and senior facility was going in. So I think that the, that the minimum track size and many of the requirements that are in the ordinance were predicated on that, in that particular situation
in that particular condition. And, I certainly understand that.

When you look at this particular application in, in that light, in my opinion from a planning point of view, it's reasonable and very standard with respect to assisted living facilities that have been developed and approved elsewhere in the community.

So I think that that particular situation. And we don't have just a standalone assisted living facility, you also have independent units, is really not a standard in which you can kind of review this to determine whether it's reasonable.

So the fact that we are on a three acre site, in my opinion, does not mean that the site is not suited or this property is overly dense.

And if you look at the other projects that are approved in this area, most of them are in the \(31 / 2\) to 4 acre range. I know of several assisted living facilities that are, that are on-site substantially smaller than that. So to me the 3 acre site in and of itself is not a, is, is not an unusual situation and is not a situation, in this instance, that would cause me any, any pause.

Moreover, in this particular situation we have substantially less units and less beds. And, our
density is right in the middle of the density range of those other projects. So the fact that we have 3 acres we have accommodated that issue by lowering the number of units and lowering the number of beds and we're right in the middle range of those assisted living facilities.

And, in each of test cases \(I\) was familiar with all of them and \(I\) was the planner on one of them. And, in those situations, they had nothing but a positive impact on the surrounding area. Some of them are adjacent to single family residential areas that have not been of effected by one iota by the fact that these projects are existing in that part of the community.

So I don't think the fact that this one is on 3 acres where your ordinance calls for 10 acres is really a cause for concern in this situation.

MR. TEAGNO: I agree, it's an inherently beneficial use.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. TEAGNO: I'm glad to see it come to Montvale. I would like every application to possibly come into conformance.

THE WITNESS: I would agree and I think the applicant has done all it can within this
```

particular context to reduce the number of waivers and
to, you know, reduce the extent of variances.
Unfortunately, because we're dealing with, you
know, with this particular site that has become
available which I think is highly suitable to be an
assisted living facility it does, it does run afoul of
your ordinance. And, unfortunately, we can't reduce
the number of variances beyond what we requested here.
And, I think that the, the task again is not the
number of variances but, you know, in the context of
the Coventry standard and the SI CA standard to
determine whether the site can accommodate any
provenance by example of the fact that it is on 3
acres versus 10 acres and the FAR is substantially
above what is permitted. And, I think, in all of
these cases I think we have proved there aren't
problems which are going to occur on the neighboring
properties or on this property.
MR. TEAGNO: Thank you for comment and
we'll see how it turns out.
THE WITNESS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Del Vecchio.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: We have no further
witnesses and the project team remains available for

```
```

any other questions from either the Board
professionals or members.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I think we have a new
planning report.
Is that correct, Ms. Green?
MS. GREEN: Yes.
MR. REGAN: B-11, we previously marked it,
dated February 28th.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Do we have an updated
planning report?
MR. REGAN: Yes.
MS. GREEN: That is the new one.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Ms. Green, No. 1, do
you have any questions or comments with respect to the
testimony, the additional testimony you have heard
this evening from Mr. Preiss?
MS. GREEN: With regard to the additional
testimony, no but I did not get to comment or question
on the previous testimony.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. So is that
incorporated in your February 28 technical review or
do we have to go over both review letters?
MS. GREEN: I did not incorporate my
comments and questions on the testimony into the
review letter. I have handwritten and if you want me

```
to give them --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Why don't you address both your notes and your review letter.

MS. GREEN: Sure. We'll start with the easier one which is the review letter and I'm just quickly going over it. I think they have answered, they have answered all of my questions.

I actually have one issue for the Board and that is it starts at the bottom of Page 14 and it includes Page 15.

So there's been this issue with how we calculate the sign area. And \(I\) went back in my notes specifically for the TSL Pike application to see how we calculated their sign area. However, their sign, in its construction, is different than the proposed sign in front of the Board this evening. And so, and I'm not sure that we've seen a sign constructed like this since \(I^{\prime} v e\) sat on the Board so \(I\) was not sure, because your ordinance reads that the frame counts in the calculation of sign area. And the question is whether or not you would count the stone that is on either the left or the right side of the sign as part of the sign area.

Depending on whether or not the Board includes that as the sign frame would then trigger a D3
```

    Conditional Use Variance for the sign area.
    MR. CULHANE: Well said.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Fette, how does
    your office typically interpret the Code as it relates
    to Ms. Green's question?
    MR. FETTE: We would generally not include
    the supporting.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Not include the
    supporting?
    MR. FETTE: Not consider it, correct.
    MR. REGAN: I think that might be
    consistent with the provision in the ordinance
    Paragraph A, the area of sign. I'll read it.
    The area of the sign shall be computed by
        drawing a square or rectangle to encompass the extreme
        limits of the writing, representation, emblem or other
        display together with the sign frame and any material,
        the integral part of the display used to differentiate
        the sign from the backdrop or structure against which
        it is placed.
    I think, when you look at that, I think Jeff's
        interpretation is correct.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Is correct. I believe
        it is, too.
            MS. GREEN: So then they don't need a sign
    ```
```

