

Block 2802 Lot 2 Qualifier C001A & C001B – Montvale Development Associates II. LLC – Mercedes Drive and Grand Avenue West – Application for Amended PUD Approval; Amended Phase II Preliminary Site Plan Approval; Final Site Plan Approval; Use Variance for Medical Offices and Soil Movement Approval

Chairman: Okay, Montvale Development Associates, anyone from Montvale Development here?

Andy Del Vecchio: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Andy Del Vecchio is present on behalf of the applicant Montvale Development Associates.

Chairman: Okay, and Mr. Del Vecchio, do you have any witnesses with you this evening?

Andy Del Vecchio: I do, Mr. Chairman.

Male Speaker: Can I ask Erica first, she – are the notices in order?

Erica: Yes.

Male Speaker: Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Andy Del Vecchio.

Andy Del Vecchio: In terms of witnesses this evening are Mike Dipple, Jamie Pat, Trine Rodriguez (Phonetic) and Richard Price.

Female Speaker: Okay, very good. Are they all online at this time?

Andy Del Vecchio: I believe they are all present, although I can't see all the Hollywood squares as they're being promoted.

Erica: Am I missing, I have, I think I'm missing one.

Andy Del Vecchio: Trine Rodriguez, Parker Rodriguez and Richard Price is there, so.

Chairman: Andy, will you be ordering a transcript for this?

Andy Del Vecchio: If you'd like me to I can. If you don't want an official transcript like a stenographer one but audio service, they're relatively inexpensive and I'm happy to order one for you. They're not always as perfect as a Court Stenographer one but they're very good.

Male Speaker: I prefer not to have to waste time listening to hours and hours of audio. If the witnesses would just go slow so I can prepare a halfway decent resolution that would be helpful.

Andy Del Vecchio: We'll do that, and if at the end of the meeting we are too hyped up on our caffeine. I'll be happy to order the, what I call the quick turnaround transcript if I can get to you in less than a week.

Chairman: And I'm going to ask all the witnesses as well as the Borough professionals that are going to testify to unmute themselves. Mike Deco if you on mute, Richard you're good, James Trine, can you unmute yourself? Good. I think that that's it. And Mr. Regan, could you swear in the witnesses and the Borough...

Male Speaker: We got to swear everyone in [indiscernible] [02:53:41].

Chairman: Why don't we swear them all in and we'll get that done with.

Male Speaker: Everyone raise your right hands including Ms. Green and Mr. Hipolit. Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you'll give [indiscernible] [02:53:52]? Thank you.

Chairman: Okay, very good. And with that said, I'm going to first go to Mr. Del Vecchio to give an introduction with respect to this application.

Andy Del Vecchio: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman, I had a scary revelation this afternoon as I was preparing this application and realize that we're here tonight to complete something that we started nearly a decade ago. The resolution granting approval to Phase one on this application was adopted in July of 2014 and several years prior to that resolution, the concept plans, the ordinance and all the work that led up to the ultimate resolution of approval were taking place.

So, a decade later we're here to finish what we started and I think we have the benefit as we do this with a little bit of hindsight. When we walked into opening up the bureau farms for redevelopment obviously nobody wanted to see the farm loss and that brought a lot of fear interpretation. We had a lot of public participation concerning about what was going to be and what might be on that center.

And I think all of us now have the benefit of looking at the center in Phase one and seeing what it has been, what it is and what it still is evolving to be as a shining beacon of what redevelopment can be. And I point to it in many communities when I appear there as an example of what good planning can produce when there are willing partners on both sides of the equation.

And we're here this evening to finish that vision and just to put some of the technicalities in place, obviously the applicant is Montvale Development Associates too, LLC. The property has blocked 2802 [indiscernible] [02:56:01], qualifier 1A and 1B, the specific property that we are looking at for Phase two is located at the corner of Philips Parkway and Grand Avenue.

The Phase two portion of the property is 2.86 acres in size, the phase one portion was and remains 22.93 acres in size which puts the total project at 25.79 acres. The property is owned in the burrows AHPUD zone and yes, this was a PUD approval which included another piece of property on summit avenue which was to produce affordable housing in connection with the development of this site as required under the Phase one approvals, that property was ultimately turned over or transferred to the burrow of Montvale for the production of affordable housing. So, the technical applications that we are here in front of you tonight consists of an amended PUD, and amended preliminary and final site plan approval. A use variance to allow a portion of one of the two proposed buildings to be built on Phase two to be used for a medical use.

A soil moving permit to move approximately 49,000 cubic yards of soil, several see variances, mostly relating to one of a familiar one that also appeared in Phase, one which is having five feet of landscaping between face of building and edge of sidewalk and many of the balance of the variances pertaining to signage related to each of the proposed uses on the property. The second use on the property which I haven't mentioned yet is for proposed building H, and building H is proposed, is approximately 12,913 sq feet in size and is proposed to be occupied by a daycare center by the name of Ever Broke Academy.

Day care centers for those who are not familiar with the statute are permitted use by state statute and all commercial zones within the state. And this as such would become a permitted use at this location. To put the overall center again into perspective, Phase one consisted of approximately 206,055 sq feet of floor area consisting predominantly of the [indiscernible] [02:58:41] with another 66,000 [indiscernible] [02:58:43] of lifestyle retail. Phase two, we'll have this 12,913 sq feet of daycare center, and 5500, I'm sorry 5000 square feet of medical use, and the remaining building I of approximately 5533 square feet is presently unleashed but proposed to be used at this point from one of the many permitted use is allowed in the AHPUD Zone.

With that said I'd like to pre mark some exhibits to facilitate the testimony going in this evening and with the chair and the fourth attorney's permission, I would propose the following marking.

Chairman: Please.

Andy Del Vecchio: A1 would be the affidavit of notice. A2 are the site plans prepared by L2A consisting of 20 sheets bearing the last revision date of March 26, 2021. A3 is the landscape plans prepared by Parker Rodriguez consisting of five sheets bearing the last revision date of 3/26/2021. A4 are the architectural plans prepared by JP2. Three sheets bearing the date of 3/26/2021. A5 is the amended EIS prepared by L2A bearing the last revision date of 3/26/21. A6 is the preliminary water report prepared by L2A, bearing a date of December 4, 2020.

A7 is the sewer capacity report prepared by L2A, bearing a date of 12/4/2020. A8 is the storm water management report prepared by L2A, bearing a date of 12/4/2020. A9 is the storm water maintenance manual prepared by L2A, bearing a date of 12/4/20. A10 Dolan and Dean letter, rate trip generation dated November 20, 2020. A11 is a resolution of approval for Phase-one adopted by the Montvale Planning Board on July 15, 2014. And last but not least is A12, a reply letter prepared by L2A, dated 3/26/2020 consisting of five pages.

Chairman: [Indiscernible] [03:01:40] were you able to follow Mr. Del Vecchio on this one?

Male Speaker: I think I have most of it Mr. Chairman.

Andy Del Vecchio: I'll be happy to send you my typed-up version after it gets typed tomorrow Mr. Regan.

Male Speaker: Fine, thank you.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. And again, in the interest of time, I think we should mark into evidence, board exhibits in case any of your witnesses, why is it necessary to refer to them. And I guess we marked into evidence already as B1, notices is that correct Bob?

Bob: That's A1 Ms. Chairman.

Chairman: The notices?

Bob: Yeah, that was Del Vecchio...

Chairman: I'm sorry. And we have a technical review letters from Colliers Police Department, Fire Department, you know what? We'll deal with them as we, as we hear testimony. So with that said, Mr. Del Vecchio, why don't you continue and introduce your first witness?

Andy Del Vecchio: Yes, I'd like to start with Mike Depo (Phonetic), our project engineer. Mike you were sworn, Mr. Chairman again...

Mike Depo: Previously qualified in the last application.

Andy Del Vecchio: Thank you, Mr. Depo you were previously except as an expert in the field of civil engineering. You heard my marking of exhibits many of them relating to the entity identified as L2A, those documents were prepared by you or under your supervision?

Mike Depo: They were yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: And you prepared the Phase-one engineering plans that gave rise to Phase-one?

Mike Depo: Yes I did.

Andy Del Vecchio: And not to throw you a curveball, but how did you think Phase-one came out?

Mike Depo: I like it, I go there often, I'm excited to see north market, so very excited.

Andy Del Vecchio: So originally planned for Phase-two was, what was generically referred to as a garden centre that obviously has not come to pass and the plans have evolved into what is being presented this evening correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: And when we presented the Phase-one drawings, we did produce traffic testimony from Dolan and Dean and that testimony included all of the anticipated traffic generation from both Phase-one and Phase-two correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: Now can you tell the board, give us a general overview of the current existing condition of the Phase-two property and then what is proposed to take place if these plans are approved?

