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CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Block 3201, Lot 4,
Ridgecrest Realty Associates, Inc., 21 Philips
Parkway, application for conditional use and variance approval, application for major soil movement permit, bulk variances approval and Environmental Impact Statement approval.

With that said, good evening.
Okay. Mr. Del Vecchio, whenever you're ready. MR. DEL VECCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Andy Del Vecchio, member of the firm, on behalf of Beattie Padovano on behalf of the applicant Ridgecrest Real Estate, LLC. We are here on continued public hearings from, I believe, November 20 th is when we last appeared.

I do have supplemental submittals that have been transmitted to the Board in advance of the hearing that I would propose, with the Board's permission, to mark as follows. And I believe we pick up with A-17. A-17 is the form of ambulance agreement with on Time Ambulance dated January 10, 2019.

A-18 is proposed to be the updated Minno \& Wasko architectural plans consisting of 9 sheets last revised January 2, 2019.

And A-19 is the L2A site plan sheet labeled CO-4 bearing a last revision date of January 3, 2019.

So with that said, Mr. Chairman, with the Board's permission, I would like to recall Bruce Englebaugh.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Before we do that, Mr.
Del Vecchio.
Mr. Regan, I believe we have a few Borough exhibits which I want to --

MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, my notes reflect that we have not marked any Borough exhibits yet.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: How about holding them?
MR. REGAN: Right now we have no Borough exhibits.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So, therefore, Mr. Del Vecchio, have your witness refrain from referencing any of the technical review letters until such time as we mark them into evidence.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Mr. Chairman, the direct testimony, while not -- I'm going to follow the normal procedure, while not intended to touch upon some of the issues that were commented on by the very nature of the direct testimony, his testimony may cover them.

If the Board wishes to mark them, I have no objection to marking them.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Then let's mark them into evidence at the request of the applicant.

MR. REGAN: They will be Board exhibits. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Please.

MR. REGAN: I suggest that Board Exhibit 1 be the report of Mr . Hipolit dated January 11 th.

B-2 would be the report of Ms. Green also dated January 11th.

I have two reports, the Police and Fire.
Do you want to have them marked?
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The first question is
of Ms. Green, Mr. Hipolit, in your review letters of January llth, did they incorporate the comments made on --

Andy, in your case this is your technical review letter No. 4.

Is it inclusive of your reviews that were shown in Report 1, 2 and 3? MR. HIPOLIT: Yes. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Bob, is it necessary -MR. REGAN: I think we should just mark the them. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The same question of Ms. Green.

Ms. Green, your review letter No. 3, is that inclusive of your technical review comments as set forth in Review 1 and 2 ?

MS. GREEN: Yes, it is.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Mr. Deblasio, I

```
believe he had two review letters.
```

Mr. Hipolit, do you have copies of Mr.
DeBlasio's review letters?
MR. HIPOLIT: I have his October 16 th one.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: There's one dated
November 16 th that I'm aware of. I'm not sure if it's also October 16 th by coincidence.

MR. HIPOLIT: No, I don't think so. No. I have, I never had a copy of it.

MR. REGAN: Dated November 16th?
MR. ZITELLI: It is. Here's one dated --
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Actually, Mr. Hipolit, is -- there are two landscape review letters, Mr. Chairman. You are correct. By coincidence they are dated October and November 16 th respectively.

MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I believe both of them, though, are superseded by the subsequent filing of the applicant of the revised plans.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, let's mark, let's mark both the DeBlasio review letters. So one is October 16 and the other one is --

MR. REGAN: November 16 th.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: November 16 th .
MR. REGAN: That will be 3 and 4.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Of the Board exhibits.
MR. REGAN: Two reports on the table from
the Police Department.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Del Vecchio, do you
have copies of the police reports.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I am checking my report stack right now.

MR. REGAN: One is October 15 th and the other is January 4th.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I do not have the
January one, that I'm positive of.
MS. HUTTER: I will make you a copy.
MR. HIPOLIT: Lorraine, I have a copy.
Hold on.
MR. REGAN: While they're doing that --
MR. HIPOLIT: January 14 th letter from the

```
police, Lorraine?
```

MS. HUTTER: Yeah.
MR. REGAN: $B-5$ would be the October 15 th letter and B-6 January 4 th.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Do we have a fire
report?
Mr. Del Vecchio, do you have a copy of the fire

```
report?
```

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I do not. July 3rd.
MR. REGAN: I make that $B-7$.
MR. HIPOLIT: July 3rd, 2018.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: If there are no other Board exhibits at this time. Okay. With that said, Mr. Del Vecchio, please continue.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: We have recalled Mr. Bruce Englebaugh who was previously sworn, qualified and $I$ remind him remains under oath.

Bruce is qualified in the field of architecture, as an expert in the field of architecture and Bruce was required and requested to come back as we have updated the plans.

DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:
Q Bruce, let's just start with the obvious which is the revised plans dated $8 / 18$ which we marked this evening as the updated architectural drawings. They were prepared by you or under your supervision?

A That is correct. Yes.
Q Can you provide the Board with an update or review of what the changes are in this addition of the drawings and what you did in these drawings?

A Sure. I think what $I$ will do is I'll just
go through the plans.
Just looking at the cover sheet here basically what we did is we modified some of the building plans and elevations to amend these three last sheets which is -- we added typical unit plans and then the trellis detail. Actually, you saw that before but there is some clarifications on that.

I'll start and run through the plans now.
Okay. We're looking at Sheet A1 which is the basement floor plan and ground floor plan dated January 2nd, 2019.

There were just some minor changes here in the floor plan, in the admin area and we changed the mix. I don't think there are any objections to any of that from any of the review letters so the map, nothing really changed on this sheet.

Q Bruce, is this the floor that had the size of the lounge questioned for the staff that would make some changes and improvements to?

A We didn't make any changes to that. The question was this private dining room which is -- you can see it right here, private dining room. I think there was a concern about a lot of people going to that space.

Basically it's just a big dining room about 170 ,

180 square feet so maybe 10 by 17 . And it's meant for families like if one of the residents has a birthday maybe six, eight family members joining in.

It's not a big room at all. It's like a big dining room. That's all it is.

I think there was a concern maybe with the cars outside and parking but it's not a big event space at all.

Q Yeah. That's the private dining.
And I think on the other side there was a staff lounge and dining area which has been enlarged now behind the administrative suite.

A Yeah. Over on this side, where I'm pointing, there was a triangular shaped staff lounge. It was a bit awkwardly shaped so we reshaped that space.

Q Thank you.
One second before you change that sheet because I know it's going to come up in an item we'll have to address later on in the review letter.

The dimensions of the face of the sign, the free-standing sign that's shown in the upper right hand corner, the actual sign face itself, including the trim work around the, I'll call it the rectangle. It's not quite a rectangle that forms the sign, you
have it labeled as a dimension of 7 foot 4 inches by 4 foot 4 inches?

A Correct.
Q And that tallies to a square footage of less than 32 square feet?

A Correct.
Q All right. You can proceed, if you can.
A Okay. The next exhibit we're looking at is Sheet A2 dated January 2nd, 2019.

On the right-hand side you'll see the second floor plan, on the left hand side you'll see the third floor plan.

There were very few changes here. I think one of the comments was we wanted to make the elevation, the architectural elevations, the side elevations that face Bears Nest a little bit nicer so we added some gables here. You can see where those projections are.

When we get to the elevation sheets you'll see the dormers.

There's projections, two of them here and two of them over here. So the back side of the building became more interesting.

We did shuffle some of the units around. That was all in that unit mix chart.

I don't think there are any objections to that.

Q And, Bruce, just again, before you shift off, we have designated with the striping or the crosshatching on this floor plan which of the units are dedicated to memory care.

A That is correct.

From this red line that I'll draw here to the left of that is all memory care.

Q Okay. Please proceed.

A Just to review, there were 24 memory care units.

The next sheet we're looking at is Sheet A3 dated January 2nd, 2019. This is basically the front elevation looking here and the side elevation looking towards, looks out towards Philips Parkway. There were no real substantial changes on this.

You see up in the upper left corner there's a tiny gable out here and those are the gables that are on the rear facing elevations that we'll see on the next exhibit.

For the most part, this didn't change.
Next drawing Sheet A4, again dated January $2 n d$, 2019.

If you look over in the right side here you'll see a key plan that shows where the elevations are.

So the top one here is in the back looking at
say a 45 degree angle in the back of the building. And you can see it's very subtle here but they are highlighted in red. Those are the two gables on this side and then over on the left side you can see two more gables.

Now if you want to see a direct view of that look at the Elevation NO. 3 directly below it. If you look over to the key plan on the right-hand side you'll see that you're looking at it this way. And this is the way those two gables would look as you see them straight on.

Q Bruce, before we come off this sheet, if you can, at this point with the changes that you have made to the, to these elevations, are they consistent and essentially of the same level of detail as the other sides of the building that you designed?

A Yes. I believe so.
And one thing to keep in mind, I was referring to them as gables but they're more than gables, they're actually projections, actually project out to the facade of the building so there will be a nice shadow that is produced from the facade as well and that happens on each one of those.

The next exhibit is Sheet A5, again dated January 2nd, 2019.

If you look up in the upper right you'll see the key plan which shows where those elevations are taken. Elevation 6 which -- I'm sorry. I need my glasses.

Elevation 5, I'm sorry, is the top one and this is what faces the Empire Corporate Center. If you look down at the lower one, No. 5, this is what faces Bears Nest.

And, again, you'll see the two gables and I guess I'll call them facade projections, that really break up that elevation quite nicely, makes it look very attractive.

Q Bruce, before you again flip off this page, in the lower corner of the elevation, seems to be a partial view of the covered patio area that forms the corner.

Again, can you remind us what features are located or proposed to be located in that area?

A That would be, like on nice days, you could actually go out and have like a dining area there.

Q Are there any permanent booking facilities like grills or anything proposed out there in the yard?

A
I think we had discussed a grill there but I'm not so sure. I have to look back in my notes on
that.
Does any team member know the answer to that? No.

Q I don't believe we proposed anything out there is my recollection.

A Okay. No grill is out there.
Q That's essentially a covered area to provide a gathering place with some shelter from the weather or the elements --

A Yeah.
Q -- for the residents is of limited size?
A Yes. It's -- I don't know the size of it off the top of my head but it is limited.

Q Okay. Please proceed.
A The next exhibit we're looking at is Sheet A6 dated January 2nd, 2019.

There's two drawings. Here, on the right-hand side, is the roof plan, on the left side is a building section.

If we look over on the roof plan on the right side all we added here were two roof hatches, one on each end of the building. These would be in the stairwells so you come up to the top of the stair, on the top floor, there would be a ladder on the wall, take you up to a roof hatch.

I'm sure you have seen these in hotels before. The left-hand side of the building section, we didn't make any changes to that.

The only thing $I$ would clarify, again, is the 43
feet 1 inch is not a building height. It just is a dimension that we show from the ground floor to the midpoint of the roof, that the civil engineer uses to establish the building height.

The next exhibit Sheet A7. There were no changes on this exhibit.

I did see one question on the review letters. And that was questioning the, the surface that is underneath this pergola, whether it is pervious. Yes, it is pervious. There is no brick or concrete walkway area under there.

Must have moved the video.
MR. HIPOLIT: You moved the camera.
MS. O'NEILL: They're in the background.
Proceed. Go ahead.
THE WITNESS: Will it catch up here?
MS. HUTTER: It should. This is new.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I think you're back,

## back on.

A Okay. Not the best focus but...
This next exhibit we're looking at is Sheet A8
and it is dated actually January 15th, 2019. And it shows four unit plans.

Starting in the upper left hand corner, this would be a one bedroom assisted living unit. And it would be an interior corner on the second floor in the back of the building.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry. The plan you identified as A8 --

THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: -- does not match the plan stapled in your drawings as A8.

THE WITNESS: Yeah. And, I think that's why the date on this is January 15 th.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: This is January 2 last revised.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Do you have the January 2 sheet we can work with?

MR. REGAN: The January 2nd, 2018 may be a mistake.

THE WITNESS: I don't have that one.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I do. This is the A8 set with a January 2,2019 revision date.

A Okay. So in the upper left hand corner we see a two-bedroom assisted living unit. Moving down we have a two-bedroom memory care assisted living
unit. Moving to the right across the bottom we have a one-bedroom memory car unit.

And then moving up on the upper right hand corner we have a one-bedroom assisted living unit.

Q And these are typical units representative of what's depicted on the overall floor plans on the preceding sheets that you have gone through.

Correct?
A Correct. Yeah.
Q There are, obviously, some floor plate dimensions shown in the earlier sheets that have slightly odd configurations just because of the way the building undulates with its exterior which will be accommodated in the typical floor plate on a

```
case-by-case basis in the floor plan?
```

A That's correct.
Q And essentially they will have all of the same ingredients of a typical floor plate that you have gone through?

```
    A Yes, they will.
    Q
    Okay. Now there are some terraces
depicted on the elevation on the southwest?
    A The facade elevations?
    Q Yes.
    I believe depicted on the engineering drawings
``` but also depicted on your elevation drawings.

A Are you talking about the terraces in the rear or the front?

Q In the south, southwest, I believe, corner, both entrance and along the rear, southwest of the building. I think it's that large terrace area that you were talking about in the back.

A Right here.
Q The terrace area. Those are one-story amenities.

Is that correct?
A That is correct.
\(Q\)
On the second and third floor there's no floor area above that covered area?

A Well, there is.
If you look close, closest to what I'll call the center line, runs at a 45 degree angle, the two spaces that are closest to that are covered terraces and there is floor area above that. But as you move farther out to the outside corners, those two terraces do not have cover --

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I'm sorry. Moved to the outside corners, those two units. I missed that.

THE WITNESS: These two terraces right here, they do not have space built over the top of
```

    them. It's open to the air.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It's open to the air?
    THE WITNESS: Correct.
    A So if you could see these two drawings,
    these two one-bedroom units that I'm pointing at now
    are over the top of these two covered terraces here.
    These terraces, this one and this one, are open
    to the air above.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Is that calculation for
    that area of the terrace included in your FAR?
    THE WITNESS: I refer to the civil
    engineer for that question.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: We will have Mr. Dipple
respond when he comes forward this evening.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: You believe they are
included in the FAR calculation?
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Please continue.
THE WITNESS: To the best of my knowledge
that is also the case.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I have nothing further
of Mr. Englebauch at this time. I make him available
to the Board Members and the Board professionals.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. I'm going

```
to start with Ms. Green.

Ms. Green, you heard the testimony of the architect this evening. You have done your technical reviews.

Are there any questions that you have of this witness or are there any unanswered questions relative to architecture included in your technical review?

And just reference the date of your review.
MS. GREEN: Yes. My review letter is dated January 11, 2019.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Which we have marked into evidence?

MS. GREEN: As B-2.
MR. REGAN: B-2.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Please continue.
MS. GREEN: Yes. So my comments begin on Page 7. The architect has answered Item No. 4. So now we understand why there's a discrepancy between the height indicated on the architectural plans versus the site plans.

I will stick to architecture here.
Comment No. 15 on Page 9, my version of \(A-6\) does not show the roof hatches that were shown on the board. So I'm unsure if that was a January 15 th revision that wasn't in our packet.

THE WITNESS: That's what I'm thinking. It's dated January 2nd but, yeah.

So if you would like us to resubmit that we can certainly do that.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes. We'll actually absolutely resubmit.

MS. GREEN: That answers my questions. They show two hatches so that actually does answer Item No. 15.

Their Sheet 8 partially answers Item No. 16 about the unit layouts. They have also added the very facade on the rear that the Board asked them to do at the last hearing.

But if we move forward to Page 11, Item No. 34 on affordable housing, one thing we asked for in all three of our review letters is where are the affordable units. And this has been a question that we've asked every applicant that proposed affordable housing in front of us because as we learn, as we go through this process, especially after approval, some applicants like to move the units or don't want to comply with bedroom distribution.

And there are very specific rules under the Mount Laurel doctrine and the COAH Rules about, specifically for assisted living units and so I guess
what I'm wondering is where are the affordable housing units and are any of those units two bedroom units.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Why don't you go ahead and then I'll add the legal twist.

THE WITNESS: Okay. To the best of my knowledge the affordable units float. There are two bedroom affordables.

MS. GREEN: What do you mean by float?
THE WITNESS: They can occur anywhere in the building.

MS. GREEN: So they move depending on the month?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: The proposal is -- it's very difficult, even by deed restriction, because a unit doesn't have, in assisted living arrangements a unit doesn't have a meets and bounds description associated with it that you can then slap a deed to it.

What we're envisioning, and we're open to suggestions if the Board or community wants to handle it differently, is a blanket deed restriction on the property that says at all times it needs to have X. , Y. and Z. and X., Y. and Z. will be not only the split between low and mod but also include the necessary bedroom distribution in order to be UF qualified which
we understand we are fully prepared to qualify and to comply with.

The other problem is, is you may have Unit 1, 2 and 3 which are dedicated affordable units that are occupied by affordable folks and be at your maximum limit and still have Unit 4 because we took somebody in and put them in an affordable unit who qualified but then we're over the maximum.

So we believe the best way to handle it is a blanket deed restriction on the property to agree to what we have said we would do and what the community expects you to do so it's enforceable.

MR. REGAN: Isn't that complicated with the Borough?

How do you assure compliance if these are going to be floating units. Typically we have a unit number that's designated an affordable unit.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: It's simple. We can file a monthly report, quarterly report and say Unit 1, 2 and 3 are affordables and --

MR. REGAN: Do you know how problematical that's going to be for the Borough in terms of who is going to enforce it?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: The affordable housing administrator whose job it is to monitor the units.
```

        If you would like to handle it a different way
    we're happy to do it. We're trying to be efficient.
MR. REGAN: The most efficient, from our
standpoint is a unit number. It's not that
complicated.
MS. GREEN: And that is how we did it with our other applications. And I can tell you in one of my other towns where we just approved an assisted living facility we actually -- they didn't have unit numbers when they filed their deed restriction so we just asked them to mark the floor plan because they just haven't figured out what the building number --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Del Vecchio.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: We're happy to comply.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: We'll have to discuss that.
MS. GREEN: Okay.
MR. REGAN: I think that should be addressed, Mr. Chairman, as a condition of the approval.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: All right. Let's make a note on that. We're going to have to revisit that because $I$ think that is a critical item and a question of enforcement is what I'm concerned about.
Ms. Green, do you have any other comments

```
```

relative to the architecture?
MS. GREEN: No, I do not, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Ms. O'Neill. I'm sorry. Questions of either
the witness or Ms. Green.
MS. O'NEILL: Sure. The witness.
On your roof mechanicals, has it changed -- A-6,
has this layout changed since the last time you
presented this?
I remember the last time we had this cut out in
the center to accommodate mechanicals. Has this
changed?
THE WITNESS: No.
MS. O'NEILL: On the elevations last time we were concerned that you could see the space that was cut out on the elevations and now you can't?
THE WITNESS: You can't.
MS. O'NEILL: So how has that changed that if this plan hasn't changed, how have the elevations changed to not be able to see it?
THE WITNESS: I think you may be getting one of the earlier --
MS. O'NEILL: No. I'm thinking of the earlier presentation to the Board where the roof plan was presented as it is now and on those elevations you

```
could see the space in between and now you can't. So I'm wondering if the elevations have changed, if that plan has changed.