variance so, therefore, we've eliminated one D3
conditional use variance. So that was the only thing
in my review letter.
If you like, Mr. Chairman, I can go over my
notes because I had to go back and read over the
transcript. I'm sure you're all aware it was very
long and extensive planning testimony so I needed to
refresh my testimony. So if you're okay, I can go
over this.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Please.
MS. GREEN: So, as I was saying, back in
January Mr. Preiss gave us very extensive testimony
covering the D3 variances, the D4 variances, the D5
density variances, the fact that it was an inherently
beneficial use and then the C Variances.
Since the last hearing they have submitted
amended plans as they testified to tonight which has
actually eliminated one other D3 variance for the
buffer.
And then I went back and looked at the Code and
I agree with Mr. Preiss's testimony in that the C
Variance that we were previously noting for the van
parking space --
MR. REGAN: Has been eliminated.
MS. GREEN: Yes, it has been eliminated

```
because they are parking behind the building so it is screened from the public view. And we just agree that the D3 Variance for sign area has been removed.

So in reviewing both the transcript and I tried to follow along with Mr. Preiss's planning report so it sort of coordinated.

So the SICA test was used for the D Variances and that's a four part test.

And the first part that was testified to was the, what is the public interest at stake. And Mr. Preiss noted that they are proposing 15 affordable beds which is a 20 percent set-aside. Tonight they agreed, they actually showed us where those beds are going to be located. So that eliminates a concern that \(M r\). Regan and I had about these affordable beds potentially floating.

I still am slightly concerned because on the affordable housing rules, in order to receive the 15 credits, the operator wants to ensure that the occupants of a two-bedroom are unrelated. If they are related the Borough would only get one credit for the unit at opposed to two.

So there are 7 two-bedroom units and if they are not monitored and occupied correctly, instead of getting 15 credits the Borough might only receive
eight credits. It's something that we would have to be cognizant of in the monitoring of any facility.

In the testimony Mr. Preiss provided that, he noted that this site would help the Borough meet its affordable housing obligation. And I would note that the site is not in the settlement agreement or the housing plan. So it is not necessary to satisfy our existing three part obligation. However, if there were credits created from the site it could be applied to any fourth round obligation that the Borough has. The next part of the test was Part 2 which questions what are the detrimental impacts. And Mr. Preiss's testimony talked about access, lot area and coverage, \(F A R\) and density, share the intent to create an efficient compact and accessible development. And if you go and rewind all the way back to 2016 when you were sitting here, we adopted a Master Plan reexamination specifically addressing bulk standards in the 0.R. 3 and the 0.R. 4 zone and permitting assisted living facilities as a conditional use. The intent of allowing those assisted living facilities was to create a residential stepping stone, if you will, for the seniors in town who maybe can't stay in their home but want to stay in Montvale and they need some assistance. So we though this would be a great
```