Mike Depo: So Phase-two is completely vacant, it sits to the east of the back of the wagons and the detention basin. It was used as a staging area for some of the construction, there is an access way which comes off of Phillips, it's just a stone access way right now which gets you up to the higher elevations. The property slopes heavily from Phillips's northward, I'm sorry westward up toward the back of the wagons.

Chairman: Mr. Del Vecchio, could someone share their screen? So as we're going through site plan pages, the public would have a better opportunity to see?

Andy Del Vecchio: Sure, absolutely. Mike are you able to start with your site plan set?

Mike Depo: I can, I can start with the set if you'd like, let me just get to the first page here.

Andy Del Vecchio: Yeah please.

Mike Depo: Okay. And this is effectively what we marked as A2 previously.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, so Mike why don't we flip to the existing condition sheet which I'm not sure it's the second or third sheet in this set.

Mike Depo: Okay, it's the third sheet shows the blow up of the property in question. This is Phase-two, the remaining 2.86 acres of land that is undeveloped as part of [indiscernible] [03:06:05] farm, the shops at [indiscernible] [03:06:06] farm.

Andy Del Vecchio: And as you describe the area that with the dark lines and what looks like a series of triangles coming out towards the left side of the page are the outlets into the detention basin from Phase-one correct?

Mike Depo: Yeah, that's correct. Over here on the left side that's, that's existing conditions and everything here is existing I'm sorry. That's the constructive detention basin, the manmade detention, these dark lines are actually the walking path of the sidewalks which wrap around the basin and the Long Grand Avenue.

Andy Del Vecchio: Let's turn the page now and start with proposed conditions if we can.

Mike Depo: I got to get through a couple, so there you go.

Andy Del Vecchio: This is sheet six?

Mike Depo: This is sheet C06 entitled Phase-two site plan, and it is the current date, I'm sorry I think it's 3/26, my apologies.

Andy Del Vecchio: Correct, so if you would walk the board through what is proposed and put some meaning to my opening remarks about building H and building I and where they are and how this all lays out.

Mike Depo: Okay, so this is the layout that that the team came up with. So you'll see West Grand Avenue, it's not shown that, the name is not shown on this sheet, but this is West Grand Avenue. At the top of the page Phillips parkway, to the right you have building H which is the daycare center, this L-shaped building which is in the west most side of the site. North is up on this page is almost true north.

And then you have commercial building I which is closer to the intersection of West Grand Avenue and Phillips parkway, access off Phillips parkway to the southeast corner of the property. When you enter the site, you have the opportunity to turn right, if you're going to commercial building, I or you can go straight if you want to go to the daycare building age.

There are 117 parking spaces on the site, 49 here in the top, another nine here facing a commercial building I and then the remainder 19 here in front of the, just to the east of the daycare building, 23 parking spaces in front of building I and then 17 here on the south side of the property as you enter, so that's 117 total. Behind building H, the daycare center is the play area for the children, it's the outdoor play area, it's all fenced in and whatnot.

And you can see the access driveways coming up from Phillips Parkway, you take a right or northbound and you could access these parking spaces continue on to larger space, there's a larger parking lot there's also access from the front of building H over to building I, the commercial building. And then of course, the exits I described earlier back out to the main drive to Philips parkway. Loading for building I is on the west side of the building and there's some pedestrian access throughout, that's an overview I think of the layout.

Andy Del Vecchio: Mike if we can, let's just talk about a couple of those features in a little bit more detail. The parking in terms of the quantum and the size of the spaces, those fully conform with the requirements of the zoning, correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct, yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: And the school or daycare center as it was laid out was laid out in such a manner to provide a courtyard or a contained area formed by two legs of the building to provide a safe and secure area to the rear of the building where the children can exit the school building and play safe and away from any kind of parking or vehicular access taking place?

Mike Depo: Yeah, that's correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: And despite that lay out the intended pedestrian walking path that were part of the original concept for this plan they will remain intact and continue to function as originally envisioned, correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct, yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: The primary access to the daycare building occurs where on this plan?

Mike Depo: The primary access is in the northeast corner, I'm going to zoom in and that is, at this location that I'm highlighting here with the hand, there are doorways here, you can see that the brick sidewalk area gets a little bit wider and you can see some elements of the building here which you'll hear more about the architecture, but it's this northeast corner.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, now with regard to the building I or the commercial building, approximately half of that building is proposed to be utilized by a medical use correct?

Mike Depo: Yeah, that's correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: And as you understand that that medical use is essentially Montvale spine and health along with its sub user or sister user, a brain center who will share the same space and provide medical services in that same space correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct, yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: And the primary access for that use, that medical use will occur where on building I?

Mike Depo: The primary use would be right in the front, currently it's designed with a series of doorways. I see four here in the front, there are more about it from the architecture. And then of course, we already mentioned the loading area in the back which is not the primary entrance but that's another entrance way, we have a few emergency egress in the back. But it's generally faced to the south toward the 23-car parking lot in front.

Andy Del Vecchio: So the front of the building, so to speak faces inward to the parking lot correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: And the portion of the building that faces the Grand Avenue, can you just give the board some general testimony as to the grading, any retaining walls in that area and how that views from the street?

Mike Depo: Yeah, you know Andy, can I go to the rendering? It's a little easier with [indiscernible] [03:12:35] colors yeah, all right. I'm going to switch over to a colored rendering and you want to mark it?

Andy Del Vecchio: Yes, let's mark it as A13 and it's a colored, colored rendering of which sheet Mike?

Mike Depo: It is also sheet C06 entitled Phase-two site plan. We added the color and we brought the landscaping in from the landscape plan. And that's all depicted here in color also.

Andy Del Vecchio: All right, so if you could describe that area that I was just referring you to along the back of the building I or the front of building I that faces Grand Avenue?

Mike Depo: Right, so long building I it's consistent with the back of the sidewalk, so the highest point on Grand Avenue consistent here would be over here on the northwest corner of the building in the back behind the loading, and we do have, we do have some great difference. I'll show you the grading comparing the parking lot to Grand Avenue, the sidewalk.

But essentially the building forms part of that great differential from the corner to the back. And then, as we move to the left side we have a series of stairways to bring you down from Grand Avenue down into the site, and so this portion here at this location is lower which is consistent with the front of the building and it transitions up around the parking lot.

This parking over here, these nice spaces are slightly higher than the loading areas, so we have a small great change or great differential between that area down to the loading, and it's carried through by this retaining wall. But in the back, it's fairly consistent with the sidewalk in the rear. The highest point being of the building compared to Grand Avenue would be this back right-hand corner, so to speak. I could flip to the grading plan if you want to see that so I can put some numbers on it.

Andy Del Vecchio: Let's do that.

Mike Depo: Let's, so here we have the building at 298 and I mentioned the building kind of forms the finished floor 298. The building kind of supports part of the slope as I alluded to as you go to the west. We have the side walk, the walk away which is their elevation 308. And then you can see the grade here in the parking lot is about 304, so we only have about a four-foot relative grade change between the sidewalk and the parking area. As I mentioned this parking area here which is 304, 303 again slightly higher than the loading area which is down around 298, so you do see a little bit of a retaining wall here supporting the loading area.

And then you know the building at 298. Here I guess in the back right hand corner is where we're most consistent with the grade, where 298 I'm getting a grade here about 299, 98 in the back corner. So that that sidewalk is existing, so we're going to fit this site in, and it's kind of driven by the access off of Phillips parkways to come in off Phillips, you can see that we're increasing the grade relatively steep but we don't have any parking in that area. And then as the grade kind of levels out, we get into the parking area and that's that services the front of the building.

Andy Del Vecchio: All right, so Mike if we can flip back, I'll ask you a few more questions and we'll try to walk through this.

Mike Depo: I'm sorry can you say it again and you get closer.

Andy Del Vecchio: Yes, can you flip back to the colored cheat and then I'll walk you through a few more questions. Yeah, now in terms of the parking area and the crosswalks and all that good stuff, the ordinance had required bike racks and electrical vehicle charging stations or any additional of either of those required for this Phase-two?

Mike Depo: Yes, according to the planning letter we require two point something like spaces I believe and I think we are we're going to provide those if I'm correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, are they currently on the drawings or will they be added?

Mike Depo: I think they are on the revised plans. If I'm not mistaken, I don't remember if we reply to, we got the engineering letter and we reply to that. If they're not on the plan, I will make sure they're on the plan.

Andy Del Vecchio: And the same thing with the electrical vehicle charging stations?

Mike Depo: That's correct, yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, now in terms of lighting of this area, how is that proposed, is it the same lighting that's used above or is it a different lighting plan?