I have no problem with the way it's designed. I'm just concerned -- I want to make sure it's represented correctly.

THE WITNESS: I, I believe we may be getting one of the presentations confused.

Earlier on this roof line in the back was lower and you could see it. One of the comments was we don't want to see that.

MS. O'NEILL: I said it.

THE WITNESS: I don't know who said it. MS. O'NEILL: That's why I bring it up. THE WITNESS: One of the comments was we don't want to see the mechanical equipment and we just raised this up and after we raised this up and this was coordinated with that there were no changes.

MS. O'NEILL: So this has changed?
THE WITNESS: Not since the last hearing. This is what was presented at the last hearing. The hearing before you could see it.

MS. O'NEILL: Okay. As long as you could not see it.

THE WITNESS: You cannot see it now. The
whole way around, the whole way around this perimeter the mechanical units will sit, well, like that. And, again, those mechanical units are for the common spaces only.

The individual dwelling units would be handled within each dwelling unit.

MS. O'NEILL: I have no further questions.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Lintner.
MR. LINTNER: I have no questions of the architect.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Zitelli, of either the architect or Ms. Green.

MR. ZITELLI: Question. Just the total number of units is 75.

Is that correct?
THE WITNESS: That is correct.
MR. ZITELLI: 26 you said were -- how many were for memory care?

THE WITNESS: There are 24 memory care and 51 assisted living. And 98 beds.

MR. ZITELLI: So the total number of
residents then would be potentially 98 ?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. ZITELLI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Culhane.
MR. CULHANE: No comments, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.

Mr. Fette.
MR. EETTE: Two comments while we're on the subject of \(A-6\) that you have up there, I think what you did was screen the mechanicals is, is a good design, especially taking into consideration the view from the back of the building. Okay.

From a building construction point of view,
that's going to accumulate a lot of snow. Okay. And I can see a situation similar to a large facade on the front of a shopping center where they, they have a pile up of snow because of drafting and drifting conditions that create an extra heavy snow load concentrated on the roof system. So certainly it's something, should the plan be approved, we would address it at the construction review level.

But my question is, what considerations have you done preliminarily to address the heavy, wet snow load?

THE WITNESS: Preliminarily, nothing more than you see right now.

MR. FETTE: Okay.

THE WITNESS: I can tell you, because of this concern about seeing mechanical equipment, we do this very, very, very often.

MR. FETTE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: And we have to size the
```

trusses accordingly.

```

I totally concur with what you're saying. We do have to size the trusses for the snow loads, the interior roof drains clog up and we need a way to get that water out there.

MR. FETTE: Okay. And my second question, this goes back to last November's meeting which I did not attend but I read the transcript and you were talking about the, the entryway in the front, the height of that being 11 feet 9 inches.

THE WITNESS: I think the civil engineer
testified to that.

Did I say that?
MR. FETTE: No, you're Bruce Englebaugh. Right?

THE WITNESS: That's me.
MR. FETTE: It's you. I got it right
```

here.

```

THE WITNESS: I believe you.
MR. FETTE: And you talked about 11 feet 9
```

inches and Andy Hipolit made a couple comments later
on about signage.
THE WITNESS: Adding a clearance sign.
MR. FETTE: Clearance signage to that.
And my question is, I think 9 feet 11 would
accommodate an ambulance but any larger fire truck,
okay, that needs to get under there I think there's
going to be a problem.
Now generally in a fire response they stay, they
stay the height of the building away in case a wall
collapses, it doesn't fall on a piece of fire
apparatus. But if it's not a working fire where they
have to stay away from the building and someone is in
a larger, a larger truck than an ambulance, do we have
a situation where someone comes in there in an
emergency situation and takes down the canopy.
And how much higher do we have to make that
canopy to avoid that situation.
And that's my question.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Just before the witness
answers, I just want to make sure the record is clear
the clearance is }11\mathrm{ feet 9. I think in the elongated
part of your sentence or your question you switched it
to 9 feet 11.

```
    MR. FETTE: 11 feet 9. I stand corrected.

MR. HIPOLIT: Jeffrey, to have full
clearance it's got to be 16 feet so all vehicles can clear 16 feet.

Anything below 16 on a roadway requires under height signs. So right at the lowest point you have to put a sign of what the actual height is.

MR. FETTE: Okay. All right. No further comments, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you. Mr.
Stefanelli.
MR. STEFANELLI: No questions.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Hipolit.
MR. HIPOLIT: I just want, and I don't know if the architect is the right person. I just want to jump in a little bit on this terrace.

So on Sheet A1 and Sheet A2 in the rear of the building we still have the ground floor terrace and the covered terrace on both sides, kind of that pinnacle corner where both pieces meet; and, on the second floor, we have what you call Terrace \(D\) and \(E\).

And, again, we're concerned about what's, what are you going to do there, what's it programmed for, why.
If you're marking it as a terrace you're going
to use it so what are we using it for and how is that noise and use effecting the number of people out there?

You designed this. What did you design it for?
THE WITNESS: Well, I'm not sure I'm the
best witness to answer that. Operations would probably be better.

But I could tell you on the ground floor the terrace, it's overflow areas for the dining.

Up top, on the second floor plan, we had a multipurpose room and, occasionally, the way I understand it, they would, they would have scheduled events out there on days that were nice enough to use the outside terrace.

MR. HIPOLIT: So am \(I\) correct in saying that the downstairs is an extension of your dining room in good weather.

THE WITNESS: That is correct. Yes.
MR. HIPOLIT: And I guess on Sheet A2 the upstairs front which we'll call Terraces A., B. and C. is for scheduled outdoor events in front of the building.

What is Terraces D. and E. for upstairs?
THE WITNESS: So these occur over top of spaces so it could either be roof. We decided to make
it a terrace that could be useable off of the units if so desired.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: The applicant would stipulate that Terraces \(D\). and \(E\). are not intended to be used. They're decorative.

MR. HIPOLIT: So, decorative.
THE WITNESS: We can put a roof and railing on it to make it effective.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Hipolit, do you have any other questions?

MR. HIPOLIT: Not for the architect.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Just let's go back to those terraces again.

So you're saying that you'll stipulate that those two terraces will not be occupied, used for any purpose.

What about the other terraces on the building? MR. DEL VECCHIO: The front Terraces A., B. and C. are meant to provide a controlled outdoor space where residents could sit and read, have a cup of coffee, cup of tea. That's really, the intended use is to provide a covered fresh air port which is still confined to the building area.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And that's limited to the terraces on the front of the building?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Correct.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Facing Philips Drive. MR. DEL VECCHIO: Correct.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: The -- I share the concern with regard to the height of that canopy. And you've indicated that an ambulance would fit in that 11 foot 9 but anything larger than that would not or should not be in that area.

Is that correct?
THE WITNESS: A fire truck would probably not go under it.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And what about the UPS driver or the FedEx truck or the Amazon?

THE WITNESS: I don't know those heights.
Maybe one of the team members would know.
I could provide that as follow-up information if you need it.

MR. HIPOLIT: I could see that's, that's like a really open-ended question because FedEx, UPS, just those two entities, they have tractor trailers all the way down to small vans so some of their trucks would fit, some of them would not fit.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, what do we, do we tell Mr. FedEx, only send your small trucks?

How do we do that?

MR. HIPOLIT: It has to be, if we -- as an engineer \(I\) do everything as \(I\) would do a roadway and for clearance we mark the under side of the obstruction at the lowest point with a sign that says 11 feet 9 inches. Every driver would know to look for that. That's a standard DOT marking on all under sides.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I think we had some discussion at the last meeting about delivery vehicles.

Is there a designated area?
I guess we'll hear the testimony from some engineer.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yeah. There is a designated -- it was moved to accommodate our neighbors but there is a designated delivery area on the side of the building but a full loading zone and delivery doors right into the building.

We don't envision anything more than a small UPS or box truck. But in the case that any kind of larger vehicle should visit the site to make a delivery, there is a full designated loading zone on that side of the building that can provide the access.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I think we're going to have to look at that canopy very carefully.

THE WITNESS: There's also the bypass drive there as well.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: We just came off of a holiday season and I don't know about where you live but where I live I think all day long there were trucks of all sizes, UPS, FedEx, but most of them were Amazon.

And I don't even know how you would control it without altering that canopy to the highest possible point you could because of the variety of trucks that are now making home deliveries.

Now we're putting 90 some odd, potentially 90 some odd residents not including the vehicles that are needed to deliver supplies and, and products to the facility.

Have we adequately planned for truck traffic on-site?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Our intention and I think our prior testimony was to take all the deliveries through the delivery doors and not have them come in the front whether it be FedEx, UPS or, you know, food product for the kitchen or paper plates or whatever it may be. It's to come in from that side door.

We really don't want the drop off area up front
to be occupied by a vehicle of any sort.
The entire layout of this front has parallel parking to provide a very convenient place for people to come in and out. That purpose gets frustrated when you have a box truck, even a small Amazon truck parked there for any point in time.

So our intent, and we have no problem accepting restriction, that requires those deliveries to use the designated loading area and we think that's the right place to take it and it really resolves the problems.

And, you know, I think, over time, maybe Day 1 someone may have some confusion, the delivery drivers, but Mr. and Mrs. Delivery Driver, by Day 2, know they could only go to that delivery door on the side to make those deliveries.

I've been here 30 years and \(I\) think I have the same UPS driver that delivers to my office. He looks like Schneider from one of the old TV commercials or TV shows but he's the same driver day in and day out so they figure it out pretty quickly.

MR. HIPOLIT: But if, let me jump in on this, using Wegmans as an example. We have that condition there. You can't deliver through the front of the store. Initially it was a big problem and it somewhat trailed off to where it's only happening once
in a while. But when it happens either Jeff Fette has to be called and get out there if he's here. We're not exactly -- we don't exactly have a full-time staff looking to wait for delivery trucks that are in the wrong spot or it just happens and they get away with it. So it's going to be, somewhat be controlled by the building owners. If the building owner is a good community neighbor there will never be a problem but if they're not, I don't know how we would control it.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I guess good or bad, Wegmans, who sits higher than this building and opposite Mr. Fette's office, Mr. Fette's operational terrace does overlook this site. He's got an eyeball right into this site day in and day out. They'll be on their best behavior.

MR. HIPOLIT: I don't know. It's a tough thing to do.

MR. REGAN: You're not going to get a hundred percent compliance.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: No, it won't.
But, but we have the opportunity, because this is not a rehabilitation of an existing building and we have to deal with a building and how it sits on a project, this is a brand new development. We have the opportunity to design, in a new development,
```

    appropriate means of accepting deliveries or shipping
    product or whatever it might be. I'm not quite sure
    if we're addressing it with that one little loading
    area in the back, not based upon the truck traffic on
    my little street alone, this past holiday season. It
    was incredible.
    MR. HIPOLIT: If they're getting a
    delivery --
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: No. No. No.
    MR. HIPOLIT: If three FedEx guys come at
    the same time --
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Where are you going to
    put these vehicles?
    MS. O'NEILL: Also that, I don't --
    correct me if I'm wrong, is there directional signage
proposed for the site that would include the delivery
entrance because Amazon does have a contract carrier,
it's not going to be the same UPS guys, not the same
FedEx guys, it's different, they have different times
of the day.
MR. DEI VECCHIO: As you imagine, we're
very sensitive to putting any additional sign on the
property but we'll put any and all directional signs
that the Board or its professionals deem appropriate.
If you want us to raise that front area --

```

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It's the adequacy of what's proposed there.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I understand and I'm offering, if the concern is that area and we want to have a secondary place where a delivery could happen, in the off chance, we can raise the roof of the porte cochere. It may make the front elevation look a little disproportionate but we can raise it and provide a secondary area, kind of a back up, if you will.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: All right. To be revisited.

Any other questions or comments?
MS. O'NEILI: No.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Hearing none, the Chair will entertain a motion to open to the public.

MS. O'NEILL: So move.
MR. CULHANE: Second.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Seconded Mr.Culhane.
All in favor?
(Aye)
Members of the public that are here, this is your opportunity to ask questions of either the Borough Planner, Darlene Green, or the architect who testified.

It's not your opportunity to offer your comments. Questions, yes. Comments, no.

We will accept your comments at the end of this
hearing and you might say I love it, I hate it or somewhere in between. But we can't do that until we reach that point.

Before we do go to the public, counsel is here. I'm going to ask that he identifies himself for the record and please state your intentions.

MR. WISS: Raymond Will, Wiss \& Bouregy, PC. I have actually no questions for the architect. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you, Mr. Wiss. Who are you representing?

MR. WISS: I am representing the Bears Nest Condominium Association.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you very much.

Any members of the public here that have an interest in asking him questions of either the architect or planner or our Borough Engineer?

None.

The Chair will entertain a motion to close to the public.

MS. O'NEILL: So move.

MR. STEFANELLI: Second.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: By Ms. O'Neill,
seconded Mr. Stefanelli.
All in favor?
(Aye)
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Mr. Del Vecchio,
your next witness.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes, I would like to recall Mike Dipple.

MR. REGAN: Mr. Dipple, you were
previously sworn and remain under oath.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:
Q Mike, you prepared the drawings that underlie the engineering drawings for this project as well as the sheet \(\operatorname{co-4}\) ?

A That's correct.
Q And can you explain to us why Sheet co-4 was advanced and the revision date?

A So we issued just sheet \(\operatorname{co-4}\) site plan dated January 3rd, 2019.

There were two changes to the drawing. The first one had to do with the height of the building.

I should point out and I was distracted a little bit during Mr. Englebaugh's testimony, there is no
discrepancy between the plans on the height. Mr. Englebauch gives the height from the finished floor to the proper elevation on the roof.

And because your ordinance requires the average grade we pick it up from there and then calculation of appears in Note 1 and gives all the average grade elevations and the, and the calculations as Mr.

Englebaugh's height to come up with a height per your ordinance of 45.29 feet. So it's not a discrepancy. It's just making sure the plans actually match each other.

The other item that we changed was a correction to the signage table. We had an incorrect permitted sign area which was throwing off the table. We have corrected it since. And we have -- so the signage table is amended.

I think they were the only changes.
We worked with, again, with Minno \& Wasko to make sure that everything that they were doing were incorporated into the plan correctly.

Q Mike, I did show you the Police and Fire Department comments that were redistributed and marked this evening.

Have you had a chance to look at them?
A I, I did. I believe that the police
comments with respect to the sidewalk may have been addressed in this plan revision because the letter is dated October \(15 t h\). The initial letter which discusses sidewalks and how they would like to see the sidewalks go through the site, this plan was reissued on November 9th, 2018 and on January 14 th Lieutenant McDowell issued another letter stating that \(I\) am unable to see my concerns from the last review were addressed. However, I believe they were.

And I think we stand by the sidewalk and pedestrian flow around the building. It comes in off of Philips, comes in the right side of the driveway which is, \(I\) believe, what the comment is, a crosswalk to the front of the building and then it encircles the building, closest to the building.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Excuse me one second.
Are you referencing Board Exhibit 5 dated October 15?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe I am. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Parking stalls.

The Police Department said building needs more parking stalls for vehicles.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. I'm looking at October 15 th from Lieutenant McDowell, Montvale Police Department -- oh, yes. He says the building needs
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more parking stalls.
I'm sorry. I skipped to the sidewalk portion.
Regarding parking, in the, in the prior revision we went from 38 spaces to 43 . We added five spaces with a new parking lot configuration.

Again, this complies with your ordinance of half a space per unit. It also complies with Residential Site Improvement Standards which agrees with your ordinance at half a space per unit.

So we believe there is adequate parking. We discussed how many employees would be here and we talked and there was testimony about the shift change and not only, not only do we think it complies with the ordinance but we think it's adequate for the site to function properly.

Q Mike, you have also had an opportunity just to conduct an informal survey of other assisted living facilities in the area just to double check how they operate with their parking and do you find this plan to be consistent with those other facilities?

A Yes. We did a, we did a study of just dwelling units which is easily accessible, one of them was here approved in Montvale so we have the resolution with the Unit Numbers. We looked at the amount of spaces. We not only looked at Google Earth
but went to a few of the sites where it was unclear and we counted the spaces and we think that this falls right in line. I think this is a parking ratio of . 57.

Now this is something we have electronically not on the board so we can bring up, we can bring up this table. But, yes, this falls kind of right in the middle of where these assisted living facilities range in terms of parking per dwelling unit. We saw some that were . 51, . 52. This is . 57 if I'm not incorrect. Some of them do include independent living which does throw off the calculation a little bit. We did study some that offer independent living if that's the correct terminology which just allows people to be there and, and likely have a vehicle. That parking ratio and some was a little bit higher, not much higher but, but we think, based upon the industry your ordinance and Residential Site Improvement Standards that adequate parking is provided.

Q And with regard to the Fire Department comments?

A The Fire Department commented again about the parking and they have an extensive discussion about how this would work. I think our testimony disagrees with some of the comments by the Fire

Department.
And, and then, of course with the loading there's, there was some concern in the Fire Department's letter about monitoring the loading and whether or not that would be available. I don't know if they plan to actually monitor it but deliveries would come, as we discussed, once a week in a box truck, 26 load box truck is a very common size. The back truck has no hinge. It's a single unit with essentially \(a\) box on the back of it, very common.

Mr. Hahn testified that, that the one typically used for this size facility would be 26 feet. That is a very common size.

So I think that there will be deliveries. There will be seasonal deliveries as has been discussed earlier but to provide this large 90 foot wide and 60 foot wide on its narrower side loading space at the doors would service the building, we believe, adequately in order to properly manage this facility with deliveries and loading.