use to be introduced into the zoning code so residents
could stay if they wanted to stay and, as a positive
side effect, create some affordable housing credits.
The intent was not necessarily a compact
development but the opposite, was purposely creating a
minimum lot size to accommodate the building, the
parking and the amenities associated with these types
of facilities.
The application requires a D3 conditional use
variance for a County, access from a county road. And
the testimony that the Board was given focused on
traffic, traffic generation and that on a normal day
there aren't significant trips.
And, I am not a traffic expert. However, the
requirement for a County road is actually in the
Master Plan reexamination, specifically Page 38. And,
I brought an exhibit which one has not been marked.
MR. REGAN: B-12.
MS. GREEN: And this is a copy of the
Master Plan re-examination. I did reduce the less
important, what I thought was the less important pages
so it's not to kill the entire forest.
MR. REGAN: B-12.
MS. GREEN: Okay. So in B-12 on Page 38
you would note that the purpose of requiring access

```
from a County road was to ensure suitable emergency ingress and egress. Traffic was not, traffic generation from the use was not the concern because we knew we were going to be locating concentration of, of residents who are more prone to have health conditions and we want to ensure that we had good access for emergency vehicles.

The testimony that was provided said that there was no County roads proximate to the site. But if you look at an aerial you will notice that the Empire Holdings site which is next door at 25 Philips Parkway has frontage on West Grand Avenue.

Moving on to the D3 testimony for the lot size, I would agree that the lot size is just shy of 3 acres. The testimony was that you can't change the lot location or the lot size.

One thing that I am curious to know is that the applicant tried to purchase additional land from property owners on either side. That could potentially not only -- it may not have reached a total of 10 acres but by potentially purchasing 25 Philips Parkway you could have increased the acreage and then had the frontage on West Grand Avenue. We didn't hear any testimony regarding that.

There was testimony that when you looked at the
development we fully and appropriately accommodated on this lot. I have to agree with this because the application does not comply with density, FAR coverage and which are connected in varying degrees to the lot size which I think is where Mr. Teagno was going with his questions.

Then the testimony moved on to the FAR variance. The testimony that we heard was that the FAR, an FAR is a less simple means of controlling density because the use is benign. However, when we wrote the 2016 Master Plan re-exam we incorporated the FAR . 35 because that was the new ratio that was being recommended for all four of our O.R. 4 zones. Previously you had a . 25 FAR ratio, an FAR standard I should say.

We wanted to control the bulk and the scale so as one drives through these O.R. zones we would preserve the landscaped campus nature that you have and blend the scale and the massing despite the use. So whether you were passing by an office development or research center or an assisted living facility the scale and the mass would stay consistent as you drive down the road in one of those O.R. zones.

Mr. Preiss also testified that an assisted living facility is larger because of the fact that
they require significant space for shared amenities. We knew this when crafting the ordinance and part of the reason for the minimum lot size was to ensure sufficient space for amenities whether those were inside or outside.

The planning report prepared by Mr. Preiss indicates that amenities are needed and standalone assisted living facilities common spaces may provide 40 to 50 percent of the entire floor area. However, I do not recall the Board hearing any testimony about the percent of common area in this building. So that would be something that \(I\) would be curious to know whether or not it's providing that common 40 to 50 percent common area which then would be partially driving the FAR.

I think if that's going to be relied upon as one of the justifications for the FAR variance the Board should be provided the square footages and percentages so that they have a better understanding.

The testimony also noted the provision of affordable -- excuse me. Actually, this is, this comment is now removed because we now know where the affordable housing units are going to be located.

Regarding D5, the density testimony, I do agree with Mr. Preiss that the .017 units that, that they
are over is de minimus in the grand scale of things. Moving on to the negative criteria specifically regarding the zone plan and the zoning ordinance. Mr. Preiss notes in his report and in his testimony the application advances two goals from the 2008 Master Plan. However, the 2016 Master Plan reexamination which I handed out tonight amended the goals and actually removed prior goal No. 14 which was to diversify the housing stock. Therefore, the application actually only advances one Master Plan goal.

The planning report nor the testimony really dived deeply into the impacts of the Master Plan or the zoning ordinance.

If you start going through the 2016 Master Plan reexamination you will see that we did a detailed analysis of the 0.R. 3 and the 0.R. 4 zones. There are 37 developed parcels. We looked at those 37 lots and based on information actually from Mr. Preiss's office when he was the Borough Planner, information from the Building Department, from the tax records we were able to prepare a table in the report.

And if you --
MR. REGAN: Page 34.
MS. HUTTER: Yep.

MS. GREEN: No. It would be -- it's the only foldout and unfortunately it's not numbered, the only foldout Excel table in the report. And this table shows all 37 lots and it provides information on their lot size, their coverage and the FAR.

What we found in looking at those 37 lots is that . 181 is the average \(F A R\) and there were only three lots at that time with an FAR greater than .25 which was the then standard in the 0.R. 3 and the O.R. 4 zone. Those three lots included 1 Glenview with . 253, 10 Van Riper which is Lifetime Fitness at . 255 and 160 Summit at . 279. Nothing in 2016 exceeded. 30 as an FAR. In fact, the highest FAR on Philips Parkway is, was at the time of 2016, China Shipping at .243. So the proposed \(F A R\) that the Board is reviewing tonight would be more than double of what exists currently -- I shouldn't say currently, what existed at the time the report was done in 2016.

After that extensive analysis, the Master Plan re-exam recommended increasing the FAR in all four O.R. zones from .25 to .35 to provide flexibility to property owners and an incentive to reinvest in the existing office buildings that were reaching, reaching an older part of their life span. The report also recommended increasing the lot coverage from 45
percent to 50 percent which was adopted.
The same re-exam that you have in front of you tonight recommended permitting assisted living facilities as conditional uses in the O.R. 3 and O.R. 4 zones and specifically notes the parcels should be 10 acres with County road access.

In reviewing the transcript from the January hearing, Mr. Preiss testified and he stated you do have a . 35 as required as the maximum and we're at .52. So that clearly is a fairly large violation of that requirement.

However, by later in the testimony, and this is Page 131 of the transcript, the Board was told with regard to the FAR that the intensity of the site has been managed and does comply with the overall purpose and intent of your ordinance.

The 2016 re-exam and the resulting ordinances were purposely crafted to amend the O.R. zone bulk standards and offer small increases in the FAR and coverage to ensure the zones were being viable. The assisted living facility conditional use was intentionally crafted with the same FAR . 35 and lot coverage at 50 percent to create cohesiveness with regard to the general esthetics in the O.R.3 and the O.R. 4 zone, cohesiveness with regard to general