Mike Depo: We have, we have site lighting proposed. I can flip to the lighting plan real quick here which is sheet C, sorry CO8, so we're proposing these small black fixtures here referred to as the independence and they provide the site lighting throughout and you can see them marked here with the letter C and the D. These are different just illumination patterns, so those lights are consistent throughout the parking area. And then we have some building mounted lights shown here, these would be kind of back a house and loading area type lights, the sconce and then we have a few of these that the architect has chosen which are to illuminate some of the signs and the sidewalk and whatnot.

Andy Del Vecchio: And these lighting pictures are all consistent with the ones that were used in Phase-one?

Mike Depo: Yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, there is in the back of the daycare building area, a proposed concrete pad to be installed, correct?

Mike Depo: It's, I think you're referring to the one in the front over here while the back left, this one here? Yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: And there's nothing proposed at the current time to be installed on that pad, correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct, that is for future use by the daycare if they choose as is shown on the plans for a potential shed, but that shed is not being proposed under this application.

Andy Del Vecchio: And if and when the structure is proposed for that pad it would be applied for and permitted in accordance with the requirements of the barrow Montvale?

Mike Depo: Yeah, that's correct. From what I understand, it may not be always necessary but the pad is required, so if down the road they need that shed space they would have to come in and apply for that.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay. In terms of the EIS, we did label the EIS report as an amended EIS, is it your opinion or your testimony that the EIS conditions from the original overall project to current date have

not substantially changed. And if they have changed various cleanup items have taken place to playing the site into greater conformance with the environmental requirements that are imposed?

Mike Depo: Yeah, I think. I think that's a good way to say that, the environmental impact statement we put together is consistent here, we have a consistent use not, not so much the use we have you know what we have the medical, there is medical now. The city MD upon Phase-one, so I guess you could say it's a consistent use, consistent layout access functions relatively the same when you get into aesthetics and things like that, and it's very consistent with that.

You'll see from the architect, the buildings that are proposed here are very consistent with what we have up there. A lot of the features that are proposed on the site like the walkways and things like that are consistent. So yeah, I think the EIS would apply. And it has been amended but basically comes to the same conclusions on Phase-two as it did for Phase-one.

Andy Del Vecchio: In the primary EIS flag [indiscernible] [03:21:47] has been addressed by the remediation requirements in Phase-One and the removal of the soil stockpile on Phase-two, correct?

Mike Depo: Yes. Andy, I just asked maybe just get a little closer to the mic so I can hear the question, that's all.

Andy Del Vecchio: Will do, sorry, all right, with regard to drainage on the site for storm water management, Mike how's that proposed to occur or be addressed?

Mike Depo: So consistent with Phase-one, we have a large portion of this site is pervious pavement, and you can see that here on the site plan, it's probably best shown on this page with this dotted hatch. So if you look at this whole site here, this whole parking area I should say, this whole parking area except for the steep slopes areas, excuse me, steep sloped driveway areas, it's all pervious pavement. And then in addition to that, we have an underground detention system to try to meet our reduction requirements. And that is shown here in this parking lot.

So, I'm not going to bore you with the details but essentially everything drains here gets held, the pervious pavement does some of the work and then it discharges out into Phillips parkway which is consistent to where it always flowed to begin with. So this really is very close to the way we had it conceptually designed under the Phase-one application which we sought preliminary site plan approval. So really, nothing has really changed. It's just been kind of engineered with the new use.

Andy Del Vecchio: And Mike, with regard to the drainage system, it meets or exceeds all the requirements of Montvale storm water management ordinance, and are the storm water management regulations of the state?

Mike Depo: Absolutely, we believe so, we've got comments from an engineer, but I think that you know we are, we are very much consistent with those requirements, so.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, now with regard to access from the site, I think we've already covered this but I want to be very explicit about it. The only means of vehicular access in or out of the site is from Phillips parkway?

Mike Depo: Yeah, that's correct. Right here in the southeast corner.

Andy Del Vecchio: And Phase-two is not connected to Phase-one by means of a vehicular connection, correct?

Mike Depo: That's correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: It is connected obviously by the series of walkways that you made reference to in your overview of the project?

Mike Depo: Yes, and they're shown here on the plan, yep.

Andy Del Vecchio: And the phase to access point that's depicted on these plans is essentially the same access point that was proposed when the PUD concept plan was presented?

Mike Depo: That's correct, furthest from the intersection, yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: And really that is practically the only real location where that access point can be located correct?

Mike Depo: Correct, due to the grating and the current access on West Grand Avenue that is the only access point.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, well I'm sure Ms. Rodriguez may cover in greater detail, there are several accessory structures that are proposed like the Pergola and the windmill that are proposed to tie this under, tie this Phase-two parts of the project to phase one, can't just point out where those exist on your site plan?

Mike Depo: Yes, and I zoomed in, so I am near the northeast corner of the entrance to the daycare center and as I mentioned, you have that access way that pedestrian sidewalk area from West Grand Avenue directly into the front of this building. You know that that act pedestrian access way continues over to the commercial building, but right here where you cross into this landscaped island, the applicant is proposing a windmill and a pergola here you know again, very consistent with Phase-one. And so, I think that's one of the biggest features there are, a couple other things like trash collection. But I think in terms of architecturally that's really where it all takes place.

Andy Del Vecchio: Mike, I know there was a question raised in one of the review letters about the crosswalks, can you just review what the materials or the proposal is for the crosswalks?

Mike Depo: Yeah, the crosswalk that was referred to as the Phillips, the crosswalk here at the driveway to Phillips. And if you go to uh phase one and especially coming in off of Mercedes drive, you'll notice a lot of stone textured brown crosswalks keeping with that farm style. And that that would be installed here at this crosswalk that I'm showing on my screen, the access way to Phillips parkway, and that would be consistent with the Phase-one stone look and color.

Andy Del Vecchio: There are internal sidewalks proposed on this layout that only are consistent of striping, is that correct?

Mike Depo: Yeah that's correct, these are the crosswalks that I refer to coming in off of West Grand Avenue to the corner of the building and then back over here to the commercial building I.

Andy Del Vecchio: Now for the board's benefit, you know it's the applicant's belief that the ordinance doesn't require what I will dubbed the enhanced sidewalk treatment or crosswalk treatment in these areas. But if it's something the board wishes us to consider, we will be guided by the board's direction on that. Mike, can we switch to building signage for a moment and just review the details of the proposed building mounted science for this project?

Chairman: Why don't, I'm got to interrupt you Mr. Del Vecchio, why don't we leave the signs to last. Let's deal with more of the site details.

Andy Del Vecchio: Sure, Mike there is adequate water and sewer capacity to treat this project and service project?

Mike Depo: Yes.

Andy Del Vecchio: And do you believe that the layout is consistent with the Phase-one approvals?

Mike Depo: I believe so yes, access points and circulation, I believe so.

Andy Del Vecchio: And the variance that is triggered by not having a 5-foot landscape area at the base of the building as it pertains to the school building, do you find that a five-foot landscape area would be appropriate adjacent to a school building?

Mike Depo: I don't think so, I don't think it would be. I have, the building is very attractive, I know the board is not seeing the building yet but there's a lot of, a lot of features on the building. It works with this sidewalk that we discussed earlier having five feet of landscaping in front of it, especially with all these doorway breaks on this building here for all of the egress and what not. It just really wouldn't, I don't think it would really work. We do have a lot of landscaping around the building where it is possible in the area here to the south even here at the corner in the front to form this little kind of standing area or queuing area, whatever you want to call it at the corner of the building.

And then in terms of, I'm going to move on to the commercial building Andy, I know [indiscernible] [03:29:41] school but I think it's the same and we dealt with this at Phase-one with the lifestyle center buildings where you know with the way this site functions, with the parking and then access to these different doorways having the landscaping in the front, whether or not it you know it seems appropriate. I don't really believe so, we don't really see that on these style commercial buildings, retail buildings, but again we're not proposing it here we think it functions better this way.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay since landscaping is going to be left to Ms. Rodriguez, I'm going to conclude my direct questions of Mr. Depo and make them available to the board and its professionals for your questions.

Chairman: Okay, very good, thank you. Yeah, before I opened it up to board members for questions, I would like to first mark into evidence as the board exhibit the colliers engineer, report dated March 4, 2021 prepared by Andrew [indiscernible] [03:31:02] and Mr. Del Vecchio, do you have a copy of that report?

Andy Del Vecchio: I do, thank you Ms. Chairman.

Chairman: And we're going to mark that into evidence Bob?

Bob: B1.

Chairman: As B1. And I'm going to start with Mr. Hipolit. Number one, do you have any questions based on the testimony we heard this evening from Mr. Dibble. This would be your opportunity to ask them. And secondly, I'm going to ask you to summarize your technical review letter of March 4th.