MR. HIPOLIT: Andy, can I jump in on the parking? I did talk to Lieutenant McDowell on the parking issue.

They agree that the ratio you have somewhat works for what is in the area. And the issue that \(I\)
think the Police Department has, this is from them, unlike another site in town, this site is such a small size site which is significantly under the 10 acres required and there is nowhere for overflow parking if you were to have an event other than our public streets. So their concern is, one, Philips is an emergency access street for our police department. They come up and down or they can go another way but this is one way they come.

In the big event, where do you go?
You can't start parking in your fire lanes around the building. So what are you going to do, bus them in from another site?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: The parking standard both in the ordinance and RSIS calls for a standard. And, you know, it doesn't design to a peak, it doesn't design to a valley. Supposedly it's, the design goal is to hit that middle sweet spot.

And just like busy holidays seasons at the mall, you're going to have peak demand and parking would be harder to find in those instances and in the middle of winter when nothing happens, parking would be easier. MR. HIPOLIT: I think the question is what's your plan? So we know that in the every day operation of this facility it's not an issue. All
these facilities are like that. They all have limited parking. Nobody is ever there except for 10 percent of the year or less.

When you have an event you have to have some plan for it. You can't be, hey, we're going to just pack Montvale streets and just park on Grand Avenue, on Mercedes, it doesn't work.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Our intent on special events and we have thought about a comment, above and beyond what the ordinance and RSIS requires.

If we know we're having a planned event we're happy to put together a valet plan where we can valet some of the cars on site, increase the parking capacity on a temporary basis.

And if the valet isn't sufficient, then we can look to make, we can look to have an arrangement with one of the neighboring property owners where one, this facility is likely to experience a higher demand, a Sunday like Mother's Day.

All of the adjacent office uses are probably at the lowest of their demands and use so we would be happy to talk to our neighbors about coming up with a, I'll call it, an overflow parking plan in the instances that they're needed.

MR. HIPOLIT: Here's where my concern
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comes from. It comes from personal issues. So my mom and dad were in a facility. I'm up here in North Jersey. They're down in Cape May. Maybe I'm not a great son but \(I\) go down on all the big holidays; Mother's Day, Father's Day, Christmas, New Years, you do what we got to do and I travel down there and there's no parking there in those couple days. My sister's like, there's parking there all the time, don't worry about it. I get there and there's no parking.

The place my parents are in down in Cape May they literally had a plan, they had a site that is a half mile away, they directed you with signs there. You went and parked there. They had a van that brought you over, brought you back. The place was packed for one day. They had food on their terraces outside. The same -- I mean everyone here has been to these facilities. They have their limited days.

I think, from a Board perspective, specifically if the size is probably smaller, there needs to be something in this testimony on file here that gives the Board some, some, and the Police Department some comfort that it's not going to be okay, we're going to wait. It's going to be China shipping or the next building, somewhere were you have an agreement so you
can park 50 cars or so, shuttle them back and forth. I think it has to be part of what you're doing here. It's a concern that is valid.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: It is not an item that is required in the ordinance. Let's start with that. Let me just --

MR. HIPOLIT: I get that.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Let's start with that. However, we hear your point. So, I mean if, as a condition of Board approval, we need to come up with an emergency or an overflow parking plan that's acceptable to the Police Department for those events that we're likely to have it. One of the nice things is, we are proposing to have an on-site van, for lack of a better word, that is available to, you know -- on the days that it's busy folks are not likely going to be needing the van to go to a doctor's appointment. On Mother's Day most places are closed. That van can be dual purpose, to provide transportation if it isn't directly next door to walk to one of the adjacent sites and we're happy to enter into an agreement with, subject to the Police Department approval, that they find acceptable and this Board finds acceptable.

MR. HIPOLIT: Darlene, how does that work with approval before the Board if they do propose an
agreement with off site parking if it's off site parking.

Technically, it's not required but they're proposing it to make us more comfortable with what's happening on those five or six major holidays.

Shouldn't we see that here before?
MS. GREEN: Well, I think it ties back into some of the proofs that have to be put on to prove their application. I mean one of the conditions to an assisted living facility is a minimum site of 10 acres. If you go back and read the Master Plan re-exam that, that started this whole discussion on this assisted living is we picked a large minimum lot size to accommodate all of the items that are associated with an assisted living facility. And we wanted to ensure we had sufficient space for not only the building but all the accessory uses and all the activities that go along with an assisted living facility.

So I think it's something that the Board has to weigh with all the other evidence the applicant is presenting.

MR. HIPOLIT: And the one --
MR. DEL VECCHIO: And, Mr. Preiss will
comment. But let's just be clear, lot size and
parking overflow are not connected. Because if you wanted more parking you would build into your ordinance -- just because somebody has 10 acres doesn't mean they're going to build more parking above and beyond the minimum called for in the ordinance. That's just -- there's no linkage between acreage and size, at least in the ordinance or the Master Plan because the ordinance calls out a specific parking requirement.

One would assume, and maybe that's incorrect but one would assume the parking requirement as selected by the ordinance is one that would accommodate the problems that the use was envisioned to occur. Whether it be on an emergency basis --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Let me say something. As we all know, the sections of an ordinance controlling the development do not necessarily stand alone. They're intertwined, lot size, FAR, bulk requirements, parking, they all have to fit together.

I think what's being discussed right now is that this property is substantially undersized based upon the ordinance requirement of 10 acres.

The question was being deferred to Mr. Dipple earlier relative to \(F A R\) and \(I\) believe it was in reference to the terraces.

Mr. Dipple, do your calculations for FAR include the terraced areas?

THE WITNESS: They include the floor of the terrace, yes. They do. They -- yeah. On every floor it's, it's the, you know, walkable floor area if you want to just put it that way.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And you're seeking a variance from this Board relative to FAR because you are substantially exceeding the maximum permitted by our code.

Is that correct?
THE WITNESS: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. For the members of the public that are here who want to ask, I'm going to ask Mr. Hipolit.

Mr. Hipolit, could you please give the public, obviously the Board Members know, a definition of FAR and how it relates to proposed development.

MR. HIPOLIT: I have to get that. Can you let him -- I'll pull it up and read it.

MR. REGAN: I have it here.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Why don't we just read it from here, please.

MR. REGAN: Well, first you have to define
floor area.
For the purpose of this ordinance the aggregate area of all floors using the outer side wall, the dimensions of all buildings including the basement and cellar area. To the extent that the basement space with the building is used for mechanical equipment such as heating and ventilating apparatus or dead storage and is not devoted to the principal use of the building or to the extent that the on-ground level or basement or cellar levels of a parking garage were devoted to off-street parking such floor areas including aisles, ramps and maneuvering space shall be excluded.

Then the definition of floor area ratio follows with maximum floor area of all buildings on the lot expressed as a percentage of the total lot area.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. If in fact this development were designed to comply with FAR, would there be any issues relative to parking?

THE WITNESS: I -- if we kept -- I think, Mr. Chairman, what you're saying, if we kept the 43 spaces and if we shrunk the building down to .35 which is the FAR requirement would there be any parking issues.

Am I correct?
```

        Michael Dipple - Direct - Mr. Del Vecchio
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Correct.
    THE WITNESS: Well, it's predicated on do
    I think there are any parking issues my testimony is,
    I don't believe so.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No, I understand that.
    THE WITNESS: I don't believe so.
    So I just -- it would, it would clearly improve
    the parking situation because my ratio would come
    down. If we shrunk the building that significant
    which would be, off the top of my head, you know,
    maybe 25 percent, let's say, 25 to 30 percent we would
    have to shrink the building to get from . 52 to . 35 and
    someone could check my math, you would lose a lot of
    residential units. We couldn't shrink the unit itself
    or the amenity base or, they kind of all shrink
    together.
    So, yeah, I guess the answer is that leaving the
    4 3 \text { spaces it would improve the parking situation if}
    you really felt that there was, there was a problem.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And if you brought the
    FAR into code compliance would that have an impact on
    coverage?
    THE WITNESS: It would likely have an
    impact on coverage.
    Now in terms of coverage, our maximum lot
    ```
coverage is allowed to be 50 and we're at just shy of 52. So by shrinking the floor area one would assume that you would now comply with coverage. But, again, we're only over by 2 percent. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: But those are two variances that would be eliminated if in fact in a redesign or an amendment to the proposed design brought those two items into compliance. THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Would other bulk variance requests be eliminated if in fact you reduced your FAR to meet the Code requirement?

THE WITNESS: There is one other technicality which is the fact that we have 2.9979 acres and not 3 acres and we have 75 dwelling units. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No, I understand that. THE WITNESS: Well, that's the only one that I see. I believe we meet yard requirements, height requirements, parking.

There's a discussion on the sign yet to be had. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: But, obviously, you have no control over the size of your property. THE WITNESS: That's correct. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Nor do you have any control over the location of your property.

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It is where it is.
But you do have control over the design of what you're proposing to build on your property.

THE WITNESS: I agree with that.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Part of that design you determine that an FAR, relief from the FAR requirements are necessary and what was that dictated by? Was it dictated by the uncontrollable aspects, the size and location or was it dictated by the number of housing units?

What dictated the need to go from 35 to 53? THE WITNESS: It's not and it wasn't dictated by, by me, personally.

I will say that the building clearly, to go to .35 the building would be small, the number of units would be small, the project may not be economically feasible to add all the other amenities that go with it and, and to produce this number of units would probably make this project a non starter.

But, I was not part of the decision making as to whether --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So it's not a technical
point but more of a business point?
The economics of the project may not work if in
```

    fact you had to comply with code requirements.
        THE WITNESS: I think that is a big part
    of it.
    ```

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I think that is a big part of it. I think Mr. Preiss, our planner, is also prepared to testify to these items, a lot of which you are raising through your questions in the context of the planning proofs.

And, I just underscore, remind everybody of the obvious. This is an affordable housing project and those affordable housing units have to be subsidized in some way in order to produce that housing as is recognized.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Let's just bear in mind, it's the 10 pounds of sugar in the five pound bag. It could be, you know -- can you exceed the capacity of the five pound bag? Maybe a little bit. But can you exceed that capacity to the extent that we're talking about without negatively impacting the surrounding area and the intent and purpose of the zone plan and the ordinances?

And this has been triggered, in my mind, by the discussions that we had earlier relative to the adequacy of the parking so they all kind of weave together. And I believe we can't lose sight of that.

Okay. Let's move on from that point.
Mr. Del Vecchio, on direct any further questions of Mr. Dipple?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: A few, if I can.
CONTINUED DIRECT BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:
Q Mr. Dipple, there were some concerns about where the on-site van would park.

Is it the applicant's intention to park it in the back of the building and the seven spaces, if you will, towards the rear?

A Yes.
Q Which has a retaining wall in front of it to kind of obscure visibility of the property lines?

A Yes. The van would be in the back and you're correct, there is a retaining wall and parking spaces on the low side of the retaining wall and behind that retaining wall there is a natural grade change or a berm, a natural berm which runs to the back of the property.

Q The generator that is located on the site, that is an emergency use only generator?

A That's correct.
Q And any testing or maintenance of that generator would occur in the daytime hours only?

A Yes. Generators typically self-test
themself -- self-test about once a week usually in the middle of the day. And I can't tell you how much maintenance this thing would need but I'm sure there will be times in which someone will come out and do some regular maintenance on the generator to make sure it's operating.

Q Now, as far as you're aware, all of the improvements that are proposed, whether they be building or parking or lamp post or light post are all outside of the 15 foot buffer area as required on the site?

A That's correct.
Q And based upon your review of your drawings, there was a comment or a request or suggestion made that some additional bollards be placed around the transformer and dumpster area.

Are you prepared to incorporate those on behalf of the applicant?

A Yes, we are.
Q Are there any other changes that you envision refining the plans with in order to make them comply with the comment or review letters that we receive?

A Regarding the comments there are a few minor comments.

For instance, fences, just making sure we have the proper details, a fence at the top of the small retaining wall. I think our plans right now are showing a guide rail or it may not be indicated but there is a retaining wall at the end of the four spaces on the east side of the site so that needs to be clarified. Perhaps a fence needs to be installed per Mr. Hipolit's comments at the top of the retaining wall behind the seven spaces if there is a significant drop just to protect anyone who errantly may be coming through there, you know, in a dark situation.

Other than that, \(I\) don't know if there were any specific comments. There are some cleanup items that we would agree to do in order to protect the plants.

One other one was the spillway in front of the basin. We're going to work with Mr. Hipolit's office to try to move that so it doesn't directly discharge onto Philips Parkway. I am a little bit challenged by grade but perhaps we can move it in slightly and move it over toward the driveway and that inlet prior to just going off of Philips Parkway. But that is an emergency spillway. A lot has to fail for that to happen.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right. The spillway and also on some of the stuff, Andy, you were questioning
```

Mike on, there are, in your January 11th letter that
does require Mike or Mr. Dipple to make plan changes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: To make what? I'm
sorry.
MR. HIPOLIT: To make planning changes to
comply with the letter and at some point we'll get to
go to you it but we need to see a full set of plans
prior to --
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Let's hold off on that.
Mr. Del Vecchio, any more questions of Mr.
Dipple on direct?
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I have one more
question --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Please.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: -- one area of questions
to ask him about, maybe two. My question is related
to landscaping.
Q There was some concern about a tree
removal permit and compliance with Chapter 119 of the
Borough code as it relates to tree removal. It is the
applicant's position that Chapter 119(a) does not
apply to this application.
Is that correct?
A I believe so. Yes.
Q And that is because, in particular,

```
```

    119(a)-3(b) would exempt this project from compliance
    with that chapter?
    A Yes. I believe that's correct. Yes.
    Q And there were some changes to the
    landscape plan that are required.
    And you have a colored drawing?
    A Yes. I'll put this up on the board.
    Hopefully we can see it through the camera. I hope
    that's clear.
    Q Mike, was this previously marked?
    A No, this needs to be marked. This is a
    new exhibit. It's a, it's a rear yard landscaping
    exhibit. It's, it's numbered Co-4. It, we'll make it
    today's date.
    A What's the exhibit number, Andy.
    Q A-20?
    A A-20, and today's date is January 15th,
    2019.
    So Mr. Livingston, who is the applicant, has
    coordinated with some of the people who live in the
back and in the Bears Nest complex and has had some
correspondence and discussions with them. And in that
what came out of it is perhaps to provide a, a varying
and more beefy landscape buffer toward the rear of the
property.

```

So what our office did today was to increase the number of evergreen trees primarily at the southeast corner of the property.

And the purpose that would serve for the development is that, as vehicles travel southbound around the east side of the building, which I'm tracing with my pen, any headlight glare then has a much beefier landscape buffer to get through in order to potentially reach the Bears Nest facility or, or development in the back.

I should say that this dark green area is existing vegetation which would remain but it is the wintertime and most of it is deciduous so having these evergreens, you know, kind of beefing up the corner there, we think that that should solve the problem. And we extended that a little bit further as you continue to the west so that as a vehicle travels around the corner the headlight glare, again, doesn't impact properties to the rear and then what we did is we kind of changed the pattern of the landscaping through some of the suggestions that we heard from the Bears Nest population there and we've included some other species which we would like to coordinate with Maser's landscape architect because he hasn't seen this, Mr. DeBlasio hasn't seen this yet. But we think
there would be some Norway spruce and other, other trees that would do well with a little bit of a canopy over the top of them and then we still have some of the Green Giant arborvitaes spread throughout which is very dense and columnar.

We are able to save some of the white pines and we show some of the white pines that are existing. I think they're only in the north -- I'm sorry, the southwest corner of the site.

So that was another change that didn't, that came up after the plans were submitted on the 3 rd and that that exhibit was actually finalized today.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I have no further questions of Mr. Dipple. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.

Before I open it up to the Board for questions, I'm going to go to Mr. Hipolit.

Mr. Hipolit, I would like for you to summarize your review letter of January 11 which has been marked into evidence as Board Exhibit 1. And highlight any concerns that you have that have not been addressed by the applicant's engineer up to this point.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. So looking at what is Exhibit \(\mathrm{B}-1\) or my letter dated January 11 th, starting at Page 4. So at Page 4 the first comment would be

Comment 3. This would be the, having vehicles on-site and you're testifying that they're going to have one vehicle and they're going to park it in the rear. So I think, from a Board perspective, you have to have some condition that makes it clearly as one vehicle in that location and can't be multiple vehicles.

Comment No. 4.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Dipple, did you agree?

THE WITNESS: I agree. I think the applicant is only proposing one. I'm sorry. If I understood it correctly there would be a condition that only allows one vehicle.

Is that correct, Mr. Hipolit?
MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.
Comment 4, I'm not sure if it's the right comment for you. We have heard testimony about a different number of employees.

What is the total number of employees?
THE WITNESS: The largest -- I can answer it. The largest shift would be 21 . It would be the midday shift.

I think it's important to note that the overnight shift is not 21. It's, it's a lot fewer than 21 during the overnight shift. But the maximum
shift would be 21. And that has all the dining people and the administrative people, the people that come in in the morning and leave in the afternoon, the office personnel.

MR. HIPOLIT: Comment 5 , we kind of discussed what would be the holiday parking. The way it's going to be held, that's something we need more detail on.

THE WITNESS: Well, the holiday parking, as Mr. Del Vecchio mentioned, not only the valet in case there's a large event but, again, some of the off site parking. I don't know if we have a site selected yet but that's something that we think could be a condition of the approval, to come with some kind of agreement as to where staff could park in order to provide very convenient parking for any visitor who came during one of those events.

MR. HIPOLIT: Comment 6 really hones in on what they talked about which is the generator/transformer and the bollards for the garbage area. They have agreed to bollards.

The issue we still have is with testing of the generator and whether the generator will require some type of sound attenuation. Generators can come with enclosures. They have Type 1, 2 and some have a Type
3.

Now there is residential homes behind us in another municipality. We would recommend either whatever type of generator you pick, Type 2 if that's their highest sound enclosure or Type 3 .

I don't know if you agree with that.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I believe we can agree to comply with the noise code and that if that requires a Type 3 generator, Type 3 enclosure, Type 2 --

MR. HIPOLIT: The problem with generator, the problem with generators, we do allow them for municipalities. The State noise code is based on duration. So if somebody was to come in and just test this under full load for a very short duration it probably would meet the weighted standards of the State code.