esthetics as well as scale and massing in those two zones.

So for Part 2 of the SICA test, I'm having difficulty accepting the testimony that the FAR violation began at the beginning of the testimony as a fairly large violation of the requirement but by the end of the presentation the Board was told that the deviation complies with the purpose and intent of the Master Plan and the ordinance.

Step 3 of the SICA test looks at what reasonable conditions could the Board impose. The testimony in the planning report that we received indicates that the project cannot have a 10 acre lot size because it's a 3 acre site.

Again, \(I\) would ask the question did the applicant try to acquire more land.

Regarding coverage violation, it was noted that the deviation is not substantial. The applicant has included pervious pavement to accommodate this, correlated to some degree to the density, lot size and FAR.

For example, and \(I\) would think Mr. Teagno is reading my notes, if the applicant is requesting less units, the parking would be required which would reduce the coverage. Some would suggest the coverage
variance is self-created.
Step 4 is the positive versus negative balancing test. And, this is where Mr. Preiss's planning report summarizes his testimony. The summary indicates that there's no substantial detriment that would ensue if the variances are granted but, once again, I think the Board has stated time and again throughout the course of hearing is that the most concerning variance is the FAR variance.

As I've noted, we conducted an extensive analysis of the 37 developed lots in the O.R.3 and O.R. 4 zone and determined to increase the FAR from .25 to. 35 .

The requested FAR significantly exceeds the newly adopted standards and would be double the FAR with the largest building on Philips Parkway today.

Let's see here. Then for Step 3 Mr . Preiss says, no additional reasonable conditions need to be imposed to eliminate impacts. And that's partially because there's no condition that the Board could stipulate as part of an approval to address the FAR issue.

Finally, looking at the balance test, the report summarizes that there is a high level of public interest against an absence of detrimental impacts.

Therefore, the D3, 4 and 5 variances can be granted because the positives outweigh the detriment.

And, I think where the testimony was lacking, again, goes back to the FAR issue and the fact that the 2016 reexamination report was so specific and purposeful in looking at the issues of FAR and coverage in these two zones where we have allowed assisted living facilities as conditional uses.

The planning report and the planning testimony essentially ended with a very brief description of the C Variances which I am not going to reiterate tonight. And, Mr. Chairman, that's really my synopsis of the planning testimony and the report. I'm happy to answer any questions of the Board.

MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, I think we neglected to mark the reexamination report.

MS. GREEN: You marked it as B-12.
MR. REGAN: We did. Okay.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Well, first
let's go to Mr. Del Vecchio.
Mr. Del Vecchio and Mr. Preiss, you have heard or you have read Ms. Green's technical review. You've heard her many comments based on the notes.

Do you have a response to anything that she has stated on the record?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Relative to the technical review which we received in advance and had a chance to look at, I don't have any comments. I think relative to the comments offered tonight from or referred to her notes, I would like an opportunity to review the relied upon Master Plan examination report and those comments will reflect on them and we'd like to reserve the opportunity to cross-examine or ask questions on it at the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm going to open the meeting to the public.

Obviously, this meeting is going to have to be carried.

I believe that Ms. Green has paid particular attention and rightly so to the FAR. And the Board has had a concern with regards to the FAR proposed but this Board has had that concern for many, many years.

And when we increased the \(F A R\) in that zone from .25 to .35 , it was not with any degree of ease that that was accomplished. It was quite difficult.

And, as most people know, the Planning Board of the Borough of Montvale held sacred for the most part FAR, at least for the 40 years that \(I\) have served. And, I was adamantly opposed initially going from . 25 to . 35 but agreed ultimately because I
recognize that by increasing the FAR, hopefully we would encourage development and redevelopment.

And assume that consistent with what this Board has done over the years, hold sacred that FAR when this application came in and I saw it, the 52 or whatever the number might be, I was a bit surprised.

I, for one, have no difficulty with the 3 acres, quite frankly.

I, for one, have no difficulty with respect to the proximity to a County road.

I, for one, very much like the architecture that is proposed. And I think the site will work though I do have questions relative to parking.

To me it really boils down to FAR and I have not heard an argument although I respect Mr. Preiss as everyone knows to the utmost, that is a very, very tough hurdle with respect to this application.

I could poll the other Board Members with respect to that. I could carry to a date which we will agree upon this evening to allow you the time you requested, Mr. Del Vecchio, to review the Master Plan amendment of 2016 and review the testimony or the transcript of the testimony of Ms. Green so that you and your witnesses could respond. But I did want to get that point across.

I think there are some very good qualities associated with the proposed. But this is a big bump in the road for me. I'm not quite sure about the other Board Members.

And, again, I give you that choice, I could poll them or just carry and allow you to come back with whatever you may decide too come back with.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: We're fine with you carrying the meeting, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. With that said,
let me open up the meeting to the public once again.
Anyone care to make the motion?
MS. O'NEILL: So move.

MR. ZITELLI: Second.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Ms. O'Neill, seconded

Mr. Zitelli.

All in favor?
(Aye)
Anyone from the public? Yes, sir. Just identify yourself.

MR. TINTLE: Dave Tintle, 49 Whitney Hill,
Park Ridge.
Mr. Del Vecchio, we heard testimony earlier this evening in regards to the four parking spots in the southeast corner of the property. There is going to
be a retaining wall for those four spots. And if I'm looking at the diagram correctly on top of it a fence.

My question is, what will the retaining wall be made of such as railroad ties, brick, stone and will the fence be a solid fence or a cyclone fence or something like that?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I'm going to ask Mr. Dipple to respond. It's really engineering comments.

MR. DIPPLE: As proposed on the plans, the retaining wall is proposed to be constructed of a segmental block. So those blocks are 18 inches by 8 inches and they're stacked by hand with a geofabric beneath. They're very common.

I know of one, I don't know if it was the subject of the earlier application but as you drive down toward the center of town from this site there's a housing development that has a, that has a segmental block retaining wall tiered along Grand Avenue. It will look something like that.

It is less than 6 feet tall now and the fence, I believe we have, is a post and rail fence proposed throughout the site, around the detention basin and where necessary for fall protection.

MR. TINTLE: Would it be possible to have a solid fence in that area, I asked, as it goes into
```