Hipolit: So, I only have, only have one question for Mr. Dibble. Mr. Dibble from the new driveway onto Phillip Parkway to the signal, we're going to expect that during construction as we paved Phillip Parkway that the access point for all construction heads in that direction. The developer currently is moving solo site in that direction and your sites also need to start that. We pave that under a DOT grant last year. So, we just ask that you guys agree to repave that after your construction.

Dibble: I don't know if that's a question for me, but I would say that I fully understand the concern. Especially if it was paved under a local aid grant, we want to preserve it. But I think it's a question for the applicant.

Andy Del Vecchio: Mr. Dibble, if I could jump in. This is Andy Del Vecchio, my understanding is that that portion in front of this property was not paid at that time, am I correct?

Dibble: So, we, it was paved on in conjunction with the signal project. We may have stopped it but still needs to be repaid from where we ended and where the signal project is. So, you'll need to repave that section.

Andy Del Vecchio: That's where I was headed. I thought there was a section across the front of this property that was not paved to allow the soil moving to occur with the understanding that we would address it as part of the Phase II of this project. And if that is in fact, what we're talking about the answers are simply, yes.

Dibble: Okay, great.

Male Speaker: Could we delineate on the plan we have in front of it, that area.

Male Speaker: Yeah, good, Bob, it would be from the, it would be from the southern property line of their property to the intersection.

Male Speaker: To the intersection of grant.

Male Speaker: Right. And then Mr. Dibble last question. Be handicapped ramp, but you're corner you're building, are you leaving that there because it's brand new?

Dibble: I'm sorry, the corner of which building?

Male Speaker: Phillips and Grand.

Dibble: Oh, yeah, I think we're showing it and showing it as existing to remain.

Male Speaker: And that's funny it was redone and we don't really need to redo it, I'm just making sure you're tight in.

Dibble: That's a bonus then.

Male Speaker: Yeah, okay so Mr. Chairman as far as my letter, so the applicant has submitted revised plans based on this letter. They're trying to address most of our comments, so I would I would find it at least, if you're okay with more productive if we issue a second letter before the next hearing on the new plans because it's going to address the majority's comments.

Chairman: Okay. Okay, with that said I'm going to open it up for questions from board members. Okay. And I guess we will now start with Mr. Culhane [*Phonetics*]. Mr. Culhane, you heard the testimony of Mr. Dibble and the comments by Mr. Hipolit. Do you have any questions at this time?

Culhane: I have one thing. I am curious about is the exiting from the commercial building. Is there sufficient room for a person stopping at the stop bar from cars entering in, do they have enough sight distance for cars coming in on Phillip Parkway?

Chairman: Mr. Dibble, could you respond to that?

Dibble: Yeah, I'm looking at it. So, I'm sorry Mr. Culhane, you're concerned about if a vehicle comes in this direction and stops here, correct. Will they?

Culhane: Is there a conflict with the cars, they have enough sight distance.

Dibble: Okay.

Culhane: Range from Phillips Parkway.

Dibble: So, if they make a left and someone's coming into the right is that I think – okay, okay so, I understand now. So looking back in this direction, would they be able to make a safe maneuver and be okay. So yeah, I think that's a, I think that's a good point to be able to look at this landscaping to ensure that if someone season opening here and they moved in this direction, you know, they will have the time. I think making this turn and coming up and starting to rise up the hill, you're going to be confronted here with someone making a fairly quick move.

I think it can be done safely Mr. Culhane, I would like to take a look at the landscape and make sure that that's a very good comment that we give them a little more sight distance looking back onto Phillips Parkway.

Culhane: Comments at this time Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you. Mrs. Curry.

Councilmember Curry: No comments.

Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Zitelli, Bob, you got a unmuted.

Bob: There we go, I didn't realize it turned it off. Okay, I want to follow up on Mr. Culhane. It does seem to me that maybe we should be looking at the circulation and in the site itself here Mr. Dibble. You know, I'm no traffic expert here but just feels like you know somebody coming in to the site maybe they should be forced to go to the right and the circulation should be, you know, in that way.

And anybody leaving the site would have to come from the bottom part of this drawing here out onto to Phillips. Just something to consider I think, and tell me about the, you know, so you don't have to answer that one now. But that's just I'd love you guys to look at that. Tell us about the windmill that's going in there, I'm just real curious about that. Is that meant to generate electricity or is this just?

Dibble: Unfortunately, no. I, it's, there is another windmill on the site. It's supposed to be consistent with that. It's very much [overlapping conversation] [03:38:21] would be nice. Okay.

Bob: And maybe this is a question for the architect. But what's the, are you looking at doing any kind of solar panels on the top of these buildings here?

Dibble: That would be for the architect.

Bob: [Indiscernible] [03:38:43] architect. Okay.

Dibble: I'm not aware of any right now, so.

Bob: Okay, all right, I'm done here Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. Moving on, Mr. Stefanelli

Stefanelli: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I don't have any questions at this point. I just, I'm just concerned about circulation also, you know, so that's -- I thought we talked originally about a secondary exit out of here at one point or emergency exit. I thought.

Chairman: I don't recall that but I certainly will defer to anyone else on that [indiscernible] [03:39:27].

Male Speaker: Yeah, I could jump in. So, I would say frank, we were against the second point of access because it would have been the Grand Avenue, and we had met with the county and they did not

want another point of access. Early, early on we talked about the point of access on the southern side connecting but degrade made it impossible. So, this...

Male Speaker: I remember having a conversation and I thought we were going to extend the, that's all we talked about extending that that laying down from the center. But I'm okay because it is steep there.

Male Speaker: You couldn't do that anymore, not basically designed to have.

Male Speaker: No further questions for me, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you, Mayor Ghassali.

Mayor Ghassali: Yeah, for the daycare center. The daycare center that we have in town now I see them and maybe you just because of COVID, there is a drop off location where cars pull up, they drop off the kids, someone comes out picks them and the car just circle out again. And I don't know if it's just COVID related or it's a practice. Just something to keep in mind, I don't see how this would happen if this was the case here.

Andy Del Vecchio: Mayor Ghassali, this is Andy Del Vecchio did have a conversation with the operations folks at ever broke to discuss their drop off and pick up procedures both COVID and non-COVID. They do require the parent, guardian, childcare, representative to park, walk the child to the door, they're checked in at the door, not at the curb. So, there's not a, what I'll call a rolling school line. They do still have to park both COVID and non-COVID and bring the child to the door.

Male Speaker: Okay, that's what I have. Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you. Mr. Huseynov [*Phonetics*].

Male Speaker: I don't have too many comments. The only concern like other board members expressed is about the circulation especially given the fact of the daycare building, so possibility of exploring another entrance. So, that's the only comment.

Chairman: Okay, very good, thank you. Mr. Teagno [*Phonetics*].

Teagno: Yes. There's several one question. If the board decided that it wanted to enforce the inclusion of a five ft landscape bed between the sidewalk and the buildings, what would be the effect of the impact on the design and functionality of the buildings?

Chairman: Yes, Mr. Dibble, can you answer that?

Dibble: Yeah. Well, I think as I alluded to on the daycare, I'll take each one you know we would have, have a five ft landscaped area to be broken up by a series of doors, it's just the way the building functions and the way it's laid out. So, what would happen I guess if we were, if you had to enforce, if you enforce that, and we either push the building back and start encroaching in here, we'd have to kind of push things around a little bit, make the building small, slightly smaller would be the result. I'm not entirely sure.

Same thing with commercial building, I, we would lose some depth and that would make the building less attractive, you know, to the potential to the current tenants and potential future tenants. But I guess that's what it would be done. I guess we're saying that we don't believe that it's a great idea for these uses but I'm not saying it can't be done but it would have an impact on the building size, I think.

Male Speaker: Okay, I was just concerned because that's obviously the purpose of that is the aesthetics of the building and you have to sacrifice the aesthetics or decide not to sacrifice the aesthetics would be the functional effect on the buildings themselves. Just that they'd be a little smaller and have a little less usable space on the inside, correct?

Dibble: I think so. I'm kind of answering that question on the slide Mr. Teagno, so I don't know if I could squeeze things further and push things and see if that would work. I will say to your point that when you see the buildings, I'm hoping that the attractiveness of the buildings and the consistency with what we have on Phase I overrides the potential for landscaping, you know, being the attractive element that the buildings themselves kind of standout, so.

Andy Del Vecchio: I can also jump in, this is Andy Del Vecchio for minutes just to remind everybody that provision that shows up or it doesn't actually even show up in the AHPUD Zone. It is included by reference and I hate to admit it but essentially it was an oversight to allow that provision to get carried over in the AHPUD Zone because it was a provision that was originally crafted and intended for the corporate headquarter properties to require those large corporate campuses to have landscape in between the sidewalk, the front elevation of the buildings in that corporate campus setting. It was never intended for the design that ultimately took hold in the AHPUD Zone and it did get carried over.