What we do in our municipalities, because we like to hold to higher standards, we either use, depending on the manufacturer, a Type 2 which is their highest sound enclosure or Type 3 which would allow us to have a conversation at the level I'm talking now while the generator is running. MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes, we can consent. MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. No. 9 discussed,
we're going to require you to mark, if you change the height, to mark it on the underside in accordance to the state standards for marking the underpass.

THE WITNESS: I would agree.
MR. HIPOLIT: So Comment 12 I could defer to Mr. Fette or Mr. Regan. You do have a new tree ordinance. Mr. Del Vecchio said it doesn't apply to this site.

MR. REGAN: Because it's affordable. I want to confirm that. I want to have that as part of my land use ordinance.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I have the section.
MR. REGAN: I'll, I'll review it during the break, on-line.

MR. HIPOLIT: Item 13 , build into what Mr . Dipple provided in the extra landscaping plan. We're going to need some lighting standards or lighting photometrics that show the mature site versus the non mature site so we can make sure we're not getting anything off-site and then you'll have hot spots. On some sites it is a problem. With some of the existing sites that are built, they're landscaped to start and they're under lit because the landscaping takes over the lights.

So we need to see some coordination between your
foot candles and your photometrics and landscaping to make sure one doesn't shade out the other one, doesn't shade and causes hot spots on the site.

THE WITNESS: If I could just add a little testimony to that per one of the earlier comments by Maser, the landscaping was pushed back 10 feet away from the ring road and the light falls within that 10 feet.

MR. HIPOLIT: I think if you agree to work with Mr. DeBlasio we're okay.

THE WITNESS: I'm fine working with anyone on any of these comments, Mr. Hipolit.

Just because you mentioned the final plans I would say that we can, we can clearly comply with that.

MR. HIPOLIT: I agree.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIT: That kind of addresses 14.
The same for 15 , just looking at that in your final plan.

We've kind of talked about 17 which is the dining room space you have testified, the architect testified to that.

Building height calculations, we are now at a building height of 45.29 .

THE WITNESS: 45.29 is correct based upon your ordinance and how it's calculated.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. Then we agree with that.

I'm now on Page 9. Not that it's important to what you're talking about but we still need to go over deed restrictions.

THE WITNESS: Understood.
MR. HIPOLIT: Public improvements, No. 25, we have to identify what they are and they eventually have to be bonded, the improvements.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
MR. HIPOLIT: No. 27, 28 are really somewhat of a combined comment. Where we have this sewer line to the rear of the property we're going to want some confirmation of size, direction, flow and potentially have it videoed as part of it because you're probably going to connect to it, I believe.

THE WITNESS: We are connecting to it. It has very little flow in it. It runs from west to east and it is 36 inches and it is made out of reinforced concrete.

MR. HIPOLIT: Would you agree to video it, post.

THE WITNESS: I, I can tell you that we
have photographs, we have it. It is clear. There's nothing in it at all. I don't, you know, the condition of it, it really has had almost no flow in it for a long time.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right. So I would say if you were to make your connection to it, rely on the video, make sure it's good, the video is done, we're good.

THE WITNESS: I think that's a fair deal.
MR. HIPOLIT: Item 38 talks about response type issues, issues still exists as far as elevations and drop offs.

Item 39, I guess you're now doing fire striping so we're okay but you have your bus --

Are we going to just, on the, on the seven spaces in the back, are you going to just park in the spaces available or mark one for it?

THE WITNESS: For the van? We can do it either way. We're assuming it would be the southern most space. It's kind of tucked into the retaining wall the most. So we assumed that it would be the southern most space of the seven.

MR. HIPOLIT: For the Board, I think if you park back there, park on-site, it's the right place. I tend -- because I think parking, on bigger
holidays, is going to be a little tighter. It's not marked for a van because they could use it if the van wasn't there. But, there needs to be a deed restriction to make sure the van is parked there.

But, you guys decide what you want.
Can you give us a little testimony on my comment Number 45 on your pervious asphalt that you're using. THE WITNESS: So we have a coverage table and I'm just going to refer to sheet co-4 because it's handy, the one that we submitted. And we show existing and proposed conditions.

On the proposed conditions we have -- we just show it as asphalt area. It's included in the impervious coverage.

Is that where you're going?
MR. HIPOLIT: Yes. Okay.
THE WITNESS: It's included in the impervious calculation however, we did add pervious pavement and that equates to the amount that we're over the coverage. That's something we did in a prior application and, and we used pervious.

MR. HIPOLIT: Hold on. Hold on. The gravel walkway now, if you go to co-4, that gravel walkway, is that included?

THE WITNESS: No, it's included in the
pervious.
MR. HIPOLIT: And how do you get a wheelchair across that?

THE WITNESS: It's compacted, it's a Q.P., quarter processed stone. It's a soft surface. It really wasn't meant to avoid any impervious coverage or anything like that. We are exceeding it. It was just meant to be a soft, softer surface, a lot of walking paths are made of that in municipal parks.

MR. HIPOLIT: Why couldn't you use pervious pavement with a ruberized surface.

THE WITNESS: We could use that. I think that would count for the impervious and I would have to change my numbers right now. We did the number real quick just in case it was -- I mean, it's gotten a lot more attention than I taught it would, to be honest with you. I apologize. Where we would be at 52.75 impervious it would change that to an impervious surface which I think would be any kind of pervious paver or anything like that would still be impervious.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay.
THE WITNESS: So if we change that to a hard surface it would be 52.75 not 51.99 .

MR. HIPOLIT: On Comment 49 did you include your pavers under the pergolas as part of your
```

impervious calcs?
THE WITNESS: Yes. Whether it has a roof above it or not is impervious.
MR. HIPOLIT: Comment No. 50 , we want on-site stockpile moved away from the residential properties at Bears Nest.
THE WITNESS: Yes. We can comply with that but, yes.
MR. HIPOLIT: 51, we believe you should have fencing on the top of these walls.
I know it's a building code requirement. I would say, if you agree to work with Mr. Fette and our office, we could probably eliminate that.
THE WITNESS: I agree.
MR. HIPOLIT: Snow storage. I, I haven't heard any testimony on snow storage.
What do you propose?
THE WITNESS: We did provide a snow storage plan on $C-10$ so we presented this type of plan in front of this Board in the past. It's, it's a way to kind of quantify the best that we could come up with for a 6 inch snow even. We could pile two feet of snow which would be barely up to the top of this -to the bottom of this table and we would have adequate area if we had a 6 inch snow event to clear all

```
streets and parking and sidewalks and that's how the calculation was done.

And, again, we pushed the landscaping back 10 feet behind the curb to provide area for snow storage. MR. HIPOLIT: I'm okay, I'm okay with the plan. I mean the Board could ask you questions on it honestly but \(I\) think that there should be some restriction that, in those areas, if we have a snow storm big enough, you have to be able to handle it, then you are required to truck it off site because you can't hinder parking.

THE WITNESS: I would agree with that. We want the site to function also if, if we had a major event, other means and methods would have to take place in order to get it out of there.

MS. GREEN: Actually, can I jump in
because --
MR. HIPOLIT: Go.
MS. GREEN: There are three areas where you're not 10 feet off. There is not 10 feet of clear space. One of them is right behind your gravel trail.

On your landscape plan you propose a lot of shrubs there and I'm afraid if you push snow there you're going to plow your shrubs right out.

THE WITNESS: Okay. We still have a lot
```

of opportunities but I can clean that up. I think
you're right, if we modify the landscape plan and
probably in our haste we didn't modify this.
MS. GREEN: Yes. That the area by the
gravel trail and then out in front on either side of
those handicapped spaces, those ends, you got
landscaping as well.
THE WITNESS: Yes. Okay.
MS. GREEN: I think you might have to do a
little amending.
THE WITNESS: We could amend this plan.
We could say 2 1/2 feet of snow storage, 30 inches.
But, again, I think, I think the idea behind the plan
is that it has been thought of and we have provided
areas where we think that snow storage can take place
on the site. And we modify the plan per your
comments.
MR. HIPOLIT: Right. I'm okay with the
plan so long as you agree, over the top of that
storage area you can't stack any more, you agree to
take it off site. And if you agree, I'm okay with it.
THE WITNESS: We agree.
MR. HIPOLIT: If we jump down to Page 15,
Item 63, we have a concern on the exhaust for the
kitchen areas. Right now I think you're exhausting

```
through the side of the building unless that's been changed in your plans.

THE WITNESS: I'm going to have to defer to Mr. Englebauch.

MR. HIPOLIT: Before you defer, just some more experience with the urban area kitchen exhaust near residential areas can provide smells that sometimes are friendly, sometimes are not friendly. And they do make devices now, one of the devices, not that you have to use it, is called the Smog-Hog, I would like something similar to that go on the end of these exhaust fans that do require maintenance that really scrub that air so you don't smell it at all.

We think, because of the close proximity to the residential properties in the area that you should provide one of those on any exhaust fan.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I ask Mr. Englebaugh, where is the exhaust proposed.

MR. ENGLEBAUGH: We haven't gotten with a kitchen designer but we can tell you it would be somewhere on the kitchen wall here, the offset stairs that go down to the basement.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: And we would agree to Mr. Hipolit's suggestion.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. Employee parking,

Comment 65, what's the proposal for where employees would park at night? Because that would be really the only traffic on-site.

THE WITNESS: So our nighttime employees would park in the seven spaces to the rear of the site which are behind the retaining wall or they could, they could park in the front of the building next to the porte cochere but we believe they will be directed toward the back seven spaces. We think that's the best place.

MR. HIPOLIT: From our perspective, we want to, again limit the impact to the residential properties. There's no activity on Philips Parkway during the night. It's limited at best. So the more we can keep employee parking out of the rear at night I think it's better for the residential properties.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: If you would prefer them to happen in that front bank of 10 , we're amenable to making that a policy.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. I mean, what I guess we could do probably is, you could say that after 11:00 or 10:30, or pick a time, all employee parking because there's nobody visiting the site after a certain time, that all employee parking should be at the front except for that van.

I'm not going to bore the Board with Comment 66 . We can work those details out together.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
MR. HIPOLIT: Item 67, I'll just say Item 67, I am concerned and we have never permitted an emergency overflow across a public sidewalk. I know it only happens in the case of emergency but in New Jersey we have had a number of emergencies in the last 25 years and it could happen. So we prefer that emergency overflow going in a direction that's not across a public sidewalk or to our public road to prevent, hopefully not interfering with emergency traffic and things of that nature.

THE WITNESS: Understood. I don't have a solution yet. I'll work with you on it.

MR. HIPOLIT: That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you. Before I open it up to Board Members for questions of Mr . Dipple or Mr. Hipolit we're going to take about a five minute break and then following Board questions we will open it to the public.

MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, one condition came about to the applicant, the tree removal ordinance.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. REGAN: Section \(119(\mathrm{a})-3\), that exempts any property which is in a zone which requires affordable housing, the ordinance does not apply.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Thank you. (A recess is taken at 9:35 p.m. to 9:48 p.m.)

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I was going to open the meeting to the Board for questions of either Mr. Dipple or Mr. Hipolit or Ms. Green.

And I guess I'm starting with Mr. Lintner.
MR. LINTNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Dipple, just a couple questions, I don't need an answer right now because I'm going to ask you to do some numbers for me so perhaps in your next testimony.

I just want to review the floor area ratio calculation. It looks like you have a gross floor area of about 68,000 square feet on \(\mathrm{CO}-4\).

THE WITNESS: I would agree to that. Yes.
MR. LINTNER: Okay. And a, the property
is 3 acres so it's approximately 130,000 square feet?
THE WITNESS: It is. It's listed in the
top, yes.
MR. LINTNER: My question is, and I'm
certainly not suggesting that the 35 percent is the goal here but for presentation to the Board, could you determine how the 35 percent can be accomplished with either eliminating a floor or what happens to the size of the building?

Again, I don't need an answer now.
THE WITNESS: I don't know if I'm the best expert to testify to that. Mr. Englebaugh designed the building. Perhaps.

MR. IINTNER: Just the square footage. Right now your ground floor is about 27,000 square feet.

THE WITNESS: So it would have to be -again, I was trying to do the percentages on the fly during my testimony but --

MR. LINTNER: It's about \(2 / 3 \mathrm{~s}\), I believe.
THE WITNESS: \(2 / 3 \mathrm{~s}\) so maybe 33 percent of the building would have to come down. The easiest way would be to knock off a floor. But I think what happens is the amenity space and the room count, the amenity space all get smaller, the office space gets smaller altogether so knocking off the floor would knock off all the residential units and not the amenity space or the amenity space would be adjusted. So, again, I don't know if I'm the best but I
```

think it's a little more complicated than that.
MR. LINTNER: Okay. But the elimination,
the elimination of a floor would keep the building the
same physical dimensions but it would accomplish the
floor area, essentially accomplish the floor area
ratio.
THE WITNESS: I, I would say it would be
pretty close.
MR. LINTNER: Thank you.
Nothing in addition.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Zitelli.
MR. ZITELLI: Can I talk about landscaping
or we're not going to do that one?
I'm just looking at some of the comments that
are in here. It doesn't sound like we addressed some
of them.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah. You're
referencing which Board exhibit?
MR. ZITELLI: It is No. 2.
I guess -- do we want to talk about that or
should I wait on that one?
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No. You could talk. MR. ZITELLI: So on No. 2, this is the one from, I think from Darlene Green, right, January lith. I just, right away --
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CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Wait. I'm sorry.
We'll cover that under Darlene's report.
I thought you were talking about Gus DeBlasio's.
MR. ZITELLI: All right. Mr. Hipolit, he
had went through so many things I don't really have anything to add to what he did so, at this point, no. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Very good. Mr. Culhane.

MR. CULHANE: The same as various members have suggested. I would like to see those numbers to see what the options are available to the Board to consider.

No other comments at this time.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Fette.
MR. FETTE: No comments, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Stefanelli.
MR. STEFANELII: No comments.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
And Ms. O'Neill.
MS. O'NEILL: I have no comments.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
With that said, the Chair will entertain a motion to open the meeting to the public.

\section*{MR. CULHANE: So move.}

MS. O'NEILL: Second.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr.Culhane, second Ms.

O'Neill.
All in favor?
(Aye)
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Counsel.
MR. WISS: Thank you.
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WISS:
Q You indicated that you had conducted a study on parking count.

The Board -- what went into that study?
A So we looked for some assisted living facilities in the area, in the general area that the Board may be familiar with, one of which was the Bristal Assisted Living in Woodcliff Lake and another one was called the TSL Pike redevelopment or predevelopment, I'm not sure if that's correct, that was in Montvale, and then there's one in Emerson, there's one in Paramus and one in Midland Park and the data for the number of rooms is readily available through the websites. We have resolutions on a couple of them for approval.

The unit count and the parking was looked at through Google Earth photography and some of the sites
were visited to clarify some of the questionable areas.

Q Okay. When you conducted that study did you just compare parking or did you compare other aspects?

A It was flat dwelling units to parking and the table which -- I don't know if it was marked.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: You need to mark it at this point, I believe.

MR. REGAN: A-21.
THE WITNESS: I don't have a hard copy of it.

MR. HIPOLIT: You need to submit that so we have it.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: We'll submit a paper copy by email.

Q Am I correct that there was no study on lot size?

A No. That's correct.
Q And let's just refer to your plan co-4.
At the top right corner there's an indication of some of the bulk requirements that are there and some of the variances that are required.

So am I correct there was no study on lot size?
A That's correct.
```

    Q Was there a study conducted on minimum lot
    coverage?
    A No, only dwelling units and parking.
    Q Was there a study on FAR?
    A Only dwelling units.
    Q Was there a study on, I'll stipulate, only
    dwellings and apartments?
    A Yeah.
    Q You had mentioned that you had looked at
    Google Earth.
What day of the week was that?
A What day of the week?
Q What day of the week?
A I don't know. We, we did do the study in
one day. We looked at different units when we looked
at Google Earth.
Q How many days did you look at Google
Earth?
A I don't know.
Google Earth photographs are from a specific
time period. It could have been from two years ago.
Q Is there any indication on the Google
Earth as to what day of the week that would have been?
A It gives you a month and a year in which
the photograph was taken. It's not a streaming image.

```
```