some living rooms, some of the residences?
MR. DIPPLE: No, I don't believe that it's
appropriate to have a solid fence there. I think
that, I think it's -- we, we provided extensive
landscaping. We have actually gained the spots away
from, purposely away from any of the residences and we
went through iterations of the plan to do that.
I think the post and rail fence is more
appropriate for the site and, and I believe it also,
you know, brings kind of, matches the architecture and
brings a little bit of esthetics to the site.
So, as you see, I'm sorry, it's just going
through but if you see the spots, they really do not
head directly toward anyone's window or living room.
MR. TINTLE: All right. I disagree but
thank you.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
Anyone else from the public?
Okay. The Chair will entertain a motion to
close the meeting to the public.
MR. ZITELII: So move.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Culhane.
MR. CULHANE: Second.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Zitelli, seconded
Mr. Culhane.

```
All in favor?
(Aye)
```

    Members of the public that are here, please be
    advised this application is going to be carried to
    what date? April 2nd. No further notice will be
given other than this announcement.
Please feel free to contact the Planning Board
secretary to confirm that date.
Thank you very much for coming.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
(The hearing adjourns 11:15 p.m.)

```
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\hline appeared [5] - 15:22, & arrangements [1]- & balance [1] - 71:23 & 34:4 & brings [2] - 77:10, \\
\hline 20:25, 43:11, 43:24, & 3:24 & balancing [1]-71:2 & beyond [2]-21:4, & 77:11 \\
\hline 48:25 & aside [1] - 61:12 & bar [3] - 46:5, 46:9, & 56:8 & brought [2] - 43:9, \\
\hline Applicant \({ }_{\text {[1] }}-1: 20\) & assistance [1]-62:25 & 46:13 & big [1] - 75:2 & 63:17 \\
\hline applicant (24) - 3:7, & assisted [21]-33:19, & based [9]-4:1, 5:12, & bit [9] - 19:4, 19:10, & BRUCE [1]-2:6 \\
\hline 7:25, 8:21, 9:9, & 49:17, 50:4, 50:13, & 10:9, 10:10, 21:19, & 19:14, 20:6, 20:7, & Bruce [1]-42:17 \\
\hline 12:24, 14:5, 14:16, & 50:18, 51:7, 53:21, & 50:12, 53:20, 67:19, & 41:3, 74:6, 77:11 & buffer [1]-60:19 \\
\hline 23:25, 27:14, 28:5, & 53:22, 54:6, 54:9, & 72:23 & blend [1]-65:19 & buffering [2] - 6:5, 9:2 \\
\hline 28:13, 29:2, 29:4, & 54:18, 55:5, 56:6, & basement[7] - \(24: 8\), & bless [1]-20:8 & Building (1] - 67:21 \\
\hline 29:25, 32:9, 35:11, & 62:20, 62:21, 65:21, & 24:10, 47:24, 48:4, & BLOCK [1]-1:2 & building [21] -6:7, \\
\hline 45:21, 46:4, 52:10, & 65:24, 66:8, 69:3, & 48:5, 48:9, 48:10 & block [4] - 6:7, 9:5, & 21:14, 21:19, 23:4, \\
\hline 55:25, 64:18, 70:16, & 69:21, 72:8 & basin [7]-18:1, 18:4, & 76:11, 76:18 & 24:6, 24:8, 24:10, \\
\hline 70:18, 70:23 & associated [2]-63:7, & 19:4, 19:6, 19:11, & blocks [1] - 76:11 & 24:13, 26:1, 26:22, \\
\hline applicant's \({ }^{11}\) - \(8: 23\) & 75:2 & 21:4, 76:22 & board [1] -6:14 & 27:15, 39:21, 43:3, \\
\hline Application [1]-1:4 & ASSOCIATES \(_{\text {[1] }}{ }^{\text {association }}[1]-10: 8\) & basis \([4]\) - 13:22,
25:14, \(50: 19,52.9\) & Board [53] - 3:23, & 47:24, 48:7, 48:10, \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { application }[18]-3: 2, \\
3: 23,4: 3,23: 2,
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
association [1] - 10:8 \\
Association [5] -4:9,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 25: 14,50: 19,52: 9 \\
& \text { bearing [3] }-10: 6,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 4: 11,4: 21,4: 24,5: 6, \\
& 5: 7,5: 10,9: 14,10: 1,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 52: 13,61: 1,63: 6, \\
& 66: 11,71: 16
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
32: 16,33: 19,53: 6,
\] & \[
5: 14,8: 21,9: 11,
\] & \[
15: 25,16: 6
\] & 10:4, 12:3, 12:13 & buildings [1] - 68:23 \\
\hline 54:3, 55:22, 58:13, & \[
9: 15
\] & Bears [15]-1:24, 3:12, & 13:17, 15:3, 15:11, & built [1] - 7:23 \\
\hline 63:9, 65:3, 67:5, & assume [4]-5:7, 24:5, & 3:16, 4:8, 4:18, 5:14, & 16:18, 17:18, 22:15, & Bulk [1] - 1:5 \\
\hline 67:10, 74:5, 74:17, & 37:17, 74:3 & 6:6, 6:18, 7:2, 8:20, & 32:2, 33:15, 34:18, & bulk [6] - 3:3, 49:20, \\
\hline 76:15, 78:4 & attach [1]-32:17 & 9:3, 9:5, 9:15, 14:16, & 38:11, 40:3, 46:21, & \(52: 18,62: 18,65: 16\), \\
\hline application's [1] - 8:8 & attention [1]-73:15 & 51:14 & 48:23, 48:25, 49:9, & 69:18 \\
\hline applied [ \([1]-62: 9\) & ATTORNEY \({ }_{[1]}\) - 1:14 & Beattie [1] - 3:7 & 49:17, 51:20, 52:5, & bump [1] - 75:2 \\