And it was something that was challenged by the AMP Competitor at the time the board granted that relief in Phase I. And the court did find that it was an appropriate relief to be granted in the context of this development. So, just a little bit of history of that provision and how it yeah stuck around but probably shouldn't have. But ultimately the variance relief was upheld by the courts.

Male Speaker: Okay, thank you.

Chairman: Thank you. Mrs. [indiscernible] [03:45:33].

Female Speaker: Yes, I share the concerns with the other board members regarding the entrance and exit to the complex. I also was going to talk about a drop off point like Mayor Ghassali [03:45:49]. But if that's the way this facility is known to operate that's not really a concern. The commercial building is going to have how many tenants in it?

Dibble: Right now, the commercial building has Montel spine and health occupied about half of the building, the rest of the building has not been tended it yet.

Female Speaker: Okay. So, they are not taking the full building but half the building. I absolutely love Phase I, I'm there all the time. I do have concerns with the parking, not that there isn't sufficient parking but I feel sometimes when I'm backing in that parking spaces, the visibility isn't always great. So, cars sometimes like to parking lot and with a daycare and in this Phase that would be my concern is

just, you know, pedestrians getting struck or the in and out of the developments. Of course, coming in and going in through the left and then going by the daycare, I think the traffic flow definitely needs to be considered. But that's my concern, and my only comment.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. Mr. Lintner *[Phonetics]*

Male Speaker: No additional comments or questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. And I think John, I started with you.

John: Yes.

Chairman: Okay, [indiscernible] [03:47:22] a motion to open the meeting to the public.

Male Speaker: Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman before we jump into that if I may, may I, you know, as I've been watching the diagram here. Let me just add that I really feel like the entrance here is going to be a difficult turn, you know, people making if they're coming and they're going to make a right into the, out there then they're making a very, very sharp right turn again. I'd almost prefer to see the entrance to the site without that kind of turn and it's so coming directly into it.

Also, I think that from Phillips that these are just comments now Mr. Chairman that we should probably prohibit people making a left turn into the site. You know, we should only allow right turns into the site in the same way exiting the site, I would think we should only allow right turns exiting the site. And again, I'm just doing this for safety for safety reasons. Again, I'm no traffic engineer. You know, I think very close to, you know close to the intersection too.

Female Speaker: The experience that we've had over the years with limiting maneuvers at intersections like this, where you say right turn only in or out. Unfortunately, cars wind up taking that right hand turn and then look for a parking lot or driveway or somewhere else to turn. And I think with the use that we're talking about, when you're picking up perhaps small children. I don't know if that is really a good plan saying when they leave the site, you can only make a right-hand turn. Even though they may want to go east on Grand Avenue and care not to drive all the way up to Mercedes and then make a right on Mercedes. I think there's room for improvement on the design. But I think restricting the movement is necessarily the answer.

Male Speaker: Okay, you know, I'll still go back to the first thing.

Female Speaker: Yeah, I got you.

Male Speaker: The sharp curve there I think is, I'm not in favor of that at all.

Chairman: And I think as Mr. Dibble's said that's got to be examined closely with post landscaping [overlapping conversation] [03:49:54]. I got it

Male Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Chairman: I do want to open it up to the public. I needed a motion to open the meeting to the public.

Female Speaker: So move.

Chairman: Mrs. [indiscernible] [03:50:05] second, Mr. Culhane, all in favor [overlapping conversation] [03:50:08]. Anyone from the public wish to be heard, Erica, are you spotting anybody?

Erica: I'm not seeing anybody raising their hand.

Chairman: Hey, [indiscernible] [03:50:30] a motion to close the meeting to the public.

Female Speaker: So move.

Male Speaker: [Indiscernible] [03:50:34].

Chairman: Mrs. [indiscernible] [03:50:35]. Mr. Culhane, all in favor, aye. Mr. Del Vecchio, who do you plan to present as your next witness?

Andy Del Vecchio: Mr. Pat, who is from JP II, the architect.

Chairman: All right, why don't we take a 10-minute break and then we will return to here, his testimony. And we'll pick it up from that.

Andy Del Vecchio: Thank you.

Chairman: Thank you.

[Audio blank] [03:51:02] to [03:58:52]

Male Speaker: So question. Mr. Chairman, are you, do you think we're going to finish at 11:00 again tonight? Is that what our target is? You're on mute.

Chairman: Yes, that is the goal.

Male Speaker: Yeah, okay. Okay, because we know we can't finish it tonight, right?

Chairman: No, we're not going to finish it tonight. But I'd like to see how much we can get done in the next 45 minutes.

Male Speaker: Okay.

Chairman: And I may pull the board with respect questions relative to the construction of the crosswalk, the type of material versus the painted walkway. The landscape offers, the five-foot landscape offers, and most importantly the flow of traffic. And I'm going to pull the board on that before we we'll finish up tonight. Okay, let's see how we're doing. Erica, everybody back?

Erica: Waiting on couple.

Male Speaker: I need Mr. Del Vecchio.

Erica: Yeah, we're reading on that.

Chairman: There's the quarter, the quarterback.

Male Speaker: I didn't have [indiscernible] [04:00:14] sorry.

Male Speaker: We just, just had your background.

Chairman: Okay, well, let's see what we can do with respect to architectures. So Mr. Del Vecchio, why don't you present your next witness, please?

Andy Del Vecchio: Yes, I'd like to call Mr. [indiscernible] [04:00:30] and similar to Mr. Dibble, Mr. Pat previously appeared before this board. And it was qualified in the field of architecture. It has to be similar accepted this evening or I can qualify him if you would like.

Male Speaker: He was previously qualified in the last application, Phase I department. What he testified to in terms of his qualifications then have not changed. I think it could be being qualified.

Chairman: Okay, [indiscernible] [04:01:03] accept recommendation the council, please continue, Mr. Del Vecchio.

Andy Del Vecchio: Mr. Pat, you were the project architect for Phase I, correct?

Pat: Yes, I was. And just a quick hello to everyone who was involved in that one, it's good to see you all again.

Chairman: Good to see you also.

Andy Del Vecchio: Mr. Pat, you heard that I attributed certain drawings to you and they were prepared either by you under your supervision for this evening's presentation.

Pat: Yes, they were.

Andy Del Vecchio: And essentially, you were charged with completing this project in each Phase II. And do you believe you've done that in a manner that is not only consistent with the requirements of the AHPUD Design standards but also what was started in Phase I.

Pat: Very, very much so. The buildings, the buildings really continue both the massing and the and the general composition of the buildings consistent with the style and the approach that we had in the first phase.

Chairman: And Mr. Del Vecchio, is Mr. Pat going to share his screen or someone else shared screen?

Andy Del Vecchio: I believe Mr. Pat can do that. Do you have your drawings available, Jamie or I can?

Pat: Yeah. They're with me. I figure out. Does not seem to be sharing.

Chairman: How about Mr. Hippolyta, could you help us out?

Male Speaker: I'm not sure I can, I can try. Which one do you want?

Chairman: New architectural, I guess we're talking about a 101.

Pat: Yeah, apologize. They don't, I have them here but they're just not loading, I'm not sure what the issue is.

Male Speaker: Or so I think. So, 3/26/21 plans?

Pat: Yes.

Male Speaker: Well, let me, I pull them up, I should be like sharing all that. Just takes a second because they're so big.

Male Speaker: I thought we had Mr. Pat's stuff just a second ago.

Male Speaker: Mike, are you able to do it from your end.

Mike: I can't do it either.

Male Speaker: Okay, looks like Pat is about this. Okay, Pat...

Male Speaker: Screen shot and...

Male Speaker: We got, Mr. Pat, we got your stuff.

Pat: Okay, great. Apologies for that.

Male Speaker: I don't see anything.

Male Speaker: You don't.

Male Speaker: No.

Male Speaker: Oh, I'm seeing.

Male Speaker: I see it, John.

Erica: Yeah, I see it as well.

Male Speaker: That's a 101.

Male Speaker: Yeah, I'm looking at a 101, that's correct. That's what I'm looking at right now.

Chairman: I've got it. Okay, why don't we move forward Ms. Del Vecchio.

Andy Del Vecchio: Yes. Here we go.

Chairman: Yeah, okay. Why don't we go in a 101?

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, perfect. Jamie, I think your screen was just bleeding over, okay. Can you start with the design and features for what is known as the commercial building or building I.

Jamie: Sure. So, again as I mentioned earlier the, both the buildings continue the sort of form and style that we started in the first phase which was really drawing on agrarian and equestrian architecture farm type buildings that are reminiscent of the history of the site and the pure a farm. And this building is no different in fact this building is very similar in nature to a couple of the buildings in the first phase. It has a large gambrel roof barn like form and also similar to one of the treatments we used in the first days. And as Mr. Dibble mentioned earlier this building is sort of pushed into the earth in its rear, and so the back of the building is actually pushed into the rising grade on Grand Avenue.