It's a still image.

```
```

    Q Would you agree with me that there would
    be more visitors to the facility on a weekend than a
weekday?

```
    A I don't know.
    Q Okay. Well, you had reviewed testimony in
    this matter \(I\) believe and let me just get the
    appropriate person -- were you here -- did you review
Miss Johnson's testimony?
    A I was here.
    Q Okay. And Miss Johnson had testified
    during the November 20 th hearing about different
    people that would be visiting a facility, an assisted
    living facility.
    Correct?
    A I believe she did.
    Q She mentioned that there would be
    overlapping shifts.
    Correct?
    A That's correct.
    Q She mentioned that there were residents
that would visit?
    A There would be visitors visiting
    residents, yes.
    Q Thank you for that correction.

There would be doctors that would be visiting?
A From time-to-time.

Q There would be spouses that would be visiting?

A Spouses would include visitors. That would, I assume, be a visitor.

Q Now on your plan, I'm correct there are 43 proposed parking spaces.

Is that correct?
A That's correct.
Q And the midday shift, I believe your testimony was, 21 staff members were present at the facility.

Correct?

A 21 and it's listed on the plan, that's the maximum shift.

Q Okay. Does that 21 account for doctors that would be visiting?

A I don't believe it does.
Q Does it count for spouses and other family members that would be visiting?

A They're not on shift so I would say no.
Q Does it account for the fact that there would be overlapping shifts within that \(21 ?\)

A There was some testimony. I did not give
```

the testimony. The maximum shift is 21 at a time and
there was testimony by someone else as to how the
overlapping shifts would work.
Q You had reviewed -- I believe this is
marked, it's the Montvale Planning Board from the Fire
Department.
Is that accurate?
A I think that's B-7. What's the date?
MR. REGAN: It is --
MR. WISS: It is B-7.
MR. REGAN: July 3rd.
MR. WISS: 7/3/2018.
Q In the middle of the page that, it
indicates that a shift change, a staff of 19, would
require close to all available non handicapped spaces.
Do you agree with that?
A No, I don't.
Q Why don't you agree with that?
A Because the testimony was that the shift
change would take place over a period of time so some
shift members would leave maybe 20 minutes before the
hour, half an hour before the shift change was
scheduled, some would leave a little bit later and
then past the actual shift change time some additional
ones would leave.

```

I believe the testimony was that they couldn't leave patients, just 21 people get up and 21 people come in because there's, there's constant care.

Q Okay. And you had mentioned some. Can you quantify that number for the Board?

A I don't remember the specific number. I don't believe it worked out exactly.

Q And so I'm correct that you would then be relying on Ms. Johnson's testimony?

A Primarily, yes.
Q Turning back to co-4, am I correct that the, in the back of the facility the width between the loading bay and the parking line is depicted as 20 feet?

A The loading bay?
Q I'm sorry. I'll point out on the side of the building where the loading bay is on the right-hand side?

A Yeah. That's, that's the drive aisle width, 20 feet. Yes.

Q Did you account in any way for the fact that a truck, a loading truck might back up to unload heavy objects into the loading dock?

A It's possible. Sure. That they may go in, come past it and then go backwards.

Q
Did you account for the fact that that would block access to emergency vehicles and other folks within that lane?

A I, I didn't account for that. I think that would be extremely unlikely.

Q Okay. But it wasn't accounted for?
A \(\quad\) No.
Q
There was some testimony about floor area ratio and some questions that were asked of you. I'm just going to defer to some of those calculations when you come back in a minute.

With respect to FAR, have you read the report of the Borough's planner?

A I have, yes.
Q Okay. Am I correct that there are five D Variances -- I'm sorry. Let me make sure I got this right.

There are seven D Variances and five bulk variances that are required?

A I didn't, I didn't count them. I think we have a question --

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I'm just going to object for a second.

First of all, this witness didn't talk about variances. It's outside the scope of his expertise
and it assumes that we agree with the variance list that is listed in Ms. Green's report which we don't entirely do.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
What we will do is, when \(I\) close the meeting to the public and we hear testimony of the applicant's planner, we then will hear from the Borough planner and we can address that question at that time.

MR. WISS: Thank you.
And, just for the record, \(I\) was only referring to that as indicated on the plan co-4. There are a list of bulk requirements indicating permitting and existing.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: That's fine. Thank you.

MR. WISS: Thank you, sir.
Q In the back of the building where the 20 foot wide sanitary sewer easement is on \(C O-4\), would a berm be permitted back there?

A It - I don't think it's, I don't think that the Borough would want a berm back there.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah, would not.
A I don't know if it would be permitted.
MR. HIPOLIT: It would not.
Q Was your testimony earlier that the overnight staff would be parking in the front of the building as opposed to the rear of the building?

A I think we landed on that the overnight staff, it might be better to park in the front of the building. We had discussed that it's a possibility to leave the seven spaces in the rear but \(I\) think, in discussion with the Board, the front is the better option.

Q Am I correct that the road that provides access to the facility is not a county road?

A That is correct.
Q Turning back to the comments of the Fire Department in the \(7 / 3 / 18\) letter.

A Okay.
Q Did you account for the fact the all, in CO-4, that the road is not a county road?

A Did I -- I'm sorry. With respect to this letter, I mean it's not a county road.

I don't know if \(I\) understand your question.
Q Okay. Let me get more specific. The CO-4, am \(I\) correct, is a horse shoe that depicts a one-way mode of traffic around the side of the building?

A It's a one-way ring road if you want to call it that. It goes counterclockwise, clockwise
rather.
Q Along the side of that ring road is depicted no parking fire lanes.

Is that correct?
A That's correct. Yes.
Q I believe there was a snow plan that you had marked or is marked into evidence and showing the Board.

Am I correct that the snow plan, the snow would be stacked above the no parking fire lane around the perimeter of the building?

A No. No, it's not.
Q And why is that?
A It's on the lawn. The snow, all the snow storages were shown on the lawn, I believe.

But these are recommended snow storage areas.
Where they put the snow is probably, you know, for the lack of better term, game day decision, wherever they can put it. But we're showing that there is ample snow removal area so that we wouldn't have to lose any parking spaces.

Q Right. And it wasn't my intention of the question to say that it was going to be in the fire lane but the snow removal plan is depicted, if you will, just above the no parking fire lane?

1

A That's behind the curb.
Q Behind the curb?

A Yes.

Q
As we go around the no parking fire lane I'm correct that there's a 20 foot wide gap between the edge of the no parking lane inclusive of the no parking lane to the front of the loading dock.

Correct?
A There is a 20 foot wide drive aisle, as I testified before, and that runs from the curb to the front or the outer part of the loading dock, yeah. That's 20 feet.

Q Within the loading zone, how many vehicles were anticipated to be, to be parked within the loading zone at one time?

A Really just one but it depends on the size of the vehicle. It's 60 feet long. The truck that they expect to bring food deliveries here as a, is a 26 foot box truck. That's the size of the box. So the truck we estimate is anywhere between 10 and 12 feet longer so that's, you know, 38 feet in total length. It's 60 feet on its shortest dimension, I believe.

So if a small truck came in behind it, the guy wasn't loading off the back of the truck, he could
```

pull in there temporarily, if it was a small FedEx
van, and get out so one to two tops.
Q And there was some testimony earlier that,
in addition to that type of loading, there would be
deliveries that were -- I believe your testimony was
you were going to try to keep them exclusively in the
back.
Correct?
A That's correct. And we can provide
signage, directional signage to make sure all
deliveries continue around that ring road to the back,
the loading area.
Q How many handicapped parking spaces are
there within the 43 spaces?
A Four.
Q And how many spaces would be occupied by a
facility owned van?
A One.
Q Within the valet service that you
indicated might apply to this, would there be staff
that would have to staff the valet service in order to
remove those cars inside and outside the facility?
A During that day it's possible, yes.
Q Am I correct that plan has not been
submitted yet as to where those cars would go?

```
```

            Michael Dipple - Cross - Mr. Wiss
    questions I have, sir. Thank you.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
    Anyone from the public have any questions of
    either Mr. Dipple or Mr. Hipolit or Ms. Green? No.
    The Chair will entertain a motion close the
    meeting.
    MR. STEFANELLI: So move.
    MS. O'NEILL: Second.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Stefanelli,
    seconded by Ms. O'Neill.
All in favor?
(Aye)
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Del Vecchio.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: Yes. I would like to
call Mr. Preiss.
MR. REGAN: Do you swear or affirm that
the testimony you will give in this proceeding shall
be the truth, so help you God.
THE WITNESS: I do.
MR. REGAN: For the record, state your
full name.
THE WITNESS: Richard M. Preiss, P R E I S
S.

```

MR. REGAN: As the Board is aware, Mr. Preiss has been here before. I recommend he be qualified as a professional planner without any further testimony.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The Chair will accept the recommendation of Counsel.

Please continue.
THE WITNESS: Thank you very much.
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. DEL VECCHIO:
Q Mr. Preiss, you have either reviewed the testimony or been present for all the testimony that preceded you in this application?

A I have.

Q You made yourself familiar with the property which is the subject matter to this application?

A Yes.
Q The neighborhood in which the property sits?

A Yes.
Q You have had an opportunity to re-review the Borough of Montvale ordinance, the Master Plan and land use documents as they might apply to this case?

A I have.

Q You have undertaken the necessary
```

background research to perform a planning analysis for
the site?

```

A I have.
Q Were there any retention constraints placed on the retention of your services on the required outcome after your review?

A No.
Q Could you tell the Board what you did, how you did it and the conclusions you reached?

A Yes. I think, as I've indicated in the prior questioning, \(I\) have looked at the site, the architectural plans, the application, visited the site, the neighborhood, reviewed the Master Plan, the zoning ordinance.

I also have been substantially involved in the design and worked with the engineer or architect and other professionals with regard to the development of the plan and I have attended prior hearings and seen the Board's prior review letters.

Also, specifically for this evening's testimony, I reviewed the letters of Ms. Green dated \(1 / 11 / 19\) which is B-2 and Andrew Hipolit's review letter of 1/14/19 designated as Exhibit B-1.

I think, I don't need to go through a description of the site, the surrounding uses and the
proposed development. I think, based on the prior testimony, the Board is very aware of that.

I will, however, note that the land uses in the established environment which, in which the application sits is decidedly one of an office development. We have aspects of such development north, east and west along Philips Parkway, the Kidde Fire Training, prior shipping and prior holdings of the corporation. This municipal complex is just a short distance away as is the wegmans development to the west of the site.

The one residential development that potentially would be impacted is the Bears Nest town home development which is located behind it to the south of the site in Park Ridge.

So that really is the context for this application.

And I'd like to start by reviewing the zoning compliance based on your planner's latest review letter, that's Darlene Green's review letter of January the llth just to set the extent of compliance and the nature of the variances.

First, with regard to the D Variances, I see that we have five D Conditional Use Variances and one floor area ratio variance.

Insofar as the \(D\) Variances are concerned, two of the D Variance, three D Variances, the one which is the requirement to be on a county road, Philips Parkway is not and to have the minimum lot size of 10 acres, we're at 3 acres.

As the Chairman pointed out, these are conditions that cannot be complied with. You can't change the location and increase the lot size so in that context those are hardship related.

One other of the variance is, in my opinion, non substantial, that's the impervious coverage development with a maximum permitted is at 50 percent and we're slightly under 52 percent. It turned out that, if we're, based on this evening's discussion, if that gravel walkway is changed to an impervious coverage it may be around 52.7. To me, on a site of this size, given the complexity, given the amount of open space, given the improvements that is not a substantial violation of that particular variance. But it is a D3 variance so \(I\) will acknowledge that.

With regard to the, the two other D3 variances, these are more in the nature of design waivers that, that are D Variances and to some extent I don't know whether these variances are actually required. One is the planting buffer in the front of the eastern
property line. I think we are compliant with the 15 foot requirement.

The question really is whether that vegetation is 6 feet in height. I think the ordinance indicates that the Board may require that it be 6 feet tall. I don't know that it is a mandatory requirement so I'm not sure that that is a variance in and of itself. I think that, and I'll get to the testimony, the vegetation, the planting that's proposed is appropriate. But, in any respect, that is a, more of a design waiver even though the way that the ordinance is written it's part of the conditional use requirements so it's characterized as a D3 Variance but it's certainly not a substantial variance in my opinion.

With regard to the monument sign, I think we do comply with your ordinance. I don't agree with the calculation of your planner.

When \(I\) was the planner here and in prior applications it was the face of the sign including the framing that was included in the measurement of the sign area.

There were pillars or other portions of structures which held up the sign, those weren't included. So her calculation is 64 square feet.

I think based on, on my understanding of how the ordinance is interpreted and has been interpreted in prior applications we do comply with that 32 square feet maximum permitted size so I don't believe that that a variance is required.

Moreover, it's more, as I've said, more in the nature of a design waiver than a D3 Variance.

With regard to the D5 Variance, it's really a function of a rounding issue. That's the site size in terms of acreage.

At \(130,590.11\) square foot, that's 2.9979 acres which typically, in cases that I've been involved in as a municipal planner, you round up with the second, to a second decimal point. That's a hundredth of an acre.

So the site really is, in my opinion, 3 acres and 75 units would be 25 units per acre which is compliant.

I think the notion that one has to round to the fifth decimal point and creates a density variance is really, I think, overstating the situation.

So, in my opinion, even if that, the Board decides to characterize that as a, as a D5 Variance it's of such a de minimus extent that, you know, it's obviously something that we have to address but it's
not something that's substantive.

The only D Variance, in my opinion, and \(I\) think the Board has focused on it tonight and I would agree, the only D Variance that is of substance from a planning point of view is the FAR variance. You do have . 35 as required as the maximum and we're at .52 . So that clearly is a fairly large violation of that requirement.

With regard to the list of \(C\) Variances, again those are more in the nature of design waivers than actually violations of your bulk variances. In Montvale we have a situation where your site design standards are located in your zoning ordinance so those are characterized as C Variances.

There are many municipalities, most that I'm aware of, that have those design, those standards in a site plan design, those would be design waivers. In Montvale they would be called C Variances. And for that \(I\) acknowledge that they are required; a retaining wall height, the addition of the access drive from the building, the height screening in the parking lot, landscaping and shade trees with the parking lot. And even those \(I\) think there are some areas for interpretation with regard to that.

The fifth one which has been called out is the shuttle van parking lot not being screened. But \(I\) think, if you read the entire regulation, it talks about that being screened from a public roadway and the location of the shuttle van parking is in the rear yard so it would be blocked by the building. They are certainly, for overnight parking, it certainly won't be visible from the street as the ordinance requires. So I don't think that that even should be called out as a C Variance.

So, in, in summary, if you're looking at the compliance, \(I\) know that our objecting attorney has tried to make a big deal about the fact that we have so many \(D\) Variances and bulk variances but if you look at the application's non-conformity, most of them are more of a detail design nature rather than anything else and rather than a substantive violation of your use or bulk requirements of the ordinance. So as far as I'm concerned, from a planning point of view, even though this is a permitted use, the only substantial departure that you would have from your regulations and the potential for impact is the FAR variance.

Now the, the case law, I'm going to be quoting a lot about case law and it is a little bit complicated insofar as this variance is concerned because, A., we're dealing with an inherently beneficial use and also because we're not dealing with a D1 use variance. So in the case of the D3 conditional use variance, the traditional Dl use variance proofs are modified. The stricter, what we refer to as the Medici enhanced quality of proofs, that is case law based on Medici versus North Plainfield, a case decided back in 1986. Essentially the court indicated that in the use variance, the Medici proofs apply, you have to indicate that the site is particularly suited to the proposed use and, moreover, the Board, on the negative criteria, has to reconcile the granting of a variance for uses that the governing body has prohibited through zoning.

Those two standards of proof do not apply in a D3 Variance.

The -- this is because the proposed use is permitted in the zone. Assisted living facilities are permitted in this particular zone albeit that it doesn't comply will all the conditions under which it's permitted.

In the inherently beneficial the case which essentially sets forth the proofs is known as Coventry versus Westwood, a case from 1980. And basically that case says that the special reasons, the positive criteria are satisfied if the applicant could prove
that the site can accommodate the problems associated with the use even though the proposal does not comply with conditions, the ordinance as established to address such problems.

So that's the affirmative criteria.
Essentially both of the prongs of the negative criteria apply. You have to demonstrate there would be not a substantial detriment to the public good or to the zone plan.

With regard to the D4 and the D5 variances, that's the FAR and the density variances, the courts have also held essentially that the Coventry standards would apply.

And with regard to the FAR variance, the case the I'm citing is Randolph Town Center versus Randolph where essentially the courts indicated that where there's a violation of FAR, similar to the Coventry case, you have to prove that despite the fact that the ordinance, the proposal does not comply with the floor area ratio that the site can accommodate problems associated with it.

And so, too, with regard to the density variance there's a case known as Grubbs versus Slothower and essentially it says that Coventry proofs apply where you have a density variance.

And, as I've indicated before, if a density variance is a result of rounding out to the fifth decimal point then, you know, that variance would apply.

So in, in all of the instances where we have the D, D Variances, the D3, the D4 and the D5, the applicant need not show that the site is particularly suited for an assisted living facility. This is because it's a permitted use in the zone. It just has to demonstrate that the site can accommodate the potential problems that may be associated with not meeting the conditional use requirements, not complying with the floor area ratio or density that is permitted.

I would also note, and as Ms. Green indicated, that the \(F A R\) and the density requirements are also listed as conditional use requirements if the zoning ordinance, and as she put it, those two variances are really subsumed within the D3 conditional use variance.

So my first order of business will be to address the D3, D4 and D5 variances in conjunction with one another.

I mentioned that the case is complicated, further complicated by the fact that we're dealing
with an inherently beneficial use. So it's slightly different than a straight forward D3 conditional use variance, a D4 FAR variance and D5 density variance because an assisted living facility has been deemed by the courts to be an inherently beneficial use.

I'm referring to a case known as Sunrise versus Madison. And there was a recent case in Franklin Lakes, Sunrise versus Franklin Lakes which is recently decided. It was not a reported decision but in both instances the court recognized that assisted living facilities are inherently beneficial.

Q If I can just interject for a second, your determination of analysis of inherently beneficial is essentially exclusively predicated on the existing living nature of the use. You have not added any factor or ingredient for the fact that this is an inclusionary project with affordable housing proposed?

A Correct.
And I'll just refer to, there is case law that includes inclusionary developments in themselves are not inherently beneficial and I agree with that.

I do think that the inclusion, particularly in this case, of 20 percent of the beds as, as being affordable elevates the nature of the inherently beneficial use but I'll get to that in a minute. But

I'm predicating the, my review of the fact that this is an inherently beneficial use based solely on the fact that assisted living facilities have been deemed as such by the courts in New Jersey.

When it comes to inherently beneficial uses, the Supreme Court in the case of SICA versus wall Township, this is a case that was decided in 1992, said that rather than going through the traditional special reasons and negative criteria test that you apply what is known as the four part SICA test.

And the focus really, in this particular situation, is not on the affirmative proofs. The court basically said, because the use is an inherently beneficial it benefits the public to such an extent that you don't even have to do address special reasons. The special reasons, the extent to which it serves the public good is automatically satisfied by reason of the nature of the use itself.

So the focus really is more on the negative criteria and as is the case in the D3, D4 and D5 variance.

And essentially the court said the Board and the applicant should undertake a review based on what is known as the four part SICA test.

Step 1 is to determine the public interest at stake.

Step 2 is to determine whether there would be any detriments if the variance were granted.

Step 3 is to determine whether the imposition of reasonable conditions would ameliorate or eliminate those detrimental impacts that might ensue if the variance were granted.

And Step 4 is what is known as the balancing test where you have to weigh the positives to the extent to which the public interest is advanced. And you have to look at the negative criteria, potential detrimental impacts assuming the imposition of reasonable conditions. And if the positives outweigh the negatives, then the variance must be approved.

If the negatives outweigh the positives, then the Board has the reason to deny the application.

So in this particular context, because we have an inherently beneficial use which requires us to go through the four part SICA test and also because the D3 conditional use variance, the D4 FAR variance and the D5 Variance has a substantially lesser burden of proof required per Coventry, I think, in this particular situation, the focus of the Board should be not upon the impact of the use but the impact of the deviation.

The court essentially said in Coventry that the governing body authorizing the proposed use as a conditional use has already determined the use is compatible in the zone so the focus of the Board is on the impact of the deviation not on the use itself.

And as before, just to summarize, the applicant only need to show that the site will accommodate the problems associated with the use even though the proposal does not comply with the conditions established in the ordinance to do address their problems.

So now going to the four part SICA test, step No. 1 .

So the court in the SICA decision basically said not all inherently beneficial uses advance the public interest to the same degree. Some do it to a greater extent, some to a lesser extent.

So the first part of the test is really to determine on the scale of inherently beneficial uses where assisted living facilities and where this particular assisted living facility ranks. Well, as indicated, the assisted living facilities have been deemed by the courts to be inherently beneficial.

I will also note that senior community housing construction, which is essentially what an assisted
living facility is, is one of the 13 purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law and in fact it's one of the very few specific uses that is actually mentioned in the purpose section of the Municipal Land Use Law.

So, in my opinion, that's substantially notable. There's not too many uses listed in that section of the statute that is under NJSA 40:55(d)2, Item No. 13.

In addition, the Municipal Land Use Law and the case law, as this community well knows, is that it calls for the adequate provision of affordable housing including and especially housing for seniors. And I would note and \(I\) mentioned this in the introduction, even though I wouldn't characterize this project by itself by virtue of the inclusion of affordable housing makes it inherently beneficial, I think that, under the current New Jersey law, in the case of assisted living facilities, 10 percent of the units are required to be eligible or affordable.

But, in this particular situation, 20 percent or double the number mandated by law is being provided.

So, to me, the fact that not only do you have an inherently beneficial use but essentially the inclusion of 20 percent of the beds is being affordable as opposed to the 10 percent requirement under the New Jersey law elevates the extent to which
this particular project will serve the public good.

It's going to help this community meet its affordable housing obligation whether that be in the third round or in the fourth round and they're surely coming in the not too distant future.

So I think you take all of those factors into consideration, the case law, the purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law, the provision of affordable housing, the fact that you have 20 percent of the beds being affordable to me that makes this particular assisted living facility rank high on the scale of inherently beneficial use. In other words, by the very existence this assisted living facility will, to a very large extent, advance the public welfare. The second step of the SICA test is to determine if there are any detriments that would ensue if the \(D\) Variances were granted. And I'm going to deal with each of the D Variance categories. The first one is the D3 conditional use, the potential detriments itself.

The first thing is, noted is the uses permitted in the zone. As to the conditions which the proposed development violates those are access, lot area, FAR and density, these all share the intent to create an efficient, compact, accessible development on the site leaving sufficient space to separate buffer and protect the adjacent uses from on-site activity and traffic associated with the use. If you look at all of those conditions which are violated, essentially the intent of those requirements is really, you know, to provide an efficient compact development on the property leaving sufficient space to separate it from the adjacent areas and also to limit the amount of traffic or parking impacts to the extent that those would be problematic.

So, in that regard, I'll address each of the D3 Variances in terms of how the site can accommodate the problems.

So the first is the fact that this property is not on a county road. It is on Philips Parkway. While it's not a county road it is a major roadway providing access to a lot of existing office and institutional uses nearby.

I think you have heard, from the testimony that's provided, the assisted living facility does not generate a substantial amount of traffic. Certainly if you compare it to the kinds of uses that are permitted in the zone such as office uses, it doesn't create a lot of traffic particularly at rush hour. The traffic is mostly limited to employees and occasionally to visitors.

So, in my opinion, the strict conformance to the condition that access only be from a County road not only is it not problematic it's certainly not feasible in this case. You know, this site is something not on a County road. However, I would note that this site in this location is perfectly suitable for an assisted living facility.

Philips Parkway is the only existing roadway that provides access to the site. There are no County roads which are located in proximity to the site. So, I believe the fact that it's not located on a County road, A., this is a condition that can't be overcome. And I don't think, because of the way that access is provided and the nature of the surrounding uses, the lack of access directly to a County road would create any problems for this particular use.

With regard to lot size, certainly at 3 acres, it's below the 10 acres required. However, I think when you look at development it can be fully and appropriately accommodated on this lot given the lot size, its shape and notwithstanding the lot being undersized, they're still able to comply with the setback requirements.

Additionally, much of the existing root cover of
the remaining trees will remain undisturbed. New landscaping will be provided along the perimeter where the site is disturbed. As such, in my opinion, there is sufficient separation and buffer from the adjacent properties.

So, even though the site is 3 acres and not 10 acres, I believe that the overall intent and purpose of that will, will be met through the design and will not create problems.

I'll be addressing some of the remaining aspects as related to \(F A R\) and density next. Obviously, that lot size has something to do with it.

And, in fact, with respect to FAR and density as I noted before with respect to density, if the, if the site were just 90 square foot larger or if the Board determined that rounding up to 100 decimal points is adequate in terms of determining the compliance with the density requirements then no density variance would be required.

With regard to the floor area ratio, in, in my opinion \(I\) think floor area ratio is an appropriate tool to be used in planning in certain cases. Certainly when it comes to some kind of non residential uses, when you talk about office development, when you talk about light industrial
development, even when you talk about single family uses, FAR is a useful tool because, in that instance, you're, you're regulating the intensity of development on the property.

When it comes to assisted living facilities, I know you have this in your ordinance, I think it's a less suitable means of, of controlling density. And, that's because assisted living facilities, by their very nature are very benign uses. I will get into this a little bit more later on when I'm talking about the negative criteria.

And, essentially, it's a function of the number of beds and the amount of staff which have to, you know, be, be utilizing this facility. And in this particular situation, having 98 beds on a site of, of 3 acres, even though the FAR in this particular situation is violated, is not going to cause impacts related to the intensity of development.

I would also note that the reason why assisted living facilities are, are large is related to the fact that they require significant space for shared amenities.

You have smaller rooms for individual residents but you have large areas of common space. You have dining rooms. You have libraries. You have activity
rooms, you have spas, you have lobbies, reception areas, wellness centers and so forth.

In those of a higher quality have a greater variety and quality of physical spaces and services that are provided.

In, in the case of assisted living facilities, all the ones that I've been involved in, and I've been involved in assisted living facilities both as a planner representing developers and as representing municipalities since, going back to 19--, the 1980s, but in the recent 10 to 15 years I've never seen an assisted living facility that has less than 70 to 75 units.

And the reason is because, in the case of assisted living facilities is a very substantial cost in providing the common facilities and common areas that have to be provided and, also, in providing the services that are needed for the residents such as meals and laundry service and cleaning and transportation and health care. You have --

There is a critical number of people that have to be able to pay for and, and subsidize that space and that number of employees to make it economically feasible.

One of our clients who we represent throughout
the State is Sunrise. Their facilities typically start at 75 units and go up from there.

And, in fact, in my experience in New Jersey, in Bergen County as well, is that assisted living facilities range in size from between 75 to 125 units as standalone facilities, that is where they're not paired with independent units or nursing homes.

And so, in this particular situation, this assisted living facility at 75 units is on the lower end of the scale.

And I did take a look at assisted living facilities which are in a five mile radius. I was able to obtain information on the lot size that they're provided, and the number of beds and able to calculate the density. The one part of the information that \(I\) was not able to obtain is the floor area ratio.

Let me just run through the examples that I came up with.

As indicated, just to provide context and the other thing I did is, in comparing assisted living facilities it's difficult to do it on an, and I don't think it's viable to do it on a per unit basis because some have a lot of two beds, a lot of, some of them have more one beds so I think you looking, looking at it in terms of its intensity, one has to look at the number of beds. That's really the common denominator as a basis of comparison.

So in this particular situation we have 3 acres. We have 98 beds. That works out to 32.7 beds per acre.

The Bristal at Woodcliff Lake is on a site of 4.34 acres, has 160 beds. That's 36.9 beds per acre. So that is, it's on a slightly larger site but it has higher density in terms of bed per acre.

The Sunrise at Woodcliff Lake is at 3.4 acres, has 116 beds. That's at a density of 33.3 beds per acre. So that is substantially comparable in terms of lot size. The density is slightly higher as well.

Brighton Gardens of Saddle River is on a site of 3.85 acres, has 132 beds, the density works out at 34.3 beds per acre. So it, too, has a higher density. The Jewish Assisted Living of River Vale is on 4.81 acres, 124 beds, that works out to a density of 25.8 beds per acre so that's slightly lower.

And the The Sunrise of Old Tappan is 3.91 acres, has 108 beds and it's at 27.6 beds per acre.

So in terms of the, the comparables, we're at 3 acres. They range in size from 3.4 acres to slightly over 4 acres. So in that context when assisted living
facilities, it's a fact that we are on 3 acres and not 10 acres to me is not a substantial departure from the norm.

Moreover, when we're talking about the number of beds and the level of intensity that is created by the number of people that will live there, four out of the, three out of the five are at a higher density, two are slightly lower. So we're certainly within the median or middle range of the density when it comes to a comparison to assisted living facilities.

When I look at those assisted living facilities and I've been by them a number of times and am familiar with some of them being the planner in some of those communities, they don't seem -- they seem to be in pristine condition. I don't see that they cause substantial detriments to the neighboring uses or to the community as a result of their density or, or their size and the fact that they're located on lots which are 3 or, 3 to 4 acres in size.

So with respect to -- going back to the Montvale standard of .35 FAR I think that was -- you know, I can't be sure but my understanding, based on the fact that the site that was chosen in the settlement, the fair share housing to be an assisted living facility was a larger site, was almost 11 acres.

There the idea was to provide both an assisted living facility and a senior care facility. And that was rezoned over as part of the overall housing settlement. The TSL Pike Redevelopment application, it's a larger facility with more units.

And in that case, because of that fact, the average square foot or gross foot of square footage per unit could be less.

And the reason why is because you certainly have the same range of common facilities that are provided. Where you have a larger number of units, where you have the 200 units, the proportion of the common space to resident space is much less.

So, in that situation, you can have a, you know, an assisted living facility where only 30 percent of the space is devoted to the common facilities and 70 percent of the space can be devoted to the resident facilities.

In this situation where you have a standalone assisted living facility, where all of that common space has to be provided, the ratio of common space to resident space is closer to about 40 to 50 percent of the area devoted to common space and then 50 to 60 percent of the space devoted to all the residents.

So when you build an assisted living facility
which is added, kind of the lowest number where you can feasibly provide all of those common facilities and services that make it a quality facility and meet the needs of the residents, you are going to end up with a facility which is of the size that you do have in this particular situation.

So I've heard about suggestions about, you know, perhaps reducing the FAR by eliminating units or taking the floor off the unit, in my opinion it's not a question of, of economics, you won't make as much money, it's simply infeasible, in my experience and \(I\) have never seen it done where you build an assisted living facility of higher quality where you have, you know, the two levels and it's around, you know, well, 45,000 square foot which would comply with the 3.5 FAR.

And I think that the most important factor to bear in mind in this particular situation is does the level of \(F A R\), does the 68,000 square foot really create a situation where you have problems off site. Does it create problems related to controlling the intensity of the development.

And when I look at the surrounding uses, certainly the assisted living facility is an attractive development. It, you know, architecturally
```