\hline appreciate [1]-15:18 & attorney [2] - 79:7, & BEATTIE \({ }_{[1]}-1: 18\) & 52:25, 57:1, 58:8, & burden [1] - \(38: 8\) \\
\hline appropriate [2] - 77:3, & 79:9 & become [1]-56:4 & 58:16, 58:18, 58:24, & but.. (1] - \(35: 19\) \\
\hline 77:9 & attorneys [2] - \(5: 4,5: 8\) & bedroom [4]-45:15, & 63:11, 66:10, 66:17, & \[
\text { BY }[13]-1: 18,1: 22
\] \\
\hline appropriately \({ }_{\text {[1] }}{ }^{\text {- }}\) & Attorneys [2] - 1:20, & \[
45: 16,61: 20,61: 23
\] & \[
68: 15,69: 13,70: 7
\] & 2:4, 2:4, 2:5, 2:7, \\
\hline 65:1 & 1:24 & beds [13]-16:17, & 70:11, 71:7, 71:20, & 2:7, 2:9, 2:9, 17:8, \\
\hline approval \([0]-3: 3,3: 4\), & attributed [1] - 17:10 & \[
43: 2,45: 7,45: 17
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 72: 14,73: 15,73: 17, \\
& 73: 21,74: 3,74: 18,
\end{aligned}
\] & 42:16, 47:21, 49:3 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 4: 11,11: 11,32: 15, \\
& 35: 16,71: 21
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
authorities [1] -9:21 \\
authorized [1] - 13:17
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 50: 16,50: 20,52: 6, \\
& 54: 25,55: 4,61: 12,
\end{aligned}
\] & 73:21, 74:3, 74:18,
\[
75: 4,78: 7
\] & C \\
\hline Approval [2]-1:4, 1:5 & availability \({ }_{[1]}-53: 20\) & 61:13, 61:15 & BOARD [7]-1:1, 1:14, & C \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { approve }[4]-11: 8, \\
& 32: 15,32: 16,32: 21
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { available [4] - 46:20, } \\
52: 24,56: 5,56: 25
\end{gathered}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
beefed [1]-20:10 \\
began [1]-70:5
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 1: 15,2: 2,2: 4,2: 7, \\
& 2: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { C.C.R }{ }_{[2]}-1: 25,79: 17 \\
& \text { CA }_{[1]}-56: 11
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { approved }[4]-9: 20 \\
14: 19,54: 7,54: 17
\end{array}
\] & \[
\text { Avenue }[3] \text { - 64:12 }
\]
64:23, 76:18 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { beginning }[3]-40: 19, \\
& 41: 9,70: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Board's [2] - 11:11, } \\
& 22: 11
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
calculate \([1]-58: 11\) \\
calculated (1) - 58:14
\end{tabular} \\
\hline April \({ }_{[1]}\) - 78:5 & average [1]-68:7 & behalf \([2]-3: 7,4: 8\) & Bob [1]-34:22 & calculation [5] - \\
\hline architect [1] - 26:23 & avoid (1) -46:5 & behind [2] - 6:19, 61:1 & boils [1] - 74:14 & 21:14, 21:19, 22:2, \\
\hline architectural \({ }_{[1]}\)-27:1 & aware [1] - 60:6 & below [1]-52:1 & border [1]-8:12 & 36:20, 58:20 \\
\hline architecture [2] - & \[
\text { aye }[4]-41: 22,42: 7 \text {, }
\] & beneath [2] - 19:6, & bore [1]-32:4 & calculations [2] - \\
\hline 74:11, 77:10 & 75:18, 78:2 & 76:13 & Borough [10]-28:5, & 6:23, 19:13 \\
\hline area [30]-5:13, 7:25, & & beneficial [ \([\) - \(51: 1\), & 28:8, 35:16, 45:8, & camera [2]-23:9, \\
\hline 8:4, 14:15, 19:7, & B & \[
51: 19,51: 20,55: 19,
\] & 61:21, 61:25, 62:4, & 44:11 \\
\hline 19:15, 19:25, 20:1, & & 60:15 & 62:10, 67:20, 73:22 & campus [1]-65:18 \\
\hline 20:7, 21:1, 26:23, & B-10 [5] - 2:20, 30:20, & benign [ \([1]\)-65:10 & BOROUGH [2] - 1:1, & cannot [1]-70:13 \\
\hline 29:22, 29:24, 39:6, & 30:21, 33:1, \(33: 8\) & BERGEN [1] - 1:2 & 1:15 & car [6]-33:21, 34:13, \\
\hline 39:22, 54:17, 55:10, & B-11 [3]-2:21, 38:22, & berm \([6]-3: 20,6: 15\), & bottom [2]-47:15, & 35:1, 35:25, 38:6, \\
\hline 58:12, 58:14, 58:20, & 57:7 & 7:3, 7:11, 10:11, & 58:9 & 38:8 \\
\hline 58:23, 59:1, 59:13, & B-12 (5) - 2:22, 63:18, & 10:12 & boundary [1] - 12:25 & care [1] - 75:12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline answeredif] 33:2, & 59:4, 61:3, 62:13, & 63:23, 63:2, 72.17 & bermed (1) - 6:10 & BOUREGY(1) - 121 \\
\hline  & 669:966:11, 66:14, &  & berming 9 [1-6:8, &  \\
\hline 41.13 & areas \(21 / 39.25\), & 31:13, 31:22 & 11:8 & 26:15, 27:4, 27:8, \\
\hline  & \({ }_{\text {arcument|| } 7 \text {-7:15 }}\) &  & bestif -6.5.8.25, & boxes (1) 26:4 \\
\hline apartil| \(12.22^{25}\) & ARNOLLM-79.17 &  &  & break (2) -3.2.21, \\
\hline  &  &  &  & (bickili 76.4 \\
\hline \({ }_{2}^{\text {apparaus }} 2 \times 2\) - 25 & 24:21, 33:22, 33:23 & backilow \((11-25: 22\) & 8.18, 14, , 28, \({ }^{\text {a }}\), & bring [1] -7:6, 9:2 \\
\hline  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline \(48: 25\) & aside (1) 66:12 & bar 313 -46:5, 46:9, & \({ }^{56,8}\) & brought 2] - 43: \(^{\text {a }}\), \\
\hline  &  &  & bign| -75:2, & \({ }_{\text {- }}^{\text {BRUCE [|] -2:6 }}\) \\