So, you can see in the elevations here, this central image here is actually the rear of the building. This is a very beautiful stone that we used. It's consistent with the stone that was used in the first Phase to push in along the grade. And there's a flat roof portion of the building in the rear and then the standing seam metal roof football. The principal elevation as was testified to earlier phase as south. And that's this upper elevation here. On this elevation, we continue that stone treatment at the base so the buildings have very clear bass middle and top. They are clad in cement fiber siding. This is the same high-quality kind of material pallets essentially the same palette that we used in the first days.

There is exterior lighting on the buildings, storefront and windows facing the sidewalk area. And then again that standing seam roof. And in this building to the, what would be the west end of the building sort of tucked in adjacent to the building is it's loading area, that loading area has a wood trellis above it. This is a glue laminated trellis similar to the wood accents that you've seen already in the first Phase buildings, so again, really tying this site back to Phase I from a standpoint of the architectural both in terms of the form and style, but also the material palette and general look and feel of the buildings.

Andy Del Vecchio: Jamie, can you just tell us where the mechanicals for this building is located?

Jamie: Yeah, so as you can see on the rear of this building, I mentioned there's this sort of flat zone, these side elevations, it's a little more apparent here. This is a screening parapet above the stone and the mechanicals would be tucked in behind that on the flat roof that's behind this screen wall, if you will. Again, this is very similar to what was done with the buildings along Mercedes in Phase I.

Andy Del Vecchio: Essentially, those mechanicals are located in the included in the enclosed roof structure.

Jamie: Correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: Now, the portion of the building that phase Grand Avenue, we, that is the retaining wall that we see at the lower level and in frustration above.

Jamie: Yes, this is the sort of retaining condition here again clad in a manufactured stone. And then this is the administrated screen wall above and then you're seeing the reforms and a portion of the flat façade.

Andy Del Vecchio: The side of the building high that faces Phillips Parkway that is the portion or the building facade that shows the demonstration along that elevation, correct?

Jamie: Correct.

Andy Del Vecchio: And the other side elevation is the side of the building that essentially faces the loading zone and for that reason does not have any fence situation or windows proposed in that area.

Jamie: That's correct. This westernmost wall does not have administration. But in fact is, you know, is sort of augmented if you will or accented with that glue laminated trust element that sits above the [indiscernible] [04:10:31].

Andy Del Vecchio: And a portion of that elevation is blocked by the retaining wall that creates the loading area on the opposite side of that building wall.

Jamie: At that point as Mike testified to earlier, the building is pushed into the ground some four or five ft.

Andy Del Vecchio: Okay, let's switch if we made to building H and review the architectural features there. Before we do that, Jamie, we'll go back one second and can you identify where the medical uses proposed to take place in which portion of Building-I is still unleased? Go back to your first sheet, if you would.

Jamie: I'm trying.

Male Speaker: Yes. Okay.

Male Speaker: Your files must be pretty big.

Male Speaker: Yes, I apologize, I did not realize they were going to be this difficult. I will see what I can do to compress them.

Male Speaker: Here we go. Either that you need a faster computer to display.

Male Speaker: It's pretty fast computer. I think it's a zoom issue, because if I'm not on a call, okay, in any event that, like you, Andy, you were saying.

Male Speaker: Can you identify and I guess by pointing to where the sign is, where's the portion of the building to occupy by [indiscernible] [04:12:32] and which portion is on lease?

Male Speaker: Right. So this is the floor plan over here. Again, Grand Avenue is to the rear Phillips parkways would be over here to the right. And the Spine Center is currently looking at taking this right-hand half of the building roughly both these first two bays. And so they would, on the facade occupy this half of the building, you can see their signage if I was trying to zoom in here. Their signage is located over this store.

Male Speaker: Okay. And let's go ahead then and switch over to building H, which is the daycare center. Now Jamie has this load. So let me just ask you a couple of questions. You were challenged with the daycare center building where you're not with applying the architectural theme for this entire center to a childcare use that has its own unique set of needs and requirements in order to be functional. Is that correct?

Jamie: Yes, it is. The childcare center has a very sort of prescribed layout. They essentially have a prototype that they use on every site that is pre-determined in terms of the location of the classrooms, the corridors, the office spaces internal to the building. And so we've worked very closely with Everbrook and their representatives and their interior architects to accommodate the footprint of that prototype and work with that program specifically within the building.

One of the key implications of that, as you'll see as I walk you through the elevations is that there are some areas that necessarily need to be solid walled on the exterior. Obviously, none of us want. You know, the children there our community to be behind storefront type windows and be essentially on display. So the windows in the building are considerably smaller. And the portions of the wall are left solid in order to hang educational materials, boards, other things inside the classrooms all of which is kind of a pre-determined program for Everbrook.

Male Speaker: All right, so please walk us through the elevations they've loaded.

Jamie: So again, the L shaped building creates a kind of courtyard on in conjunction with the retaining walls and the civil features that are and landscape features on the site, the retaining wall and the retention basin. It actually creates a very, very nice solution for a secured courtyard area behind the building for the children. The architecture, wrapping around that with an entrance at the corner. So in this top elevation you're looking at the East facade, this is the facade you'd be driving out as you enter the site.

And you can see that the entrance is in this northeastern corner. There is a kind of recessed porch, if you will. So the roof comes all the way out to the building line with appear. But the actual physical entrance and doorway to the building is tucked in underneath that. So you'd be out of the weather as you were entering and exiting the building.

The building is a series of gables. And this particular building really harkens more to the kind of equestrian stable like architecture that, again, was initiated in the first days of the project that really carries into this so that if I could characterize it that way, the gambrel building that we looked at

previously is a bit like the buildings toward the Wegmans on the upper half of the site. This building we think is a bit like the buildings that are against Mercedes in terms of its reforms and basic fenestration, there are a series of windows and doorways. These are doors directly into the classrooms and enable them to move children in and out of the building along the sidewalks and safely into the play areas.

And then, again, the building is clad in cement fiber siding, painted siding, with standing seam metal roof and the same stone water table, across the facade, that facade essentially repeats itself to the north. So both of the kind of public faces, if you will, of the building that are visible from Grand visible from Philips, those facades are very highly articulated, as you can see a lot going on dormer roofs, multiple gables, windows, doors, et cetera. And, of course, the signage for the occupancy.

The rear of the building, facing into the courtyard is indeed a little bit simpler. So you can see that the rear really only has the doors and windows but a much simpler fenestration really facing that, that interior courtyard, these facades are fundamentally not publicly visible.

And I know there was a comment about the West facade in particular, not having the amount of glazing, we have asked, I think, for relief from that requirement in the ordinance. And the reason is that these facades if you look at the site plan carefully, you'll see that they're, they're essentially facing retaining walls that are part of the step down on the site from the retention basins.

Male Speaker: Jamie, the design other than the fenestration, or the glazing or windows, two elevations that face into the courtyard, and above the retaining walls, do they otherwise fully comply with the requirements of Montvale design standards for this zone?

Jamie: Yes, I believe they do. They're still very, you know, very handsome buildings, very handsome facades with a stone base that carries throughout the entire building. So none of the sort of fake treatment that you sometimes see where something's just stuck on one facade and doesn't even turn the corner. These are all the same materials wrapping all the way around the building, the stone base wraps the building, the cement siding, stays the same all the way around the building. So really just a simpler look on these more utilitarian sides that that face the courtyard.

And remember that this whole area that these are facing is either a play area that the children will be in or in fact, you're literally, for example, on this wall, I think we're under 10 feet away from the adjacent retaining wall on the site. So effectively, you're not even going to see this facade, but it does, in fact, still comply from a standpoint of all of the high-quality materials carrying all the way around the building.

Male Speaker: And with regard to the HVAC equipment, where's that proposed to be located for this building?

Jamie: So in this building, there is a small, flat roofed area that sits between the two reforms. And it's a little bit hard to see. But essentially, it would be behind this half of triangle here on the facade, there, there is essentially a flat roof back behind here, and the HVAC units will sit in that flat roof zone.

Male Speaker: All right. And the signage that is proposed for the school is located on what are called either end of the corner entrance in the gable above that main entrance doorway, one facing Phillips and the second facing Grand Avenue, correct?

Jamie: That's correct.

Male Speaker: Okay, I have no further questions of Mr. Pat at this point. Ms. Chairman make them available to the board and his professional for your questions?

Chairman: Very good. Thank you. Hey, and I believe I'm starting now with Mayor Ghassali [phonetic]. Mayor, do you have any questions of the architect? Mayor, you have done.

Mayor Ghassali: No questions, no, thank you.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. I'm just going to go in the order the way you came up. Mr. Teagno.