it, it's very nicely designed, fits in well, I think,

``` and is compatible with the town house development which is the only residential development to the rear. It's certainly compatible with all of the office developments in the vicinity.

Yes, the building is slightly taller and larger. But in office developments you have a greater need for parking so the FAR, the amount of square footage that is provided on the site is less and you have larger parking areas, in this situation the proportion of the site which is devoted to the building and the building itself is larger proportion to the parking because you have less parking.

But we can provide, as the testimony in the prior applications in this evening has been indicated, we can provide a perfectly function, functional and viable assisted living facility that can provide for all of the needs of its residents in a very high quality environment without creating impacts on the adjacent uses.

Certainly the parking can be accommodated on a daily basis.

I've been involved in assisted living
facilities. And there's a reason why the .5 spaces per unit is the, is the number which most
municipalities adopt and which the Residential Site Improvement standards have adopted because on \(a\), on \(a\) day-to-day basis assisted living facilities can operate very, very well with that number of parking. Most of the parking is provided for the employees, very few of the residents drive.

The visit, you know, on the shift change, particularly in this situation, you won't have all of the staff leaving and, and coming at the same time.

And in terms of visitors visiting, visitation is typically in the evening so it's not substantial on the weekends, again not substantial.

So the only times that you run into -- and there are no events. It's not like a school play or an event that's held in a library or institutional facility, as Andy has indicated and he's absolutely right, there's a few occasions in the year; Mother's Day, Father's Day, Christmas, Easter and so forth where, Thanksgiving, where you do have a number of visitors.

And as we've indicated, rather than create the need for additional parking on the site or reduce the size of the building because on three or four times a year you can't accommodate the parking, you can accommodate it on a daily basis, you can clearly put a
plan in place where visitors can be brought to the site and, and from the site in a very feasible and viable manner. It's done all the time with assisted living facilities given the nature of the surrounding uses and the fact that typically on those days those offices are closed. There's ample opportunities for that kind of plan to be put in place.

So the fact that you have, I think, higher EAR than is permitted in my mind does not create the parking problem. I think it's a completely separate problem.

The setbacks can all be provided. Buffering and open space can be provided for this particular property.

Assisted living facilities, typically there's very little use of outdoor space. So essentially the outdoor areas essentially are walking trails is more than sufficient. The perimeter of the site could be buffered. You're not going to have any activity in those particular areas.

The extent of the outdoor activity, there will be a few seniors and people sitting on the outdoor terraces from time-to-time, even that is a limited amount of time. There is certainly no noise or other impacts which are going to be felt off site.

So the, you know, in, in terms of the impact on the adjacent uses, there are very few uses likely living facilities where the impacts on the adjacent community are less benign than this particular situation. It's certainly not going to have any impact on the adjacent uses including the Bears Nest.

And, as indicated before, discussions with the Bears Nest have indicated some changes to the site plan which the applicant is more than willing to do. And with that in place, I don't think it would be any impact.

So, at the end of the day, when you look at the violation of the FAR, as I said before, first of all the FAR, to me, in the case of an assisted living facility, is really not the most appropriate way to limit the intensity of development. I think the, you know, the density in terms of beds per acre, building coverage, setbacks, those kind of things, those are far more important.

And to a very large extent, the height of the building, the building coverage, the setbacks, those have all, and the parking have all been accommodated on the site. So the intensity of the site has been managed and does comply with the overall purpose and intent of your ordinance.

And the fact that the \(F A R\) is violated, even to the extent which it is, to me does not create problems which can't be accommodated by this site.

So, to me, the FAR is really, will not cause a detriment to the surrounding properties and will allow this particular facility, with the common spaces, with the facilities that it services, operate on a very high level and would be a very high quality facility that can satisfactorily address all of the needs of its residents.

And, as indicated, I don't want to make too much of this but certainly to the 20 percent of the beds which are going to be devoted to affordable that, that also takes that into consideration.

In terms of the excess of density, it's so de minimis \(I\) think, in the context of this overall application, the fact that we're .017 units per acre above the permitted density, is certainly not going to create problems. The site could accommodate the fact that the density is slightly violated.

So the last two are the, is the screening. Essentially it's a D3 Variance. The fact that you don't have 6 foot tall landscaping, certainly the landscaping that is proposed is appropriate, particularly you don't have to have 6 foot screening
for the kind of use that we're talking about here, particularly in the context that you have office developments in the area.

The screening is heaviest in the rear portion of the property adjacent to Bears Nest. I don't know if that is even necessary but it's something that has been worked out. So I don't think any problems are associated with that.

With regard to the signage, as I've said before, I think we do comply with the, with the size of the monument sign. To me that's more of a design waiver.

To the extent that the Board interprets it as a larger sign, there's two things that could be done. One is the Board could look at it and say, well, include the area of the posts adjacent to the sign. That's an esthetic improvement. So there that's an added benefit.

To the extent that the Board says that we are going to interpret it that way, that could be, those areas could be eliminated. I would see it as diminishing the attractiveness of the monument sign but if the Board approved it as is, certainly in the context of this particular community and the fact that both Parkway is mostly office developments and the municipal complex that sign is not going to have, create any problems associated with it.

So talking about the, with respect to Step 2 of the SICA test which is, are there substantial detrimental impacts associated with the development and under the Coventry standard can the site accommodate the problems associated with the violations of those requirements to me that there, the site can accommodate those problems very adequately. I don't think it's overdeveloped and I don't think the intensity of the development would have any impact on the surrounding area.

Getting back to the negative criteria, the two prongs, the public good and the zone plan, first with regard to the public good, from a land use point of view, again it's a permitted use. I have mentioned assisted living facilities are very benign in terms of their activity. Really most of the activity is employees coming and going from the site. That is over a period of time. That's not all at once. There's not a substantial amount of movement certainly if you compare that to office development where you have peak hours, people coming and going it's substantially less.

You have extensive landscaping, tree covers, buffers to screen and shield the development from the surrounding uses, particularly the Bears Nest to the south.

So from a land use point of view, there's certainly no impacts.

In terms of the visual impact, the building design incorporates vertical and horizontal articulation to break up the mass of the building. It complies with the design requirements set forth in the conditional use requirements. A greater attention has been paid to the design of the facades and compelling architectural detail, the use of materials which is common to the community and using a traditional architectural style that is compatible with the residential use of which it has the potential to have the greatest impact, certainly it's compatible with the office development in the area.

The architectural design \(I\) think would be a substantial improvement from the existing vacant building and the proposed design setbacks, buffering and landscaping certainly will have a positive impact on the esthetic characteristics of the immediate area.

With regard to traffic and parking, we've had testimony with regard to that. Those are problems that the site can accommodate. Parking is sufficient with the proviso that we work out a plan for those heaviest peak uses on special e occasions.

We do exceed the minimum number of parking spaces that are required both by RSIS and your ordinance. On-site circulation, I think, is appropriate for garbage pickup, deliveries and emergency vehicles. And I think those, the changes that have been made recently certainly indicate that contact circulation is not a problem.

In terms of the environmental impact, there's not any sensitive environmental considerations here. I would say that a redevelopment project conserves precious land resources by building on an already developed site and the majority of thee mature trees and vegetation can remain undisturbed. The detention basin, the detention facilities can handle the storm water on the property.

So from an environmental point of view, there's no impacts.

In terms of municipal services and taxes, the facility, by its very nature, provides virtually all of the services and needs that the residents will require. There will be very little reliance or use of municipal services. At the same time, because there are no school children that would add substantially to the tax base of Montvale and as indicated earlier this evening, emergency transportation will be provided through private ambulance service so that will not be a burden on the municipality.

So if you look at the potential negative detriments, land use, visual, traffic, parking and environmental municipal services and taxes, to me, none of those, there's no substantial detriments.

With regard to your zone plan and your Master Plan, the zoning ordinance already allows the proposed use obviously provided it meets conditional use standards. But essentially, the failure of the proposed use to meet the required conditions, as I've indicated, will not create any problems such as intensity of use or inadequate separation and buffering.

So with the grant of those variances, would really reconcile the governing bodies intent to limit such impacts.

In addition, I think the use directly advances several State goals of the year 2008 , the Master Plan which were reaffirmed, in subsequent re-examinations. The first being to increase the Borough's ratable base.

As mentioned before, the Master Plan says residential uses which reduce school children result
in a positive fiscal impact on the Borough.

Assisted living facilities are certainly high valued uses, don't require much municipal services, don't generate school children so it wouldn't contribute substantially to the tax base.

The other goal is diversity of housing stock. There's a mention in the Master Plan of, especially addressing allowing seniors to remain in the community, assisted living facilities will certainly provide that. And, also, the fact that you're providing 15 affordable beds support the Borough's fair share housing element.

So, in my opinion, with regard to the second prong of the negative criteria would there be a substantial detriment to the Master Plan or zone plan, I don't think there would be.

So in context, in looking at the second part of the SICA test which is are there any substantial detrimental impacts, I don't believe there are any. Can the site accommodate the problems associated with the fact that you don't meet the requirements of the D3 conditional use variance, the fact that there's a D4 FAR variance and a D5 density variance \(I\) believe that if the variance is granted there would not be a substantial detriment to the public good or zone plan.

On the contrary, I believe the development serves the public welfare, advances the goals of the Municipal Land Use Law, the Borough's Master Plan and housing element and the Fair Share Plan and conforms to the intent and purpose of the Master Plan.

Step 3 of the SICA test is the Board can impose reasonable conditions where they believe substantial negative impacts would occur. So, to a large extent the failure of the project to be on a County road and on a 10 acre site cannot be ameliorated so the Board can't really impose conditions with respect to those items.

With respect to the density, the violation is so de minimus that \(I\) don't see there, it being necessary for the Board to impose a condition there. You know, for example, to lower the overall density of units or beds per acre.

In terms of the violation of the coverage, again, it's not a substantial violation and doesn't result in any substantial impacts.

As Mr. Dipple indicated, the applicant is willing to provide pervious cover such that to the extent that the impervious coverage limitation is violated, the actual area of the hard impervious coverage where storm water runs off will remain under
```