\hline \({ }^{\text {Preme }}\) &  & (10.910:1, 21:19, &  & Bruceeli -4:179 \\
\hline  &  & 50.12, 53,20, 67:
722.23 &  & buteorli-60:19 \\
\hline (8:3, 29:2, 29:4, & \({ }_{5} 54.18,8,56,5,56,6.6\) & basement|-2 & bless 11 - \(20: 8\) & Buiding ||1-67:21 \\
\hline  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline 5.25, 64.78, 70:16, & \({ }^{69221.72: 88}\) & basinfl -18.1.18:4 & 70,17018 & 24:6,2 24, 2, 24,10, \\
\hline \(\xrightarrow{70,18,70: 23}\) apilicats & \({ }_{\text {assoliated } 171} 63.7\) 7, & 19:4.19:9.6.19:11. & blocks (1) -7:11 & \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline Application(1)-1:4 & Associates [|| -1:3 & basisisl -13.22, &  &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
application [18]-3:2, \\
3:23, 4:3, 23:2, \\
54:3, 55:22, 58:13, \\
63:9, 65:3, 67:5, \\
67:10, 74:5, 74:17 \\
76:15, 78:4
\end{tabular}} & \({ }^{\text {assocataion (1) } 10.7}\) & 25:74, 50:19, 52:9 &  & 52:3, 61:1.63.6, \\
\hline & A.tat & bearne 15.17 .10 .6 & , & builings \({ }^{\text {cin }}\)-68:23 \\
\hline &  &  &  & builtil \({ }^{\text {b }}\) \\
\hline &  & (e) & Sele &  \\
\hline &  & 9:3,9:5:9,9:9, 14:16, & 38:1,40:3.4.2.21, &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{application's [1]
applied [1] - 62:9 appreciate [1] - 15:18 appropriate [2] - 77:3} & ATTORNE Y \(_{\text {I }}\)-1:14 & Beatie [|] -3.7 & 49:17, 51:20, 52:5, & bump (1) 7 75.2 \\
\hline & attorey 7 (2) - 99.7 , &  &  & burden 11.3 -3:8 \\
\hline & attomeys 12 -5:4, 5:8 & bedroomil -45:15, &  & BYY \(137-1: 18,1,1: 2,2\), \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
appropriately [1] - \\
65:1
\end{tabular}} & \({ }_{\text {Attorees } 512]-1: 20,}^{1 / 24}\) &  &  &  \\
\hline & attributed (1) 17:10 & \({ }_{\text {S }}\) & 72:14, 73:15, \(5173: 17\), & ( \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline  &  &  & 78.7 & c \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Approval [2] - 1:4, 1:5 \\
approve [4] - 11:8,
\end{tabular}} & avalability (1) -53:20 & 61:13, 61:15 & RODM 1-1:17: & \\
\hline & avalatepel-46:20. & beefed (11-20:10
began \(11-70: 5\) & \({ }^{1: 175,2}\) &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{32:15, \(32: 16,32: 21\) approved [4] - 9:20, \(14: 19,54: 7,54: 17\)} & Averue (1) - 64.12 . &  & Boards [2] -1:171, & calculate [1]-58:11 \\
\hline & \({ }^{642,23,76: 18}\) & \({ }^{419.970 .5}\) &  & calculatedil| \(58 / 14\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{April [1] - 78:5 architect [1] - 26:23 architectural \([1]-27: 1\)} &  & betind \(\{1]\) P: \(6: 99,6: 1\) & boils 11.74 .14 &  \\
\hline &  & \({ }^{\text {below (1) } 1.52: 1,}\) & border (1) 8:12, &  \\
\hline architecture [2] - & \({ }_{\text {a }}\) & & Borough (iol- 28.5 , & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & B & 20. 55:19, &  & \(44: 11\) \\
\hline & & & borouch iz 11.1 & \(\xrightarrow{\text { campus (1)- }}\) cannot \\
\hline  & 30.21, 33:1, 33:8.8. & BERGEN (1) - 12 & & 17-33:21 \\
\hline  & \(\underset{\substack{\text { B.11, } \\ 57.7-2.21, ~ 38.22, ~}}{ }\) &  & & 5:25 \\
\hline 58:2, 59:1, 59:13, & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline answeredif] 33:2, & 59:4, 61:3, 62:13, & 63:23, 63:2, 72.17 & bermed (1) - 6:10 & BOUREGY(1) - 121 \\
\hline  & 669:966:11, 66:14, &  & berming 9 [1-6:8, &  \\
\hline 41.13 & areas \(21 / 39.25\), & 31:13, 31:22 & 11:8 & 26:15, 27:4, 27:8, \\
\hline  & \({ }_{\text {arcument|| } 7 \text {-7:15 }}\) &  & bestif -6.5.8.25, & boxes (1) 26:4 \\
\hline apartil| \(12.22^{25}\) & ARNOLLM-79.17 &  &  & break (2) -3.2.21, \\
\hline  &  &  &  & (bickili 76.4 \\
\hline \({ }_{2}^{\text {apparaus }} 2 \times 2\) - 25 & 24:21, 33:22, 33:23 & backilow \((11-25: 22\) & 8.18, 14, , 28, \({ }^{\text {a }}\), & bring [1] -7:6, 9:2 \\
\hline  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline \(48: 25\) & aside (1) 66:12 & bar 313 -46:5, 46:9, & \({ }^{56,8}\) & brought 2] - 43: \(^{\text {a }}\), \\
\hline  &  &  & bign| -75:2, & \({ }_{\text {- }}^{\text {BRUCE [|] -2:6 }}\) \\
\hline \({ }^{\text {Preme }}\) &  & (10.910:1, 21:19, &  & Bruceeli -4:179 \\
\hline  &  & 50.12, 53,20, 67:
722.23 &  & buteorli-60:19 \\
\hline (8:3, 29:2, 29:4, & \({ }_{5} 54.18,8,56,5,56,6.6\) & basement|-2 & bless 11 - \(20: 8\) & Buiding ||1-67:21 \\
\hline  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline 5.25, 64.78, 70:16, & \({ }^{69221.72: 88}\) & basinfl -18.1.18:4 & 70,17018 & 24:6,2 24, 2, 24,10, \\