Teagno: Yes, just a quick question. In case of emergency in the building, and the children and staff would have to be evacuated if their evacuation route was into the play area, which is surrounded by building walls and retaining walls. If they couldn't get back into the building, is there another way that they could get out of that square?

Jamie: Yes, the square is sort of open at this and down here, if I can draw on this. Well, first, let me say that the interior of the building is such that there's an L shaped corridor that sort of does this, right and has classrooms arrayed off it. And so from any given space in the building, you could exit this way out to the front of the building, or you could exit this way out to the front of the building. And in fact, those same passages are available for the courtyard itself. So there's, there's egress in two directions, both interior and from the courtyard area.

Teagno: Okay, great. I was under the impression from the description that the retaining walls were enclosing the place.

Jamie: The retaining walls really sit one of them forgive my crude drawings here, but I think it helps one of them sits here. It's a good distance from the building, and then it comes this way. And I, you know, over here, it's tighter, but there's actually still an exterior passage there.

Teagno: Okay, perfect. Thank you very much.

Chairman: Hey, thank you. Mr. Stefanelli.

Stefanelli: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I have no questions for this.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. Mrs. Curry.

Councilmember Curry: I have no questions.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Huseynov.

Huseynov: I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Culhane.

Culhane: Yes, depending on the [indiscernible] [04:25:18] ability of that planting strip that the ordinance calls for.

Jamie: I'm glad you asked me that actually. One of the things that we actually thought was superior in terms of this site plan is and I don't know how many of you recall the much earlier conceptual site plan with the landscaping facility. But this site plan actually opens up quite a bit more and particularly from Grand you have an opportunity really to view into the site and to see this building and to look across that that lovely landscaped area that accents the parking area, and has the trellis hurdler in it and has the windmill in it.

And from Philips, you look up into the site, and you see significant landscape in the middle of the site. And you have views past these two buildings that are juxtaposed from each other as opposed to sort of one strip of building along one side of the site. And the reason I think that that is so superior, is it allowed for a lot more green space out on the site, big areas of green, that are augmenting the parking and breaking it up. And if we are asked to comply with the five-foot planning strip.

I think the result of it is we're going to lose those nice areas that are consolidated and more meaningful out on the site. You're going to basically tear up all the green space into these little tiny strips against the building where you really don't get the same kind of big, ultimate mature trees that can grow in these larger areas.

And I mean, I would defer to treaty and the landscape architect on some of this, but we actually think this is a much superior solution. And I also think, frankly, that the landscaping around these buildings, particularly around this building, it's really not helpful, you're going to have little kids picking at it and try to eat leaves, you're going to have trash in it, you're going to have other maintenance issues that you really get away from when the building itself is just very clean, and sits on the site. And the landscape is consolidated into these bigger areas where they're more meaningful. So that's, that's my professional opinion on it.

Culhane: No other comments, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Zitelli [Phonetic].

Zitelli: I guess I'll just ask the question about solar panels. Is there any possibility of getting any solar panels in here it's going to be cosmetically or aesthetically?

Jamie: I wish I could say that we were doing something more sustainable with perspective that but we're not. Everbrook just it's not in their program for their facility. We're certainly looking at very energy efficient systems throughout. But solar panels did not did not really enter into the discussion. And with respect to the retail building, the dilemma there is that we still don't even know who half the tenants are. We know the spine centers going in, but.

Zitelli: Yes, we just opened up a little more around this statically pleasing, so I understand.

Chairman: Okay, thank you.

Zitelli: No other questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Carter Quest [phonetic].

Cudequest: I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Lintner.

Lintner: I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Mayor I started with you.

Mayor Ghassali: Okay. To open up to the public [indiscernible] [04:29:16] motion open meeting to the public.

Chairman: So moved.

Chairman: Mrs. Cudequest, seconds to Culhane, all in favor? Aye. Anyone from the public wish to be heard with regard to the testimony of the architect this evening? Erica, you picking up anything?

Erica: No one's raising their hand.

Chairman: Okay. I'd like to entertain a motion close the meeting to the public.

Female Speaker: So move.

Male Speaker: Parker.

Chairman: Mrs. Cudequest seconded Mr. Culhane, all in favor? Sorry.

Green: Mr. Chairman, may I ask this witness one question?

Chairman: Sure.

Female Speaker: Mr. Pat, can you tell me how many children this facility will be licensed for?

Pat: I have to confess to you I don't know that number.

Male Speaker: Ms. Green I did ask the operators what their levels of stem of children would be. They believe that on average, their facilities in New Jersey are occupied at about 135 at the max.

Green: Okay, thank you.

Male Speaker: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a follow up question to what Darlene?

Chairman: Sure.

Male Speaker: Mr. Del Vecchio, I don't know whether it would be probably wouldn't be this witness the architect but maybe the operator of the daycare facility will be getting any testimony concerning security issues pertaining to the facility and has the applicant or the proposed operator of the daycare has any consultation with the Montvale Police department concerning security issues.

Del Vecchio: I do have an operator are a representative of Everbrook who is in charge of operations. If there are questions, we can ask her to answer them. There hasn't been consultation with the police department because we don't have a site plan approval yet. We would of course expect them now introduce themselves and avail themselves of the expertise of the Montvale Police Department if they are approved.

Male Speaker: I think there should be some testimony placed on the record concerning that issue. Considering what happened elsewhere, I think it's important to have information given to the board on that particular matter.

Chairman: Mr. Del Vecchio, we only have about another 12 or 13 minutes or so left? Do you have another witness this evening who could present on direct anything meaningful in that short period of time?

Del Vecchio: I think our landscape consultant can give you a good overview of the landscaping in that timeframe.

Chairman: Okay. Why don't we do that, and then we'll cut off direct sharply at 11.

Del Vecchio: Great, I'd like to call Trini Rodriguez and like the two witnesses that preceded her. Trini did testify in phase one. She's a licensed landscape architect. And I would ask that she be accepted as an expert in that field again.

Male Speaker: She was qualified last time I see no problem with that.

Chairman: Set recommendation to council, please continue.

Del Vecchio: Trini like the other witnesses, I did make reference to certain plans that were prepared by your organization Parker Rodriguez, they were prepared by you or under your supervision.

Trini Rodriguez: Yes, that's correct.

Del Vecchio: And you participated in the design, or the redesign of certain landscaping in phase one, as well as the design of the landscaping in North market. And you've been asked to carry the design theme into phase two here, correct?

Trini Rodriguez: That's correct.

Del Vecchio: I asked you to just give us a overview of your landscape plans. And as you heard, there is some concern, this evening about the five-foot planting strip across the front of the buildings, I encourage you to offer your opinion on that topic as well.

Trini Rodriguez: Good evening, everyone. So one of the sort of goals of this next phase was really to make it as consistent to phase one and to make your read as a continuation and completion of this actually wonderful project, I think many before me have, you know, agreed that really, it is a really wonderful environment. I mean, I actually work in a lot of areas throughout the country. And I have to admit this is a very, very effective sort of mixed-use development that really kind of makes, you know, Montvale, you know, very special place.

So with that in mind, I think the treatments for the landscape was really continue that sort of lush environment that has been proposed around the perimeter. The project, both along Grand as Phillips Parkway, I don't know, Mike, if you want to maybe put the graphic ahead that color. So in that, you know, and kind of.

Mike: I was just pulling up my landscape screen for you.

Trini Rodriguez: Correct, thank you.

Mike: You're drawing. Is that work?

Trini Rodriguez: So just kind of in continuation of that it's a mixture of evergreen, we have a very strong perimeter treatment. That is a combination of planting, fencing walls. There is a very clear circulation diagram for pedestrian movements throughout the site internally as well it's connecting to the exterior, just as Michael was suggesting. Those entrances are especially that one is punctuated by two peers we create in a very strong pedestrian gateway into the site. That circulation system has given us all tied together, leading people to the front doors of all of these buildings.

Something that we should emphasize is that once we were in inside of this next phase of the development, it was important that really recall phase one grading you know, sort of a retail environment. And you saw how the architecture and the engineering explanation really reinforcing, you know, this idea of yet that extension of phase one, and creating this sort of interface between the pedestrian connection the pedestrian environment and the buildings themselves. [Indiscernible] [04:36:26] needs to Pat sort of described before the buildings were articulated in such a fashion really helped sort of reinforce that pedestrian orientation really, lots of doors as he described them on the childcare center, as well as the as the commercial building.

So some of the features that were discussed before on this new pedestrian access and, you know, spine of Grand Avenue was punctuated by this sort of Central Island, which has a seating area, a pergola. And then also, we have a windmill, which is really a feature that is also present in phase one of the project we're using, you know, an element that is the same, it's actually 32 feet in height. And really the idea to sort of create these iconic elements that tie the two projects together both, you know, the architecture

does that as well as the landscape elements. I want to excuse myself one second, because my light just turned off.