1 5 percent which is in compliance with the purpose and
intent of that particular regulation. And, it's
something which has been applied and utilized in other
facilities, memory lifetime facilities. It was
utilized, I believe, Wegmans facility, that was a
permitted and utilized to compensate for the
impervious coverage.
To me the fact that you're violating the FAR, permitted FAR it, it is necessary, in this particular situation and it's not unusual when you look at assisted living facilities, that are provided in the surrounding areas, to have them on lots of a similar size and have them with the same number of beds per acre.
I haven't been able to obtain the floor area ratios for those but my, my guess is that the floor area ratios are closer to the 50 percent level than the 35 percent which is mandated.
I would note also that the other assisted living facility and the TSA, Pike Redevelopment, they also were, requested an FAR variance not one which was substantial as this one. I believe it was . 41. But as I've indicated, it's a larger site. It had a lot more independent units. So it's slightly a different animal. Assisted living facilities tend to be

``` standalone, assisted living facilities tend to be a, a larger animal. But, despite this violation, I don't believe that it's overly large and I don't believe that it's overly intense for this site.

So I really don't see it as being necessary for the Board to set as a condition either lowering the FAR or the density or trying to cut back on the number of units or the area devoted to common facilities, I just think it diminishes the extent to which the facility is able to provide high quality services and common areas for the development itself.

Throughout the course of the hearings there have been conditions which the Board has mentioned and certainly, \(I\) know Mr. Williams has been taking note as is Mr. Del Vecchio.

I think those mentioned are sufficient to reduce the impacts and assure the surrounding area that there would be no impacts on them and if the variance is granted. I can't think of any other conditions that are necessary because there are certainly not substantial negative impacts if the variance was granted as is.

So that leaves me with the final part of the SICA test, the balancing test where you weigh the positives and negatives.

So going back to the Step 1, in terms of the public interest at hand, I've indicated that an assisted living facility, particularly this one, by its very nature and the fact that it has 20 percent of the beds are devoted for affordable, are going to be affordable for residents, I think ranks higher on the scale of inherently beneficial uses.

On the other hand, my analysis is that there are no real substantial detriments if the applicant is approved. And I don't believe beyond what the Board has indicated, no additional reasonable conditions appear to be necessary to ameliorate or eliminate the impacts.

So coming to the weigh test, if you weigh the high level of public interest against the absence of detrimental impacts indicates that the positive impacts substantially outweigh the detriments and the D3, D4 and D5 variances should be granted.

So very quickly, \(I\) know the hour is late, I'll just talk about the \(C\) Variances.

As I mentioned before, there's a question as to even whether, you know, they are necessary. However, I would say that these are not typical bulk variances like, you know, building coverage or setback. These are in the nature of design requirements.

The first being retaining walls exceeding a permitted height of 6 feet. There's a couple of instances where the proposed height exceeds it by as much as 2 feet. However, given its location, it would not cause a visual detriment to the adjacent property due to tree cover and landscape covers around the perimeter of the property. And, I don't believe that there are any other negative impacts associated with that.

The other one is the, the height of the screening within the buffer area. I believe what's been proposed is appropriate given the nature of what's being screened. I don't believe that a 6 foot, for example, a 6 foot high screening in the front of the property is necessary or appropriate. I think what's being proposed adequately screens and buffers the property. It won't cause visual detriments to any of the adjacent properties particularly the Bears Nest behind.

With regard to the distance between the building and the building, \(I\) believe that generally the 10 foot distance is complied with. There are instances where there may be walkways or, or landscaping which is between the building and, and the adjacent roadway area. That's very typical of developments like, like
this. I don't believe that there's any significant detriment. I believe that the area around the building is adequately landscaped and that the driveway is sufficiently distanced from the building not to cause any problem.

With regard to landscaping within the parking lot, I think the intent of the, of that ordinance is to ensure that where you have very large areas of parking you want to break it up by having a certain amount of landscaped islands and some shade trees within them. Where you have the type of design here which is essentially a ring road off which there is some parking spaces, you're having the shade trees and the landscaping on the perimeter of the property outside of the parking areas is really the right way to go.

I really don't see the need to have planting islands located anywhere within the areas where they're not being provided.

And then, the last one is, as I've indicated, the, which was called out as a, as a C Variance, shall not be adequately screened, it is going to be parked in a space in the rear yard. For all intents and purposes it could be invisible to the public roadway and therefore not a major impact.

So, in my opinion, the C Variances are more in the nature of \(a\), of \(a\) design waiver and \(I\) certainly think that in the instances where they do exist, what
has been proposed is certainly adequate to meet the
need and to the extent that the Board believes those
variances are necessary I believe there's a sufficient
basis to grant them.
    Thank you.
    Q Thank you, Mr. Preiss.
        CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Del Vecchio,
anything further on direct --
        MR. DEL VECCHIO: No, Mr. Chairman.
        CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- of this witness.
    Obviously, the hour is late. I was hoping to
conclude this matter this evening. However, we've yet
to hear any testimony from the Borough Planner. We've
yet to hear questions from Board Members and we've yet
to hear questions from the public.
    So this matter is going to have to be carried.
The question is, with our agenda being as busy as it
is, the only --

MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, can I make a comment before you go into scheduling?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. REGAN: I always enjoy hearing Mr.
Preiss testify. I think he started his testimony
tonight around 9:59. It's now 11:15. It really would
have been helpful to me and maybe to the Board if we
had a written report instead of him just reading his
report into the record. It's kind of unfair to the
Board. That's my own personal opinion.
    Ms. Green provided a written report. I just
don't see, Mr. Del Vecchio, why we don't get a written
report on an application this significant with
significant deviations that, of relief that are
sought.

Again, \(I\) have the highest regard for Mr. Preiss. I know if he was authorized and directed to provide a written report he would, I'm sure, he would have done so. But just to have him read his report into the record, \(I\) challenge him to take copious and accurate notes for the past hour and 15 or hour and 20 minutes. I tried the best I could.

But, you know, Mr. Del Vecchio, you may think that gives you some advantage in the process, I don't know. I think it would have been helpful to the Board to have a report in writing rather than just us sitting here attempting to take notes and try to take it all in.

That's my opinion.

MR. ZITELII: Is that, that some -- that
Mr. Del Vecchio would provide to us, he just read the report. If you're willing to tell us verbally why wouldn't you give it to us in writing.

MR. DEL VECCHIO: What Mr. Preiss provided was an outline of his testimony. You will get a written transcript of everything and every word that is said.

MR. REGAN: That's true. But if we had the report tonight or a few days before like we had Ms. Green's report.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. I think it's well-noted. Let's get back to the mundane scheduling.

MR. REGAN: Yeah.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The only available dates. There's a possibility of February \(19 t h\) or probably March 5th.

I'm sorry. What?
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Mr. Chairman, it's tough to hear the testimony then remember two weeks later.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I recognize that.
MR. REGAN: That's why I made my comments.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I don't imagine the Board wants to go another hour and a half.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: No, I agree.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Starting at \(11: 15\) to go
into questions.
I know I have a number of questions of Mr.
Preiss and \(I\) have questions of Ms . Green as well.
So to start that now, I don't think it's fair to anyone, to our professionals, our Board Members and most importantly the public.

So, Mr. Del Vecchio, is your testimony available for February 19 or --

MR. DEL VECCHIO: It would have to be March 5th, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Which, obviously, would give adequate time for you to have the transcript of this hearing prepared and distributed.

Members of the public that are here, we apologize for the lateness of the hour. However, the testimony that we heard this evening from the applicant's professionals was very informative, very detailed. It is a very detailed application.

It's the policy of the Montvale Planning Board that, that we listen as intently as we possibly can to give the applicant the opportunity to present their case to us.

We, in turn, want that same opportunity to
```

answer questions. And that will happen. But,
unfortunately, it won't happen until March 5th.
No further notice of this meeting will be
provided to you other than this announcement. But
please feel free to contact Lorraine Hutter to confirm
that and please feel free to share with your neighbors
the opportunity to come back to the hearing on March
5th if they have any questions or would like to hear
the Board's questions of the applicant as well.
I thank you for coming to the meeting and
apologize for the lateness of the hour.
MR. CULHANE: The one thing I would like
to make sure of I'm assuming but is the transcript
that Mr. Preiss read it before it's sent to the Board
so if there's any changes he wants to make.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I think that's
reasonable.
MR. DEL VECCHIO: I was going to offer and
in the instances where we usually do accommodate it as
in pending applications that Mr. Preiss is involved
in, I'm happy to have Mr. Preiss submit a written
report in advance of March 5th essentially
encapsulating his testimony from this evening.
He'll be back. He can supplement and
authenticate that report when he's here if that's

```
```

helpful to the Board. We're happy to do it. We're
also happy to update the drawings to reflect the
compliance items reflected in both of the Board's
professionals' reports in advance of the 5th since
there is adequate time to make that happen at this
point.
So we offer both up to the Board. We're happy to accommodate any way we can.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you. And the Board does appreciate that.
And for the benefit of the members of the public that are here that may have an interest in this application, when would you be expecting to deliver copies of that document to the Board.
MR. PREISS: I'm going to need the transcript so $I$ know what $I$ said.
I believe it will definitely be in two weeks in advance.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Members of the public, so we're carrying to March 5th. I guess around the 15 th to the 20 th of February, if you contact Ms. Hutter, I'm sure she would be able to send you a PDF of the either the transcript or of the testimony of Mr. Preiss so that you will have the same information.
MR. WISS: Thank you, sir.

```

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you Mr.
Del Vecchio, Mr. Preiss.
Anything else?
MR. DEL VECCHIO: So we're carried to
March 5th, no further notice.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Carried to March 5th and when we open on March 5th I'm going to expect to hear the report starting with the report of Ms. Green, any questions from Board Members of Ms. Green and Mr. Preiss, then open to the public. Mr. Del Vecchio, do you anticipate bringing in any other witnesses that have not already testified?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: Not at this time, Mr. Chairman. No.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And do you expect to return with your witnesses that were here this evening?

MR. DEL VECCHIO: I was planning on returning with Mr. Dipple. I'm not sure there is anything left open on the architectural. If there is, I will ask Mr. Englebaugh to come back. But my notes seem to reflect that that is pretty clean other than showing the hatches that are on the roof now.

If the Board is willing to accept either a representation that there will be or we'll give you a
```