\hline \(\xrightarrow{70,18,70: 23}\) apilicats & \({ }_{\text {assoliated } 171} 63.7\) 7, & 19:4.19:9.6.19:11. & blocks (1) -7:11 & \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline Application(1)-1:4 & Associates [|| -1:3 & basisisl -13.22, &  &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
application [18]-3:2, \\
3:23, 4:3, 23:2, \\
54:3, 55:22, 58:13, \\
63:9, 65:3, 67:5, \\
67:10, 74:5, 74:17 \\
76:15, 78:4
\end{tabular}} & \({ }^{\text {assocataion (1) } 10.7}\) & 25:74, 50:19, 52:9 &  & 52:3, 61:1.63.6, \\
\hline & A.tat & bearne 15.17 .10 .6 & , & builings \({ }^{\text {cin }}\)-68:23 \\
\hline &  &  &  & builtil \({ }^{\text {b }}\) \\
\hline &  & (e) & Sele &  \\
\hline &  & 9:3,9:5:9,9:9, 14:16, & 38:1,40:3.4.2.21, &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{application's [1]
applied [1] - 62:9 appreciate [1] - 15:18 appropriate [2] - 77:3} & ATTORNE Y \(_{\text {I }}\)-1:14 & Beatie [|] -3.7 & 49:17, 51:20, 52:5, & bump (1) 7 75.2 \\
\hline & attorey 7 (2) - 99.7 , &  &  & burden 11.3 -3:8 \\
\hline & attomeys 12 -5:4, 5:8 & bedroomil -45:15, &  & BYY \(137-1: 18,1,1: 2,2\), \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
appropriately [1] - \\
65:1
\end{tabular}} & \({ }_{\text {Attorees } 512]-1: 20,}^{1 / 24}\) &  &  &  \\
\hline & attributed (1) 17:10 & \({ }_{\text {S }}\) & 72:14, 73:15, \(5173: 17\), & ( \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline  &  &  & 78.7 & c \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
Approval [2] - 1:4, 1:5 \\
approve [4] - 11:8,
\end{tabular}} & avalability (1) -53:20 & 61:13, 61:15 & RODM 1-1:17: & \\
\hline & avalatepel-46:20. & beefed (11-20:10
began \(11-70: 5\) & \({ }^{1: 175,2}\) &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{32:15, \(32: 16,32: 21\) approved [4] - 9:20, \(14: 19,54: 7,54: 17\)} & Averue (1) - 64.12 . &  & Boards [2] -1:171, & calculate [1]-58:11 \\
\hline & \({ }^{642,23,76: 18}\) & \({ }^{419.970 .5}\) &  & calculatedil| \(58 / 14\) \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{April [1] - 78:5 architect [1] - 26:23 architectural \([1]-27: 1\)} &  & betind \(\{1]\) P: \(6: 99,6: 1\) & boils 11.74 .14 &  \\
\hline &  & \({ }^{\text {below (1) } 1.52: 1,}\) & border (1) 8:12, &  \\
\hline architecture [2] - & \({ }_{\text {a }}\) & & Borough (iol- 28.5 , & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & B & 20. 55:19, &  & \(44: 11\) \\
\hline & & & borouch iz 11.1 & \(\xrightarrow{\text { campus (1)- }}\) cannot \\
\hline  & 30.21, 33:1, 33:8.8. & BERGEN (1) - 12 & & 17-33:21 \\
\hline  & \(\underset{\substack{\text { B.11, } \\ 57.7-2.21, ~ 38.22, ~}}{ }\) &  & & 5:25 \\
\hline 58:2, 59:1, 59:13, & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline answeredif] 33:2, & 59:4, 61:3, 62:13, & 63:23, 63:2, 72.17 & bermed (1) - 6:10 & BOUREGY(1) - 121 \\
\hline  & 669:966:11, 66:14, &  & berming 9 [1-6:8, &  \\
\hline 41.13 & areas \(21 / 39.25\), & 31:13, 31:22 & 11:8 & 26:15, 27:4, 27:8, \\
\hline  & \({ }_{\text {arcument|| } 7 \text {-7:15 }}\) &  & bestif -6.5.8.25, & boxes (1) 26:4 \\
\hline apartil| \(12.22^{25}\) & ARNOLLM-79.17 &  &  & break (2) -3.2.21, \\
\hline  &  &  &  & (bickili 76.4 \\
\hline \({ }_{2}^{\text {apparaus }} 2 \times 2\) - 25 & 24:21, 33:22, 33:23 & backilow \((11-25: 22\) & 8.18, 14, , 28, \({ }^{\text {a }}\), & bring [1] -7:6, 9:2 \\
\hline  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline \(48: 25\) & aside (1) 66:12 & bar 313 -46:5, 46:9, & \({ }^{56,8}\) & brought 2] - 43: \(^{\text {a }}\), \\
\hline  &  &  & bign| -75:2, & \({ }_{\text {- }}^{\text {BRUCE [|] -2:6 }}\) \\
\hline \({ }^{\text {Preme }}\) &  & (10.910:1, 21:19, &  & Bruceeli -4:179 \\
\hline  &  & 50.12, 53,20, 67:
722.23 &  & buteorli-60:19 \\
\hline (8:3, 29:2, 29:4, & \({ }_{5} 54.18,8,56,5,56,6.6\) & basement|-2 & bless 11 - \(20: 8\) & Buiding ||1-67:21 \\
\hline  &  &  &  &  \\
\hline 5.25, 64.78, 70:16, & \({ }^{69221.72: 88}\) & basinfl -18.1.18:4 & 70,17018 & 24:6,2 24, 2, 24,10, \\
\hline \(\xrightarrow{70,18,70: 23}\) apilicats & \({ }_{\text {assoliated } 171} 63.7\) 7, & 19:4.19:9.6.19:11. & blocks (1) -7:11 & \({ }^{2}\) \\
\hline Application(1)-1:4 & Associates [|| -1:3 & basisisl -13.22, &  &  \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
application [18]-3:2, \\
3:23, 4:3, 23:2, \\
54:3, 55:22, 58:13, \\
63:9, 65:3, 67:5, \\
67:10, 74:5, 74:17 \\
76:15, 78:4
\end{tabular}} & \({ }^{\text {assocataion (1) } 10.7}\) & 25:74, 50:19, 52:9 &  & 52:3, 61:1.63.6, \\
\hline & A.tat & bearne 15.17 .10 .6 & , & builings \({ }^{\text {cin }}\)-68:23 \\
\hline &  &  &  & builtil \({ }^{\text {b }}\) \\
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