So a couple of things that were discussed, as you can see, on the plan was at the entrance of the project, most of the plantings on that area are low plantings, they're actually all, most of them are below 18 inches, so you'll still have a lot of visibility. But given the discussions that we've had, I think it may be appropriate to even further open that up, which we will revise this planting to make sure we can provide as much visibility as we possibly can to make all of these movements as safe as possible. Now that we're in this area, just want to briefly describe how kind of a landscape helps direct people also by just sort of delineating those movements with the plantings, as you can see here.

And then lastly, just sort of going back to sort of a rear of the daycare, I think, James described the movements within that. The nice thing about the layout is that the building itself creates a very strong edge to this area, creating a very safe environment in the rear for the kids where they're open. So the perimeter is fence with gate and control axes are the two points that were described before, and then creates a safe environment protected by both the retaining wall in the rear, the building itself, and then the fence. We have a number of play areas that have been worked out with the help of the future tenant. And you know, we're providing different play areas for different age groups, as you can see.

Chairman: Okay. Mr. Del Vecchio, anything further on direct with this witness?

Del Vecchio: Just one question, if I can Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Sure.

Del Vecchio: Trini, you heard the question asked about is it better I think as Mr. Pat framed it, is it better to have these large areas of landscaping created as pockets within the parking lot or to provide the strip planting across the front of the buildings in your opinion?

Trini Rodriguez: So in my opinion, I think what this was really set up to do is I mentioned before, it's sort of a continuation phase one. I personally think that this really engages the pedestrian feeling of, you know, and accessibility to these buildings. The planting on these islands was very specific because what it does is create rooms. What we try to do is create a sort of parking rooms and really break up the parking so it didn't feel like a large area of paved contiguous paved area. So the planting was really strategic began to create sort of a series of rooms within the project.

Del Vecchio: And you believe that produces a better alternative for this project than strictly complying with the zoning code?

Trini Rodriguez: I do.

Del Vecchio: No further questions at this point, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Okay. Thank you. Any board members have any questions of Ms. Rodriguez?

Male Speaker: Mr. Chairman, I get many call on happy comments about the tulips on faith from phase one. The corners by Wegmans. They look nice in the spring and all that. Are there any tulips or any similar planting to phase one?

Chairman: Miss Rodriguez?

Trini Rodriguez: We actually do have seasonal planting again on now. I better check that we do have tulips because tulips are things that get planted kind of seasonally because many of them are not don't return, but we'll certainly make sure those are there because I agree they're really nice to have that seasonal punch.

Male Speaker: Thank you.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. I for one agree with Ms. Rodriguez with regards to the planting areas in the parking areas. Unfortunately, some developments that we've done in town, we did not pay as much attention to creating those planting islands. And we wind up with the sea of black. And that's exactly what we don't want to see. And as originally it was indicated that this was going to be a landscape, retail center greenhouses, we kind of envisions a sea of green. And I'd like to maintain as much green as possible, at least in my opinion. And I find the islands to be far more important than putting the five-foot strips in front of the buildings. I think we could achieve more in the island approach. We will revisit this Mr. Del Vecchio. But before we close out, I do want to ask board members and let me see if we could get back to where we were here.

There are opinion on a couple of questions that came up. Number one, the crosswalks that are shown on the plan, I believe the applicant indicated they wanted to make markings or striping on the pavement designating the crosswalk. The applicant on Mr. Del Vecchio on behalf of the applicant stated that if it were the choice of the board to go with something other than that, I presume, such as brick pavers as we've done elsewhere on site. It would certainly be my preference to go with pavers rather than striping of the blacktop. Anyone disagree with that? Okay, so Mr. Del Vecchio I think that answers that question.

I think it was pretty unanimous in what I heard the concern of the board members with respect to traffic circulation, not only from a visibility point of view, but just negotiating these parking areas with a specific use. I'm going to ask that the Mr. Dibble and the traffic experts look at it very, very closely to address the concerns that you've heard this evening from the board members.

I think there may be a better way of laying it out than what's shown. I'm not looking to reduce the sizes of the buildings. I think the buildings are properly sized. It is an irregular shaped piece of property. But we do have to make certain that the flow of traffic certainly gives priority to the safe passage of vehicles and pedestrians at all times. So we're going to ask that you look at that.

And then finally, with respect to the board's opinion, I stated mine, I really don't have much of a problem. But when it was said that if we went with the five-foot strips on these buildings, we'd be taking away from the bigger landscape areas. That's something I don't want to do. And I do want to pull the board as to their opinion on that to hopefully give the applicant a little bit of direction with

regard to that. And I'm going to start John, what, do you prefer more of the landscape islands or the five-foot strips as per ordinance?

John: Landscaped islands.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Zitelli.

Zitelli: I go with the islands also, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Thank you, Ms. Cudequest.

Cudequest: I'll go with the islands.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Lintner.

Lintner: I agree the islands.

Chairman: Thank you, Mayor Ghassali.

Mayor Ghassali: I agree.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Teagno.

Teagno: Yes, I agree with the islands.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Stefanelli.

Stefanelli: Islands.

Chairman: Thank you, Mrs. Curry.

Councilmember Curry: Islands.

Chairman: Thank you, Mr. Huseynov.

Huseynov: I agree with the island.

Chairman: Okay. So I think those were all the questions and comments that I heard Mr. Del Vecchio, is there anything else you would like for me to pull the board on? So that when your people do revise plans, they may change it accordingly?

Del Vecchio: No further on the polling, Mr. Chairman, but I would ask through you whether or not it would be appropriate and acceptable if I have our consultants reach out for Mr. Dibble, Mr. Hipolit, sorry, to discuss the traffic issues, so we can try to come to a consensus.

Chairman: Yes, I think that will be necessary because no one seems to have a very specific recommendation as to what should be done. And we're asking for Mr. Dibble's assistance, and the oversight of Mr. Hippolyta its organization to come up with the best possible plan. So on behalf of the board, I have no difficulty we have no difficulty with the two professionals communicating. Now I understand that there are revised plans, is that correct?

Del Vecchio: Well, we have submitted revised plans in advance of this meeting, along with our comment letter, responding to the first set of comments issued by Mr. Hipolit. If there are any open items after Mr. Hipolit looks at that we will of course, address those promptly.

Chairman: Yes, I'm not looking to put you through the ordeal of chopping down a lot of trees and making a lot of prints of plans with revisions. I'd like to see if we could incorporate as many of the result, revisions into the least amount of paper.

Stefanelli: I also have a comment, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman: Sure, Mr. Stefanelli.

Stefanelli: We're changing what was not going to be a landscape or greenhouse type of thing. We're changing to a school. And what I hear is, we have 135 kids, you know, in the school, and I would assume we're going to have a rush in the morning, we're going to have a rush after work. And I have a concern about, you know, those kids coming in and out at that time.

And I guess the question is, if it's going to be traffic, I know most schools we either have like, you know, something, something that. The question is, is there going to be small buses or are we going to have handicapped children coming in? So those are things that I think we need a traffic expert, and have somebody have a conversation about that?

Chairman: Yes, I agree with that. But I also believe that because of that unique nature of the use, that we do have a representative of the operator explain to us exactly how they operate the school. It's somewhat unique. I remember early discussions about it with the age groupings and how they break the soul lab. So Mr. Hipolit, can you arrange to have someone from Everbrook available at the next meeting to deal with this?

Hipolit: It's really you mean Mr. Del Vecchio?

Chairman: I'm sorry. You're showing to close on my screen. Hollywood stars.

Male Speaker: I can only reach across the square like we used to be able to.

Chairman: I presume you will have somebody come, correct.

Male Speaker: Yes.

Chairman: Okay, with that said, I think we've done it for tonight. Erica, I'd like to see if we can move this as quickly as possible. Mr. Del Vecchio, are you and your witnesses okay with carrying to our next regularly scheduled meeting, which is in two weeks.

Del Vecchio: For now, yes. I just have to re-check with Mr. Dibble. He may have a conflict that night.

Dibble: No, not in two weeks.

Del Vecchio: Okay. Then we're good.

Chairman: Okay. And Mr. Price are you good for two weeks?

Price: I am Mr. Chairman, thank you, good evening.

Chairman: Good evening. So, why don't we, so that further notices require reliance on this announcement that this public hearing will be continued to that date which is, I'm sorry I don't have a calendar.

Male Speaker: 4/20.

Chairman: 4/20. And again, no further notice will be provided other than this announcement. And Mr. Del Vecchio if there is in fact, a change please reach out to Erica so that we have to move a way, we have to move it.

Del Vecchio: Yes, absolutely. Thank you and thank you to the board this evening.

Chairman: Okay, thank you. Have a good evening everyone.

Del Vecchio: You too.

Male Speaker: Thank you.

Chairman: We just have to close out our meeting folks. I believe we have made all the announcement that we have to make.