    plan showing them without his testimony. I don't plan
    to bring him back.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, submit the plan
    and we'll advise you as to whether or not we believe
    he should.
    MR. DEL VECCHIO: Fair enough. Thank you,
    Mr. Chairman.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Very good. Thank you
    and good evening.
    MR. WISS: Thank you and good evening.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Let's close up this
    meeting.
    ```
    (The hearing adjourns at 11:25 p.m.)
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\hline drivers [1] - \(38: 12\) & elevation [10]-11:14, & engineering [2] - & 103:4, 110:3, 115:10 & \[
16: 9,16: 10,16: 25
\] \\
\hline driveway [3] - 45:12, & 11:18, 12:13, 14:10, & 18:25, 43:15 & Estate [1]-3:12 & \[
65: 12,65: 13,65: 15
\] \\
\hline 63:20, 144:4 & 14:13, 18:22, 19:1, & Englebauch (3] & esthetic [2] - 133:16 & 67:12, 85:18 \\
\hline drop [3] - 37:25 & 41:7, 44:3 & 20:23, 44:2, 80:4 & 135:21 & exhibits [6]-4:7, 4:9, \\
\hline 63:10, 74:12 & elevations [15] - 9:4 & Englebaugh \([6]-4: 3\), & estimate [1] - 98:2 & 4:12, 5:1, 7:3, 8:6 \\
\hline dual [1]-52:19 & 11:15, 12:18, 12:24, & \(8: 9,30: 19,80: 17\), & evening [14]-3:7 & exist [1] - 145:3 \\
\hline due [1]-143:6 & 13:14, 14:2, 18:23, & 84:8, 151:21 & 8:18, 20:14, 21:3, & existence \([1]-117: 13\) \\
\hline dumpster [1]-62:16 & 26:14, 26:16, 26:19, & ENGLEBAUGH [2] - & 44:23, 128:15, & existing [11]-39:22, \\
\hline duration [2] - 70:14, & 26:25, 27:2, 44:7, & 2:3, 80:1 & 9:11, 137: & 66:12, 67:7, 71:21, \\
\hline 70:15 & 74:11 & Englebaugh's [2] - & 45:15, 148:18, & 75:11, 95:13, \\
\hline during [8]-43: & eligible [1] - 116:18 & 43:25, 44:8 & 49:23, 151:17, & 112:14, 118:17, \\
\hline 68:25, 69:17, 71:13, & eliminate [3] - 77:13, & enhanced [1] - 109:5 & 52:9, 152:10 & 19:9, 119:25, \\
\hline 81:14, 84:15, 90:12, & 114:5, 142:12 & enjoy [1] - 145:25 & evening's [2] - 102:20, & 135:18 \\
\hline 99:23 & eliminated [3]-58:6, & enlarged [1] - 10:11 & 104:14 & exists [1]-74:11 \\
\hline dwelling [8] - 28:5, & 58:11, 133:20 & ensue [2] - 114:6, & event [9]-10:7, 49:5, & expect [3] - 98:18, \\
\hline 28:6, 46:22, 47:9, & eliminating [2] - 84:4, & 117:16 & 9:10, 50:4, 50:11, & 151:7, 151:15 \\
\hline 58:15, 88:6, 89:3, & 127:8 & ensure [2]-53:16, & 69:11, 77:25, 78:14, & expecting [1] - 150:13 \\
\hline 89:5 & elimination [2]-85:2, & 144:8 & 129:15 & expects [1]-24:12 \\
\hline dwellings [1] - 89:7 & 85:3 & enter [1]-52:2 & events [6]-33:13, & experience [4] - \\
\hline & elongated [1]-31:22 & entertain [4]-41:16, & \[
33: 21,50: 9,52: 12
\] & \[
50: 18,80: 6,123: 3
\] \\
\hline F & email [1]-88:16 & \[
42: 23,86: 24,100: 7
\] & \[
69: 17,129: 14
\] & \[
127: 11
\] \\
\hline & emergencies [1] - & entire [2] - 38:2, 108:2 & eventually \({ }_{[1]}\) - 73:1 & expert [2]-8:12, 84:8 \\
\hline Earth [7] - 46 & 82:8 & entirely [1] - 95:3 & evergreen [1] - 66:2 & expertise \([1]-94: 25\) \\
\hline 87:25, 89:10, 89:16, & emerg & entities [1] - 35:20 & evergreens [1] - 66:14 & EXPIRES [1]-153:18 \\
\hline 89:18, 89:20, 89:23 & 31:16, 49:7, 52:11, & entrance [2] - 19:5, & evidence [6] - 4:16, & explain [1]-43:18 \\
\hline easement [1] - 95:18 & 54:14, 61:21, 63:22, & \[
40: 17
\] & \[
4: 25,21: 12,53: 21
\] & expressed [1] - 56:16 \\
\hline easier [1] - 49:22 & 82:6, 82:7, 82:10, & entryway [1] - 30:14 & \[
67: 20,97: 7
\] & extended \({ }^{[1]}\) - \(66: 16\) \\
\hline easiest [1] - 84:18 & 82:12, 94:2, 136:6, & environment \({ }_{[2]}\) - & exactly [3] - 39:3, 93:7 & extension [1] - 33:16 \\
\hline easily [1] - 46:22 & 137:1 & 103:4, 128:19 & exam [1]-53:12 & extensive [2] - 47:23, \\
\hline east [4]-63:6, 66:6, & Emerson [1] - 87:19 & environmental [4] - & EXAMINATION [4] - & 134:24 \\
\hline 73:20, 103:7 & Empire [1] - 14:5 & 136:9, 136:10, & \(8: 15,43: 13,87: 9\), & extent [23]-56:5, \\
\hline Easter [1] - 129:18 & employee [6] - 80:25, & 136:17, 137:6 & 101:9 & \[
56: 9,60: 18,103: 2
\] \\
\hline eastern [1] - 104:25 & 81:15, 81:22, 81:24, & Environmental [1] - & examinations [1] - & 104:23, 106:24, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 96:7, 98:7, 98:11, } \\
& \text { 104:25, 143:14 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 61:17, } 63: 19 \\
\text { Grand }[1]-50: 6
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 17:23, 18:3, 93:18, } \\
& \text { 142:2, 142:8 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 117:2 } \\
& \text { helpful }[3]-146: 3,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { 40:5, 69:6, 69:9 } \\
\text { holidays [4]-49:19, }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline frustrated [1] - 38:4 & grant[2]-137:16, & handicapped [3] - & 146:21, 150:1 & 51:4, 53:5, 75:1 \\
\hline full [7]-32:1, 36:17, & 145:7 & 79:6, 92:15, 99:13 & herein [1]-153:5 & home [2] - 37:11, \\
\hline 36:22, 39:3, 64:7, & granted [7]-114:3, & handle (5) - 23:20, & high [8] - 117:11, & 103:13 \\
\hline 70:15, 100:23 & 114:7, 117:17, & 24:9, 25:1, 78:9, & 128:18, 132:8, & homes [2] - 70:2, \\
\hline full-time [1]-39:3 & 138:24, 141:19, & 136:15 & 138:2, 141:10, & 123:7 \\
\hline fully (2) - 24:1, 119:20 & 141:22, 142:18 & handled [1] - 28:5 & 142:15, 143:14 & hones [1]-69:18 \\
\hline function [5]-46:15, & granting [1] - 109:11 & handy \({ }^{[1]}\) - \(75: 10\) & higher [14] - 31:17, & honest (1] - 76:17 \\
\hline 78:13, 106:9, & gravel [5] - 75:23, & happy [g]-25:2, & 39:11, 47:16, 47:17, & honestly [1] - 78:7 \\
\hline 121:12, 128:16 & 78:21, 79:5, 104:15 & 25:14, 50:12, 50:22, & 50:18, 70:19, 122:3, & hope [1] - 65:8 \\
\hline functional [1]-128:16 & great [1]-51:4 & 52:21, 149:21, & 124:10, 124:14, & hopefully [2] - 65:8, \\
\hline FURTHER [1] - 153:6 & greater (4)-115:16, & 150:1, 150:2, 150:7 & 124:17, 125:7, & 82:12 \\
\hline future [1] - 117:5 & 122:3, 128:7, 135:9 & hard [3]-76:23, & 127:13, 130:8, 142:6 & hoping [1] - 145:14 \\
\hline & greatest \({ }_{[1]}\) - 135:15 & 88:11, 139:24 & highest [4] - 37:9, & horizontal (1]-135:6 \\
\hline G & Green (7)-2:19, 21:2, & harder \({ }_{[1]}\) - 49:21 & 70:5, 70:21, 146:12 & horse [1] -96:21 \\
\hline & 7:4, 85:24, & hardship [1] - 104 & highlight \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(67: 20\) & hot (2) - 71:20, 72:3 \\
\hline gable [1] - 12:17 & 46:7, 148:5 & haste [1] - 79:3 & highlighted [1] - 13:3 & hotels [ 1 - 16:1 \\
\hline gables [8] - 11:17, & green [15]-5:5, 5:10, & hatch [1]-15:25 & himself [1]-42:8 & hour [10]-92:22, \\
\hline 12:17, 13:3, 13:5, & 5:22, 5:23, 21:1, & hatches [4]-15:21, & hinder [1]-78:11 & 118:24, 142:19, \\
\hline 13:10, 13:19, 14:8 & 25:25, 26:5, 28:13, & 21:23, 22:8, 151:23 & hinge (1) - 48:9 & 145:14, 146:17, \\
\hline game [1] - 97:18 & 66:11, 83:10, 100:6, & hate [1]-42:4 & Hipolit [18]-2:18, 5:4, & 147:25, 148:17. \\
\hline gap (1)-98:5 & 102:21, 111:15, & head [2]-15:13, 57:10 & 5:10, 6:4, 6:14, 31:1, & 149:11 \\
\hline garage [1] - 56:10 & 151:8, 151:9 & headlight [2] - 66:7, & 32:13, 34:9, 55:16, & hours [2]-61:24, \\
\hline garbage [2] - 69:20, & GREEN [16] - 1:16, & 66:18 & 55:17, 67:17, 67:18, & 134:22 \\
\hline 136:5 & 6:1, 21:9, 21:13, & health [1]-122:20 & 68:14, 72:12, 82:20, & house [1] - 128:2 \\
\hline Gardens [1] - 124:15 & 21:16, 22:7, 23:8, & hear (10]-36:12, 52:9, & 83:10, 86:4, 100:6 & housing [21]-22:15, \\
\hline gathering \({ }_{[1]}\) - 15:8 & 23:11, 25:6, 25:17, & 95:6, 95:7, 145:16, & HIPOLIT [70]-1:14, & 22:19, 23:1, 24:24, \\
\hline general \({ }^{\text {[1] - 87:14 }}\) & 26:2, 53:7, 78:16, & 145:17. 145:18, & 5:17, 6:6, 6:10, 6:18, & 59:11, 60:10, 60:11, \\
\hline generally [2]-31:9, & 78:19, 79:4, 79:9 & 147:20, 149:8, 151:8 & 7:15, 7:18, 8:4, & :12, 83:4, 112:17, \\
\hline 143:21 & Green's [3]-95:2, & heard [7]-21:2, & 16:17, 32:1, 32:14, & 115:24, 116:10, \\
\hline generate [2]-118:21, & 103:20, 147:11 & 66:21, 68:17, 77:16, & 33:15, 33:19, 34:6, & 116:11, 116:15, \\
\hline 138:4 & grill \({ }^{\text {[2] }}\) - 14:24, 15:6 & 118:19, 127:7, & 34:11, 35:18, 36:1, & 117:3, 117:9, \\
\hline generator [10]-61:20, & grills [1]-14:22 & 148:18 & 38:21, 39:16, 40:7, & 125:24, 126:3, \\
\hline 61:21, 61:24, 62:5, & gross [2] - 83:18, & hearing [12]-3:16, & 40:10, 48:21, 49:23, & 138:6, 138:12, 139:4 \\
\hline 69:23, 70:4, 70:9, & 126:7 & 22:13, 27:20, 27:21, & 50:25, 52:7, 52:24, & hundred [1] - 39:19 \\
\hline 70:11, 70:23 & ground [6] - 9:10, & 27:22, 41:15, 42:4, & 53:23, 55:20, 63:24, & hundredth (1) - \\
\hline generator/ & 16:6, 32:18, 33:8, & 90:12, 145:25, & 4:5, 67:23, 68:15, & 106:14 \\
\hline transformer [1] - & 56:9, 84:11 & 148:15, 149:7, & 69:5, 69:18, 70:11, & Hutter [2] - 149:5, \\
\hline 69:20 & Grubbs [1]-110:23 & 152:13 & 70:25, 71:5, 71:15, & 150:22 \\
\hline generators [3]-61:25, & GRUBER [1] - 1:16 & hearings [3]-3:13, & 72:9, 72:16, 72:18, & HUTTER (4)-1:15, \\
\hline 69:24, 70:12 & guess [12]-14:9, & 102:18, 141:12 & 3:3, 73:9, 73:13, & 7:14, 7:20, 16:21 \\
\hline Giant [1] - 67:4 & 22:25, 33:19, 36:12, & heating [1] - 56:7 & 73:23, 74:5, 74:10, & \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { given }[7]-104: 17, \\
\text { 104:18, 119:21, }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 39: 10,57: 17,74: 13, \\
& 81: 20,83: 11,85: 20,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { heaviest }[2] \text { - 133:4, } \\
& 136: 1
\end{aligned}
\] & 74:23, 75:16, 75:22, 76:2, 76:10, 76:21, & I \\
\hline 130:4, 143:4, 143:12 & \[
140: 16,150: 20
\] & \[
\text { heavy [3] }-29: 16 \text {, }
\] & 76:24, 77:4, 77:9, & Id [11]-2:12, 2:14, \\
\hline glare \({ }^{\text {2 } 2}\) - \(66: 7,66: 18\) & guide [1]-63:4 & 29:21, 93:23 & 77:15, 78:5, 78:18, & 2:15, 2:17, 2:18, \\
\hline glasses [1] - 14:3 & Gus []] - 86:3 & height [24] - 16:5, & 9:18, 79:23, 80:5, & 2:19, 2:20, 2:21, \\
\hline goal [3]-49:17, 84:2, & guy [1] - 98:24 & 16:8, 21:19, 30:15 & 80:25, 81:11, 81:20, & 2:22, 2:23, 2:24 \\
\hline 138:6 & guys [4] - 40:10, & 31:10, 32:5, 32:6, & 32:4, 82:16, 88:13, & idea [2]-79:13, 126:1 \\
\hline goals [2]-137:20, & 40:18, 40:19, 75:5 & 35:5, 43:23, 44:1, & 95:22, 95:24 & identified [1]-17:8 \\
\hline 139:2 & & \[
44: 2,44: 8,58: 19,
\] & Hipolit's (4) - \(63: 8\), & identifies [1] - 42:8 \\
\hline God [1] - 100:20 & H & 71:2, 72:24, 72:25, & 63:16, 80:24, 102:22 & identify [1] - 73:10 \\
\hline Google [7]-46:25, & & 105:4, 107:20, & hit [1] - 49:18 & image [2] - 89:25, 90:1 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
87:25, 89:10, 89:16, \\
89:17, 89:20, 89:22
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Hahn }[1]-48: 11 \\
& \text { half }[5]-46: 6,46: 9 \text {, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 107:21, 131:20, } \\
& 143: 2,143: 3,143: 10
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\operatorname{Hog}_{[1]}-80: 10\) \\
hold [5] - 7:16, 64:9,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { imagine }(2)-40: 21, \\
& 147: 24
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline governing [3] - & 51:13, 92:22, 147:25 & heights [1] - \(35: 14\) & 70:19, 75:22 & immediate \\
\hline 109:12, 115:2, & hand [12] - 10:23, & held [4] - 69:7, 105:24, & holding [1] - 4:10 & 135:21 \\
\hline 137:17 & 11:10, 11:11, 13:8, & 110:12, 129:15 & holdings [1] - 103:8 & impact [18] - 57:21, \\
\hline grade [4]-44:5, 44:6, & 15:17, 16:2, 17:3, & help [2] - 100:20, & holiday [4] - 37:4, & \[
57: 24,66: 19,81: 12
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}


\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { mature }[3]-71: 18, \\
71: 19,136: 13
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 116:12, 134:15, } \\
& \text { 137:24, 141:13, }
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 50: 6,87: 19,92: 5, \\
& 101: 22,107: 12,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline maximum [11]-24:5, & 141:16, 142:21 & 107:18, 125:20, \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
24: 8,55: 10,56: 15
\] \\
\(57 \cdot 25,68: 25,91 \cdot 16\)
\end{tabular} & Mercedes [2]-1:8, 50:7 & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
136: 25,148: 21
\] \\
monument [3] -
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \[
92: 1,104: 12,106: 4
\] & met [1] - 120:8 & 105:16, 133:11, \\
\hline 107:6 & methods [1] - 78:14 & 133:21 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { McDowell (3) - 45:7, } \\
45: 24,48: 22
\end{gathered}
\] & MICHAEL [1]-2:5 midday [2] -68:22, & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { moreover }[3] \text { - 106:6, } \\
109: 10,125: 4
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline meals [1] - 122:19 & 91:11 & morning \({ }_{[1]}\)-69:3 \\
\hline mean (9)-23:8, 51:17, & middle [6] - 47:8, & most [16]-12:20, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& 52: 9,53: 9,54: 4, \\
& 76: 15,78: 6,81: 20,
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 49: 18,49: 21,62: 2, \\
& 92: 13,125: 9
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 25: 3,37: 6,52: 18 \\
& 66: 13,74: 20,74: 21
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 96:18 & Midland [1] - 87:20 & 74:22, 107:15, \\
\hline means [3] - 40:1, & midpoint [1] - 16:7 & 108:14, 127:17, \\
\hline 78:14, 121:7 & might [8] - 40:2, 42:4, & 128:25, 129:5, \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { meant (4) - 10:1, } \\
& 34: 19,76: 6,76: 8
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 79: 9,93: 22,96: 4 \\
& 99: 20,101: 23,114: 6
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 131:15, 134:17, } \\
& \text { 148:8 }
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { measurement }[1] \text { - } \\
& 105: 21
\end{aligned}
\] & Mike [7]-43:9, 43:14, 44:21, 46:16, 64:1, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { mostly }[2]-118: 25, \\
& 133: 24
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline mechanical (5) - & 64:2, 65:10 & Mother's [4]-50:19, \\
\hline 27:16, 28:2, 28:3, & mile [2] - 51:13, & 51:5, 52:18, 129:17 \\
\hline 30:2, 56:6 & 123:12 & motion [4]-41:16, \\
\hline mechanicals [3] - & mind [5] - 13:18, & 42:23, 86:25, 100:7 \\
\hline 26:7, 26:11, 29:8 & 60:15, 60:22, & Mount [1] - 22:24 \\
\hline median [1] - 125:9 & 127:18, 130:9 & move [12] - 19:19, \\
\hline Medici [3]-109:5, & minimis [1]-132:16 & 22:14, 22:21, 23:11, \\
\hline 109:6, 109:8 & minimum [6]-53:10, & 41:17, 42:25, 61:1, \\
\hline meet \((9)-32: 20\), & \[
53: 13,54: 5,89: 1
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 63: 17,63: 19,87: 1, \\
& 100: 9
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline 117:2, 127:3, & minimus [2]-106:24, & moved [5] - 16:16, \\
\hline 137:12, 138:21, & 139:14 & 16:17, 19:22, 36:15, \\
\hline 145:4 & Minno [2]-3:21, & 77:5 \\
\hline meeting [10]-30:12, & 44:18 & movement [2] - 3:4, \\
\hline 36:9, 83:9, 86:25, & minor [2] - 9:12, 62:25 & 134:20 \\
\hline 95:5, 100:8, 111:12, & minute [3]-82:21, & Moving \({ }_{[1]}\) - \(1: 5\) \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 149:3, 149:10, } \\
& \text { 152:12 }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
94:11, 112:25 \\
minutes [2] -92:21,
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { moving [3] - 17:24, } \\
& 18: 1,18: 3
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline meets [2]-23:16, & 146:17 & MR [225]-2:4, 2:6, \\
\hline 137:10 & Miss [2] - 90:9, 90:11 & 2:7, 2:9, 3:9, 4:8, \\
\hline member [2] - 3:10, & missed [1] - 19:23 & 4:11, 4:17, 5:1, 5:3, \\
\hline 15:2 & mistake (1) - 17:19 & 5:17, 5:19, 6:6, 6:7, \\
\hline members [12] - 10:3, & mix [2] - 9:13, 11:24 & \(6: 10,6: 12,6: 13\), \\
\hline 35:15, 41:22, 42:19, & \(\bmod (1)-23: 24\) & \(6: 14,6: 18,6: 19\), \\
\hline 55:14, 86:9, 91:12, & mode [1] - 96:22 & \(6: 25,7: 2,7: 4,7: 8\), \\
\hline 91:21, 92:21, & modified [2] -9:3, & 7:10, 7:12, 7:15, \\
\hline 148:16, 150:11, & 109:4 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 7:17, 7:18, 7:21, 8:2 } \\
& 8: 3,8: 4,8: 8,8: 15,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Members [6]-20:24, & modify [3] - 79:2, 79:3, 79:16 & 16:17, 16:22, 17:16, \\
\hline 55:18, 82:19, & mom [1]-51:1 & 17:18, 17:21, 20:13, \\
\hline 145:17, 148:7, 151:9 & money [1] - 127:11 & 20:17, 20:22, 21:14, \\
\hline memory [8]-12:4, & monitor [2] - 24:25, & 22:5, 23:3, 23:13,
\[
24: 13,24: 18,24: 21
\] \\
\hline 12:7, 12:9, 17:25, & 48:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 24: 13,24: 18,24: 21, \\
& 24: 24,25: 3,25: 14,
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { 18:2, 28:19, 28:20, } \\
& 140: 4
\end{aligned}
\] & monitoring [1] - 48:4 & 25:18, 28:9, 28:14, \\
\hline mention [1] - 138:7 & \[
\text { month }[2]-2
\] & 28:18, 28:22, 28:25, \\
\hline mentioned [14] - & monthly [1] - 24:19 & 29:3, 29:6, 29:25, \\
\hline 69:10, 72:13, 89:9,
90:17, 90:21, 93:4, & MONTVALE [1] - 1:1 & \(30: 4,30: 11,30: 19\),
\(30: 22,30: 25,31: 4\), \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
90:17, 90:21, 93:4, \\
111:24, 116:3,
\end{tabular} & Montvale \([13 \mathrm{l}\) - \(1: 8\), & \[
31: 20,31: 25,32: 1,
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

32:7, 32:11, 32:14, 33:15, 33:19, 34:3, 34:6, 34:11, 34:18, 35:1, 35:3, 35:18, 36:1, 36:14, 37:18, 38:21, 39:10, 39:16, 39:18, 40:7, 40:10, 40:21, 41:3, 41:18, 42:10, 42:15, 43:8, \(43: 10,43: 13,48: 21\), 49:14, 49:23, 50:8, 50:25, 52:4, 52:7, 52:8, 52:24, 53:23, 53:24, 55:20, 55:22, 55:25, 60:4, 61:4, 61:5, 63:24, 64:5, 64:12, 64:15, 67:13, 67:23, 68:15, 69:5, 69:18, 70:7, 70:11, 70:24, 70:25, 71:5, 71:9, 71:12, 71:13, 71:15, 72:9, 72:16, 72:18, 73:3, 73:9, 73:13, 73:23, 74:5, 74:10, 74:23, 75:16, 75:22, 76:2, 76:10, 76:21, 76:24, 77:4, 77:9, 77:15, 78:5, 78:18, 79:18, 79:23, 80:5, 80:17, 80:19, 80:23, 80:25, 81:11, 81:17, 81:20, 82:4, 82:16, 82:23, 83:2, 83:12, 83:21, 83:25, 84:10, 84:16, 85:2, 85:9, 85:12, 85:19, 85:23, 86:4, 86:9, 86:16, 86:19, 87:1, 87:8, 87:9, 88:8, 88:10, 88:13, 88:15, 92:9, 92:10, 92:11, 92:12, 94:22, 95:9, 95:16, 95:22, 95:24, 100:2, 100:9, 100:16, 100:18, 100:22, 101:1, 101:9, 145:12, 145:22, 145:25, 147:1, 147:5, 147:9, 147:14, 147:23, 148:11, 149:12, 149:18, 150:15, 150:25, 151:4, 151:13, 151:18, 152:6, 152:10
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